U. S. Congress.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 90—PART 10

JUNE 13, 1944, TO SEPTEMBER 8, 1944

(PAGES A2971 TO A3942)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1944

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

APR 23 '45

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Address by the President on Opening of the Fifth War Loan Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President last night in connection with the opening of the Fifth War Loan drive.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All our fighting men overseas today have their appointed stations on the far-flung battle fronts of the world. We at home have ours, too. We need, and are proud of, our fighting men—most decidedly. But during the anxious times ahead let us not forget that they need us, too.

It goes almost without saying that we must continue to forge the weapons of victory—the hundreds of thousands of items, large and small, essential to the waging of the war. This has been the major task from the very start. It is still a major task. This is the very worst time for any war worker to think of leaving his machine or to look for a peacetime job.

And it goes almost without saying, too, that we must continue to provide our Government with the funds necessary for waging war not only by the payment of taxes—which, after all, is an obligation of citizenship—but also by the purchase of War bonds—an act of free choice which every citizen has to make for himself under the guidance of his own conscience.

Whatever else any of us may be doing, the purchase of War bonds and stamps is something all of us can do and should do to help win the war.

I am happy to report tonight that it is something which nearly everyone seems to be doing. Although there are now approximately 67,000,000 persons who have or earn some form of income (including the armed forces), 81,000,000 persons have already bought War bonds. They have bought more than 600,000,000 individual bonds. Their purchases have totaled more than $32,000,000,000. These are the purchases of individual men, women, and children. Anyone who would have said this was possible a few years ago would have been put down as a starry-eyed visionary. Of such visions, however, is the stuff of America fashioned.

Of course, there are always pessimists with us. I am reminded of the fact that after the fall of France in 1940 I asked for the production by the United States of 50,000 airplanes per year. I was called crazy—it was said that the figure was fantastic; that it could not be done. Today we are building airplanes at the rate of 100,000 a year.

There is a direct connection between the bonds you have bought and the stream of men and equipment now rushing over the English Channel for the liberation of Europe. There is a direct connection between your War bonds and every part of this global war today.

Tonight, therefore, on the opening of this Fifth War Loan drive, it is appropriate for us to take a broad look at this panorama of world war, for the success or failure of the drive is going to have so much to do with the speed with which we can accomplish victory and peace.

While I know that the chief interest tonight is centered on the English Channel and on the beaches and farms and cities of Normandy, we should not lose sight of the fact that our armed forces are engaged on other battle fronts all over the world, and that no one front can be considered alone without its proper relation to all.

It is worth while to make over-all comparisons with the past. Compare today with just 2 years ago—June 1942. At that time Germany was in control of practically all of Europe, and was steadily driving the Russians back toward the Ural Mountains. Germany was practically in control of north Africa and the Mediterranean, and was beating at the gates of the Suez Canal and the route to India. Italy was still an important military and supply factor—as subsequent, long campaigns proved.

Japan was in control of the western Aleutian Islands; and in the South Pacific was knocking at the gates of Australia and New Zealand—and also threatening India. She had seized control of nearly one-half of the Central Pacific.

American armed forces on land and sea and in the air were still very definitely on the defensive, and in the building-up stage. Our allies were bearing the heat and the brunt of the attack.

In 1942 Washington heaved a sigh of relief that the first War bond issue had been cheerfully oversubscribed by the American people. In those days America was still hearing from many amateur strategists and political critics, some of whom were doing more good for Hitler than for the United States.

Today we are on the offensive all over the world—bringing the attack to our enemies.

In the Pacific, by relentless submarine and naval attacks, amphibious thrusts, and ever-mounting air attacks, we have deprived the Japs of the power to check the momentum of our ever-growing and ever-advancing military forces. We have reduced their shipping by more than 3,000,000 tons. We have overcome their original advantage in the air. We have cut off from a return to the homeland tens of thousands of beleaguered Japanese troops who now face starvation or surrender. We have cut down their naval strength, so that for many months they have avoided all risk of encounter with our naval forces.

True, we still have a long way to Tokyo. But, carrying out our original strategy of eliminating our European enemy first and then turning all our strength to the Pacific, we can force the Japanese to unconditional surrender or to national suicide much more rapidly than has been thought possible.

Turning now to our enemy who is first on the list for destruction—Germany has her back against the wall, in fact three walls at once.

On the south, we have broken the German hold on central Italy. On June 4 the city of Rome fell to the Allied armies. Allowing the enemy no respite, the Allies are now pressing hard on the heels of the Germans as they retreat northward in ever-growing confusion.

On the east, our gallant Soviet Allies have driven the enemy back from the lands which were invaded 3 years ago. Great Soviet armies are now initiating crushing blows.

Overhead, vast Allied air fleets of bombers and fighters have been waging a bitter air war over Germany and western Europe. They have had two major objectives: To destroy German war industries which maintain the German armies and air forces; and to shoot the German Luftwaffe out of the air. As a result German production has been whittled down continuously, and the German fighter force now has only a fraction of its former power.

This great air campaign, strategic and tactical, will continue, with increasing power.

On the west, the hammer blow which struck the coast of France last Tuesday morning was the culmination of many months of careful planning and strenuous preparation.

Millions of tons of weapons and supplies and hundreds of thousands of men assembled in England are now being poured into the great battle in Europe.

From the standpoint of our enemy we have achieved the impossible. We have broken through their supposedly impregnable wall in northern France. The assault has been costly in men and materials. Some of our landings were desperate adventures; but from the advices received so far, the losses were lower than our commanders had estimated would occur. We have established a firm foothold and are now prepared to meet the inevitable counterattacks of the Germans with power and confidence. We all pray that we will have far more than a firm foothold.

Americans have all worked together to make this day possible.

The liberation forces now streaming across the channel and up the beaches and down

the highways of France are using thousands and thousands of planes and ships and tanks and heavy guns. They are carrying with them many thousands of items needed for their dangerous, stupendous undertaking. There is a shortage of nothing—nothing. This must continue.

What has been done in the United States since those days of 1940, when France fell, in raising and equipping and transporting our fighting forces and in producing weapons and supplies for war has been nothing short of a miracle. It was largely due to American teamwork, teamwork among capital and labor and agriculture, between the armed forces and the civilian economy, indeed among all of them.

And everyone who bought a War bond helped—and helped mightily!

There are still many people in the United States who have not bought War bonds or who have not bought as many as they can afford. Everyone knows for himself whether he falls into that category or not. In some cases his neighbors know also. To the consciences of those people, this appeal by the President of the United States is very much in order.

All of the things which we use in this war, everything we send to our fighting allies, costs money—a lot of money. One sure way every man, woman, and child can keep faith with those who have given, and are giving, their lives is to provide the money which is needed to win the final victory.

I urge all Americans to buy War bonds without stint. Swell the mighty chorus to bring us nearer to victory!

Bureaucratic Government Leads to Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED J. DOUGLAS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a soldier in the service:

Have you seen the Reader's Digest for February 1944? There is an article in there entitled "You Can't Pay Workers That Much." It tells how Government bureaus are dictating to an efficient American manufacturing concern and thereby would reduce its efficiency. Read it and see if your blood doesn't boil.

Now, what I would like to know is, if we are fighting a war against dictatorship, why do we permit it inside our country? Isn't an enemy within more dangerous than one without? If we are going to tolerate dictatorship anyway, wouldn't it be a lot cheaper if we did not wage a war against it? It seems ridiculous to me.

I think a situation like this demands a strong protest from every thinking citizen to our Senators and Representatives in Washington. Congress is delegated power by the Constitution to manage our affairs and no appointed Government agency should be granted such authority as the Price Adjustment Board and probably countless others.

I wish that you would copy this letter and send it to our Representative and both our Senators. It is not very inspiring to us over here to think of coming home only to find the very thing in our own Government that we have been seeking to destroy during these years that we have been away.

The article from the Reader's Digest follows:

"YOU CAN'T PAY WORKERS THAT MUCH"

(By Roger William Riis)

"What's wrong with working with your hands?" demanded Charlie Wilson, welder. He makes $7,000 a year. "Just because I work with my hands this Treasury fellow says I shouldn't be paid more than $5,000 a year. Did you ever see copper welded?"

He flipped down his helmet and deftly ran a weld around a machine part. Molten copper is fluid as mercury; the operation calls for a surgeon's touch. "A good artist makes more than $5,000 a year, and he works with his hands," Charlie resumed. "Welding copper looks like a kind of art to me."

The Lincoln Electric Co. at Cleveland manufactures welding equipment without which planes and ships could not be built on this war's scale. It is 100-percent piecework. The average Lincoln worker makes $5,400 a year. His weekly pay is rather less than the wage in some adjacent plants, but he gets a year-end bonus which roughly equals his wages. The workers accumulate the bonus, totaling $3,000,000, through efficiency in production. All Lincoln stock is owned by Lincoln executives and workers and their families; they really work for their own company. The 1943 year-end bonus was no wartime innovation; it has been going on for 10 years.

But now both the Treasury and the Price Adjutment Board attack the Lincoln method. The Treasury demands $1,600,000 of the bonus as taxes, on the ground that such rates of pay to workers are not an allowable expense. The P. A. B. (even though Lincoln is not a direct contractor with Government) demands $3,250,000 through renegotiation of prices. But this is no instance of removing surplus funds from a small group of absentee stockholders, who will groan and pay; here the Government attacks the wages of 1,300 workers.

In the course of the argument, the Treasury agent in charge of the case asserted, "A man who works with his hands shouldn't be paid as much as $5,000 a year." Lincoln workers naturally are shocked and indignant over the Treasury's dictum that Government should set an arbitrary distinction between what can be paid to a mechanic and to a white-collar man.

"They tell us production is what will win this war," Charlie Wilson went on. "Well, we produce. None better!"

Lincoln Electric does indeed produce! The company, 47 years old, makes half of all the electric welding equipment used in America. Dollar production per worker has risen in the last 10 years from $5,000 to $28,000; it is now four times that of competitive plants. And they pass the benefits of their efficiency on to the customer. Over these 10 years they have cut the price of a welding machine from $600 to less than $200. Lincoln figures this has saved the Government $60,000,000 since Pearl Harbor.

This is individual initiative functioning at full speed.

It is a basic belief at Lincoln that a man is worth all he can earn. "What we make, we split," says Charlie Wilson.

"Our system is incentive pay at its best," Vice President A. F. Davis comments. "And the War Labor Board specifically exempts from freezing any wages of increased productivity under incentive plans. Yet the Treasury now works up this new theory on us."

"Because we work the way we do," said the export manager, "we can manufacture, ship, pay freight and duty, and lay down our stuff in any country at lower prices than that country can make it. Looks like good business for Americans. Why pick on us?"

"The Government doesn't seem to like our system," diagnosed a toolmaker. "This Treasury man says we have no right to make real money. The renegotiation boys say we have to fork over to them more than all we have saved for the year-end bonus. I don't know which is worse."

Reese Dill, another worker, breathes anger. "If an industry is inefficient and can produce only at a loss, Government gives it what they call a subsidy. I call it a crutch. If a company is very efficient, Government fines us. Do they want to put all industry on crutches?"

To the Treasury, J. F. Lincoln, the company's president, said, "If, instead of 1,300 workers, we had 3,500 and paid them the same amount we pay the 1,300, would you then question our pay rates?"

"No," replied the official.

"Then," said Lincoln, "the real crime for which we are being fined is that through our high productive efficiency we make 2,200 men available for other war effort."

"You can't put words into my mouth," retorted the official.

But there are words—defiant words—in the workers' mouths. It is not a matter of objecting to taxes; the company now files 288 Federal and State corporation tax returns, and the men of course pay their personal taxes. What they object to is being told by Government that they must not receive the results of their own intense labors, because they aren't worth it.

"What do they mean, telling us what we can earn?" demanded Joe Galati, expert coil winder of 20 years' experience. "If any Government orders people around at their jobs that way, ain't that dictatorship? Ain't that what we're fighting against? I thought this was a democracy."

"I hope our company fights this thing till hell freezes over," emphasized Gerald Gilletly. "We make our money by producing. I used to be in another company. We work a lot harder here, but this place is so good that men almost never quit. We work for our money, but the great thing is, we get it. Or we will, if these new ideas don't stop us."

These men are on the company's advisory board, a group of 24 employee-elected employees which functions in internal matters much like a board of directors. It was the advisory board which telegraphed to Washington protesting the fine. They all term it a fine because Lincoln's competitors make no comparable profit and are not therefore in difficulties with Government.

"How much must we reduce our efficiency in order to get down to the level where we won't be fined?" ran the workers' telegram to the Price Adjustment Board, which has not yet found any answer beyond: "You either agree with us or we shall make a unilateral determination."

Ten members of the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means recently criticized such P. A. B. actions as "arrogant, highhanded, and tyrannical."

"Naturally, I'm prejudiced on our side," said welder Jim Macey. "I've benefited plenty. When I came to work here I didn't have a nickel. Now I own a home, and it's paid for."

"I'd like to see the man here who doesn't like our system," agreed George Stevens at the next bench. "Here you don't sit around on your fanny and draw a regular wage. You get just what you work for. If you don't work for it you don't get it. If the other guy loafs it hurts my bonus. But now look at what the Government does!"

"How do I feel about it?" Angus Campbell MacDonald was concise: "At 27 I have two kids, own my home, and have stock in the company."

"What do they think they're doing, these Government bureaus, trying to put a premium on loafing?" demanded another.

"Our way just gives a man a full chance to work," Charlie Wilson sums it up. Lincoln himself says it has brought "employee benefits unparalleled in industry."

"We serve one function only," he says, "and that is production. We are now being penalized for producing at the highest rate in the industry. I wish I didn't have to spend so much time fighting off the Government."

Even as we talked, a carpenter was measuring the office walls for more bookcases to house more Government orders and findings. Bound volumes already on the shelves totaled 48,000 pages of O. P. A., priority, and such matters. Reports on law in 5,400 labor cases ran to 64,613 pages. These pages were clean, unthumbed, for Lincoln has no so-called "labor relations"; the company is comprised entirely of fellow workers.

"We're independent here. The new idea seems to be that no one can do anything without Government O. K.," says Charlie Wilson thoughtfully. "But people don't do so well if they always lean on something. I wouldn't stake up every plant in my garden; pretty soon they couldn't stand alone, and I'd run out of stakes. You ought to see my garden."

It is the Treasury man, with his deprecating theory of a worker's value, who ought to see Charlie's garden.

Charlie's house stands on an attractive suburban street lined with sycamores. You walk from the two-car garage through the vegetable patch and 85-bush rose garden. In the bright living room a log fire burns. On a wall hang three awards which the Wilson's garden won in 1943. In the cellar a storage room is full of garden truck which Mrs. Wilson canned.

It is a beautiful house; it has literally everything—except a mortgage. "Most everybody around here has a mortgage," Wilson says, "but we fellows at the Lincoln shop are lucky—90 percent of us own our homes."

With his company stock, pension, and insurance Charlie can retire in 5 years with a monthly income of $200. Federal Social Security in 10 years—not 5—would give him a maximum of $85.

Through his own study and experiment Charlie has constantly lifted his production. By eliminating one standard but useless motion he raised his output from 40 to 41 rotors an hour. By changing the support for his electrode he knocked off several more minutes per job. Having increased his production, he makes a lot more money than he used to earn. His company says he is worth it.

But Government says 1,300 workers can't be paid $5,400 a year. They work with their hands.

Republican Platform Articles by Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles written by Wendell Willkie dealing with suggested planks for the Republican platform, published in the Washington Post of June 12 and June 13, 1944, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 12, 1944]

WILLKIE OFFERS REPUBLICANS HIS IDEA OF PLATFORM NEEDS

(By Wendell Willkie)

The Republican Party in its beginning arose from the people's urge to build a strong National Government to offset the disruptive, weakening influence of the States' rights doctrine of the Democratic Party. Paradoxically, now, in 1944, that same Republican Party is urged to dedicate itself to the doctrine of States' rights.

In the days of the party's founding, a strong Central Government was necessary to prevent disruption of our political union. Today, a strong Central Government is necessary to prevent disruption of our economic and social structure by a variety of conflicting authorities and interests. In that early day, Federal power was necessary to make us in fact a nation. Today, Federal power is necessary to enable the United States to live and lead in the family of nations.

The debate concerning the concentration of power in Washington is a recurring one. It arises to some extent in every Presidential campaign and becomes particularly violent during war periods. But the sincerity and vigor of the present protest have been occasioned by causes beyond the normal maneuvers of politics or the dislocations created by the Federal assumption of necessary war powers. It arises from more far-reaching causes.

CITES MANY ABUSES

The spectacle of the present administration's arbitrary use of vast authority; the caprices of a government of men grown bold and reckless with the use of power, favoring first one economic group and then another, while subjecting individuals and their rights to the judgment of whims and theories; the manifold evidences of every citizen, even in his own community, of the inefficiencies and reckless extravagances of Federal agents—all these abuses have aroused dissatisfactions among the people which have naturally formed an issue for the opposition party. But we must not be confused as to what the issue is or where the solution lies.

It is not the worn-out issue of States' rights versus strong Federal Government. That is not an issue; that is a relic.

The States have their proper functions and Republicans can be proud that in the administrations of the 25 Republican Governors we have an outstanding example today of competent State government.

But ever since the adoption of the Constitution, with the expansion of the country and the growth of its concerns, there has been a trend toward stronger central government. It was firmly established in the Civil War and became increasingly marked after World War No. 1. President Hoover's committee on recent social trends published a report in 1933 that noted the growth of Federal functions during the three preceding Republican administrations and concluded:

"The shifts from State to Federal authority thus reflect the incapacity of the several States to deal with problems of transportation, communication, merchandising, labor-capital relations, and other vital aspects of social and economic life."

It could hardly be put better.

MUST EXERCISE VAST POWERS

Any national administration in a modern complex industrial society must exercise vast powers. The United States cannot be divided into 48 separate economic units. We cannot, for instance, have 48 different minimum wage laws, nor can we have a variety of State policies if we hope to protect the farmer against the precipitated downward spiral of post-war agricultural prices. Businesses national in scope, social and economic problems that affect all our people alike can only be dealt with on a national basis. The number and character of such problems increase steadily with every step in our industrial growth and expansion. And the more we move, as we must move, into the affairs of the world the more this will be true. For we will be living and functioning and trading in a world where other peoples have granted to their governments the power and the authority to act for them.

TODAY'S ISSUE DIFFERENT

No; the issue today is not the issue of States' rights versus Federal power. The issue is government administered under law. For if economic and social regulations in our modern industrial age must be national in scope to be effective, so their administration must be by law and rule if the citizen is to remain free.

The solution lies in a weakened central Government. It lies in assuring the proper use of the power we have deemed it wise and necessary to grant to the Federal Government. That means a sense of responsibility in administration. It means—and this is important—local administration of numerous Federal functions in their application. And it means primarily the substitution of government by law for government by caprice and unlimited discretions. Under such exercise of Federal power, every citizen, rich or poor, labor leader or factory manager, issuer of securities or wage earner, farmer or businessman may know his rights and may know that in case of dispute they will be adjudicated fairly and equitably under law and rules which at least his lawyer can understand.

CONCERN HUMAN FREEDOM

The issues involved in Federal power and its proper use concern human freedom itself. They are issues which Republicans should state clearly and fight for—not behind an outmoded mask of States' rights or in conjunction with those who use that mask to prevent social and political advance, or those others who, by a pretense of concern for the rights of the States, really seek to weaken the Federal Government to such an extent that the United States will be unable to play its appropriate role in the world of today.

They are issues we should fight for vigorously, frankly, and openly. If we prevail we will have a Government representing us abroad with dignity and power, an instrument of the united will of our people which can lead the world to tangible economic and political cooperation. And at home we shall have a Government with power to vitalize our economy, eliminate its abuses, and, at the same time, preserve and extend the freedom of its citizens.

To build such a Government—strong centrally and just in its administration—is in the finest tradition of the Republican Party.

[From the Washington Post of June 13, 1944]

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

(By Wendell Willkie)

NEGRO'S EQUAL RIGHTS

Under the leadership of Lincoln, in the fires of civil war, the Republican Party's struggle to save the Union was transposed into the great moral issue of human freedom. By the Emancipation Proclamation and by amendments to the Federal Constitution, under Republican leadership, the Negro was legally and constitutionally guaranteed exactly the same

rights as every other citizen of the United States.

It is therefore strange that Republicans, year after year, yield to the old States' rights argument and a narrow interpretation of Federal power, to prevent the passage of Federal statutes which constitute the only practical method by which the Negro's rights can be assured him.

One of these basic rights is the right to vote. Another is the right to live free of the haunting fear and the too-frequent actuality of mob violence. The first can be guaranteed, under the circumstances existing today, only by a Federal statute eliminating State poll taxes and other arbitrary prohibitions against the free exercise of the voting franchise, the other only by a Federal statute making the crime of lynching tryable in Federal courts and punishable by Federal law.

The Republican Party in its platform and in the declarations of its candidates should commit itself unequivocally and specifically to Federal antipoll tax and antilynching statutes.

The Negro people of the United States understandably refuse to accept the technical arguments against cloture in the debates on antipoll tax and antilynching bills, or even the sincere claims of constitutionalism which prevent such just measures from becoming law. And the very fact that the Republican Party was the instrumentality through which the Negroes were given freedom makes them the more resentful that it should join in acts which prevent them from obtaining the substance of freedom.

Nor will they be satisfied by the counsels of patience and the assurances of kindly men that progress has been made, that eventually, through fair treatment and cooperative effort, Negroes will in some distant day obtain the rights which the Constitution itself guarantees to them.

No one who has not stopped seeing and thinking could have missed the events of the past few years that have drawn together 13,000,000 Americans—one-tenth of the Nation—into a determined, purposeful unit.

In that time Negroes have known the bitter humiliation of seeing their men and women, eager to serve in the Nation's armed forces, excluded from some branches of the service or often relegated to menial jobs in the branches to which they have been admitted. They have witnessed the ugly and tragic results of race hatred and riots. They have known the brief security of good jobs at decent wages while their help was needed in order to make the tools of war, only to be filled with deep anxiety for fear that in the readjustments of peace they will be shuffled off into unemployment and poverty.

At the same time, from the battlefields of Italy to the gold-star homes here in America they have learned that there is nothing more democratic than a bullet or a splinter of steel. They want now to see some political democracy as well.

Millions of them distrust the Democratic Party which for years has deprived the Negro of his rights to vote in Atlanta while seeking his vote as the friend of race in Harlem. But in view of the economic advances and social gains which have come to Negroes during the past 12 years, they will not leave that party for vague assurance of future action expressed in pious platitudes, or for a 1944 version of the States' rights doctrine, or even for procedures which, however legally correct, in practical effect indefinitely postpone correction of sore and desperate abuses.

Negro leaders are alert and educated and sophisticated. They know that their problem is a part of the world-wide struggle for human freedom. For their people they ask only their rights—rights to which they are entitled. The Constitution does not provide for first- and second-class citizens.

They are entitled to the same opportunity to acquire an education—an education of the same quality—as that given to other citizens. They should receive the same per capita expenditure of public moneys for schools, housing, health, and hospitalization as is allotted to other citizens.

Their right to work must equal that of any citizen and their reward should be the same as the reward of any other citizen for the same job.

Their economic opportunity should not be limited by their color.

And last, they should have the right of every citizen to fight for his country in any branch of her armed services without discrimination and with equality of opportunity.

These are merely rights that the Negro of our communities is entitled to share with other citizens. Republicans should see to it that he gets them. For all of these reasonable demands are consistent with the very principles upon which the Republican Party was founded. All of them are a part of the freedom for which men of every color and race are dying. Our adoption or rejection of them will be the test of our sincerity and of our moral leadership in the eyes of hundreds of millions all over the world.

Work of Congregation at Glennonville, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recounting the very remarkable pioneering development conducted by Father Peters and his congregation at Glennonville, Mo.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FATHER PETERS, A PIONEERING PRIEST—HE OVERCAME ALL OBSTACLES TO ESTABLISH THE FIRST CATHOLIC CHURCH IN DUNKLIN COUNTY

(By F. A. Behymer)

GLENNONVILLE, Mo., February 21.—On a mild winter day Father Peters, coming from the holy hour for servicemen at the church, paused and swept the familiar scene with his eye—the tiny town and the fat lands that encompassed it and the weariness that had been upon him fell away. It was for this that he had toiled through 38 years. He had planted and God had given the increase. All was well in the colony.

Into the woods and swamps the father went 38 years ago to clear them and colonize them for the good of men's souls and the greater glory of the church. Into them he had put his life, losing it but finding it in the losing.

On an autumn day in 1905 Father Frederick Peters, serving a church at Jefferson City and destined, people said, for a high place in the priesthood, was called to St. Louis by Archbishop Glennon. The prelate told the priest of his plans for Catholic colonies. Down in the St. Francois Valley, in Dunklin County, he had bought 16,000 acres for one such colony. "I would like for you to go down there," he said. "I think you are the man for the place."

Father Peters might without impropriety have demurred, but he didn't. Asked now if it was gladness or obedience that had its way with him, he answers simply, "I was obedient." He told his superior he would go where he was sent and do his best.

So to the town of Malden on November 3, 1905, came Father Frederick Peters to begin the new life that had been planned for him. Through timber and waste of waters he rode horseback until, 11 miles from town, he came to higher ground. There, he decided, he would take his stand and raise the cross and call men made of the stuff of pioneers to come and follow him. That was the launching of the colony and of the first Catholic parish in Dunklin County.

One thing that Father Peters had made up his mind about was that he would pick his people. They must be men and women with the hearts of pioneers who would be able, no matter what came, to take it. He knew two men in St. Louis who filled the bill and called them to follow him. They were Jim Hogan, an Irishman, and Ed Bihr, a German. That made it two to one, with Jim on the short end, because Father Peters was of German birth.

The three men, strangely assorted, but pioneers all, made their way through the waters to the higher land which was to be the colony's heart. There was nothing in the way of a habitation there except the deserted cabin of a chopper who had worked for the tie company that had taken out the best of the timber. They took it over and made it their home, the first house in the tiny town of Glennonville that was to be. For a parish church Father Peters acquired a shabby shed that had been the tie company's commissary, and placed at its roof-peak the cross that was to be the colony's symbol. It was a church that would do until a better could be built.

The cut-over timber the tie company had left was the only subsistence the land offered until it could be cleared and drained and the water-soured soil cured and brought under cultivation. For the timbermen who would come and the families that would follow there would have to be shelter. Lumber was the primary need.

The lumber was there, in the trees, but a mill was necessary to saw it up. A sawmill was set up. The need for lumber was so urgent that for more than a year the priest, lacking another to do the work, handled the lever. During the first and second years he sawed more than a million feet of lumber. With the assurance of shelter, families picked and invited by Father Peters began to come in, the first ones from Howard County, Mo. Later several families came from Jasper County, Ind., also by invitation, and on their recommendation others came.

The sawmill was not the only industry in the earlier days. To hasten the clearing of the land and to give employment while this was under way, the priest set up barrel heading, stave, and ax handle plants, which operated under his direction, employing 30 to 40 men. Over a period of 8 years thousands of handles, millions of barrel heads, and millions of staves were turned out and sold in the cities.

Most of the families that came to make new homes in a new land were large or became large in due course. There had to be a school for the children. The first one was built of logs, to be followed by frame structures for grade and high schools, in which, although they are part of the public-school system, the teaching is done by the Ursuline Sisters of Mount St. Joseph, Ky. All the children are Catholic except those of seven families that were there before the colonists came and stayed on.

Through the years the floods that came down the St. Francois and spread over the valley were the colonists' greatest trials. Many seasons their crops were destroyed, too late for replanting. As early as 1908 an attempt was made to solve this critical prob-

lem. Under a 20-year plan a great drainage district was formed. It helped but it was not until the Wappapello Dam was built that the long fight was won. "Now the floods are over," says Father Peters, "thanks be to God."

Now that the colonizing project has won through to success and a rating as the best in the United States, the colonists say "thanks be to God and Father Peters." Thanks be to Father Peters because without his advice and guidance they would not have come through. He was not only their spiritual pilot but he was the best farmer of them all. Father Peters would not say that, but it is true that from the beginning he took it upon himself to find out all that was to be known about the farming problems that were peculiar to the colony land. He was equally diligent in telling them what was good or bad for their souls and what was good or bad for their soils.

He is also the doctor of their bodies, for with more than a little medical knowledge he renders first aid in all emergencies, even to the setting of bones, with the approval of the doctors of the region, who know his skill.

In the field of public relations Father Peters was and is the voice of the parish, pressing always for needed improvements and consulted constantly by State and Federal agencies because of the confidence felt in him. It was through his efforts that 30 miles of roads were built with county aid after he had surveyed them. He was active and influential in the promotion of the Wappapello Dam. He is a member of the Harbors and Rivers Commission at Washington, was a member of the W. P. A. local board and vice president of the Ozark Border Electric Cooperative, the largest in Missouri, with 750 miles of energized wire and with over 700 miles waiting to be attached after the war. He is active in the promotion of public-health measures, and his advice is sought by the Farm Security Administration.

In the depression, when so many banks failed, the colony farmers lost over $50,000. Now there has been established a Credit Union bank which is considered the best in southeast Missouri.

Now that the days of difficulty and struggle are ended and success has been won, Father Peters' greatest satisfaction is that all the families who came pioneering at his bidding, stuck through thick and thin, enduring the hardships and keeping the faith. When the people were disheartened and about to give up Father Peters said to them: "Stay with us, people, we're going to get through somehow." They stayed.

That morning when he came from the holy hour for servicemen at the church it was not so much the weariness of his years pressing upon him as the burden he bore for the grief and anxiety of his people, the 300 who had prayed in the church for the soldiers' return. Spring will soon come, and sowing in its season, with no fear of floods, and after that the harvest. Except that there is yet no promise of peace, all is well with the colonists of Glennonville Parish, and Father Peters is thankful and content.

Amending Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 194

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Amending Price Control," published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 10, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDING PRICE CONTROL

By passing several of the proposed amendments to the price-control law, Congress would contribute to price inflation, black markets, and enforcement difficulties. To impede the stabilization program now is clearly no way to fight the war.

One amendment proposed by Senator BANKHEAD would definitely tend to raise clothing prices, which already are gravely troubling the O. P. A. Clothing has gone up 7 to 8 percent in 2 years through authorized price raises and has slumped enormously in quality. Stabilization Director Vinson told the Senate committee that the change would cause an increase in the price of textiles and give the mills a special bonus without adding a red cent to what the grower gets for his cotton.

Another proposed amendment would tend to raise the level of rents by tying the hands of the O. P. A. enforcement division with red tape. The war might be over before some violators could be brought to account and then, in all probability, they would escape penalties for their disservice to stabilization. Still another modification of the present law, already approved by the Senate, would open the way to ceiling violations and more black markets by freeing violators of liability if they presented evidence that the breach was unintentional.

No frontal attack on price control and stabilization has been made because the country is well aware that only stern control can prevent runaway prices and general chaos. But as O. P. A. Administrator Bowles says, attempts are being made to kill price control with kind words. Proponents of modification pose as strong supporters of stabilization, yet singly and in the aggregate their amendments would weaken restraints where restraints are most necessary and obstruct enforcement, which already is the weakest feature of the program.

On the whole the O. P. A., the War Food Administration, and the War Production Board has not done badly. The necessary weapons and food have been produced and within the limitations imposed by Congress, public sentiment, and the need for popular cooperation, a sincere and commendable effort has been made to apply and enforce appropriate price ceilings. Congress should not permit itself to be misled by narrow interests or partisan considerations into tampering with the laws under which the control agencies have been able to operate effectually. Insofar as we have observed public sentiment favors reenactment of the price-control law as it now stands.

Do We Want Profit Control?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, sitting as a Committee of the Whole House Monday, Congress refused to adopt my amendment to the Price Control Act which, in effect, would have instructed the Office of Price Administration to keep its hands off of profit control.

The "steam roller" was well greased and working smoothly when this amendment was, too briefly, discussed. Under a motion that had been previously adopted, no supporting arguments were permitted, and the membership saw fit to follow the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] and voted it down. This is to be regretted, because the issue was far too important to be so lightly dismissed.

We will hear much more about profit control in the future. In order that the membership may be better informed when the matter is again brought before us, I ask permission to extend my remarks and include an excellent statement prepared by Dr. Ivan Wright, professor of economics at Brooklyn College and executive secretary of the Economists Committee on Reconversion Problems:

COMMON SENSE ABOUT PROFIT CONTROL

The American people want the cost of living held stable during wartime, when shortages of most goods are unavoidable. They know that, while the fighting goes on, the Nation cannot produce all the goods required to satisfy every demand of both the armed forces and civilians. Willingly, they accept such inconveniences and sacrifices as are incident to price control and to rationing by the Office of Price Administration.

Price control. Yes.

But in setting ceiling prices for certain goods, the O. P. A. has gone much further. It has undertaken to regulate profits as well as prices.

Profit control is a horse of a different color. Profit control tampers with the very mainspring of our economy. If the profit motive is to be ruled out of our economy, production will dry up. Jobs will disappear. The whole structure of American business will topple.

The purpose of this statement is to spell out in simple terms the issues involved in profit control. What is at stake is nothing less than the survival of the system of free enterprise which made this country great, and which can make us greater still in the era of peace that we all hope will follow victory in the bloody conflict now raging around the globe.

If the O. P. A. should clamp down a rigid limit on profits during the post-war era, it would be a major disaster not only to industry, but to labor which wants jobs in industry, and to the farmers who look to labor and to industry for markets for their products.

Let us see just what is involved in this question of profit control.

FROM WAR TO PEACE

Some day, we hope soon, this war will be over. Some day the drums of war will roll out only to give cadence to the steps of our boys as they swing up Main Street through cheering throngs in final victorious review before doffing uniforms for "civies," and returning to their homes, families, and the jobs they left behind.

Before that day comes this country must be ready. The millions who left jobs to go to war, or to do work in aircraft plants and shipyards, expect to find those jobs, or adequate substitutes, when they return. The Nation's economy must be made ready to provide those jobs. It must be made ready also to give work to millions of others who went to war as boys without a place in the economic scheme of things, but who will return as men who have earned the right to have jobs. And there will be a third large group for whom jobs will be needed—the dependents of those who won't be coming back or will come back permanently disabled. These will have to become breadwinners.

JOBS—THE BIG POST-WAR PROBLEM

Basically, no discussion of the reconversion period or the post-war period to follow can be separated from the really fundamental problem that must be solved—the problem of post-war employment.

In plain language, if we hope to have a peaceful peace at home when the war ends, we must plan our reconversion to a peacetime economy so that it will be lush with employment opportunities for the ten-million-odd veterans who will be seeking them, along with the other millions who will be released from war plants.

This problem cannot be chalked up on a blackboard for solution. It is a problem in human lives, etched in broken hearts, blasted careers, mangled limbs, orphaned children, widowed young matrons, bereft parents of missing sons, blood, sweat, and tears.

PROFITS MAKE JOBS

You cannot separate profit from the free-enterprise system. They are inseparable. As Prof. John V. Van Sickle, of Vanderbilt University aptly put it:

"The capitalistic engine is built to operate with the fuel of profits and the lubrication of confidence." [1]

Take away profits and you take away the incentive to produce. Take away profits and you take away jobs. Take away profits and you take away the urge to keep costs down and to offer better quality at lower prices. Take away profits and you take away the private enterprise system. Regulations unduly limiting profits thus go to the heart of our economic system.

The profit motive has been widely recognized in both peace and war. When we wanted an expanded output of agricultural products, what did we do? We permited farm prices to rise and fixed high support prices so that it would be more profitable to produce the required items. When we desired to expand the output of war goods, workers were induced to migrate to war-production centers by offers of higher wages. Contract-renegotiation officials of the armed forces have allowed profits up to 20 percent, and more to war contractors. No matter where we turn in our economy, we find evidences of the catalytic role played by profits in stimulating production.

PRICE CONTROL, PROFIT CONTROL, AND CONGRESS

The main objective of wartime price control is to prevent inflationary increases in the cost of living. Inevitably, such control over prices has some incidental effect upon profits.

But profit control has been made, in certain directives of the Office of Economic Stabilization and orders of the Office of Price Administration, an end in itself rather than an incident. When the O. P. A. undertakes to control profits rather than prices, it hits at the heart of the free-enterprise system, to which we look for the millions of post-war jobs that will be needed after victory has been won.

These attempts to control profits do not stem from the law itself. Congress has shown a full understanding of the key role of the profit motive in expanding output and lowering costs.

Again and again the Congress and its committees have acted to conserve and safeguard the profit motive. The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 says that ceilings shall be adjusted for "general increases or decreases in profits." Congressional committees have criticized cost-plus contracts severely on the ground that they take away the incentive to cut costs.

At the same time Congress has permitted no profiteering in this war. It passed an excess-profits tax to take away 95 percent of profits above a level specified as normal. On sales to the Government prices are subject to renegotiation where they produce excessive profits. As previously noted, however, profit margins up to 20 percent have been allowed in individual renegotiation cases because of extraordinary efficiency, inventive contributions, or the assumption of unusual risks.

UNCERTAINTY FOR BUSINESSMEN

The desire to control profit for its own sake manifested by O. E. S. and O. P. A. has created an unhealthy tension in business circles everywhere, particularly among manufacturers of consumer goods.

Businessmen have become convinced that Government directives and orders which seeks to control profit for its own sake are inspired or written by employees of Government bureaus who want to change our economic system in essential respects. These bright young men, who have been glibly critical of the private enterprise system in the past, want to substitute bureaucratic regimentation for our free economy. Profit control would be one effective way to do this.

Now, we are not going to solve the thorny problems that lie ahead if our manufacturers become jittery, fearful from day to day of new efforts to squeeze profit margin by Government decree. Yet that is exactly what is happening. Businessmen, large and small, who must provide the know-how and the venture capital for enterprise must be able to see and plan ahead, so that they can take steps to recover their costs and earn a reasonable return if they are efficient. Profit control by Government makes this impossible.

Some people say: "Suppose businessmen are jittery. What of it? Who cares?"

The answer is that when businessmen are unable to make a profit, no matter how well they run their enterprises, they will curtail or abandon operations. This means fewer jobs and less goods. Unemployment and a falling standard of living will result.

TWO PERCENT OR NOTHING—VINSON

The much discussed Vinson directive, the most inclusive profit-control measure yet issued by a Government agency, had its origin in the disappearance of many low-priced textile lines from the market because manufacturers could not keep pace with rising costs except by turning out higher-priced lines. The result was hardship for low-income consumers, who had to buy higher-priced goods or do without certain products. Under these conditions, there developed pressure to expand output of the disappearing low-priced lines.

A program was finally evolved under which the W. P B. would make available the materials required to produce low-priced items, and the O. P. A. would permit adjustments in price ceilings so that manufacturers would not lose money on such production.

Since a rise in ceiling prices was involved in this plan, approval of the Office of Economic Stabilization was required. Director Vinson issued a directive to W. P. B. and O. P. A. on November 16, 1943, laying down the principles to govern such price ceiling adjustments. This directive limited profits to 2 percent, before taxes, in all such ceiling adjustments. It was not made public at that time, although excerpts were finally released to the public on December 13. The published excerpts revealed the amazing fact that, instead of being confined to low-priced lines, the directive applied to all "essential civilian goods." Clearly, advocates of profit control for its own sake had scored a great victory within the Office of Price Stabilization.

The directive caused such consternation in business circles that Director Vinson issued a "clarification" on January 26, 1944. In this second statement, he explained that the first order "was intended to apply primarily if not exclusively to the field of basic textiles and apparel. At the suggestion of the W. P. B. officials * * * it was broadened to include other essential consumer goods. This has served, however, to create so much misunderstanding that I am constrained to revert to the original purpose and intentment of the directives. Therefore, it will in the future apply only to textiles and apparel."

But, after thus seemingly narrowing the troublesome term "essential consumer goods," Director Vinson then went on to say:

"Problems arising in connection with shortages of other consumer goods where price adjustments are involved shall be presented to this office (O. E. S.) on an individual basis, for treatment which is consistent in principle with that provided for textiles and apparel."

With one hand, Director Vinson sought to reassure manufacturers of civilian goods other than textiles. With the other, he gave profit control right back to them—in spades.

The Vinson directive made 2 percent, before taxes, the maximum profit in such price-ceiling adjustments. But where a manufacturer reports profits, once again, before taxes, more than double those earned in the 1936–39 base period, no profit whatever over costs would be allowed. Here was profit control with a vengeance.

Manufacturers, naturally, were profoundly disturbed, particularly the thousands of smaller concerns for whom civilian-goods manufacture had become an urgent, immediate problem. As large prime contractors increased their efficiency, and as they received notice of cut-backs on their war orders, they tended more and more to pull in their subcontracts. This hit smaller manufacturers who were working on these subcontracts. Considering the substantial investment required for reconversion and the risks involved, these smaller manufacturers could not see how they could undertake to return to their peacetime operations under a 2-percent or no-profit-maximum rule.

JUST NOTHING—BOWLES

The Vinson directive tried to limit profits to a maximum of 2 percent. In April, the O. P. A. decided to go the O. E. S. one step better by providing that price ceilings for many products could allow no profit at all.

A very important price order applicable to many consumers durable goods is MPR 188, which covers such products as household furniture, office equipment and machines, dental supplies, commercial kitchen utensils, and similar items. The amendment to this order issued in April provides that, when setting ceiling prices of these products to permit resumption of their manufacture, the Office of Price Administration will make them high enough to cover only manufacturing, packing, and shipping costs. Where a manufacturer's entire operation is actually being conducted at a loss, the ceiling price could be high enough to cover selling and administrative costs as well.

Here, profit control for its own sake reaches its logical end—the elimination of profits. What would this mean to our post-war economic system? How can industry be expected to provide millions of new jobs if it can only recover costs, and no more, regardless of how good the products sold or how economically they are manufactured and distributed?

LET'S BE SENSIBLE ABOUT THIS

We don't want to have post-war inflation. We don't want to have a post-war depression. We don't want to have post-war unemployment.

Rigid profit control creates conditions that may bring on all of these evils. By discouraging reconversion and curtailing production, profit control curtails the supply of goods, thus paving the way for a runaway price rise. Reduced production, also, spells depression and unemployment.

[1] Has Private Enterprise a Future?—Trusts and Estates, May 1944.

It is axiomatic that if we are to avoid inflation, we must have adequate production. We are not going to get production if capital and management are scared away through fears instilled in businessmen by efforts to control profit for its own sake.

Let's not monkey with this thing. It is too important. The Nation must not permit personal differences, political differences, ideological differences, and other clashes of viewpoint to take our eyes off the ball. Our country's problem is to see that there is full opportunity for employment for all who want to work when the war is over. Anything that even threatens to impair the solution of that problem must be discarded in the common cause.

Our country's war production triumphs which followed conversion from a peacetime economy have been the industrial miracle of the ages. It has been praised as such even by Marshal Stalin. This triumph was not accomplished by rigid profit control. It was made possible by the dual incentives of reasonable profits and the patriotic appeal which caused both labor and capital to turn out the best that was in them. Let's take a leaf out of the book of conversion in solving our reconversion problems, particularly since the patriotic motive necessarily becomes less potent once hostilities cease.

Let's be sensible about this thing.

We Are at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Charles E. Broughton, fighting Democratic editor of the Sheboygan Press:

WE ARE AT THE CROSSROADS

In a two-party government such as we have members of both parties owe it to the Government to enter full tickets, not only in the primary but in the general election.

Unless you have a State ticket and candidates for the assembly and senate in every district you are promoting absentee voting. The same is true of a county ticket. When the two conventions, the Democratic and Republican, are held in Chicago nominees will be offered to the people and platforms adopted. Unless we have complete State legislature and county tickets we are playing into the hands of those who would like nothing better than to upset much of the legislation that has been enacted in the last 11 years.

When President Roosevelt went into office in 1933 we had the most pathetic situation in all history. We had soup kitchens in operation and people starving while others had plenty. The purchasing power of the Nation had broken down and factories were closed; banks had already closed in many instances and we were in mortal terror as to what was to happen. Revolution was in the making, and that same situation will recur again if we are not guardians of our own destiny.

You can't expect to win a Presidential election without a united front here at home. You can't have partial tickets and expect to combat a well-organized and well-greased machine. There isn't a member of the Democratic or Republican Party who doesn't owe it to his Government to get out and see that the tickets are filled and then follow through with an organization aimed to win an election. We have 48 States, and unless every State is linked up to the national election with a complete ticket we may sacrifice the electoral vote in that particular State.

You will recall back in the time of the Wilson-Hughes election the results finally rested upon one State, and we doubt very much today whether Mr. Wilson would have been elected if Charles Evans Hughes had not passed Senator HIRAM JOHNSON up when he visited California, normally Republican. They resented the slight and voted for Wilson.

We point to California as an example of what can occur in any election if we fail to organize, or if, as in the case of California, we overlook a bet. We are much concerned about Wisconsin, with only 6 days to the final filing of nomination papers. True, if a candidate withdraws, the party's State central committee can fill the vacancy, but that is never as successful as an aroused sentiment in support of a conference-endorsed candidate or one whose nomination papers have been filed and who is a candidate in the primary.

Supposing Mr. Roosevelt were to run for reelection or be drafted at the coming convention; that would not insure Wisconsin's electoral vote for him. It takes a mighty organization knitted together in every one of the 71 ccunties to insure that result.

It is with this in mind that we appeal to the people in this county and every county in the State to have a full county ticket; and if you have no candidate for Congress, draft someone and draft him now.

Democratic National Committeeman Thomas King has done a good job as far as his duties are concerned, but it takes more than one man to bring about victory. He has consented to run for State treasurer, in order to fill the ticket. It takes a mighty big man to accept this responsibility, but he was equal to the test.

The Republicans have numerous candidates and ample funds and they are prepared to give the Democratic Party a real test as to strength. It would be a source of keen regret if the American public were to face defeat because the people were willing to accept all the benefits of the last three administrations and did nothing in return—in other words, shirked their responsibility.

Up to this time no Republican candidate who is an avowed enemy of isolation has been able to muster strength in the party opposing the Democrats. The old war horses want to name their candidate, and they want an isolationist and a Roosevelt hater. They want to go back to the days of Harding so that they can dictate a candidate. We had a Harding and a Coolidge and a Hoover, and the fruits of their labors resulted in financial disaster. The voters would be short in memory if they encouraged a return to those days. Social Security, aid for the unfortunates, and a return to isolation would undo all the benefits that have accrued during the last 11 years. The foreclosures on homes and farms are not so far back that we can forget.

Yes, we can gamble in this election and lose the fruits of our labors. We can invite another disaster. Following a war, there is bound to be prosperity, but what of 10 years hence? Will we be in the saddle for a depression or a war, or will we make this war a final one? That question will be decided in the coming election, for the winners will make the peace.

Naturally Mr. Roosevelt has made enemies by his fearless stand, his intense desire to win the war irrespective of party success. The Old Guard is at the signpost hoping to profit by those who think they have been subjected to certain restrictions or hardships. Measure these by the hardships of the men and women in the service, and they are mere trifles. America must awake if it would prevent another war, and make the United States a breathing and living democracy, and play its part in a just and lasting world peace.

Address of William H. Webb, Executive Vice President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT CANNON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of William H. Webb, executive vice president, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, before the Propeller Club of the United States, port of Miami, Fla., Monday, May 22, 1944:

Mr. President, members of the Propeller Club, and distinguished guests: It is a great privilege and pleasure for me to join with you in the twelfth annual celebration of National Maritime Day. I have been for several years a member of the Propeller Club of Washington, D. C., and New York City, and am familiar with the splendid work of your organization on behalf of the American Merchant Marine. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress through the years has cooperated closely with your national headquarters on many matters of mutual interest.

Strange as it may seem, this is the first time we can say truthfully that the American Merchant Marine is sitting on top of the world. We now have the greatest tonnage any nation has ever possessed in the history of shipping.

Statistics are dry, but in round numbers we have about 50,000,000 tons. The shipbuilding and ship-repairing and conversion industry has done one of the greatest production jobs of all times. It was done under the pressure of war, but every real American—especially you men gathered here—wants to see the result of this war production redound to our benefit and advantage after the war.

The national president of the Propeller Club of the United States during his recent visit to Miami explained how important our merchant fleet is going to be in the peace negotiations. The colorful phrase that Commander Tode used was that our shipping will be "the blue chips at the peace table," and he sounded a very serious warning that this country should not let itself be hornswoggled out of the advantage it now has. I cannot add much to that message but when the time comes I hope this community through its citizens, through you men, your Congressmen and Senators, will stand up and demand that we do not lose any advantages we have gained.

It has been our past experience that after wars we always slide back because public interest is not sufficiently maintained. We must not let that happen again. The press of your city is alert to the problem, and I want to quote briefly from an editorial that commented on Mr. Tode's visit. The Miami Herald said:

"We can take our rightful place as a great maritime nation after the guns are stilled if we let common sense dictate that we must not fritter or give away with peace what we have amassed through the travail of war, but capitalize on our merchant-fleet potential to strengthen national defense and benefit our economic security."

No speech that I could make on this fundamental problem could compete with the evidence of men like Admiral Land and Admiral Vickery which will appear in tomorrow's newspapers. Consequently I am

going to give you a somewhat different talk.

As all of you may not be familiar with the work of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, permit me first to tell you something of our organization, its scope, and purposes. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is a nonpartisan, nonprofit association, dedicated to the improvement and development of the inland waterways and harbors of the United States.

Originally organized in the year 1901, it was a pioneer in the struggle for the protection of our national resources and has taken a leading and active part in this fight for more than four decades.

All Members of the Senate and House of Representatives are honorary members of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, and many of them take an active part in its work. The officers of the Corps of Army Engineers engaged in river and harbor work are likewise ex officio members of the Congress.

The active membership of the congress is composed of States, cities, chambers of commerce, waterway and similar associations, firms, and individuals, numbering upward of 25,000 located in every State in the Union. Among its members are many nationally known public officials, as well as outstanding leaders in the business and professional world.

The organization has for its purpose the promotion of continued improvement of the Nation's rivers, harbors, lakes, and waterways, and the investigation and approval of justifiable waterway projects throughout the country. It provides a forum for discussion of all problems relating to water development and use, serves as a clearinghouse for coordinating the activities of local and sectional organizations, and affords a means for securing united action by all the interests concerned with the various phases of water development.

It is generally the policy of the congress to follow the recommendations of the United States Army Engineers in advocating projects, and it is in no sense an organization which approves any project of the pork-barrel type. Virtually every bill passed by the Federal Congress for improvement of harbors and waterways has been composed almost in toto of projects previously investigated and recommended by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The projects endorsed by the congress upon the recommendation of its projects committee, composed of an outstanding waterway leader in each of the engineering divisions of the United States, are vigorously and continuously advocated for inclusion in the Government's public works program and appropriations or allocations of funds sought therefor.

May I emphasize that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress is not sectional or regional but national in its scope. It looks at the whole Nation and the general welfare of all. It rejoices to see railroads, airways, and highways develop and prosper. Our organization is interested not only in the improvement of maritime and inland navigation, in river and harbor development, but it is also concerned with flood control, the generation of hydroelectric power, irrigation, reclamation, conservation of our soil and forests, and the utilization of our land and water resources. We deal with the very things that are so vital and necessary to our war effort and support these projects which are essential to the safety and defense of the Nation.

I want to say also that there is a Government agency to which the obligation of the people runs, an agency which for generations has enjoyed the esteem, the confidence, and the respect of the American people. I speak of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. I know that a grateful country and a grateful posterity will remember the high standards of conduct and the fine quality of vision which that corps has contributed and will continue to contribute to the welfare of America.

Your Virginia Key project was so capably presented before our projects committee by Professor Hart, Captain Sharlow, and others, that they induced the committee and the Congress to give it a No. 1 rating. We were glad to work with your able representatives, and now the bill which will authorize and adopt the project is in the final stages of legislative enactment.

We have been delighted to learn that you have created a port authority. I need hardly tell you that having a single responsible unit charged with port matters should expedite your progress. Most of you know that community dissension and confusion have hampered your progress in the past.

Through our mill in Washington come hundreds of projects. Many of them are of extreme local importance but we are compelled to take the national point of view. So are the various departments of the Government that are charged with executing the projects. When the National Rivers and Harbors Congress endorsed Virginia Key, we felt its development would be a national asset, not merely a local benefit, and now it is up to your properly constituted authorities to see to it that Virginia Key becomes an accomplished fact.

We may assume that this will be done, so let us look at south Florida for a moment from that national point of view I mentioned a few moments ago. It is commonplace that you are a great winter resort and that you consequently have a great deal to contribute to the health and recreation of the Nation but those of you who have seen the Virginia Key briefs filed with the Army Engineers know that this alone is not a sufficient economic justification for a great harbor. In your briefs you set up a case of economic justification on previous population growth, cargo gains, and trade potentialities that won the approval of the Army Engineers. But you cannot let it rest at that. You must implement potentialities that have been used in your argument of economic justification.

Let me take my cue here from an address made before this club on this same occasion in the year 1940 when you celebrated Maritime Day. Your speaker at that time was Col. R. A. Wheeler, then resident member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. This same Colonel Wheeler is now Gen. R. A. Wheeler who was recently the subject of an article in the Saturday Evening Post because of his great war accomplishments. Men of General Wheeler's capacity do not make statements lightly. In the course of that speech in 1940 he made several references to the fact that this area should develop its back country. Not only did he have in mind the immediate usufructs such as edible vegetables but he pointed out you should take advantage of numerous agricultural products that can be processed for industrial purposes.

In the course of looking over information that is forwarded to us from this area I find that the Propeller Club of Miami has been a proponent of extending Miami River via the Miami Canal to Lake Okeechobee.

Considering the numerous political subdivisions and rival interests that are involved, you have a big job on your hands, but in nearly 20 years in waterway work I have seen a great many extremely complicated and involved set-ups successfully solved in other sections of the country.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, as I have said, is interested in water control and soil conservation as well as in navigable waterways. The Propeller Club project for extension of Miami River to Lake Harbor would serve all three of these purposes. It would open up some 1,200 square miles of the most productive land in this area, and through locks and other water-control methods you could check the dangerous oxidation of muck soil, prevent the fires that have filled this area with smoke, and provide a perpetual water supply for the city of Miami.

The omnibus rivers and harbors bill, H. R. 3961, authorizes surveys of a number of projects through the central part of the State to which this Miami-Lake Okeechobee waterway would provide a final link and open up a vast area for water transportation. From the national point of view this Lake Okeechobee-Miami link would complete a continental pattern of the utmost significance.

Four years ago General Wheeler told you to pay attention to agricultural development, and it is plain what he was driving at. The Army Engineers do not merely look at facilities on an urban water front, but they take into consideration the entire tributary area. The Okeechobee watershed is unquestionably one of your great tributary areas. In this section you have the greatest winter farm production within easy reach of northern markets. But that is not all. In those vast acres you also have resources of an agricultural nature that can be developed and processed into some 1,500 manufactured products. You already have a big sugar mill. I understand a $20 000,000 starch mill is being built; that there are numerous plastic products contemplated, and that the cattle business is also going forward by leaps and bounds. You have the opportunity for the development of any number of industries based on your distinctive climatic and soil conditions. From a national point of view it is the contribution that you can make by taking advantage of these resources that fits you into the national picture—enables you to make a contribution to the national economy that perhaps no other area within the boundaries of this country can offer. All of these things will increase your port business, your wholesale business, and your retail business.

Your club has made such a signal contribution in the preparation of material that won approval for Virginia Key and the Intracoastal Waterway that I am confident when you put yourselves down to it you can make out as energetic and as well documented a case for your back country as you have for your terminal and deep-water facilities on the sea lanes.

And now just a word about foreign trade. My good friend, Tom Lyons, of the Department of Commerce, was here last January to tell you about a foreign trade zone. He also spoke about aviation's role in the postwar period. I have heard that some people were surprised he did not confine himself to waterborne commerce. Anyone who does not face the progress of aviation in cargo-carrying, frankly is going to be left far behind. Also he is going to miss the boat if he ignores aviation as a passenger carrier. The practical, big steamship lines are not so short-sighted. They have today on the drawing board revisions of ship plans that take into account competition by airplanes. One of the things Mr. Lyons brought out in his speech, which I have read with great interest and which was widely published, is the fact that before you can put in a foreign trade zone you have to make a thorough economic survey to find out what purposes it can serve. Such a survey should be made regardless of whether you apply for a foreign trade zone later because without it your foreign trade progress can only be made by fumbling in the dark and hoping that you will stumble on something good.

Miami is one of the cities credited with being able to hold its war gains in population. There is ample proof that it cannot only hold these gains but should make new ones. Your marine program should not merely keep pace, it should be several jumps ahead.

And now in closing may I express on behalf of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress the great pleasure we had in staging

our last convention in your magic city just 3 weeks before Pearl Harbor. The pleasant memories of that event are still fresh in our minds and we look forward to returning after the war to your fair city, glamorous, entrancing, beautiful, inspiring Miami, that glistens and gleams and nestles like a diamond buckle upon the slippered foot of Florida.

Invasion Presents Test of Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I have read an article by Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., in Hearst's Baltimore News-Post of June 10, 1944. I derived a great deal of satisfaction from it because it is evidence that the Hearst newspapers, once violently antagonistic toward this administration, are coming to realize that President Roosevelt is making a really effective effort to achieve as early a war victory as possible, regardless of the effect an early victory would have on his own political fortunes. This article by Mr. Lewis clearly shows that the best interests of the country are at all times first and political advantages secondary with President Roosevelt.

The article in question reads as follows:

INVASION PRESENTS TEST OF ROOSEVELT
(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, June 10.—Many and glorious will be the sagas about the courage and heroism of the G. I. Joes who swarmed the beaches of Normandy last Tuesday.

But in that Allied invasion there was another bit of courage that seems to have gone unnoticed.

It was on the part of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and it consisted of the simple act of giving the nod for the invasion to go on, at that particular time.

It was a political rather than physical courage.

But it took plenty, because it's a clear cinch that the materialization of the invasion completely changes the lights and shadows on the November Presidential election picture.

And the President must have foreseen those implications when he gave the orders.

There's no use cradling this thing in soft language and frills.

The truth is that a considerable number of the more fanatical Roosevelt haters were convinced that the President was going to put off any invasion attempt until such a time that the war would still be going on as of election day.

GRUESOME THOUGHT

A gruesome and diabolical idea, to be sure, but many are the anti-New Dealers who have nursed and even whispered that suspicion.

Some backed into it by saying that he probably was not doing it by deliberate design and intention, but rather that the subconscious wish was fathering his military decisions.

The decision as to when an army is ready to strike is riddled with indeterminables, anyway.

PLAUSIBLE EXPLANATION

It would be easy, they said, to rationalize a continued postponement on the grounds that time costs nothing, and the longer we were prepared the less would be the final cost to us in casualties.

There were others who played the direct shot; they believed—and they really did—that the President was planning it that way as cold-blooded, fourth-term political strategy.

Both ideas went up in smoke, of course, on the Norman sands. The President kept faith, even though he had plenty of opportunity for doing otherwise.

VARYING OPINIONS

There are innumerable competent military men all over the world who would have supported a decision to wait for more preparation.

Churchill is one of them. It's open information that he has never wanted to attempt a Channel crossing, and didn't at this time.

And to keep political consideration out of the invasion decision as completely as Mr. Roosevelt did was to pick the hard way.

The most naive political adolescent can see, by a little analysis, that all of the political advantage lay on the side of postponement.

Congress and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker, House of Representatives, before the Foreign Policy Association, New York City, on Monday, June 12, 1944:

In the early years of the Nation the American people were alertly conscious of the conduct of foreign affairs. The national existence might be in peril from without. But growth in material strength and a century of freedom from serious external danger tended to reduce the popular interest in international matters. Events of the past 30 years have brought a return to intense and deep interest in our foreign affairs.

Foreign policy concerns more than the activities of a few diplomats; it vitally affects the lives of us all. We now know, and we must never again forget, that we are directly and vitally concerned in world affairs. As the elected Representatives of the people, Members of both Houses of Congress play their part in determining that we have a foreign policy supported by the enlightened judgment of the people, and that this policy will protect our own security and promote a world order in which men can live in peace.

The casualty lists which come in from day to day are a grim reminder of our great responsibility in preventing the recurrence of such a catastrophic war. With a humility born of sorrow, we must dedicate ourselves to the high resolve of preserving forever that peace which our brave soldiers, and the soldiers of our gallant Allies, are giving their lives to obtain.

There are those who may taunt and jeer at the idea of a system of world peace and security by saying that it is a dreamer's dream, that it is impractical, that it has never before been done. War obscures the fact that international agreements have in the past accomplished a good deal toward world security and order. The methods of former years have not been sufficient to check a madman drunk with power. But, happily, mankind is able to learn from reason and experience. The efforts of the past furnish experience on which the reason of today may build.

A clearer approach to the problem can be made, I believe, by considering it from the point of view of the imperative security needs of the United States. We must approach the formation of a system of world peace and security with the realism and the practicality that we apply in our own domestic life. It is not a dreamer's world to say that we must have law and order, for that is the elementary foundation on which the American civilization is based. The demands for law and order, for peace and security, are as vital to our Nation in a world of nations as they are to our citizens in their domestic affairs. We want our Nation to live and to live in peace. We want to join hands with our friends in keeping this peace, for we are highly resolved that the great calamity now besetting us shall not again occur.

The lesson we must learn and remember and never forget is that it is futile to wish for peace without providing the methods for keeping the peace. We must assume our share of the responsibility for securing that which we desire. The old method, the fallacious method, the method which helped bring on this calamity was the feeling that we were secure because wishing would make it so. Those people who say that we can go it alone and who, once the war is over, want to return to the old days of yesteryear are the dreamers. They are worse than dreamers; they are reckless men, irresponsible men, men willing to gamble again with the fate of the Nation rather than admit that they are wrong.

There are those who say that we would lose our sovereignty if we joined with other nations in keeping the peace. Such statements may be made to confuse or to deceive, but the truth is that the power to make international commitments is the essence of sovereignty. We can make commitments or not make commitments as we choose, we can make them for short periods or long periods, or terminable at will, but in any case we would be exercising the prerogatives of a sovereign nation. These commitments are not made once and forever. We do not propose today to solve the problems of all time. Rather, we meet in a flexible system the problems which we now know and which require joint action. It is as serious a fallacy to suppose that cooperation among States lessens their independence as it would be to suppose that cooperation among individuals is the enemy of freedom.

We do not intend to become the Santa Claus of the world. I believe that no one would deny that we must assist in rehabilitating the occupied countries, feed and clothe those impoverished by war, and assist those countries to begin again a normal operation of their economy. We want, in brief, to create those conditions by which the countries now ravaged by war can rehabilitate themselves as rapidly as possible.

The part which our Congress must play in creating the conditions of world stability is great. The fact that Congress has great power in determining foreign policy is too little realized, and this power is in addition to the power possessed by the Senate to advise and consent to treaties. Although the President alone has been given certain constitutional authority in handling foreign affairs, many of the President's actions and the actions of Government agencies in relation to foreign policy are determined by laws enacted by Congress. The constitutional power of the President relating to foreign affairs and the

treaty-making power shared by the President and the Senate go but a little way in determining the many-sided aspects of our foreign policy. Congress has been an integral part in formulating our foreign policy in the past, and it must prepare to cooperate with the Executive in solving those important issues which will face our country during and after the war. This cooperation is essential because the welfare of our country demands that the executive branch and the legislative branch work together for a common end. While their functions and their powers are separate, their objectives toward the national welfare are the same.

Appropriations for the support of the Government are made annually, and this includes appropriations for the conduct of our foreign policy as well as for the conduct of our domestic policy. Congress must, in other words, determine how much is to be spent in carrying out our foreign policy. We have to appropriate money for the Department of State and its Foreign Service, and for the wartime agencies which are especially concerned with foreign affairs, such as the Office of War Information and the Federal Economic Administration. Some of the old-line departments of the Government also received money for foreign activities. In addition we appropriate funds for participation by the United States in international organizations such as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. The congressional power of the purse is a very real control over the type and extent of the foreign policy which our Government follows.

Our commercial relations with other nations are to some extent determined by the tariffs which we and other nations place on imports. The present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act sets the standards and determines the limits within which the Executive can negotiate trade agreements with other nations. Our commercial relations are also determined by our shipping policies, and Congress must determine whether we should have a large merchant marine and whether such a merchant marine should be supported by subsidies of one type or another. The war has emphasized the importance of air power, and after the war we know that air power will have an increasingly large commercial significance. Congress must assist in formulating a policy which will maximize the benefits from the commercial use of the air. Our immigration policy is determined by laws enacted by Congress. In other words, Congress is responsible for the formulation of many policies directly affecting foreign affairs, policies which are enacted in the form of law and not in the form of treaties. In addition many treaties require legislation to make them effective. Congress also enacts other legislation which directly or indirectly affects the foreign policy of other nations as well as that of the United States. Our monetary policy will affect the currency exchanges throughout the world. Our agricultural policy will affect the growth and the price of agricultural commodities in other nations.

During the dark years from 1939 through 1941, Congress in cooperation with the Executive enacted many laws which have assisted in resisting the designs of the aggressor. In 1939 Congress repealed the arms embargo in order to make it possible for the Allies to continue purchasing the arms which they so much needed. Whereas Germany was armed, the Allies were not fully prepared in the fall of 1939 to meet the might of the German military machine, and our arms embargo cut off the supplies to Great Britain and France in the hour of their death struggle. In actual practice this embargo affected only the Allies and not Germany, and Congress very wisely removed that prohibition from the statute books.

The fall of France made all Americans realize the military power behind Germany's aggression, and it revealed to many that which had long been realized by some: that a Nazi-Germany which controlled the Continent of Europe was a threat to our own security. Thereupon the Congress appropriated huge sums for stepping up our armament program. In the late summer of 1940 Congress enacted the selective-service law, a measure which has been equal to the great task of providing manpower for the superb citizen armies which are now defending America.

In March 1941 Congress passed the Lend-Lease Act which provided that the Government should allocate the distribution of war material to those areas which were deemed essential for the defense of the United States. This act was one of the most important ever enacted by any Congress, and the far-sighted wisdom of this act becomes increasingly apparent with the progress of the war. With the development of the concept of reverse lend-lease, we have worked out a practical mechanism where the resources of the United Nations can be applied where they are needed, when they are needed, and by whom they are needed.

In November 1941, shortly before our entrance into the war, Congress repealed most of the remaining provisions of the Neutrality Act, thereby increasing our ability to defend ourselves against the mounting danger from Axis aggression. The Neutrality Act was based on the premise that the danger of our being involved in war depended upon our acts. Accordingly it was supposed to follow that the less we did the less would be that danger, and that if we renounced rights of action long held the aggressors would not bother us. Experience of other countries as well as of our own has too clearly shown that inaction is not the best road to peace. By the repeal of the Neutrality Acts we reasserted good American doctrine which recognizes that the defense of this country requires positive means.

During the war, many of the basic policies affecting both our domestic and foreign policies are determined by the primary demands of the military. But the demands of the military encompassing though they may be, do not determine all of our contemporary foreign policy and they make more pressing the need for considering now the shape of a more adequate foreign policy which we will demand in the future peace that is to come. Congress is now giving attention to the future problems of maintaining the peace and security for which we fight.

A few months ago the House of Representatives, by an overwhelming bipartisan majority, adopted the Fulbright resolution favoring the participation of this country in international peace machinery. The resolution reads, "*Resolved*, That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes." That brief resolution, while not a blue-print for an international organization, states clearly the objectives toward which we wish to direct our foreign policy and the premises upon which a system of world security should be based. The Senate passed a similar resolution, sponsored by Senator Connally, also by an overwhelming bipartisan majority. These striking declarations of the House of Representatives and the Senate together with the momentous Four-Nation Declaration adopted at the Moscow Conference have played their full part, I am sure, in making clear to the world that this Nation stands united behind a policy of effective international cooperation.

The Senate has a singular part to play in determining foreign policy because of its power to advise and consent to treaties and its power to confirm nominations submitted by the President. During recent weeks, a bipartisan group of eight Senators has held frank discussions with Secretary Hull on the general principles, questions, and plans relating to the establishment of an international peace and security organization in accordance with the principles contained in the Moscow Four-Nation Declaration and the Connally and Fulbright resolutions. The first phase of those talks has been completed, and the Secretary is carrying forward similar discussions with a bipartisan group from the House of Representatives. Meanwhile, the Secretary of State is initiating informal discussions on the establishment of an international peace and security organization with Great Britain, Russia, and China, and then with governments of other United Nations.

I cite these conferences to you as an example of the earnestness with which those in responsibility are approaching the great problem before us. We are determined that petty considerations, that personal rivalry or partisan advantage or jealousy between institutions shall not obstruct our vision or deter our efforts. Although Congress and the Executive have distinct powers, both are responsible to the people and both are united in the common goal of securing a world of peace and freedom. The Congress of the United States will do its share, I am confident, in making the will of the American people effective in the promotion of international peace and well-being.

I want to see this greatest of all democracies do a man's part in the world's great work of peace.

United States Industry's Working Assets Up Seventeen Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is my candid opinion that there is too much unnecessary stress and fear in relation to industrial reconversion to peacetime activities. I am satisfied that most of the industries and plants have been and are now adjusting themselves, rearranging and reconverting at Government expense to enable them without unnecessary delay to resume peacetime production; but despite this the United States Chamber of Commerce and all similar organizations are inordinately stressing, through the press and publicity agencies, the great need for plans for reconversion.

I have talked to many manufacturers and I am satisfied that they are not overlooking any opportunity in that respect. I regret that a great many outstanding officials and otherwise well-meaning men are unduly alarmed because of this publicity. Although the last war ended abruptly in 1918, I do not recollect any let-up in business before the latter part of 1919 and early 1920, when President Wilson aimed to stop the speculations and manipulations and

hoarding by many clever and shrewd operators who were aided by the banks, and because of that legitimate businessmen were denied and refused financial aid by these banks. Then an orderly procedure to aid legitimate business was necessary to stop loans for speculative and hoarding purposes, which procedure had for a short time an adverse effect upon some businesses.

And at that time we had not made any provision for servicemen as we are doing now. Today the industries are in far better position than they were in 1920, as is shown in a newspaper article covering a late report of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which under leave to extend, I will insert in the RECORD. This report discloses that, aside from banks and insurance companies, American industry's working capital jumped from $24,600,000,000 in 1939 to $41,600,000,000 in 1943 and that more than half of the 70-percent increase occurred in the last 2½ years. Cash increased from $10,900,000,000 to $22,600,000,000, this after taxes and renegotiations were settled.

Manufacturers and railroads and trade showed the greatest increase in working capital. Railroads increased their working capital by 300 percent.

I urge the reading of the article covering the report issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission, as follows:

UNITED STATES INDUSTRY'S WORKING ASSETS UP SEVENTEEN BILLION

PHILADELPHIA, June 8.—American industry's working capital reached an unprecedented level by the end of 1943, pointing to the possibility of post-war reconversion and expansion without need of financial assistance from outside sources.

A Securities and Exchange Commission analysis of current assets and liabilities of all American corporations (other than banks and insurance companies) from 1939 through 1943 disclosed today that net working capital "in an extremely liquid form" jumped from $24,600,000,000 in 1939 to $41,600,000,000 in 1943. A substantial proportion of the total is in cash.

WARTIME TREND

More than half of the 70-percent rise occurred after the United States entered the war.

Among the changes in assets and liabilities during the 5-year period:

Cash increased from $10,900,000,000 to $22,600,000,000.

Government securities leaped from $2,200,000,000 to $16,000,000,000 and Federal income tax liabilities from $1,200,000,000 to $15,900,000,000.

Increases in working capital during this period are "attributable for the most part to retained profits after taxes and dividend disbursements," the analysis states.

LIQUID ASSETS SOAR

Until late 1941, the rise in working capital took the form of inventories, reflecting a rising level of business. Liquid assets, exclusive of inventories, have risen from $6,500,000,000 to $14,700,000,000, while inventories remained relatively constant, the analysis reveals.

Manufacturing groups, railroads, and trade showed the largest increase in working capital. Railroads increased their working capital 300 percent during the period, with trade, manufacturing, and utilities recording increases of from 50 to 70 percent.

Lend-Lease Aid to the Italian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Normandy and Rome are almost a thousand miles apart, and yet they are both sectors of the same gigantic battlefield in which we have trapped the enemy for his final overthrow. The rout of the Nazi armies in Italy weakens the resistance which the enemy can oppose to our boys landing on the coast of France. Our increasing control of the Mediterranean is costing the enemy dear in the shape of men and materials already engaged, or waiting for attacks in other quarters.

But while we have brought the Nazi machine to bay, we still may have a long bitter task of fighting ahead of us. It is a task in which we should utilize to the full all the millions of Europeans who, after 4 years and more of oppression, want to fight against the Germans. If we fail to utilize the fighting men of Europe, we are to that extent needlessly sacrificing the lives of our own boys.

Of some of these brave legions of fighters in Europe we are already well aware. We have heard of the French underground, and we all acknowledge the aid given us by the heroic struggles of Tito's men in Yugoslavia. But I do not think we are all aware of the efforts of the Italian people, efforts now being made, and which can be greatly increased in the near future.

Many facts prove that a new Italy is being born. Eleven months ago, Mussolini was ousted and is now nothing more than a hated, secondary Quisling in Nazi-occupied Italy. When Mussolini fell, the King, who had collaborated with fascism for 21 years, asked Marshal Badoglio to form a new cabinet, which immediately sought for the armistice, and after a few weeks formally declared war on Germany, as a cobelligerent with the Allies. After two reshufflings of the Badoglio government, however, it appeared evident that the Italian people were not willing to support either the King or Badoglio, both compromised during the long life of the Fascist regime. At the fall of Rome, the anti-Fascist parties succeeded in imposing the will of the Italian people without compromises. Now the King is gone, and Badoglio has been replaced by Premier Bonomi, an honored liberal statesman, a man who held no office under fascism, and who was the head of the underground movement in Rome during the bloody months of German occupation.

Premier Bonomi said on the day he was requested to form the new Cabinet that his program was to do away with everything Fascist and to see that the war effort continues. "We hope to be of real assistance to the Allies," he said. He has excluded all old Fascists and Fascist officeholders from his Cabinet. All members of the Bonomi Cabinet have refused to swear allegiance to Prince Umberto or to the Savoy monarchy. They pledged loyalty only to the Italian Nation.

These political developments foreshadow increased Italian aid to the Allies in the future, but they are outstripped by what the Italian people, bewildered, oppressed by Fascists and Nazis, and torn asunder as they were last September, are already doing. The Italian Fleet is now sharing the honor and the risks of the war in the Mediterranean for the ideals of the United Nations. Units of the Italian Army are fighting alongside the Allied troops in Italy, and it can be hoped their numbers will soon increase.

Italian prisoners of war in this country and in the British Empire have been recently allowed to volunteer for special noncombat service units, but the enthusiasm with which they answered leaves no doubts about their willingness to join combat units.

But what is perhaps the most important contribution of the Italians to our military operations is the activities of the heroic partisans, who fight the Germans in northern and central Italy as well as in Yugoslavia.

In the Balkans entire units of the Italian armies joined Marshal Tito's forces at the time of the armistice, forming that Garibaldi division which under Tito is gallantly fighting the Nazis in Montenegro.

In central and northern Italy the number of partisans is daily increasing. Already in January the Free Italian News Agency in Cairo announced that 650,000 guerrillas were operating in Nazi-occupied Italian territory under the coordination of a single supreme command. Italian generals lead partisan groups. Villages, towns, entire valleys are, or have been, under the complete control of the partisans, and suffer the bloody revenge of the Nazis when the latter succeed in overwhelming their heroic resistance. Thousands of partisans have lost their lives in the fight against our common enemy, thousands of hostages have been shot, innumerable houses and entire villages have been destroyed by the Nazis in their fury of reprisal.

The importance of the activities of the partisans is now receiving official recognition. On May 21 General Alexander, supreme commander of the Allied Army in Italy, concurred with the Italian high command in establishing six zones in Nazi-occupied Italy for the purpose of organizing their resistance. At the same time General Alexander's headquarters made public the first comunique issued by the Italian underground, stating that guerrilla activities in the north had forced the Germans to send 6 of their 25 divisions in Italy to counteract them. On June 6, General Alexander transmitted by radio a message to the partisans of northern Italy, urging them to rise against the common enemy, to cut communication lines, to increase the confusion in the areas behind the enemy, to cooperate with the Allies in their fight

against the Germans. "The liberation of Italy"—the message says—"is now taking place. Cooperate among yourselves. Cooperate with me. Together we will attain victory."

The Italian contribution to our common victory cannot be increased or continued unless Italy is adequately supplied with the necessary arms, goods, and equipment for the struggle against the common enemy; and also with the means of relieving the starvation, malnutrition, disease, and economic chaos which are a threat and handicap not only to Italian armed resistance but also to our own campaigns there. President Roosevelt, in his broadcast of June 5, stated that our troops have found in Italy starvation, malnutrition, disease, a deteriorating education, a lowered public health. All of these are byproducts of the Fascist misrule and of the unhappy necessities of war.

The instrument which we customarily use to supply the necessary weapons, equipment, and food for war is lend-lease. We have extended lend-lease to nations who are sacrificing less in blood and suffering for our cause than Italy is sacrificing at this moment. The Italians want to increase their efforts, and we should do everything we can to make that possible.

Therefore, for the purpose of shortening the struggle against the enemy, of utilizing all available resources of manpower and fighting spirit, and of furthering the efforts and increasing the effectiveness of the Italian people, I believe that Italy should be made a lend-lease country. To this end I have introduced a resolution stating that the House recommends that the President make Italy a lend-lease country.

The Truth About Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, precisely because he has a very great following Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., has an unusual responsibility to the people of this Nation for giving an accurate and fair appraisal of the things which he discusses in his radio speeches and in his columns in the newspapers. As the Members of the House well know, it is my profound belief that in the cooperative method of doing business there is available to the people of this Nation, whether they be farmers, consumers, purchasers of electricity, holders of insurance policies, people in need of credit, or whoever they may be, a method of solving their problems by their own efforts and by the application of the principle of mutual loyalty and without any reliance whatsoever on the Government. Cooperatives are nothing more nor less than the common man's opportunity to have some part in the free enterprise which we talk about so much. And yet Mr. Lewis has gone out of his way to paint a picture of the operation of some of the outstanding cooperatives of this country which is not only unfair but seriously inaccurate. I am, therefore, asking consent to include with my remarks the answer of the Cooperative League of the United States to the charges made by Mr. Lewis. This answer appeared in the Cooperative League News Service for May 25:

FULTON LEWIS MAKES UNPROVOKED ATTACK ON CO-OPS—COOPERATIVE LEAGUE ANSWERS CHARGES MADE BY COMMENTATOR

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio commentator and columnist, in his column of May 13 and 14, made an unprovoked attack on the cooperative movement—the Cooperative League of the United States of America declared today. Lewis accused cooperative leaders of using unlimited expense accounts, he contended that the co-ops are evading payment of taxes, declared that the cooperatives are subsidized by the Government through low cost of credit and that the cooperatives have become the kind of big business the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is trying to destroy. All these charges are untrue, the Cooperative League of the United States of America declared.

"Mr. Lewis opened his column by pointing out that he is a member of two cooperatives, one to supply electric light and power and one handling farm supplies, yet he made grievous errors in fact which could easily have been checked through sources open to any co-op member or to any reporter or to the public at large," the league declared. Apparently no attempt was made to check these facts for Mr. Lewis did not consult any of the three offices of the Cooperative League, National Federation of Cooperatives, with offices in Washington, New York, and Chicago, nor did he check obviously incorrect material with the office of the Consumers Cooperative Association or Mr. Cowden, its president, who was personally maligned in the syndicated column.

Mr. Lewis declared in his column that the salary of co-op officials must not be more than $7,500 a year, which is too bad, because Mr. Cowden, for instance, undoubtedly is worth several times that salary. However, there's no limitation on expense accounts. Both of these statements are false, the Cooperative League contends. There are no provisions limiting salaries to a specific figure. Salaries are fixed by boards of directors elected by members of cooperatives and expense accounts are audited by independent auditors and are subject to review by both the directors and the members of the cooperative.

Lewis declared that cooperatives can sell only to stockholder members, which is untrue. Anyone may buy in a co-op and anyone may join.

He continued to say that "There are ways around it" (speaking of this nonexistent provision). He goes on to say that "the (co-ops) are supposed to take your name and address, and when you have bought a certain amount, you get your share of stock." That again is untrue. Consumers must make application for membership and make an initial payment to become members of cooperatives.

Lewis charges that the Government extends subsidized loans to cooperatives. Actually some cooperatives may borrow from the Bank for Cooperatives at the customary rate of 2½ percent which is neither charity or subsidy. In fact, the Government has considerable revenue from these loans. Other types of business have access to loans from the R. F. C. and other sources not available for cooperatives.

Most puzzling of Mr. Lewis' inaccuracies, the Cooperative League points out, is the fact that he has denounced the co-ops because of their differences in operation from ordinary business and then turns around to say "there is no discernible difference between the private company and the cooperative."

Lewis charges that the consumer cooperatives are exempt from taxes. Consumer cooperatives pay the same income taxes, property, and license taxes as ordinary business, they also pay corporation taxes, sales taxes, and excise taxes. The savings which cooperatives return to their members or which the members democratically vote to invest in capital is not income and therefore not subject to income taxes. This is the same right which is available to other business which may return overcharges to their customers if they wish.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it may be pointed out that such tax exemption as has been granted to farm cooperatives by action of Congress has been given them specifically because it was recognized by Congress that agriculture as a whole has throughout the years received very substantially less than its fair share of our national income. The advantage accruing to farm cooperatives from this tax exemption is a very slight one indeed if we are talking about those portions of their receipts which really are income within the meaning of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution.

But what the enemies of cooperatives are really after is to secure the passage of a confiscatory tax on the savings which cooperatives make for their members and which are refunded to those members at the end of each year on the basis of their patronage. Such savings never are part of the income of cooperatives, nor would they be a part of such income even though the tax-exemption provisions now accorded farm cooperatives by Congress should be repealed. For cooperatives only act as servants of their members in purchasing supplies for them.

Mr. Fulton Lewis is only one of those who is making these attacks. The so-called National Tax Equality Association and powerful forces associated with it must also be taken into account. Should they have their way with regard to the taxation of cooperatives the effective response of the cooperatives would of course be very obvious. For every single such cooperative, whether it deals in petroleum products, feed, fertilizer, or whatever the product may be, has always been in the position to reduce prices if it wanted to. Cooperatives have not cut prices but have sold at the regular market prices, partly because this is one of the fundamental principles of cooperation, partly because they have deliberately refrained from underselling their competitors. If however the present well heeled enemies of cooperation had their way and commenced the taxing of savings returned to members, it would not be the co-ops that would in the long run suffer. For they could quite as well make the savings available to their members in lower prices as by the present method. The consequences of their doing so are I think hardly the results desired by those who now seek their destruction.

A great hue and cry has also been raised about the banks for cooperatives which are part of the cooperative farm-credit structure. It is apparently forgotten how frequently Government lending agencies have given credit at very low interest rates to industry which was not cooperative. If we are seeking real equality there are a great many factors which must be taken into account and these factors upon careful analysis will certainly not show that farm cooperatives or any other kind of cooperatives have on balance received anything like the special favors that have been granted to other groups in the country.

It certainly is not difficult to understand the deep concern of small-scale business under the present situation. But it is not cooperatives that are causing the distress of small business. Rather it is the very monopolies which cooperatives have in so many instances been successful in combating. In the petroleum field for example, it is not the farm cooperatives which produce and deal in petroleum which threaten the independents in this industry, but rather the stranglehold by the major companies.

Post-War Position of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent, Mr. Gustaf Ek, of East Portchester, on the post-war position of Finland and my reply to him:

JUNE 9, 1944.

DEAR MRS. LUCE: I am very worried about the position of Finland in the post-war world. It seems to me that Finland is not the same kind of a country as Germany or Japan or the other German allies. It seems to me that Finland from the beginning was simply fighting a war of national sovereignty and to protect herself against aggression. Do you think that she will be, or should be, treated the same way as the Germans and the Japs at the peace table?

I am a good American of Finnish ancestry, but I cannot help hoping that our administration will see that Finland gets a just peace.

I would like so much to know what you think about this.

Sincerely,

GUSTAF EK.

JUNE 13, 1944.

Mr. GUSTAF EK,
East Portchester, Conn.

DEAR MR. EK: I am glad to answer, to the best of my knowledge, your inquiry in regard to Finland's position in the post-war world. Naturally, no one can tell you today what Finland's post-war position will be. But many people know what, in terms of international justice, it should be.

Through these last years, when heroism and sacrifice have become commonplace, the epic of Finland's resistance to an unprovoked aggressor in the winter of 1939–40 is unsurpassed, though more and more these days it becomes expedient to forget it.

You remember, of course, that Russia, as Hitler's silent partner in 1939 and 1940, occupied eastern Poland, the Baltic states and Bessarabia. While this was going on in the East and while Europe was performing the first dreary scene of the first act of World War No. 2, Russia presented Finland with territorial demands which Finland found impossible to accept. When the Finnish Government politely declined to accede to these demands, Russia attacked, neglecting the outmoded formality of a declaration of war. Most Finns learned that their country was at war when the Helsinki Airport was bombed by planes of the Russian Air Force.

The course of that brief war is familiar to all of us. The Finns, fighting a nation which outnumbered them 60 to 1 in population, stained the Arctic snows red with their blood and the blood of the invaders.

It was a struggle between an armored giant and a valiant but ill-equipped pigmy.

Through the long months of Finland's ordeal, the outside world expressed its sympathy for the Finns in unlimited outpourings of words.

President Roosevelt said, in an address to delegates of the American Youth Congress on February 11, 1940: "Here is a small Republic in northern Europe. A Republic which, without any question whatever, wishes solely to maintain its own territorial and governmental integrity. Nobody with any pretense of common sense believes that Finland had any ulterior designs on the Soviet Union * * *. American sympathy is 98 percent with the Finns in their effort to stave off invasion of their own soil. That American sympathy by now is axiomatic * * *.

"The Soviet Union, as a matter of practical fact, as everybody knows, who has the courage to face the fact, the practical fact known to you and known to all the world, is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world. It has allied itself with another dictatorship and it has invaded a neighbor so infinitesimally small that it could do no conceivable, possible harm to the Soviet Union, a small nation that seeks only to live at peace as a democracy, and a liberal, forward-looking democracy at that."

Winston Churchill said in a speech in January of the same year: "The service rendered by Finland to mankind is magnificent."

The American press outdid itself in praising Finnish valor, and New York audiences applauded There Shall Be No Night, the Pulitzer prize-winning play by Robert E. Sherwood on Finland's battle against a totalitarian aggressor. Mr. Sherwood is now Director of Overseas Operations of the Office of War Information, charged with making our democratic ideology plain to our enemies.

In Sherwood's preface to the published version of There Shall Be No Night, written on September 13, 1940, he said: "Here was a decent little democracy, which had paid its debts and played no part in any of the vicious European intrigues, ruthlessly assaulted by an overwhelmingly superior force and gallantly fighting for its own freedom. There could be only one reason for America's reluctance to give any help to the Finns, and that was abject fear. And if we were in a state of abject fear, then we had already been conquered by the masters of the slave states and we must surrender our birthright." Mr. Sherwood flatly suggested we should have gone actively to Finland's aid against Russia.

As a result of the attack on Finland, Russia became the only country ever expelled from the League of Nations—the last official effort of that unhappy organization to go on record against international aggression.

But in March 1940 Finland, still alone and with no hope of real help from the "sympathetic" world, its soldiers exhausted from constant fighting without relief or reenforcements, its power of waging war at an end, accepted Russian peace terms. To obtain peace, Finland had to cede to Russia 16,173 square miles, or about 12 percent of her territory, and later the Soviet Union brought forth other demands which had not been included in the original peace treaty.

With nearly 500,000 of her people homeless, her cities in ruins, 15,000 to 25,000 of her young men dead on the field of battle, thousands of war orphans and widows and maimed survivors of the struggle, plucky Finland engaged at once in a vast program of reconstruction.

Even in the midst of the hopeless struggle with Russia, it had paid the installment on its war debt to the United States. Now, in peace again, it continued to live up to its reputation for honor, progress, and respectability among the nations of the world.

On June 22, 1941, Hitler attacked Russia. Three hours later Russian planes bombed Finland. The Finnish Government requested an explanation. It received none, but the bombings continued and on June 25 Russia made a full-scale attack.

Those Finns who had tuned into Moscow on their radio had already learned that the purpose of these attacks was to wipe them off the surface of the earth. What could the Finns do under these circumstances? What would America do? What did America do under very similar conditions after Pearl Harbor?

Thus, the Finns went to war. They found themselves, of course, on the same side as the Germans who were attacking Russia. But they were not in spirit a German ally or satellite. And America, you will remember, after Pearl Harbor, entered the war as an actual ally of the nation which President Roosevelt himself has called less than 2 years earlier "a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world." The ideological line has become badly crossed by the terrible necessities of power politics.

Last winter the Finns attempted to negotiate with the Russians in the hope of obtaining an armistice, but the minimum terms presented by the Soviet Government constituted an actual physical impossibility and could not have been proposed with any desire for acceptance. Nor would the Russians hear of a Finnish counter-proposal or engage in any bilateral discussion of possible terms.

An example of the minimum Russian demands is an indemnity from Finland of $600,000,000 American dollars, payable over a period of 5 years in goods. The total annual national income of Finland is less than $600,000,000 and such an indemnity could be paid—if at all—only if every Finn became an abject slave and a drudge for Russia.

Some of the other Russian demands, to anyone at all familiar with European history, were equally unacceptable to any country which wished to retain its national independence.

It is to be remembered, of course, that in this second chapter of her war with Russia, Finland has occupied only the territory which was stolen from her in 1940, and such additional marginal land as had to be taken as a protection against a Russian counterattack. Finland did not engage in the assault on Leningrad. Its armies have not undertaken an offensive since 1941.

Recently the State Department criticized the Finnish Government for the alleged suppression of a Swedish-language pro-Allied newspaper. But Finland was attacked by one ally, Russia, and another ally, England, has declared war on her. How would Americans feel if a Russian-language newspaper, which favored the Japanese, because Russia is still on cordial terms with Japan, were being published in America? We would suppress such a paper instantly. Isn't there every justification for Finland to suppress a publication which supports the countries

which are at war with her and will not give her possible terms for peace?

Now you ask about Finland's post-war position. The only answer I can give is that Finland is as much a victim of aggression as Poland, Belgium, the Netherlands or any of the small countries of Europe which American soldiers are now fighting and dying to liberate. Finland is not on the side of the Axis, but on the side of all free people everywhere who are willing to defend and, if necessary, die for their freedom and national integrity.

We are not, for example, fighting for communism because we are fighting with Russia. We are fighting to protect our country, and appreciate the support of the Russians with all our hearts. Finland is not fighting for nazi-ism because she is fighting with Germany. She is fighting for the independence of Finland.

Under the Atlantic Charter, under all our sacred pledges, under our avowed war aims and the avowed war aims of our allies, under the prayers we have addressed to God in asking His aid in this war, Finland and the Finns should be free to pursue their own national destiny in peace and security.

But this is only an extended preamble. The best and only possible answer to your question about Finland in the post-war world was given by Winston Churchill in January 1940.

Mr. Churchill said in a speech at that time: "We cannot tell what the fate of Finland may be, but no more mournful spectacle could be presented to what is left to civilized mankind than that this splendid northern race should be at last worn down and reduced to servitude worse than death by the dull brutish force of overwhelming numbers. If the light of freedom which still burns so brightly in the frozen north should be finally quenched, it might well herald a return to the Dark Ages, when every vestige of human progress during 2,000 years would be engulfed."

What Mr. Churchill said in 1940 was true then and is true today and will be true in the post-war world and forever, as long as freemen are considered better than slaves and courage a higher virtue than submissiveness.

The only possible justification of Russia's two attacks on Finland is its nationalistic claim to a necessary security sphere. But today or tomorrow Russian security will never lie in the erection of a human wall, a wall composed of Finns and Poles and Latvians and Lithuanians and Estonians, to absorb the punishment of Russia's continental enemies. It will lie in the destruction of German military power for time out of mind. The United Nations have pledged themselves to the effective disarmament of Germany, and on this, and this alone, does the security of western Russia depend. In a post-war world of international cooperation, as expressed in the Moscow Agreements with a demilitarized Germany, Russia would have no need to seize Finnish territory or interfere in the internal affairs of Finland. Stalin's attitude on this one question, and on the other current Baltic problems, is the measure of his faith in the Moscow Agreements, and the measure of his faith in American will to participate in the policing of a conquered Germany. I do not feel he need doubt America's willingness to see that an aggressive Germany shall not arise again, nor America's willingness to cooperate with a friendly, nonaggressive Russia.

The security of Russia is of great importance to the whole world, but so is the security of Finland. For we have seen, in two world wars, that one nation's security cannot be purchased at the cost of extinction of another. But should the final decision be an expedient one, should Finland and Poland and the Baltic states be placed on the auction block in the interests of temporary international political tranquility, then the seeds of World War No. 3 have been planted.

Surely our Government and the governments of our allies can persuade the Russians that we will work with them so closely and so realistically in drawing up the pattern of a secure and peaceful post-war world that there will be no need for Russia to deprive its neighbors of freedom in order to safeguard its own borders. The question of little Finland's future is part of the tremendous question which this war is being fought to answer for all time: the question of whether might or justice will rule the world.

I hope with all my heart that the United Nations will answer that question wisely.

Sincerely,

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

P. S.—I believe it to be of the utmost significance that Russia has marked the opening of the second front in Europe by Anglo-American forces, not so much to launch a large-scale attack against Germany through Poland but to knock Finland out completely. This recalls the first week of June 1941. However, military necessity may dictate this move completely. All the world hopes so.

Ten Years of F. H. A. Mortgage Insurance Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago Congress passed the National Housing Act which was approved on June 27, 1934. Since that time, in accordance with the declared purpose of the act, more than 6,000,000 American families have been enabled to improve their housing standards and conditions. Private capital to the extent of $7,500,000,000 has been invested by the Nation's financial institutions in home mortgages and loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

During the past 10 years industry has benefited directly and indirectly by the revival of the home building which followed the enactment of the National Housing Act. Communities throughout the Nation have profited by the prompt collection of real-estate taxes on properties financed with insured mortgages. Our war program has benefited by the major contribution made by private enterprise in the production of war housing under the F. H. A. insured mortgage plan.

The insurance of mortgages and loans in the home-financing field, authorized by the National Housing Act, has been an unusual Government venture. Here, instead of Government control of private business we have an outstandingly successful example of Government cooperation with private enterprise. Relying upon private capital and initiative for results, the Government has merely extended its support through insurance of private home credit transactions. The venture further is unusual in that the Federal Housing Administration is a Government agency that is paying its own way.

Confident of the fundamental soundness of the National Housing Act, Congress in 1934 authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make available to the F. H. A. sufficient funds to inaugurate the program. Within 3 years the F. H. A. was paying part of its administrative expenses out of income obtained from insurance premiums, fees, and interest on its investments. And, within 5 years after the beginning of its mortgage insurance operations the F. H. A. was independent of the Public Treasury. Since June 30, 1940, the F. H. A. has not only paid all of its operating expenses, and its mortgage insurance losses, but also annually has added surplus income to the mortgage insurance reserves which now aggregate $81,000,000.

When the National Housing Act was passed 10 years ago American homes were being allowed to fall into disrepair and were not being kept abreast of modern improvements. Workers in the building trades were unemployed and the building industry was at its lowest production level in many years. Mortgage money was frozen almost solid; channels of credit open to home owners were practically nonexistent. The repercussions of a major down-swing in real estate values had reached proportions of a national calamity.

Within a decade conditions in the home-building field have completely changed. American families have been able to obtain more than four and one-half million F. H. A.-insured short-term personal credit loans for property improvement or maintenance. Approximately 1,350,000 families have been able to build or buy homes that are modern and financed within the borrowers' earning capacity. Until the war demands necessitated curtailment of the use of critical materials, aggressive measures used to bring the F. H. A. insurance programs before the public engendered an additional large volume of property improvements and new construction. As a result building activity was stimulated; workers in the building trades left relief rolls; and the wheels of the building and allied industries started to turn again producing materials and equipment used in the construction of hundreds of thousands of American homes.

The benefits of home-building activity have been far reaching. Our natural resources—the mines and forests—were reopened to produce the materials and equipment used by the building industry. Transportation of all kinds was required to carry raw materials and finished products across the country. New homes and improvements meant new furnishings—an important stimulant to the furniture, textile, and related industries. Builders, building supply dealers, professional workers, real-estate operators, and a host of others found new opportunities as a result of the home-building activity that accompanied the release of private investment funds.

A prime objective of the National Housing Act was to provide home owners with an economical, dependable, sound source of credit. It was designed to bring our home-financing system out of a chaotic condition and restore it on an

improved basis, able to meet the legitimate demands of the borrowing public. Through the judgment and integrity with which the act has been administered by the Federal Housing Administration these objectives have been accomplished within a relatively short time.

Under the F. H. A.-insured mortgage plan, home owners today have the security of fully amortized long-term single mortgages obtained at lowest cost in history. Instead of mortgages representing 50 or 60 percent of the property value with second and third mortgages piled on top, often at usurious interest rates, home owners today are able to obtain one loan up to 80 or 90 percent of the F. H. A. property valuation. Instead of mortgages due in 3 to 5 years, with uncertain and high renewal fees, home owners today can obtain mortgages payable in monthly installments over a period up to 20 or 25 years without need of renewal and without paying a premium for that privilege. The F. H. A. has succeeded in reducing the interest rate on the mortgages it insures to the point that the average home owner can pay for his property, pay the interest, taxes, hazard insurance, and mortgage insurance at an average monthly cost of about $37—often less than he would pay for renting a comparable house.

The F. H. A. affords home owners a measure of protection never before available and nowhere else now available. For the first time in history inexperienced home owners have an unbiased agency to which they can turn for aid to avoid the dangers and pitfalls of home ownership. Home owners for the first time have the benefit of impartial appraisal of their properties by trained valuators. Through the insured-mortgage system home owners may obtain better planned, better built, and better financed homes than ever before—homes built in attractive, well-planned neighborhoods.

In financing their home purchases with F. H. A. insured mortgages borrowers have the satisfaction of knowing that they are buying a home upon a basis that is within their earning power. Reducing the number of properties sold at a sacrifice as a result of the borrower having bought beyond his means, it also has proven an effective aid in stabilizing the real-estate market.

In addition to the tangible benefits that have accrued to individual home owners, builders, and industry through the National Housing Act, there have been major benefits to the national economy. Within a 10-year period the F. H. A. has not only made home financing possible at uniformly low cost throughout the entire country, but has made insured home mortgages marketable securities any place in the Nation. This is a remarkable accomplishment, for previously it had always been assumed that mortgage transfers were almost exclusively limited to local transactions.

While the great bulk of insured loans have been originated and held by local financial institutions, a sound, dependable secondary market for insured home mortgages has been developed. The marketable quality of these mortgages has resulted from uniform methods of underwriting, requirements of good building and property standards, and the establishment of these mortgage loans on a sound investment basis. Backed by the United States Government, these loans are safe investments that can be bought and sold with confidence by financial institutions at any time, in any place.

To stabilize home-mortgage financing the National Housing Act recognized that home mortgages must be marketable. To this end the act provided for the chartering of national mortgage associations empowered to deal in insured mortgages. The soundness of that feature of the act has been demonstrated by the formation and activity of the Federal National Mortgage Association which has provided the necessary mechanism to assure the marketability of these mortgages. The creation of a secondary mortgage market has been effective in bringing an ample supply of home mortgage funds on F. H. A. terms to all sections of the country.

Insured mortgages brought within the range of conservative investment have provided financial institutions with a profitable outlet for funds that had previously been difficult to place. These funds—largely the savings of millions of depositors—are safeguarded by mortgage insurance. Home mortgages thus have been given an investment status that provides financial institutions with assets or collateral upon which to obtain emergency loans. In case of foreclosure, the insured-mortgage plan provides lending institutions with negotiable interest-bearing securities in place of temporarily unmarketable properties. Safeguarded by mortgage insurance some 9,000 national banks, State bank and trust companies, insurance companies, savings and loan associations, and other financial agencies have been enabled to invest nearly $6,000,000,000 in over a million and a quarter long-term amortized mortgages on residential properties.

The war has emphasized the emergency value of the National Housing Act. Without mortgage insurance private capital would not have assumed the risks involved in financing housing built in rapidly expanding war-industry areas. Through the application of techniques and insuring policies successfully developed by the F. H. A. under peacetime conditions, private industry has been enabled to build approximately 330,000 dwelling units for occupancy by essential workers in war industries. It has been estimated that loans of over a billion and a half dollars insured by the F. H. A. have financed at least 85 percent of the Nation's privately financed wartime emergency-housing needs, and have relieved the Federal Government of the immediate outlay of this large sum of money.

Losses experienced under the National Housing Act thus far have been low. Out of more than four and one-half million property improvement loans insured in 10 years, defaulted notes have numbered only 4 percent of the total volume. Recoveries on these defaulted notes have reduced total claims paid by F. H. A. to 1½ percent of the total amount insured. In 10 years the F. H. A. has found it necessary to take possession of only 4,000 properties—virtually all of which have been sold—out of 1,055,000 mortgages insured under title II of the act. Losses chargeable to the handling of these properties have been more than offset by the $3,700,000 in prepayment premiums paid by mortgagors who have paid their mortgages in full prior to maturity. Out of 356 large-scale housing projects financed with insured mortgages, the F. H. A. has been forced to take possession of only 18. Out of nearly 250,000 mortgages on war housing insured, the F. H. A. has had to take over less than 1,500 to date.

On the occasion of the F. H. A.'s tenth anniversary Congress should be congratulated on its wisdom and farsightedness in enacting this highly successful piece of legislation. F. H. A.'s 10-year experience will be invaluable in providing the facilities for financing the large volume of housing that must be built after the war ends. F. H. A. also will be in a position to aid the financing of the large amount of repairs and improvements to dwelling properties that have of necessity been deferred during the war period. It has been demonstrated that insured mortgage and loan financing is a powerful stimulant to the vital home-building industry. The National Housing Act provides the means whereby private industry can immediately begin to function—go from a war to peace basis, and put men to work in peacetime occupations—after victory is achieved.

The Honeybee Goes to War—Beeswax Needed for War Uses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, northwestern Minnesota is a territory of bread and milk and honey truly in fact. We raised considerable wheat and we produced a lot of milk and honey last year, and we will again this year along with many other farm crops.

In the 15 counties of the Ninth District, there are almost 400 individual farmers and city people who keep bees for honey production. Bees are doing their part in the war effort, because the products which are made from honey are essential in the production of numerous war articles. Beeswax is needed for war uses.

A statement with reference to this was recently issued by the War Food Administration of the Department of Agriculture, which reported that more than a million pounds of beeswax a year are needed for use in war products—in adhesive tape used for sealing shells—as waterproofing and protective coatings for shells, belts, coils, and machinery,

especially when shipped into warm climates where ordinary grease would run off—and as protective coverings for our fighting planes.

Because it is of great interest to bee keepers of the Nation and the public as well, I herewith insert a copy of a radio address delivered sometime ago by Mr. James W. Gwinn, president of the American Honey Producers League, of Madison, Wis. The speech, which was entitled "The Honeybee Goes to War," follows:

Because of the increased production of livestock and livestock products brought about by the war emergency, the Government suggests large increases of all legume seeds. At least 28 percent more alsike seed and 54 percent more red cloverseed should be produced. Wisconsin and Minnesota produce large quantities of these seeds and should contribute its share of this increased program.

Red, alsike, and white dutch clovers are practically self-sterile and depend on cross-pollination to produce seed. Research at many experiment stations—particularly Ohio—shows that when pollination insects are excluded from clover blossoms, not more than one to three seeds develop per head. Under maximum honey-bee pollination, alsike enclosed in cages, yielded 120 to 155 seeds per head. This would represent from 15 to 20 bushels per acre.

Research studies in many seed-growing localities reveal that natural pollinating insects, such as bumblebees, solitary bees, flies, butterflies, etc., are entirely too few to insure profitable seed crops of alsike and red clover. Such fields would have to be cut for hay because of poor seed set. The magnitude of the work of pollinating an acre of alsike clover is apparent when we consider that there may be from 300,000,000 to 500,000,000 blossoming florets per acre. It has been found that when a field of alsike were within a mile of a commercial yard of bees ranging from 40 to 200 colonies, the number of seeds per clover head was from 41 to 90.

Experimental work has also shown an alarming scarcity of natural pollinating insects on red-clover bloom. Bumblebees are our best red-clover pollinators, but because they are so few in number, they cannot be depended on. Of the more than 20 different kinds of insects that pollinate red clover, the honeybees are responsible for from 75 to 85 percent of such work; bumblebees 13 to 17 percent, and all others 2 to 5 percent.

White dutch clover, so desirable in pastures, are largely dependent on honeybees for pollination and the production of seed. During the drought years of 1930, 1934, and 1936, these shallow-rooted clovers were killed. In those areas where honeybees were plentiful volunteer crops appeared as soon as moisture and weather conditions were favorable, due to the fact there were seeds in the soil.

The most immediate method for meeting the clover-seed quota suggested by the Government, is for farmers located within 1½ miles of commercial bee yards, to place every emphasis on clover-seed production.

Throughout the southern and eastern part of Wisconsin, and in parts of Minnesota there are hundreds of commercial bee yards ranging from 40 to 100 colonies of bees in a yard. Each colony of bees which has been well managed, should contain 60,000 or more worker bees. Thus where 40 to 100 colonies are located, there would be concentrated at a focal point from 2,400,000 to 600,000,000 of the best type of pollinating insects available.

At best, red clover is a poor seed producer. During favorable years clover seed yields 2 to 4 bushels per acre for red clover and from 4 to 7 bushels per acre for alsike clover, providing there are enough pollination insects present to insure cross-pollination of the clover.

What has been said about cross-pollinating legumes is just as applicable for fruits and vegetables. Most people have some appreciation that the honey bees are the only source of honey and beeswax. Few realize, however, that although the beekeeping industry in the United States produces in excess of 200,000,000 pounds of honey and 4,000,000 pounds of beeswax annually—these are merely byproducts—and that its principal role is in the pollination of many agricultural crops for the production of seed and fruit. Without the help of insects to effect pollination, many species of plants will not set seed or produce fruit no matter how well they are cultivated, fertilized, and protected from disease and pests.

The following fruits and vegetables are more or less dependent upon the honeybee for cross-pollinating agency; apples, apricots, blackberries, raspberries, blueberries, cranberries, gooseberries (who wants gooseberries?), grapes, cucumbers, peaches, pears, muskmelons, plums, strawberries, watermelons, asparagus, broccoli, brussels sprouts, buckwheat, cabbage, carrots, cauliflower, kale, kohlrabi, onions, peppers, pumpkins, radishes, rutabaga, turnips, etc. To make myself clear, we do not need the honeybee to grow the aforesaid crops, but we do need the honeybee to fertilize the seed that produces these crops.

As has been previously pointed out, the natural pollinating insects, such as bumblebees, solitary bees, flies, butterflies, etc., are too few to insure adequate pollination. The reasons for their scarcity are several; as the elimination of the old rail fences, heavy grazing, forest, brush, and grass fires, increased areas of cultivation, rotation of farm crops, drainage of swamp lands, good roads and fast automobile travel. Do you recall the dead insects on your windshields and clogged radiators? Poisoning from insecticides.

When nature shows a proper balance between plants and pollinating insects, both plants and the insects flourish. Agricultural development, however, has seriously interfered with this balance. It has demanded the growing of certain plants in enormous acreages, and unwittingly, destroyed native pollinating insects, as well as their nesting places. As a result the burden of pollination has been increased to such an extent that wild bees are no longer adequate or dependable, particularly where agriculture is highly developed.

Then owing to conditions brought about by the present war, the beekeeping industry must be safeguarded. Beekeeping can be mastered only through years of experience. It cannot be learned as a trade. The fact that bees have a propensity for stinging, discourages many persons from keeping bees, and only certain persons possess the proper temperament to be beekeepers.

The Government needs honey and they need it badly. The Government needs beeswax, they need it badly, too. Most of all, it is imperative we have the best possible pollinating agency—the honey bee that we may secure better seeds, fruits, and vegetables—so "the honeybee goes to war."

In Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem, by John Henry Curtin, from the Las Vegas Morning Tribune, Las Vegas, Nev., of June 6, 1944:

IN MEMORIAM

Underneath a shattered palm tree on a sandy, wave-lapped shore
Lies a husky lad of 20—maybe less or maybe more.
He is just the sort of youngster you have seen on your home street;
And, if you were halfway friendly, he was mighty nice to meet.
You have seen him on the football team you have in your high school;
Or maybe playing basketball, quite snappy as a rule.
He wasn't any angel, and he wasn't very bad;
Just the normal sort of youngster you would like to call you "Dad."
You may go ahead and praise him, but he won't hear what is said;
For, although it seems he's sleeping, the trouble is—he's dead!
He's "the price we pay for victory" in counting up the cost;
He's the simple, silent reason that we won instead of lost.
They can't hear our lovely speeches, as we decorate the graves;
But these dead upon the beaches kept us all from being slaves.
So, I wonder, in memoriam, recalling sacrifice,
If we can't do more than utter empty words that sound so nice.
For the lad beneath the palm tree, and our brave dead everywhere,
Will sleep in peaceful slumber—when we show we really care!

Bankhead Amendments to the Price-Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, on June 5, 1944:

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee, over the protest of a minority of its members, has reported out a bill to extend our price-control and stabilization laws. Included in the bill thus reported out is the Bankhead amendment.

This amendment is designed to increase the price of all cotton textiles. It will not add a red cent to what the cotton grower is now getting and it will cost consumers hundreds of millions of dollars. The only group that can benefit from this amendment are the textile mills, already making profits nine times as great as they made before the war.

So far as the cotton grower is concerned, present ceiling prices of cotton textile products are already at levels which enable the mills to pay parity prices for cotton. The consumer is already paying for parity cotton. The farmer is not getting parity, however, which means that the mills are keeping part of the return supposed to go to the grower. The mills are able to get cotton cheap because, while supplies are large, the manpower they can get has been falling off and the amount of cotton they can use is decreasing.

The further increase in the prices which the Bankhead amendment would compel consumers to pay will not increase the manpower in the industry, will not increase the amount of cotton which the mills can use, and will therefore add not 1 cent to the cotton farmer's income. It will simply increase the already high profits of the mills.

Even if the farmer could get parity through this amendment—which he can't—it would be a thoroughly bad way of doing the job. For the Bankhead amendment will increase the returns to the mills by $150,000,000 to $200,000,000 a year, while it would cost only $50,000,000 a year to pay parity prices to the farmer. What sense does it make to give the mills $4 in order to enable them to pay one? And there is nothing to indicate that they will pay even the $1 though they receive the four. If they aren't paying parity now, although they are financially able to do so, they won't pay it under the Bankhead amendment.

In 1943 the cotton textile industry earned nine times the dollar profits it averaged in peacetime. The industry earned 33 percent on its net worth, that is, what the owners actually had invested in the business. This compares to their peactime return of 4.3 percent. Under the Bankhead amendment, if the mills pay parity prices, their earnings will still be increased to a level 14 times their peacetime average and to 50 percent on the money invested in the business. But if they don't pay parity—and I don't think this amendment will make them pay parity—then for the first 4 months after passage of the act the mills will be earning at an annual rate 16 times their peacetime average and at an annual return of 60 percent on net worth.

There is a simple and direct way of getting a parity price for the cotton grower. That is by increasing the loan rate on cotton. An amendment to do this has also been reported out by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. If this amendment is enacted the grower's problem is solved, solved the only way that is possible and solved without presenting consumers with a second bill for parity and without further inflating textile profits, which are already ample to pay the full parity price.

I fully share Senator BANKHEAD's concern about the prices cotton farmers are receiving and the prices consumers are paying. Furthermore, I know that Senator BANKHEAD is absolutely sincere and earnest in his purpose, even though I completely disagree with his amendment. But I can't see any point in going all around Robin Hood's barn when there is a direct route, and I don't see how we shall ever get to our goal if we steadily back away from it.

The Bankhead amendment is a devasting blow at our stabilization policy. If the cotton industry obtains from Congress a special bonus at the housewife's expense, other pressure groups will not let themselves be ignored.

The pressure group parade has started. I earnestly hope the Senate will call an early halt.

Jobs—Who Will Provide and Pay for Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the press has carried many statements on the subject of jobs after the war is over. With war production out of the picture, there will be many idle factories, many jobless workers, unless private industry or the Government provides new work.

We know that Government jobs can be paid for only by taxation or borrowing and that borrowing cannot continue indefinitely. That leaves to pay for Government-controlled factories, Government-provided jobs, only taxation to be levied upon the people themselves. It is evident to every thinking person that there is an ever-lessening number of primary producers; that is, tillers of the soil, miners, and those having to do with production directly from the earth. That group cannot continue to bear ever-increasing burdens placed upon them by either Government jobs or jobs at excessive wages.

Now think that through and you will see that the demand that the Government provide, after the war is over, jobs for everyone at union wages, is impossible of realization. Especially is this true if the unions insist that those who have money are to create and maintain the factories and pay the wages demanded by union leadership.

Union leadership constantly refuses to provide jobs but it demands that someone else provide the jobs and pay the wages fixed by it. That just will not work out and the sooner we all face the facts and get on a sound working basis, the quicker the true solution to this very serious problem will come to all of us.

An editorial from the Baltimore Sun of June 2 gives one slant at the problem. That editorial is as follows:

Regard with respect those sit-in workers at the Long Island City plant of the Brewster Aeornautical Corporation. They are pioneers of the new economic order. They have developed a new pressure-group technique, which might be called the strike in reverse. They have put across their point, not by refusing to work, but by refusing to stop work.

More than this, their point itself represents a new labor principle. They have successfully asserted a claim (though it doesn't yet have the status of a legal right) not only to have jobs but to have those jobs where they want them to be and at their current rates of pay.

Where they want them, of course, is at the Long Island City plant of the Brewster company. Representatives of other war industries have made them offers—indeed, would love to hire them. The War Manpower Commission has stated that 11,000 jobs are "immediately available" in the nearby New York City area, more than enough to accommodate the full 9,000 on the Brewster plant lists. But those Brewster employees want to keep on working right where they have been working, and the administration has obediently accepted that proposition. Pressed to it by President Roosevelt himself, the military procurement agencies are trying to rejuggle the military production program to meet the wishes of the Brewster workers.

This is, it must be admitted, a novel complication in the planning of military production. If it becomes an accepted part of the procedure, soon or late it is bound to raise the question whether military production is being undertaken primarily to provide our fighting men with the weapons they need or to suit the convenience of the war workers.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other approaches toward the difficulty which will surely confront us when the war is over and it behooves labor leaders to give some sound, constructive consideration to the problem, instead of making impossible demands.

Japanese on the Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, there have been constant rumors circulated recently to the effect that the War Relocation Authority was planning to release persons of Japanese descent to return to the Pacific Coast where they have been excluded by military order. In an effort to clarify the situation I recently addressed letters to Henry Stimson, Secretary of War, and Dillon Myer, Director of the W. R. A., asking them to inform me of the official attitude of both agencies on this vexing question.

For the information of the Congress and the country I am inserting herewith the replies which I have received:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: This will acknowledge your letter of May 31 reporting rumors that evacuees are going to be permitted to return to their homes on the Pacific coast despite objections of the War Department.

The exclusion of persons of Japanese descent is by military order and the order can be revoked only by responsible military authorities. The War Relocation Authority at all times observes the military order. There has been no announcement by the military that the coastal zone is to be reopened to persons of Japanese ancestry. There have been, however, a few instances in which permission to return to the restricted military area has been granted by the Western Defense Command to evacuated persons.

Sincerely,

D. S. MYER,
Director.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I have your letter of May 31 concerning the War Department's official attitude toward the return of Japanese to prohibited areas.

Under Executive Order 9066, the authority to exclude individuals suspected of subversive or disloyal activities from sensitive areas was given to the War Department and is exercised for California by the commanding general, Western Defense Command. As you know, the present exclusion of persons of Japanese ancestry was undertaken solely for military reasons, it being deemed advisable due to the impossibility of determining quickly the individual loyalty or disloyalty of the large Japanese population in west coast areas.

However, the military necessity for their continued exclusion is under constant study and surveillance by both the War Department and the Western Defense Command, and any forthcoming changes in policy which would result in the return of such persons will hinge entirely on changes in the military situation. Consequently, it is impossible to predict at this time when the War Department estimate of the situation will warrant their return to the west coast. Obviously, we are maintaining constant liaison with the War Relocation Authority and other Government agencies and are keeping them currently informed of the War Department's policy on exclusion.

I trust this will serve your purposes and appreciate your bringing your concern over the matter to my personal attention.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Service Folks Should Be Allowed More Gasoline When Home on Furloughs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire and intention to offer an amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act today, but I was advised that my amendment would have been ruled out on a point of order. Therefore, I take this occasion to advise the House relative to my amendment even though it could not be considered.

My amendment was as follows:

Such act of October 2, 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. —. The Administrator is hereby directed to put into effect a schedule of gasoline rations for members of the armed forces while on furlough, giving due consideration to whether the applicant has been on overseas duty or stationed within the continental limits of the United States, and further scheduling one amount for the first furlough in any 1 year, and lesser amounts for a second or subsequent furlough in any 1 year."

The least the country can do to show its appreciation for the sacrifices of returning servicemen is give them a decent allowance of gasoline. The paltry 5 gallons allowed at the present time is shameful and a disgrace considering the automobiles one sees regularly at race tracks and other places of recreation on the home front. The reason a man is given a furlough by the Army or Navy is that he may have a rest at some lake resort or seaside, a hunting trip or a visit to friends or relatives in the country.

To my way of thinking, extra gasoline used by a furloughed overseas serviceman is "essential driving" and he should be given an adequate amount—even at the sacrifice of home front pleasure seekers.

This amendment would also correct what I feel is a very unfair arrangement under the present system of doling out furlough gasoline.

At the present time a serviceman may be so fortunate as to be stationed at a camp near his home and receive frequent furloughs. He might be able to get 5 gallons of furlough gasoline each time he comes home. Another soldier from the same town may be stationed at a camp in the extreme part of the country and only get one furlough in a year. He only gets 5 gallons.

I feel that the Administrator should set up a schedule of say 15 gallons of furlough gasoline for the first furlough in any one year, 10 for the second furlough, and 5 for the third, or some proportionate schedule. It is most unfair to the man returning from overseas on his first furlough in 2 years to receive only 5 gallons for his rest period in which he may desire to go fishing, hunting, or visiting, or get away at some quiet lake where he can forget what he has been through. I hope my amendment will carry.

The following editorial from the Fergus Falls (Minn.) Journal brings out the absurdity of the present system:

TREATING ALL ALIKE?

A Minneapolis paper tells of a soldier, Sgt. Lynn Channing, who came home on a 30-day furlough after 18 months fighting in the South Pacific. His brother offered him the use of his car and told him he could secure some gasoline from the Minneapolis ration board. He went to the board, and was told he could have 5 gallons of gas. That was the rule for soldiers home on furlough.

While waiting in line to present his application, he had talked with a young soldier from Fort Snelling, who told him he had had three furloughs in 6 weeks and had gotten 5 gallons allotments each time. The soldier home from overseas battles was entitled to only 5 gallons after 18 months.

The matter has been carried to higher authorities and an exception will probably be made in his case, but the story brings out glaringly the absurdity of some governmental rules and regulations.

To the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "To the Flag" by Bishop Richard J. Cushing, D. D., administrator of the archdiocese of Boston, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Advertiser, June 11, 1944:

TO THE FLAG

(By Bishop Richard J. Cushing, D. D., administrator of the archdiocese of Boston)

Flag Day. Every day is flag day, yet we have done well to dedicate one day as no other in the year is dedicated.

Many are the interpretations of the red, white, and blue, but the whole has but one meaning—union. Union in itself is beautiful, but we do not live or die for a mere union; union is nothing without its purpose. Men are united in one State for the purpose of working their way back to the Heavenly Father who made them. If there were no purpose beyond the State itself, the tragedy would be dark indeed. Where the divine purpose is clear, the man who fights lives a life of flag days, face to face with the things of the soul. And those that die, die well. For they go to death full of the love of life, knowingly sacrificing their will to the inscrutable goodness of God.

Let us also learn from them. For the sacrifice they are so plainly making in these days of the invasion is the same that underlies our own daily decisions. Every union involves sacrifice. Because our flag expresses the Union of the United States, it expresses some sacrifice of sovereignty by every State—a sacrifice of liberty by every citizen. And the fruit of sacrifice is peace.

This is our consolation as the crosses are planted in foreign fields, and to family after family comes the word that one they loved has made the supreme sacrifice for flag and country. These loved ones have found their way home to their Heavenly Father and the fruit of their sacrifice will be peace.

Without the offering of these young lives, there could be no peace.

"Our hearts to you, our country,
And take the pledge we give,
To love, to bear, to suffer,
To die that you may live;
And though beneath your banner
We fall, our names untold,
Thank God, if we have filled it
With service stars of gold."

Support Price Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tennessee Farm Bureau News of July 3, 1941:

ALBERT GORE SCORES VICTORY ON C. C. C. BILL—FARM BUREAU BACKS GORE'S BILL TO PROVIDE FOR AT LEAST 85 PERCENT PARITY ON C. C. C. PURCHASE FOOD. IS SUCCESSFUL

The farm bloc in Congress won another major victory recently with the passage of an amendment to the appropriations bill for purchase of food for relief and for distribution to other nations under the Lend-Lease Act providing that no purchases be made at less than 85 percent of parity.

This is designed to give protection to producers of nonbasic commodities similar to that provided basic crops under the C. C. C. 85 percent parity loans.

This measure was written and introduced by one of our own State's most able Congressmen, ALBERT GORE of the Fourth District. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, threw the strength of organized agriculture behind the measure when it was up for consideration before the committees of the Senate and House.

High praise for Congressman GORE'S work to protect the income of agriculture was voiced by Mr. O'Neal, and passage of the amendment marked the completion of an-

other great victory for agriculture during this session of Congress.

As first introduced by Mr. GORE, the measure provided for 100 percent parity, but stiff administration opposition to this plan brought about a conference between the opposing groups, with all agreeing upon 85 percent. However, it should be pointed out that with no action, those in charge could have hammered down prices to any figure they desired, which would have been very injurious to producers.

In view of the seemingly changed attitude of the administration toward farm prices, the enactment of this law is particularly significant, for many agricultural leaders have been puzzled by recent administration attempts to keep farm prices low, after striving for 8 years to raise prices.

A Soldier's Wife Writes a Letter on Her Babe's Second Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Las Vegas Morning Tribune, Las Vegas, Nev., of June 6, 1944:

A SOLDIER'S WIFE WRITES A LETTER ON HER BABE'S SECOND BIRTHDAY

To the EDITOR:

This is a letter which a young Las Vegas mother has just written to her little daughter in the East.

Not only because the writing is a piece of literary art but because it helps to show us civilians the great sacrifice which our servicemen and their families are making on our behalf, I have secured permission of the young mother to send it to you. I hope you will be able to print it.

A. B.

DARLING DAUGHTER CAROL: Tomorrow is your second birthday and your mother and daddy are far away from you—a whole continent between us. Your daddy is out on bivouac this lovely June evening.

Two years ago tonight he was at work at this time and I was preparing to go to the hospital to bring you into this beautiful world of sunshine, singing birds and nodding flowers in the wind.

Would that I might see you tonight and tomorrow and have you here with me. Your daddy has seen so little of you since you were 3 months old that he sometimes feels you are not his but, never fear, he loves you every bit as I do and longs to have you here with us.

Often we cry at night when we are waiting for the sandman to come. You think it unmanly for your daddy to cry? We love you, Carol, but we are too poor to have you here now, but it won't be long before I shall go back East to fetch you out here for we really aren't happy without you.

Some day, perhaps, you will read this letter written this brilliant moonlight night. Perhaps you will have a glimmering of the heartbreak your daddy and your mommy suffer when you aren't with them.

Perhaps you will be able to understand somewhat the meaning of all the tears that are shed. Then someday you may fall in love, marry the man and know just why your mommy left you with your grandparents when she went West to live with your daddy for how long she did not know.

Our Father in Heaven has guided your daddy and your mommy in almost everything they have done.

Without His constant watchfulness and loving care we would have made many more mistakes than we have even thus far. May He be your constant guide also, Carol, and may you always look to Him in your joy, in your sorrow and in your perplexities.

Of the latter you will probably have many, and your deepest joy will be born of your most heartrending grief. In all these things may you never lose faith, my daughter.

Almost 2 months ago I left you asleep in your crib. I kissed you as I had tucked you in for your afternoon nap. I closed the door as I had done many a time before. You did not know that your mommy would be gone when you awakened.

I walked out of the house with a heavy heart for I knew I would not see you for a long time.

You asked for me every day for a long time. You used to go to the window and watch for me to come home. (You had often done that when I was at home with you.)

How could you know a war was being fought, that your daddy was away across the country teaching in an Army camp? How could you understand that he needed mommy for he might not stay in the States too long?

Your baby heart knew its first real lonesomeness those first weeks of our separation.

I pray tonight, dear Carol, that those weeks that have stretched into 2 months may not stretch too much further. I pray for your safe keeping until I can be with you once more to care for you myself as a mother ought to do. I pray that you will not have forgotten me completely by now.

When we were at home together I cried at night, you didn't know, because your daddy was not with us, or we with him.

Now that he and I are together we need you here, too, to make the family complete. We have done the best we know how to do under all circumstances.

May we be forgiven if our choices have been erroneous.

When the day comes that we can all be together again living a more normal life, the one hope and desire in our minds and hearts is to be the very best parents we know how to be so that you in your turn may also be a good parent, a good citizen, a real person.

Good night, my baby daughter. May the good Lord bless you all the days of your life. Happy birthday tomorrow and all the tomorrows that follow.

Your daddy and your mommy love you very much.

YOUR MOTHER.

Henry Bascom Steagall

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, when the great, loving, and kind heart of the late HENRY B. STEAGALL throbbed for the last time, the Third Congressional District of the State of Alabama, and the State of Alabama—yea, this Nation—sacrificed to eternity and immortality one of our truly great sons.

HENRY STEAGALL, aptly termed the "man who stabilized America's banking system" and "the farmers' best friend," died on the battle front of this House floor. Fully aware of his serious physical condition, he came to the floor to deliver one of the greatest speeches of his career in a cause that he believed was right. He spoke even though his friends and family members urged him to take care. Yes, he spoke, and when he had concluded there was an ovation—a response from both sides of the aisle—the like of which has seldom been heard in these Halls.

In his last speech, as he was being frequently interrupted in the debate of the highly controversial subsidies legislation, Mr. STEAGALL said:

I do not believe there is anybody in the House who knows me who thinks there is any sectionalism or bitterness in my soul. I do not believe there is anyone who knows me who could credit me with selfish partisan purposes in my views. * * * I am speaking for the people of the section of the country with which I am best acquainted.

These were not words in defense of himself but words in defense of his position. HENRY STEAGALL was speaking of the section of the country he knew best. He was thinking of those people who for 30 years had sent him to Congress. Mr. STEAGALL, having served faithfully, had served long. He was a man who typified the American representative system functioning on a high level.

A review of the legislation that bears his name is indicative of the strong place HENRY STEAGALL has had in the history of our Nation for more than a quarter of a century. Elected to the Sixty-fourth Congress, he served continuously until his death. As chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of this great body, he wielded a power that has left an everlasting impression on our great Nation. As a legislative strategist, HENRY STEAGALL has known few equals and no superiors.

HENRY STEAGALL, the profound student of government, took great pride, and rightly, in his representation of the common man—the little fellow. His sponsorship of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act was a dream that came to realization after 20 years of thoughtful activity on the subject. When he came to Congress in 1913, Mr. STEAGALL often said, it was with a determination to formulate some legislation to protect those people who had small deposits in small banks.

If people are going to continue to put their little savings into banks, the greatest service I can render them is to make it possible for them to get those hard-earned savings back.

The belief became with him a life-long ambition and conviction. This conviction became the law of the land in 1933.

Representing a district that is 90-percent agricultural, Mr. STEAGALL earned the name "the farmers' friend" without

serving on the Agricultural Committee. His potency as a legislative strategist, his authority as a leader in this House, his courage as a fighter-to-the-finish, was best displayed when the cause of the farmer and agricultural interests were at stake. He knew when to act and what to do and the farmer never suffered for having HENRY STEAGALL as his Representative.

A great statesman, rightly one of Alabama's favorite and most illustrious sons, a man who wrote his name in a life that will stand as a shining symbol to those of us who follow in his wake, was HENRY STEAGALL.

In my humble opinion, one of the finest qualities in the life of HENRY STEAGALL was his ability to make and keep friends. To know him was to love him, and he will live forever in the minds and hearts of his friends.

The heart of a friend never wonders or doubts,
No matter if years intervene;
The old faith is there and naught can compare
With the comfort it gives though unseen.

Yes, the heart of a friend is the one thing I prize
As life lengthens and twilight descends;
It's the last boon I'll ask when I've finished my task,
That I live in the hearts of my friends.

Supreme Court Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article, by John Griffin, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., June 11, 1944:

SUPREME COURT ABANDONS EXPERIENCE AND PRECEDENT IN ITS RECENT DECISIONS—MAKING OF MAJOR FINDINGS BY SMALL MINORITY INCREASES GROWING LACK OF FAITH ON PART OF GENERAL PUBLIC

(By John Griffin)

Up until comparatively recently it was possible to tell within reasonable limits how the Supreme Court of the United States would function in making its findings. Most lawyers had some idea of how the court would rule, knowing that it would generally follow precedent and experience.

Lately, however, it is about as easy to predict which way a fly will take off as it is to anticipate the Court's actions, for under the present set-up there seems to be little continuity of action and thinking.

Some of the members of the Court have openly expressed their contempt for the thoughts of other members, and on at least one occasion a member has ridiculed the thinking of other members.

NEW IMPORTANT CASE

The most recent case which has focused attention more than ever on the rulings of the Court is the decision that interstate insurance business comes under the Sherman Antitrust Act.

This decision overrules a decision made by the Court years ago, which in itself is not perhaps too surprising, inasmuch as the present Court does not appear to have a great regard for previous decisions; but in this case it is the first time that an important constitutional question is being settled by a minority of the Court.

Able conscientious lawyers and historians say that in the long history of the Court no question of constitutional significance has previously been settled by a minority decision.

In the insurance case four Justices out of nine held that the insurance business should not be regulated by the States, but by Federal rulings. Three Justices dissented, and two did not take part in the decision at all. Thus we find the great and important question dissolved by the decision of only four Justices out of nine. Certainly this is not a healthy situation.

SOME EXPECTED ACTION

Perhaps it is to be expected that sooner or later the insurance business would find itself subject to Federal regulations and domination, inasmuch as it has been about the only business that has escaped the ambitions and reforming desires of Washington.

It is difficult to figure out, however, why at this stage of the game that reform can't wait for a while and why the insurance business, which is under strict regulations by the State, has to face now a determined drive on the part of the reforming group.

This time they are tackling a problem that vitally concerns most Americans, for if there is one thing that the average person expects will not be tampered with, it is the insurance structure of the country.

Americans have been taught for many years that it is their duty to provide for the future—if not for themselves, then at least for their dependents—and men of character are willing to make sacrifices to their own comfort in order to assure adequate protection for members of their families.

INSURANCE A FOUNDATION

As a result of this desire and the great increase in the insurance business over the years, the whole financial structure of the country rests in great part on the security of insurance foundations. If they are going to be rebuilt or remade or remodeled, there is going to be a great deal of nervousness and worry on the part of people who have contributed their dollars for many years to build a future for themselves and for their families.

The insurance business, because of the facts cited above, is, of course, a business that should be regulated. This theory has been well established and accepted by everybody concerned, including the insurance companies, but the regulation has always been by the States, and the custom has grown for 75 years or more.

Why then, at this particular time, is it necessary for the court to step in and proclaim that the regulation should be in the hands of the Federal Government rather than under the direction of the States?

The very least that can happen under the circumstances is a great deal of confusion and a great deal of worry which might lead to a very serious situation.

Of course, we learned a few years ago from the do-gooders and reformers that thrift, which had always been considered a virtue, was no longer something to be admired and sought. Undoubtedly, they would like to extend their theory further so that some of their trick economic theories could have a wider trial and broader influence.

Nevertheless, it is going to be very difficult to convince people who have set aside some of their earnings to provide for the future that there is nothing in the Government grasping of control except the sincere desire to provide for the public interest.

SAW IT COMING

During the past few years many thoughtful and observant people have wondered when the Federal attempt to gain control of the insurance business would be set in motion. The constant change in the make-up of the courts and their tendency to give considerable consideration to political aspects has increased the anxiety of these people.

Now, apparently, the first gun in the campaign has been fired, although Attorney General Biddle assures everyone that the Justice Department "has no desire or purpose to break down State regulations," but it is the Justice Department which set in motion the case which resulted in the Supreme Court decision, and obviously it will result in a strong Federal control and a lessening of the State control.

It is, therefore, another long step toward complete domination by the Federal Government of all activities which concern the people of the country, and is, therefore, a further lessening of the rights of the States.

Not so long ago one of the members of the Supreme Court complained that the tendency of the court to ignore or upset precedents had become so strong of late "as to shake confidence in the consistency of decisions and leave the courts below on an uncharted sea of doubt and difficulty without any confidence that what was said yesterday will hold true tomorrow."

If the justice is so worried about the difficulty that will confront lower courts, it isn't difficult to realize that the confusion and bewilderment among the public will be infinitely greater.

If the court itself remains inconsistent so that lower courts and all concerned with the law cannot see clearly, there is small chance that the general public will be able to have any confidence at all. The decision in the insurance case will be upsetting to everybody except, possibly, Mr. Biddle.

The Dies Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, let faint-hearted Congressmen beware. Let friends of America be on guard. From the National Republic of June 1944 comes the following:

The history of all investigations of subversive movements and conspiracies against American constitutional government has been the same. Smear attacks destroyed the Palmer investigation. An attempt was made to blow up the home of Attorney General Palmer, endangering his life and the lives of the members of his family. The smear attack continued until his death. The Lusk committee was more successful in its work, following closely as it did on the heels of World War No. 1, and showing conspiracies of Marxist and German agents against our Government. But many efforts were made by the Reds to discredit it. The Fish committee was savagely attacked, and attacks are still made by the Reds on Congressman FISH, chairman, and now the only surviving member of the committee.

In several States committees set up to investigate the Red menace have been circumvented by Red smears or are still being attacked. Attorneys General Biddle and Jackson, and J. Edgar Hoover, head of the F. B. I., have been attacked by the Communists as a result of their criticism of the Red menace; as have some Government departments and congressional committees.

The Dies committee, of course, has been the constant target of the subversivists. It has been accused of "attempting to create disunity" in war in spite of the fact it has on occasion suppressed evidence at the request of the Government on the theory publication of the evidence would interfere with the war effort.

With the defeat of Congressman STARNES and the withdrawal of Congressman DIES from the political arena the future of the Dies committee is uncertain. The committee will carry on its work until January. If the new House elected is controlled by the Republicans or by Republicans and sound Democrats the committee may be continued. If the leftists control Congress, it will, of course, be abandoned, which will make a Roman holiday for the Reds and other subversivists.

With Congressman DIES withdrawing from seeking reelection because of ill health and Congressmen STARNES and COSTELLO defeated in the Alabama and California primaries, America loses three outstanding, staunchly patriotic statesmen.

Radicals of all stripes, including the C. I. O., Political Action Committee, and the Communists are openly rejoicing in the ill health of Mr. DIES and the defeat of STARNES and COSTELLO. They hope to eliminate other outstanding House Members in the election next November so that a start will be made on what may eventually become an actually Marxian Congress.

Albert Rains, who won in the Alabama primary by 485 votes, already shows evidence that he doesn't relish his left-wing support. Rains received fewer votes in the primary than he did when he ran against Mr. STARNES 8 years ago, but Congressman STARNES' vote shrank in greater proportion.

Congressman DIES has been in ill health for months and does not feel that he can stand another grueling campaign. This, of course, rejoices the Reds and their brethren, but the general elections are not over yet.

Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, of all those deserving of the especial honor, care, and protection of this country, the claims of no class are entitled to greater attention than the disabled veterans. These men made sacrifices second only to those who gave their lives—the victims of battle or disease. We cannot, of course, do anything for the dead beyond paying them honor. They do not need our further care. Thus it is to the living to whom we turn with honors while they live to enjoy them, made the more sincere by looking out for their present and future welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the one organization chartered by Congress exclusively for this purpose is the Disabled American Veterans, formed in 1920 and out of a wealth of experience in the aftermath of World War No. 1, peculiarly fitted to continue for the benefit of veterans of the current war who may return from service disabled to take up against the battle for health and existence. It is not enough to say that the Nation will not be ungrateful to those so deserving. Such undoubtedly is the disposition of all of us. But in the administration of relief and care nothing can take the place of an organization to stimulate administrative effort and to see that the just claims of individuals are brought to the attention of those in control of governmental agencies. Were it not for this organization many cases would escape the attention of those who would otherwise act and many more would be so subjected to delays and red tape as to be denied, in effect, proper relief.

Mr. Speaker, on June 5, over radio station WINX, at Washington, D. C., Mr. Earl G. Hendrick, national dependents claims officer of the Disabled American Veterans, gave a very interesting and informative address on the procedure to be followed in filing and establishing claims of disabled veterans and their dependents. I desire to add the text of this radio talk to my remarks in the hope that the information may be given added publicity so that its beneficial effects may be more widespread. The information is specific, clear, and helpful to disabled veterans and their dependents. Mr. Hendrick's radio address follows:

Every member of the armed forces, today and tomorrow, together with their dependents, is a potential beneficiary of the Veterans' Administration. As a matter of fact, this Bureau is now carrying the insurance on almost every member of the armed forces. As department service officer for the Disabled American Veterans, it is my business and specialty to handle claims of disabled veterans and their dependents, for the District of Columbia and nearby areas; also the death claims coming into the central office either locally or from the various regional offices throughout the country.

The function of our office is to prosecute and expedite action on your claim or claims. I think the local situation is well in hand and this subject is thoroughly understood by the majority of you. This is essentially true inasmuch as I have had the pleasure of discussing personally, the majority of the local cases. Those of you who live in the District of Columbia and nearby, are at an advantage in having not only your departmental officer, but the advice, judgment, and assistance of our national service director and his entire staff. Therefore, the information afforded in this broadcast is intended primarily for those of you who are unable to call at my office and who are unacquainted with the scope of the service given by the Disabled American Veterans.

The disability claim is filed by the veteran for benefits payable to him as the result of injury or disease resulting from military service. The award of compensation is based on the degree of disability which is determined according to the Veterans' Administration schedule provisions. Any disability, except misconduct, is compensable if it is as much as 10 percent disabling. This application is known as form 526. It is simple to execute and seldom does one have any trouble answering the questions. Additional evidence is seldom required. This is particularly true on the adjudication of the initial claim. No subsequent formal claim need be filed. If the veteran is dissatisfied with his present rating he can submit medical evidence to this effect.

However, it should be borne in mind that the doctor's statement must state not only his diagnosis but sufficient findings to warrant it. It is essential that this evidence show, or at least indicate, a higher degree of disability than the present evaluation. Upon receipt of competent medical evidence, the Veterans' Claim Service will authorize an official examination for rating purposes, thereby reopening the case for further consideration.

Entitlement to benefits is provided by law for the widow, child, or children, and the dependent parents of every deceased World War veteran, if his death was in line of duty, or if he had of record symptomatic service-connected disability at the time of death. Dependent parents are entitled to benefits only if death resulted from a disability of service origin.

Form 534 is the regular application to be submitted by the widow for benefits due her and her children. There must accompany or be submitted subsequently, official documentary evidence showing proof of the date of birth of the widow as well as of the children and official evidence of her marriage. There must also be submitted official documentary evidence of any and all previous marriages and divorces of both the deceased veteran and his widow. If the child or children are adopted or are stepchildren, this proof must also be submitted, and in the case of illegitimate children, there is required in writing parental acknowledgment in the writing of the father—only his illegitimate child, but not the widow's, may qualify as his dependent.

Frequently adjudication is delayed pending the receipt of pertinent documentary evidence, thus requiring unnecessary correspondence by the Veterans' Administration, with the claimant or claimants. Your Veterans' Administration central office has been quite prompt in the adjudication of these claims when all of the required evidence is in their possession. They cannot expedite the adjudication of the claim if there is a divorce decree, a marriage certificate, a birth certificate, or other essential evidence, which they must write for and wait for until it is submitted.

I want to stress the fact that the ordinary marriage certificate or copy thereof is not sufficient. There must be a certified official copy bearing the seal of the clerk or official of the court. Necessarily, the divorce decree when obtained will be in proper form. Birth certificates and death certificates also may be obtained upon request, from your local public health service or officials keeping such records.

While it is essential that all of the above-mentioned documents be of record before the claim is adjudicated, the submission of the claim should not be delayed even though difficulty is experienced, or anticipated, in obtaining one or more of these statements. The claim should be filed at an early date and immediate steps should be taken to obtain any evidence pertinent thereto. Officially requested evidence must be submitted within 1 year of the date of filing the claim or else payment may be precluded for that year.

Present rates of payment are: "Widow but no child, $50; with one child $65, with $13 for each additional child; no widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38 (equally divided), with $10 for each additional child (total equally divided). Total amount payable to widow and children, $100."

The term "parents" means the natural parents or anyone who stood in loco parentis to the decedent. That person may be a grandmother, uncle, or any other relative, he or she may be one who bore no blood

relationship whatsoever. Their status as to entitlement is no different from that of the natural parent. They are entitled to the same consideration and the same monetary benefits, provided their status as a parent is established and it has been determined that they are dependent.

Claims of parents must show dependency. That is to say, a claim filed by the parent or parents on Veterans' Administration Form 535 must actually show that the parent, or parents, is, or are, dependent. Usually it is advisable to submit a supplemental itemized financial statement showing all income and all necessary expenses. Careful consideration should be given this statement. There are moneys which are considered income and some which are not. For example: Government insurance being paid the parents as the result of the death of other members of the family are not considered as incomes; whereas, allotment from other members of the family in the armed forces to the dependent parents is considered income. Remember the issue in the claim of dependent parents, provided other requirements are met, is strictly one of dependency. The rate of payment is $25 each or $45 monthly, if only one.

For the benefit of those living outside this area, I want to say that we have a representative of the Disabled American Veterans in practically every regional office, and contact representatives or chapter officers in all areas. They will be glad to furnish you information and any assistance in the execution of this application for benefits in the Veterans' Administration field.

I want to further stress the fact that all of the heretofore mentioned applications must be properly notarized, and the Veterans' Administration locally and nationally have employees who will render this service free of charge.

I call your attention to the fact that the law requires that a power of attorney be signed by the veteran or the dependents, designating the organization they desire to prosecute the claim. They need not name an individual employee, merely the name of the organization and then any accredited representative is afforded access to the case file. For example, if you desire a representative of the Disabled American Veterans to appear in your behalf, you execute what is known as Form P-22 and merely place in capital letters "D. A. V." on the line over which is stated in brackets "Name of organization." This form or power of attorney does not require a notary seal, the signature is sufficient. Form P-22 may be obtained from any service officer or from any Veterans' Administration facility, regional office, or substation.

We invite you to call in person at our office, room 156, Veterans' Administration, Fifteenth and I Streets NW., in this city, to discuss any phase of your claim that you are in doubt about.

Thomas Henry Cullen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character and public service of Hon. THOMAS HENRY CULLEN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, my late colleague and friend, THOMAS HENRY CULLEN, has been called from among us to fill his allotted place in the great tomorrow without having been able to complete the last mission which an admiring and loving constituency intrusted to him. His personality will live forever in the hearts of the people of New York.

His hearty laugh, his genial manner, and his earnest and sincere loyalty to the people in his neighborhood, together with his deep interest in humanity and human kind, won him their everlasting gratitude, respect, love, and adoration, which all combined compose the bouquet of the human heart.

Congressman CULLEN's parents belonged to that noble race whose love of liberty has caused them to fight on the side of freedom under every flag when it stood for justice and equality of the individual. The inborn love for his fellow man, which shone out of his radiant face at all times, he inherited from his ancestral lineage.

Mr. CULLEN was born among the poor in the district that he represented, in the country his parents adopted, and never deserted their interests. He, knowing their wants by intimate contact, saw that they were filled; he was the arbitrator of their disputes, the leader in their pleasures, the champion of their cause, and the idol of their heart. He was their best friend.

They, his devoted followers, honored him with the best gift they had—their franchise, which placed him among us as a Member of the House of Representatives, previously having sent him to the Legislature of the State of New York, and thus delegating to him their interests in the framing of the laws under which they have to live.

TOM sailed in his youth. He knew the ports of the world from personal visits and realized the important part shipping played in the development of the United States. He frequently visited with men who came here from every part of the world. As a result of his sailing and business activities he acquired a knowledge of the affairs of men and of places that was most useful to him in his work as a Representative in Congress and particularly as a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Long before he came here in 1919, back home in our State legislature, beginning in 1896, the Congressman, then a member of the assembly, devoted himself to a legislative program of general welfare proposals for the people of the city of New York. In my opinion, he did more than any man in this House today to advance the interests of the shipping industry and the men who go to sea. He was constantly alert to their problems and brought to their solution an intimate knowledge based on many years of actual business and lawmaking experience. He was a leader in every movement to improve the hours, wages, and working conditions of his people.

A sympathetic man, he could understand and appreciate problems of the other man. He was always tolerant. He was intensely partisan but always put the interest of his country first in deciding all questions before the Congress.

I first met TOM CULLEN in 1913 at the first inauguration of Woodrow Wilson. I had the privilege of serving on a committee with him in connection with inaugural ceremonies. I liked him at once and since that time he has always treated me with the greatest kindness and respect. Through the years I have enjoyed his friendship and I have been inspired by his enthusiasm and sincerity.

So, today, I join with my colleagues, from the entire country, in paying tribute to the life, service, and character of our departed friend, THOMAS CULLEN. He was steadfast in his devotion to his congressional duties and steadfast in all those things that mean so much to God and country. He was one of those fine citizens that always stand four square for honesty and justice.

I mourn the passing of THOMAS CULLEN as a colleague and a friend. We have lost a skilled legislator, a great humanitarian, and a true Catholic gentleman.

"Haec olim meminisse juvabit."

Army Decorations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am setting out in full a letter dated April 10, 1944, that I received from Gen. George C. Marshall regarding the matter of Army decorations, and I am including my reply to General Marshall, dated April 12, 1944, together with the complete article I released to the press on March 29 entitled "Awards of Decorations to Members of the Army in World War No. 2." I hope this information will be of value to the Members of Congress who are particularly interested in the matter of Army decorations in this war:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF.
Washington, April 10, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: My attention has been called to a statement in the press indicating your concern over the number of Army decorations that have been awarded in this war. I am frankly disturbed about the apparent general lack of understanding of combat decorations and their value in sustaining the morale of the men who are doing the actual fighting. Napoleon is alleged to have said: "Give me enough ribbon to place on the tunics of my soldiers and I can conquer the world." I cannot vouch for the accuracy of that quotation but I certainly share the view which such a statement indicates.

We have awarded, since the outbreak of the war, probably 12,000 combat decorations other than the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal, about 3,000 decorations for distinguished or exceptionally meritorious service, and about 135,000 air decorations (Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal).

When the size of our Army, and the extensiveness and nature of its operations are considered, the number of awards in the first two categories is surprisingly low.

The air decorations should be measured against the remarkable achievements of the Air Forces and the special nature of continuing air combat. For example, at the end of 1943, the Army Air Forces had flown 392,000 combat sorties, exposing 1,375,000 individuals to the danger of enemy fire. They have lost their hands and their feet in flying and fighting at temperatures far below zero. They suffered heavy loss of pilots or crew members, and almost as many sorties have been flown in the past 3 months as in all of 1943.

These are the men who pioneered the daylight bombing over Europe when the usual pessimistic predictions were that such tactics would be suicidal. They are the men who fought the Japanese air force against tremendous odds until they ultimately gained air-superiority. They continued to fly missions when their chance of safe return was apparently less than one in five. They still take heavy casualties day after day, week after week. Yet their morale has continued high and their achievements have soared, and one of the reasons is that they have positive evidence that their work has been given immediate recognition.

No one who considers all of these things, and who understands the morale effect of the prompt bestowal of a bit of ribbon and bronze, would ever feel that our awards of combat and air decorations have been excessive. In fact, I wonder if we have given the men sufficient recognition. It is a tragic fact that the men who have received the most decorations are usually lost to us by their own continued daring and leadership.

It has been my opinion that one of the grave errors of the previous war was our ineffective policy in the award of decorations and our dilatory policy regarding campaign ribbons. We seemed to begrudge prompt recognition of the men who did the fighting, suffered the hardships, and took the losses. After the war the attempt was made to correct this, but as might have been expected, more of the importunate than the modest and deserving received these belated awards, and heavy political pressures were usually involved.

From the beginning of this war I determined that we would not repeat what clearly appeared to me were serious mistakes in the past. I have impressed upon our commanders in the field not only the value of decorations and their proper use, but of the necessity for their prompt bestowal. And, incidentally, there is small chance of the wrong or undeserving man getting the decoration if it is given in the field. From personal observation of the results, I am convinced that my view is the correct one.

I was so impressed with the effect of the Air Medal and the adverse effect of the lack of a suitable award of the same level for the long-suffering infantrymen that I personally asked for and secured the President's approval to a corresponding decoration for the ground forces, to be known as the Bronze Star. I want to obtain the same effect with this among the ground troops, particularly the infantry who suffer such a high percentage of our casualties, and I intend that it shall be awarded with the same freedom as the Air Medal.

In short, it is my sincere belief that we cannot do too much in the way of prompt and appropriate recognition of the men who carry the fight and live under the conditions that exist at the fighting front.

I intend to see that these young soldiers enjoy this small fruit of their military effort while they are amongst their war comrades and confronted with the ordeal of further fighting.

The immediate award of the campaign or theater ribbon had a somewhat different purpose. One of our most serious morale problems related to the men serving in isolated distant posts, often under extremes of temperature and usually in discomfort. They did not have the stimulation or excitement of contact with the enemy to fix their interest or satisfy their normal desire for active service, and they suffered increasingly from loneliness, from the fact that they could do little to merit public recognition. Therefore the theater ribbon. The fact that some officer in Washington may wear one or two is not a proper argument against the present policy. Furthermore, in considering matters of this kind there is little similarity today with our deployment and the short duration of the war in 1917–18.

I am writing you personally and at considerable length because of the importance that I attach to this subject. I think it essential that our friends in the Military Affairs Committee understand the problem, and have a complete appreciation of how we are using our decorations, and why we are proceeding along this line.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1944.

Gen. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: Thank you very much for your good letter of April 10 and for the time you have taken to reply so fully to recent press releases quoting me in the matter of Army decorations.

I am enclosing the complete text of my statement and you will note that my views are very much in line with yours on most points. I was considerably interested in the contrast in the headlining done in the general press of the country and the presentation of the identical material in the last issue of the Army and Navy Journal. The enclosed article is identical with the ones I handed to the newspaper reporters and the one I handed to the reporter for the Army and Navy Journal. The headlining and the presentation of the material reveal widely different reactions and resulting emphasis.

There is one phase of this subject that you have discussed that I wish I had included in my statement, namely, the matter of prompt and appropriate recognition of the men immediately by the commanders in the field. I sincerely hope that this practice will avoid the heavy political pressures you so well describe in the second paragraph of the second page of your letter. I have no objection whatever to the liberal award of the Air Medal and the Bronze Star and to the extent that these awards reduce the number of higher ranking awards they will serve a very real purpose in the maintenance of the rating of the higher awards.

You will be interested to know that I made a special effort to secure the information set out in the second paragraph of your letter, but could not secure any estimate of the number of awards except of the Medal of Honor.

I really believe that publicity setting out the number of awards of the Air Medal and Bronze Star, and of the Purple Heart, together with the estimated total of all other combat decorations, will keep the public properly informed of the relatively small proportion of higher decorations awarded. Perhaps the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal should be lumped together as you have done in your letter. At any rate, the purpose would be served of presenting an accurate picture to the public so that they may be in position to give the proper weight to the higher ranking awards.

I agree with you very strongly that the Infantry must absorb the brunt of battle and the greater proportion of casualties especially as the war progresses but I am finding it difficult to locate many people who believe the Infantry is taking much part in this war. Thus far, publicity has gone all-out for the Air Corps and the unbalanced number of decorations together with the return home of more members of the Air Corps than any other branch of the service has given rise to a very unbalanced picture in the public mind. I deeply appreciate what the Air Corps has accomplished and there is no more important development in this war than the accomplishment of the Air Corps in achieving what has been considered by many to be the impossible, but when it comes to publicity and to decorations we have a real job ahead to make service in the ground forces and especially in the Infantry equally attractive. The present situation is reflected quite vividly in my mail in regard to the recent transfer of the entire A. S. T. P. student body and of 36,000 prospective aviation cadets to the Army ground forces and mostly to the Infantry. These transfers are necessary and I have heard no criticism of the general policy resulting in these transfers, but I have received a surprising volume of mail from parents and relatives and friends voicing objections to such transfer of individual soldiers. I can see no basis for this general complaint except that it is brought about by the publicity, recognition, and glamor that has been built up around the Air Corps in contrast to the other branches.

Sincerely yours,

THOS. E. MARTIN.

AWARDS OF DECORATIONS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMY IN WORLD WAR NO. 2

The War Department release of February 24 announced the details for the award of the Bronze Star Medal and in my opinion this award will fill a very definite place in the field of awards for heroic or meritorious service against the enemy. The Bronze Star Medal is to be given for such service when the service does not involve aerial flight and it is in that sense a counterpart of the Air Medal. Until the creation of the Bronze Star Medal, the award of the Air Medal together with the Oak Leaf Cluster and Silver Leaf Cluster to denote additional awards of the Air Medal, comprised the great bulk of the decorations bestowed upon our soldiers in this war. Looking ahead it is reasonable to suppose that the awards of the Bronze Star Medal will make up a large portion of the decorations especially as the operations of the ground forces in this war increase. If the Bronze Star Medal is awarded on the same basis that the Air Medal has been awarded it will become something of a yardstick of service in contact with the enemy but it remains to be seen whether the Bronze Star Medal will be awarded on a basis similar to the number of combat missions which is used in the Air Corps for the award of the Air Medal.

There is a tendency always to increase the number of awards as the war progresses. Whenever a precedent is established for the award there is a tendency to make similar awards wherever those conditions are thought to be met. As the war progresses there will always be more clashes with the enemy resulting in more cases of heroic or meritorious achievement or service. But we should bear in mind always that the appraisal of value of a decoration is in inverse proportion to the number of awards of the decoration.

There are now 10 decorations that may be made in recognition of outstanding service of various degrees. The highest ranking award is the Congressional Medal of Honor and War Department records as of this date, reveal that only 34 awards of the Congressional Medal of Honor have been made during this war. Even that number is much larger than in any similar period of time prior to this war. The other awards in the order of their rank are as follows: Distinguished

Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Soldiers' Medal, the Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart, Air Medal.

As stated above, Oak Leaf Clusters and Silver Leaf Clusters are given for successive awards of the same medal. All of these awards are given on the recommendation of theater commanders or some general officer to whom the theater commander has delegated the authority to make such awards, and the award is a recognition extended to the individual soldier for his services and cannot be demanded or requisitioned by him as a matter of right. The only exception to this rule is the award of the Purple Heart which is made on application of the soldier or his representatives and is based upon the proof of the fact of wounds received in action against the enemy. There have been approximately 175,000 awards made in this war to date but it is impossible to give the exact number of awards of the different decorations, except the number of Congressional Medals of Honor. Newspaper accounts indicate that more awards have been made of the Air Medal and Oak Leaf and Silver Leaf Clusters than of any other awards. This situation has resulted from two factors. The increased activity in aerial warfare against the enemy and the fact that Air Medals and Oak Leaf Clusters have been awarded for each five combat missions flown. This has resulted in many members of the air crews receiving several awards of the Air Medal and Oak Leaf Cluster so that the total number of men receiving the 175,000 decorations is somewhat less than that number. When we consider the large size of our Army today and the far-flung and extensive contact our Army has with the enemy, the total number of awards of most of the decorations is not large. As stated above the number will tend to increase rapidly as the war progresses and the value or rating of the awards will rise or fall in public estimation in inverse ratio to the number of such awards made.

The matter of making awards by direct congressional action came before the House of Representatives on March 14, when the bill H. R. 4377 was passed, authorizing the award of the Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. This bill is now before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs. There is no doubt whatever as to the worthiness of this award to Admiral Nimitz but the precedent is a very dangerous one because the tendency will be to increase the number of cases beyond all reason and to place upon Congress a function that is very difficult for them to perform fairly and equitably without serious intrusion upon the vast field of legislative duties. Our experience with such legislation following the First World War is ample proof of the dangers involved in such procedure. In my opinion the matter of such awards should be left to the Army and War Department officials who are best qualified to determine the merits of each case because of their experience in such matters and because of their opportunity to observe or investigate the facts as they have developed within their jurisdiction.

G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I join with all the friends of the boys and girls in our armed forces in voting for the conference report on Senate bill 1767, which is known as Federal Government Aid for the Readjustment in Civilian Life of Returning World War No. 2 Veterans.

I am delighted to have had the opportunity of working with the representatives of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars in the preparation of this important legislation. At this time I wish to congratulate the members of the legislative committees of both Houses who worked so hard and faithfully in an effort to obtain adequate and satisfactory benefits for the returning soldiers and the dependents of those who have made the supreme sacrifice.

It is hoped that the terms of this bill are sufficiently broad to meet every possible problem that may be presented for solution. If it does not, I am sure the Congress will be glad to amend the bill to correct any injustice or discrimination that may develop. It is the intention of Congress, by enacting this bill into law, to make available to every veteran the complete facilities of all Government departments.

As a member of the New York State Legislature and since 1930 a Member of the House of Representatives, I am proud of my work on behalf of our soldiers. Today, I am again enjoying the privilege of casting my vote for a bill which contains many of my own ideas on soldiers' benefits and on the manner in which the act should be administered by the Veterans' Bureau. I favor a liberal and sympathetic interpretation of this legislation.

Because the conference report on S. 1767 has already been printed in the RECORD, I shall not attempt a detailed description of the many provisions contained in the bill. Suffice it is to say that the passage of act and its approval by my friend, President Roosevelt, will bring to a favorable and happy conclusion a difficult job but a most worthwhile and constructive piece of humane legislation for our most deserving fellow Americans.

Regulation of Liability of Air Carriers and Foreign Air Carriers

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill regulating the liability of air carriers and foreign air carriers for death or personal injury to a passenger, for the loss or damage to goods and delay in their delivery, and for injury or death to persons or damage to property on the ground. This bill is designed to provide a solution to the many problems which have plagued both the airlines and the passengers and shippers who have in some respect suffered damage as a result of an aircraft accident.

In the case of passengers and shippers the common law imposes a very heavy burden of proof. In any action for damages it is necessary for them to prove that the aircraft operator has been negligent. Air-line operation is a highly technical and specialized business and for that reason proof of negligence has been very difficult and very expensive. In addition, the present limitations on recovery for the death of a passenger prescribed in State laws may vary from $5,000 to $20,000 and thus the passenger's recovery may be drastically affected by the sheer coincidence that the accident happened in one State rather than another.

On the other hand the air lines, faced with an endless variety of possible recoveries against them have found it unduly expensive to maintain an appropriate insurance program.

Thus the present situation is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of all parties concerned because it imposes unnecessary hardships upon them all. The bill I have introduced aids the passenger and shipper by transferring to the air line the burden of proof in any action against it. In other words the passenger or shipper under the bill would not have to prove negligence. It would be up to the air line to prove that it was not negligent. In addition, in order to make certain that any recovery granted to a passenger or shipper is promptly paid, the bill grants to the Civil Aeronautics Board authority to make regulations requiring appropriate liability insurance. The bill would also help the air lines to plan their insurance programs with certainty by prescribing limitations upon the extent to which a passenger or shipper could recover. While the limitations as specified in the bill are liberal, I believe that the airlines will nevertheless benefit by reason of the fact that there is some limitation upon the extent to which they may be held liable.

In addition, the limitations upon liability for loss or damage to goods or delay in their delivery or to a passenger's baggage or personal effects are subject to agreements which may be made between the air line and passenger or shipper under which the passenger or shipper declares a higher value and the carrier charges a correspondingly higher rate for carriage.

There is precedent for this proposed legislation in State laws, in the Harter Act, which applies to vessels, and in the so-called Carmack amendment, which applies to carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. In introducing this bill I am not taking the position that all of its provisions are entirely satisfactory either to the author or the interests affected. I think the problems with which it deals should be solved for the benefit of all concerned and I hope that all those interested will consider this proposed legislation carefully and give me their comments in writing. I will not press for hearings on the bill immediately but will wait until it appears that ample time has been given to study the legislation.

The problems involved are as complex as they are important and this bill is

introduced with the hope that it will encourage and invite suggestions and amendments which will not only improve the bill but will result in the best possible legislation.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, Polish people all over the world celebrate May 3 as the anniversary of the adoption of a constitution which granted freedom and democracy to all their people. Poland was the first country in Europe to write a constitution granting individual rights to her citizens. This was adopted on May 3, 1791, so this year marks the one hundred and fifty-third anniversary. And not only people of Polish descent but all lovers of freedom should rejoice on this memorable occasion.

After the First World War Poland survived and rose again to become one of the most democratic and progressive countries in Europe and reached a height only a sturdy, industrious, free nation can attain when allowed to live and work in peace.

We all remember with bitterness how Hitler, in September 1939, launched an unprovoked attack upon this country, dealing out suffering and death to many of her people, destroying her homes and churches, maiming and killing one-tenth of the entire population, including women and children. The sufferings of her people have exceeded those of any other country trampled by the heel of German might, but the spirit of Poland could not be destroyed.

Other nations fell for the subtle Nazi propaganda and allied themselves with Hitler's plan of conquest—but not Poland. She was the first to resist Nazi oppressors. Despite every inducement which Hitler could offer, no traitorous Quisling could be found among the Polish people and she proved that deceit could not break the indomitable will of a freedom-loving people. And, thus, she has won the admiration of liberty-loving people throughout the world because she chose to maintain her honor by resistance rather than live in subjugation by a policy of appeasement.

The willingness to suffer for the cause of freedom has produced unexcelled bravery in Polish soldiers, sailors, and aviators fighting on every front on land, on the seas, and in the skies. Millions of Americans of Polish descent are indispensable in the war effort, either in active participation or otherwise assisting in war industries, scientific research, and on the farms.

Poland, through the years, has made priceless contributions to the world in literature, science, music, and statesmanship. She has produced Joseph Conrad and Sienkiewicz, great masters of literature; Copernicus and Mme. Curie in science; Chopin and Paderewski in music; Count Pulaski and Kosciusko and Niemcewicz in statesmanship. Poland has demonstrated her ability to make the greatest contributions to the world that have brought happiness and blessings to millions and she has also shown that unconquerable spirit which will endure untold suffering for a worthy cause—that of freedom and liberty.

With such a background as this, who can predict the heights to which Poland will reach when she rises from the present yoke of bondage and again takes her place among the free people of the earth?

God grant that His greatest blessings may fall on this worthy nation and that the day may soon come when she may again enjoy the priceless blessings of liberty.

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. ELMER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, this is Flag Day 1944. Where are you? What flag do you love? What country is yours? Are you standing by the Government founded by Washington and Jefferson; defended by Lincoln and Cleveland? Or: Are you lost? In doubt? Love some flag other than the Stars and Stripes? Some country, other than your own? Some scheme of world supremacy, you know not what? By some people, you know not whom? A supergovernment over the United States of America? A dictatorship over the world? A foreign policeman over you?

Herein is copied a post card I received asking me, as a Congressman, to support this universal flag. This is a world flag. It is not the United Nations flag which is yet unofficial, and is—a white field with four red vertical bars—and will be official if the internationalists win the 1944 election. Following is my National American answer.

The brotherhood flag consists of five horizontal stripes of equal width. The length of the flag is twice the width of the five stripes combined. Each stripe represents one of the five different groups of the human race, namely: red, white, brown, yellow and black. Respectful display of this flag will help promote unity, equality, freedom, peace, brotherhood, and a genuine respect for international law, among all peoples of the earth.

WORLD PEACE ASSOCIATION,
JENKINS, MINN.

I have your post card of the brotherhood flag. I have a flag, too. It consists of 13 red and white horizontal stripes representing 13 weak struggling colonies in 1776, and 48 stars on a blue field, representing 48 sovereign States of the American Union, in 1943. It is in all sizes from tiny to big. As a whole, it represents a powerful Nation that protects all races, colors, creeds, in equality, freedom, peace, and brotherhood, who shelter beneath its folds. Respectful display of this flag brings a peace that passeth all understanding, to those who love it. It shone at its rise, and shines at its zenith, as the majestic light of liberty of the New World. I cannot trade it for any other flag for fear the light will be blown out and the whole world left in total darkness.

WILLIAM P. ELMER,
Member of Congress.

Read and re-read. Cut out and post in your home. Have your children read. Tell them which is right; which is American, which is God's. You cannot dodge this issue in 1944. It is here. You must decide it—you voters. It is the most vital question of your lifetime. If you make a mistake, our country is gone for good. You will determine if our sons shall have died in vain if "the government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." You know where I stand. Americanism is bred in my bones and sinews. I cannot fail it. And I know where you, as true, loyal Americans, stand. You will serve the God of your fathers, and not the Baal of internationalism.

What's a Hog Worth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Omaha Daily Journal Stockman entitled "What's a Hog Worth?"

This editorial indicates the confusion which is caused by the Government trying to regulate the business of producing pork. The farmer was urged to produce more hogs. He did so. The result has been that the choice hogs which he has for market cannot be sold until those either over or below the choice weight are sold, and at a loss of from $1 to $2 per hundredweight. In the meantime, the choice hog loses weight and he in turn is then sold at a loss.

The condition that now exists in the hog market may well prevail in the cattle market beginning late this summer. The feed lots are empty. There may be less than 50 percent placed on feed. At the same time there are some 12,000,000 more cattle on the ranges than ever before. There will be shortage of feed, a shortage of labor. The half-fed, grass-fed animals will flood the slaughter pens. The packers and butchers will take advantage of the situation, and then the farmers and stock raisers will take the same loss on their cattle as they have been experiencing in the past few months on their hogs.

Most of these difficulties can be traced directly to this administration, which has refused to recognize the importance of the production of meat. The handling of all food should long ago have been placed under one administrator. If this

is not done we may well see millions of pounds of meat permitted to spoil and turned into fertilizer just as some 1,400 carloads of eggs standing on the railroad sidings of this country are now spoiling and being turned into tankage. Truly, the handling of the food problem is a smelly mess in any language.

The editorial follows:

WHAT'S A HOG WORTH

Anyone who tries to analyze what a hog is worth under the existing confusing price control in both pork and hogs will end up tearing out his hair and giving up the job. Our reporters can tell accurately what is paid from day to day for the various classes and weights of hogs, topsy-turvy though the market is these days, but it would be an impossible task for any of them to try to figure out what a hog is worth.

To say that hogs are selling too high or too low in relation to what the packer gets for pork under these conditions would at best be a ridiculous statement that could not be proved either way. Under ordinary conditions it is possible to ascertain within a reasonable degree what a hog is worth to the packer. However, these are not ordinary times. The entire industry is in the midst of a price-control experimentation conducted by men inexperienced in the operations of either livestock markets or the pork-packing industry.

Neither farmer nor packer knows where he stands. An example of what farmers and packer buyers contend with in determining the value of hogs under existing conditions is best illustrated by a few hypothetical sales of the various weights. Take 3 carloads of hogs, each weighing a total of 20,000 pounds. In 2 of these loads are 75 hogs each, making them average 266 pounds and eligible to the floor price. The other load carries 70 hogs, making them average 285 pounds and they sell $1.75 a hundred pounds below the floor price. The same packer obtains all 3 loads, and together they make up a drove of 220 hogs averaging 272 pounds at a cost of 59 cents a hundred pounds below the floor.

However, another packer the same day obtains 2 loads of 70 hogs, each weighing 20,000 pounds, or an average of 285 pounds, at $1.75 below the floor and gives the floor price for only 1 load of 75 hogs averaging 266 pounds. The result is that he goes in with a drove of 215 hogs, averaging 279 pounds, at a cost that is 58 cents a hundred pounds below the first packer and $1.17 under the floor.

Any bright young student of price control (Washington is full of them) who comes forward with the suggestion that 7 pounds difference in the average weight of a drove justifies the difference of 58 cents a hundred pounds in the cost had better take a back seat. No man can guess the weight of a drove of hogs that accurately with any consistency.

Yet, this is not the worst of the tale. Another packer comes along who completely ignores the Government weights and gives $1.75 below the floor for all 3 loads, going into the pork trade against his 2 competitors with a drove of 210 hogs, averaging 285 pounds, at a cost that is 58 cents below 1 packer and $1.17 below the other, with practically the same class of pork. Certainly the price of the pork from the 3 droves would not vary.

The real return to the producer of hogs is gaged by the level of the prices paid for off-weights and the quantity of such kinds available to packers as well as the level of the floor price. In order to get the same average drove cost as the buyer who did not take any Government weights the packer who gave the floor price for two-thirds of his drove would have to buy the other third $5.25 a hundred pounds below the floor instead of $1.75 below.

Well, you figure, and let's all go crazy together.

Editorials From the Capital Times of Madison, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a series of editorials from the Capital Times, at Madison, Wis. This newspaper, edited by the able and fearless William T. Evjue, has been for 25 years the outstanding organ of liberal political thought in the State of Wisconsin.

The titles and dates of the editorials are as follows: May 5, 1944, "Gutter Language in the State G. O. P. and Can Washington Do Anything to Suit Them"; May 7, 1944, "The Modern Platform of a Political Party and They Still Hate Roosevelt More Than They Do Hitler"; May 9, 1944, "The Strange Attitude of the La Follettes Toward Roosevelt"; and May 10, 1944, "The Cumbersome Foreign Policy Plank in the Progressive Platform."

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of May 5, 1944]

GUTTER LANGUAGE IN THE STATE G. O. P.

The degree to which Republicans are willing to go in sounding their inflammatory abuse of President Roosevelt was illustrated at the Republican State convention in Milwaukee when Attorney Charles F. Smith, called the "silver tongued orator of the Wisconsin G. O. P." by the Milwaukee Sentinel, let loose an incendiary blast that can only come from one of the present day professional Roosevelt haters.

It is significant that Smith's venomous utterances were cheered by his audience of Republican leaders.

Here is what Smith said concerning President Roosevelt:

"Mr. President, we are not satisfied with you as either President or Commander in Chief. We are not satisfied with your conduct of the war. You lost the Philippines and caused our boys to be murdered there and at Pearl Harbor through your bungling as Commander in Chief."

That is pretty strong language. It is intemperate language. Our guess is that the people of Wisconsin, including many who are opposed to the President, will not sanction barrel-house language of this kind.

If the Republicans of Wisconsin are determined to conduct this campaign on the gutter level, they will do so at their own peril. There is a place, even in politics, for such things as decency and good taste.

CAN WASHINGTON DO ANYTHING TO SUIT THEM?

The Republicans evidently have only one plan for riding into power—daily and everlasting criticism of the Roosevelt administration.

For months the Republican whisperers have been peddling the story that there has been a tremendous surplus of meat stored up and that there was no need for a program of rationing.

On Wednesday the O. P. A. announced that rationing restrictions on all meats, with the exception of beef steaks and beef roasts, would be eliminated.

Immediately the critics of the administration began whispering a new line. Now they are saying that the action of the O. P. A. on Wednesday was dictated by politics—that President Roosevelt will run again next November.

It is quite obvious that Washington can do nothing that will satisfy its carping critics.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of May 7, 1944]

THE MODERN PLATFORM OF A POLITICAL PARTY

The modern-day political party platform is usually a slick array of words and phrases which say everything and mean nothing. The leaders of a political party today turn over the writing of a platform to literary craftsmen who are masters in the art of double talk, planned ambiguity, and glib rhetoric that can mean all things to all men.

The platform just adopted by the Republican State convention at Milwaukee is no exception to the rule. It is a vehicle on which candidates seeking votes can ride with comfort.

There is, however, one surprising declaration in the G. O. P. State platform. That is the plank on foreign policy which says that following the war "there should be set up some kind of an international organization that shall provide a just method of settling international disputes and shall have the power to preserve the peace of the world."

Many people were expecting the Republicans of Wisconsin to move in the other direction on foreign policy, considering the results of the convention delegate contest in the recent primary in which Mr. Willkie, with his One World foreign policy, was handed such a severe defeat. It wouldn't have been unexpected if the State G. O. P. had come up with a foreign policy plank smacking of isolationism.

But this 1944 plank, reiterating statements of 2 years ago, indicates that Republicans in Wisconsin are beginning to realize that they cannot win by advocating a narrow policy of isolation. Unlike the Chicago Tribune, Gerald L. K. Smith, and other isolationist spokesmen, they apparently don't consider the Wisconsin primary results a victory for blind nationalism or isolationism.

In this they are following the trend sensed by Governor Dewey and Governor Bricker, both of whom recently came out with surprisingly straightforward declarations in favor of post-war world cooperation and international agreements to enforce peace.

The pronouncements of Bricker and Dewey were bitter medicine for Colonel McCormack and his isolationist crowd, as was the unconditional statement by General MacArthur that he was not a candidate for President. So, too, must have been the foreign policy platform plank adopted by the Republicans of Wisconsin at their Milwaukee meeting last week.

Much of the G. O. P. State platform, however, is so much double talk. Point after point it reiterates the old vote-catching platitudes, the glittering generalities, and the declarations in favor of things in which everybody concurs.

Then, there are the usual inconsistencies which occur in a document that tries to be all things to all men.

For instance, the platform endorses the record of the 1943 legislature and at the same

time claims to favor a generous rehabilitation program for returning servicemen. The 1943 legislature voted to deprive returning servicemen of funds to finance a $7,000,000 appropriation by voting to repeal the surtax on 1942 incomes.

Then again the platform, after taking the bold stand on foreign policy noted above, gives its blanket endorsement to the attitude of Republican Members of Congress from this State, despite the fact that the attitude of these Congressmen has generally been on the isolationist side and the platform calls for international cooperation.

The platform is hypocritical, too, in the way it lets down Governor Goodland. The Governor is not mentioned by name, and his splendid record in the public interest is dismissed by a one-sentence reference to the State administration.

The platform says the Republican Party favors the maintenance of the "new rights of labor." What that means is anybody's guess. The Republican Party in this State is the party which wrecked the State's advanced labor laws and substituted a labor act conceived by antilabor employers so bad that it has been boycotted since its inception by bona fide labor organizations.

With the exception of the plank on foreign policy, the platform approved by the G. O. P. at Milwaukee is what its authors intended it to be, a masterpiece of double talk and ambiguity.

THEY STILL HATE ROOSEVELT MORE THAN THEY DO HITLER

Some Members of Congress seem to be more interested in protecting the enemies of the Government than they are in standing by the friends of the Government.

The speed with which Congressmen came to the defense of Sewell Avery, the arrogant head of Montgomery Ward & Co. who defied the Government in a labor dispute, was significant.

Now comes the case of a woman factory owner, Miss Vivien Kellems, in Connecticut who has been writing letters to a Nazi in South America. She is the same lady who recently defied the Government by refusing to pay wartime tax levies and urged other employers to follow her example.

Excerpts from Miss Kellems' letters to this German Nazi in South America were recently printed in Drew Pearson's Washington Merry-Go-Round column.

And what is the reaction of these Members of Congress to the disclosure of this woman's correspondence with an enemy of the United States? Pearson is denounced for publishing same and the Office of Censorship is denounced for permitting the information to leak out.

On Thursday the Senate Post Office Committee voted approval of a resolution to investigate Pearson and named Pearson's bitter foe, Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, Tory Democrat from Tennessee, as chairman of the proposed investigation.

The degree of Senator MCKELLAR's judicial approach to Mr. Pearson's activities is evident from his recent reference on the libel proof Senate floor to Pearson as "an infamous, dirty, low-down, mean, lying scoundrel and skunk."

One can imagine the kind of a hearing which will be conducted under MCKELLAR's chairmanship if this investigation wins Senate approval.

Congress, it appears, is more burned up over the fact that these letters have been made public than it is over the implications of an American citizen who is communicating with an enemy of this Nation.

We reiterate what we have frequently said: There is a crowd in Congress that hates President Roosevelt more than it hates Hitler and Hirohito.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of May 9, 1944]

THE STRANGE ATTITUDE OF THE LA FOLLETTES TOWARD ROOSEVELT

The speech of Senator LA FOLLETTE at Milwaukee which pegged the future course of the Progressive party to a program of hostility to President Roosevelt and the New Deal will bring a keen sense of disappointment to thousands of Progressives and liberals in Wisconsin and throughout the Nation.

These people believe that the President is entitled to the support and loyalty of the forward-looking voters of the United States.

They will never be able to understand why the La Follettes have not been willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with President Roosevelt in the fight to promote the common good.

How can Progressives in Wisconsin join in an attitude of hostility toward President Roosevelt without publicly convicting themselves of rank ingratitude?

For a generation the name La Follette was synonymous with the great battle which was fought to emancipate this State from corporate domination and to make government an instrumentality to promote the general welfare.

To promote this end, the movement fought gallantly to translate Progressive principles into the laws of this State. As a result, Wisconsin became known as a model commonwealth and it served as an inspiration for the promotion of the Progressive ideology throughout the Nation.

Franklin D. Roosevelt became President during one of the most dangerous crises this country ever faced. He at once demonstrated his courage by using the vast powers of government to rescue millions of people from the devastating effects of the worst depression this country had ever seen—a depression that brought business paralysis, unemployment, mortgage foreclosures, and a general economic demoralization.

Under the courageous guidance of the President, recovery soon began to set in and the President succeeded in placing on the statute books an impressive array of progressive legislation.

In his first two terms in the White House Mr. Roosevelt succeeded in placing in the law of the land the things for which Progressives had been fighting for decades. Look over this record:

The Social Security Act of 1935 providing for the establishment of a system of old-age benefits and better care for the crippled, the aged, and the blind.

The act of 1934 providing for the insurance of bank deposits which is now effectively protecting the savings of the American people.

The Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, an act designed to protect the American investor from unscrupulous practices on the part of those who have unloaded billions of dollars of questionable stocks on the public in the past.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and later legislation which rescued hundreds of thousands of American farmers from bankruptcy.

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 which brought the blessings of electricity to hundreds of thousands of farms that had previously been denied this service.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1935 designed to protect this country's greatest asset, its topsoil.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation which enabled millions of American home owners to save their homes.

The National Housing Act of 1934 which made it possible for thousands of American citizens to acquire their own homes.

The National Labor Relations Act of 1935 which paved the way for better relations between employer and employee.

This is only a partial summary of the forward-looking legislation which was adopted under the Roosevelt New Deal. The New Deal represented the greatest advance in progressive and liberal legislation that this country has ever seen.

As a result of this fight to make Government serve the interests of the people, President Roosevelt incurred the bitter enmity of the moneyed and privileged interests of the country—the same crowd that in earlier years had sought to destroy old Bob La Follette because of his fight for progressive ideals.

Yet today we find the sons of old Bob La Follette now seeking to direct the Progressive movement of this State into an attitude of hostility toward the man who has placed more progressive legislation into the law of the land than any living person.

Many people in seeking to rationalize this anomaly are under the impression that the La Follettes broke with the President on foreign policy. This is not true, as was evidenced by Senator BOB LA FOLLETTE's speech in Milwaukee in which he referred to the New Deal's "tarnished record of failure."

The first sign of the La Follette desertion of President Roosevelt was seen as far back as 1937 when, during the recession of that year, Phil La Follette thought that the New Deal was at the end of its rope. Phil La Follette then proceeded to organize his own abortive political alinement on a program of criticism of the New Deal.

What prompted the La Follettes to repudiate the man who has done more than any occupant of the White House since Lincoln to advance legislation to aid the common man?

We leave our readers to make their own deductions on that matter. We simply wish to ask here how the Progressive movement can win the confidence of the people and how there can be any Progressive solidarity when its leaders turn on those who have done the most to advance Progressive principles.

The Progressives who took part in the Milwaukee convention and lent their endorsement while the New Deal was called a failure will stand convicted in the minds of thousands of Progressives in the United States as guilty of rank ingratitude.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of May 10, 1944]

THE CUMBERSOME FOREIGN POLICY PLANK IN THE PROGRESSIVE PLATFORM

There was a time when Progressives in their party platforms said what they meant and meant what they said. The involved and cumbersome jumble of words which constitutes the foreign policy declaration in the platform adopted by the Progressive Party at Milwaukee last Sunday is quite in contrast with the simple and straightforward statements made in Progressive platforms of earlier years.

In commenting on the foreign policy plank of the Progressive Party, the Milwaukee Journal in an editorial, printed in the adjoining columns, very aptly said:

"It is a peculiar property of truth that when you mean a thing you don't need a thousand words to say what you mean."

With the exception of the foreign policy declaration the platform is a fine statement of principles on domestic issues. It stakes out fine objectives on such issues as social security, money and credit, civil service, co-ops, nutrition programs in the schools, public utilities, labor legislation, veterans' legislation, and housing. And yet, strange to say, these declarations on domestic issues were framed in an environment of hostility toward the Roosevelt administration—the regime that has done more to advance these principles for which Progressives are fighting than any administration in a generation.

But the kind of a world we are going to live in after this war is still the paramount question facing the people of this country. And here the Progressive Party comes up with a lengthy array of double talk that serves as a thin disguise for a policy of isolationism on which the Progressive Party evidently aims to base its appeal to the people of this State in the coming election.

Mr. Rubin and other spokesmen for the Progressive Party undoubtedly will still maintain that the Progressives are for some form of international cooperation. Mr. Rubin and his associates dislike the implications of the word "isolationism." But it so happened that there was a little incident on the floor of the convention that completely revealed what the vague ambiguities of the platform declaration did not reveal. Assemblyman Earl Mullen of Dane County was not satisfied with the platform declaration and offered this clear and concise amendment of a few words from the floor:

"We favor an international organization dedicated to carry out these principles of peace."

The Mullen amendment was quickly ruled out of order.

The following is the heart of the foreign policy declaration of the Progressive platform:

"Progressives will cooperate in supporting sincere efforts made by the United States' representatives at the peace table to secure a just and lasting peace. We affirm our unalterable opposition to territorial aggrandizement for the purposes of imperialism, discrimination against races or peoples, monopoly or cartel control of trade, insupportable indemnities, the oppression of peoples or the selfish exploitation of their natural resources, and the prolonged military government of conquered or occupied nations."

Everybody will agree that these are desirable objectives to be carried into a treaty of peace. Everybody is for a program that will get at the causes of war. But what will declarations of this kind amount to in a peace treaty if there is no machinery to guarantee their enforcement? We agree completely with the Progressives in this statement:

"We affirm our unalterable opposition to territorial aggrandizement for the purpose of imperialism."

Assume that such a declaration finds its way into the coming treaty of peace. How do the Progressives plan to give validity to that declaration? Suppose that after the treaty is signed some aggressor again arises and embarks upon a program of territorial aggrandizement in order to exploit a weaker people. How will such an aggressor be dealt with? The Progressives do not say. If a group of nations can unite during the war to stop an aggressor why can't a similar organization of nations act cooperatively during a period of peace to stop any future aggressor who may arise?

But in the concluding paragraph of the foreign policy declaration the America First inclinations of the Progressive platform makers stick out. The concluding paragraph says:

"Progressives reaffirm their profound conviction that in the last analysis our greatest contribution to world peace will be determined by what America does for Americans. Our primary task is to make democracy and equality of opportunity living realities here at home. By putting our own house in order we can prove to people everywhere that men can have both freedom and security."

If this doesn't mean that America should go it alone in a post-war world, what does it mean? The familiar slogan, "Put our own house in order," is the favorite alternative always suggested by La Follette Progressives whenever the question of foreign policy is brought up. We have never been able to understand why any plans for putting our own house in order should preclude us from taking our part in helping to build a decent world order. Must we necessarily solve the poll-tax question before we can proceed to the job of trying to stop future world wars?

Yes, indeed; the Milwaukee Journal was right when it said: "It is a peculiar property of truth that when you mean a thing you don't need a thousand words to say what you mean."

Resolution of the Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the correct and officially signed resolution passed by the Polish-American Congress together with a communication from Charles Rozmarek, addressed to me. This is intended to correct the error contained in the resolution inserted by the distinguished Member from New York, Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS, Monday, June 5, 1944:

POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE,
Chicago, June 9, 1944.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: We presume in submitting herewith for your kind consideration the text of the resolution unanimously adopted by 3,174 delegates gathered in council at the call of the Polish Congress on May 28, 29, and 30, in Memorial Hall Arena at Buffalo, N. Y.

This resolution, we feel certain, expresses the sincere sentiment of the overwhelming majority of American citizens of Polish ancestry.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President.

Three thousand one hundred and seventy-four delegates and delegates at large, gathered in council at the call of the Polish Congress in Buffalo on May 28, 29, and 30, 1944, authorized by mandates given to them by societies, organizations, churches, and clubs in their communities to speak in behalf and in the name of 6,000,000 Americans have unanimously voted to address the following appeal to the civilized world now engaged in total war against the enemies of democracy.

We are mindful that this appeal is being written on Memorial Day, when our Nation pays tribute to those who have given their lives for the United States. Many thousands of old graves of Americans of Polish ancestry, many monuments of Polish heroes, will be decorated today with the American flag. Thousands of mothers will weep today, their hearts will bleed not knowing where the graves of their beloved sons are.

There is in this sacrifice a holy unity between them and all the mothers in America, Poland, and other lands.

We are also mindful that the thoughts and sentiments of this appeal are being written on the eve of the invasion of Europe. We all live in grave anticipation of news that will announce victory—and death of many.

We can, therefore, speak only in solemn seriousness in the name of our beloved ones who are there with our consent and with our blessing.

To all of us there shall be only one consolation that will redeem this great sacrifice—the knowledge that they have not died in vain. The principles for which they fought are accepted by all the nations who signed the Atlantic Charter.

Poland signed the Atlantic Charter, accepting those principles as rights as well as obligations.

We wish to remind the world that on September 1, 1939, when the German barbarians invaded Poland there was only one boundary question. Poland's boundaries were violated by the Germans. The whole world stood up in arms because the boundaries of one nation were violated by force and brutality of another nation.

England and France declared war because this violation of a principle challenged international morality, the principle that the boundaries of every country are a sacred responsibility of the whole world. One could enumerate many sins of diplomacy that have brought upon us this global war. All started with violations of boundaries as in China, Ethiopia, Austria, and Czechoslovakia. A fourth partition of Poland, by any nation would be dangerous to peace and tend to destroy the moral influence and responsibility of the United States. Our soldiers understood the perilous trip to the battle fronts of the world and will march on carrying the flag of the United States as a symbol that America not only lends and leases money, food, and arms, but also lends and leases the lives of millions of Americans who are carrying with them the American tenets of a new world embodied in the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. This specifically applies to Russia, to whom Poland as one of the United Nations will be the best guaranty against Germany. Poland had repeatedly rejected German attempts to win her into an alliance against Russia, always faithful to her pledges and pacts.

Unjustified propaganda claims that Poland may become a Fascist country. There need be no such fear. Poland had been partitioned three times before—because she was a democracy and she now self-sacrificed herself for the cause of democracy, rejecting fascism and religious oppression.

Russia need not fear Poland unless she fears democracy.

The Atlantic Charter pledges that "no territorial or other aggrandizement should be tolerated."

That the United Nations "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

The Polish people will never give accord to Russian claims or grab by force. They will continue to repeat this pledge of the Charter and we Americans shall join them, because the Atlantic Charter is America's moral responsibility to humanity.

The Atlantic Charter plainly states that—

"The United Nations believe that all nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of use of force."

It is for this reason that we resolve to unite our material and spiritual forces to defend the Atlantic Charter, which is a passport for every American soldier on his way to victory, and any attempted act repudiating the Atlantic Charter is a thrust at the unity of nations.

We solemnly appeal to our fellow Americans and to the citizens of all civilized countries to stand by and adhere to collective responsibility for Poland. This is a test case of international morality.

To the Polish Government in London, the only legitimate and constitutional representative government of Poland, to the Poles whose country is again a battlefield in the common cause of civilization and Christianity, to our sons in the American armed forces, to the gallant soldiers of the Polish Army and to the armies of all United Nations, we send this message that we dedicate ourselves to the end that they will not have suffered, fought, and died in vain.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
Chairman, Polish American Congress.

Flag Day—1944

REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, when the early immigrants to our shores caught their first glimpse of Old Glory fluttering in the clean free wind of the New World, their eyes filled with tears of gratitude to Almighty God, and their hearts were lifted up with fresh hope and faith and courage and resolution.

Even as they fled the ancient oppressions and quarrels of the Old World to defend and enjoy the privileges and opportunities of the New World, so today once more their sons and their sons' sons—yes, and their daughters, too—are fighting and dying all over the world under the same glorious flag to preserve for us and our children and the countless generations as yet unborn those same privileges and opportunities.

What did our gallant marines, storming the blood-stained beachhead at Guadalcanal, think and feel as they followed that banner into battle; followed Old Glory through the perilous murk and mist of the tropic dawn; followed through shot and shell and ambush and death—until that flag floated in triumph over the Solomons? It was no mere piece of colored cloth to them; not just a sheet of striped silk waving gracefully before their grim eyes. Ah, no, it was far, far more than that. It was the visible symbol and memory and meaning of the American creed and American courage.

Listen with hushed and thankful hearts as Old Glory whispers the inspiring message of Bunker Hill. Listen as it shouts the deathless heroism of Gettysburg. Listen as it sings the crimson bravery of Belleau Wood. Listen as it storms the stubborn cliffs of Tunisia or the fog-shrouded ridges of Attu. Listen as it keeps the lonely watch with the sailor at sea or the sentry at his post.

To all of them and all of us it speaks with one voice as the banner of one people, united in war and in peace; the grandest banner that ever hallowed the winds of the world. It speaks, declaring in effect: "I am Old Glory. For more than eightscore years I have been the banner of hope and freedom for generation after generation of Americans. Born amid the first flames of America's fight for freedom, I am the symbol of a country that has grown from a little group of Thirteen Colonies to a united Nation of 48 sovereign States. Planted firmly on the high pinnacle of American faith, my gently fluttering folds have proved an inspiration to untold millions. Men have followed me into battle with unwavering courage. They have looked upon me as a symbol of national unity. They have prayed that they and their fellow citizens might continue to enjoy the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness which have been granted to every American as the heritage of freemen. So long as men love liberty more than life itself; so long as they treasure the priceless privileges bought with the blood of our forefathers; so long as the principles of truth, justice, and charity for all remain deeply rooted in human hearts, I shall continue to be the enduring banner of the United States of America. I am Old Glory."

Indeed, we can with profit take a lesson from the flag pledge of the Boy Scouts of America:

> My flag! Whether floating proudly in the sunshine before the Capitol at Washington, or fluttering from the stern of a battleship ready to protect our liberties, or borne in loyal peace in school, church, or civic occasion, my flag. The flag of my America, home of liberty, soil of opportunity, tower of power rightly used My America. * * * The blue of my flag represents justice, like the eternal blue of the star-filled heavens; its white is for purity, cleanness of purpose, of word or deed; its red is the red lifeblood of brave men and women, ready to die or to live worthily for their country.

Let us this day, and all our days, remember that if we look to our flag for the guaranty of our cherished "four freedoms," our flag looks to us for the full discharge on our part of the corresponding four responsibilities. From every citizen who finds in its glorious folds the benefits and blessings of the American way of life—our flag, I insist, has a right to expect the fulfillment, without evasion or half-hearted compromise, of the four responsibilities, namely: Service, sacrifice, tolerance, and patriotism.

For, in the eloquent words of President Woodrow Wilson, uttered during the darkest days of the last war:

> This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought, and purpose as a Nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute these choices, whether in peace or in war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us—speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us, and of their records they wrote upon it.
>
> We celebrate the day of its birth; and from its birth until now it has witnessed a great history, has floated on high the symbol of great events, or a great plan of life worked out by a great people. * * *
>
> Woe to the man, or group of men, that seek to stand in our way in this day of high resolution, when every principle we hold dearest is to be vindicated and made secure for the salvation of the Nation. We are ready to plead at the bar of history, and our flag shall wear a new luster. Once more we shall make good with our lives and fortunes the great faith to which we were born, and a new glory shall shine in the face of our people.

In that same spirit and with that same fortitude and noble resolve, we, here in the Capital of the Nation, as well as in the humblest American home, shall hold Old Glory high in our hearts, shall follow that beloved flag to new victories and triumphs, and shall, in the end, under God, enjoy a just and lasting peace.

Problems Facing Forest Communities in Washington State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, H. J. Andrews is regional forester, Northwest Pacific Region of the United States State Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture. His headquarters are in Portland, Oreg. Recently he made a notable address before the Northwest Conservation League in Seattle which contains very interesting observations and information of a highly educational nature. I commend its reading and study to those who would familiarize themseives with the present status of the lumber industry and who are interested in America's potential timber resources. Forester Andrews, in this speech, predicts that the rate of movement of logs into Puget Sound should decline fairly rapidly in the State. He suggests some remedies for the grave situation confronting the Pacific Northwest with respect to lumber. His proposed remedies are particularly striking and worthy of serious attention. The address is as follows:

PROBLEMS FACING FOREST COMMUNITIES IN WASHINGTON

(By H. J. Andrews, Northwest Conservation League)

Your chairman asked me to talk on the topic "Forest Resources of the State of Washington." I suggested that a mere statistical picture of acreages and types of forest land and volumes of timber and general statistics on depletion and growth might be rather dreary. Also, that in my opinion the next 20 or 25 years will be a very critical period in Washington and that I would prefer to discuss the problems facing the communities and forest industries in the State in the next 20 or 25 years.

Originally, there was a tremendous volume of timber in the State of Washington. There still is a lot of timber. There has been a large industry developed as a result of this timber. In the past few decades this generated more employment than any other industry. This employment has been the accompaniment of a surplus of installed capacity, in fact far too much installed capacity. I would like to see certain aspects of the current situation continued, particularly the employment possibilities. I doubt if the present rate of employment in the forest-using industries can be continued in spite of some additional transition from sawmills to pulp and paper mills and to

veneer mills. Broadly speaking, those mills which manufacture pulp and also paper use more man hours per cubic foot of wood than the average sawmill, and to a lesser degree this also is true of veneer mills. As I stated, I have been doubtful for some time if this employment could be continued and the recent pressures of the war for timber have more than confirmed my doubts. Prior to the war we had a so-called open-log market on Puget Sound and on Grays Harbor. In those days there was more private timber than public timber. Today the situation is somewhat reversed with public timber, including both State and Federal, greater in volume than private timber.

The Forest Service has been selling timber for years. Prior to Pearl Harbor some sales were small and for short terms and others were larger, extending over periods of several years. When the war came along we changed this policy and are making no more long-term sales for the duration. Existing sales were not canceled, but for the most part, since Pearl Harbor, new sales have been on a year to year basis, or for even shorter periods. The reason for this is that we have reached a time when, except for the war, many mills would have cut out and might have quit business or moved elsewhere. Due to the war it is costly and almost impossible to move a mill and we have tried our best to keep as many mills as possible going so long as they have no timber of their own or no contractual arrangements for other private timber. This has meant some over-cutting in certain sustained-yield units but there seemed to be no other choice. In order to do the best possible job of marketing the timber we have left and also because Senate bill 250 (the so-called cooperative sustained yield bill) seemed as though it would pass during 1944 we figured it was time to take stock of the situation. So late last fall we asked all of the forest supervisors in the two States to spend January, February and March working on the problem. We furnished each forest with a map showing every description of merchantable old growth timber in the two States. On these maps the supervisors indicated timber ownership and the location of each and every wood-using plant in the State. The approximate life of each mill was then determined and from this analysis of the timber situation outside the boundaries of the national forest we expect to get a fairly accurate picture of the needs of each mill in each community for public timber. This has been quite a chore. The maps and reports came in to our office about the first of April and we are now integrating and analyzing these data. I think it will be another 40 to 60 days before we have the job all done, but even now we can come to certain preliminary conclusions as to the situation. I have the data to present the picture in every major economic unit in the State but in the short period allotted for this talk I will speak only of the situation on Puget Sound.

The Puget Sound area comprises all of the territory that drains into the sound, including the north side of the Olympic Peninsula. In this area there is something over 93,500,000,000 board feet of timber in old growth merchantable stands of which around 43,000,000,000 feet is in private ownership, 40,000,000,000 in national forest and about 11,000,000,000 in other public ownership, principally State. Note that I said "timber in old growth merchantable stands." The figures I am using do not include the volume in trees of merchantable size in second growth stands and the volume in some of the more remote and currently inaccessible parts of the national forests. The inclusion of such timber might increase my volume figures by about one-fifth. However, whether such timber is or is not included in this discussion will have but little bearing on what I have to say about the mills which will be out of timber in the near future. For the most part any timber volume I have not accounted for will be used by mills whose life is estimated at over 15 years.

The present annual log requirements for established plants, including sawmills, pulp mills, plywood and veneer plants, and shingle mills, is about three and one-half billion board feet. The allowable cut based on the present mature timber, together with the growth on restocking lands, is estimated at a little less than one and one-quarter billion feet.. In other words, the allowable cut is approximately one-third of the actual cut. In our preliminary analysis we have projected a few years ahead the average annual cut of mills during the last 5 years in order to get a picture of probable future developments.

In general, the requirements are about as follows: 218 sawmills require a little over 2,000,000,000 feet annually; 11 pulp mills require about nine-tenths of a billion feet annually; 18 plywood mills require close to thirty-six one-hundredths of a billion feet annually; and 74 shingle mills require about two-tenths of a billion feet.

In all, some 320 plants require about three and one-half billion board feet of logs per year. If private timber, only, were taken into consideration, and if all of these plants were to cut exclusively in this private timber, there would be sufficient to last the industry about 12 years. Actually, of course, some plants have an assured life longer than this in their own timber, but others will be forced to close even sooner. Based on the best information available to us and again speaking only of private timber, it appears as though some 165 mills with log requirements of about one and four-tenths of a billion board feet would be out of logs in the next 5 years. About 100 plants with annual requirements of 260,000,000 feet would cut out in the period from 5 to 15 years from now, and another 55 plants which require about one and eight-tenths billion feet a year would have an estimated life over 15 years.

That is not a very optimistic picture. To say the least, it poses some very difficult problems to the administrators of publicly owned timber, both State and Federal. To follow the line of least resistance and sell all public timber just as fast as needed by every applicant would violate the principles of sustained yield. It would give full-scale employment for 10 to 15 years and then there would be a wholesale shut-down on a scale which would shock the economic structure of the region.

Note that without public timber, both Federal and State, and without imports 41 percent of the production would cease in from 1 to 5 years, 8 percent in from 5 to 15 years, and 51 percent can go beyond 15 years. This is based on present uses and standards; that is, boards, veneer, pulp. Under peacetime conditions we would not work toward long-time community stability if we allocated any great volume of national-forest stumpage to mills which have at best a very short lease on life. This would seem to indicate that the major portion of public timber should be used to continue the existence of mills which give promise of contributing to long-time community stability. Only half the current production seems to offer this promise. I feel that if preference is to be given any firms and communities—and recent legislation legalizes such preferences—we should bend our efforts to see that public timber goes into the channels which will give the most employment per unit of raw material and also sustain this employment for a long time. However, there may be some virtue in using a part of the federally and State-owned stumpage to taper off the closing out of the 41 percent of production which otherwise may be out of the picture in the next 5 years. To do this would reduce the allowable sustained cut from the national forests involved 5 years from now and thereafter for the balance of the first cutting period. On the other hand, a loss of 41 percent of production is quite a jolt for the Puget Sound region to take all at once. At the moment, I have no "tapering off" formula. At best it should involve only a small part of the publicly owned stumpage. I realize that developing one will create a lot of headaches for the administrator of public timber.

You will recall that the mills now in the Sound area require 3,500,000,000 feet of timber per year. I estimated the life of the industry on the basis of the remaining private timber in the same area. There is a fallacy in my predictions to the extent that logs reach Puget Sound area from Canada and from other areas in Washington and Oregon, in some instances from points pretty far south in Oregon. If logs continue to be shipped into the Puget Sound area from the Grays Harbor or Columbia River areas in Washington or from the central or southern Oregon areas, my predictions as to life of plants will be too conservative. I doubt if the movement of logs from one section of the Douglas-fir region to another continues at past rates for very long. Very few national-forest logs have been manufactured outside the territory in which they were cut. I anticipate that the Forest Service will not look with favor on long-distance moving of logs from point of cutting to point of manufacture. The recently passed cooperative sustained-yield law permits the earmarking of Federal timber for communities and many communities are showing a decided interest. Some are also interested in the disposal of the privately owned stumpage in their vicinity.

Puget Sound may, therefore, continue to import logs, but I would guess the rate of import will decline fairly rapidly. One good reason for this is that the Grays Harbor, Columbia River (both Oregon and Washington) and Willamette Valley areas are more or less in the same fix as Puget Sound because of excess milling capacity.

In the rest of western Washington exclusive of the Puget Sound territory the situation is briefly as follows: About 143 mills of different sizes require some 2,300,000,000 feet a year. Old growth stands in the same area amount to about 48,000,000,000 feet, about 46 percent private, the rest public. Without public timber and based on no imports from the outside, some 20 mills, representing about half the current annual requirements can continue over 15 years, the balance would be through in the next 15-year period. In eastern Washington (exclusive of the Spokane territory) with about 23,000,000,000 feet of old-growth timber, some 46 mills use 317,000,000 feet annually. In this area about half the current production is in mills which can continue over 15 years.

What can be done? There is no single step which can quickly remedy a situation involving a heavy overinstallation of mill capacity together with a serious depletion of standing timber. Certain moves will help. In some of these the action will have to come from the industry, individually and collectively; in others the action will have to come from the public. The following would help:

1. The best possible utilization in woods and mill. Some plants have just about attained this goal; many others have not.

2. Development and prompt application of new uses.

3. A maximum of local manufacture.

4. More use of so-called "minor" species, including hardwoods.

5. Stop premature wasteful cutting of second-growth stands except as a thinning process.

6. Development of certain main-line common-carrier railroads to tap large bodies of public timber together with intermingled private timber. These could be fed by individually owned truck roads. Improvements

in forest transportation systems usually result in far better forest utilization.

7. Help resist pressures to break down sustained-yield programs for public timber.

8. Protect scenic and recreational areas, including roadside strips.

9. Develop sources of employment in the region other than those depending on timber.

10. Individual and collective effort on the part of industry to so conduct its cutting and logging operation as to keep lands reasonably productive and assure a future crop.

11. The practice of selective logging where feasible as a means of reserving for future quality products, material which for various reasons is presently not utilized but is torn down in the clear-cut logging process. There is danger in the unqualified assumption that test-tube forestry and fabricated pieces will enable western producers to compete in eastern markets with eastern and southern manufacturers. Quality lumber always has and will continue to move at premium prices.

You will note the emphasis is on better utilization. In general, we leave one-fourth of the tree in the woods and after sawdust, slabs, and various trimmings are accounted for, the average sawmill turns out in finished products about one-half of the three-fourths that come to the mill. In other words, finished products account for about 37½ percent of the solid-wood volume in standing timber. The utilization in pulp and veneer mills is better. It is physically possible to make various products such as alcohol, plastics, etc., from the five-eighths of the tree which is either not used at all or used for fuel. If these processes can be put on a commercial basis, obviously more labor can be obtained from our remaining old growth. It is doubtful if these miscellaneous uses which can be developed from the so-called waste in the woods and sawmills should be developed in a manner which would result in a faster rate of depletion of our remaining timber. Certainly, first efforts should be toward an integration of industry so that more hours of employment result from every tree felled. If, as techniques improve and requirements change, the various "new" uses such as alcohol and plastics give more employment than is obtained from puttings logs through sawmills, then such uses may well replace some sawmill capacity, preferably that which gets the least out of the logs.

In any event, I can see no basis for any increase in the rate of cutting. There is no control of practice on private lands. Some owners are trying to prolong their woods and mill operations and get on a sustained-yield basis, others aren't. I anticipate strong pressures on the Forest Service to overcut the sustained-yield capacity of its several units. They are already being felt and one argument is that Forest Service sustained-yield calculations are based on rotation ages which are too high; that in the future, wood conversion will be either a process of converting chips into various products or gluing little boards together to make big ones. If this is so, 30- to 70-year rotations may serve instead of 100-year or long rotations. When and as this theory is proven our concepts of rotation should be changed; not before. Also, when that happens, the west coast will take on a type of competition with the East and South which it is not now carrying.

The bulk of our finished forest products, pulp, paper, lumber and veneer, are marketed outside the region with a heavy transportation charge, a much heavier charge than forest products manufacturers in the East and South have to pay. The industry in the Northwest pays woods and mill wages which are higher than those in other parts of the country. In the past and today it is the high quality of our lumber and veneer that has allowed this region to ship its products to other regions where the local forest industries have every advantage except in quality of timber. When everything is on a chip and glue-up basis these other regions will have every advantage, smaller freight charges, cheaper labor. Even today with wartime demands we have great difficulty in getting the smaller trees used on national forest timber sales. Our old growth should be treasured and used to tide over a very difficult transition period. In the next few decades it can help carry the competitive load which will face those who will manufacture our oncoming second growth.

Our analysis of the forest situation in Washington indicates that if all the second-growth areas come through as we hope they will, we may be better off 50 years from today than in the next two or three decades.

Texas on the War Path

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am including, at the request of an old-line Democrat; a press release recently distributed by the anti-fourth-term American Democratic National Committee.

My attention is called to the fact that the importance of the revolt is not to be found in the number of delegates involved so much as in the fact of the number of Texans really behind the opposition to a fourth term.

The recent resignation of the Honorable James A. Farley as State chairman in New York and the more recent activities in Texas in opposition to a fourth term lend added interest to what the American Democratic National Committee is attempting to do.

The press release follows:

The anti-fourth-term American Democratic National Committee hails the split in the Democratic ranks in Texas, as another feather in its cap.

From its national headquarters in Washington, former Congressman John J. O'Connor, of New York, eastern vice chairman of the American Democratic National Committee, today stated:

"The split in the Democratic ranks, this week, in Texas, over a fourth term, was, at least, in part, due to the work of our committee there, under the leadership of our vice chairman, Texas Secretary of Agriculture, J. E. McDonald, with headquarters in Fort Worth. Likewise, we participated in the uprisings of Democrats in Louisiana, South Carolina, and other States, where the followers of Thomas Jefferson have balked at the orders of alien-tongued cheer leaders for the New Deal. Before Chicago, there will be more States heard from!

"What has happened in New York recently should deter a considerable number of real Democratic delegates from even attending the perfunctory convention, to be held in the Windy City in July. That meeting, originally called by the Democratic National Committee, formerly presided over by a real Democrat, James A. Farley, will be run by the Big Four organizations, which have already decreed that Mr. Roosevelt, and also Mr. WALLACE, mind you, must be renominated. It's all over, 'cept the singing of the Internationale!

"The American public now knows that the bosses of the Democratic machine are no longer Tammany and Hague and Guffey and Kelly and their like. While those leaders are still in the game, because they do not dare to quit the captain and face the court martial, they have been benched for none the less than Browder, Hillman, and Dubinsky, the three big bosses of the Big Four and the fourth term drive.

"The Big Four are:

"First, Browder's refitted Community Party or association.

"Second, Hillman's Communist C. I. O. Political Action Committee, which just used its slush fund to renominate the 'rubber stamp' Senators—PEPPER in Florida and HILL in Alabama—and to defeat independent and courageous Representatives STARNES, of Alabama, and COSTELLO, of California—not to forget the boastful threat the same bunch held over the head of Representative MARTIN DIES.

"Third in the Big Four is Hillman's—the same habitue of the White House, a sort of a two-timer boss—communistic American Labor Party. That this cell is Communist-infested is admitted by its former tenants.

"Fourth in line is the Liberal Party, the illegitimate offcast of Hillman's A. L. P.

"In pleading for the united Communist support of Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term, Mr. Browder, whose right to vote, even, rests upon President Roosevelt's pardon from prison, said—despite the Communists' hocus-pocus about disorganizing and changing their name—'We remain an organization of Communists * * * who hold the principles of Marxism.' So does Stalin! As long as he does, they will.

"Incidentally, that is the same Communist Party which Mr. Roosevelt's General Biddle—second in command at the battle of Montgomery Ward—legally held as having as its principal purpose the overthrow of our form of government by force. Yet they're still doing business at the same old stand—1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

"The second boss is Mr. Hillman, of the White House-blessed firm of Hillman, Lepke, and company, about which Governor Dewey, if nominated for President, will probably have a great deal to say.

"Add the third boss, the 'Leftist,' pinkish radical, Dubinsky.

"What a triumvirate to be running, not only the affairs of our party of Jefferson, but actually directing the destinies of a Nation of 130,000,000 people, with whom they have nothing in common.

"In fact, they and their lieutenants, who are now running the administration, with Mr. Roosevelt as their tool and Mr. WALLACE as their new 'white hope'—

"They just don't look like Americans;
"They don't think like Americans;
"They don't act like Americans;
"They don't smell like Americans,
"They just 'ain't' Americans.

"Despite all of which, they have the audacity to use the word 'American.' They then warp the word 'liberal' to meet their foreign concepts—the principles Marx stood for.

"Like President Roosevelt's announcement of the dropping of the shibboleth 'New Deal,' they change their party names, as well as their own—willy-nilly.

"Talleyrand said: 'An important art of politicians is to find new words for institutions which under their old names have become odious to the public.'

"The real Americans in the two great parties could meet this challenge to the continuance and the future welfare of our country, by recalling that 112 years ago, last Monday, the first Democratic National Convention nominated as its candidate Mr. Andrew Jackson, who, 4 years earlier, had been

elected President, as a Republican. We have today a Farley and a BYRD and many other real Democrats and outstanding Republicans, who can proudly carry the standard of the real Americans."

The Plight of the Stock Grower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address prepared for delivery by me at the fifty-fifth annual convention of the stock growers at Scottsbluff, Nebr., June 9, 1944:

Mr. President, members of the stock growers association, ladies and gentlemen, like every other group in this country, the stockmen are looking to the future and trying to make plans to weather the succeeding crises that are bound to come before we again settle down to a more or less normal life in this country. I am convinced that the problems they are facing today have been brought about to a great extent by too much planning on the part of governmental agencies that are long on theory and short on experience. I have lived and worked for 25 years in the cattle country and for the past year and a half have had daily contact with the agencies of government who have taken over control of the production, distribution, and the regimentation of this country. One thing seems certain, that there is entirely too many Government agencies with their fingers in the pie of the production, handling, and distribution of food. There should be one individual with authority to head up all of the buying for the Army, Navy, lend-lease, and for civilian use. This has been recommended by the food producers of the country. It is being ignored by Washington authorities.

In spite of the fact that there are from ten to fifteen million more cattle on the ranges in this country than at any previous time, the consumer finds it impossible to get good beef in the retail markets in sufficient quantities to satisfy his wants. While the supply of cattle on the range has greatly increased, there has been a 30- to 40-percent reduction in the feed lots of the country. This will eventually mean less meat to the consumers because meat is actually produced in the feed lots of America. At this date, June 9, 1944, we understand some orders are being considered which may change the classification of meat and may well bring further discouragement to the producers of cattle. It is difficult to find out just what orders are about to be issued, but some are forthcoming. It is not likely that it will clarify or help the meat situation. It may even cause a further unbalanced situation.

One thing seems certain with the greatly increased supply of cattle on the range coupled with a marked decrease in the amount of available feed, and with the reduction of the amount of labor, we can well expect a flood of grass fed cattle going to the markets between September and December. It may well surpass the congestion which occurred in the marketing of hogs. It could mean a demoralized market. The cattlemen must be prepared. Regardless of the number of cattle on the range, it through a combination of circumstances, it cannot get to the consumer, the surplus is bound to affect the price and it spells a rough road ahead. Right now there is a decided shortage of labor on the ranches. This picture is liable to change soon after Germany is defeated. Then there is a shortage of grain and protein feeds. On top of all this the Government is maintaining a ceiling price on livestock. The factors I have mentioned above—shortage of labor, scarcity of feeds and their high price, and the ceiling price of livestock—have brought about this natural result and accounts for the shortage of good beef on the retail markets.

There is an additional matter that the cattlemen must take into consideration. It is the unintelligent and unsympathetic handling of the meat situation by Government agencies. Although committees have been set up to advise these agencies they have too often been considered with suspicion and their advice, when given, has been disregarded. Most of the time the committees have been summoned to hear an announcement of a policy already decided upon by some planners in the agencies.

The entire cattle industry is under an artificial price control. These controls are being manipulated and conducted by inexperienced men in Washington. These controls bring on a hopeless tangled condition. It means red tape and confusion. The cattlemen's business has been subjected to man made rules and regulations which hamper, annoy and bring discouragement to the industry. Many of these conditions will prevail until there is an end of hostilities and a change of this administration. I am certain there are men in this administration who want to control and regulate everything from your shoe strings to your hair tonic. It is up to the American people to effect a change.

Up to recent weeks the administration has not been interested in getting cattle in the feed lots. They have not wanted any corn-fed meat. They fail to realize that it is possible to put two or three hundred extra pounds of meat on the same frame by giving the animal a little grain. There were recent meetings with the War Food Administration and O. P. A. and it seems now that they may adopt a different attitude and even urge that cattle be placed in the feed lot in order to produce more meat.

Politics is another factor that the cattlemen must consider in their future plans. You will recall that Mr. Bowles, Administrator of O. P. A., had an article in the May 6 edition of Collier's in which he said there would be no changes in the near future in the rationing of meat. However, on May 4—he had written the Collier's article before this—he announced the take-off of points on all meat with the exception of a few cuts of beef. Mr. Bowles had no intention of changing O. P. A.'s policy on meat rationing when he wrote the article. The policy had been determined upon by his experts in the agency. But Mr. Bowles did not have the last word. No, somebody in the inner cabinet figured it would be good politics to relax rationing at this time and ordered him to do so in spite of his experts. You see, there is the Office of Economic Stabilization, set up by the President without authority of law and presided over by Judge Fred Vinson, whose principal purpose seems to be to take care of the political angle. This is the Office that carries out the orders of the New Deal inner circle. It gives orders to O. P. A., the War Food Administration, the War Labor Board, and the other war agencies.

There is another major factor that must be considered by the cattleman in making his future plans. That is the factor of national income for the future of the industry will depend a lot on this factor. There has never been an oversupply of food in this country. Rather there has been underconsumption because the people lacked the money with which to buy. The national income reached a high in 1929 of $83,300,000,000 and then dropped to a low of $39,900,000,000 in 1932. In 1942 it was $119,700,000,000. It is estimated it was over $150,000,000,000 in 1943 and will also top that figure in 1944. In order to continue prosperity in this country it is believed that the national income must be maintained at not less than $100,000,000,000. In addition to the demand for meat in this country we will be faced with furnishing food for a time to the people of the liberated countries.

All these things must be taken into consideration by the cattlemen in their plans for the future. The cattleman is essentially an individualist. He is that because during the past he has had to meet the staggering problems of his business with his own ingenuity. Through his associations he has spread his experiences and gained from the experience of others in his own field. He will continue to do this and will continue to solve his problems. There is only one thing that he will be unable to cope with and that is a continued unintelligent and unsympathetic interference of government in the industry. We must see to it that government controls are relaxed as soon as possible after the war is over and in the meantime we should make every effort to get Government agencies to take a different attitude toward the problems of the production and distribution of meat.

Franco—Hitler's Imitator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been attempting to persuade my colleagues and the people of the country that they should exert themselves to the end that we sever diplomatic relations with Franco Fascist Spain. It is my contention that we stultify ourselves in the eyes of the people of occupied Europe and the champions of democracy everywhere in the world when we appease and collaborate with Franco Spain.

Miss Dorothy Thompson, in my judgment, is one of the most eminent feminine intellectuals in America. She is a profound student of international relations. She has a thorough understanding of the complicated picture affecting the diplomatic maneuvering between various countries of Europe. She is realistic. She recognizes the transcendent importance of our showing to the people of Latin America that we mean what we say when we claim to be fighting a war against fascism. The state of our relations with Latin America depends in no small part on the acceptance by the Latins of our bona-fides as implementing our professions of devotion to democracy. Recently, Miss Thompson delivered a notable address over the Blue Network of the National Broadcasting Co. which was reprinted in the weekly magazine The Nation. This speech sustains the position I have taken

in the Congress with respect to Franco and Phalange. Here it is:

FRANCO, NEW AXIS CHIEF

(By Dorothy Thompson)

During the past weeks I have been observing something I think very important. You may not be convinced by what I am going to say, but I shall produce concrete evidence. Fascism is not just an Italian or a German idea. The chief German Nazis—Hitler, Rosenberg, Goering, Goebbels, Himmler, Hess—are not ordinary German nationalists at all. (Conrad Heiden, in his book Der Fuehrer, calls them armed bohemians.) Of these six men I have just named, only two—Goering and Goebbels—were even born in Germany. All of them have always looked far beyond Germany. They organized, in national socialism, a movement which was designed to sweep the world. They built up this conspiracy methodically in all countries. Their idea was to create a new kind of state, and world union of states, based on the overthrow of popular governments and the substitution of military despotisms by means of organized mass movements—all these states to be pawns in the hands of the intellectual and political leaders of the Nazi-Fascist Parties.

The key point of the whole plot was Berlin, the strongest capital of the strongest state in Europe.

They know now that the Nazi-Fascist war may be lost. They have to take that into their reckoning. Of course, they will prolong it as long as they can. They know that there can be many a slip in war. Allies, for instance, can split; governments can change, bringing new policies. They will try, and probably succeed, in turning the path to Berlin into a path of blood. But they have to take into their calculations that in all probability, sooner or later, they will lose the war. So then what will they do?

What they are already laying plans for is to create a new Axis. They are planning to find new ground from which to continue their fight against free governments and peoples, against the passion of the peoples to cast off their chains of militarism and oppression and—as Lincoln said—find freedom in the brotherhood of life.

The Nazi international foresees that Europe may be almost wholly lost to it. Whether the Russians descend on Germany with grim, relentless fury, or whether the Anglo-American troops march triumphant from Calais to Berlin, fascism will be finished in belligerent Europe with our winning of the war. It will be finished in Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Poland. And it will be finished in Berlin and Rome.

Where then will it go? I will tell you. It is going to make this hop: Berlin-Madrid-Buenos Aires. The center of the new Nazi-Fascist Axis will not be Berlin. It will be Madrid. Hitler's experience shows that you don't need a great power to start with. He didn't even start with Germany, but with one town—Munich. The rest he did by propaganda and tactics. And the rallying ground for a new attempt to overthrow political freedom and the countries based on it will not be in the Old World but in the New World—in Latin America. The signs and portents reveal themselves daily. And the old familiar pattern repeats itself, too—the pattern of appeasement.

The most dangerous man in the world the day after victory will not be Hitler, who will have managed to ally the whole world against him and lead his country to catastrophe. No; the most dangerous Fascist will be Franco, who is managing to help the Axis while winning gratitude from us for his so-called neutrality.

What does that neutrality amount to? Is it a neutrality comparable, for instance, to that of Sweden and Switzerland? Is it the neutrality of a man who wants us to win, because his country is, like Switzerland and Sweden, freedom-loving and democratic? Not at all. Franco's neutrality is the neutrality of a man who would like to see the Axis win and has repeatedly said so, but who thinks it may not, and intends to preserve one place in Europe where fascism can take a new lease on life after this war. Franco is betting on Germany and Italy being defeated but on fascism surviving.

For the past weeks dispatches from Madrid to the United States have appeared under such headlines as "Franco currying favor with Allies," "Spain frees republicans for Christmas amnesty," "Franco seeks to allay hatreds—his new liberalism intended to remove threats of revolts, Spain paying debt to United States exporters"—all these creating the impression that Spain is swinging over to our side in the war and even to domestic liberalism. Several news reports from Spain say that Franco is gradually dissolving the Phalangist Party—the Spanish Fascist Party.

But if one reads these dispatches carefully they furnish no evidence whatever that any of this wishful thinking is true. Has Franco freed political prisoners, in a movement toward greater liberalism? According to the Phalangist newspaper, there were in January 1940, 270,719 republican political prisoners. The Christmas amnesty freed 40,000 of these. That left more than 230,000. Dispatches say that 34,000 cases are under review. That would still leave over 200,000 unaccounted for. And a little item explains this. "The majority of Spanish prisoners," it says, "were arrested without any charges whatsoever and the amnesty does not apply to them." So our liberal Franco is apparently holding around 200,000 persons without warrant, without indictment, without any reason ever given to them or to the world. These men who were imprisoned for their resistance to fascism are infinitely worse off than Nazi prisoners of war in British or American internment camps, whose treatment is under international conventions and checked by the Red Cross.

Is Franco gradually dissolving the Phalangist Party, as reported by Herbert Clark, correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, on January 8? The only evidence Mr. Clark gives for this is that Franco is taking some non-Phalangists into his government. Hitler has had men who were not Nazi Party members in his government from the beginning to the present time. The Phalangist Party is the only legal party in Spain. It is supported right out of the state treasury. And this year's budget increased the appropriation for the Phalangist Party. A fine way to dissolve a party—to subsidize it out of the taxes of the people.

How about the Spanish Legion, fighting with the Germans on the eastern front? Franco has had to admit that 1,500 of them are still fighting. And what do you think he told British and American diplomats when asked to explain. He said they were mostly criminal elements, whose return to Spain would be bad for the country.

There are some other things happening which tell the truer story. The International Labor Office knows that Franco still has a treaty with the Germans, entitled "Concerning the Allocation of Spanish Manpower." Under that treaty Franco has furnished labor to German factories. These workers aren't volunteers. They are conscripted by their own Government and sent to Germany to make bombs with which to kill us. No such treaty exists between Germany and any other neutral country.

On January 16 news broke of a series of bomb explosions on British ships carrying oranges from Spain to England. This made the British hopping mad, and the British Ambassador to Madrid took occasion, at a dinner given to the diplomatic corps, to take Franco aside and protest in no uncertain terms. What was the result? Franco got the American Ambassador, Carlton Hayes—who has leaned over backward to behave correctly toward Franco—into a conversation and told him that Algiers was a hotbed of communism, and all the Free French were Communists. Hayes was so angry that it almost came to an international incident—but it's proof enough that Franco feels little necessity to appease us.

It is as clear as distilled water that Franco is playing the Axis game as a neutral while making himself the pet boy of the Allies. He apparently hopes to emerge from the war as the only decent Fascist in the public opinion of a large part of the Allied countries. And what does that mean to us, the United States?

It means the most dangerous situation imaginable. For all European countries, the one with the greatest influence in Latin America is Spain. Latin America is predominantly Spanish in culture. Already one Fascist coup has been engineered in the Western Hemisphere, namely, in Argentina, where a Fascist military dictatorship on the Franco pattern has seized power. The Ramirez dictatorship is pro-Axis. The recent severance of diplomatic relations with the Axis is no more in conflict with this fact than is Franco's neutrality. The best position for a Fascist regime today is that of neutrality toward or collaboration with the winners—especially if they are able to strangle the country's economy.

The Argentine dictatorship speculates that after the war fear of the colossus of the north can be created in country after country south of the Rio Grande. The argument that Latin America is threatened by northern domination will be used to prove the necessity for strong governments, namely, military and totalitarian dictatorships. And this Argentine pattern is already spreading—to Bolivia, for instance.

Just the other day I heard from a most reliable source that the Nazi regime is preparing, when defeat is no longer avoidable, to shift machinery from German industries to neutral Spain, where it is to be stored until it can be shipped after the war to the Argentine. Their idea is to industrialize and arm the Argentine, spreading from there through all Latin America. They already—as the papers revealed last week—have a formidable spy ring operating from there. In it are even Argentine officials. When the British arrested the Argentine consul in Trinidad, exposing a whole plot, the Argentine Government was forced to act. It had to pretend it had only just discovered the machinations of the Axis in its country, whereas in fact the plotting had been thoroughly exposed by an investigating committee of the Argentine Congress. A Montevideo newspaper published a letter the other day from the secretary of the political bureau of the German Embassy in Buenos Aires promising the iron cross from the Fuehrer to those who work well in Latin America and help all revolutionary anti-Allied and anti-Semitic elements in Latin America. * * *

What can we do about all this? There is only one thing we can do. Diplomatic notes and formal protests may change tactics but not essential sympathies. What we can do is to help our real allies, who are the people of these countries. There are strong popular underground movements in both Spain and Argentina—movements which, not for our sakes but for their own, long to overthrow these military despotisms. We should help these movements, help them by all possible means. Hitler saw long ago that the way to get on without war is to overthrow hostile governments from within. And that much we should have learned from him.

Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I know that the House today will want to join in the all-America salute being accorded Vice Admiral Russell R. Waesche as he begins his third 4-year term as head of the United States Coast Guard. Serving with great distinction, Admiral Waesche and the Coast Guard have contributed mightily to the winning of this war. With his officers, men and women, the admiral should be proud of the manner in which they continue to carry on the great traditions of this sea service. I mention the women because the SPARS, under the capable direction of Capt. Dorothy Stratton, are now a part of the Coast Guard and their contributions have been such as to warrant their permanency.

The Washington Post this morning editorially pays Admiral Waesche and the Coast Guard the following timely tribute:

COAST GUARD

It gives us a good deal of pleasure to extend our congratulations to the amiable and energetic Vice Admiral Russell R. Waesche, who today enters his third 4-year term as head of the United States Coast Guard. Admiral Waesche is, we believe, the first Coast Guard officer ever to hold so high a rank, and the honor is in itself a recognition of the very large and important role which has been assigned to this service in this war. Since its establishment in 1790, the Coast Guard has had some part in all the conflicts in which this Nation has been engaged, and had a considerable part in World War of 1917–18, when the number of its officers and men lost in action was proportionately greater than that of any other service. But this is the first time that its activities have taken it so far beyond those coasts of which it is the traditional guardian and policeman. The Coast Guard seems to have had some share in nearly all the campaigns involving operations by sea and an important share in those at Singapore, Tulagi, Guadalcanal, the Gilberts, Salerno, and Normandy.

Although, as regards publicity and eclat, the Coast Guard perhaps is still the most neglected of the services, it in no way suffers by comparison of its record with that of any other service. The work of the Coast Guard harbor and coastal patrols is perhaps less vital now than it was in the months immediately after Pearl Harbor. But is was certainly vital then. It was the first American service to take German prisoners in this war. It was a Coast Guard man, you will remember, who engineered the capture of the saboteurs landed on Long Island from a German submarine, and it was Coast Guard vigilance that discouraged the Nazis from landing others. It certainly did its part and a little more in the great and difficult battle that may yet prove to have been the really decisive battle of the war, namely, the Battle of the North Atlantic. In the meantime it has continued all those duties of lifebuoy tending, ice breaking, life saving, and so on, which are its peacetime province, though it is probable that the revenue-collecting activities may have slumped a bit. Looking over the record, Admiral Waesche and his officers and men have every reason to be proud of their now highly ramified organization.

Jews in Up-State New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, Jewish participation in the development of up-State New York began when there was yet no such thing as New York. While in the commencement of American settlement, the bulk of the Jews coming, went to Manhattan, there was from the very inception—a trickle up the Hudson. In 1655, we already have record of a real estate transaction in Albany in which the name of Asser Levy figures.

At the time, Albany was a small trading post established by the Dutch West India Co. and was known as Fort Orange. It will be recalled by those who know their early American history that Peter Stuyvesant was something of a pompous and arbitrary official, scarcely typifying the Dutch spirit of tolerance, which particularly shone out at that time of almost universal intolerance.

The city of Amsterdam in Holland was one place where Jews in Europe could become citizens. It was not only Jews who took advantage of the Dutch tolerance. As we know the Pilgrims also found refuge there. A reactionary of the day characterized Amsterdam contemptuously as a "mixture of Arianism, Anabaptism, and Judaism."

The Dutch West India Co. which sponsored the settlement of New Amsterdam had a considerable percentage of Jewish stockholders. There was, therefore, every reason to expect, both from the point of view of the Holland traditions and that of material interests, that Peter Stuyvesant would uphold in full the Dutch traditions as to equality of the Jews in New Amsterdam.

Unfortunately, while an able individual in many ways, Stuyvesant was narrow—a narrowness which some historians believe was largely the cause for the loss of New Amsterdam to the Dutch, for when the English attacked New Amsterdam, there was little resistance on the part of the people—many of the people believing that they would fare better under a less arbitrary regime if the English took charge.

The Jews in Manhattan under Stuyvesant were subject to numerous restrictions as to trade and one forbade them to trade at South River and Fort Orange.

An appeal was made to the Dutch West India Co. The company wrote to Stuyvesant reproving them:

We have seen here and learned with displeasure, that your honors, have against our apostille of the 15th of February 1655, granted to the Jews or Portuguese nation at their request, have forbidden them to trade at Fort Orange and South River and also to purchase the real estate which is allowed them here in this country without any difficulty, and wish that this had not occurred, but that your honors had obeyed our orders which you must hereafter execute punctually and with more respect.

Asser Levy who was the first Jew to have any business dealings at Albany had already established a reputation as a fighter in Manhattan.

He first came in the limelight when the schout—sheriff—of New Amsterdam entered his butcher shop with a bill for taxes.

Asser Levy looked up. "Why, I have already paid my taxes."

But this, the schout explained, was a special tax on Jews imposed on them for their exemption from standing guard and military service.

"But," remonstrated Asser Levy, "I have not asked for any such exemption, and moreover I insist on my right to stand guard like the other burghers."

Asser Levy had a fight on his hand, but he won this one of the first battles for religious equality in America.

Asser Levy was always fighting. His name appears frequently in litigation with the most prominent residents—the aristocracy. Generally, such a man is classified as a turbulent sort and does not enjoy the respect of the community, and yet it is very evident that this is not so in the case of Asser Levy.

The Jew who insisted on his right to shoulder his gun and stand guard apparently enjoyed a wide respect among his fellows of the community. This is evidenced in particular by the number of non-Jews who named Levy executor of their wills. Apparently he was a man whose integrity was respected by all of his Christian neighbors and who was thoroughly trusted.

Among other Jews who are mentioned as having traded at Fort Orange and the South River along this period of 1655 are Joseph de Acosta and Benjamin Cardoso.

In colonial days, Jonas Phillips was a well-known resident of Albany. Levy Solomons who was engaged in the manufacture of chocolate and snuff is listed as among the ardent supporters of the American Revolution.

The first Jewish settlers of Albany were Jews of Spanish-Portuguese derivation. Around 1838, with the beginning of a heavy German immigration to this country, the German-Jewish element became dominant and in that year the first Jewish congregation was formed. While previously, the immigrant flux stayed in New York, canals, turnpikes, and steamboats transported the newer immigrants to the rapidly growing urban centers of Albany, Troy, Peekskill, Poughkeepsie. Jews penetrated far north into the Plattsburg settlement and went west to the cities of Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, and Buffalo.

The first rabbi of the Albany Jewish community was Isaac M. Wise, a man who was destined to play an important role in the whole of American Jewish life. Wise was a very interesting figure and counted among his special friends Seward, whom he first met when the former was Governor of New York.

Wise, then an immigrant from Germany, has told of his first visit to Albany. He wrote:

The steamer seemed to be a floating palace, the people higher beings, and the Hudson a second Chedquel, flowing out of the Garden of Eden. The lofty walls of rock above New York seemed to shut off the Old World and

the steep heights in the vicinity of West Point were for me the mighty door, the giant gate opening into the New World. Overcome with awe and devotion, I could have embraced every mountain, every rock. Then we reached the broad valley near Rhinebeck.

In the midst of this ecstasy which the sight of the Hudson evoked in him, Wise relates a comical incident, which helps us visualize those times when the Hudson scene was bursting with new life as large numbers of immigrants were coming into the country. Continues Rabbi Wise:

When I began to feel somewhat more prosaic, I saw a man who seemed a countryman of mine walking through the boat anxiously and searchingly.

"Have you lost anything?"

"I have lost everything," he cried, "I have lost my English language."

"You have lost the English language? I do not understand."

"You do not understand? Neither do I and therein lies my misfortune. I arrived at New York and after I had paid all my debts, I had $20 and 5 shillings left. So they said to me, 'Cohen, you must have a basket for 6 shillings and $20 worth of kuddel muddle and then you must go peddling in the country.'

"I cry out: The country speaks English, and I do not. How in the world can I get along?

"That makes no difference, they told me. We will write everything down for you. Well, they gave me the basket filled with kuddle muddle and wrote for me the English language on a piece of paper and sent me up the Hudson. Now I have lost the English language and am perfectly helpless."

"If that is all you are in need of, I can help you." I told him to write down in German the terms of which he required the English equivalent and translated these words for him. He now had his English language again.

Enthusiastic about American institutions, it was natural that when the occasion offered, Rabbi Wise should stop off at Washington to see the Capitol. Seward, whom he had known as Governor of New York, was now in the United States Senate, and through Seward Rabbi Wise was to meet Daniel Webster and on different occasions several of the Presidents of the United States.

The first President he met was Polk. Later he met "Old Rough and Ready" Zachary Taylor.

"You came because you never before saw a President of the United States," said President Taylor.

"No," said Rabbi Wise. "Your Excellency, I had already met a President. I met President Polk. I came to meet the hero of Buena Vista."

General Taylor made a gracious bow at this.

Later, Wise met President Fillmore, who at one time as Comptroller of New York had lived in Albany, although Wise had not formed his acquaintance there.

Fillmore was very gracious to Wise, but after some talk it was plain there was something on Fillmore's mind. Finally it came out, when Fillmore said: "Well, Washington is an expensive place to linger in. So if you have anything to say, there is no reason for delaying. I presume you are here about the petition."

"Petition," said Rabbi Wise. "What petition? I know of no petition."

"Do you mean to say you know nothing about this petition?" said President Fillmore, taking out a long petition signed by many score residents of Albany asking that Rabbi Wise be appointed to a position at the Congressional Library.

Rabbi Wise was dumbfounded. A number of his Christian neighbors who knew President Fillmore had, without asking Wise, asked the President to name him to a political post.

Rabbi Wise said the offer to the Library was very attractive to him, but at the time he had other ideas. Wise was grateful for the incident as showing him the respect which he enjoyed in the Albany community.

BUFFALO

A few Jews were to be found in Buffalo from almost the very beginning, but it was not until 1825 that something of outstanding interest in connection with the Jews developed there. This was nothing less than a scheme to establish on Grand Island near Buffalo a kind of American Zion—a haven for the oppressed Jews of the world.

The sponsor of the scheme was Maj. Mordecai Manuel Noah. Major Noah was born in Charleston, S. C. George Washington, according to a tradition, was present at the wedding of his parents.

In Charleston, Noah was editor of a paper, fought several duels, and then moved to New York, where he became an important figure politically. He was the publisher of the New York Enquirer and was generally regarded as the editorial spokesman of Martin Van Buren. It was probably due to his meetings with Van Buren that Noah became familiar with up-State New York. Anyway, he appeared to have developed an attachment for the region. His daughter, Zipporah, he sent to a school in Schenectady.

This scheme for the establishment of a Jewish haven on Grand Island was quite an extravagant one (but the major had a great imagination). As early as January 19, 1820, Noah petitioned the State legislature to permit the sale to him of Grand Island in the Niagara River "for the purpose of attempting to have the same settled by the emigrants of the Jewish religion from Europe," but not until September 1825 did Noah issue an appeal to world Jewry, solemnly inviting them to join him, Mordecai Noah. He described himself in this call as a "citizen of the United States of America, a late consul for the said States for the city and kingdom of Tunis, high sheriff of New York, and counselor of and by the grace of God, governor and judge of Israel."

Most of the things which he claimed in this description were true. He had served as consul to Tunis, appointed by President Madison, and he had been sheriff of New York, but the post of governor and judge of Israel he had conferred on himself.

He named this place of asylum "Aararat," thus tying up the ark of Noah of the Bible with his own proposed ark.

Noah was a firm believer in the theory then held by not a few that the Indians were the lost 10 tribes. It was held in support of this theory that the Indians, for example, counted time as the Jews, by the moon, not the sun, that they seemed to partake of an aversion to pigs, that some of their laws for sexual purification resembled the Jews'. In this new asylum for Jews at Grand Island, Major Noah proposed to reunite the lost 10 tribes of the Indians with the Jews. Apparently, he had converted Red Jacket, the famous Indian chief, to this view. At any rate, Red Jacket was present at the exercises laying the cornerstone of the new settlement.

Preceding the exercises, a company of New York Militia marched through the village of Buffalo to lend martial dignity to the event.

The dedicatory service was held at St. Paul Church in Buffalo, as there were not sufficient boats for the crossing to Grand Island. Major Noah and the rector of the church were the only two speakers.

Alas, nothing was to come of Major Noah's grandiose and benevolent idea. The slab of stone for the dedication may still be seen at the Buffalo Historical Society. It is all that is left of this American Noah's Ark.

Noah, as has been indicated, was a versatile sort. He had something of a flair for playwriting. He wrote no great plays—he dashed them off lightly and apparently had no delusions about his being a great playwright, but his plays were well received by the public. He was, one might say, the original George M. Cohan. The patriotic motif was accented. One of his plays, She Would Be a Soldier, dealt with the War of 1812. Another of his plays, Marion or the Hero of Lake George, as its name indicates, deals with the locale of northern New York. It is interesting to note that recently when the bicentennial of George Washington was nationally observed, Columbia University, in marking this event, gave a production of Noah's Marion.

JEWISH PATRIOTISM

If Noah paid tribute to the patriotic sacrifices during the Revolutionary War, another family in up-State New York gave a splendid exemplification of patriotism in real life. This was the Hays family which was scattered in the up-State, with the seat of the family at New Rochelle.

The Hays family was of Dutch descent and emigrated from Holland in the early part of the eighteenth century. According to a family tradition, they came in their own ships together with that of their servants, cattle, implements of agriculture, arriving in New York in 1720. Many of them remained as farmers.

Benjamin Ettings Hays, who farmed at Bedford, was highly esteemed by his Christian neighbors, who spoke of him as "Uncle Ben, the best Christian in Westchester County." He was very philanthropic and donated the land for the first school in Pleasantville.

Jacob Hays, the eldest of the four brothers, lived in Rye, Westchester. His sons, Michael and David Hays, were farmers at Mt. Pleasant.

David Hays, Jr., served under George Washington in the French and Indian War and was present at Braddock's defeat.

The family of David Hays played a very dramatic role in the American Revolution. Westchester County, by reason both of its strategical importance and the large number of Tories scattered among its patriotic population, was the scene of almost constant warfare during the Revolution, regular and irregular.

David Hays was too old at the time of the Revolution to do much fighting himself but he helped with his cattle in provisioning the American Army, while his sons were members of Washington's fighting forces.

Once, while all the menfolks of the Hays establishment were absent with the patriot army, the Tories entered the Hays house, finding only Mrs. Hays and her daughters and a Negro servant in the house. The Tories suspected that members of the Hays family had driven the cattle to the American lines through the enemy lines and they sought to get the facts out of Mrs. Hays—about this and other American plans. Mrs. Hays was lying on her sick bed at the time with her infant child but she refused to play the traitor and the house was burned down. Mrs. Hays was conveyed by the faithful Negro servant to a shelter in the woods.

Mrs. Hays' brother, Reuben, a clerk in a bank, had joined the American Army immediately after the Battle of Lexington. He was taken prisoner by the British at Charlestown and when the British learned that the rebel was a Jew, they gave him for food only pork, which he refused to eat, subsisting, until exchanged, on such morsels of unforbidden food as he could obtain from his fellow prisoners. Weakened by confinement and privation, he died of consumption soon after his release.

Jacob Hays, born in Bedford, 1772, the eldest son of David, was later to achieve almost national renown, when he was appointed high constable of New York. He acquired world-wide fame as a detective. Old Hays was said to have been a terror to evildoers.

In the French and Indian War, Judah Hays played a conspicuous part. His 16-gun ship, *Duke of Cumberland*, saw service as a privateer during the French and Indian War.

In the War of 1812, Maj. Mordecai Myer achieved the reputation of a hero. He later served as mayor of Schenectady. He was an officer of the Thirtieth United States Infantry and was wounded at the battle of Chryslers Field. From 1831 to 1834, Myer was a member of the New York Assembly and from 1851 to 1854, he was mayor of Schenectady. He was very prominent in Masonic circles.

None has made early New York life so well known to posterity as Washington Irving. Most of us who have any knowledge of old Dutch days derive it from Irving's writings.

In that connection, there is a very interesting story about Irving and a character for which he was responsible, but which he did not create. That character was Rebecca Gratz, the daughter of a leading Jew of Philadelphia.

It was at Saratoga Springs that Washington Irving met Rebecca Gratz, who was to become, thanks to Irving, the "original" for the Rebecca of Scott's Ivanhoe.

The acquaintance between Irving and Rebecca Gratz stemmed from the fact that Rebecca Gratz was a very close friend of Matilda Hoffman, the one love of Washington Irving's life.

When the beautiful Matilda Hoffman died of consumption Washington Irving was heartbroken, as were indeed all those who had known the beautiful Matilda. A solace to all of them in this hour of trial was Matilda's friend, Rebecca. She proved a great comfort to Judge Hoffman, the father of Matilda and to Washington Irving.

Sometime after that Washington Irving went abroad and met Sir Walter Scott and told him about Miss Gratz. After Scott had finished Ivanhoe he wrote to Irving, asking if the picture he had drawn of Rebecca tallied with the original.

To enumerate the multitude of ways in which Jews have participated in the life of up-State New York would be an endless story. There is much that might be said in the field of commerce, of education, of philanthropy, of all fields.

In the city of Amsterdam, it was Julius Wasserman who developed that town as a center for the making of carpets. The philanthropies of Lucius N. Littauer, of Gloversville, are well known. Up-State New York has sent two Jews to Congress—Mr. Littauer and Meyer Jacobstein. To the supreme court, it has given Michael Hirsberg, of Newburgh; Irving Goldsmith, of Saratoga Springs; Simon Fleischman has been president of the City Council of Buffalo; Morris Block, mayor of Kingston; Myer Einstein, mayor of Dunkirk; Julius Frank, mayor of Ogdensburg; David Heller, mayor of Elmira; Eugene H. Lehman, mayor of Tarrytown; Julius M. Goldstein, mayor of Oneida.

Louis Marshall, for long one of the foremost constitutional lawyers of America, was a native of Syracuse and practiced law for many years in Syracuse before going to New York City. The law was his profession, but Marshall was a lover of forestry and did much for the conservation movement in America. It was fitting that the University of Syracuse should have given his name to their building devoted to forestry.

Charley Wilson of W. P. B.—True Giant of Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily News of June 6, written by Edwin A. Lahey, entitled "Charley Wilson of W. P. B.—True Giant of Production":

CHARLEY WILSON, OF W. P. B.—TRUE GIANT OF PRODUCTION

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

WASHINGTON, June 6.—Whatever a critical citizenry might say to the contrary, the war has brought to Washington a number of men who are giants in their own right, men big enough not to be embraced in Joseph Tumulty's observation that "Some men grow in Washington; others just swell."

Of the true giants on the scene today, Charles Edward Wilson is one of the least known, but not the least. Here are the statistics on him:

He's Executive Vice Chairman of the War Production Board; 56 years old; 6 feet 1 and 200 pounds; mild mannered and cordial, but one of the toughest men in Washington; he gets $8,000 a year; works from 9 till 7 in his modest office, and more at his hotel apartment; he has enacted a Horatio Alger story in his life—born on the West Side of New York of poor parents; went to work at 13 at $3 a week; studied in the New York night schools, stayed with the same company all his life, and became its $175,000-a-year president.

General Electric is his company. He had run its business up to $1,000,000,000 a year when he took a leave of absence 2 years ago to become one of the main cogs in Donald Nelson's organization. Charley Wilson felt with some pride that $1,000,000,000 a year was a pretty big business. Today he is running a $70,000,000,000-a-year business, superintending the manufacture of our war equipment.

STILL AN INDUSTRIALIST

Wilson has remained the industrialist during his stay in the Capital. Washington frequently has subtle effects on the business and professional men it draws into the war machine—they become touched with the virus of bureaucracy, the purr of international society, the lure of power, or the intrigue of politics, but the General Electric executive is today no more nor less than what President Roosevelt has called him, one of the ablest production executives in the country.

Not that Charley Wilson lives in an intellectual vacuum, a slave to the assembly line which is in his blood. He has very vigorous ideas of the kind of society we can make after the war is over. He becomes energetic when talking of the possibilities for post-war America. Last December he startled the members of the National Association of Manufacturers, whom he calls, "my own people," by telling them at their convention in New York that they had less to fear from left wing ideologies than from their own reactionary approach to the problems of a dynamic industrial society.

We asked him, when we visited Wilson in his simple office in the W. P. B., whether he still felt as strongly about the hard shell attitudes of his fellow industrialists as he appeared to feel that day in New York. He laughed, and opined that industry is "swinging in the right direction."

The right direction, for Wilson, is a spirit of cooperation, a recognition by all segments of society of a common stake in the future.

SCALE OF LIVING

"We are going to have to provide a scale of living that we're capable of," Wilson says, "and to do that men of good will in every phase of life, industry, labor, agriculture, government, have got to sit down wholeheartedly and work out the future.

"We are on the verge of great things, a better standard of living, and we won't get results by poking at one another. The areas of disagreement are not so wide as to be insoluble."

A framed cartoon on Wilson's office is the tipoff to the man's interest in post-war prob-

lems. The cartoon shows a man and wife at a dinner party, with the wife berating the husband as follows: "Really George, I've never been so humiliated. Everybody has a post-war plan but you."

General Electric has been Charley Wilson's whole life; hence it is reasonable to assume that his post-war thinking is tied up with the future of his corporation. There are reports in Washington even now that Wilson will soon surrender to an itch to return to General Electric.

His intimate personal plans are his own secret, however, and right now he is up to his neck in his Government job, wrangling and planning with the brass hats of the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission, reviewing and approving their production schedules, keeping the vast rivers of supplies moving into the factories of the nations, and the instruments of war moving from these factories to the fighting fronts all over the globe. His office day is a constant round of conferences and telephone conversations.

The present stage of war production is a challenge to the industrial genius of Wilson. The "all out" phase of production, in which factories produced all they could of everything, is past. Programs today are highly liquid, and must be kept closely attuned to changing military needs.

Wilson's organization has just been through a process of cutting and changing production schedules to keep the increasing need for landing barges and heavy military equipment balanced with the military requisitions for invasions.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say something which very much needs to be said to the membership of this House. Some of the Members seem to think that O. P. A. is like a man with his hand upon a faucet which he can turn on to make this or that price adjustment or rent adjustment, then turn off at will. They think we can give a little more profit to the textile mills, already making almost 900 percent more than they made before the war. They think petroleum prices can be advanced to swell the greatest profits ever earned by the oil industry. They have 100 other schemes for increasing the earnings of this or that industry or for lending aid and comfort to black-market operators—to raise prices the underground way by weakening enforcement. They know that all these proposals will increase the cost of living—each one a little; taken together a great deal. But they think then that the faucet can be turned off again and all will be forgiven and forgotten.

Instead of being like a man with his hand upon a faucet which he can turn on or off at will, O. P. A. is like the little Dutch boy with his finger in the hole in the dike. The danger is not from the trickle that will come through if the finger is removed. The danger is that the trickle will become a stream and the stream a flood inundating the land with inflationary prices and bringing human devastation in its wake.

In the last war we paid a sorry price for inflation. Fixed incomes shrank to 40 cents on the dollar. War costs were increased by 70 percent. And the collapse which followed inflation was tragic beyond belief. Business profits turned to losses. Business failures rose 40 percent above the pre-war period. Unemployment rose five and one-half million, and the pay of those who kept their jobs shrank 25 percent.

Farm prices fell from 35 to 80 percent and the income of farmers shrank from $1,360 a year to only $460. And in the next 5 years over 450,000 farmers lost their farms through mortgage foreclosures.

Those things happened last time. But the forces of inflation then were picayune compared with those now abroad in the land. The total cost of the last war—inflationary cost and all—would pay for only 4½ months of this war. The income of the Nation today is over three times what it was in the fourth year of the last war. Then, moreover, 75 percent of all goods produced stayed home for civilians to buy. This time only a little more than half of all goods produced stay home for civilian purchase. At the end of the last war money in circulation totaled only $5,900,000,000. Now it totals over $20,000,000,000.

Yet, due to O. P. A., the price line has been held for 12 consecutive months without gain against these tremendous inflationary pressures. Living costs are today right where they were in May, 1943.

I, for one, will not, after such outstanding success and in view of the power of inflationary pressures, vote to take any step that will turn the price line upward again. I am against any order to O. P. A. to remove its finger from the dike to let even a trickle through.

No one who wants to squeeze further the 20,000,000 people with fixed incomes will get my vote. No one who wants to add billions to the cost of this war, so as to place a needless burden upon future taxpayers, will get my vote. No one who wants to swell already swollen wartime profits of corporations, to upset the morale of the Nation and our fighting forces, will get my vote. No one who wants to force the workers of the Nation into strikes to keep up with a soaring living cost, and so hamper war production, will get my vote. No one who wants to let price and rents soar now, making a post-war collapse inevitable, will get my vote. No one who wants to hamper O. P. A. enforcement action so as to give aid and comfort to black-market operators will get my vote.

The American people are almost solidly united for price control; as the recent Gallup poll showed. And they are going to be a lot more important when the votes are counted next fall than the swarm of lobbyists who have been infesting the halls of Congress during recent weeks seeking added profits for industries already better off than they ever were before. If I do not miss my guess, any man and any party that votes against price control and for inflation, even for a trickle of inflation, is going to have some explaining to do to the people back home, whose happiness they put in jeopardy. The price line must hold right where it is now.

Veterans' Hospitals in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I introduced in the House two bills, H. R. 5021 and H. R. 5022 for the establishment of two veterans' hospitals in Alaska, one in south central Alaska and one in southeastern Alaska. Each bill authorizes an appropriation of $1,000,000.

The principle outlined in these bills is completely sound. Alaska veterans eligible for hospital treatment should be cared for in Alaska. The delay incident in travel and communication between Alaska and the States is so great as to deny prompt relief in many cases where it should be given to the sick or injured veterans. These bills were drafted in the office of Mr. W. M. Floyd, national commander of the Regular Veterans' Association. In support of the bills, Mr. Floyd has given me the following statement outlining the need for such legislation:

The Regular Veterans Association is asking that two Veterans' Administration hospitals be established in Alaska without delay. Since World War No. 1 over 9,000 veterans have settled in Alaska and since 1941, 756 have voluntarily enlisted and over 4,000 have been inducted. These thousands of Alaska veterans, many of whom will be maimed or diseased during this global war, will return to their native land, Alaska, following the peace, and many thousand more veterans will elect to make Alaska their home in the future. Some provision must be made to care for the hospitalization of these men who have so honorably served their country during the present war.

Let me call your attention to some facts pertaining to the difficulty of caring for a disabled Alaska veteran in a Veterans Hospital at the present time. It now takes well over 20 days for a disabled veteran in Alaska to be admitted to a hospital if he is lucky. It is necessary for the veteran to appear before a medical doctor in his town in Alaska. The doctor in turn will write to the Veterans Hospital in Seattle, Wash. In the meantime, the veteran waits until this mail has gone through by boat and has been considered by the Veterans' Administration doctor. The Veterans' Administration doctor after considering the application will then see if there is bed space in the Seattle hospital. If they have space, they will write to the doctor in the veteran's town and the letter will return to Alaska by boat. Then the veteran must wait for the boat to take him to the States in order to be admitted to the hospital. If he is still living by this time, it will have taken approximately 20 days to complete this red tape.

Already specialists of the United States Employment Service are recommending Alaska for discharged members of the armed forces

who have suffered from malaria and similar tropical diseases as the climate seems to be a cure for this type of disability.

We, of the Regular Veterans' Association, believe that men who have served in the armed forces should have the best of care after this war. It should not be necessary for our Alaska veterans to face all of the red tape now required for hospitalization, and neither the Veterans' Administration nor our Government should expect this. Some part of the funds recently appropriated by Congress to the Veterans' Administration should be made available for two hospitals in Alaska, one in the southeastern part of the Territory, which can be reached by boat in 2 days. Travel by boat is practically the only means of transportation which we have. The other hospital should be located in or around Seward, Alaska, which can be reached by boat in 3 days or by train in 18 hours.

By establishing these hospital facilities, the members of the armed forces will not be a burden on the small hospitals in Alaska which are few and far between. This matter is of the utmost importance to the welfare of the members of the armed forces who have served their country in its time of emergency and who have kept our enemies from invading the shores of both the United States and Canada.

I am a resident of Alaska and I know what I am talking about. Our organization has 1,995 members in Alaska. Many hundreds more belong to the Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion.

I know that following this war the residents of Alaska will welcome any and all members of the armed forces who select our Territory for their permanent home. All we ask is that you give us a square deal and let our veterans remain in Alaska for speedy treatment of their disabilities. We ask you to support this measure at once. These bills are H. R. 5021 and H. R. 5022.

G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, my pledge to G. I. Joe is: History shall not repeat itself.

I am fully cognizant of the failure of the Congress following World War No. 1 to enact the Woodrow Wilson League of Nations Peace Pact, and to enact legislation to protect the war veterans of that historic conflict. The isolationists behind closed doors in Washington failed to capitalize on legislation to honor at least in a small measure the human sacrifice made, and as a result the national expression "They died in vain" was born. Lest we forget, our heroes and starving veterans of World War No. 1—many of them carrying the wounds of Flanders Field, Chateau-Thierry, and Verdun—were run out of the National Capital at the point of bayonets and with tear gas when they came to fight for their rights—simple rights—to work and earn a livelihood in a democracy for which so many of their buddies paid the supreme sacrifice. With that record so clear in my mind, I pledged to my boys fighting everywhere, and to their parents, that history shall not repeat itself.

As one humble Member of the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth wartime Congresses, I am happy to lend my influence and cast my vote in favor of the conference report on the G. I. bill of rights, the provisions of which bill are now substantially the same as when it passed the Senate. It is the greatest and most liberal forward measure enacted for war veterans anywhere in the world.

The major concern and the principal thought in the minds of all our gallant fighting sons in the Air Corps, the Infantry, Navy, Marine Corps is, Will I get my job back? Will the country soon forget me and fail to get me employment? While looking for work, will my Government tide me over so that I will not be required to sell apples or seek relief?

What agency will answer my questions and help me? Can I continue my high-school and college education? Can I repurchase my garage business which I sacrificed to go to war? Can I borrow sufficient money to make home improvements? Can I borrow money to build a home?

I am happy to support the G. I. omnibus bill of rights that fully answers all these questions and protects you, G. I. Joe, completely. The bill, which will soon be signed by President Roosevelt, provides for complete Federal aid in the readjustment to civilian life of returning veterans of World War No. 2. The bill makes provision for expeditious completion of additional hospital facilities for war veterans. It provides for a director of servicemen's education and training under the direction of the Veterans' Administration. Those eligible for education and training shall be entitled to the full benefits of a college education. A veteran, while going to school, shall be entitled to $50 per month for subsistence if single, and $75 per month if married.

Further, the bill provides for definite processes of rehabilitation; we must guarantee to all our gallant soldiers that this Government will do everything possible to restore the sick and wounded to good health. There must be absolute assurance as guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration of a sound convalescent-treatment program.

Social adjustments bristle with difficulties. The handicapped will be trained for occupations so that they will be able to earn a decent livelihood to prevent any panhandling, peanut vending, or apple selling which became such familiar scenes following World War No. 1.

The G. I. bill of rights provides for guaranteed loans up to $2,000 and interest for the first year to be paid by the Veterans' Administration, in order to give the veteran a flying start.

The bill provides for an effective job-counseling and employment-placement service within the United States Employment Service for veterans.

A great feature of the bill which I urged and fought for in the House is the unemployment-compensation provision which allows each veteran $20 a week for each week of unemployment after discharge up to 52 weeks. It will give every veteran who is tired, hardened, and calloused after discharge a chance to get his bearings and recondition himself to civilian life.

These—employment, education, training, hospitalization, loans, job-counseling, unemployment insurance—are substantially the main provisions to reestablish our veterans when they return and provide a solid foundation that will go a long way toward the complete rehabilitation of G. I. Joe. This the Nation owes to him.

No amount of money could ever repay the great sacrifice made by the flower of American youth. We all remember—and will never forget—Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Corregidor, Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Anzio beachhead, D-day. Thousands of our gallant boys died so that we might live. Thus, it is clearly our responsibility to guarantee these returning servicemen the right to live, work, and worship as they believe, in a great country that has clearly proven in wartime that by working together we can outproduce the world. And certainly we have the facilities to continue such production to rehabilitate the world in time of peace.

We must not fail our servicemen. They have not failed us.

Many Millions Prefer Silver as Money Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Nevada State Journal, Reno, Nev., of June 8, 1944:

MANY MILLIONS PREFER SILVER AS MONEY BASE—STOCKS DEPLETED AS INDUSTRIAL USE EXPANDS

Figures released by the War Production Board show that domestic industrial consumption of silver in 1943 totaled 118,000,000 ounces. During the same period we imported only 63,000,000 ounces because that was all the silver offered us by foreign countries. Most of it came from South America, the Wallace Miner reports.

Because there is not enough foreign silver at the market price, industry is drawing heavily upon the silver stocks in the United States Treasury and the Treasury supply is being depleted faster than it can be built up. Mexican imports of silver declined from 108,000,000 ounces in 1942 to 45,000,000 ounces in 1943.

The United States controls the price of silver and the future of the metal rests with the United Nations, China, India, Mexico and many of the South American and European countries favor silver as their principal money metal and would no doubt welcome a gold and silver money standard.

In a recent meeting in Mexico City, the Mexican Bankers Association stated that it was the opinion that "silver is still the favored medium of exchange among nearly

half of the inhabitants of the globe and the devaluation of silver would bring about a tremendous upset among all these millions of people."

The association requests the American Treasury "not to alter the established price without having previously consulted the central banks of the other American countries."

The Mexican bankers base their valuation price at $35 for gold and $1.29 an ounce for silver.

Those countries which have had the experience of changing governments know the worthlessness of paper money not backed by gold or silver. Silver coins would always buy them bread under any circumstances when paper money would not.

The paper money now being printed and circulated by Germany and Japan will be worthless after they have lost the war, but the silver and gold coins the people have been able to hide from the invaders will buy bread.

The gold and silver standard is, of course, a man-made system for the control of money, but no better system has ever been devised for the purpose. The United Nations can make it a wonderfully popular and successful system.

Facing the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, very recently, through the facilities of the O. W. I., William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, was permitted to broadcast over the short-wave radio a message to the workers of Germany. I want to commend the O. W. I. for this particular effort because it is my profound conviction that a bond of understanding exists between the workers of all the nations of the world, which rises above diplomatic and political efforts toward international understanding.

It is also noteworthy that the real keynote and spirit are emphasized in the statement that "It has never been America's purpose to seek vengeance against Hitler's unwilling slaves, against the common people who were duped by him or forced to do his bidding at the point of the bayonet." This one statement most emphatically pronounces the feeling of understanding among the workingmen of the nations of the world and the spirit of justice upon which the permanent peace that we seek must be founded.

The article reads as follows:

FACING THE FACTS

(With Philip Pearl)

The soil of France again is being soaked with blood. Fate seems to have ordained it as the perennial battleground of freedom. Radiophotos of our dead lying on the beaches of Normandy and of enemy dead strewn along the highways to Cherbourg remind us of the terrible price which human beings have been forced to pay through the ages to be free and to stay free.

Not all the fighting is being done on the battlefields. Despatches from neutral countries report widespread strikes in France against the Nazi overlords and even armed uprisings in several industrial communities. Many of these workers will be slaughtered for their daring resistance against their oppressors.

This kind of fighting may seem futile and hopeless, but in the long run it probably will accomplish more toward the overthrow of Hitler's gang than air raids and frontal attacks by tanks, artillery, and infantry.

Collapse of Hitler's war machine behind the lines—in Germany as well as in France and other occupied countries—will end the war much sooner than an unaided military assault, even with superior forces. This was proved in the last World War, when Germany was forced to surrender because its people suddenly quit supporting the Kaiser's war effort.

GERMANS FED UP WITH HITLER

Our hopes for ending this war much sooner than expected rest upon the belief that the common people of Germany must by now be completely fed up with Hitler's lying promises, with his terroristic methods, and with the sufferings which he has brought upon them.

They must realize, as all the world does, that the cause of the Nazis is now hopeless and that further resistance against the United Nations will only multiply tenfold the torrent of death and destruction pouring down upon them relentlessly, day after day and night after night, from the skies.

Can any human beings endure indefinitely the modern holocaust of air bombings when they no longer can hope for or expect relief?

The workers of Germany, who were never sold on Hitler and have served as his unwilling slaves under threat of execution or imprisonment in concentration camps, must be near the breaking point.

For this reason, A. F. of L. President William Green addressed a message to them via the short-wave radio facilities of O. W. I. a few days after the successful invasion of France by the Allied armies of liberation. He advised the workers of Germany to stop working and stop producing for Hitler and to prepare themselves for the signal to rise up against him when such action can be taken with some assurance of success. That time may not be far off now, but an unplanned and premature uprising would be unfortunate. The signal must be given by General Eisenhower at the proper moment.

THE SWORD OF FEAR

The only hold Hitler still maintains over the workers of Germany is fear. He has made this sword of fear a double-edged weapon. They fear his vengeance and they fear our vengeance.

It is important, therefore, that we blast Hitler's propaganda regarding our motives and purposes with respect to the common people of Germany.

All Americans are in agreement that those responsible for the Nazi atrocities must be punished with utmost severity. Unquestionably, a large proportion of German workers join with us in the hope that this punishment can be meted out at an early date.

But it never has been America's purpose to seek vengeance against Hitler's unwilling slaves, against the common people who were duped by him or forced to do his bidding at the point of the bayonet.

Hitler is trying to make his people believe that the Allied troops intend to put every German to death. Those Americans who prate about a hard peace and who profess to regard every German as a murderer are, therefore, playing right into Hitler's hands.

If we hope to shorten the war by inducing the German people to turn against Hitler, we must make clear to the German people that such efforts on their part will earn mercy and consideration at our hands.

Right now, those inside Germany who know the facts—and the number is growing daily—realize their only hope of survival and salvation lies in a quick victory for the United Nations. If we slam that door in their faces, they can only go on fighting and resisting with a hopeless desperation which will not change the outcome of the war, but will delay it and cost many thousands of lives.

James A. Farley's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Batavia Times, Batavia, N. Y., Thursday, June 1, 1944:

JAMES A. FARLEY'S VISIT

One of the pleasant and profitable gains of the summer are the acquaintances we make. Folks are friendly, more friendly after passing through another winter. Such was the case last Saturday when this outstanding gentleman of national prominence paid a visit to Batavia to honor the editor of this paper on his fiftieth anniversary in connection with the printing industry. The event took place at the Stafford Country Club, which was a beautiful setting for such a party.

Much color was lent to it through the appearance of Mr. Farley, a close friend of long standing of the editor of this paper. All those present knew what a busy man Mr. Farley is, and when he left Batavia, it was his sixth straight night on a Pullman and for him taking the time out to come to this event, was another thing that not alone pleased ourselves but the many people who attended the event. There were many prominent Republicans present and even the Republicans were very democratic and came out to greet us.

Appearances fool you. A fellow like Jim Farley comes along in an informal dress like the rest of the folks and to your surprise, he really is somebody. Often the loudest are the least and the homeliest are the highest. Nature calls for naturalness and the most important are usually the last in posing. That, perhaps, was the opinion of many, but we know that always they have had a real admiration for Jim Farley's name.

One who does the work and shares few honors when the job is done, a plugger, he, and a plodder and a patient performer, so we say that many learned the great admiration for Jim Farley because he is one of those who has always carried the load and brought his party into pleasant places. Faithful is his name and loyal is his nature. It was really typical and pretty to see the friends that Jim Farley made. Perhaps that is his great gift, because all who met him at the Batavia Club prior to this event showed him much respect.

It has been said of Mr. Farley that he never forgets a friend, which was proven on this occasion to come this distance to pay his respects to the editor of the Times. As far as we are personally concerned, we thank him for his presence and we would like to tell our friends that he has an amazing memory—so much sagacity he shows which is almost more than human and we know, to our many friends who had not meet him, it was a pleasure and that he left an im-

pression of a very interesting, natural man—rightly named.

He is admired by all for his uprightness and his honesty. The words of truth he speaks, the fair way he has always dealt with the public in his high political activities, and his honesty of purpose. Few men like him are living today, so that is him, Jim Farley, the man.

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is Flag Day, a day set apart to commemorate the adoption of our National Banner and celebrate its glory and inspiration.

The Stars and Stripes, whose silken folds salute the American skies from a hundred thousand staffs today, is the symbol of the Nation, the insignia of its power and authority, the emblem that brings to our minds a vision of the Republic's greatness and to our hearts a new dedication to its service. At home or abroad the sight of that flag of beauty with its significant stars and stripes is to every American an assurance of peace and protection, of freedom and faith, of safety and security, and as it waves in the free air of heaven it wakes in the breast the loyalty of the citizen and the pride in our country and its glorious mission on earth, and its bravery and beauty are a call to patriotic duty and devotion.

Nevertheless with all its appeal, with all its associations, with all the heroic deeds it recalls and the historic memories it revives, we must not forget that the flag of our country, the Stars and Stripes, is after all only a sign, a symbol, an emblem of something greater, higher, nobler—the United States of America, the greatest Republic on earth, the fairest effort made by men to bring justice, humanity, equality, and freedom to the race, and frame it in a scheme of human government. In honoring the flag, in our insistence that it shall be treated with respect by all our citizens on all occasions because of its symbolism and significance, in demanding that it be treated with a usage commensurate with the pride and power, the dignity and decorum it represents, we must remember that back of the flag is the fatherland, the Nation.

The Stars and Stripes is a symbol of our country and not a synonym for it. The flag and the fatherland march down the years together; and while we honor the flag and hail it with patriotic emotion, our duty and devotion, our sacrifice and service, must be given to the Republic, to the land that has given to the world government of the people, by the people, for the people. This is an age of unrest, an age marked by much shallowness and superficiality; of much talking and little thinking; and here in this magnificent country of ours there is too easy an acceptance of the shadow for the substance, of the promise for the performance and a growing habit of evading the realities and responsibilities of our citizenship and the obligations we owe to good government. It is not sufficient answer to the call to public duty, to the need of maintaining good government, and the correction of the evils that creep into public administration, to hail it and cheer it, and to shelter ourselves in its folds, while evils afflict the government it is the emblem of. Patriotism is a work of conscience and conduct that calls for service and sacrifice that will keep our country free from peril and disaster in peace and war. Flag-flapping, shouting, cheers and unthinking emotions do not constitute patriotism. No land was ever saved by the lungs and tongues of its people; and when people convince themselves that shouting is the whole duty of American citizens the flag ceases to be an emblem of honor, and the country is in danger.

Every rightly constituted American loves and honors the flag of his country; it has been in the forefront of all his country's triumphs; it has emerged from disaster and defeat when they have come, without stain or dishonor; and the suffering and sacrifice of the long years of the Nation's life have endeared it to the American heart. To love and honor the flag is a passion of every American worth his salt; and because of this consuming passion he is open to the arts and crafts of the traitors and rascals in the American community, who degrade and dishonor our beautiful symbol of Americanism by flouting the American flag, behind whose ambush they plot the destruction of American liberty, the perversion of American principle, the nullification of the American Constitution and the end of that peace, justice, and equality that have made our country what it is. This is one of the great evils that grows out of the conduct that makes the worship of the flag the supreme duty of an American, instead of making the respect and honor we give the Stars and Stripes subordinate to the preservation of our Government and its principles, which is the first duty of the real patriot.

War, as a rule, comes unexpectedly, like a flash of lightning from the skies; and while untoward events have led up to war, the declaration itself has come suddenly and has usually found us unprepared; and that false economy which puts off the day of preparation and that delusive folly that seeks to convince us that war will never come again have combined in all our history to increase the horrors of war and multiply the waste of human life and treasure when the battle is on.

War is the horror of national life, peace is the normal condition of the country's days, and because we have found no way yet to avoid war, the common sense of America demands that we put the sentimentalism and theory of visionaries and dreamers behind us and by serious and practical measures prepare ourselves for the inevitable. America loves peace—conscious of its strength, power, and resources of men and money, it seeks quarrel with no nation—and for the honor of the land and flag it meets the weak with justice and consideration and the powerful with confidence and dignity; but it has learned that the country that is rich and peaceful and unprepared is never safe from the encroachments of the powers that are predatory and prepared and seeking imperial domination.

Brief as the years of war have been in the life of the Nation they have placed a heavy burden on the years of peace. The waste of war has arrested the onward march of the Nation, it has crippled industry, handicapped commerce, multiplied misery, and made life harder for every man and woman in the Republic, and the practical and sensible thing to do is to so prepare ourselves in peace that the powers that prey will hesitate long before they strike.

Flag waving is folly when it becomes a substitute for practical patriotism, it is treason when it is made an excuse to cover up weakness and unpreparedness.

We must never permit the flag of our country to be made the rallying place of sham patriotism or the emblem of treason and betrayal. Under that beautiful flag the brave and true have served and sacrificed, fought and died; it has ever been as a pillar of smoke by day and of flame by night to the armies of freedom. It was consecrated by the labor and wisdom of Washington and his heroic soldiers; it was held aloft by Lincoln and the armies of liberation in the battles that freed the slave and preserved the Union; it fluttered in the flame and smoke of the titanic First World War and was borne in triumph from Chateau Thierry to the Argonne; and it has become to all the world and its people, par excellence, the symbol of free government and free people.

Honor and salute the flag of America; keep it sweet and clean from the soil and stain of the secret plotter, the slinking conspirator, and the nocturnal traitor. Hold it aloft in the light of the sun and proclaim it the oriflamme of liberty, equality, and good government; and add to its honor and acclaim by adding to the honor, greatness, and fame of the Republic whose emblem it is.

Honor the American flag and bring it the unbought honor of the world by making the honor of the American Republic secure and stainless by our service and devotion. As long as that splendid flag waves over a country conceived in liberty and dedicated to government of the people, for the people, by the people, administered in the spirit of the fathers and sustained in the loyalty and honor of its citizens, the Stars and Stripes will salute the heavens in honor, secure in the faith of its people.

The American flag is one to follow, to fight for, to fall for, if need be, for it symbolizes in its folds and its history a record of work well done for the liberation of a world from age-old wrong, the rescue of a race from the oppressions of kings and conquerors, the severing of a people from the corrosions of feudal systems and the degradation of hereditary rule. With its unfolding to the free skies of America that glorious flag told to the earth that a

new dispensation had come to men, which was the flower and fruit of the seed sowed on the Mount of Calvary, when He died who came to liberate the souls of men.

Salute the flag of America, the symbol of liberty. Hail it and honor it, and so live in loyalty and serve in allegiance that none can stain or dishonor it.

Hog Price Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

PRICE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NORTHEASTERN INDIANA HOGS

Whereas W. F. A. hog price ceilings for the northeastern Indiana area are 10 cents per hundredweight lower than are the ceilings for the central Indiana area; and

Whereas the hogs from the two areas are consigned largely to the same eastern packers; and

Whereas the hogs from the two areas are believed to be of the same grade and quality; and

Whereas the freight rates from the two areas to slaughterers are practically identical; and

Whereas W. F. A. ceilings are said to have been determined on the market histories of the respective areas, indicating a long-time discrimination against the northeastern Indiana area: Be it hereby

Resolved, That we, the undersigned members of the United States Department of Agriculture War Board, for Allen County, Ind., petition the Federal Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, and the Director of the Purdue University Agricultural Experiment Station to (1) establish the cause or causes for discrimination in price against hogs marketed from the northeastern Indiana area, and (2) that State and Federal agencies with authority take the necessary action to correct and eliminate said discrimination in price ceilings and market practices; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be submitted to all Federal and State agencies concerned, to other county U. S. D. A. war boards of the area and to the press.

HENRY J. KOLMERTEN,
Chairman, County Agricultural Adjustment Association.
A. LEIGH BOWEN,
Field Supervisor, Farm Security Administration.
ROY W. LINT,
Field Agent, Albion Production Credit Association.
C. V. KIMMELL,
County Agent, Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service.

Unanimously adopted, June 5, 1944, Fort Wayne, Ind.

EVASION OF HOG MARKETING REGULATIONS

Whereas we, the undersigned, local representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture and others, acting under instructions from our superior officers, in 1943 urged farmers to maintain a high rate of pork production as a patriotic duty, assured that they would at least receive the Federal W. F. A. floor price for their hogs; and

Whereas farmers did respond by producing for the 1943–44 market one of the county's largest hog crops; and

Whereas farmers in marketing their crop have been forced to accept prices much below the floor price established for the area and promised them by the Government; and

Whereas farmers have been obliged to submit to unusual, unorthodox and unethical practices on the part of buyers in their (buyers) effort to bypass the intent of the floor regulations; and

Whereas pork products are retailed to consumers on the basis of O. P. A. ceiling prices independent of prices paid to the farmer; and

Whereas packers are subsidized $1.30 per cwt. on all pork products slaughtered (regardless of weights) to enable them to pay floor prices or better for live hogs; be it hereby

Resolved, That we, the undersigned members of the United States Department of Agriculture War Bonds for Allen County, Ind., petition the respective Federal authorities in charge—

1. To keep faith with hog producers by making the support prices apply to all weights of hogs, thereby eliminating "floor dodging."

2. To provide that packers who resort to unusual practices not common prior to floor regulations, thereby securing unusual shrink in weight or otherwise evading the intent of the floor's objective, be made to disqualify themselves for subsidy payments in so doing.

3. To investigate the hog marketing system in this area; to withhold subsidies past due from all packers who have in any way evaded, or colluded with others to evade the intent and purpose of the floor; and to make the withholding retroactive on all such evasion purchases; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the War Food Administration, the Office of Price Administration, the United States Senator and Representative in Congress for this county, the National and State U. S. D. A. War Boards, the U. S. D. A. War Boards of other counties in this marketing area and to the press.

HENRY J. KOLMERTEN,
Chairman, County Agricultural Adjustment Association.
A. LEIGH BOWEN,
Field Supervisor, Farm Security Administration.
ROY W. LINT,
Field Agent, Albion Production Credit Association.
C. V. KIMMELL,
County Agent, Cooperative Agriculture Extension Service.

Unanimously adopted, June 5, 1944, Fort Wayne, Ind.

H. R. 4883

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at the thirty-ninth annual conference of the Municipal Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada held recently at Cleveland, Ohio. I am inserting this in the RECORD since the subject matter of the resolution is included in the bill (H. R. 4883) which I introduced on May 25, 1944, and which has for its purpose extending retirement pension and annuity payments up to $1,440 a year:

Whereas there are in operation in the United States many State and municipal retirement and benefit systems for public employees maintained in whole or in part by taxes levied against local taxpayers; and

Whereas the Federal income tax now cuts deeply into the income which these beneficiaries receive, which, in most cases, is their sole and only means of support, and which income they cannot generally supplement to offset the rising cost of living because of their advanced age or disablement; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has deemed it wise and just to exempt from taxation the pensions received under the Social Security Act, Railroad Retirement Act, World War Veterans' Act, and similar benevolent legislation, and many States have exempted allowances or pensions paid by the United States from the application of their State income-tax laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the committee on public employee retirement administration of the Municipal Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada, in regular meeting assembled at its annual conference now being held in Cleveland, Ohio, this 8th day of June 1944, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal income-tax law so that it will provide that there shall be excluded from gross income, for the purpose of income-tax computation, all annuity, pension, or retirement income up to $1,440 in any year which any participant or his beneficiary shall receive through a legally created and established retirement, pension, or annuity system, or by any combination thereof, by reason of service rendered to any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive director of this association be, and he is hereby directed, to forward a copy of this resolution to the chairman and each member of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, and to the chairman and each member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the end that they may initiate or support proper legislation to carry into effect the purposes and intent of this resolution.

Baer Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, when I was recently privileged to make a visit to Baer Field, the air base in Fort Wayne, Ind., I was guided over ground that had been familiar to me for many years. During the period of my early familiarity with the area, however, it had presented quite a different picture. There today an air base is humming with activity where before—not many years ago—were farms and fields. There today are smooth, paved runways over

which mighty planes skim speedily along where before were lanes and paths which knew only the trot of horses' hooves and the trundle of wagon wheels. There today are huge hangars and busy administration buildings where once were friendly houses and big red barns. The passage of time and our amazing scientific achievements have wrought a tremendous transformation on this land I knew so well, and as I was introduced to the efficient and varied activities now carried on at this vitally important base, I found it hard to believe that not so long ago I had driven in horse and buggy over this ground on many occasions to make professional calls on the farms that once flourished on these acres. And not so long ago I had played and hunted through the woods where now are busy offices and barracks. Little did I then dream that in a few short years mighty birds of war would be thundering over this once quiet, rustic ground.

It was in August 1940, that citizens of Fort Wayne began working on a project to bring an air base to the city. In November 1940, Mayor Harry W. Baals was notified by Army Air Corps, Washington, that construction would begin in the spring of 1941. A site southwest of Fort Wayne was purchased by the city, and Baer Field came into being.

Named for a World War No. 1 hero, Baer Field has from its inception played a most important role in World War No. 2. Originally designed as a pursuitship base, the field was assigned to the First Air Forces in March 1941. The first plane landed at the field in August 1941—by accident. A member of the Thirty-first Pursuit Group on a cross-country flight got lost and landed on the field while it was still under construction.

The field's first commanding officer was Col. E. A. Lohman. Selfridge Field, Mich., Langley Field, Va., and Camp Lee, Va., supplied the original complement of men stationed at the base. In September 1941, Colonel Lohman was assigned to Langley Field, Va., as commanding officer. He was followed as base commander by Maj. James Ferry and Lt. Col. Peter B. Skanse.

The first group of pursuit ships, P–39's, arrived at Baer Field a few days before Pearl Harbor and left a few days after December 7 to make an outstanding name for themselves both in the Mediterranean and South Pacific areas. Base commanding officer at this time was Lt. Col. Ulysses G. Jones.

After the departure of the Thirty-first Pursuit Group, two more pursuit groups were based at the field. On January 1, 1942, Col. Douglas B. Netherwood was named commanding officer.

In September 1942, Baer Field became part of the Third Air Force as a base for the famed B–26 bombers. During this period the mission of the base was an extremely important one, since it was at this field that the final processing of the bombers for overseas duty took place. The field was only a few hours from the actual front in terms of air travel as the ships made only one stop from the field before they were actually involved in combat. An incredible record of action against the enemy was marked up by the planes which left the field, among which were such famous ships as the *Coughin' Coffin*.

The field remained a B–26 base until March 1943, when the I Troop Carrier Command took over the post, although B–26's were processed until April 1943, when the first C–47's arrived.

Organized in less than 2 years to transport parachute, glider, and other air-landing troops as well as equipment, and to evacuate the wounded, planes and pilots of the T. C. C. have participated in combat operations in every major war theater.

From the inception of the I Troop Carrier Command, Baer Field has played an extremely significant role in the processing, equipping, and maintaining of T. C. C. ships.

The present base commander, Col. Robert L. Copsey, came to the field in October 1942, from the Springfield depot, Springfield, Ill. Colonel Copsey's background in aviation goes back to 1917, when he became a flying officer at Kelly Field, Tex. He is a native of Wyoming, and his Army career includes 11 years in the National Guard. Associated with aviation since 1917, he is a member of two noted flying clubs, the Master Pilots and the Early Birds, which is a group of aviators who flew before the entry of the United States into World War No. 1.

The base organization under Colonel Copsey performed its all-important role of maintaining the base and its services and equipment with a high degree of success. As the coordinating agency between the Troop Carrier Command and the Air Service Command, the unit performed a most important mission in the carrying out of the work performed by the subdepot for the T. C. C.

The first reception and final phase unit was set up as a separate unit at Baer Field in April 1943 under Maj. Richard E. Pfennig, acting commanding officer. The original purposes of the reception center were the reception and classification of all personnel initially assigned to the T. C. C.; inspection and completion of all personnel records; basic training and reassignment of personnel to other T. C. C. bases and units. The final phase unit had the mission of fully equipping tactical units, combat crews, and planes; the inspection of combat crew members for proficiency; inspection and completion of personnel records; inspection of planes for modification for designated theaters; first and second echelon of maintenance; and familiarization of combat crew members with overseas flight routes and communication procedures.

In October 1943 the reception center was closed, and Col. Samuel J. Davis became commanding officer of the Final Phase Unit. The end of March 1944 saw the Final Phase Unit merged with the base organization under Colonel Copsey to become what is now the Eight Hundred and Sixth Army Air Forces Unit.

The fifth subdepot, which had been under the Air Service Command until January 1, 1944, when it became part of the Troop Carrier Command, has played a major role in the sending out of the planes and equipment playing a vital role in the present-day conduct of the war. The depot, composed in the main of civilian employees, processed and equipped through its engineering, supply, and signal sections planes which have gone to all parts of the globe to perform their missions.

Today, after almost a year of service to the Troop Carrier Command the Eight Hundred and Sixth Army Air Force Unit of Baer Field represents a highly efficient, closely coordinated working organization. Combining all the work formerly performed by the subdepot, the final phase unit, and the base organization, it represents in terms of the functions performed an all-important part of the Troop Carrier Command. Recently commended by Brig. Gen. Frederick W. Evans, commanding general of the First Troop Carrier Command, for its splendid accomplishment in meeting a processing directive, the personnel of Baer Field is today ready to carry out its future tasks, confident that these tasks will be performed with the same high degree of success that has marked its work in the past.

The original land area of the base was 741.95 acres and has been increased 284.39 acres to make a total of 1,026.34 acres. The total construction cost to date is approximately $10,000,000.

There are six hangars at the field, one 150 by 400 feet, three 120 by 75 feet, and two 130 by 320 feet. Since the original design of the field was for a fighter plane base, it became necessary to increase the thickness of the runways when the bombers and C–47's arrived. At present the runways are heavy enough to hold every type of aircraft in existence.

The entire area now occupied by barracks, offices, and so forth, was originally completely wooded and had to be cleared before construction could be started. At the present time there are 255 buildings on the post although the post has never been completed and construction still continues.

The field is like a small city. It maintains its own water plant, which is fully automatic and produces 100 gallons per capita per day and can accommodate 10,000 persons. It has its own fire department, which has grown from one truck to a size comparable to that of a city with 10,000 population and includes a crash truck on duty 24 hours a day. The field has its own theaters, stores, heating facilities, police department, and so forth. The only facilities derived from Fort Wayne are electrical, telephone, and laundry facilities.

Baer Feld is a typical example of an Army air base. Its men come from all over the United States and represent every type of military skill and occupation necessary to the maintenance of such a base. In May 1943 the first contingent of WAC's arrived, and today are represented in almost every section of the field. They work side by side with men in communications, driving, hospital work, and as office and administrative technicians, supply workers, entertainment directors, mechanics, radio operators, and so forth.

The Five Hundred and Seventy-first Army Air Force Band at Baer Field is one of the best-known military organizations of its kind in the entire Midwest area. Its weekly dance orchestra broadcast "Baer Field calling," as well as its military band broadcasts, are heard by thousands from one of Indiana's largest radio stations. The military band plays for all reviews, formal retreats, and other military occasions. The dance orchestra plays for numerous occasions, including a weekly dance at the Fort Wayne Servicemen's Club.

The civilian personnel of Baer Field has from the opening of the field played a major role in the success of the carrying out of the mission of the post. Working in skilled technical capacities in the subdepot organization, as well as in many and varied administrative capacities, the civilian population of the field has contributed much to the field. Not the least of its jobs is the maintaining of the upkeep and facilities of the field under the direction of the post engineers.

The military personnel at Baer Field have expressed themselves as being extremely fortunate in receiving the finest type of hospitality from the citizens of Fort Wayne. At the Service Men's Center, 600,000 soldiers have found a home away from home. The Service Men's Center sponsors all types of entertainment, including 2 weekly radio shows—the Farnsworth Firing Line broadcast and the Baer Field dance orchestra. These are open at all times to the men and women of the field. The U. S. O. maintains a center in downtown Fort Wayne as well as a lounge in the Pennsylvania railroad station. Free movie tickets are available to military personnel, and the entire city has joined in offering hospitable entertainment to Baer Field.

The record established by Baer Field since its opening is an imposing one. Approximately 300 B–26 bombers were processed at the field and left there to deal death and destruction upon the Axis. Approximately 2,500 cargo-type planes have left the field since the Troop Carrier Command took over the post. Countless thousands of parts have been manufactured and repaired at the field since its establishment.

The Fourth Congressional District of Indiana can indeed be proud of the part played by Baer Field in today's conflict. Its contribution is immeasurable.

I Am Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of one of the elderly citizens of Los Angeles, I wish to insert in the RECORD a poem which he has written entitled:

I AM OLD GLORY

(By Frank B. Hewitt, 72 years of age)

For more than eight score years, I have been
the banner of hope and freedom for
generation after generation of America.
I represent the ideals, aspirations, and history of our people,
I engender a feeling of patriotism and respect.
I was born amid the first flames of America's fight for freedom
I am the symbol of a country that has grown from a little nation of a group of 13 colonies to a united nation of 48 sovereign States.
I am the symbol of every right enjoyed by the American people; having been planted firmly on the high pinnacle of American faith, my gently fluttering folds have proved an inspiration to untold millions.
My beauty of truth flies over the capitols of all our States—over our county courthouses and our public schools signifying education and the administration of justice.
I fly perpetually over our National Capitol as a sign of national perpetuity.
Men have led me into battles with unwavering courage, peoples have looked up to me as a symbol of national unity, in this citizens might continue to enjoy the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, which have been granted to every American as the heritage of free men.
I represent the law of the land. I reflect the wealth and grandeur and patriotism of this great land of opportunity.
I believe in tolerance. I stand out as a badge of the Nation's greatness and the emblem of destiny.
At a time like this when European monarchies, kingdoms, and republics are in constant change and crumbling, I as your great flag—the American Flag—have a greater dignity, a greater significance, a greater purpose than ever before.
So long as men love liberty more than life itself, so long as they treasure the priceless privileges brought about by the sacrifice of human blood of our forefathers, so long as the principles of truth, justice, and charity for all remain deeply rooted in human hearts, I shall continue to be the enduring banner of the United States of America.

Freedom's Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Postmasters Gazette, Mount Morris, Ill., of June 1944:

FREEDOM'S FLAG

I am the American flag. For more than a century and a half I have been the light of the world, the hope of every man and woman who loathes tyranny and loves liberty, who has a horror of slavery and to whom freedom is dearer than life itself. Born in the flames of the American Revolution when the brave men and noble women of the Thirteen straggling Colonies, on the Atlantic seaboard wrested democracy from the mailed fist of oppression, I have been the hope of the world and the symbol of the American Republic.

Planted firmly on the mountaintops of the immortal faith that all men are created equal with the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, I float o'er land and sea, the emblem of the American Republic, in defiance to oppression and the guarantee to the nations that created me that liberty shall not perish from the earth, and that as long as the sons and daughters of the Republic treasure the priceless heritage purchased by the blood, agony, and tears of the people seeking liberty, I remain the standard of truth, charity, and justice of the mightiest Nation on which the sun has ever shone.

I am not a painted rag, I am America and all that America means. In my silken folds and stripes of white and red runs the blood of brave men living and dead. My stars shine brighter than the morning stars of high heaven, before they start to dim in the rising sun. First fashioned in the dark days of the American Revolution by the skillful hands of Betsy Ross and officially recognized by the resolution of the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777, my natal day has been celebrated each succeeding 14th of June.

Woe to the man or men, nation or group of nations, that seek to tear one thread from my stripes or dim one star in my field. I have been unfurled to the breeze of the war score of times and never furled in defeat and please God never shall be. Wherever I go, the knees of tyranny shall quake, the thrones of the oppressor shall crumble. I am the insignia of the last best hope of the earth. I am the Star Spangled Banner, Old Glory.

Letter From Secretary Hull to Speaker Rayburn Relative to Congressmen Jarman and Chiperfield's Mission to South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD a letter from Secretary of State Hull to your distinguished self which is complimentary of my friends, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD], two of my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 16, 1944.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am certain that you and your colleagues in the House of Representatives will be interested in knowing of the reports which I have received from our Embassies in certain of the other American Republics concerning the excellent impression which Congressmen PETE JARMAN and ROBERT BRUCE CHIPERFIELD made in Chile and en route there as the official representatives of the House of Representatives of the United States of America at the ceremonies arranged by the Chilean Chamber of Deputies for the celebration of the "Day of the Americas" on April 14.

Ambassador Bowers in Chile reports that Congressmen JARMAN and CHIPERFIELD made a very favorable impression at Santiago by their cordiality and their natural liking for people. He says that they were overwhelmed with invitations and that their visit did a great deal of good. The Ambassador feels that Messrs. JARMAN and CHIPERFIELD rendered a real service to their country, and that it was most advantageous to the United States to be so well represented at the celebrations.

Ambassador White in Lima reports that the two Congressmen, who stopped in that capital on April 12 on their way to Chile, made an excellent impression upon the Peruvians.

Chargé d'Affaires Muccio at Panama was equally enthusiastic in regard to the two visitors.

The above remarks indicate only too clearly how successfully Messrs. JARMAN and CHIPERFIELD have carried out their mission and leave little for me to add except an expression of my own appreciation, not only for the real contribution they have made toward improving our relations with the other American Republics but also my gratitude for the very cooperative and understanding assistance which you, Mr. Speaker, have rendered in selecting two Members of the House so well qualified to represent you at this inter-American celebration.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Legislation by Decree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial appearing in the May 19 issue of the London News Chronicle. This editorial, Legislation by Decree, was sent to me by Capt. William McCulloch, former Speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives, now a member of the armed forces. Mr. Speaker, you will note this editorial deals with a subject, Legislation by Decree, that we in the United States are familiar with, and I am sure will prove interesting:

LEGISLATION BY DECREE

The House of Commons has this week been considering one of the most difficult of the many problems which the circumstances of the war have thrown into relief.

This is the problem of delegated legislation. The war has made necessary an enormous increase in the degree of interference which the Government exercises over people's lives. There is hardly any type of organized activity which is not now subject to control. Hence, to enable the executive to function, ministers have taken power, on an unprecedented scale, to promulgate what are in effect new laws in the form of statutory rules and orders.

This development—which is only novel in that its scale has been intensified—has confronted Parliament with a very awkward dilemma. The House of Commons already has the power to criticize, and even to annul, regulations to which strong exception is taken.

But that device is a clumsy one. Administrative decrees, far-reaching in their scope, may be overlooked altogether. Thus Parliament must either accept the fact that a good deal of legislation is carried through by ministers on their own responsibility, or must risk impeding the Government by continual interference.

This problem will continue after the war. It is hard to imagine any plan of social reconstruction being carried through expeditiously which does not involve the delegation to ministers of very considerable powers.

It is all to the good that this vexed question has now been tackled by the House itself. As a result of this week's debate, the Government is to move the setting up of a permanent committee of the House which will review proposed administrative decrees and will recommend their amendment should they be vague, ill-defined, or unnecessarily comprehensive.

This committee will not, of course, be concerned with the principles underlying the proposed regulations. That is a matter for Parliament itself. The committee's job will be to see that the regulations conform to the powers granted by Parliament.

If this device works well—and there is no reason why it should not—it will be a constitutional development of some importance.

Let's Keep the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about "weakening" amendments and "inflationary" amendments to the Emergency Price Control Act.

Some have gone so far as to say that if Congress insists on "emasculating" O. P. A. the Chief Executive will find it necessary not only to veto the amended act but to appeal to the public in an effort to obtain public support of his veto.

It is high time that the American public were given the facts.

Congress wants prices controlled and will insist upon an administration of price control that will insure the American consumer the lowest possible prices.

The so-called Hartley amendment prohibiting O. P. A. from use of the highest price line limitation provision is not inflationary in any sense of the word.

It will not weaken price control. Rather, it will permit the consumer to buy at lower prices.

This amendment leaves O. P. A. completely free to establish ceiling prices in any manner they desire. They may continue to use the present formula for establishing selling prices. Or, if they desire, they may establish dollars-and-cents ceilings or frozen mark-up percentages.

This amendment does not in any way restrict O. P. A. in establishing ceiling prices. They may use any formula they desire, so long as it is generally fair and equitable.

The highest price line limitation does not now and never did have any bearing on the establishment of selling prices for women's and children's outerwear. All these goods have been priced by use of a pricing chart which is prepared by each retailer in accordance with O. P. A. pricing instructions. O. P. A. is free to require that each merchant continue to use such a chart. Price control is not interfered with in the slightest degree.

The amendment does, however, require that the O. P. A. permit free competition at or below the ceiling price they have established.

It permits the small stores and the low-priced stores to compete on all goods that are currently available and because such stores customarily operate on low margins, the American housewife will soon again find them able to supply her needs at lower prices than she is now forced to pay speculators, profiteers, or high-priced stores for identical goods.

Congress never intended that O. P. A. have the right to eliminate competition or to tell legitimate businessmen what they could or could not sell. Is it not ridiculous for O. P. A. to stop a dress store from selling dresses and permit a men's shop to sell the identical dress at higher prices—or a furniture store, or a garage?

Is this price control?

This amendment will give the small stores and the low-prices stores the right to sell women's and children's outerwear—dresses, coats, suits, skirts, jackets, slacks, and coveralls at prices lower than O. P. A. now permits the identical garments to be sold for by high-priced establishments and profiteers.

The amendment will bring prices down and lower the cost of living by permitting the low-priced stores to sell for less.

By eliminating or restricting the small stores and the low-priced stores, O. P. A.'s regulations have forced women's and children's wear prices to advance four times as fast as other goods. They have forced quality to deteriorate to a point that it is considered a national scandal. They have forced low-priced merchandise off the market.

The consumer has been forced to patronize high-priced establishments, pay through the nose, or do without.

Again the amendment does not interfere in the slightest degree with O. P. A.'s complete authority to fix and regulate prices.

The inexpensive small stores, and the low-priced larger stores, can make a sizeable contribution toward lowering the cost of living, and this amendment will afford them an opportunity to do so.

It will not permit any merchant to increase the selling price of any article.

It will give the consumer the opportunity to buy for less.

With Victory There Will Be Freedom for Everyone and Glory Enough for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the address which I delivered at the national memorial services of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States in the magnificent Temple Emanu-El in New York on Sunday afternoon, May 21, 1944.

Following a beautiful and colorful parade down Fifth Avenue, 7,500 persons assembled in the temple for the purpose of honoring the memory of those of Jewish faith who have made their contributions to the cause of freedom, and I had the honor of delivering the following address:

We meet in this serene and sacred shrine for an exalted and patriotic purpose. We are at this hour motivated by the highest and the holiest impulses that have ever animated the human heart. We gather in a memorial which renders homage to the distinguished dead, who not only stood in the "rockets' red glare" but who laid down their lives on the altars of freedom.

We come not to glorify bloodshed but rather to commemorate the memory of those who have made their grand contribution to the cause of freedom. We come not to beautify the character nor to exalt the life, but rather to commune with the spirit, of those of Jewish faith who have made their lives sublime. We come today to touch again their lives and to feel again the dynamic power of their magnificent presence.

By feeling again the majestic spirit of those of Jewish faith who have suffered and died, in those heroic times when to love the institutions of freedom meant to lay down one's life in the cause of freedom, all Americans may reinvigorate their just devotion to the great principles which they by their lives and labor so well exemplified.

As we recall the glorious aspirations which thrilled the souls of the men who engaged in the terrific combats from the burning fires of which freedom was born and upon the ashes of which a republic was built, we must be ever mindful of the grand contribution which was made by those of Jewish faith to the success of that fight for freedom.

I cannot recapitulate all of the countless contributions which have been made to freedom's cause by those of Jewish faith. They have lived and labored and fought and bled and died on every field of glory, from the dim dawn of civilization to the present hour, and today they are writing their achievements in their own blood, on all of the battle fronts of the universe; they are fighting courageously and they are dying magnificently in the ancient cause to which they have always been devoted; the cause of individual liberty. Their patriotism needs no praise and offers no apology. In peace as well as in the pageantry of war their achievements speak more eloquently than all of the beautiful words which may be spoken in their behalf.

I speak to you not as men and women of Jewish faith, but rather as Americans who love the traditions and institutions of your great Republic. The world may be a temple of tumult and a tower of discord, but America must not be divided. There are those who would divide us according to race and color and creed. Yes, there are those who enjoy the hospitality of this great home of liberty-loving people who would pull down the temple and crush and destroy the institutions which we have here established. We are heirs of the same inheritance and children of the self-same God. We are born in the image of our Maker and in our breasts is a spark of that celestial flame which surrounds His throne. Our immortal souls cry out against evil forces which seek division, disunity, and destruction, but in unity we shall continue to carry the banners of freedom and will "proclaim liberty to all the land and to all of the inhabitants thereof." That is the inscription which is emblazoned on the Liberty Bell; that is the language of the Old Testament and language which was spoken by a man of Jewish faith.

Our teeming and towering cities may at this hour be silhouetted against clouds of conflict, yet they shall continue to stand as monuments in the march of mankind, and the green fields and golden plains of America shall still commune with Nature's God, as our people, with undaunted courage, go forth to defend the ideals and the institutions for which true Americans have always been willing to make the supreme sacrifice.

This thing that we call Americanism is an attribute of the spirit and a quality of the soul. It is an impulse of holiness which inspires a supreme devotion to the grand ideals and the great principles upon which our Republic was founded. It embraces all of the immortal instincts and nobility of purposes which are embodied in the high and holy ethics of civilization. It loves justice and equality. It adores tolerance in the truest sense of that word—yet it means fortitude and courage which cannot be surpassed.

In all of the languages of earth you will not find a word that is more all-embracing nor more comprehensive than the word "Americanism." In it there is love of honor and of heroes, and of home; the love of mother; the love of God and love of country; the love of martyrs who have given their blood on a thousand blood-drenched battlefields, and on a hundred crimson seas, that men might worship at the altars of freedom. In it is love of the pioneers who carved this Nation from the heart of a wilderness and established here a home, an asylum, for the persecuted and oppressed of every land beneath the bending sky, and gave to men and women the right to cherish the sanctuaries of worship and the altars of their God. It is something intangible, yet dynamic and full of force. It despises oppression and hates all battles of conquest.

Though we have lived by such a standard, yet our civilization has come again to the crossroads; one road leads to death and devastation, to oppression and despotism, and the other road leads across the fields of carnage to the citadels of freedom. Though we have lived by such a standard, yet we are today living in a sad and sorry world, a world that is torn and twisted by the agonies of an awful war. Men have been forced to abandon the gentle arts of peace and have turned again to the cruel arts of war.

Today Americans are fighting for a new world—the world of tomorrow—a world born of death and bloodshed, but which will be dedicated to the ethics of a new civilization. The world of tomorrow will be a world of peace but it will be a peace which has been purchased by the precious blood of patriots. Only by thinking of that world of tomorrow and of the future in which we must live shall we be able to influence the destinies of our great Republic and the lives of the people who dwell therein.

I know that I need not tell you of the intriguing schemes and imperialistic ambitions which have caused men and women in other parts of the world to renounce their belief in the soundness of democratic government, and to lose their faith in the ability of people by their own judgment to govern themselves.

I need not tell you that the homes of men are haunted by fear and the lives of men are beshadowed by sorrow, as ruthless, evil, and imperialistic power runs roughshod over the sacred rights and liberties of men and women who once enjoyed the blessings of free government.

This Nation was dedicated to the cause of peace and to the gentle arts which minister to the welfare and progress of mankind. We would heal the heartaches of humanity and we would ease the pains of the troubled hearts of the universe, and with godly faith we would find the perfect light which would lead all mankind to the sacrament of divine love, to the hilltops of human happiness and to universal peace. But evil forces beyond our immediate control have compelled us to engage in a conflict, the consequences of which we cannot yet determine.

Though we still pray for peace, we are engaged at this moment in war—war with all of its agonies—its broken hearts and blighted lives, its toils and its tears, its woes and its wants, its deaths and devastation, its ghastly ghosts, and all that rides in the bloody wake of modern warfare.

Though we love peace, we are building all of the instrumentalities and machines of death which have been devised by the genius and ingenuity of man throughout the ages. The sons of America are bleeding and dying on the bosom of the seven seas and on all of the battle fronts of the world. We are spending countless billions in a fight for the preservation and perpetuity of the priceless heritage of freedom which was purchased by the blood of the patriots whose memory we honor at this hour. They neither asked nor counted the cost, but were inspired by a superiority of purpose and by a supreme devotion to the ideals for which they fought and died. With their blood they purchased these institutions of freedom, and with our blood we shall preserve them. We shall not cringe in fear before the tyranny of merciless power. We shall not be terrified nor intimidated. The spirit of America can never be conquered; yea, though we must walk through the violent vortex of death, the spirit of America shall triumph.

Not the wealth nor the rich resources of our Nation; not the might nor the power of our military forces, but the moral fiber and fabric of our people is our grandest garrison, a garrison which will never fall, neither under the first nor the last assault. America bows only in humble submission before the infinite wisdom of an omnipotent God, from whose Divine Hand we have received a grant of power, infinite in its scope and magnitude and unequaled by that of any nation on earth and in wielding that power we shall not be actuated by the glamour of conflict nor the glory of conquest.

Thank God our Nation can rise above the spirit of vindictiveness and above the promptings of angry passions, sinister impulses, and selfish motives. In the true spirit of America and in the splendor of moral greatness and strength and power we shall meet our enemies on all of the battlefronts of this troubled and distracted world. We shall devote the genius of our generation to the consummation of the grand task to which we have dedicated the rich resources of our Nation, and God Almighty shall direct our course as we go forth to battle for the preservation of the integrity of our territory and this great Republic, the sanctuary of freedom.

Unless the men and women of America are inspired by patriotic zeal and do, not just their bit but, their dead level best in the winning of this war, they will fail their Nation and their heroes in this hour of greatest peril.

Civilization's greatest curse of the centuries has been the persecutions of those of Jewish faith. The demons of hell must have shuddered at the diabolical atrocities which have been committed in the name of the superior race and according to the wish of that mad-dog who cursed the earth with this war. No greater crimes have ever been committed.

Our beloved country will never be truly worthy nor really great until love and brotherhood are engraved upon the many forms of its great heart. In the silence of the tomb death knows no distinction; in common graves the Catholic, the Protestant and the Jew, sleep the sleep that knows no awakening. Each night there sails on the bosom of a lonely sea a Rabbi, a Priest and a Protestant, and out yonder on the ramparts of freedom

men of every faith are dying in a common cause and for the Stars and Stripes.

If I should dislike a man because of his race, color or creed, I would hate and despise myself for having committed an offense so great. Only by ridding ourselves of intolerance and bigotry can we be really united in the cause to which we have devoted all of our resources and the lives of all of our citizens.

If we are to continue to enjoy and to intensify the blessings of free government, we must fully appreciate the importance of a united and all-out effort, and we must follow the magnificent leadership of our Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the real and true friend of all men who love liberty, regardless of their race and color or their creed. In this war we have but one Commander in Chief, and upon the success of his leadership may well depend the survival and the supremacy and the perpetuity of representative government. With victory there will be freedom for every one and glory enough for all.

Fulfilled Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe:

FULFILLED PROMISES

The past week deserves to go down into history as the week of fulfilled promises. When the heavy cloud of fascism turned day into night for several hundred million people in Europe years ago, life would not have been worth living for them had it not been for that faint light in the west, where the sun disappeared after Dunkerque and where the people of Europe hoped it would rise again some day. To see that dawn again they have endured hardships for years; to see it they have continued a life which otherwise would have been nothing but a burden. Day after day, month after month, year after year they have waited and have watched the west for the rising of that sun of freedom. Many times they thought to see the first rays of the coming dawn. It turned out to be a mirage of their wishes, not a reality. But this week the sun rose again. The invasion has begun. Liberation is in sight.

Another promise seems nearer fulfillment.

Four years ago, a week from tomorrow, a little-known French Army officer stepped up in front of a microphone of the B. B. C. in London and made a historic pledge: "Although we are today crushed by mechanized force," he said, "we can, in the future, conquer through superior mechanized force. Therein lies the destiny of the world." He also told his compatriots: "France is not alone. She is not alone. She is not alone." England and the United States are behind her, he said.

Perhaps few Frenchmen then believed in those words of Gen. Charles de Gaulle. As time went on more and more saw their only hope in that promise, and today there are very few who have any doubt of fulfillment of the pledge. They will enthusiastically greet the redemption of another promise made by the President of the United States, who, to them, has become the symbol of the power and the assistance that will come from this country.

Mr. Roosevelt told his press conference that he had invited General De Gaulle to see him. The general might arrive in Washington to seal, finally, French-American friendship on the anniversary of the day on which De Gaulle begged the French to build their hopes and their future on this friendship.

The forthcoming visit of the head of the French Committee of National Liberation means still more. It has been an open secret that relations between De Gaulle and Mr. Roosevelt have not been too cordial because the general desired recognition of his leadership of France, while the President considered it wiser to be slow in making promises. All he would do was assure the French and the world that the appointment of the semi-Fascist Darlan and his clique was "temporary expediency." When the time appeared ripe for it, the Fascists were dropped. Now the last cloud seems to be disappearing. Unity among the Allies may well become stronger, as a promise of a brighter, securer morrow for all people who believe in democracy.

That confidence received further strength yesterday, when the other much-criticized expedient was discarded with the changes in the Italian Government. This one week brought the liberation of Rome, the retirement of a king who—voluntarily or involuntarily—had played ball with the dictators, and the resignation of a premier who, much as he opposed Mussolini as a rival, was not entirely opposed to the Fascist ideals of imperialism and aggression if there was no risk involved.

Events in Italy and in France are symbolic and symptomatic. There was a time when it looked as if treachery and brutality would win in the end. Then came the turning of the tide. And today—on the fourth anniversary of Mussolini's declaration of war on France—the greatest promise of all emerges: That confidence in the victory of decency will be rewarded.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Keynote Address by Governor Cooper, of Tennessee, Before the State Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Prentice Cooper, Governor of Tennessee, at Nashville, Tenn., on June 6, 1944, before the State Democratic convention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Democrats and fellow Americans, June 6, 1944, will be remembered because of an event that took place on the northern coast of France, as long as this Nation endures, compared to which any action taken here will seem of small importance; yet what is done here and in similar State-wide conventions held throughout this Union, will determine how this Nation will be governed. On how this country is governed, depends how this war will be run, when it will end, and what kind of a peace will be made. In other words, we meet to carry out certain orderly processes of democracy that are vital to the very existence of this Government of freemen because we are here to name men to conduct it.

We meet today to elect delegates to the Democratic National Convention and to prepare for the fall elections of the important offices of President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Governor of Tennessee, Members of Congress, and utilities commissioner. A great responsibility rests upon us here on the home front, for we are met not only as Democrats but as leaders of the Democratic Party in Tennessee, the party that the people have entrusted with power.

I am proud to be a Tennessee Democrat and I want to thank you, the Democrats of Tennessee, for the wonderful support you have always given me, and to tell you how greatly I appreciate all that you have done for me. Not only have you nominated and elected me Governor of Tennessee three times, but 4 years ago you named me chairman of your delegation to the Democratic National Convention and today you have honored me by naming me your keynote speaker for this quadrennial convention, which, in some respects, is the most important since the Democrats started holding conventions in this capital city more than a hundred years ago.

I hope it may not be regarded as out of order, since we meet only once every 4 years, to briefly consider Tennessee democracy. Ours is a great party with a great record. We are proud that our founder was Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence. Tennessee, hereself, contributed that patron saint of democracy, Andrew Jackson, to the party. But Tennessee has also furnished to the Nation two other Democratic Presidents. James K. Polk, who added more territory to the United States than any other President, was a Democrat; and, strange as it may seem, Andrew Johnson was also a Democrat, who had been elected as a Democrat as a running mate of Abraham Lincoln to compose differences then existing among the border States.

Tennessee's Democratic roster of the past is replete with the names of great men such as Sam Houston, Aaron V. Brown, John Bell, and Isham G. Harris, and many others of an earlier day, as well as of distinguished Democrats, whose voices have so recently been stilled that we can almost hear their eloquence today in these halls; like Robert L. Taylor, E. W. Carmack, Benton McMillin, James B. Frazier, and Austin Peay.

Likewise new chapters are being written in the history of our party today by distinguished Tennesseans.

No man of our time excels, in respect, throughout this Nation, our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. He has had charge of this Nation's foreign policy longer than any other man in its history and by his reciprocal foreign trade agreements has offered the world one of the best ways to avoid future wars by substituting economic cooperation between nations for economic warfare.

Another distinguished Democrat, who has won more victories for the party in Tennessee than any other, a fearless leader and tireless champion of good government, is our Democratic National Committeeman, Edward Hull Crump.

Another has served longer in the United States Senate than any other Tennessean, the author of the Federal Aid Road System and of other great programs, the Honorable KENNETH D. MCKELLAR.

TOM STEWART, our junior United States Senator, deserves mention for making a valiant fight for something very near to the heart of the South—equality of freight rates.

Leadership of the Democratic women of Tennessee is in the capable hands of a faithful and effective party worker and organizer, a woman of grace and charm, Mrs. Albert E. Hill, of Nashville, our Democratic national committeewoman.

Nor can we overlook on this occasion in our preliminary remarks the distinguished service rendered to the party by our Democratic Representatives in Congress. One especially typifies the harmony now existing within our party—JIM MCCORD.

And, finally, a word of appreciation should go to those prominent Democrats now serving the party on the Democratic State Committee, and especially to the committee's distinguished chairman, Russell Kramer.

We may note with satisfaction that the leaders of Tennessee Democracy assemble today when our party was never better united. In this time of supreme crisis there is no serious division of opinion among us. We know what we want. We are determined. We believe in ourselves and in the accomplishment of the Demorcatic Party. Democratic leadership has been proven and tried by the severest ordeals of history. It has stood the test.

Since I have been responsible as Governor for the conduct of this State's affairs for the past 5½ years, I feel I would be remiss in my duty to the Democratic Party if I did not, at least briefly, outline the accomplishments of this Democratic administration.

It is of the utmost importance to know that the Volunteer State has maintained its great tradition of powerfully assisting this Nation win every one of its wars and in this greatest of all wars, Tennessee is second to no State in the Union in assisting the Federal Government in the successful prosecution of this war.

Tennessee appointed this Nation's first defense council on May 22, 1940.

Tennessee originated this Nation's best wartime agricultural program, as is shown by the fact that Tennessee's home-food-supply program was made a model in most of the States of the Union.

Tennessee completed one of the largest State armory programs in America with 15 new armories constructed at strategic points throughout the State.

Tennessee was one of the first States to send an industrial representative to Washington to secure wartime industry, and Tennessee today has more than a billion dollars worth of war industries. Not even the Republicans are asking for any more.

Tennessee has the largest State guard in the Nation in proportion to population, well equipped and well disciplined to preserve peace and enforce the law within the State during this war.

Tennessee taxpayers contributed a million dollars to buy land on which to locate Camp Forrest and Smyrna Air Base.

Tennessee has been the training ground for a million soldiers and sailors to fight in this war.

Tennessee has been complimented by the Federal authorities for the efficient manner in which it has raised an army of 275,000 of her sons—to go away and fight upon the battlefields of the world. This compares with only 78,000 Tennesseans who fought in the First World War.

Tennessee has based its war effort on the strong foundation of sound fiscal policy. We have paid $45,000,000,000 on the State debt. We have accumulated the State's largest surplus. We have saved a million dollars a year by reducing personnel 20 percent.

The State's credit is at an all-time high. Sixty percent more money has been spent on education than ever before; free textbooks have been introduced and the education of Tennessee's children during this war has been protected by increasing 20,000 school teachers' salaries $20 per month.

The greatest humanitarian program ever undertaken in this State has been made effective to raise old-age pensions. Aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind; to establish a modern system of tuberculosis hospitals throughout the States and to complete the State's largest institutional building program for the care of its unfortunates.

All these things have been accomplished without new taxation, leaving the taxpayer free to better shoulder the heavy burdens of this war.

I wish I had time to tell you how our forests and park lands have been increased seven times; how we have accumulated an unemployment compensation fund of 54 million dollars; how labor reforms have been instituted; how insurance rates have been reduced; how the laws have been enforced by holding pardons to a minimum, and by giving increased law enforcement powers to an efficient highway patrol.

These accomplishments and many others have been made through excellent legislative cooperation that has resulted in the shortest sessions of the legislature in the history of Tennessee. Our last regular session was the shortest in America, lasting only 39 days. These sessions demonstrated the ability of the Democrats of Tennessee to work together in the public interest to get things done with expedition and economy.

The people in wartime have appreciated such attention to business and will not hazard the conduct of their affairs in 1944 by installing a Republican Governor to be at loggerheads with a Democratic legislature while the people wait patiently for needed laws which, in all probability, would never be enacted.

Let's turn now to national affairs. The people of Tennessee are proud that a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress gave us T. V. A. T. V. A. has justified itself alone on the basis of its wonderful contribution to America's war effort, but it has also improved navigation, established flood control, and given Tennessee the lowest electrical rate they have ever enjoyed.

The President has made some mistakes and so has every man that is human, but the President has done these things of supreme importance, supremely well. We all know that the supreme objective of this Nation is full and complete victory over Germany and Japan. To this one great end, everything else must remain subordinate.

We are assembled at the most fateful hour of history. We have embarked on the great crusade. This very day during the early morning hours, under a full moon, on the northern crest of France, the invasion of Europe began.

All this morning American boys—boys from east, middle, and west Tennessee—by the thousands have been landing by sea and from the air along the beachheads of the northern coast of France, especially near the great French port of Le Havre and at the mouth of the River Seine.

It is the greatest amphibious military operation in all history—one of such magnitude that Hitler at the very height of his power after Dunkerque would not dare to attempt. It will probably be at least 72 hours before we can judge how great our initial success has been.

We do know that our military forces are irrevocably committed to this undertaking. They cannot now withdraw. The march to Berlin has begun. We have crossed the Rubicon.

Four years ago almost to a day on June 10, 1940, a proud and arrogant Mussolini stood upon a balcony of the Venezia Palace in Rome. He was in the company of the foreign minister, his son-in-law, Count Ciano. Il Duce was dressed in the gaudy uniform of an Italian field marshal. As he addressed the crowd, he lifted his chin and shouted that he and Hitler would destroy the decadent democracies of the world. Two days ago one of those "decadent" democracies—the United States of America—with some help from the British, captured Mussolini's capital, the proud, eternal city of Rome, including the very palace where Mussolini had done his boasting. Of course, he, himself, had long since fled. Months before his little Fascist world had crumpled under the force of our arms and Mussolini, lacking other means to wreak his vengeance, blamed his son-in-law, that same Count Ciano, who had married his favorite daughter and had been his bosom friend, and had him murdered by his own personal order.

Today is the beginning of the end of Hitler. General Eisenhower is commanding the armies of the democracies, assisted by General Montgomery, who is commanding the actual invasion forces. Montgomery, with our powerful help, already has beaten Rommel in Africa and Italy. Rommel will again be beaten in France. The nations that both Hitler and Mussolini have ridiculed as weak and decadent struck this morning with 4,000 ships, supported by 11,000 planes, a force without even a near parallel in the world's history.

On this historic day we can definitely see that we are on our way to victory and are about to be rescued from Hitler's threat of tyranny and of slavery. Who, we may well ask, is responsible for this happy chain of events? There is one man in the world who, more than anyone else, has gotten us thus far on victory's way, and his name is Franklin D. Roosevelt, our Commander in Chief. Do we at this time want to replace him?

Those of you who voted for Roosevelt 4 years ago in our Democratic State Convention and later in the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, and broke precedent by nominating Franklin D. Roosevent for a third term, can know that by naming him Commander in Chief of our forces at that time that you had a part in the successful invasion of north Africa, of Sicily, of Italy, and of the capture of Rome. We know these miracles have been wrought under his leadership. We cannot assume they would have occurred had our ship of state been steered by a less experienced pilot. "The difficult we do immediately—the impossible takes a little longer."—Motto on wall of a Roosevelt secretary.

Some of you have sons who at this moment are on the coast of France taking part in this invasion of Hitler's Fortress Europe, and all of us have relatives who are fighting for us today in this greatest invasion of all time. Are any of us here willing to commit their safety into untried hands? I propose that we all take as big a part as any of us are capable in the overthrow of Hitler and Hirohito by endorsing Franklin D. Roosevelt for a fourth term.

It is true that the democracies of the world have been on trial since the Second World War began, more than at any previous time, because the democracies of the world were opposed by a new kind of foe, the Hitler-Mussolini type of powerful dictatorship that could act as quickly as one man could change his mind. The processes of democracy operate more slowly and are necessarily more cumbersome. There was a time after Dunkerque when there was a question whether there was time for the democracies to mobilize their strength.

It is probable, indeed, if three great men, Marshal Stalin, Winston Churchill, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, had not gotten together to do a great job in mobilizing the resources of Russia, Great Britain, and the

United States, Hitler's dream of world conquest might have become a reality.

In this grave hour of our Nation's peril, we would do well to capture the spirit of a Tennessee boy, Capt. Clare McLain Smartt, pilot of a Flying Fortress. This Putnam County boy was flying his bomber when a wing was severely damaged before the bomber had made its run. Captain Smartt ordered the crew to continue in formation. A few minutes later one of the engines was knocked out. Captain Smartt's order still was to follow formation. The bombs were dropped, the objective was attained. A number of German fighters were brought down, but upon his return to his English base, Captain Smartt's only report was: "Followed formation."

We, too, as Democrats, must hold to our party organization and maintain formation to gain the objective set for us by Thomas Jefferson and keep secure the principles of democratic freedom that gave our Nation birth.

Legislation To Prevent Monopolistic Growth of Bank Holding Companies Is Essential

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly I have warned the House about the dangers of the power of monopoly in our American economic life. I pointed out how the very existence of monopoly renders it impossible for the benefits of technological improvements to reach the people generally; how monopoly makes a mockery of the very phrase, free economic system, or private enterprise. I have introduced legislation to try to prevent the further growth of monopoly in the period at the close of the war, and in connection with the disposition of Government-owned plants, and I have shown how financial monopoly has over and over been the mother of industrial monopoly and the very heart of the monopoly dangers.

In this connection there is an important recommendation for legislation in the 1943 Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System which demands immediate and serious consideration. I refer to the Board's recommended legislation on bank holding companies commencing on page 34 of the report.

The Board, in the light of its experience, says frankly that the present law is inadequate. It advises us that the corporate device can and has been used to "run around" branch banking statutes and otherwise to accomplish by indirection objectives which could not be accomplished directly. It calls our attention to the lack of any effective control over the unlimited expansion of these companies in banking or, for that matter, in any other field. It points out the facility with which the holding-company device can be used by a few people to obtain control over vast resources and to use the resources so obtained to acquire additional properties. Finally, it objects, with good reason, to a bank-holding company being in all sorts of businesses and to a situation where the borrower and lender of depositors' funds are under the same management.

Let me call your attention to the situation in my own and surrounding States.

In California practically half—49 percent to be exact—of all the banking offices in the entire State are controlled and dominated by one management. I refer to the management of Transamerica Corporation and Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association. Bank of America alone has 495 branches. Think of this—50 percent of the total of 1,035 banks and branches in California are controlled by the management of Transamerica Corporation and Bank of America. These banks and branches hold over 40 percent of all bank deposits in the State, well over three and one-half billions of dollars.

In Nevada 80 percent of the banking offices holding 80 percent of bank deposits are controlled by this management; in Arizona 13 percent of the banking offices holding 23 percent of bank deposits; in Oregon over 34.3 percent of the banking offices holding over 40 percent of bank deposits; and in Washington over 4 percent of the banking offices holding over 4 percent of bank deposits. In these five States this one management controls and operates over 40 percent of all banking offices holding more than 36 percent of all bank deposits, a figure of more than $4,250,000,000.

This is aside from other controlled businesses which are varied and far flung. According to its latest report, Transamerica Corporation controls the Occidental Life Insurance Co., the largest life insurance company on the Pacific coast and among the 25 largest in the United States. It controls the Pacific National Fire Insurance Co., a fire insurance company, and the Premier Insurance Co., an automobile insurance company. It controls the Axton-Fisher Tobacco Co., in Louisville, Ky. It controls Adel Precision Products Corporation and Aerco Corporation, which fabricate or manufacture airplane parts and accessories. It controls Enterprise Engine & Foundry Co., which builds engines and machinery. It controls General Metals Corporation, a foundry; and it controls vast real-estate resources, urban and suburban, through one of its companies, the Capital Co.

Here, indeed, is an illustration of the great economic power which, through the holding-company device, can be wielded by a small group without the responsibilities of complete ownership. Only last year its resources were used in an attempt to acquire stock in a local bank in Los Angeles. Here was a case where one day Transamerica Corporation delivered an ultimatum to the directors of the bank and the next day initiated a high-pressure public campaign, unloosing brokers, and offering the equivalent of $33 per share in cash for stock which only the month before had been quoted at from $23 to $25 per share. Cases like this are not rare—it just happens to be the last one. I do not know what percentage of the stock of this bank it obtained as a result of its efforts, but I do know that, with the resources of millions of people in these few hands, there is nothing to prevent new offers at higher and higher figures until the last vestige of independence is gone.

I warn my colleagues that unless they are prepared to assume a responsibility which I, for one, do not wish to share, we had better act, and act quickly. The Board's report checks it squarely up to us:

Banks and branches in the Transamerica Corporation group compared with all banks and branches in the same States, Dec. 31, 1943

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	Number of—			Deposits of banks and branches [1]
	Banks	Branches	Banks and branches	
Transamerica Corporation banks: [2]				
Arizona	2	3	5	53,082
California	12	495	507	3,660,629
Nevada	4	10	14	80,081
Oregon	9	39	48	370,436
Washington	1	8	9	71,233
Total	28	555	583	4,235,461
All banks in same States:				
Arizona	12	26	38	229,204
California	208	827	1,035	8,859,654
Nevada	10	13	23	99,098
Oregon	72	68	140	909,136
Washington	131	88	219	1,579,366
Total	433	1,022	1,455	11,676,458
Ratio (percent) of Transamerica banks to all banks in same States:				
Arizona	16.7	11.5	13.2	23.2
California	5.8	59.9	49.0	41.3
Nevada	40.0	76.9	60.9	80.8
Oregon	12.5	57.4	34.3	40.7
Washington	.8	9.1	4.1	4.5
Total	6.5	54.3	40.1	36.3

[1] Separate deposit figures for branches are not available.
[2] Includes Bank of America, N. T. & S. A., San Francisco, and National Bank of Washington, Seattle, which are not included in the "26 Transamerica-owned banks" shown in the Transamerica Corporation 1943 annual report but are shown there as "Banks in which Transamerica Corporation and its subsidiaries have substantial minority interests."

NOTE.—The number of branches shown above does not include banking facilities at military reservations provided through arrangements made by the Treasury Department with banks designated as depositaries and financial agents of the Government.

Summary of Bureaucratic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 10, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the resolution I have introduced, which provides for a nonpartisan, nonpolitical congressional investigation of bureaucracy and unconstitutional trends of government

is attracting strong support throughout the country.

Lawrence Sullivan, the distinguished author of Bureaucracy Runs Amuck, one of the latest of the best sellers, has sent me the following letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: The press of the country reflects enthusiastic approval of your proposal (H. Res. 547) to inquire into the operations of our top-heavy Federal bureaucracy. You are doing a great work in keeping this important discussion on a nonpartisan basis, for it is truly a problem on which all defenders of the American constitutional system can unite wholeheartedly. Our prevailing system of dictatorial bureaucracy threatens the whole structure of ordered liberty under law. One need only examine the recent report of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the Montgomery Ward case to understand how far we have drifted from our constitutional moorings.

* * * * *

I will be most happy to have you call on me at any time if I can be of assistance in this great enterprise.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE SULLIVAN.

Probably no one in our country has devoted more time and conscientious study and research to the evolution and development of our bureaucracy than Mr. Sullivan. He has prepared a summary of bureaucratic growth which is interesting and edifying. It is as follows:

Throughout the Nation bureaucracy has become a household word—a symbol of burdensome and excessive regulations and compulsory civilian routines interfering with the vigorous prosecution of the war.

"Give America her head, and watch our smoke" is the coast-to-coast plea from the home front.

Yet few citizens have paused to examine details of the new Federal structure, or inquire into its aims, methods, and gargantuan fiscal diet. Not until the Senate Finance Committee discovered some 35 different Federal agencies engaged in various phases of post-war planning did Congress undertake a systematic vivisection of the recent yeasty growth of our American bureaucracy.

Through the Byrd committee Congress found that some 200 new Federal bureaus, boards, commissions, offices, and administrations had been created by law or Executive order since 1933—an average of about 20 additional governing units each year. Many had begun with an elaborate questionnaire to be filled in, audited, and certified in triplicate. And several of these new agencies, while presumed to be discharging purely war functions, were discovered to be assiduously shaping plans for post-war operations on a permanent basis. While our military services are smashing through to certain and conclusive victory on the far-flung battle fronts, many of our civilian bureaus and commissions in Washington are digging in for post-war permanency.

Today the Federal civil pay roll carries 3,300,000 men and women exclusive of all military personnel. This is about 1 Government employee for every 41 in the national population. In June 1933 the combined civil rolls of the Federal Government carried only 567,000 names (again exclusive of the military), or about 1 to 200 population.

Senator BYRD'S committee reports have alluded to this extravagant civilian pay roll as a peril to America's victory program, saying:

"It is imperative that the people of the United States become aware of this shocking abuse of manpower in the Federal Government, and that they promote the transfer of all unnecessary Government workers to essential war industries. Unless this is done quickly, the overstaffing and inefficiency in the Federal establishment will constitute a serious peril to our war effort.

"Excluding those engaged in mechanical and construction work, one may say that fully one-third of the entire remaining civilian personnel of the Federal Government could be dismissed. Rather than impairing the necessary functions of government, this action would result in greater efficiency, provide manpower for industry and the armed forces, reduce the cost of government, and aid substantially in the successful prosecution of the war."

Although there has been a consistent trend of Federal expansion over the last century, the increase of bureaus during the last decade has been on a scale previously unknown anywhere in the history of the world.

Between 1800 and 1925 the Federal departmental pay rolls doubled about every 20 years. But after 1933 Federal civilian employment doubled in 7 years—from 500,000 to 1,000,000. And after June 1940, it doubled again in 18 months, to 2,000,000. Then another million were added during the next 14 months, to 3,000,000. During the last 10 years the national population has increased by approximately 10,000,000, and more than one-fourth of that number have been added directly to the Federal civil rolls.

Already we hear in Washington of plans to convert the great civilian agencies of wartime administration to the work of peace: "Rationing must be continued indefinitely * * * price controls must be maintained * * * lend-lease surely cannot be abandoned." During 1943 and 1944 bills were presented in Congress to expand social security, Federal health and medical programs, agricultural controls, and manpower allocations.

We experienced no such expansion in World War No. 1. Between June 1916 and November 1918, Federal employment doubled, but the November 1918 peak was only 918,000 civilian workers—fewer than we had at the start of the rearmament program in June 1940.

Today we have 1 civilian pay-roller for every 3 men in the military services—against a peak of 1 to 6 in the last war.

As compared with the last war, why do we now need twice as many civilian workers in government for every man in military uniform? That's the challenge of bureaucracy today.

The total Federal civilian pay roll today equals, in manpower, the striking force of 220 infantry divisions on the battlefield. (The total field force of the entire Nazi military machine is estimated at only 330 combat divisions.)

For the whole Federal structure, two out of every three civilian pay-rollers are men.

The country recalls vividly that during the period 1933–36 every new Government program was establised as an "emergency" enterprise to fight the depression. The implication was clear, often stated officially, that the end of the emergency would bring demobilization of the costly programs. But the depression emergency merged smoothly with the greater war emergency, and now we see the war emergency merging again with the even more compelling emergencies of peace.

Every bureau costs money. In 1933 Uncle Sam's civilian pay roll for a month averaged about $75,000,000. But now it is $475,000,000 a month, exclusive of the military.

Here are some of the queer activities and interests which make the current picture of bureaucracy at work and play:

Although the Federal Government operates the largest printing establishment in the world, covering 33 acres of floor space, it still buys outside printing at the rate of $10,000 a day.

One copy each of a week's mimeographed press material from Washington weighed 46 pounds and 12 ounces, making about 875 columns of type in a standard newspaper.

One war agency published a home-maker pamphlet advising, "If sheets are laundered at home, use plenty of soap and water."

Publicity bureaus of the Federal Government (exclusive of the military service) use 8,813 cameras—movie and still—to apprise the taxpayers of their accomplishments, plus 19,078 pieces of auxiliary photographic equipment and 53,717 pieces of photo processing equipment.

A Senate committee discovered at least 6,000 draft deferments in nonwar agencies.

The Federal telephone bill, exclusive of the military, runs about $30,000,000 a year.

One member of the Cabinet has 18 Federal Executive-order jobs besides his regular departmental responsibilities, and another is a director in 33 federally owned corporations and business associations.

Heroism of Corp. Paul B. Huff, Cleveland, Tenn., Is Great Inspiration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the newspaper report of the Chattanooga Times, Monday, June 5, which sets forth the remarkable acts of heroism of Corp. Paul B. Huff, a constituent of mine from Cleveland, Tenn.

Tennessee had the distinction of furnishing Sgt. Alvin York, the No. 1 hero of World War No. 1. The noble acts of Corporal Huff will place him in the front list for consideration as No. 1 hero of World War No. 2:

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL WON BY INTREPID CLEVELAND MAN—CORP. PAUL B. HUFF, PARACHUTE INFANTRYMAN, CITED FOR HEROISM IN ACTION AGAINST GERMANS

Corp. Paul B. Huff, 25-year-old parachute infantryman and former railroader of Cleveland, Tenn., has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism in action against the Germans near Carano, Italy, February 8, the War Department announced yesterday.

Corp. Huff, son of Isham Huff, of Route 6, Cleveland, will receive the medal, the Nation's highest honor for a fighting man, at an overseas ceremony, the announcement stated.

In action almost paralleling that of Sgt. Alvin York, Tennessee's famous hero of World War No. 1, Corp. Huff, single-handed, advanced 350 yards under heavy artillery, mortar, and machine-gun fire through an enemy mine field and wiped out a German machine-gun crew. He then deliberately drew enemy fire on himself to determine the strength and location of the enemy and led his six-man patrol to safety after the German unit was annihilated.

Corp. Huff's parachute infantry battalion was in a forward position in the vicinity of Carano, Italy, on February 8, when the battalion started receiving small arms fire on its exposed right flank. He volunteered to lead his patrol into enemy territory to

determine the strength of the Germans facing them. The weather was clear and there was almost no cover. The enemy had good observation when the patrol began its dangerous trek early in the morning.

Huff and his men selected a slight draw as the only possible point from which to observe the enemy. The draw, in addition to being mined, was covered by three enemy machine guns and a 20-mm. gun. The guns opened up on the patrol from about 350 yards and with bullets peppering as close as 3 feet away and mortar shells exploding within 5 or 10 yards, Corp. Huff ordered his men to take cover and he went forward alone to within 75 yards of the first machine gun.

"Under direct fire from the rear machine gun," reported his company commander, Lt. Joseph J. Winsko, Niagara Falls, N. Y., "he crawled the remaining 75 yards to a position behind the closest one, which was well hidden and strongly emplaced, and with his machine gun killed the crew, and put the gun out of action.

"He fired from a kneeling position," Lieutenant Winsko continued, "in a deliberate effort to draw the fire of the enemy, from which he was able to estimate correctly its strength and location, thus accomplishing the mission of his patrol."

Corporal Huff, according to War Department information, then returned to his patrol and under concentrated fire led his men to safety after having been under enemy fire for 4 hours.

KILL 27, CAPTURE 21 NAZIS

His reconnaissance enabled his unit to kill 27 Germans, capture 21, and route the remainder of an enemy company of 125 men, his officers reported.

The citation to the Medal of Honor follows:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at risk of life above and beyond the call of duty, in action on February 8, 1944, near Carano, Italy. Corporal Huff volunteered to lead a six-man patrol with the mission of determining the location and strength of an enemy unit which was delivering fire on the exposed right flank of his company. The terrain over which he had to travel consisted of exposed, rolling ground, affording the enemy excellent visibility. As the patrol advanced, its members were subjected to small-arms and machine-gun fire and a concentration of mortar fire, shells bursting within 5 to 10 yards of them and bullets striking the ground at their feet.

"Moving ahead of his patrol, Corporal Huff drew fire from three enemy machine guns and a 20-millimeter weapon. Realizing the danger confronting his patrol, he advanced alone under deadly fire through a mine field and arrived at a point within 75 yards of the nearest machine-gun position. Under direct fire from the rear machine gun, he crawled the remaining 75 yards to the closest emplacement, killed the crew with his submachine gun, and destroyed the gun. During this act he fired from a kneeling position, which drew fire from other positions, enabling him to estimate correctly the strength and location of the enemy. Still under concentrated fire, he returned to his patrol and led his men to safety.

"As a result of the information he gained, a patrol in strength sent out that afternoon, one group under the leadership of Corporal Huff, succeeded in routing an enemy company of 125 men, killing 27 Germans and capturing 21 others, with a loss of only 3 patrol members. Corporal Huff's intrepid leadership and daring combat skill reflect the finest traditions of the American infantryman."

ALWAYS A SURE SHOT

Huff's exploits are not surprising to friends around Cleveland, who remember him as the quickest and surest shot of the gang, with gun or pistol, on hunting trips to White Oak Mountain, near Cleveland. His friends also had heard of his interest in the parachute branch long before he entered jump training at Fort Benning, Ga. Prior to entering the service, he was splitting his civilian time working between the Cleveland Chair Co. and the Southern Railway System. Often when talking things over with the boys at his lunch hour, he would declare:

"When my time comes, and it's coming soon, I want the paratroopers. They call it the suicide squadron, but that's for me."

He has been overseas 2 years. He was inducted in June 1941, just 3 days after his twenty-third birthday. He received his basic training at Camp Wheeler, before being assigned to the parachute school at Fort Benning.

FAVORITE OF ENGINEER

Born in Cleveland, the son of Isham Huff, veteran employee of the Southern Railway System, Paul, like his three brothers, wanted to be a railroad man. One of his biggest rooters is C. J. Butler, veteran engineer, to whose engine Huff was often assigned as fireman. Butler observed:

"Yes, sir, Paul's a tough Tennessee nut and if we had more like him, we wouldn't need such a large Army."

The parachutist likes horseback riding, swimming, boxing, and dancing, according to friends. His girl friend, Miss Ruth Gentry, also resides in Cleveland and friends predict their betrothal when the hero returns home.

His father and stepmother live on Harrison Road, Route 6, Cleveland, and Paul lives with his brother, Clayton, a short distance from his father's home. His mother died when he was 3 years of age.

He has three brothers and six sisters. One brother, Clinton, is with an engineering battalion in New Guinea. The other brothers, Clayton and Decatur, live near Cleveland. Also living in Cleveland are the sisters, Mrs. S. M. Lemons, Miss Beryl Huff, Mrs. D. W. May, Mrs. Neil Chase, Mrs. Homer Green, and Mrs. James Ingram.

During his overseas service, Corporal Huff has not been content with physical action against the enemy. He has sent $1,300 in War bonds to his sister, Mrs. Neil Chase, for safekeeping.

Insurance Legislation

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, for the past several days telegrams have been sent to the membership by various labor leaders in which they voice their protests against the attempts being made by the Committee on the Judiciary to prevent a further encroachment by the courts on our prerogatives.

It has been suggested that if the insurance bill becomes law, it may be so construed as to remove the employees of insurance companies from the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act and other laws which have been enacted for the protection of labor.

Not only is this fear entirely groundless but, as a matter of fact, the aim of the advocates of the bills is completely in harmony with the position of labor itself in regard to the antitrust laws. Labor has consistently opposed the application of the antitrust laws to labor unions and its position has in large measure been sustained by Congress and the courts. Insurance, on the other hand, has never been subject to the antitrust laws and the purpose of the Bailey-Van Nuys bill is to insure that the existing status shall be continued and to prevent the great injury which would result from suddenly applying the antitrust laws to a business which has been built up under an entirely different system of regulation by the States.

The bill does not modify in any way the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act, or any other labor legislation, nor does it affect the constitutional basis of such legislation. It does not purport to declare that insurance is not commerce—that question is under consideration by the Supreme Court, and the bill does not deal with it. The bill merely declares that the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act shall not be construed to apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business or to impair its regulation by the States. The applicability of existing labor legislation is in no case dependent upon whether the employer is subject to the antitrust laws.

Even the question whether the employer is engaged in interstate commerce—and we repeat that the bill does not affect this question—is not the test which determines the applicability of labor legislation to insurance employees. The Supreme Court, in *United States* v. *Darby* (312 U. S. 100 (1941)), said that it has "many times held that the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce extends to the regulation through legislative action of activities intrastate, which have a substantial effect on the commerce or the exercise of the Congressional power over it."

The Court in that case held that while manufacture is not of itself interstate commerce, the control exercised by Congress under the Fair Labor Standards Act of the wages to be paid to workmen engaged in manufacture is within the power of Congress.

The Fair Labor Standards Act—Twenty-ninth United States Code, pages 201–279—applies by its terms to employees engaged in interstate commerce or in production of goods for interstate commerce or employed in any process or occupation necessary to the production of goods for interstate commerce.

Another example of the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to an intrastate activity is found in *Kirschbaum* v. *Walling* (316 U. S. 317 (1942)). The Court there upheld the application of the act to employees of a loft building—including firemen and elevator operators—who were not themselves engaged in interstate commerce, on the ground that the work of these employees had such a close tie with the process of production for commerce that they should be regarded as engaged in an occupation necessary to the production of goods for commerce.

The National Labor Relations Act—Twenty-ninth United States Code, pages 151–158—applies to activities affecting commerce. In *National Labor Relations*

Board v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation* (301 U. S. 1 (1937)), the Court upheld the application of that act to employees engaged in a manufacturing operation which in itself was not interstate commerce.

The Supreme Court, in *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111 (1942)), upheld the application of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—Seventh United States Code Annotated 1281 et sequentia—to production not intended in any part for commerce but wholly for consumption on the farm. There a farmer was penalized for raising for his own use more wheat than his quota allowed him. The Court said that Congress can appropriately consider that wheat consumed on the farm where grown, if wholly outside the scheme of regulation, would have a substantial effect in defeating its purpose of stimulating trade at increased prices, since the grower thus forestalls resort to the market by producing to meet his own needs.

In *United States* v. *Wrightwood Dairy Co.* (315 U. S. 110 (1942)) the Supreme Court upheld the application of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act—Seventh United States Code, page 608–c—to the business of purchasing and reselling milk entirely within one State, on the ground that it was in competition with milk which came from without the State. The act by its terms applied to the handling of milk in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or which directly burdens, obstructs, or affects interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity.

Under the holdings in the above cases, it seems abundantly clear that the power of Congress to legislate respecting labor does not depend on whether the employer is in interstate commerce, and a fortiori it does not depend on whether the employer is subject to the Federal antitrust laws.

The Government itself, in its brief in Polish National Alliance of the United States against National Labor Relations Board, now pending before the Supreme Court, argued that the National Labor Relations Act applied to the insurance business because it affected interstate commerce, and that "the Court has never held respecting any aspect of the insurance business that it did not affect commerce."

Commencement Exercises in Mooseheart, the City of Childhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the horrors and chaos of a global war, it is most reassuring as we survey this broad land of ours to observe in numberless communities diligent and thoughtful programs for the training of young people in exercising their responsibilities as citizens that they may be better prepared for the task of directing the destiny of our Nation in the years that are to come. It is comforting to realize that the future of our country will rest in the hands of these millions of young men and women being thus reared and educated, because we are satisfied that the strongest safeguard of future national security and progress is a generation properly prepared for citizenship, and trained in responsibilities and obligations to each other and to their fellow man. Today, throughout the world, we witness the heartbreaking spectacle and the grim tragedy of sovereign nations being ravaged and strangled and bled—the shocking and inevitable result of a generation of young Fascists trained to exalt evil and terrorism and war, and taught to practice murder and brutality and every vile instinct that would drag mankind to a level lower than that of the beast.

Mr. Speaker, one of the many communities dedicated to the great task of combatting the evil tendencies of the old world and of training our future citizens in the principles of true Americanism is of outstanding prominence. Mooseheart, known throughout the length and breadth of our fair land as the City of Childhood, is located in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent, and it is of this remarkable character-building community that I wish today to express a few thoughts to my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Mooseheart is the home and school financed by the fraternal society known as the Loyal Order of Moose and operated by this society for the benefit of the orphan children and their widowed mothers within the ranks of the organization. It nestles on the west bank of the beautiful Fox River just a few miles north of the thriving and progressive city of Aurora. From this picturesque setting, during the past quarter of a century, Mooseheart has each year been graduating and distributing into all parts of our Nation large classes of young men and women who are firmly grounded in the faith of their fathers, trained and equipped to their fingertips to succeed in the world without infringing upon the rights and opportunities of others, and imbued with a deep and abiding sense of responsibility to God and country. No further proof of this love of God and hatred of evil need be adduced than the fact that more than 600 recent graduates of Mooseheart, both young men and young women, are in the armed forces of our country, serving on the far-flung battle lines with distinction to themselves and honor to the community which produced them.

Children come originally to Mooseheart from homes all over the country that have been broken up by the death of the breadwinner. The widowed mother accompanies her children and resides with them until they graduate. The children are given an excellent home and individual attention. They are educated through the high school, nurtured in true religious and moral precepts, and grounded firmly in civic responsibility. They are taught a useful trade at which, when they graduate to take their places in the workaday world, they can earn an honest living and can look forward to that time when they can rear and educate families of their own.

Commencement exercises were held this year at Mooseheart on June 10, and the program of activities of that day prompts these observations of mine. A feature of the program was the commencement address delivered by the founder of Mooseheart and the man who has served as the chairman of its board of governors for 30 years, the Honorable JAMES J. DAVIS, Secretary of Labor in the Cabinets of three Presidents, and now serving his fourteenth year as United States Senator from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Formal exercises for the young men and women of the class of 1944 were held in the forenoon in the Roosevelt Memorial Auditorium. This part of the commencement program differed from tens of thousands of other commencement programs throughout the country in only one respect. The difference lay in the fact that all of the class were without fathers, and most of them without mothers. They were graduating from the only home that most of them had ever known during the best part of their life, and they were plunging into the struggle of life without the comforting voice of a mother or the reassuring counsel of a father to guide and encourage them.

The class of 1944, I learned, had been in combined residence at Mooseheart for a total of 360 years and 10 months. The average time spent there was 9 years and 3 months. This ranged from a residence of 10 months for one graduate to a period of 16½ years for another. Half of the entire class had been residents for more than 8 years. The average age of these young men and women this year was 18 years and 2 months. They came to Mooseheart from Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Idaho, Ohio, Montana, Virginia, West Virginia, California, Colorado, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and Wisconsin, a total of 16 States, with Illinois having the largest number of representatives.

The activities of the Mooseheart commencement took place in the open air that same afternoon. Every child on the grounds, graduate and undergraduate, took an active part. The scene was the large athletic field in front of the stadium plainly visible to all north- and south-bound traffic on the Lincoln Highway, which cuts through Mooseheart's borders at this point.

The program opened with folk dances by the tiny tots—infant boys and girls from the Pennsylvania Baby Village, a lilliputian city within the confines of Mooseheart itself, and one of the best-known features of the institution. The older girls in the grades and the high school followed in costumes representing various places and periods. They presented a magnificent exhibition of mass calisthenics, flag drills, gymnastics, tumbling, marching, folk dancing, and singing. The boys from the elementary grades and the high school in cadet uniforms participated on the athletic field

in an exhibition drill staged by the Mooseheart Cadet Corps and in the Mooseheart Students' Band, which provides stirring music for these and other occasions.

One thing that fascinated the spectators was the harmonious blending of these young men and women, these boys and girls, these tiny tots and infants, with old Mother Nature herself. They were literally bursting with vitality and energy, graceful in their dances, precise in their drills, and noticeably blessed with sturdiness of body and naturalness of action that would be most difficult, if not impossible to surpass in any other community. It spoke eloquently of long and intimate association with the green fields and luxuriant farms—1,200 acres—to be found in abundance within the borders of Mooseheart.

Assiduous care has been taken in providing an adequate religious, academic, and vocational program for these young Americans. The responsible authorities early realized that a sturdy physical foundation is prerequisite to happy childhood, good morals, high scholarship, and lofty ambitions, hence concentration was directed to instructions and exercise in the gymnasium, on the athletic fields, in the summer pools, and on the frozen waters of the campus lake to assure Mooseheart boys and girls of healthy bodies to complete the triangle with mind and soul.

What has been accomplished at Mooseheart can be likewise achieved in other communities. Of course, those responsible for its success must devote the same care and the same attention to the problem as do those who have attained such gratifying results in the city of childhood. Constant supervision is, of course, necessary, but this of itself is insufficient. It has been a supervised program of constant activity that has really worked the wonders at Mooseheart. There no problem of juvenile delinquency exists. Why? Well, chiefly because Mooseheart boys and girls are all too busy in their various activities and have no idle time in which to entertain evil thoughts.

Programs such as are practiced at Mooseheart most assuredly cost money. Actually, however, they are the strictest of economies. An ounce of prevention is always worth a pound of cure. A hundred dollars spent for the purpose of training boys and girls for clean and useful careers is far less costly than the expenditure of a thousand dollars in an attempt to retrieve them after they have fallen into evil ways. Mooseheart has pointed the way to successful child training. It is a model that other communities might well emulate. Each year of its continued existence it has contributed to our Nation hundreds of the finest type of citizens whose influence in the communities into which they have gone has been for the preservation of American ideals and respect for the rights of their fellow man.

At the commencement exercises, the Honorable JAMES J. DAVIS, in speaking to the graduating class, climaxed their years at Mooseheart with a review of the many advantages those young people had enjoyed through the foresight and kindness of a great society of men and women devoted to ideals of peace and brotherhood, and coupled with it a patriotic plea for them to stand firm at all times in the defense of their ideals and those of their country. To them he said in part:

You who leave these halls today are graduating into a world at war, a world torn by strife and turmoil, a world in which freemen are laying down their lives to turn back the tides of treachery and tyranny which threaten to engulf the universe.

Today, many of your predecessors in these halls, more than 600 of them, are now serving with the American armed forces in all parts of the world. Today, certain of your predecessors are now engaged in that great cross-channel effort which shall lead to the ultimate liberation of France and the whole of Nazi-dominated Europe.

This war is being fought to preserve the rights of freemen and to sustain human decency throughout the world. It is a war designed to safeguard your generation and all generations who follow you from the forces of tyranny and oppression which have menaced the world in all ages.

This Nation will expend untold quantities of material wealth and untold numbers of human lives before this war is won. The road to victory will be long and hard and brutal, and much American blood will flow along the way. We, as free men and women, shall have to pay a heavy price to prove that we are worthy of the freedom which is ours.

You of this generation, like all other living Americans, have a solemn obligation to see to it that our sacrifices in this war shall not be in vain, and that the peace which follows this war shall be a just and enduring one.

You who leave here today are equipped to play your full part in that challenging work which lies before us, for when you leave this school, you will take with you the best of training, the best of character, and the best of culture that lies within our power here to offer you.

You have seen and known the community life of the city, the town, and the farm. You have performed almost every manner of productive work with hand and brain. You have known the friendship and the guidance of wise and helpful teachers.

You have learned many of the primary lessons of life—not only those that are written in books for all men to see—but those other lessons which come only to those who labor with their hands, either at the sowing and cultivation of crops, on our 1,200-acre farm here at Mooseheart, or at the learning and application of an honored trade, in one of our vocational shops. Those of you who leave here today have mastered both of these, and they will serve you well throughout all the years of your lives.

Here at Mooseheart your welfare and development have always been uppermost in the minds of those who were around you. You have had—as all young people should have—the essentials of good wholesome food, skillful and effective medical care and exercises to develop the body and the brain.

You have been taught self-respect and social responsibility. You have learned the honor and humility of honest toil—of a task well done. Each of you has been reared in the religious beliefs of your parents. You have learned reverence toward and sincerity in the words and teachings of Almighty God.

You are equipped to take up your station in life. You are equipped to go forward and make your contributions to society and the world.

Many there are who will tell you that the doors to opportunity and progress are closed. Many there are who will tell you that honest work brings with it no reward. They are the dissenters; they are the shiftless; they are the wreckers. I know that you will find no company in such a lot as that.

You are a part of a new American generation. You were born and reared in a free society. The freedom you have is yours to destroy or strengthen as you see fit. I cannot say how you might live. I can only say that if you live in accordance with the principles of God and Americanism your freedom will remain unsullied.

Though there are those who will tell you that the future is dark and foreboding, that all of life is but a struggle in a somber sea of futility, I say to you that you must turn your eyes upon the world of the future, and I say to you that the future of the world shall not be the dark and wearisome way.

For upon the ashes of this great wave of human error and destruction, there shall be built a world more fine, more perfect, and more inspiring than the minds and hands of humanity have ever before devised.

There shall be built upon the ashes of war an era of peace and human calm that surpasseth all understanding.

There shall be built upon the blood and suffering of death a way of life more full and more gentle than the bravest hopes of any man.

There shall be built upon the plunder and grief of fell destruction a progress more powerful, more sustained, and more enduring than the memory of man.

This world of the future shall be your world. You and your generation shall carry the banner of human progress to the highest pinnacle that civilization has ever known.

For all that flows from this war shall not be base and evil. Out of the harrowing experiences of this struggle will come discoveries, attainments, and methods which will rebuild our lives in a world of peace.

Already, in the field of medicine, men who would have died but a few short years ago from similar wounds, are now being snatched from the very jaws of death by the new wonder drugs, penicillin and the sulfa derivatives, by blood plasma, and by improved surgical methods.

No man can say what vast achievements lie before us in our eternal struggle against the ravages of time and disease. No man can foretell how many years of worth and comfort we can add to the lives of men.

The amazing mechanical, electronic, and scientific developments which have come in the wake of this war will, even as they have dealt death in the hour of battle, enrich life in the hour of peace.

In almost every field of human activity, in housing, education, transportation, in agriculture, radio, and in the thousands of other activities, both established and yet to be established, there will come great improvements in the lives of men and boundless opportunities for the attainment and advancement of all men with the courage and determination to labor and to serve.

Each generation has produced outstanding men. In my span of years I have seen the humble and rudimentary works of such courageous and determined men as Edison and Ford and Westinghouse ultimately lighten the burden of mankind and endear their names to the world.

It shall be so with you. You who labor to improve the lot of your fellow men will be met with the forces of doubt, derision, and skepticism. But those of you who are worthy will not falter.

The paths of progress will open up to you, and all men will be grateful for the labors you performed in their behalf.

If past generations have produced great men in America, if past generations have produced talented artists, able industrialists, profound scholars, sincere humanitarians, and masterful public servants, this generation and the generations to come will pro-

duce men of deeper courage, of greater ability, and of higher attainments than have been produced by any previous generation in the history of the world.

So, as one who has watched the development of civilization for more than half a century, I say to you, "Look to the future, for the past serves only to inspire you to the great accomplishments which you will realize in the days of your years."

But even the glorious past of this great Nation will pale in the light of your achievements; for upon the base of their effort you will erect the structure of life, and peace, and progress, which was envisioned by the God of our fathers when He placed His handiwork of men upon this earth.

"Weep not for the vanished ages,
With their great, heroic men,
Who live on history's pages
Or dwell in the poet's pen.

"For the grandest times are before us,
And the world is yet to see
The noblest worth of this great earth
In the men that are to be."

During the approaching week, we in America will commemorate the one hundred and sixty-seventh anniversary of the Stars and Stripes.

All of you have learned to honor our flag and to respect those enduring principles of justice, peace, and liberty, which it symbolizes. I know that you will keep faith with this Nation and its flag. I know that you will never permit this flag to be used as a symbol of conquest or as an instrument to dominate and control the world. For you know and I know that if we permit our flag to be used as an instrument of oppression, its honor and its glory will be forever lost.

You have been taught to cherish freedom. And if you would preserve the freedom, sovereignty and independence of this great Nation, you will hold true to this flag and its principles, and you will never abandon the Stars and Stripes for any other flag, no matter by what name or what description it may be called.

As you go forward into the progress of the future, hold this flag of America high and ever before you. And may it ever be, down through all the centuries of time, that when men inquire after our flag, they will always be met by this same stirring answer: "'Tis the Star Spangled Banner and long will it wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Free Enterprise: What It Means to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor:

[From the American Federationist of June 1943]

FREE ENTERPRISE—WHAT IT MEANS TO LABOR

(By George Meany)

In hundreds of advertisements, in speeches on the platform and over the radio, and through all the other instruments of twentieth century publicity, America's major industrial firms and the spokesmen for organized business have unceasingly exhorted the people of this country during the past few years to preserve free enterprise.

In view of all these clarion calls, it may be assumed that many of our leading businessmen entertain some fear that the continuance of free enterprise in the United States is seriously threatened and that public opinion must accordingly be mobilized for the defense of our economic system against those who wish to see it emasculated or abandoned.

To businessmen who have such apprehensions it will be comforting to learn that free enterprise—genuine free enterprise—enjoys the firm support of the American Federation of Labor and its millions of members. We are convinced beyond doubt that the American way of life holds more possibilities for the good of all the people than any other way.

As is the case with many other terms that are widely used in present-day discussion, free enterprise is variously understood and variously defined. Notably, the concept of free enterprise held by many businessmen does not coincide in all particulars with that of wage-earning people.

Thus, at least some businessmen still regard free enterprise as a system under which those who own a business must have the absolute and unquestioned right to do exactly as they please, with no concern or responsibility for the public interest or the well-being of their employees.

Under their feudalistic conception of free enterprise, it is not only proper but virtually mandatory to resist unionization and collective bargaining. As they see free enterprise, it means freedom to use industrial spies, tear gas and firearms to block the organization of workers.

Businessmen clinging to an outdated, unreconstructed idea of free enterprise regard as utter nonsense the suggestion that free enterprise, if it is to continue, must provide jobs for all after the end of the war.

We know, however, that there are large numbers of businessmen today to whom the old concept of free enterprise is repugnant, at least in part. Nevertheless, there can be no question that the old-school notion of what free enterprise means is still cherished by a very substantial body of employers.

Organized labor asserts its support of a system of free enterprise. This, it should be noted, is quite different from pledging adherence to the system of free enterprise.

SELF-SEEKING SYSTEM NOT BACKED

America's wage earners do not support any system of free enterprise; specifically, they do not support a blind and self-seeking system of free enterprise.

With the cry "Preserve free enterprise" filling the air, it is not inappropriate to examine recent economic history to see whether real free enterprise has been the prevailing condition. If we make even a casual review of the last 20 years we discover altogether too many businesses that have been neither free nor enterprising, in the best sense of those words.

During the boom years of the roaring twenties, American business rode rather high. Occasionally it rode wild, and when it rode wild it rode very handsome indeed.

And then, in 1929, the bubble burst. What happened? Was our so-called system of free enterprise equal to the challenge? Did it display any real enterprise? The answer is history. Instead of enterprise, business treated the Nation to a show of cowardice and shortsightedness. After 1929, with the unemployed numbered in the millions and misery ravaging the land, we came very near to the end of our system of free enterprise, and with it our entire system of private property and representative democracy. For that debacle, business must bear the brunt of the blame.

Aided by governmental shots in the arm, the free enterprise system did somewhat better by the American people between 1933 and 1939 than it had done in the preceding 3 years, when business was wholly on its own. Yet even with the help of governmental pump priming, our free-enterprise system did not end mass unemployment.

Today, with our country serving as the arsenal for the Allied Nations and American industry saturated with Government contracts, unemployment has finally been removed. But is there any warrant for claiming for the free enterprise system a major share of the credit or, for that matter, any credit at all for this belated attainment of full employment?

How much enterprise is a manufacturer called upon to manifest to keep his plant humming when the customer, the Government, obligingly comes to him and shoves a mass of million-dollar contracts at him?

Notwithstanding all the shouting of the full-page advertisements in magazines and newspapers, it seems clear that, in view of the tremendous role played by Government expenditures during these past few years of war, the provision of jobs for all cannot be accurately called an achievement of our free enterprise system. One cannot hide the plain fact that it was not until war came and our Government began to pour billions of dollars into our economy that widespread unemployment, which had persisted for a decade, was finally erased.

When American labor states that it endorses and supports a free economic system, it is expressing its preference for a system that is truly free as against one where the economic life is directed by an all-powerful state. Labor is opposed to State control of the economy. But let no one jump to the conclusion that, since labor opposes State control, it is willing to have private individuals and concerns twist, hobble and rig the economy in defiance of true free enterprise. Totalitarian governmental control is repugnant, but so, too, is private monopolistic control. Industrial combinations so mighty that they can compel the consumer to pay whatever prices they choose to set are not representative of free enterprise as labor understands the term.

What then does free enterprise mean to labor?

Free enterprise, as labor understands it, must be a system which, while based on the profit motive, recognizes and fulfills its responsibility to provide workers with jobs, and does this not out of any altruistic impulse but out of an appreciation that full employment is essential to prosperity.

A truly American system of free enterprise must be based on fair trade practices and upon honest dealing and fair value. As American labor understands it, free enterprise does not admit the use of sham advertising, tie-in sales and unfair combinations in restraint of trade.

The American worker believes that he has an important place in the system of free enterprise. He believes in capitalism and he believes in private property, and he wants to have some of it. He looks to free enterprise to enable him, through work, to secure the good things of life for himself and his family. He expects free enterprise to make it possible for him to accumulate a reserve sufficient to provide him and his dependents with reasonable security.

To labor, free enterprise means a system in which free labor and the workers' right to join together for their economic betterment are accepted without question, a system in which bona fide collective bargaining is recognized as an essential element, a system in which the oppressive practices exposed by the La Follette committee are beyond the pale.

To labor, free enterprise is a system that protects and improves the national wage structure, thereby protecting the national

purchasing power. American industry's best customer in post-war days will be the American people. What they can afford to buy will depend on whether they, as producers, are paid a really fair share for their services.

More than this, free enterprise in the future must conserve its assets, including its human assets. No responsible corporation fails to provide for upkeep and replacement of machines. But, generally speaking, few corporations make any provision for maintenance and depreciation costs of manpower.

What is politely termed "an efficiency expert," we of labor learned, is usually the fellow who could get the most work out of the personnel in the shortest time—and then escape paying for the damage.

That is not free enterprise. Our Nation cannot afford to waste its resources, human or material. Genuine free enterprise would adopt a conservation policy for both.

It is time for labor and business to get together and work out the ways and means of keeping our tremendous economic machinery working at full capacity in post-war days. We know that production power and purchasing power sustain and revitalize each other. We can gear our economic machine to balance these two powers.

It is a tough job, but it is a job that has to be done. And we of the American Federation of Labor stand ready to help.

When the war is won our millions of ex-servicemen and demobilized war workers will need employment. Then will come the real test for the free-enterprise system.

If the end of the war is followed by any extended period of mass unemployment, then free enterprise will have failed. American labor, as represented by the American Federation of Labor, is ready and willing to cooperate to the fullest extent with business and Government to the end that this does not happen. The same type of cooperation that has made America really the arsenal of democracy during these days of war can make America a citadel of better living in the days of peace.

Platform Issues—Articles by Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, without being captious, I have scanned through the RECORD, but have not found that the articles of Mr. Willkie have been inserted by anyone in the Appendix of the RECORD. I think they should be inserted, and therefore I request unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Willkie appearing on the 14th of June and the one appearing on the 15th of June be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 14, 1944]

PLATFORM ISSUES

(By Wendell Willkie)

SOCIAL SECURITY

(In the third article of his series about national issues confronting the platform drafters of the Republican Party, Wendell Willkie discusses social security. On the eve of the G. O. P. national convention in Chicago, Mr. Willkie was asked by a number of newspapers to express his views about what he considers the major issues of the coming Presidential campaign. His articles were made available for general distribution to the American press.)

A free economy, by its nature, entails a certain amount of fluctuation and risk. As a matter of fact, much of its strength and its very freedoms are directly related to its risks. But one cannot enjoy the freedoms of such a society without a minimum of economic security. Therefore the risks must be spread sufficiently to guarantee that all members of society are protected against the final economic disaster of going without the bare necessities of life. This is the function of the social insurances.

We have too often been led to regard the social insurances as the opposite rather than the supplement of our enterprise system. We have been presented with them as alternatives. Do you want security or initiative? Do you want protection or adventure?

This is a factitious issue. We need both. Indeed we cannot have one without the other. We cannot have security in terms of an advancing standard of living without enterprise. We cannot have the initiative and energy we need for an expanding economy without preserving and increasing the vigor of our human resources.

Our present social-security laws are inadequate for this purpose. The proposed Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill contains some of the essentials of an inclusive social-security program. But unfortunately it is in many respects poorly conceived and perpetuates the inequities of the present law. Taxes still fall most heavily upon the lowest-paid workers, while benefits are largest to the most highly paid. Coverage is still incomplete and eligibility rules are complicated.

Need knows no rules of eligibility or coverage. Protection against old age, illness, and economic misfortune must be a right for everyone. Benefits must be adequate to provide a minimum sustenance in health and decency, regardless of a man's previous earnings. This is important not alone to the individual, but to assure the relative stability of our consumer industries and agricultural production and well-being of our whole society.

Complete medical care should be available to all. But any plan adopted today should be sufficiently flexible to allow for experimentation and growth, and in any program of public medicine the value of the practicing physician's relationship to his patient must be recognized. Adequate provision must be made for building facilities where none now exist, for developing health and diagnostic centers, and for funds for research and medical education.

Another form of insurance that is of outstanding importance for the relatively stable functioning of our free economy is an adequate and uniform system of Federal unemployment insurance. Today we have 51 separate laws governing unemployment compensation. Our economy is too interdependent to allow this division of responsibility to continue. The present tax-collection machinery, Federal for some insurances, State for others, with duplication of records, is wasteful, costly and time consuming. And benefit rates vary widely and are inadequate.

The post-war reconversion strain will fall unevenly on the States. In this crucial period we shall need the stabilizing influence of uniform standards and procedures, and of adequate benefits fixed not according to former wages but on the basis of a regional cost of living, to cover bare necessities.

For a long time our society left the education of children to the individual parent's ability to pay. Then it made a decision which changed civilization. It decided that all children should be educated, regardless of their parents' income.

We are now faced with another decision as logical and as necessary, about which we must begin to think. We have left the feeding, clothing, shelter, and medical care of our children to be determined by their parents' income alone. It hasn't worked and can never work, for a man whose skills may permit him to earn only the minimum wage may have five or six children to rear on that wage. No wage or income based upon the value of the economic contribution of the individual can ever be made to take into proper consideration the needs of his dependents.

The children of America are the future of America. The principles of self-preservation, no less than those of humanity, demand that we place squarely on society the responsibility of making the citizens of tomorrow healthy, energetic, and educated. We should begin the moment the war is over to see that every child in America grows up with the basic necessities of education, good food, adequate clothing, medical care, and a decent home.

We, whose faith is in a freely competitive society, have the special obligation of seeing that all start fair, physically and mentally, as well equipped for the race as their natural endowment permits.

There is nothing new in providing men with minimum protection. When our society was predominantly agricultural Abraham Lincoln's homestead laws offered to the people of the United States what was then necessary protection—land and a change to build a home. Today when our society is predominantly industrial, the formulas must change. And all the resolutions for the preservation of the enterprise system will not do one fraction as much to preserve it as the assurance to men and women of the protections which they are rightfully demanding, protections which are basic to their time.

The Republican Party should see to it that they get them.

[From the Washington Post of June 15, 1944]

PLATFORM ISSUES

(By Wendell Willkie)

POST-WAR ECONOMY

IV

The American people believe in a life of enterprise and expansion by individual initiative. But all the talk of a return to free enterprise and private initiative is merely an expression of feeling; not a solution of problems. We are not going to return to anything. We must never go backward. We must press on—on to the days of demobilization and the complex economic problems they will bring.

The profound nature of the changes we must face is evident in the trend of affairs in Europe, Russia, with whom we are destined to have progressively closer economic relations, is a completely state-controlled economy. The aftermath of war will see a tremendous rise in western Europe of state ownership of resources and industries, what we call state socialism. The problem is well illustrated in the question of what is to become of the big industries of France, which the Germans have taken from their former private owners. It is likely that a large portion of this French production will become state-owned.

The trend in Great Britain is becoming increasingly clear. Lord Woolton has just rendered an official report for the British Conservative Party which would take Great Britain far along the path of government control of industry.

The plain facts are that Europe and Great Britain are moving as they are in economic thinking because of an insistent demand

on the part of those millions of men who labor but do not direct. They demand that they shall be protected against the hazards and unpredictable destruction of human values involved in the violent fluctuations of modern industrial life.

We are facing the same situation here in the United States. And the full employment which has been created by war will make the demand for protection against post-war unemployment increasingly insistent. Already, looking to the future, men are asking: Must we have war to have jobs?

There is no doubt that the pressure of State-controlled economies in all of the countries with which we must trade and live will in multiple, intricate, and subtle ways inevitably affect our own society. But because of our youth as a nation, our great geographical area, our natural resources, together with the enormous potency of our belief in the possibilities of the individual, our answer to the problems of demobilization will not be the complete controls of Russia or even the elaborate controls suggested for Great Britain. Despite the pressure from without and the demands from within, we have an opportunity for a different answer. But only if we recognize the basic causes of unemployment and act with boldness and imagination to overcome them.

Industry, labor, and government—local, State, Federal—should set up a cooperative mechanism which will act as a clearing house for information and constructive programs. Through such a mechanism capital goods expenditures, such as the building of roads, public works, industrial plants, so important a factor in the wide fluctuations of our economic cycle, can be spread and leveled over the years. Plant location and appropriate housing can be rationalized to the end that congestion and distortion in our economic system may be prevented.

But we must be realistic enough to acknowledge that the best efforts of private industry, even supplemented by such intelligent cooperation will not always be enough. In addition the Federal Government must exercise a countercyclical influence against depression in order to preserve a reasonably high level of employment.

Some of the obviously necessary measures to this end are: Direction of the capital market to encourage a flow of new capital when depression threatens and to discourage it in the face of a boom; the undertaking of legitimate Government projects at Government expense, but by private contract, the moment depression sets in, projects, for instance, that will improve the health and welfare of the people, create new markets, new purchasing power; broad social insurances which will both protect the individual and help to stabilize consumer industries and agriculture.

But our basic answer to the problems of a demobilization economy, and one for which we are peculiarly fitted by temperament and natural circumstances, lies in our great productive ability. Our industry has performed a miracle of production in the goods of war. It waits eagerly to perform the same miracle in the goods of peace. The new automobiles, the new houses, new planes, new plastics, television, new uses for farm corps, new discoveries born of war research, all clamor to be developed. And the markets of the world will be waiting for them—that is if we do our full part to help stabilize the world.

If our industry, however, is to develop its possibilities of post-war production to the best advantage of all, it must have certain releases and certain safeguards. Capital is necessary—risk capital that is ready to take a chance on the future. Because we have failed while we fight to pay for the war to the full extent of our abilitiy through an adequate tax program, it is going to be impossible to have any early general reduction of taxes when the war is over. But there should be a drastic revision of the tax laws to encourage risk capital for new investment and new ventures.

Also, in order that industry may function venturesomely, new and effective methods must be found for counteracting and controlling the tendency toward monopoly and monopolistic prices. They are the Trojan horse of the free enterprise system and in essence a protective device by men and industries who want to escape the hazards and penalties which are the counterpart of the opportunities the system offers.

Under such releases, under such safeguards, our genius for production will go a long way toward solving the problems of a demobilization economy. There will be employment; there will be good wages; there will be goods to buy. There will be better living for all.

Add to this Government's part in the picture and the sincere cooperation of industry, labor, and Government to distribute the strains, and you have the American answer to the problem of a demobilization economy.

The Republican Party cannot meet the need of the post-war period by merely passing resolutions in favor of "free enterprise." It must realize the inevitability and the justness of the people's demand for both protection and opportunity, and it must find the answers, answers which exist uniquely within a responsible enterprise system.

Congressional Power To Void Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Irving Brant, constitutional historian, to the New York Times. The letter demonstrates the impracticability of a constitutional amendment, but reinforces the constitutional basis for an act of Congress voiding the poll tax.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO AMENDMENT NEEDED—CONGRESS HELD TO POSSESS POWER TO VOID POLL TAX

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your belief, expressed editorially, that the poll tax can easily be eliminated from Federal elections by a constitutional amendment, seems to me overoptimistic and based on needless uncertainty as to the power of Congress.

To act by legislation it is necessary to defeat the Senate filibuster by a two-thirds vote to limit debate and then pass the bill by a simple majority.

To act by constitutional amendment it is necessary to defeat a Senate filibuster by a two-thirds vote to limit debate, then obtain a two-thirds majority in both houses of Congress, and after that secure ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

A filibuster against an amendment is just as certain as against a bill and as certain to succeed unless stopped by the same weapon—cloture. Aside from the red herring of unconstitutionality, every argument advanced against cloture during the poll-tax debate, and still more the secret reasons operating against it would be just as potent to prevent limitation of debate on a constitutional amendment. Republican Senators who sabotaged the anti-poll-tax bill by voting against cloture, and then made a bid for support of the anti-poll-tax people by offering a constitutional amendment, would have the same reason to sabotage the amendment by failing to end a filibuster against it—the partisan advantage of seeing northern and southern Democrats arrayed against each other and the latter rousing several million voters to anger by their conduct.

AN EXAMPLE CITED

Suppose it should be submitted. Before we assume that ratification of so salutary an amendment is certain, let us remember what happened to the child-labor amendment, doomed by a false invocation of religious prejudice. The theory that all except the eight poll-tax States would promptly ratify the amendment takes no account of the fictitious scare already raised in New Mexico and other States about the possible effect upon Indians not taxed, nor of the historic hostility of Vermont to all Federal controls, nor of the vested interest which Republican States have in prolonging a cause of turmoil in the Democratic Party, to say nothing of perpetuating a Southern Democratic appendage to the Republican Party in Congress.

But why an amendment? Why amend the Constitution to give Congress power which it almost certainly possesses now? Surely when such authorities on constitutional law as Professors Hamilton, Borchard, and McDougall of the Yale Law School; Dean Garrison of the University of Wisconsin Law School; Dean Katz of the Chicago University Law School; Dean Greene of Northwestern and Dean Wettach of North Carolina, all agree that the anti-poll-tax bill is constitutional, there need be little hesitancy in letting the Supreme Court decide whether it is or not.

ANTIS OBFUSCATED

I have followed the debate on the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill rather closely, and was myself a witness on the subject before the Senate Judiciary Committee, chiefly on historical phases. It appears to me that the arguments of the antis in Congress have been largely obfuscation, while on the radio they have consisted of unfounded dogmatic assertions. But the defenders of its constitutionality have been no less at fault in failing to put their case clearly and understandingly before the public.

I would not ask for the space needed to cover this issue, with all its ramifications into the relationship of republican government to majority government, the power of the National Government to preserve itself from debauched elections, and the rights of citizens. Little space is needed, however, to clarify one important aspect of it—the indicated attitude of the Supreme Court.

The statement has been made over and over that the Supreme Court has denied the power of Congress to outlaw the poll-tax restriction. That is not true. The court in two cases (*Breedlove* v. *Suttles*, and, by refusing certiorari, *Pirtle* v. *Brown*) has declined to strike down the poll tax by judicial edict, without an act of Congress. It has never denied the power of Congress to do so.

CONGPESS POWER UPHELD

On the contrary, it has strongly and very recently suggested that Congress has this power—the Court's attitude in that regard representing a return to the general trend of decisions following the Civil War, affirming Federal power, after a movement in the contrary direction beginning with the Newberry case in 1921.

This suggestion of congressional power to deal with the poll tax is found in the 1941 case of *United States* v. *Classic*, a Louisiana election fraud case not involving the poll

tax, but involving the clauses of the Constitution pertinent to it.

Writing the Court's opinion in that case, Chief Justice Stone warned against loose statements concerning the right to vote which he said were to be found in the Breedlove case, *Minor* v. *Happersett*, *United States* v. *Reese*, *and McPherson* v. *Blacker*—the four cases chiefly relied on by the anti-poll-tax forces. He then went on to knock out their whole position by saying that the power of the States under article I, section 2, could be restricted by the power of Congress under section 4 and other clauses. I quote the words of the Chief Justice:

"While in a loose sense the right to vote for Representative in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States, see *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 162, 170); *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 217–8); *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 38–39); *Breedlove* v. *Sutties* (302 U. S. 277, 283), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution, 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.'"

Accept the plain meaning of those words, and the argument that the anti-poll-tax bill is unconstitutional vanishes into thin air. That argument is based entirely on the supposition that section 2 is not limited by section 4 or other clauses, but stands by itself, unaffected by the general power of Congress over elections. The Supreme Court has declared to the contrary.

How is that statement by the Supreme Court answered by those who continue to claim that Congress has no such power? They say that the Chief Justice did not know what he was saying. The usual remark, made by the poll-tax minority of the Judiciary Committee, is that his language was "unfortunate." One Senator told me he had heard that word a dozen times in executive session. It is based on an attempt by the chief anti-poll-tax witness, Attorney General Staples of Virginia, to prove that the Chief Justice did not intend to say what he said.

Quoting the words I have cited from the Classic case, the Virginia attorney general testified (p. 367 of the 1942 hearings): "In using the language italicized, it is obvious that the Chief Justice was not being precise." He then stated that section 4 of article I allows the States to make election regulations which, under the same section, can be altered by Congress.

ARGUMENT CALLED EXTRAORDINARY

He concluded that Chief Justice Stone did not intend to say that section 2 could be restricted by section 4, but that the State powers in section 4 could be restricted by the Federal powers in section 4. This must be the meaning, he said, because the four cases cited by the Chief Justice to support his statement did not refer to section 2, but to section 4.

This is certainly one of the most extraordinary arguments for the unconstitutionality of a bill that has ever been offered to Congress—the argument that the Chief Justice of the United States did not know what he was saying when he wrote one of his most important opinions.

But it is less extraordinary than the evidence offered to support the charge. For in presenting the quotation from the Classic case, Attorney General Staples omitted the four cases cited by Justice Stone in the middle of the sentence—omitted them without even an asterisk—and used instead four other cases (ex parte Yarbrough and others) which followed the quotation. The four cases thus omitted—the four the Chief Justice was talking about—all bore on section 2, not on section 4.

It is by such methods that the fiction has been built up that Congress has no power to legislate on the subject of the poll.

IRVING BRANT.

GATLINBURG, TENN., *May 26, 1944.*

Timid Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Timid Planning Can Botch the Job," from the Chicago Sun of May 24, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIMID PLANNING CAN BOTCH THE JOB

It is time for America to recognize that the job of post-war planning is being botched. In our preoccupation with the coming invasion we cannot forget that this military action, when it comes, will have behind it months of intricate planning. No less important is it to plan now for the shift from war to peace that will begin when Hitler has been conquered.

Ninety days after the Baruch report, and months after agreement had been reached on the necessity for speedy winding up of war contracts, the Senate has just passed a bill establishing procedures for that purpose. The bill is vital. It should have been passed long ago. But it deals with only one segment of the problem: At this rate, how long will it be before the country has a complete program for avoiding post-war depression and making full employment possible?

We are botching the job. Congress is botching it and the administration is botching it. Ever since reaction triumphantly killed off the National Resources Planning Board, we have lacked a dynamic agency devoting full time to over-all economic planning. By default the planning function has devolved upon James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, and Bernard Baruch for the administration; and upon various congressional committees.

The common denominator of these planners is their conservatism. In general, they are men whose bias runs against the kind of bold and unprecedented action that we need. Bewitched by the ancient and discredited trickledown theory of prosperity, their inclination is to aid industrial reconversion through contract termination, loans, etc., and to think that the job is done.

Nothing could be further from the truth. We need not only planning for business, but planning for the people. The post-war job is twofold: First, to bridge the gap in the flow of purchasing power during the transition period; second, to maintain that flow at full flood thereafter. Timid and piecemeal efforts cannot succeed. The situation demands a strong planning agency to establish goals of employment, production and national income, and to advise Congress and the administration on the steps necessary to attain them.

We cannot put 15,000,000 men to work solely by giving business the green light. The industrial machine must have gas in the tank and oil in the crankcase. It is Government's responsibility to see that it runs on all cylinders in peacetime as in war.

Congress Should Receive Airport Survey Information — Development Program Advocated in H. R. 5024

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 5024, which proposes to provide for Federal aid to States and public bodies in the development of public airports. The bill authorizes annual appropriations to be apportioned to the States on the basis of population, registered aircraft, and area. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $100,000,000 for 10 consecutive years. It has for its objectives the development of an adequate national system of public airports to serve aviation in the United States. In addition, it provides for the disposal of surplus war airport properties, so that such airports will be available for use in civil aviation in the post-war period.

The grants of funds would be made to the States on the basis of a formula of the allocation of such funds, and moneys would be matched by the States. The actual construction work will be accomplished through the State construction services under its direction and jurisdiction. Projects selected for development under this program will be in accordance with the national airport development plan.

It is necessary for Congress now to formulate a workable plan for the fullest development of facilities for the operation of aircraft. It is certain that we shall have an unprecedented growth in all types of air travel, especially in the field of private flying. A coordinated program, embracing upwards of 10,000 airports of varying size and utility, will be vital in keeping America the No. 1 transportation nation of the world.

The measure which I have proposed can properly be a pattern from which Congress can direct its study. There may be changes, or improvements, which can be written into legislation before it becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention also to the necessity for an airport survey to be completed for the United States, with a report of the findings made to the Congress. I have been deeply interested in legislation to effect such a result, and on May 10, 1943, I introduced the first measure for this purpose. My bill, H. R. 4250, reintroduced February 23, 1944, is before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I am pleased to

know that the Secretary of Commerce and the Civil Aeronautics Administration favor its passage. It is my hope that the committee will bring to the House legislation for a survey of the need for a system of airports, and I trust this may be accomplished before the anticipated recess or adjournment next week.

New Tricks for an Old Dog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Morgan, from the Boston Sunday Globe of June 4, 1944:

NEW TRICKS FOR AN OLD DOG—REPUBLICANS WILL DECIDE AT THE CHICAGO CONVENTION IN 3 WEEKS WHETHER THEIR PARTY CAN RENEW ITS BOLD YOUTH AND FACE FORWARD OR WILL INSIST ON GOING BACK TO THE "GOOD OLD TIMES"

(By James Morgan)

On the guess that the question of who will be the Republican nominee for President is foreclosed except for the last-minute rush to the Dewey band wagon, there is a brave effort to relieve the monotony by starting a fight for the second place on the ticket. But the customers are not interested. They know full well that a contest for the minor title cannot be magnified into a major bout.

Be reassured that this article is not about the Vice Presidency. Rather it is a warning against our being switched off from the main line onto that sidetrack. If Governor Dewey is to be nominated, and the time for stopping him grows short, the nomination for Vice President will make no difference in the campaign or election. By the record, the odds are 33 to 6 that it will make no difference afterward. The real fight at Chicago 3 weeks hence will not come over the Governor's running mate. It will come, if both sides really mean business, over the platform on which he shall run.

The nationalists, as the pre-Pearl Harbor isolationists have rechristened themselves, will seek solace for their disappointment in Governor Dewey by thrusting under him a foreign policy plank that will throw a monkey wrench into the internationalism he has lately espoused, or by slipping into the plank a few of what Theodore Roosevelt called weasel words. By infiltrating the Committee on Resolutions and the delegations, they will bore from within to undermine the position the Governor took in his New York speech in April, which nipped in the bud their premature ardor for him as a man after their own heart.

G. O. P.'S ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL NATIONALISM

Without a violent convulsion, the Republican Party cannot unequivocally endorse the views Governor Dewey lately has been expressing. It has been the party of conservatism ever since the Civil War disposed of the radical free soil issue that gave it birth. Naturally, the conservative in this country, as in England, is a nationalist, like Mr. Churchill, for instance. Republicans did not oppose the League of Nations because it was sponsored by the Democratic Woodrow Wilson, although that contributed a partisan bitterness to their opposition. Instinctively, they were against it as a challenge to nationalism.

The Republican policy of tariff protection is the economic expression of political nationalism. Following the defeat of the League in 1920, the party all but closed the gate on foreign immigrants, and twice in 10 years it raised higher the walls against foreign imports.

The Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930 set an example which was quickly adopted by other nations. The next year England definitely abandoned free trade, and Canada enacted a higher tariff. The British Empire in its Ottawa agreement of 1932 established an imperial preferential tariff. The strangulation of international trade was nearly complete when the least self-sufficing big nations—Japan, Germany, and Italy—took up arms in a war to wipe out national frontiers and create a new order in Europe and a coprosperity sphere in Asia.

TRYING TO TEACH AN OLD DOG NEW TRICKS

To take an affirmative stand on the overshadowing question of 1944, the Republican Party would have to break with its past as radically as it broke with its antecedent Whiggery, Federalism, and conservatism in 1854, when it was born to challenge the further spread of slavery. For 60 of those 90 years of the party's existence, a struggle has gone on unavailingly to moderate the isolationism of its trade or tariff policy.

Mr. Willkie is the latest leader to attempt a modernization of the party, with results that are fresh in the public memory.

Blaine was the first of the Republicans to raise the banner of reciprocity, and in his table-pounding denunciation of the McKinley bill in a committee room of Congress his plug hat suffered a historic blow from his fist. In due course McKinley himself attempted to call a halt, and in his last speech, the day before he was shot, he said that the time had come for a readjustment of the tariff that would modify our exclusion of certain foreign products from our home market in exchange for the opening of foreign markets to American products. President Taft next sought in vain to turn the party in that direction. Speaking on Lincoln's birthday last year in Lincoln's home town of Springfield, the late Frank Knox asked, "Have we not learned that there can be no enduring political security (from war) without economic cooperation, that trade barriers and economic nationalism spread poverty, not prosperity, that we cannot maintain our standard of living in a world of want?"

The price of international cooperation for peace is international cooperation in commerce. That does not mean free trade. It means no more and no less than the reciprocal removal or lowering of unnecessary barriers and an end to discriminatory tariffs and restrictions that favor some nations at the cost of others. Still far off would be the goal set by Mr. Henry Ford in his recent remark that "The world ought to have a universal currency for a universal economy, with a universal market." But obviously, nations cannot really unite against armed warfare while waging trade wars against one another and leaving the devil to take the hindmost.

EASTPORT FISH, AROOSTOOK POTATOES

Two of our Republican Governors here in New England see the question that imperatively confronts their party. At the Lincoln birthday dinner in Boston of the Middlesex Club last winter, Governor Baldwin, of Connecticut, gave up as dead as a door nail what he said had been the party's greatest issue for many years, the protective tariff. But the Governor lamented that the far-reaching and progressive pronouncements adopted by the Republican conference at Mackinac Island in September seem to have been lost somewhere. Impliedly they were lost by Republicans who still sigh for the good old days, which Mr. Baldwin warned would not return. The party, he insisted must put forth now a program of sound liberalism.

In a New York speech lately, Governor Sewall, of Maine, confessed that the applause which greeted him when he came home from the Mackinac conference quieted down as his constituents got to thinking about lowering tariff barriers on the fish of Eastport and the seed potatoes of Aroostook. This admonished the Governor that it is going to be harder to win the peace than to win the war, and that in the process many politicians are going to risk their necks unless they sell their beliefs to the grass-roots folks. Notwithstanding this international venture is going to be fraught with danger and we may have to do some blind flying, Mr. Sewall's watchwords were "Let's get going."

WILL G. O. P. WALK BACKWARD OR FORWARD?

The need of the hour is for an opposition that will not merely negative whatever the foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration may be, thereby confusing the country with a partisanship full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. Mr. Baruch, our elder statesman, tells us that "when the war is over, no country will be able to improve the well-being of its people without our help," and that we can make the future "what we will it to be."

We can obtain an expression of that will, which the world will heed, if we have an opposition that will champion an affirmative policy. Such a challenge to the administration would force the problem of post-war settlements out of the secret conclaves of diplomacy and bring it into the forum of a Nation-wide debate this summer. That would give an informed public opinion the opportunity to decide the issue and put its mighty power behind the decision.

To do that timely and great service for the country, the Republican Party would have to be reoriented and turned toward the direction in which it started 90 years ago. That would take a stand-up fight at the Chicago convention. * * * and not over the Vice Presidency. Let us keep our eye on that ball and not permit the thimble riggers to distract us from it, or the compromisers fool us with a line of double talk.

"I walk slowly," said Lincoln, "but I never walk backward." Shall his one-time party walk backward in this gravest crisis since its tragic period? If it should, it will not get far, even though its time-servers rode back into power on another Harding landslide of reaction to normalcy.

Address by Hon. Homer Cummings Before Connecticut State Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by former United States Attorney General Homer S. Cummings at

the Democratic State convention held at New Haven, Conn., on May 26, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman Dowe, Senator TRUMAN, ladies, and gentlemen of the convention, I assume with gratitude and, indeed, with pleasure the not unfamiliar task of presiding over a Democratic convention. Never, in the long years of my political activity, have I felt a deeper sense of pride in the achievements of our party than at the present moment. Its long record of devotion to the public interest I shall not pause to review. History will devote many glorious pages to that stirring story.

It is enough to say that I am willing to match the Democratic record under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, with the Republican record during the incumbency of Warren Harding, Calvin Coolidge, and Herbert Hoover—and abide the result.

But now we are confronted by immediate things that cut to the very heart of our life and living. All too long we, as a people, refused to read the handwriting on the wall.

Hitler achieved full power in Germany almost precisely on the day that Franklin D. Roosevelt entered the White House. From that moment these men have been relentless enemies. Their natures were as wide apart as the poles and they represented systems of Government predestined to clash.

During my tenure of office as Attorney General I had occasion to appraise, at first hand, the persistent efforts made by our President, through diplomatic channels and otherwise, to avert the tragedy that ultimately engulfed the world. No one more clearly than Roosevelt grasped the significance of the events that were being put in motion by the psychopaths and criminals of Berlin and Tokyo who had set out to destroy free government and enslave mankind.

No one more often or more earnestly warned the people of the dangers that beset them or took timelier action to prepare for the ghastly drama that was about to be enacted.

In this program he was constantly hampered by the unthinking and the unwise. He was called a warmonger and an alarmist and was charged with seeking to establish a dictatorship.

He took his political life in his hands when, on the eve of election, he made his declaration for conscription of our sons for military training when war seemed to the average person neither imminent nor threatening.

He constantly struggled against that torpid indifference which had brought us to the verge of disaster.

Patiently he built up the good-neighbor policy which has brought rich dividends in our hour of trial.

The Lend-Lease Act was his brain child and was signed when Great Britain stood alone against a triumphant Germany.

The smaller countries had been swallowed up and France lay helpless at the feet of Hitler.

The Lend-Lease Act was a master stroke of statesmanship. Had Germany crushed Great Britain and completed its mastery of Europe we would inevitably have felt the bite of war here on our own soil.

But Britain held on grimly—and we got ready. We let England have the materials of war. How well I remember the outcry in September 1940 when the 50 destroyers were transferred to Great Britain in exchange for 99-year leases on naval and aircraft bases. But Roosevelt was right. He was engaged in the mighty business of saving America.

It was not until Pearl Harbor that our people became fully aware of the true nature of the world struggle and realized that the days of doubt and debate were over at last.

A vast army was built up. Our Navy is now the largest and most powerful in the history of the world. Our factories were keyed to war production and our Government supplied the funds for new factories. Arms, planes, ships, tanks, munitions, supplies of all kinds, food, clothing, medical equipment, training schools, hospitals—all these things came into being as if my magic.

Never in the history of war have the men who actually wage it been better looked after, better supplied, better officered, better fed, or better led. Someone—someone—someone—has been doing a superb over-all job, that America will be proud of as long as there is a grateful heart to remember. Could it by any possibility be Roosevelt? I leave your own hearts to answer. How stirring have been the events since the mind of America was awakened and the soul of America was on the march. Casablanca, the meetings of Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek; the growing unity among the Allies and the steady push from El Alamein to Cassino. We have driven the enemy back 2,000 miles—from the shadows of the Pyramids, across the desert, across the sea, across Sicily to the heart of Italy. The great paws of the Russian bear are clawing at the backs of the retreating Germans and the monster of all time has been caught in a vise which is squeezing out his life. On the other side of the world the Jap is upon the run everywhere we get in touch with him.

Yes; the war is going well. The soldiers and the sailors and the men of the air are doing their part and will continue to do so through the greatest ordeal that man may know. Are we, safe here at home under untroubled skies, doing our part to support the armed forces and our chosen leaders? Are we striving to secure and promote the unity of our people? Yes and no. There are millions who are doing their duty to the utmost; but there are all too many who seek to breed discord at home and create enmity and distrust amongst our allies.

I hear men bitterly and with intense emotion complaining about taxes, gas and food rationing, price control, priorities, the inconvenience of railroad travel, and other minor discomforts and petty annoyances when, as a matter of fact, we are the most secure, the best fed, the best clothed, and the most comfortable people on earth. I see those who wish to profit unfairly from war conditions. I see those who wish to capitalize discontent and racial prejudice. I see those who never in their hearts wanted to win the war.

This, I say, is not the America I love. There is a greater and better America, fitted for high adventure, endowed with great courage, and moved by the finer things of the spirit.

That is the America that must finish the war we are in and make certain of enduring peace.

We must highly resolve that never again shall a Hitler or a Hirohito "get the start of the majestic world" or have the power to force our youth to risk their lives and torture their bodies in the ghastly business of war in order that liberty may not perish from the earth.

The difficulties, of course, are enormous. The danger lies in a loss of faith or the sheer lassitude following victory or the bedevilments of politics or a thousand disorganizing factors that tend to destroy the inner unity of our people.

After the present conflict comes to an end, we shall secure international peace, supported without flinching by all free, peace-loving people—or we shall revert to chaos and, after a period of drifting, slip once more into the abyss.

A third world war is both unthinkable and possible, and that is not a contradiction of terms.

Nor can we have settled peace, based upon the principles of freedom and good faith, unless we prepare for it, think about it, work for it, get ready for it, struggle for it and, as a united Nation, demand it.

We here in America must take no chances with this serious business.

This is no time for amateurs.

Who is to represent us at the peace table? Churchill will be there and Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek—all strong, skillful, and able. Who will be the fourth? It would be madness for our Nation to choose any man except the one most fully qualified.

He should possess intimate knowledge of world affairs; he should have the respect of world opinion; he should know personally the leading statesmen and diplomats of the principal countries; he should possess high qualities of courage; he should know America and what is due to America; he should have wide experience in public life; he should have the power to persuade; he should possess wisdom and infinite patience, and he should be a lover of peace and justice and humanity.

Who shall fill the fourth place, or perhaps I better say, the first place at the international council table? I know your answer. The same answer comes from the hearts of a vast majority of the people of our country.

We do not ask Roosevelt to accept a renomination on his own account, or on our account, or on account of our party. We do not ask it for any ulterior purpose whatsoever. We ask it because of the desperate needs of the hour which override all lesser considerations.

Two Junes—1940, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Morgan, from the Boston Sunday Globe of June 11, 1944:

TWO JUNES, 1940–1944—ALTHOUGH 4 YEARS HAVE SEEN THE TURNING OF THE TIDE OF WAR, WE ARE ONLY BEGINNING, WITH THE OPENING OF A WESTERN FRONT, THE MOST DIFFICULT OPERATION IN THE RECORD OF WARFARE

(By James Morgan)

Shall we take our bearings today from two Junes 4 years apart and survey the change that has taken place in the tide of war? At the opening of this month in 1940, a routed British Army of more than 335,000 men had just made a headlong flight across the Channel from Dunkirk, leaving behind them nearly all the military equipment their country possessed. The heaviest weapon remaining to the United Kingdom was the voice of Prime Minister Winston Churchill. But his was the voice of 45,000,000 free people. Their one stronghold was in their bare but indomitable breasts when he spoke their determination to carry on the fight from beyond the seas, if their island should be subjugated, and "until in God's good time the new world, with all its power and might, sets forth to the liberation and rescue of the old." Two days after the fourth anniversary of Mr. Churchill's prophecy of the event, the Channel was recrossed, at last, by the navies and armies and airfleets of two worlds under the supreme command of the American General Eisenhower.

BACKDROP OF THE NORMANDY STAGE

History is repeating in reverse a Channel crossing almost nine centuries ago. From the same gentle Normandy coast, whose long beaches the Allies seized last Tuesday, William the Conqueror sailed forth. Near the point of his embarkation, in the village of Dives, is one of the quaintest of inns, bearing his name, and once upon a time its landlord told me that the fire on its great kitchen hearth was kindled before the Conqueror sailed.

On that peninsula, also, our own troops are at a scene where American history was made long before they themselves began making it. The decisive naval engagement of our Civil War was fought off the port of Cherbourg 80 years ago this June when the U. S. S. *Kearsarge* sank the Confederate raider *Alabama*. After the Allied forces shall have taken Cherbourg, some of our boys out for a stroll may chance upon the little cemetery on a hill where some of the dead of the *Kearsarge* lie buried.

Here is a footnote: The last cannon shot from the sinking *Alabama* was fired by a great-uncle of Mrs. Roosevelt, Irvine Stephens Bullock, of Georgia, brother of the mother of President Theodore Roosevelt.

A FLASH BACK

Already, 48 hours before the delivery of Europe from its long nightmare had begun in the north, Rome had been delivered. Her deliverance befell 4 years, lacking a week, from the June day when, in the words of President Roosevelt, the dagger of Italy was stuck into the back of a neighbor. The announcement of that declaration of war on France was made by Count Ciano who, in the unfolding of the tragedy, was to desert the sinking ship of his father-in-law and to crumple before a firing squad by the command of Germany. The King-Emperor, Victor Emmanuel III, in whose name and by whose authority Ciano spoke, was to see his empire swept away, and he, in turn, was to leap from the pirate craft in an ignominious effort to save his kingdom.

Ciano's father-in-law himself is now but a pale shade, "so abject, yet alive," as Byron exclaimed over a truly great man, the fallen Napoleon. I, for one, hope the Allies will have the good sense to restrain their natural impulse to overturn the lofty column on which Mussolini carved his name in the forum which this pinchbeck Caesar erected by the Tiber. Let it be a spared monument to stand as a warning to the Italian people against surrendering to another demogogic adventurer the liberties which their valiant ancestors won in the glorious Risorgemento.

AVE ROMA IMMORTALIS

In the swift movement of great events, no time was left us to mark the significance of the freeing of Rome only a week ago today. We may be sure that the city was not spared by its latest barbarian invader out of what the Declaration of Independence termed "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." Hitler lost Rome in the battles before its gates, where his generals were so outmaneuvered and outfought that his battered armies had no time to lose in fleeing the first Axis capital to fall.

That was one of the best political breaks the Allies have had. For months the allied peoples had watched with dread the tide of this most devastating warfare as it rolled toward the Eternal City, and any share of theirs in its destruction would have weighed heavily on their spirits. When the news flashed through the Sunday air that American and Canadian soldiers had arrived at the Forum virtually unopposed, a wave of infinite relief swept over the Western World. Ave Roma immortalis.

Berlin is only German, as Moscow is Russian and New York American. If London is more than British, she yet belongs only to the English-speaking peoples. Although Paris no longer is the place where all good Americans hope to go when they die, as a Boston wit said in the glittering days of the second empire, and her gayety has become a commercial synthetic, she remains the favorite international playground.

Few are the truly great cities. One is the greatest among them, as she has been through most of the 27 centuries since her shepherds began to expand their sheepfold from the Seven Hills until their flocks were the peoples of many lands. Our civilization still turns in homage to the source from which it received law, government, and church, and hails, "O Rome, my country, city of my soul!"

EVIL SPELL OF 1940 BROKEN IN 1944

June 4 years ago the beasts of the Apocalypse were loose, taking peace from the earth and riding forth conquering and to conquer while they trampled nations under their hooves. It was the English Channel that saved the world, Hitler not daring to cross it in pursuit of the unweaponed British Army fleeing from Dunkerque. With unconquered Britain at his back, and back of her the overwhelming production of America flowing across the Atlantic on lend-lease, he committed the mad folly of attacking Russia 3 years ago this June.

Russia broke the evil spell of the superstition that the Prussian Army was as invincible as it boasted itself. It has not been able to win and hold an objective since the capture of the island of Crete in May 1941. Its every subsequent campaign has failed of its goal. What prestige remains to German generalship is from its skill in getting out of traps and running away. Germany's most renowned field marshal is the world's champion long-distance runner. Generals who know their business keep out of traps, and no army, even though it be led by Rommel, can retreat to victory.

In a moment of weakness, the Nazis stooped to conquer France by the seduction of her faint-hearted and black-hearted, like the aged, bewildered Petain, on the one hand, and the cold-blooded Laval on the other hand. For the collaboration of Vichy, Hitler paid the ruinous price of leaving unoccupied the southern half of the country and also the empire. This was to lose him the great French Fleet at Toulon, which was sunk as, too late, he reached out to take it. Worse still for him, French North Africa was delivered to the Allies for a base from which they freed the Mediterranean and invaded Italy.

A HARD CAMPAIGN ONLY BEGUN

While German military commanders have shown an unexpected lack of imagination and resourcefulness, and their political boss has proved to be more fatuous than we dared to expect, German soldiers are not yet the quitters we expected them to become. Their Nazi fanaticism has changed them from the hands-up, kamerad, kamerad chaps, who surrendered in herds when they found the other war going against them. Their leaders, moreover, in fear of the penalty for their crimes, have reason to be more desperate than the Kaiser's generals were, and they are goading their troops to desperation. The latest evidence of this was the threat of death which the high command made last week for mere infractions of discipline or a sign of cowardice in the ranks.

For whatever reason, the German Army, in its long succession of retreats from lost battles, and the German civilian population, under a rain of fire from the sky, have surprised us with their capacity for taking what has been coming to them. We are about to confront an enemy who, by all appearances thus far, is still tough after three years of rough going in a war he long ago lost the hope of winning.

Our home front must brace itself for some grim news from the battlefront which we are only struggling to establish while we yet have but a foothold on the shores of France. Separated by the most unruly of seas from its bases of supply and reinforcements, and with a great port adequate for receiving and handling them still to be captured, the most difficult campaign in the history of warfare has begun well, but it has no more than begun when this is written.

Veterinarians and Lay Inspectors in the Bureau of Animal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I shall not at this time dwell at great length on the amendment to the Agriculture appropriation bill providing for the upgrading of veterinarians and lay inspectors in the Bureau of Animal Industry. There are, however, a few evident misconceptions about this proposal which I should like to clear up.

In the first place, the provision does not call for increases in salaries—it calls for a just and proper classification of veterinarians and lay assistants in this Federal agency. The Budget Bureau has already approved this reclassification and has requested the additional funds necessary to make the reclassification. The Civil Service Commission has recognized the training of veterinarians and their lay assistants for inspection service in controlling animal diseases and providing healthful meat and meat products for the people of this country. Congress has provided the Classification Act to take care of this group of employees along with others under civil service. But unfairly and unjustly the personnel of the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Meat Inspection Service have not received their proper classification because no appropriation to take care of it has been made. This amendment merely implements action already taken and makes it possible to carry out the reclassification which has already been approved.

In the second place, this unfair treatment of these employees has resulted in a loss of personnel in the Meat Inspection Service at a time when our national health and welfare is making increased demands on the Service. Men have left the Bureau and it has not been possible to recruit new employees at a time when the health of the Nation is dependent upon an efficient Bureau. More millions of food animals are being slaughtered today than ever before in our history. The Army, the Navy, and Federal purchasing agencies are demanding more and more meat. And yet, in the face of such increased demands for the services of these employees, we find that their ranks are being decimated because such employees are not receiving salaries commensurate with the training and ability necessary.

or equal to the salaries and opportunities for advancement to other professional groups in the Federal service. In the third place, 90 percent of the doctors of veterinary medicine now employed in the Bureau are in grade 1, from $2,000 to $2,600, and grade 2, from $2,600 to $3,200. Surely that is not adequate compensation for men who have studied for 5 or 6 years and spent several thousand dollars on their education, and who are engaged in exacting and difficult tasks which require abilities of the highest type. And many of these men in these low classifications have been there for years with no opportunities for advancement. Educational requirements for veterinarians have continued to rise, but there is certainly no inducement for good veterinarians to make civil service in this important agency their life work.

I should like to add that we are speaking now of a Government agency doing work which is vital to the health of the Nation, and I earnestly urge the Members of this House to approve this amendment which means so much to the efficient functioning of an agency charged with controlling disease and inspecting our food.

As Others See Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, just what Americans hope to gain by the incidents commented upon in an editorial from a Philadelphia paper is difficult to understand.

Do not the people know that the repetition of incidents such as those disclosed below but make it more probable that our fighting men, when captured, will be treated with greater cruelty?

The editorial is as follows:

STOP THIS SOUVENIR TRADE IN HUMAN BODIES

A few weeks ago ago many Americans were shocked to find in a national magazine a picture of a young woman with the skull of a Japanese soldier, sent to her as a memento of the South Pacific campaign.

That bit of ghoulishness has its sequel in the reported gift to President Roosevelt, from a Pennsylvania Congressman, of a letter opener made from the forearm of a Jap soldier killed in the Pacific theater. The President is said to have remarked, "There'll be plenty more such gifts."

We hope not.

To treat human bodies as souvenirs, to rob the graves of soldiers killed in battle, and make trophies of their bones is a barbaric practice that cannot be condoned.

We turn in disgust from the debased head hunters, who adorn their bodies with the shrunken skulls of their slain enemies and make ornaments of their bones and teeth.

Are we to imitate that savage desecration of human bodies, just because they happen to have been those of our enemies?

It is not difficult to imagine the outcry in this country if the bones of an American boy killed in Bataan or New Guinea were to be made into toys for Hirohito's children, or if the skulls of our soldier dead were to be exploited as souvenirs exhibited in the streets of Tokyo.

This grisly stuff is made-to-order propaganda for the Japs. It can only horrify people everywhere who give to the bodies of the dead the honor of decent sepulture.

The sending to this country of Japanese bones as war trophies is atrocious. It should be halted at once.

I doubt that any Congressman made any such gift to the President, or that the President made such a reply, and I doubt, too, the story of the young woman and the skull.

I intend to believe that such things just do not happen here in civilized America. The Japs are cruel and savage, but that is no reason why we should imitate them in unnatural desecration of the dead.

Peace Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert an article by the Reverend Dr. John C. Walker, pastor of the Second Congregational Church, Waterbury, Conn., on the subject of Peace Under God.

In the modern world we have had one crisis after another for many years past, but the evidence accumulates that we are rapidly approaching the most decisive of all these crises. There is every confidence that victory will be won on the field of battle, but there is by no means the same expectation that we shall be wise enough to make the just and lasting peace all peoples everywhere so ardently desire.

There is a really surprising measure of agreement with regard to the necessity for building this peace on moral and spiritual foundations. Leaders of all the Christian denominations have spoken for a Christian peace. The Jews ask for a peace in conformity with the laws of God. The six pillars of peace sponsored by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America won widespread approval and the seven principles set forth in the joint statement of Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Protestant leaders likewise met with almost unanimous acceptance. Hundreds of thousands of Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, and other laymen are engaged in writing to the State Department and Members of the Congress calling for peace based on moral and religious principles and a world-wide organization of nations to enforce peace.

In the face of all these definite pronouncements, it is very difficult to understand the timidity and hesitation with which some react to the concrete proposal for bringing spiritual influence directly to bear on peace-making through a religious advisory council composed of acknowledged leaders, lay and clerical, of the recognized faiths of the world, which would have official status and act in a consultative capacity at the peace table and during the discussions and agreements which lead up to the final peace.

So many seem to think that once pronouncements have been made and resolutions passed we can safely leave everything to diplomats and politicians. Can such confidence in the unselfish motives of the gentlemen in question be justified? We wonder why it is accepted in some quarters that there will be experts of all sorts and descriptions at the peace discussions now in process and the final treaty making but that religion and religious leaders must be relegated to the background. If people contend that religious influences should properly be left to the delegates themselves, we wonder if they remember how such spiritually animated men as Woodrow Wilson and Lord Cecil could get nowhere when confronted with the selfish realism of the other delegates at Versailles?

The fear is growing that the third world war is in the making. The most desperate efforts must be made if we are to avert the occurrence of world catastrophe. If God-fearing men and women actually believe what they say about their faith, they must certainly insist that humane, moral, and spiritual ethics prevail at the time of the peace settlement. Is there any hope that, by some shadowy kind of remote control and by bowing out of the picture, they can make their influence felt? Is it not reasonable to suppose that if sound, practical, religious insights are needed to undergird peace settlements, outstanding religious leaders should be available for advice and counsel?

The large and growing number of lay and clerical leaders of all faiths who stand behind the plan for such a religious advisory council or commission as advanced by William Montgomery Bennett, of Woodbury, are determined that this subject shall be kept very much to the fore. It is believed that the people of the churches and men of good will everywhere will support the plan with enthusiasm and see to it that it is put into effect—if only a greater number of responsible leaders in the churches can be brought to the point where they will take a courageous stand demanding implementation of the plan by our Government.

Some people seem to feel that a religious advisory council would get no where as an effective force in peacemaking. To resolve their fears and reassure themselves that the plan is workable, they have only to read the article released by Religious News Service setting forth the startling accomplishments of the legislative committee of the New York State Council of Churches, which for 7 years has been functioning at Albany. Composed of six clergymen, or as many denominations, and four laymen, the committee works closely with the Governor, State officials, and the lawmakers, seeking to influence legislation solely by education and moral suasion, on bills affecting the life of the church in the State, social problems, child welfare, child labor, gambling, liquor, and the general social well-being of all citizens. The Albany committee has successfully done on a State-wide basis what the proposed religious advisory commission would accomplish with equal success on an international basis.

The Protestant Episcopal Church has officially called on the President of the United States and the State Department to make effective arrangements for bringing Christian principles into the peace through representation by leaders of the recognized churches of America; that church has also certified the proposal to the World Council of Churches by means of a resolution at its general convention "requesting the World Council to take such steps as may be necessary to insure that Christian principles are brought to bear upon any peace settlement." It is hoped that other religious organizations will soon take like action.

Unlike conditions on previous occasions, peace plans arrangements are now being talked over by representatives of governments

and are being gradually evolved and negotiated so that pretty concrete decisions will have been reached when hostilities cease. For that reason it is imperative that, to be effective, a special religious, advisory council should be set up now—not at war's end. Let all speak out boldly demanding a voice for religion in seeking the basis for a righteous, just, and lasting world peace. Should not the church of God speak bravely and clearly in these days? Is not the church the ambassador of peace, the representative of the Prince of Peace?

What Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, how far we have traveled along the road toward tyranny is disclosed by Westbrook Pegler in the following editorial. Read it and ponder.

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, June 15.—This is mid-June. Two weeks from now, the nominally free male civilians of the United States above the age of 17 will face the proposition of surrendering their freedom for involuntary servitude to private employers and slavery to the unions and the New Deal political party, or going on strike against an absolutely lawless decree issued by Paul McNutt.

After July 1, McNutt has said, any male civilian over 17 who leaves a nonessential job must go into essential work. He can't take another nonessential job. If that job is to be filled at all, it must be taken by a women.

McNutt also has attempted to direct all such workers into the United States Employment Service for placement in essential industries. This U. S. E. S. is an evil growth with which the general public is little acquainted. From its very beginning, it has been as a dragooning service to heard unwilling civilians into the unions. In many places, union agents have occupied chairs in U. S. E. S. offices, supported by the taxpayers, or adjoining premises.

Applicants for war jobs have been required to pay cash on the line to the unioneers for the privilege of helping to win the war on the home front. The U. S. E. S. refers applicants to the unions for clearance with the understanding that if they don't clear by paying initiation fees and dues, or signing promises to pay out of their immediate wages sometimes through the check-off, they won't be hired. In no case is there a guaranty that the applicant will hold his job after he has earned the amount of the shake-down plus an equal amount for himself. There are always more saps coming in and the temptation is strong to lay off those who have been clipped for the union treasury and trim the new suckers.

The U. S. E. S. also has assumed the power to order independent employers to hire whomsoever it sends them, regardless of the applicant's competence or character or the employer's judgment of his or her personal fitness. The individual is not a person but a unit, or number, a case on file.

A dirty person, even a prostitute may be referred to a company engaged in packing food for package lunches in a war plant, and must be accepted. The U. S. E. S. is especially stern if the dirty person or prostitute is a member of a "minority group." If a business has a practice of employing Negroes to run its elevators and asks for a Negro to fill a vacancy, the U. S. E. S. will charge the management with racial discrimination against white men and make him accept a white man. Then, if the applicant himself, being a white man, refuses to accept the job, he, in turn, may be condemned for racial prejudice against Negroes, marked "unavailable" on his card and denied all further opportunities to earn his living. For nonessential work is closed to him, and the U. S. E. S. which controls essential hiring has put him on its blacklist.

If a worker, leaving a nonessential job, refuses to take a job deemed to be essential, however inferior the work may be to his intelligence and skill, and however inferior the pay to his usual standards and his unavoidable commitments, he doesn't go to jail, of course; he just goes idle, a man wasted, and broke and hungry until necessity breaks him down or enough other men like him get sore enough to tell McNutt and the unions and the U. S. E. S. to go to hell in a voice loud enough to be heard by President Roosevelt and Congress.

Fair Employment Practice Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am extending a statement made by me before the Labor Committee of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, June 14, 1944, in support of the bill sponsored by me, H. R. 4005, the bill sponsored by Representative DAWSON, of Illinois, H. R. 4004, and the bill sponsored by Representative SCANLON, of Pennsylvania, H. R. 3986, to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission:

Chairman NORTON and members of the committee, I appear here as the sponsor of H. R. 4005, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, and in behalf of that bill and H. R. 3986, introduced by Representative SCANLON, of Pennsylvania, which the committee is presently considering, and H. R. 4004, previously introduced by Representative DAWSON, of Illinois. These bills are, for all practical purposes, similar in their language and similar in their purposes.

The committee has previously had the benefit of much legal, technical, and factual testimony in support of this legislation designed to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission by act of Congress to supplant and give congressional sanction to the principles and purposes which led to the establishment of the present Committee on Fair Employment Practice, heretofore established by Executive Order No. 9346 on May 27, 1943.

I hope that I may be able to bring to the committee certain points of view in connection with this legislation which have not been heretofore presented to the committee, or which, in any event, may constitute an expansion of or a supplementing of ideas and points of view heretofore presented. To my mind, so many arguments could be advanced and elaborated upon in support of this legislation that, considering the necessity for brevity in my present approach to this question, I should like to preface my statement by saying that I am offering at this time the most meager sketch or outline of certain approaches to the questions involved in this legislation, which by no means exhaust my thinking upon the question, but which are primarily offered for the purpose of stimulating thought and discussion by the members of the committee, and possibly by the Members of the House when, as, and if the committee reports any of the bills now pending before it.

I shall, therefore, treat upon but three subdivisions of my fundamental thinking on the questions involved in this legislation: First, the fundamental ethic behind the legislation; second, constitutional approaches to the legislation; and, third, suggested improvements or amendments to the legislation.

I. THE FUNDAMENTAL ETHIC BEHIND THE LEGISLATION

I believe that intellectual honesty and moral courage demand the passage of this legislation and its support by all of the Members of the Congress who profess their belief in the fundamental democratic ethic which underlies the thinking of the citizens of this country and which is the same ethic for the preservation and advancement of which we claim to be fighting this war.

Because in the balance of my remarks on this subject I shall often use the word "democracy" in referring to the ethic, I wish to distinguish my use of the term "democracy" in the ethical sense from the limited use of the term which we customarily use, viz: as descriptive of a form of government. A democracy or a democratic form of government, used in its political sense, I think, has reference only to a form of government in which the people to be governed directly vote and participate in the decisions which are to be made for the purpose of governing their conduct. In other words, the old New England town meetings were pure democracies in a political sense; and used in the political sense, our Government, of course, is not a democracy, but is a republican or representative form of government. Nevertheless, the ethic under which this representative government is to work, and must work, is the democratic ethic, if it is to permit us to develop in America the sort of civilization to which all people of good will in this country inherently aspire.

Democracy then, in this broad sense, is an ethic and a philosophy arising out of Hebraic-Christian thinking and centered upon the belief that man is spiritual and the most dignified being on earth. Democracy in this sense is not capable of being divided or stratified. There is but one democracy, which is a philosophy based upon a complete application of the injunction of Christ, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," which He called the second commandment. And, this commandment and this ethic must be practiced by man exclusively in all fields of man's efforts and endeavors and operations on earth. Thus conceived, it is true that democracy operates and has rules which we must still unfold, discover, and develop in the field of economics and in the field of racial relationships, as well as in the field of political science; but, it is self-evident to me, nevertheless, that there is but one democracy. It is a faith, a hope and an ethic, which requires our unswerving devotion to and practice of a set of principles in every field in which man comes in contact with his fellow man.

If we accept the above concept of democracy as sound, then it follows that the application of this philosophy and ethic in the field of economics demands of us that we believe that nothing shall interfere with a

man's opportunity to occupy any position or hold any job, except his own lack of ability to hold the job or lack of emotional balance or character qualities which permit him to work in conjunction with others harmoniously and without disrupting the work of those with whom he is working and associating himself.

But, it is fundamental that this question of the development of abilities and skills and the development of self-discipline and character qualities is an individual characteristic and that the individual's capacity is neither biologically nor psychologically based upon the color of a man's skin or his racial origin.

It follows, therefore, that any limitations upon any individual's opportunity to hold a job or to make economic advancements which are based upon racial considerations or so-called racial qualities are false limitations which are inconsistent with the democratic ethic as I have defined it, and consequently have no right to exist in a democratic society and civilization.

And, it finally follows that if such limitations exist in a republic, which is operating as a government for the purpose of advancing the democratic ethic, then they are not only contrary to the principles upon which that government is founded and operated, but they are antisocial limitations which it is not only the right, but the obligation and the duty of such a government, operating under such a philosophy, to remove through the enactment of positive and definitive legislation at any time when it clearly appears that these limitations have existed for such a long time and are so firmly entrenched that they cannot be removed except by positive legislative action.

Therefore, since I believe that such limitations exist in our society; that they are false limitations, as measured by the ethic and philosophy in which we, as a people, profess a belief, I must conclude, if I am to be logical, intellectually honest, and morally courageous, that I must support such legislation as is calculated to remove these impediments against full economic opportunity to any member of that society. It is for these reasons that I not only support this legislation, but that I also find it impossible to oppose it.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES TO THE LEGISLATION

In discussing the question of constitutional approaches I shall again divide it into a very broad discussion of inherent constitutional power of the Congress as such and, secondly, present a discussion of my personal thinking upon the obligations which a Member of Congress' oath of office places upon him in casting his vote upon legislation in which it is asserted that constitutional questions are involved.

The many decisions which have been handed down by the Supreme Court in discussing the constitutionality of the Wagner Act, in my opinion, have clearly established the constitutionality of this legislation. In a sense also, the opinions of the Federal Courts, in construing the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act have clearly established that this legislation is drawn to operate in a field in which the Congress clearly has the power to act.

But more than that, the Supreme Court, in upholding the provisions of the Wagner Act, which permits an employee wrongfully discharged for union activities to recover from his employer the difference between the wage which he was receiving at the time he was discharged and the wage which he received or might have received in reasonably similar employment during the time that he was unemployed, establishes a measure of damages which the English common law had previously established as the method of measuring damages for the loss of a comparable property right. For instance, if a tenant breaks his lease before the end of the term, the landlord, under proper pleadings under proper provisions in the lease, is entitled to recover the difference between the rent fixed in the lease and the rent which he actually received or which he might reasonably have received from the same property from another tenant during the unexpired term. This right was given to the landlord because his ownership of real estate was recognized as a form of property. Is it not logical to infer that the measure of damages used in the Wagner Act and the method of measuring damages establishes the proposition that a job is a form of property?

By the same token, the provisions of the Wagner Act which, under certain circumstances, entitle the employee to be reinstated in his job over the protest of the employer is rather analogous to the right of a person in possession of real property to resist wrongful removal by the owner, and likewise, somewhat analogous to the right of replevin by the person entitled to possession in the case of personal property. From which, I think it is again proper to infer that a job or the right of employment in industry or the right to work, if you choose to use that expression, under the rulings of the Supreme Court in construing the Wagner Act has clearly advanced from the concept of a commodity and has reached the dignity of at least a quasi property right in the eyes of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is true that this job cannot yet be sold and transferred and it is not capable of being inherited, which are attributes of things which we have always understood to be property, but nevertheless, it is certainly proper to say that the right to work and the right to hold a job is at least a quasi property right.

If this is true, does it not follow that the Congress fundamentally has the same right to adopt this legislation for the purpose of regulating this quasi property, at least the right to acquire and to hold a job, as fully as it has the right to regulate with reference to those things which we have always recognized as property and which we have always recognized the power of Congress to regulate and control by Federal legislation?

What I am trying to point out is this: That whether many of us realize it or not, the effect of the rulings of the Supreme Court, particularly in upholding the provisions of the Wagner Act, is to take a step forward to the creation of a new concept of property, which is the right to work at a gainful employment; and if the fundamental effects of the Supreme Court decisions are what I believe they are, it must clearly follow that we are proposing, in effect, legislation with reference to property in the bills now under consideration by this commitee.

Again I can only speak for myself with reference to my understanding of my obligations under my own oath of office in voting for legislation in which a constitutional question is involved. I do not believe, particularly with reference to those questions as to which the law of the land is at present in a state of flux, that a man need have a conviction, beyond a reasonable doubt, that legislation is constitutional in order to support such legislation and at the same time not violate his oath of office. I think that he must conclude for himself that there are reasonable grounds to believe that legislation comes within the provisions of the Constitution. In order to reach his reasonable conclusion as to the constitutionality of legislation, he is, of course, not entitled to engage in speculation or wishful thinking, but his conclusions must be based upon and his thinking must be measured by standards which require the exercise of correct and common modes of reasoning in fitting the law into or under the Constitution. However, if a Member of the Congress of the United States concludes by reasoning processes which are neither specious nor speculative, that there is a reasonable ground to believe that legislation is constitutional, then he is entitled to vote for it, upon constitutional grounds, because, under our system of Government, the final determination of that question is left to the Judiciary.

Perhaps I can best explain my thinking by illustrations. I am a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. Under my oath of office as a Member of the Congress, I clearly could not vote for legislation which proposed to establish the Protestant Episcopal Church of America as the compulsory faith to be adhered to by every citizen of the United States. This is true because I could not by any common or accepted modes of reasoning rationalize the constitutionality of such legislation.

On the other hand, I cannot only vote for, but propose legislation such as that now under consideration because I have reason to believe, by the exercise of common and accepted modes of reasoning, that if the Wagner Act is constitutional and the Fair Labor Standards Act is constitutional, that this legislation, in its purposes and its language so clearly parallels those acts, whose constitutionality has already been upheld, that I have reasonable grounds to believe that this legislation is constitutional, even though its constitutionality has not been presented to a court for review—until which time, of course, I can have no positive conviction as to its constitutionality.

I have laid bare my own mental processes with reference to my understanding of the limitations placed upon me by my oath, not gratuitously for the purpose of binding any other member of this committee or of the Congress, but with the thought that perhaps it might establish a standard to which other members of this committee or of the Congress might choose to adhere to. I have no thought of setting out a standard by which anyone else but myself might be judged.

III. SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS OR AMENDMENTS TO THE LEGISLATION

In discussing the third subdivision I shall not point out specific amendments or specific language. However, I think it is proper to point out that the legislation needs tightening, particularly with reference to bringing the Federal Government and its agencies clearly within the provisions of the act so that the Federal Government will be honest with its citizens and clearly demonstrate that it intends to apply the same standards to its own employment practices as it fixes for other employers and labor unions and employee associations.

It also occurs to me that the sanction with reference to Government contracts in Section 13 (b) on page 12 in lines 9 and 10 should certainly be modified to conform with the standards for offenses and penalties fixed in Section 14; namely, that the prohibition against a Government contract should in any event be made to read "not to exceed 5 years" so as to make the sanction flexible and permit the Commission to exercise discretion in imposing these sanctions.

I also want to point out that Section 12 contains a very commendable provision, which is included for the first time in any Federal legislation dealing with the power of commissions to adopt rules and regulations, namely, that the requirement that these regulations be transmitted to the Congress for their consideration and with the right of the Congress to amend or nullify them by appropriate legislation, if it considers them not within the scope of the act or within the

powers delegated to the Commission. The language in its present form is probably not as carefully drawn as it might be in order to guarantee to the Congress this power. However, the act does propose a method by which the Congress can exercise continuing control over the regulations promulgated by commissions and it is clearly a step in the right direction.

The inclusion of this section in this bill of itself is evidence of the good faith of the proponents in advancing it.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, F. S. A. is best measured by the fruit of its own work. I have followed its work in my district for many years. I know its value. Let me cite proof. The following histories are typical examples of the families in Florida who are buying farms with loans from the Farm Security Administration and who are borrowing money to carry on farm operations. These families are repaying their loans, with interest, establishing themselves on the land and helping to swell the Nation's basket of vitally needed war foods.

GEORGE E. HAGLER, JACKSON COUNTY, FLA.

After 1 year on the Farm Security program, George E. Hagler, 46-year-old farmer, route 1, Bascom, Jackson County, Fla., exactly doubled his net worth, was up to date on his F. S. A. operating loan payments, and had made two payments on his F. S. A. farm-ownership loan.

He sold $294 worth of cotton, $601 worth of peanuts, some cows, poultry, butter, and eggs that first season.

Hagler came to the Farm Security office in 1941, asking for operating funds and also applying for a loan to buy a farm in accordance with the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. His net worth was $639. He owned a mule, 4 cows, 4 hogs, and 50 chickens. The family was living in an old log house, only one room of which had a ceiling and glass windows. There were no screens. The other buildings were in very poor condition. Hagler had been farming the same place for 12 years.

As 1942 began, the picture was much different. The current payment on the operating loan had been paid. The equivalent of two annual payments on the farm-ownership loan had been paid. There was capital on hand for the 1942 season. Hagler's net worth had increased to $1,276, and he had 2 mules, 6 cows, 30 hogs, 150 chickens, and machinery valued at $133. He was buying a farm of his own. His land, house, and chattels were worth $5,888, with $3,800 owed on the land and buildings. The family had canned meat, vegetables, and fruit laid by, and a year-round garden in production.

MR. AND MRS. WILLIAM T. MING, JACKSON COUNTY, FLA.

This statement is from the Jackson County Floridian, Marianna, Fla., Friday morning, December 24, 1943:

JACKSON FARMER AND WIFE HONORED BY MARIANNA LIONS—CIVIC LEADERS PAY TRIBUTE TO COUPLE FOR OUTSTANDING ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Honoring the first F. S. A. borrowers in Florida to pay their loan in full, a special program was given at the regular weekly meeting of the Marianna Lions Club at Hotel Chipola Tuesday evening. Honor guests were Mr. and Mrs. William T. Ming, of Union community of Jackson County, who have the distinction of being the first recorded beneficiaries of the F. S. A. tenant purchase loan plan in Florida to pay off their loan in its entirety.

With President Jack Donald presiding, the meeting opened with an almost 100 percent attendance of Marianna Lions, together with a number of distinguished visitors. The principal speaker was R. A. Willis, president of the Bank of Greenwood, who, in commending Mr. and Mrs. Ming for their outstanding accomplishment, said that this was the first meeting of its kind ever held in Florida. During the course of his remarks, it was brought out that Mr. and Mrs. Ming made the purchase of their farm, 180 acres, in September 1938, for which they agreed to pay $3,600. The loan, however, was for $5,900, which included a number of improvements which they contemplated at that time. The financial position of the Ming family at the time of making the loan, was placed at $2,100—today, with all obligations discharged, the farm is estimated to be worth $10,000, and all obligations have been discharged in full. A check with the office of George E. Simmons, county F. S. A. supervisor, verifies these figures.

Distinguished visitors attending the meeting at Hotel Chipola Tuesday evening included W. H. Nobles, president of the Citizens State bank and first State chairman of the tenant purchase committee; W. B. Anderson, member of the first county committee; R. W. Blackshear, State tenant-purchase specialist, Crestview; D. H. Yawn, district F. S. A. supervisor, Marianna; Miss Gertrude McArthur, associate district supervisor, F. S. A.; Jesse P. Day, Jr., assistant county F. S. A. supervisor for Jackson County; Mrs. Edith H. Middlebrooks, associate county F. S. A. supervisor; S. L. Morrow, supervisor, Chipola River soil conservation district; Mrs. Alyne C. Heath, county home demonstration agent; John E. Lambe, former member of the tenant purchase committee; F. M. Golson, chairman, county school board; E. T. Denmark, county school superintendent; and a number of other visitors.

Mr. and Mrs. Ming were warmly commended by all present for their outstanding accomplishment, and local agricultural and civic club leaders expressed their satisfaction that the first and most outstanding accomplishment under the F. S. A. program occurred in Jackson County.

JAMES A. ALLEN, OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLA.

James A. Allen and his family, of Okaloosa County, Fla., owned exactly $1.09 worth of belongings when they applied for help from the Farm Security Administration in 1939. Literally they were "down and out." They had been sharecropping for a number of years. They had no workstock, no cows, no chickens, no tools. Mrs. Allen had been ill for several months and the children were forced to stay out of school to help with the work.

In 1939 the Allens moved to a better farm and got an F. S. A. loan of $776 to buy poultry, a cow, some seed, a brood sow and some feed. They seemed to take a new lease on life. They followed the suggestions of the county F. S. A. supervisor and carried out a diversified farming program, and worked hard. The addition of milk to their diet resulted in better health for the whole family. Mrs. Allen's health improved to the point where the children were able to return to school.

The supervisor brought Mr. Allen and his landlord together and helped them work out a long-term leasing arrangement. The landlord furnished material for repairing the house and barn and for fencing necessary to divide the farm acreage into four fields. Mr. Allen did the work.

In the spring of 1942, the Allens got an additional F. S. A. loan of $291 to increase food-for-freedom production. By the end of 1941, they had repaid $446.89. Whereas they had no hogs at all in 1937, the Allens in 1942 raised 54 head. In addition to cotton, they produce cane and potatoes, raise a big garden each year and market eggs and milk every week. In 1942 they had $385 worth of food in their cellar and had on hand $480 worth of feed.

There are many others like those I have named. We cannot look upon this type of progress and service with indifference. We must continue to provide an opportunity for those thousands of American farm families who are yet reached and encouraged only through the Farm Security Administration.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Committee on Labor:

Mr. DAWSON. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, for one to understand clearly the necessity for such a bill I do think we should have something of the background that caused the appointment of the present Fair Employment Practice Committee. Prior to the war, when business was just beginning to speed up, and when the manpower shortage was first felt and labor became scarce in various industries, efforts were made by advertisements in the papers and by radio and public rallies to cure this situation. But Negroes were not called to work. They went to factories advertising for help and were turned down because they were Negroes.

After Pearl Harbor the situation became even graver. War production went into high gear. Labor was at a scarcity. Women were being called for jobs that women had never done before, even children of school age were urged to work part time because of this manpower shortage. And yet Negroes who

were laborers, Negroes with skill, were turned down—because they were Negroes.

The labor situation got so acute that the war industries and the war movement were being retarded. The President, in his judgment, in order to meet a war situation, in order to cure or seek to cure a glaring wrong, appointed this Committee. Mr. Scanlon has told you that the Committee had no power of subpena; they had no power to compel witnesses to come before them; they had no power to enforce their directives by any action against employers, against unions, or others. Their only powers were those of persuasion. If you could understand and have knowledge of the great work that has been done by this Committee, armed only with the power of persuasion; if you could appreciate how they have gone to the management of various industries and laid the situation before them—the necessities of the country, the fairness and squareness of giving employment to all Americans—if you could see the results that they have gotten in thousands of cases, causing many thousands of men and women to be called into war plants, you would appreciate the great work that has been done in the war effort by this Committee.

But that has not been all—the speeding up of the war work by the committee. I wish I could convey to you something of the psychological attitude of millions of people, citizens of a country, who were denied the right to work simply because of the color of their skin; how they felt in the land of the free; what their attitude would be toward the Government of the country in which they were born, when they saw their boys were being called to the colors, and yet, the mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters of those same boys were denied the right to work, at a time when every industry was advertising for men and women. In some instances industries went so far as to pay bonuses to employees who induced other people to come to work and stay as long as 30 days on the job. A bonus was given to that employee who obtained a new employee, so grave was the situation.

There was great bitterness in this country among 13,000,000 Negro people. We might as well face this situation. Thirteen million people compose one-tenth of the population of this great Nation of ours. What shall be the attitude of America toward those 13,000,000? Are you going to deny to them the opportunities that you proclaim to the world should be given to all men? No. There is not a fair-minded man or woman in this Nation who would not say that such a condition should not obtain. But we do need a lot of education in this country to bring sane, sensible people around to the knowledge that, after all, this question of race is not a thing to be afraid of. This question of difference of color is not a thing to be afraid of. If our Christianity be right; if we believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; if our democracy means what it claims, the embracing of all human beings within its scope; then, for the sake of the Christianity that we claim, we have got to look the matter fairly and squarely in the face and do all we can to alleviate the unjust conditions and unfair problems of any people, regardless of race or origin or creed or religion. Sooner or later, here in this country, we have got to face the question and settle it right for all times in the minds of the people. And there is no better way to begin to face that problem than to assure to every people that they will have the opportunity to work, along with all other peoples in this Nation of ours. The right to work is synonymous with the right to live. Take from me my opportunity to work; deny to me the opportunity to work because of my color, and you deny to me the opportunity to raise a family, you deny to me the opportunity to educate my children, and you deny to me the opportunity to build a home and to acquire those things which, according to all human standards, should be the minimum which any individual should have.

Certainly, in a land as rich and powerful as ours, there is plenty for everyone. The F. E. P. C. is a step to assure to the American public the consummation of a right, not the infliction of a wrong. There is no wrong to be done to any human being within this country by assuring to any other human being the right to work if he or she has the skill and ability. That is not taking anything from any other man—to give to me the thing that I am entitled to as a man—and certainly within the confines of this great Nation of ours, there is enough for everybody, of work, of money, and of opportunity, if we will but lay the foundation for it.

And the F. E. P. C. is seeking to lay the foundation for something that is of vital importance to the ideals of this Nation. You say, "What do we care about it?" I will tell you. If our Nation is to assume its rightful place among the nations of the world as the champion of democracy, if we are to gain their confidence and obtain trade to keep our industries going, we have got to care.

Just the other day I talked to natives from Puerto Rico. One walked into my office. He was surprised to see a Negro sitting in the Congress of the United States, because he had been in a certain section of our country where Negroes are not even permitted the ordinary opportunities that would come to the poorest of human beings in some other countries. He could not understand why white people and colored people could not work together, and live together, and build a great nation together without all this friction and racial bickering among one another. Certainly he could not understand how we could claim that we had a democracy. He said, "You do not have a democracy. You may have a republican form of government, but that is not a democracy. You do not have as much democracy here as we have in our own country."

Then take the countries of South America. If we are going to maintain our friendly relations with them; if we are going to maintain our neighborly policies with them, how can we do that and continue within our own country some of the habits and customs that we have been indulging in in the past? We will be but the laughing stock of the members of those nations when after the war they come to this Nation in ever-increasing numbers and find that even the fundamental human right of the opportunity to work and earn a livelihood is denied to American citizens because of race or national origin. It will destroy the faith and confidence of other nations in the sincerity of the American people. Loss of faith and confidence in us is bound to retard our trade with those nations and thus destroy markets for our industries.

So when we come before you with this bill for a permanent F. E. P. C., we are asking for permission to do a job for national unity. We are asking for a committee to be charged with the responsibility of seeing that every American, regardless of race, creed or color, gets an opportunity to work regardless of what his nationality, origin, race, creed or color may be. That is no more than what our Constitution guarantees us.

If the Constitution guarantees us that in words, and we say in practice we are not getting that result, is it not then the fit and proper thing for the law-making body to do the thing which it thinks and believes will help make that Constitution a living reality?

It is all right to speak of the Constitution as a great document, but a document not based upon human service cannot survive. It will be a short-lived document and not the document that the forefathers intended the Constitution to be, and time has proven that it can be what our forefathers wished it to be, if we but do the thing as lawmakers to shut up the gap, to pass those laws which will put in operation movements that will support the underlying principle of the Constitution.

I have listened to arguments against this committee, most of which were very unreasonable. For instance, some say it is dictatorial. How can any committee be dictatorial that does not have the power of punishment or arbitrary enforcement? How can any committee be dictatorial when the members of that committee must depend upon persuasion in order to achieve objectives?

I have heard others say that the working activities of the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee breed disunity within the Nation. Those who make that claim are the authors of or adherents to the philosophies which make the existence of a Fair Employment Practice Committee a necessity. Men and women who are denied the right to work within the country and who see their sons called to die for the country may have a just cause to be disgruntled, and when the class of those who are so rightfully disgruntled reaches the size of one-tenth of the population of the Nation, then you do have a situation which is bound to engender low morale, which makes for national disunity in time of war. But those who would deny to other citizens the right to work when their Nation is at war, and when manpower is short, and when the very war effort itself is being hindered by lack of workers, and who would resist the efforts of the Government to use every bit of available manpower among its citizens, regardless of race, color, or national origin, are the breeders of national disunity.

I have also heard some say that the majority of those who worked for the F. E. P. C. were Negroes. Yes; the Negroes of America are the largest minority group. They constitute the biggest problem of unemployment, and we must face that. Then, if you are going to endeavor to obtain someone to go out and do this job, what better person could you find than a member of that very group itself? If a Negro can by the powers of persuasion get other Americans to conform to the directives of the F. E. P. C., is there anything dictatorial about it, or is there anything unfair about it?

I am sure that there can never be any fear of anyone armed only with the power of persuasion and who is better fitted to speak for any people than a member of those people? Nobody knows except a Negro what it means to be segregated and discriminated against because of race; what it means to be turned down on a job when you have seen their advertisements for men and women, and then you walk up and ask for a job, and you know how much depends upon a job—you have a family—and then they turn you down because of color.

So, take this problem from any angle you wish and it appears to be a necessary thing, both in wartime, as a member of the War Department said, and also in time of peace, in order to assure fair play to other nations, in order to guarantee to other nations that the "four freedoms" for which we fight will not be empty words, but something that we will live up to. It will be an empty promise to them as long as we deny to those within the confines of our own country the "four freedoms" that we are claiming to be fighting for for other countries.

Therefore, it seems to me that, any way we look at it, this F. E. P. C., both in time of war and in time of peace, is a matter that the Congress of the United States ought to do something about.

The President has set the pace. The results that have been obtained by this present committee, if looked at fairly and seen without bias, will be regarded as one of the great-

est war efforts put forth by any committee during this entire emergency.

Mrs. Chairman and members of the committee, I do hope that this matter will be reported favorably to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. DAWSON. You have made a very fine and clear presentation of your case, and I take it from what you said your interest lies particularly in economic equality; is that right?

Mr. DAWSON. That is right.

Mr. KLEIN. I would like to add this one comment. I agree with the chairman, and we all commend you, Mr. DAWSON, on the fine statement you have made. I agree that the Negroes are today the outstanding victims of economic persecution, but you will admit, I am sure, there are other minorities as well who are also subjected to the same sort of thing.

Mr. DAWSON. I do, sir, but I feel that when the day comes that we are broad enough to encompass the Negro within the confines of the Constitution all other minority problems will be solved.

Mr. KLEIN. I agree with you wholeheartedly. I simply wanted to point out that all other minorities would probably gain from an act such as this. Democracy is just a hollow word if we are going to enforce discrimination such as we have been doing in all parts of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Again, I want to thank you, Mr. DAWSON, for that very clear and fine statement that you have presented to the committee. I think that you have stated your case remarkably well, and we are very grateful to you for it.

Mr. DAWSON. Thank you.

James O. Mullins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of yesterday carried, under large headlines, an Associated Press dispatch from "Aboard a hospital ship off England" detailing the heroic exploits of a young friend of mine, James O. Mullins, of Grundy, Va. Believing that a record of his heroic acts should be preserved among the records of this Republic, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein the Associated Press dispatch to which I have referred.

I extend to the father and mother of James my congratulations on having raised such a cool-headed, fearless, patriotic son, and assure them that the Nation deeply appreciates the valuable service he rendered our country under such hazardous and dangerous circumstances.

The last sentence in the dispatch, "Gosh, I hope my mother doesn't worry," is expressive of the feeling that is deep-seated in all of our soldier boys. They realize, as all thinking people do, that the mothers of America are the ones upon whom war visits the greatest grief and worry. May it please a merciful God, Mrs. Mullins, that worry be not your portion; and under His protecting care may James' life be spared, so that in the not too distant future he may come marching back home in triumph to the hills we all so devoutly love.

EISENHOWER'S LETTER INSPIRES VIRGINIAN TO HEROIC ACTION

ABOARD A HOSPITAL SHIP OFF ENGLAND, June 14.—Pvt. James O. Mullins, of Grundy, Va., has distinguished himself under fire as an acting sergeant to deliver an important message on the beach-head front.

Now wounded—not seriously—Private Mullins said yesterday he was sustained by a phrase from a general letter sent to the armed forces recently by General Eisenhower: "I have confidence in your courage and devotion to duty and skill in battle."

He said he was sorry only because he had lost his own copy of the letter. Here is his story:

"I went in with the first wave of our ground force units. We established a command post and I was assigned to the communications section. We had difficulty maintaining contact with our advance units and finally the line went dead.

DIDN'T BELIEVE HE'D SURVIVE

"I was made an acting sergeant and sent on an important mission 5 miles to the front. I never expected to live through it. At the end of an hour I had reached a small village and slipped into a French shop where I bought sandwiches.

"An old lady refused money, but I left 50 francs on the counter.

"It was after leaving this village that I ran into trouble.

"I remembered General Eisenhower's words in his letter and knew then I just had to keep on moving. I tricked a sniper into disclosing his position by throwing rocks to draw his fire. One shot silenced him."

Private Mullins said that after what seemed hours he finally reached his destination. On his way back he lost his original route and was stopped by machine-gun fire. He went in close and tossed a hand grenade. It silenced the enemy.

The young Virginian said he saw a German shoot at crew members of an American tank. He shot the German and took a pad he had in his hand.

PAD HAD VALUABLE DATA

"The next instant," Private Mullins related, "a shell exploded in front of me. I don't know when, but it must have been hours later I was at the command post. I had lost my watch, billfold, and Eisenhower's letter. I felt pretty bad. A chaplain later told me the pad I had taken from the German had valuable information.

"I went to the beach for medical aid. There a soldier told me that after I left the command post it was hit by a shell and the chaplain was killed. I want another crack at the Germans now. They are not so tough.

"Gosh, I hope my mother doesn't worry."

Valedictory Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a very able and timely valedictory address. The address was delivered by Mr. James Carter, of New Orleans, La., the valedictorian of the class of 1944 of the St. Stanislaus Academy of Bay St. Louis, Miss. Due to the favorable light in which the efforts of this splendid young man were received, and at the request of some interested parties, I submit it for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Carter's address follows:

Reverend fathers, kind teachers, honored parents, gracious friends, and fellow classmates, it has been customary to limit the substance of a valedictory to the more strict sense of the word, that is, a farewell address. Although it is the sincere wish of class 1944 to bid you, our honored teachers and dear friends, a fond adieu, the profound hope that you will hear from us again abides deep in our hearts. Our earnest desire is that our names will not fade into obscurity, but that we shall be able to assume positions in the great world of the future which are worthy of our background and education.

The establishment of peace and the formation of a world capable of retaining that peace are projects which call for many Catholic leaders, men of Christian ideals who are willing to assume the responsibilities entailed in these undertakings. We know that such leadership must come from our ranks, from among the graduates of our Catholic institutions. No one else has been indoctrinated with true Christian ethics and ideals as we have. Consequently, we stand ready to shoulder the burden which lies before us. May God guide our footsteps.

There is no need to elaborate upon the fact that a large number of us will soon be involved in a conflict which none of us had even the smallest share in bringing about. Rather, the duty has fallen upon us to share in the making of a durable peace the like of which the world has not known since the twelfth century. We must face that duty manfully. With modern warfare ever growing more ruinous and terrifying, we can readily understand what disaster would befall civilization, and possibly all mankind, if a third world struggle among nations should ensue. Therefore, our generation must see to it that there will be no third world war. We must set the world on a genuine basis for lasting peace and friendship, or we shall perish with civilization. To realize success in the gigantic task which confronts us we shall need the advice and guidance of all who have seen the present hostilities develop. We have the ideas and the energy but we need your wisdom gained by the experiences of the past 20 years to direct our purposes toward the goal. With these thoughts in mind, we ask you, the present generation of leaders, to give us your help and understanding when our time will come to take over.

Youth has always been noted for its idealism. We have great ideals and visions as to how the world of today might be made into a veritable utopia. Only through your tolerant cooperation and help can we hold any hope for the materialization of these ideals in a practicable way. If we are thwarted and hampered at every turn; if we are told that our dreams are nonsensical fantasies, full of imagination but lacking practicality, we shall soon lose faith and be forced to stand by while civilization prepares another attempt at its own destruction. Ideals of themselves can do nothing. Their fulfillment requires a tremendous amount of effort on the part of both the idealist and his beneficiary. In order to bring about any type of improvement, be it moral, social, economic, or political, full cooperation is needed between groups and individuals, who, though striving toward the same end, have dissenting views as to the methods to be employed. Therefore, we request that you inspire us with the conviction and courage that we shall need to fulfill our pattern for a permanent victory.

Our chosen fields of endeavor are varied indeed. For the present, many of us will have no voice in the selection of a profession and will have to postpone our dreams and ambitions for an indefinite period of time.

But whatever we do, wherever we go, each one of us will always have foremost in his mind the thought that his primary vocation upon earth is the salvation of his own soul. Whether he enter college, the higher life, or the services, he will always remember that no matter what may befall him, his first duty is to obey the commandments of his Creator. Just as the American soldier is about the best trained fighting man in the world, so, too a St. Stanislaus graduate is one of the best-trained fighters to battle the powers of evil. Whether or not he makes use of his training once he enters the battlefields of life with its temptations is a matter which rests entirely in his own hands.

We are proud of our Catholic education because we know that it is our best guaranty of happiness and our most reliable insurance against spiritual harm—the only evil we have any cause to fear. We know that in the indistinct future there will be a multitude of occasions when we will have no other foundation upon which to stand except our Catholic faith. We take joy in the realization that we have been taught to love and cherish that faith so well during our years at St. Stanislaus. Numerous tales have found their way from the battlefronts telling of miraculous conversions on the field of action. Atheists, pagans, and men who had been grossly indifferent to their religious duties, in the face of death suddenly through prayer and the Grace of God came to realize that the only sound philosophy of life upon this earth was that of Jesus Christ. How fortunate we are today prepared for any eventuality by the parents, brothers, and priests who have instructed us in our Catholic faith. We thank God for our faith.

The St. Stanislaus graduating class of 1944 does not sit before you in its entirety. Some of our fellow students did not get the chance to receive their diplomas here today. They knew that their country needed their services, and they left with a smile on their lips but with sorrow in their hearts, to fight that we, and millions like ourselves, might be able to continue our education in peace and security. We pay tribute to our classmates who have gone before us and who are now face to face with the enemy whom we may never be called upon to fight. And so, good friends, class '44, both at home and abroad, bids you au revoir.

C. I. O. Political Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, under leave heretofore granted, I submit copy of a letter written by me to the Attorney General and a copy of his reply:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: You will, of course, recall previous correspondence I have had with you concerning the violations of the Corrupt Practices Act by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and you will doubtless recall that after your letter to me of April 6, in which you stated that you had discovered no violation of the law by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, I wrote you under date of April 7. In reply to that letter, you wrote me under date of April 10, stating that you had directed Mr. G. Maynard Smith of your staff to obtain from me the evidence in my files. Your Mr. Smith called on me on April 11, and I turned the files over to him with the understanding that they would be examined, and further investigation conducted.

A period of 2 months has now elapsed, during which I have received no further communication from you nor any indication that it is the purpose of the Department of Justice to prosecute violators of the Corrupt Practices Act.

As there are rumors that other well-financed minority groups may adopt a similar subterfuge to violate the Corrupt Practices Act on the strength of your previous opinion, it seems to me imperative that an early and decisive opinion in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee case should be had. Otherwise, any group such, for example, as corporations, could adopt a similar subterfuge by setting up a political action committee to which they could contribute large sums of money that would ultimately be used to influence the coming elections. Such a situation would seem to me to be the equivalent of a repeal of the Corrupt Practices Act.

May I earnestly request an immediate answer.

With kind personal regards,
Sincerely yours.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1944.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I have your letter of June 12 with respect to violations of the Corrupt Practices Act by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

The files that you turned over to Mr. G. Maynard Smith, to which you refer, were examined but did not give us any additional information.

For some time Mr. Tom Clark, head of the Criminal Division of the Department, has been engaged in a further investigation not only of this committee but of other organizations engaged in political activities. If any violations of the Federal statutes are shown, prosecutions will follow.

With personal regards, believe me,
Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Bill To Amend the Constitution To Abolish the Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have this day offered a bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution which has for its purpose the abolition of the outworn, useless, cumbersome electoral college.

This contrivance for the indirect election of the President and Vice President must be discarded. Too few people in this country realize that they do not vote directly for President and Vice President and that at the polls in their various States they elect mere automatons, called electors, who are supposed to cast their votes in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the voters in such States.

However, it is possible for these electors to refuse to be mere robots. Under the Constitution, they are not compelled to vote as "instructed" by the popular vote.

Under the practice now obtaining, the voters on election day cast their ballots for Democratic, Republican, or other party electors. They vote for these electors en bloc. There is no voting for individual electors. When a voter goes into a booth, he votes for the entire list of Republican electors or Democratic electors. However, it is possible for Republican or Democratic electors not to carry out the mandate of the voters.

A revolt is brewing in some of the Southern States. Some of the Democratic leaders, notably in Texas, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Louisiana have threatened to have their electors "uninstructed." They want certain planks inserted in the Democratic platform, all providing for so-called white supremacy in the South. They want the restoration of the two-thirds voting rule in the Democratic National Convention. They demand the elimination of WALLACE as the Vice Presidential candidate. They demand the abolition of the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee. They want no more discussion of anti-poll-tax legislation. Unless they obtain these objectives, they threaten to have the Presidential electors from these States—who ordinarily would be pledged to vote for Roosevelt—disregard the choice of the Chicago Democratic National Convention, and force them to vote either for Dewey or for some Democrat like the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Senator BYRD.

If such tactics are successful and the vote for the Presidency and Vice Presidency is otherwise close, these electoral votes of these Southern States might be sufficient to prevent the election of Roosevelt or might prevent a majority from going to either Democratic or Republican candidate, in which event, the election for President would be thrown into the House of Representatives and the election of Vice President into the Senate. If the election is thrown into the House, then each State has only 1 vote, regardless of the number of Representatives any State has in that Chamber. Such a contingency in the midst of a war would be no less than catastrophic. Twice before in our history, the election was thrown into the House of Representatives and as a result of political log-rolling, turmoil, and self-serving interests, the candidates receiving the largest popular vote were not chosen. In both instances, processes, the very antithesis of democracy, prevailed.

Certain forces in both parties are bent upon putting a broomstick between Roosevelt's legs, and in any event, to prevent his reelection. The unnecessary, awkward, mischief-breeding electoral college lends itself beautifully to this purpose.

The amendment to the Constitution abolishing the electoral college, which I have offered today, of course, cannot be

acted upon before the ensuing election, but the attention of the Nation must again be drawn to the dangers lurking within the mechanism known as the electoral college. I liken it to the appendix, unnecessary, but subject to festering and inflammatory ills.

Its most patent defects may be briefly summarized:

First. The electoral college is an unnecessary go-between between the will of the people and the final choice for President and Vice President.

Second. It is undemocratic in that it disenfranchises a large segment of the popular vote by ignoring the minority vote.

Third. It encourages nonvoting by minorities in States that are known to be definitely one party or the other.

Fourth. It can thwart the will of the people as it did several times in our past history. John Quincy Adams became President although Andrew Jackson received the majority of popular votes as did Rutherford Hayes when Samuel J. Tilden had the majority vote, and as did Benjamin Harrison, although President Cleveland received the larger majority popular vote.

Major Step for Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe:

MAJOR STEP FOR BOSTON

The Civil Aeronautics Board decision handed down yesterday authorizing for additional airlines to begin flights connecting Boston with points to the south and west marks an extremely important phase in the commercial, cultural, and economic life of the city, and the entire New England area. It is a major step toward making the city a key skyport on the airlanes of the post-war world.

Granting certificates of necessity and convenience to Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., United Airlines, and Eastern Airlines, in addition to American Airlines, which has long served New England, gives the area the benefit of the Nation's greatest air carriers.

The ruling closely integrates the highly important New England section with the air transport pattern of the Nation. Through present operating and connecting services the city will now be within a few hours, or a few days, of any principal point in the Western Hemisphere. The city is now definitely in a strategic position as an important base for routes that will girdle the world in the coming "age of flight."

With the authorization of service by Northeast Airlines on the New York-Boston route the two major cities will be brought still closer together by more frequent service, while the establishment of this carrier as an all-New England airline will integrate the air travel of the entire area. With the extension of Eastern's northern terminal to Boston, and in conjunction with Northeast's service to Montreal and the Maritime Provinces, complete air service has been established along the entire seaboard of North America.

One outstanding lesson has been learned by Boston and New England in its long battle to bring in the major air lines, and that is, organized public opinion plus strenuous and consistent effort can achieve the desired results.

Youth Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1944, it was my high privilege to speak to the graduating class during the commencement exercises of the Spartanburg Junior College at Spartanburg, S. C., of which Dr. R. B. Burgess is the president.

During the ceremonies Miss Jewel Schofield, one of my fine young constituents of Gray Court, S. C., delivered a most impressive speech entitled "Youth Today."

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a copy of Miss Schofield's address:

As I approach the topic on which I speak to you—youth today—I do not approach it pessimistically. I do not approach it as a question of problems, but rather as a question of unprecedented opportunities. I cannot deny the fact that youth today do have problems unparalleled by those of any other age. On the other hand, was there ever an era in the history of our Nation when so many doors swung open before the leaders of the future? I should like to call to your attention opportunities before the youth of America—opportunities in the fields of social work, religion, politics, general improvements, and education.

Will you look with me into the field of social needs? At a meeting of the social workers of South Carolina, which took place recently in this city, one of the speakers informed the group that there is a minimum need of 12,000 case workers. In preparation for this work the student is trained to cope with problems of child labor, delinquency, slums, unemployment, war, and the race, migrant and other social evils. The field of social work presents a wide scope of varied problems for the young people interested in this work.

No less urgent is the need for workers in the field of religion. The church has its doors open to youth. From an institution in which only men were allowed to speak in worship services, to the church led by both sexes, though only in the adult age, we now have the church whose main emphasis seems to be centered on youth—youth movements, youth crusades, youth camps, clubs, and organizations. The church of today is depending on its youth as leaders of tomorrow.

As an example of what lies ahead for the voice of youth in politics, let me paint a scene that took place in the marble chambers of the State house in Trenton, N. J., last April. These chambers housed, not gray beards and rough voices, but beardless chins and voices that often cracked into a shrill soprano. The New Jersey Boy's Model Legislature was in session. They were high-school boys serving as senators and representatives from their own home counties. Each year for 5 years this legislature, organized by the youth and government committee of the New Jersey Y. M. C. A. and actively sponsored by Princeton University, has given intensive training in the principles of democratic government to 180 boys. This doubling of the number of regular representatives was for the purpose of spreading the training as far as possible. Then these young elder statesmen go home to their own communities and apply what they have learned in organizing model city councils operating on the same basis. This particular example is followed by many other cities over our country. The door of politics has swung many degrees in the interest of youth in the last decade.

Youth has advantages in the world today because of improvements to be made. Lincoln Steffens has clearly expressed the unlimited opportunities for youth in these words:

"There is everything for youth to take over, and it is an inspiration for them to learn:

"That we have not now and never have had in the history of the world a good Government.

"That there is not now and never has been a perfectly run railroad, school, newspaper, bank, theater, factory, grocery store; that no business is or ever has been built, managed, financed as it should be, must be, and will be some day—possibly in their day.

"That what is true of business and politics is gloriously true of the professions, the arts and crafts, the sciences, and sports. That the best picture has not yet been painted; the greatest poem is still unsung; the mightiest novel remains to be written; the divinest music has not been conceived even by Bach. In science, probably 90 percent has yet to be discovered. We know only a few streaks about astronomy; chemistry and physics are little more than a sparkling mass of questions." [1]

After considering these open doors, you may say, "Yes, we agree that the opportunities for service are varied, but such service as this calls for intensive preparation." Indeed it does—but wait—another door swings open. Let me illustrate what it has to offer by using an example with which I am most familiar. In the field of preparation for just such service as we have been reviewing, this is what the Methodist Church alone has to offer. She has nine universities with graduate courses leading to a master's or doctor's degree. Most of them maintain professional schools in administration, law, business, dentistry, engineering, and medicine. For young persons interested in full-time Christian service the Methodist Church offers, in addition to her graduate schools of the universities and theological schools, training schools for professional, social, and religious work. Distinctive schools or departments of music, fine arts, or dramatics also have their place along with courses in business, journalism, science, teacher training, social service, and religious education. There is also the junior college of general education with or without vocational emphasis.

Thus, if a young person desires to attend a college for women, a college for men, a coeducational school, a junior college, a liberal arts college in a university, or a college where he may earn his expenses, he has only to seek and he shall find.

This is an example of what the Methodist Church has to offer, not to mention the splendid opportunities given by other institutions and the country at large. You might take especial note of the scholarship plans and work programs offered in many of these schools.

[1] Lincoln Steffens, Unlimited Opportunities for Youth, Reader's Digest (twenty-first publication, December 1942).

To American youth all doors are open—social, religious, political, and educational. Improvements need to be made in all these groups. The future challenges youth to investigate the needs and possibilities of each field, to equip themselves with adequate preparation in their chosen field for rendering maximum service to their fellow men. Youth must not, they dare not, stand with idle or hesitant head, heart, or hands. They must press forward on eager feet through the open doors of opportunity to the new world of tomorrow.

Mr. Farley's Resignation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Farley's Resignation," published in the Hartford Daily Courant of June 9, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. FARLEY'S RESIGNATION

If one less sincere and truthful than James A. Farley had announced that "business duties and obligations" required him to resign the chairmanship of the New York Democratic State Committee, a position Mr. Farley has held for 14 years, one might question the genuineness of the reason advanced. As it is, those of a suspicious mind may be so unkind as to insinuate that since Mr. Farley vigorously opposed a third term for President Roosevelt, the looming prospect of a fourth nomination is rather too much for his indulgent nature.

Despite his attitude on the previous occasion, Mr. Farley conducted the Democratic campaign in New York with his customary efficiency. His intense loyalty to the party would not permit him to do otherwise, even if he had little personal enthusiasm for the task. But it would be asking rather too much of him to go through the experience again, and it probably comes to him as a not unpleasant realization that as chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Sales Co., he has duties and obligations to discharge that are just now of transcendent importance. Our boys overseas demand their "coke," and big-hearted Jim Farley, full of patriotism as he is, is in a strategic position to see that they get it. Compared with that, what else matters?

Mr. Farley will take time out to attend as a delegate the national convention of his party. How he will comport himself in that capacity remains to be seen. That his conduct will be exemplary from the Jeffersonian point of view cannot for a moment be doubted; but should he insist on the convention's adopting his own viewpoint, and be defeated in the attempt, he very likely would do what he has always done—support the nominee of the party. He holds to the political philosophy that if one participates in a party convention, wages a fight for what he thinks is right but loses, one is still under a moral obligation to abide by the decision of the majority.

Jim Farley's devotion to what is still called the Democratic Party is almost sublime; and, come hell or high water, he will remain a Democrat to the last, which does not mean that he cannot have mental reservations against any President's having more than two terms. He would rather, in certain circumstances, confine himself exclusively to exporting Coca-Cola.

New York Soldiers May Be Disfranchised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial entitled "New York Soldiers May Be Disfranchised," published in the Buffalo Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK SOLDIERS MAY BE DISFRANCHISED

Governor Dewey of New York having refused to call a special session of the legislature to loosen up the restrictions on voting by New Yorkers in the armed services, it becomes evident that a large proportion of the citizens of the Empire State will be disfranchised.

Under the existing law in order to get in his ballot the soldier or sailor, WAC or WAVE must write to the secretary of state (the State official, not Mr. Hull), his application will, theoretically, at least, be transmitted to his local election board, which will assay his title to vote in that district. If the local board accepts him, it is supposed to mail a ballot to the soldier, who will then have an opportunity of voting for everybody, including sheriff and coroner, swear to it before an officer and mail it back to the New York War Ballot Commission, which would transmit it to the local election board to be counted.

Under last year's law, which was simpler, less than 3 percent of the fighting folks got in their votes. There being about a million one hundred thousand New Yorkers in the armed services, what chance is there of approximately one-fifth of the State's citizenry having anything to say about their Government?

The only change sought from the proposed extra session was to cut out some of the red tape, by permitting friends or relatives of the absentees to make their application for a ballot for them.

The Government rejected the proposal without giving any direct reason. Of course, the circumstance that the Governor feared that a majority of the men in the camps or at the front would vote Democratic had no bearing on the matter. Mr. Dewey is, according to his own declaration, not a candidate for the Presidency, but does not disregard that he might be drafted. In the whole history of conscription there never was a draftee more willing to be coaxed or coerced than the Governor of New York.

He has expressed his sole interest in his Governorship, which makes his arraignment of the national administration and his vehement but hardly lucid entrance into the controversy of post-war diplomacy as logical as fitting an elephant's foot into a lady's dancing slipper.

His passionate concern lest a fellow in a fox hole in Italy ducking enemy machine-gun fire, or 5 miles over New Guinea picking the spot on which to drop a half-ton bomb, should not have the opportunity to scan and mark a yard-long ballot is only equalled by his dismay that the soldier might be deprived of the privilege of voting for pound-keeper in his home town.

The answer to all this is that the folks at home—the mothers, wives, and sisters, and sweethearts—should take over. Just as they have gone into uniform to replace the man who is overseas, they should vote as a sacred duty as they believe their soldier boy would vote—if political strategy had not made it as difficult and impractical as possible for him to do his part in the determination of our national destiny.

Henry Bascom Steagall

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. PAUL BROWN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my steadfast friend and colleague, HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL, was serving his fifteenth term in Congress at the time of his sudden passing on November 22, 1943. As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, for which he was so eminently qualified, he distinguished himself and maintained the high regard and ready cooperation of every member of the committee by his quiet strength combined with gentility. His unwavering zeal and industry, and consistent efforts in behalf of the little man, won for him his life battle. Many important laws are now on the statute books of the Nation as living memorials to HENRY STEAGALL, the leader, the statesman and great American. Alabama and the whole country have lost a true patriot, and the farmer has lost his best friend.

He was born at Clopton, Dale County, Ala., and received his early schooling in the common schools of Alabama, having graduated in law at the university of his State. He practiced law a number of years, was a member of the State Legislature of Alabama, and was State district prosecuting attorney several years before he was elected, without opposition, to the Sixty-fourth Congress on June 29, 1914. He was elected to each succeeding Congress until the time of his death.

He was a man of fine intellect and keen perception, and thoroughly understood all proposed legislation that was brought before the Banking and Currency Committee during his more than a decade of outstanding service as its able chairman and leader.

It was my privilege to know HENRY STEAGALL intimately and to love him dearly, and I submit these brief remarks as a final tribute to him whose sincerity of purpose and greatness of character enriched the lives of all who were fortunate enough to be touched by his ennobling influence, which seemed to radiate around him like warm sunshine.

Where Constitutional Power Truly Rests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. DANAHER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well-thought-out letter entitled "Where Constitutional Power Truly Rests," which appeared in the New York Sun Saturday, June 3, 1944. I commend the letter to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TRULY RESTS—DIVIDED BETWEEN CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT BUT WITH VAST RESERVOIR ENTRUSTED TO CONGRESS

To the EDITOR OF THE SUN:

SIR: Attorney General Biddle's recent assumption in the Montgomery Ward case that Mr. Roosevelt, as Chief Executive, possesses extraordinary constitutional war powers, is, I think, without substantial legal basis. Such powers are vested in the Congress and in it alone.

One of the main purposes for which our National Government was established is to provide for the common defense. Under the Constitution that task, with all its attendant problems, is entrusted to the Congress. It alone is authorized to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, and see to it that the militia is organized, armed, and disciplined. It alone may make rules for the government and regulation of these armed forces. Obviously, countless unnamed legislative powers must necessarily be implied in order to perform these essential yet complex duties. By "legislative powers" I mean powers of the Congress to decide what shall be done, how it shall be done, and who shall do it.

Justification for such implication is found in the closing paragraph of article I, section 8 of the Constitution. The Congress is there authorized "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof."

Here then, in the Congress, is a vast reservoir of express and implied war powers, with emphasis on those implied, for no one could foretell all the things which might be required to preserve and defend the Nation.

By contrast the President's constitutional powers in respect of war are very limited indeed. "The President," says the Constitution, "shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States * * *." This is all there is to it, except that with the advice and consent of the Senate the President appoints the commissioned officers of the armed forces.

THE CIVIL POWER

As head of our Military and Naval Establishments, the President is as completely subject to the rules and regulations prescribed by the Congress as is any one of his subordinates. But, as Chief Executive he has an additional obligation; namely, "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed" (art. II, sec. 3).

The eminent jurist, Benjamin R. Curtis, said: "The military power of the President is derived solely from the Constitution. He is the General in Chief; and as such, in prosecuting a war, may do what generals in the field are allowed to do within the sphere of their actual operations, in subordination to the laws of their country, from which alone they derive their authority." But he added this warning: When a General in Chief disregards those laws "he super-adds to his rights as Commander the powers of a usurper; and this is military despotism."

In time of war, the Congress may very properly vest in the President such unusual powers, consistent with the Constitution, as the efficient prosecution of the war may seem to demand. Where these powers affect civilian life they must be given to the President as civil magistrate, not as military commander. In no other way can the military be kept subordinate to the civil power.

The duty of the legislative and judicial branches of government to support and defend the Constitution should make them especially vigilant to check any tendency on the part of a President to exercise powers not traceable directly to clear and explicit legislation. This is particularly true these days, when personal government is in the air everywhere and its consequences visible in the charred and blackened ruins of Europe and Asia.

There are those among us, of whom Attorney General Biddle seems to be one, who act as though they believe that war suspends the Constitution for its duration. If written constitutions mean anything, such a view is untenable. The Constitution of West Virginia makes this quite clear.

"The provisions of the Constitution of the United States and of this State," it says, "are operative alike in a period of war as in time of peace, and any departure therefrom, or violation thereof, under plea of necessity, or any other plea, is subversive of good government and tends to anarchy and despotism" (art. I, sec. 3).

ON BEING TOO CLEVER

This declaration is of especial significance, because West Virginia was born during the Civil War. Its Constitution was drafted by a citizenry loyal to the Union; it was approved at the time by the Congress, whose Members presumably knew and understood the principles for which that war was being fought.

But, say the molders of our "new social order," the war will not wait for the decisions of the Congress. It requires immediate executive action. Those who take this view have no faith in the American people. They must doubt both our patriotism and our ability to govern ourselves. They underestimate the capacity of a President to get quick action, provided he has shown that he knows his proper place, and that he intends to stay in it.

In the midst of a war for our survival as a nation any forthright Chief Executive can count upon the wholehearted cooperation of every Member of the Congress. Our Representatives will never refuse him any legitimate request. But debate will be prolonged, and action delayed, when Executive proposals are just too "clever," when they suggest the presence of ulterior purposes, or when experience has shown a disposition in the executive department to give meanings to statutes quite opposite to the legislative intent.

These are the things which make the democratic process seem inefficient. The system is not to blame. The blame should fall upon those unprincipled politicians who use the war or any emergency for their own selfish ends—men who believe it is easier to manage a single individual, though he be a President, than to control a Congress, who, for that reason, ignore the Constitution and claim for the Chief Executive unlimited war powers.

As an American, I abhor personal power in the hands of any man. As an American, I believe the Constitution of the United States is our only effective shield against dictatorship. And as a Republican, I hope the candidates and workers of my party will, in the coming campaign, keep that Constitution constantly before the voters as the living symbol of their liberty, and convince them that it, and it alone, is the supreme law of our land.

ARCHIBALD E. STEVENSON.
NEW CANAAN, CONN., *May 29.*

Newton D. Baker General Hospital Is Dedicated at Martinsburg, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Friday afternoon to participate in the dedication exercises of the Newton D. Baker General Hospital, near Martinsburg, W. Va. This splendid Army institution, which will accommodate upward of 2,000 patients, is named in honor of a distinguished native son of that community, who later became Secretary of War under President Woodrow Wilson.

More than 3,000 persons listened to the appropriate program and hundreds personally inspected the buildings, equipment, and grounds. Many of the boys now being hospitalized there have seen service in the European theater of war. More than 160 have been flown to the hospital for treatment and rest.

Mrs. Newton D. Baker, widow of the distinguished American, was present for the program, which was featured by talks by Col. Gilbert Van B. Wilkes, Corps of Engineers; Col. Everett L. Cook, hospital commander in charge of Newton D. Baker Hospital; Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, The Surgeon General of the United States Army; Maj. Gen. James L. Collins, commanding general, Fifth Service Command, and several others.

The dedicatory address, delivered by the Honorable John J. Cornwell, former Governor of West Virginia, made a deep impression on the audience, and I include it herewith, because of its genuine worth:

In this crucial hour of the greatest armed conflict in the history of the world; at the very moment when countless numbers of our American soldiers are being maimed on far-flung battle fronts, we have assembled formally to dedicate an institution devoted to the work of rehabilitating and restoring to health men who have suffered the shock and strain of battle.

Of the millions of men in our armed services, the job and the duty of the vast majority is to kill and to wound the enemy, for only in that way can the war be won. There are so many horrible phases of war that it hardly is prudent to pause and contemplate them while we are engaged in it. The struggle is so titanic, so fierce, and so scientifically conducted, it is necessary that the thoughts of civilians as well as those in the armed

forces be concentrated upon the successful prosecution of the war in order that victory may be achieved and peace restored at the earliest possible moment.

But the more diligently it is prosecuted the more casualties there are, of necessity; the more of our boys are killed or wounded.

MEDICS BRIGHT SPOT

In all this conflict raging around the world; in all this destruction of human and material resources, there is but one bright spot; but one pleasant picture; but one cheerful thought, and that is the marvelous work being done by the medical and surgical branches of the armed forces and their aides and services. Never in any previous war were sick and wounded men evacuated from the fighting fronts so promptly, cared for so tenderly, or treated so effectively. Never before was the percentage of deaths so low, the percentage of recovery from wounds so high. All this illustrates not only the tremendous strides that have been made in medical and in surgical science; the marvelous use of the airplane in the evacuation and transportation of sick and wounded servicemen, but it illustrates the high value set on human life by the American service forces and officers and by the American people.

A wounded Japanese, like a captured Japanese, is written off just as though he were a dead Japanese. Those yellow rodents have no time to be burdened with their wounded. It makes them a more difficult foe to fight but it marks the difference between people whose civilization is a mere veneer over oriental savagery and a people who possess hearts of love and of tenderness and of mercy.

SPIRIT OF NATION

And so, as the care and consideration of our sick and wounded servicemen are the brightest phase of this cruel war, hospitals such as the one you are formally dedicating here today are the personification of the spirit that is responsible for that brighter phase. All over the country these hospitals have been erected or structures already standing have been converted into hospitals. All of them are equipped with every modern gadget and instrument. They are staffed with competent doctors, technicians, and nurses. The work of the doctors and technicians is well understood and thoroughly appreciated. Thousands of wounded men, who, in former times and past wars, would have come out hopeless human derelicts, through modern surgical skill are restored to useful, self-supporting, and happy citizens. Sometimes, however, I wonder whether the general public has a full appreciation of the work being done by the nurses. Those of us who have undergone serious operations know the value of skillful, tender touch of a nurse; know how she bolstered our morale as she sat by our bedside when we endured long, painful, sleepless nights. We can appreciate what that professional skill and personal charm means to a wounded soldier after fighting for days, weeks, and even months in snow, sleet, and storm on the Italian front or in the feverish jungles of the South Pacific. These nurses go to the very front lines, accompany the wounded as they are flown through the skies, and they are here at home in the hospitals to help the man back to full and final recovery. They are truly angels of mercy. May their number increase and their work be more generally appreciated.

PROUD OF PART

For all these reasons I am proud to be a humble participant in the formal dedication of this marvelous institution of mercy and of rehabilitation. But there still is another reason for my presence. This hospital is named for Martinsburg's distinguished son who was my close, personal friend—Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War during the First World War. I do not know who is responsible for designating this the Newton D. Baker Hospital, but it not only was a gracious thing to do, it was a fitting thing.

While Newton D. Baker was a great Secretary of War, having directed the prosecution of the First World War to a successful conclusion even though the country was less prepared for it than it was for the present war, he was a pacifist at heart. He loved mercy; he was gentleness personified, and he walked humbly with his God. He was, indeed, one of the humblest, most unpretentious, and kindliest men I have ever known. He was a great man, great in intellect, great in soul, and great in spirit.

I saw him many times during that war when he was burdened with grave responsibilities. His vision never was clouded. His objective was to win the war. He bent all his energies to that end. He selected competent commanders, in whom he had confidence and permitted no interference.

SOUL OF HONOR

I knew Baker even more intimately after the war. We were members of the same board of directors, and his firm was our counsel at Cleveland. He was the very soul of honor and honesty in business. It was my privilege to stand by his side and to try to aid him in his last great fight for a political and governmental principle.

A disciple of the immortal Woodrow Wilson, he firmly believed the future peace of the world depended on our cooperating with other countries, through the League of Nations, to effect disarmament and to settle international disputes. That was the firm position of the Democratic Party in its platform adopted at the national convention at San Francisco in 1920.

At the famous Madison Square Garden convention 4 years later, Baker represented Ohio on the platform committee. I represented West Virginia. We knew the leading candidates for President and their followers, who constituted a majority on the committee, had reached the conclusion that the League of Nations should be dropped as a vote-getting proposition. They thought it had become unpopular. Baker and I prepared a minority report on that particular point to be submitted to the convention in case the committee rejected the League endorsement. The committee did reject it after a memorable struggle behind closed doors. Comparatively few men are living today who participated in or witnessed that fight which never was reported in the press.

The meeting lasted all night, much of the time being consumed in a wrangle over the Ku Klux Klan.

Finally, the great League of Nations issue came up, and while only a few of us supported Baker against an array of United States Senators, the debate was furious and bitter.

"Night's candles were burnt out" and the first rays of a July sun were peeping through the window when Baker concluded his great speech for his League of Nations plank.

He believed the hope of world peace and the lives of countless thousands of our citizens depended upon our joining the League and cooperating with other nations to preserve world peace.

He predicted that without our support the League would fail, that if it failed, the world would soon be engulfed in another—the worst of all wars. His final challenge was that if from fear of defeat the Democratic Party deserted the ideal of world peace through world cooperation, it no longer would be a party of principle but it would become a party of expediency. He repeated that statement before the convention later in the day in support of our minority report. As history records, the party did desert that ideal.

Well, the world has traveled a long and tortuous road since Newton D. Baker, like his dead chieftain, went down to defeat in a courageous effort to commit his political party and his country to a practical plan for the maintenance of world peace. We are now treading its bloody end in sorrow and sacrifice.

It has taken this war and all its tragedies to bring us back to the ground Woodrow Wilson and Newton Baker occupied in their quest for world peace a quarter of a century ago for there appears to be a general conclusion that if the human race is not to be exterminated there must be cooperation among countries in dealing with international questions; that cooperation can come only through some such organization as the League of Nations, for which Woodrow Wilson gave his life and for which the man for whom this hospital is named continued the fight gallantly until the principle was deserted by the political party for which he had done so much.

But it is too late for the millions who occupy unmarked graves and so late that the whole question is complicated by new international issues, some of which may be difficult of solution.

To Make Sure Our Servicemen Can Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. PRATT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 12, 1944:

TO MAKE SURE OUR SERVICEMEN CAN VOTE

Pennsylvania's machinery for assuring its service men and women the vote in next fall's election will be set in motion today.

A house-to-house canvass will be started in Philadelphia today—and begun in the rest of the State on Wednesday—to list all soldier and sailor eligibles. Two hundred thousand volunteer workers of local defense councils will conduct the poll, which will close July 7, when the names and military addresses will be officially recorded.

This is a gigantic undertaking, intended to make possible the dispatch of ballots, without any bother whatever on the part of those in service, to the 500,000 to 800,000 eligible Pennsylvanians in the armed forces and related agencies.

Soldier voting could have been wrapped up in all sorts of red tape regulations, requiring the men overseas to take time off from the war to fill out many forms, and then run the risk of never having their vote counted.

It is to the credit of Governor Martin and the leaders of both parties that this State has adopted a soldier-vote law marked by complete simplicity. The absentee servicemen don't have to take any prior steps at all. Once their names are listed they will be sent the ballots for marking, without registration or application and with plenty of time allowed to get the votes back for counting.

The canvass beginning today is an essential part of the vote set-up, and it is imperative that the information required be collected. The canvassers are warned, of course, to seek no information of military nature and to leave politics outside the door.

The wardens have shown great efficiency in civilian-defense activities and they may be relied upon surely to do a good job here.

It should mean a great deal to them, as to all of us, to make sure that nothing is left undone to facilitate voting by those away from home in the serious business of war.

Unhonored and Unsung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, much has been said, and rightfully so, in praise of the amazing production for our national defense. It has been the wonder of the modern world, and no country in the world could have done it except the United States of America. This is due to the intelligence of American industry, and the high standard of the American worker.

Yet all this great flood of production would have been useless if there had been no means of transporting it. The railroads of our country brought the production from the place of manufacture to the port of embarkation. Here again was an example of splendid achievement, for the railroads were badly handicapped. Lack of workers, lack of material, lack of replacements, lack of new rolling stock, lack of nearly everything essential to meet the problems of transportation was enough to dismay the most optimistic. Yet the railroads met the issue to an extent that challenges one's imagination.

During 1939 there were 338,000 ton-miles transported on the railroads per every man employed, while in 1942 there was a 502,000 ton-mile transportation per everyone employed. That is an increase of 48 percent. In 1943 it was still greater, so that the railroads must be given credit for transporting this tremendous amount of freight and also passengers across the country.

THE TRUCK HAULER

However, that is not all the story, for there is one more person who should not be overlooked—and that is the truck hauler. Stop all the Nation's trucks today and we would begin to go hungry in less than a week. Trucks get perishable foods and livestock to market before they spoil. On top of all the food that was hauled to the consumer, the trucks also hauled for the armed services eleven and one-half billion pounds of lend-lease food; they rushed 78,000 pounds of food daily to each armored division at the front.

Just look at these figures—60 percent of the meat is carried to stockyards by trucks, 100 percent of the milk for 34 large cities is hauled and delivered by truck, 89 percent of the poultry received alive at Chicago, 79 percent received in New York arrives by truck, 51 percent of the fruits and vegetables for our largest cities come by truck, 45 percent of the butter comes by truck, as also does cream, eggs, and cheese. All vital foods, even condensed and packaged foods, come all or part way by truck. This is an amazing achievement in the face of various serious obstacles.

There are and have been shortages of truck equipment, restrictions in rubber, poor quality gasoline, and manpower difficulties, and these have had to be met. The truck driver gets up before daylight, he collects his fresh fruit and vegetables, or milk products, and hauls them to a concentration point where either the railroad or the long-distance truck haulers carry on, but his day's work is not over when he has delivered his load at the concentration point, and he must go to the junk yard, the second-hand dealer, or wherever he can get what he needs in order to find replacements for worn-out parts. This takes time and is done at the sacrifice of the trucker's sleep.

In spite of these handicaps and in spite of the fact that highways have not been properly maintained, the trucker has smashed bottlenecks on food and war production by cutting delivery time in half. So let us give a hand to the truck hauler whose remarkable achievements have been unhonored and unsung.

We Will Not Neglect the War in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the news that American B–29's are bombing Japan proper is heartening. It is a sign that in conjunction with our attacks on the Marianas and the landing of American troops on Saipan we are approaching full offensive strength and that we consider the Pacific and Asiatic areas fully as important as the European theater. We are engaged in a world-wide struggle and we must bend all our efforts to bring Hitler and Hirohito to their knees. We must spare no effort either at home or abroad to bring this barbaric war to an end just as quickly as it is humanly possible.

We must also remember the part that China has played in this struggle and see to it that she receives every available bit of assistance we can send her. With China using her manpower, ingenuity, and skill plus the matériel we send to her we can shorten the Pacific war and thereby the whole struggle. It is to our best interests to see that the major efforts now being exerted by Japan in central China be defeated at the earliest possible moment. Every set-back of Japan by China means the saving of American lives and the shortening of the war.

We can depend on our gallant soldiers, sailors, and marines doing their part under Chennault, Stilwell, MacArthur, and Nimitz in defeating our Japanese enemy. We pledge to them out there that they can depend on us at home to back them to the limit.

We will not neglect the war in the Pacific and this bombing of Japan is evidence that we are now developing our offensive against the "beat China first" campaign now being carried out by the Japanese.

Mr. Speaker, I am including an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of June 6, 1944, which is worth the consideration of all Members of the Congress:

CHINA AND THE INVASION—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Roscoe Drummond)

However formidable the struggle on the invasion coasts of France, there will be no neglecting the war in the Pacific.

One reason is that Japan isn't going to permit the United States to let up one instant at any point along the whole Asiatic front, and the evidence now developing is that the Japanese are launching a formidable "Beat China First" campaign.

This is Japan's reply to the Anglo-American plan to beat Hitler first, and it is giving the gravest concern to the Chinese military mission recently arrived in Washington.

General Shang Chen, director of China's National Military Council and one of Chiang Kai-shek's most trusted military advisers who accompanied him to the Cairo meeting with President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, sees Japan already embarked on a now-or-never offensive calculated to knock China entirely out of the fighting.

As obtained from both Chinese and American sources in Washington, the significant facts behind—and the possible consequences of—this new operation are these:

Since March 1 of this year the Japanese have moved 500,000 of their fresh, best, well-armed troops from Manchuria into China—part to be used against the Americans and Australians in the South Pacific and the remainder to be thrown against the hard-pressed Chinese.

In consequence the Japanese are turning against General Chiang a bigger offensive than they have heretofore brought to bear.

The purposes of this campaign are to cut China in two, establish a Japanese west wall from Peiping to Hankow to Canton as a last-barrier protection to the Japanese islands themselves, and so to deprive inner areas of unoccupied China of food supplies as would completely cripple its ability and will to fight.

There are at least five major consequences, damaging to the Allies, which could result from this operation:

1. It will take vital segments of now unoccupied China in the south out of the hands of the Chungking Government, and will drive the Chinese forces 700 to 800 miles farther inland.

2. General Chennault will lose present and potential airfields which would ultimately—when the air power is available—be within long-range bombing distance of Japan itself. New airfields would have to be built hundreds of miles farther inland.

3. Japan would come into full and effective possession of the entire southern coast of China where its present hold is only tenuous and maintained primarily by its ability to control the coastal seas.

4. An Allied landing on the coast of China would be rendered doubly difficult—perhaps as hazardous as the landings in France last week. Admiral Nimitz himself has publicly stated that the Allies intend to bring the war to the Chinese coast, and we must, therefore, have a major port from which to operate. If the Japanese succeed in establishing the Peiping-Hankow-Canton wall in the

early future they will deny to the Allies the opportunity of making a coastal landing in the midst of a friendly Chinese population and to which supporting Chinese troops could soon effect a junction.

5. General Chennault was quoted by the Associated Press this week as declaring that the creation by the Japanese of this projected "west wall," dividing and crippling China, would prolong the Asiatic war by years. The prospect may not be quite as omnious as that, but there is no easy assurance that the new Japanese offensive will not succeed and the most conservative judgment among the military here is that it would not fail to put off the defeat of Japan at least a year longer than it otherwise would be and cost the lives of many Chinese and American and British men.

The American-British Chiefs of Staff, now meeting in London, are, it can be said with assurance, not unalert to the gravity of the developing situation in the Far East.

Why Waste $273,355,225 of Our Taxpayers' Money and Spend Another $100,000,000 To Train Personnel for the Same Jobs?—Something That the WASPS Can't Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this great country of ours was founded on the principle of justice for all. We are now fighting a war to preserve the principle. Yet, in the armed forces of this Nation there is a group of men who are being treated unjustly, victims of indifference and apathy. These unfortunate loyal Americans are the War Training Service trainees, and instructors under the direction of the Civil Aeronautics Administration prior to abandonment of that program. Through association with a number of these men I have become familiarized with the vital facts concerning their plight, and in the name of justice I am compelled to wholeheartedly support the motion to commission these men. There are approximately 9,000 of these forgotten men.

These men entered this program with the thought of serving their country in the air; some did not meet requirements for combat flying because of age or minor physical disability, but they were given the explicit promise of being ferry pilots, transport pilots, air line pilots and copilots, liaison pilots, glider pilots, towtarget pilots, and flight instructors and commissioned as second lieutenants or flight officers upon completion of a certain number of courses. Many of these men had established themselves in the business world and some had families, but they eagerly accepted the opportunity to support the war effort in the air because they could fly. A cry far and wide begging these men to enlist and train and instruct cadets so we could have a great air force was heard the length and breadth of the United States.

First they willingly gave up their jobs, and enrolled in the program without any remuneration. They purchased their own flying khakis, their own goggles, their own helmets; then there was laundry, haircuts, cigarette money; small items, but looming large to a man getting only the bare essentials of room and board. Their wives worked, fathers and mothers sacrificed, some borrowed money, mortgaged property, and they all depleted whatever savings they had, believing that they were contributing to the war cause.

There were interminable delays between courses, and during these times room and board were summarily cut off and the men were on their families. Few employers were willing to hire the men because they did not know from one day to the next when they might be available. When the men were assigned to fields for the next course, there were further delays, lack of instructors, insufficient planes, poor preparation for students, and additional courses were added until the men who had entered the program thinking they could manage on family savings for 6 to 8 months, found themselves in debt and their families in dire need. Finally a bill was passed to give these men $50 a month retroactive to December 1942, giving the men a lump sum of around $250. Some of these men requested a release which was denied. Others stuck it out with the grim hope that the promise of a commission and a job as instructor or other type of flying would make it worth while.

The program was abandoned on January 15, 1944, and these men found that their 12 to 18 months of arduous efforts to fly had been in vain, and the majority of them were assigned to technical schools to start the long grind over again as buck privates.

These trainees are excellent officer material. They have completed successfully the courses prescribed in the regulations issued jointly by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Army Air Forces. They have kept faith with the Government and are entitled to commissions in the Army Air Forces. At a time when the distribution of manpower is a vital issue, can we afford to fail to make use of these trained men? Shall we waste the Government's funds already spent to make their training useful? At the present time much of the ferrying work in this country is being done by women, and I say "hats off to them," but there is now a proposal before the Congress that women be trained as cadets and commissioned in the Air Forces. Needless to say, whatever will shorten the war is what we want, but shall we spend more money and time in training noncombat pilots when we have already spent, according to figures of former Executive Director of Training R. McLean Stewart at the hearings before a Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, February 2 and 3, 1944, $273,355,255 training our great Air Force and for this purpose, and then spend another $100,000,000 to train women pilots for the same specific jobs these men were trained for?

Not only in fairness and justice but from the standpoint of good old-fashioned horse sense, I say that the men we have already trained should be commissioned and given the jobs for which they were trained.

Fair Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 13, 1944:

FAIR PRACTICES

There is a simple yet very vital issue involved in the current fight over funds for the Fair Employment Practice Committee. The issue is: Shall economic opportunity in America be limited on grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin? There can be no doubt as to how the American people, or their Representatives in Congress, would settle this issue if it were stated in these real terms. Unfortunately, however, the issue has been distorted and obscured—imbued with wholly irrelevant emotional overtones and linked with complex questions of interracial relations. Some of this confusion has stemmed from misunderstanding. Some of it has been intentionally obscurantist in purpose.

The F. E. P. C. has as its sole function the elimination of unwarranted discriminatory practices in the employment of American workers. It is not concerned with abstract questions of social equality between races. It is not attempting—and has never attempted—suddenly to make over the mores of any section of the United States. It is not trying to do away with segregation or any of the manifestations of Jim Crowism—however repugnant these may be to democratic principles. As the committee chairman, Malcolm Ross, phrased it in testimony before the House Labor Committee the other day, "The mass of the American people can do as they please in their private lives but when it comes to earning a living, someone else with the hire-and-fire power offers the terms and conditions under which a man can earn his bread."

Race prejudice is an ugly factor in American life. Nevertheless it is a real factor and needs to be faced. The F. E. P. C. did not create race prejudice—as some of its critics have irresponsibly suggested. It is simply a mechanism for counteracting the effects of race prejudice in the economic sphere. As such, it performs a service which is indispensable to the freedom of minority groups and invaluable to the welfare of the American economy as a whole.

During the progress of the war, the F. E. P. C. has done much to integrate the skills and energies of minority elements into our production program. We should have had fewer tanks and planes and landing ships for D-day if workers had been barred from industry through discrimination. In the course of the past 10 months the F. E. P. C. has ended 26 work stoppages in vital production fields which had their origin in unfair employment practices; three of them were serious strikes in the steel industry. Its orderly, understanding approach to labor problems of this nature will be needed more than ever when we encounter the problems of demobilization and reconversion. For in this

period discrimination can create chaos. If whole classes of men are denied an opportunity to earn a living because of the color of their skin, they will become desperate and dangerous.

The House has voted an appropriation of half a million dollars to carry on the F. E. P. C.'s work. The Senate Appropriations Committee, despite an unfavorable subcommittee report, has recommended the approval of this sum. Today the Senate as a whole will begin discussion of it. We hope that the discussion will be concerned with the real issue—not with bugbears conjured up to obfuscate it. We cannot deny to citizens of the United States equality of economic opportunity.

Haven for Europe's Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorials:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 11, 1944]

HAVEN FOR EUROPE'S REFUGEES

The President's press conference statement on the rescue of refugees from Nazi Europe brings some encouraging news. The arrangements for the transfer to a temporary haven at Fort Ontario, N. Y., of a thousand refugees from overcrowded camps in southern Italy means that this country is undertaking at once its share of responsibility for refugees' care. The fact that camps in Italy are overcrowded means that tens of thousands are escaping. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration supplementing the President's news, reports that since May 1 six refugee centers in the Middle East have been housing 40,500 Greeks and Yugoslavs, mostly women and children, and that the number is expected to swell to 54,000 soon. These centers are to be expanded and new ones built.

The President indicated that a workable escape route is that through Yugoslavia to Italy—1,800 came out of Yugoslavia last week. This influx taxes facilities in southern Italy and threatens to hamper military activities. Other Mediterranean havens take some, but the overflow, apparently, is great enough to warrant the transfer of a thousand immediately to this country.

The thousand will be admitted outside the regular immigration procedure and given haven here for the duration. "It is contemplated that at the end of the war they will be returned to their homelands," the President wrote. The War Department is to equip Fort Ontario, near Oswego, to receive them, to arrange their transportation from port to camp and take the necessary precautions to see that they remain in camp. The camp will be administered by the War Relocation Board; it will be financed with funds pooled from various Government agencies dealing with foreign relief, supplemented, if necessary, from the President's emergency funds.

This news of the escape of driven and persecuted peoples, with its import of new hope and new heart for thousands, is a poignant preface to the coming liberation of millions like them as the armies of freedom batter through the walls around fortress Europe.

[From the New York Times of June 10, 1944]

PORT OF REFUGE

We believe that there will be prompt and generous approval of the President's plan to establish at Fort Ontario, near Oswego, a temporary haven for refugees who may escape from the European nations which are still under Hitler's domination. There is nothing in this proposal that seeks to evade the immigration laws or to disturb existing quotas. It is planned to provide food and shelter for approximately a thousand persons. This is only a tiny fraction of the great mass of homeless and helpless people of many faiths and many races who have been victims of the Nazi terror. We hope, ourselves, that more than a mere thousand can be sheltered under an expansion of the present program. But neither those who come now nor the others who may be enabled to come later will come as permanent residents of this country, in excess of the immigration quotas. They will come merely on a temporary basis—as war prisoners come, in fact, or as goods in crates are permitted to enter our free ports, without payment of customs, if they are simply in transit from one foreign country to another. All that the plan involves is an overnight shelter, so to speak, until it becomes possible either to return these distressed people to their native lands or to find permanent homes for them elsewhere.

This is all that the plan involves, but it is enough to be helpful. For it will encourage other nations to take similar steps and, to the extent that it is generally adopted, it will remove one of the great barriers—a lack of places of even temporary refuge—which have been blocking the escape of Hitler's victims. This is a work of mercy. The President believes it important that the United States should share in it, not through words but through deeds. Every warm-hearted American will agree with him and approve his action.

The plan has nothing to do with unrestricted and uncontrolled immigration. It is simply a proposal to save the lives of innocent people.

[From the Washington Post of June 11, 1944]

FREE PORTS

That the President has adopted the idea, first bruited by Mr. Samuel Grafton, of free ports for the detention and care of refugees from war-torn Europe is cause for gratification. The purpose of the plan is to make it possible to grant asylum to refugees without admitting them to the country under the immigration regulations. The analogy for this procedure is the arrangement whereby goods in international trade, not intended for import to this country, can be held in storage, duty-free, until they can be transshipped to their ultimate destination. But the opening of our doors to only 1,000, to be put into a single camp, is a drop in the bucket compared with the needs. Senator GILLETTE and several like-minded Senators feel that we can do more. Of course we can, and the resolution bearing the name of the humanitarian Iowan, which will come before the Senate Wednesday, will give the Senators a chance to say so. The resolution wouldn't involve the assumption of any responsibility that could be called a burden. In authorizing the setting up of rescue camps where entries, selected by the War Refugee Board, would be given temporary sanctuary, it merely enables us to do our part, along with other nations, in shielding a sizable segment of humanity from the defeat-crazed excesses of Nazi butchers.

The proudest tradition any country can boast is that it is a haven for the oppressed and the persecuted. Half a dozen countries are still jealous of that honor. France was a notable example till she was seized by the barbarians to whose victims she used to give such sympathetic sanctuary. Sweden and Switzerland have construed their neutrality as a mandate to succor the hunted from other nations. Hungary, till she was overrun, was hospitable to the Jews fleeing from Germany. Our country, which has been enriched by the persecuted of other lands, has done what it could within the restrictions of the immigration statutes and has a right to a top place among the world's asylums.

Perhaps we have not been as selective as we should. Stories come to one's ears from time to time of troublemakers in our midst, and one wonders how in the world they got their visas. Then there is a horde of rich foreign parasites in New York who are intent only on keeping out of harm's way. In their place one would have liked to see in this country many worthy folk of professional and other attainments who would have been useful additions to the American population. Many of them sought but couldn't get admission. Some of them perforce have had to work for collaborationist governments. It is strange that we use so much talent in the preclusive buying of materials and so little on the preclusive acquirement of people.

The Gillette resolution is a belated attempt to recognize the responsibilities and acknowledge the sympathies of a great people for the victims of furor teutonicus. The policy it seeks to promote is national. But the opportunity is continental, and the attempt should be made to get the other republics of this hemisphere to join in establishing a system of free ports for the people who, after suffering dreadful tribulations, are now in peril of massacre at the hands of our bestial enemy.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the fifth bond drive opens with two real bangs.

All know that every unnecessary expenditure hinders the war effort.

Out in the country, people do not all have running water or furnaces, but they are free from C. I. O. leaders and Communists yet, thank goodness.

A mockingbird in the giant shrubbery by the House entrance, sings thrillingly each morning since the invasion, as the Members enter—a messenger of victory and cheer.

Greater care by women and children to protect themselves from danger while helping out with farm machinery is imperative. The weekly papers indicate numerous accidents.

Lawrence Cox, 6 foot 4, superintendent of Lake Shawnee, Topeka, resigns to become again a Baptist preacher, in Missouri. We wish you, Larry, the continuous overflow there you have been experiencing.

On Flag Day a Member said before the House, "This is United Nations Day." It used to be the birthday of the Stars and Stripes—the Red, White, and Blue—Old Glory, and it is yet. He just does not know.

Men and women are most interesting. The unfolding of the activities and the

abilities of colleagues, especially the newer Members, is a fascinating experience to observe. Wish I dared to particularize.

An editorial here this morning praised Lindbergh for recent research in stratosphere flying and on imparting it to Nimitz's men. This afternoon Japan is bombed from 30,000 feet. Could it be that Charley leads again?

Mr. Brownlee, Deputy Administrator for price in O. P. A., admits he was drawing a salary of $125,000 when he assumed his present duties of holding everybody down. At Harvard he was a coxswain, the little man who steered the shell and shouted the ceilings to the crew.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED J. DOUGLAS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur with Governor Dewey in his remarks made before the National Conference of Governors on May 29. He said in part:

> We must not again sit on the side lines as mere observers or commentators while future kaisers and fuehrers and war lords grow stronger and perfect their plans for aggression.

Enlarging upon that expression, it is my own opinion on the future policy of foreign affairs that we must concede that if there is one lesson which the American people have learned from this war, it is that isolationism, or to use the current term, nationalism, breeds world wars. America can no more escape involvement in a world-wide war than she can escape being involved in a world-wide economic depression. The time has passed when nations can live in and by themselves. Like an epidemic of disease, war and economic depression know no boundary lines.

In the process of winning the war, we must not neglect the means to make the dearly won victory a permanent one. This can only be done through American participation with other nations in the field of international relations. Only through such international cooperation can incipient aggression be crushed.

Out of this war is coming some sort of a council of nations. Such a council will be formed for the double purpose of being able to use force, if necessary, to prevent future wars and also to do away with the barriers which prevent trade as between nations and to establish sound monetary standards.

I firmly believe that this can be the war to end all wars if the American people appreciate that the only guaranty against future war is to cooperate freely with other liberty-loving nations to prevent the arising of conditions which promote war. I earnestly favor such cooperation and will lend my support in the House of Representatives to any movement looking toward a cooperative role for the United States in the post-war world.

H. R. 5019 Is a Bill To Create Post-War Opportunity for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill designed to create and expand post-war opportunity by encouraging the establishment of small businesses. This objective must challenge the attention of this Congress.

In contrast to many proposals which provide supervision and governmental wet-nursing, this bill would help the ambitious American who wants to start a small business by eliminating the initial Federal hobbles. This bill would give him a period of freedom from Federal taxes and social-security payments to get his enterprise firmly established.

There are two great benefits of this proposal. The first is that its passage would result in many more small concerns being started because of the encouragement afforded by the provisions of this act. Secondly, the infant-mortality rate among these new small businesses would be much lower because of the tax advantages and lessened overhead resulting from this freedom from expensive governmental red tape and tax burdens.

Perhaps the merit of this proposal can best be demonstrated by an illustration. Two G. I. Joes are discharged from the Army. They want to start an electrical service and repair shop. They have considerable ability along this line, gained from their Army training.

With their discharge pay and a G. I. bill of rights loan—which, incidentally, they could obtain more readily because of the tax exemptions this bill would provide, they decide to open up an electrical shop. This bill would provide that their fledgling business would have approximately 3 years to get on a profitable and paying basis before the tax collector could get in their cash box.

This bill would enable the two G. I. Joes to get started without hiring an expensive accountant to keep track of social security and other payments to the Government. Likewise, it eliminates from the initial burdens of the shop the hiring of expensive legal advice to avoid conflict with tax collectors.

The problems of starting a business are always difficult. During the first few months of any enterprise the cash outgo is large and the cash income is usually small. This bill would give the new business a fair chance to get under way and perhaps accumulate a small reserve before it is subject to Federal collections.

The bill as introduced contains a number of safety provisions to prevent its abuse. Among the protective clauses are the following:

The act shall not apply—

(a) When the invested capital exceeds $100,000; or

(b) When salaries, bonuses, or other remuneration are paid to officers or employees not legitimately engaged in the affairs of the enterprise; or

(c) When the control of the enterprise is held, directly or indirectly, by another enterprise; or

(d) When the enterprise claiming exemption is the outgrowth of, or takes over the assets or business of, an existing business; or

(e) When the company pays over 6 percent return in cash or stock on capital or borrowed funds.

It is possible that other clauses limiting the application of this act should be added to prevent the abuse of its advantages. As introduced, however, the bill provides genuine help for the individual or group of businessmen who would like to start a new enterprise in this difficult period. Legislation of this kind is vitally necessary if the birth rate of new small business, now at the vanishing point, is to be increased, and a healthy economic situation restored.

The small businessman, making up the bulk of the middle classes of America, is an indispensable man in the preservation of the Republic. This legislation or legislation with similar provisions must be passed if this Congress is to give substance to its announced intention of restoring opportunity for small business in America.

Legislation of this nature can well result in the creation of thousands of small businesses, employing hundreds of thousands of workers. Likewise, such legislation will tend to offset the trend toward centralization of economic power, as new small business finds an opportunity to compete on something approaching equal terms with large existing economic units.

All the veterans' legislation passed by this Congress will have little permanent value unless economic opportunity is restored. If present G. I. legislation is to be of long-term benefit, private enterprise must be revitalized. The people of America and the boys on the battlefield recognize this vital fact. It is up to this Congress to face the problem forthrightly and constructively—now.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a copy of a resolution recently adopted by the members of Local No. 21, United Federal Workers of America, C. I. O., New York City:

Whereas 26 percent of the population of New York City live in substandard homes; and

Whereas child care and other community facilities are not available to all those needing them: Be it

Resolved, That Local 21, United Federal Workers of America, C. I. O., New York City, favors a minimum post-war low-rent slum clearance housing program of at least 20,000 homes per year for 25 years as being immediately necessary for New York City; be it further

Resolved, That all homes should be related to an inclusive city plan so that they will have easy access to necessary community facilities such as schools, stores, churches, parks, playgrounds, recreation centers, and transportation; be it further

Resolved, That the mayor of the City of New York, the president of the city council of New York, and the Chairman of the New York City Housing Authority be notified of this resolution and be requested to support this program; be it further

Resolved, That the Representative from New York City and the Senators from New York State to the United States Congress, and Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman, Special Post-War Economic Policy and Planning Committee, and Representative FRITZ G. LANHAM, chairman, Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, be notified of this resolution and be asked to support necessary legislation to make this program a reality.

Capt. Maurice Britt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, last week the tragedy of war came home to my alma mater and that of three of my colleagues from Arkansas, Mr. CRAVENS, Mr. GATHINGS, and Mr. FULBRIGHT. On the University of Arkansas campus, the Congressional Medal of Honor was presented to one whose heroic exploits in Italy a few months ago were heralded throughout the world, and who returns now to his mother, his wife, his friends, handicapped in body but just as stalwart in spirit as when he sparked the Razorback football teams from his position at end.

My reference is to Capt. Maurice Britt. At the University of Arkansas, his journalism teacher was W. J. Lemke, for whom all students who come in contact with him develop an attachment which extends far beyond the campus boundaries and their classroom years.

It was Mr. Lemke's idea that the Congressional Medal of Honor should be presented to Captain Britt at the commencement exercises. He maintains contact with his erstwhile students through what he calls the Journalism News Letter, the sixty-first issue of which, dated June 9, gives a poignant account of the ceremonies—an account which I confess filled my eyes with tears and my heart with resolve to contribute my bit, small though it may be, toward saving future generations of our youth from such terrible sacrifice.

I quote from Mr. Lemke's News Letter to the University journalism alumni:

DEAR GANG: Purpose of today's letter is to give you a report on commencement. The big event, of course, was the presentation of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Capt. Maurice "Footsie" Britt, U. A. journalism grad. * * *

The Britt party arrived by Army plane Sunday afternoon. "Footsie" was accompanied by his wife, Nancy, his mother, medical attendants, and public relations officers. They stayed in Fayetteville until Tuesday morning, when they went to Fort Smith for a reception there in Britt's honor. From Fort Smith "Footsie" returned to Atlanta, where he is a patient in Lawson General Hospital. My first glimpse of Maurice was at an informal reception Sunday night at the home of Johnnie Porter. The last time I had seen him was when he got his journalism A. B. in June 1941.

My first impression Sunday night was "Footsie" hadn't changed a bit. He had the same shy smile and quiet manner of speaking that I remembered from his classroom days. Although his right sleeve is empty and his broken foot encased in a cast and his body covered with shrapnel scars, his morale is excellent and his spirits high. He looks swell. The enemy maimed him but they never dented the courageous good nature that is characteristic not only of Britt but of all American youth both on the gridiron and on the battlefield.

I was hoping I'd get a chance to talk with "Footsie" alone but they kept him on the go constantly and I never got the opportunity. Anyway, that conversation can wait. He did tell me that he got a kick out of the News Letter in which I told about his making a D grade in one of the journalism courses. He rattled off some of the big words we had in that class (critical writing) and said he still didn't know what they mean. The university had asked me to get some "Britt day" pictures, so I and the Speed Graphic were trailing "Footsie" all day. I shot him early in the morning at the Delta Gamma breakfast and noticed that he didn't have any trouble handling the food with his left hand. He gets his artificial arm next week and will spend several months learning to use it.

At noon I shot pictures of the alumni luncheon where "Footsie" sat at the head of the speaker's table flanked by several generals, the Governor of the State, a number of "big shot" financiers, and other celebrities. Britt's wife and mother were seated directly across the table from him. And speaking of his mother—she explains a lot of things about why and how this lad from Lonoke fought through to the top. She's a real American mother. At the luncheon, Britt's former high-school principal and coach introduced him and in his introduction paid a grand tribute to Britt's mother.

At 5:30 that evening I still had the camera pointed at "Footsie." This time it was at a dinner at his fraternity house. The Sigma Chis had rounded up a distinguished gathering of alumni, including Captain Britt, Brig. Gen. Charles G. Hillman, Congressman Bill Fulbright and many others. I noticed several men in uniform whom I knew: Capt. James Woods, of Rogers, just back from 65 missions over Europe (his brother was killed recently on his first mission); Capt. Paul Chambers, returned after 2 years in the Aleutians; Lieutenant Oliver, with ribbons indicating service in both Alaska and Italy; Lt. Herbert L. Thomas Jr., just back from the Pacific; and others.

At 3 p. m. there were close to 8,000 people in Razorback Stadium to see the ceremony in which Captain Britt received the Nation's highest award, the Medal of Honor. I've talked to many people who were there and the consensus is that it was the most impressive ceremony ever held here. It was a stirring sight to see the several hundred men of the Rainbow Division standing in formation on the football field, with their colors of the 48 States forming a semicircle behind the troops. Captain Britt, General Collins of the Rainbow Division, other high ranking officers, State and university officials occupied seats on a reviewing stand built in front of the west stand. At 3:30 Captain Britt left the stand and walked to a position directly in front of the stand. The band played the "Star Spangled Banner." Lieutenant Colonel Tanner of the Forty-second Division read the War Department order and official citation, telling of the action which won the award for Captain Britt. While the Rainbow Division's band played the University's Alma Mater, General Collins and Colonel Tanner left the stand and took their places directly in front of Captain Britt. The general paid high tribute to Captain Britt's bravery and placed the blue ribbon with the Medal of Honor around the Captain's collar. Britt responded in a clear voice and said just exacty the right thing—that he was accepting the honor on behalf of all the men at war today. He said that the real heroes are those who have given their lives in the war and those who are on the battlefronts today. After the presentation Captain Britt and General Collins 'trooped the line' in front of the contingent from the Rainbow Division and then returned to the stand. The troops passed in review.

The ceremony was covered by newsreel, radio, and press. There must have been a hundred photographers out there. I've been in some photo jams in my day but nothing like the mob that shot every feature of the ceremony. Britt was very accommodating and after the ceremony he posed for the cameramen for quite a while. They shot him kissing his wife, hugging his mother, grouped with Coach Rose and Razorback football players, and so on. I didn't stick around to get any posed shots. I'd gotten a lump in my throat when the band played the alma mater. Henry Tovey's great hymn has never been played with the feeling and finesse that the Rainbow Division's band put into it.

It was a ceremony that no one who witnessed it will ever forget. It was a big day for Footsie and he deserved it. And just for the record, I'd like to say that it was my idea that the medal of honor be presented to Footsie on his own college campus and before his home folks. When I read that the medal would be given to Britt in the hospital at Atlanta, I wrote to President Harding that it might be possible to have the ceremony here, where folks from his native Carlisle, from Lonoke where he went to high school, from Fort Smith where Nancy's folks live, and the alumni, students, and townspeople of Fayetteville could join in paying tribute to him. Dr. Harding wrote to Washington and got the ceremony transferred here. Maybe it's immodest for me to claim any credit, but I never was known for my modesty. Anyway, I want a share of Britt. I like to think that there's a bit of me in every student who was in my classes. If I didn't believe that, there wouldn't be any sense to teaching school.

Guess I'm funny. I heard the commencement address, not much of it, but I caught the phrase "private enterprise" occasionally. But I wasn't really listening. I was sitting up there near the back of the Greek Theater, on the grass, and I thought of Tom Lincoln, Bill Russell, and Ned Butler, three U. A. journalists who went out in flaming crashes. Behind me stood a mother whose youngest son had just died the same way. I turned around and looked at her.

At the alumni luncheon I was just as absent-minded. They were introducing the distinguished visitors, but their achievements

didn't register with me. Because I was watching the rootin' rubes who waited on table, with their white silk blouses with a razorback on back and their red skirts. In particular, I was watching one rootin' rube, a small dark-haired girl, pretty and smart. Her name is Lou Alice Wright. She was in one of my classes. She's a junior. She wears a wedding ring, but her husband isn't here. She doesn't know where he is. Two years ago last month Sgt. Mack Wright bailed out of a stricken bomber over Lae, New Guinea. His parachute was seen to open. They could recognize him because he always wore a strip of parachute silk around his neck for a scarf. But nobody has seen him since. When he had been missing a year the War Department continued to carry him on the rolls as "missing in action." Last week it was 2 years. And Lou Alice still has her chin out, makes A grades in her studies, carries on.

I don't know why I feel this way. Guess it was Britt saluting with his left hand.

Information for Servicemen, Veterans, and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee of the House of Representatives, the committee charged with preparation of laws for veterans of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, it has often come to my attention that many of those now in the service, as well as veterans and their dependents, frequently do not get all the benefits to which they are entitled simply because they do not know about them. This is understandable because there is so much legislation on veterans benefits it is too much to ask the busy average citizen to keep abreast of it.

I have had many inquiries from my district for an outline of the benefits we in Congress have made available to the servicemen, veterans, and their dependents. The Government of the United States is liberal with those who have worn the uniform of their country. Our soldiers, sailors, and marines are the best paid and best equipped in the world. Our veterans and their dependents receive more adequate care than any others in the world. This is a field in which our Government has taken the lead. Much needed to be done remains undone. We cannot anticipate at this time all the requirements which will have to be met. We do not know at this time what our country can afford to pay in full settlement of its obligation to veterans. These are questions for the future. I am proud that I have had an active part and a special responsibility as a member of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee in promoting much of the progressive legislation now on the lawbooks and of benefit to veterans and their dependents. The country owes a special duty to help readjust the veteran to civilian life and, as President Abraham Lincoln said, "To care for his widow and orphans." That is historic American policy.

I have prepared, in cooperation with the Veterans' Administration, an outline of information indicating the kind and amount of benefits currently available under Federal law, the qualifications therefor, and how to proceed to get them. In this outline monetary benefits based upon service-connected disability or death are referred to as compensation and pension. The reason for use of both terms is that, under existing laws, the service-connected monetary benefits for World War No. 1 veterans and their dependents are termed compensation, while World War No. 2 service-connected benefits are termed pension.

I repeat, this is only an outline. Any citizen can get more detailed information from the Veterans' Administration or from his Congressman about these benefits. The citizens of the Sixth Missouri Congressional District, which I represent, can continue to get help on their problems by addressing their inquiries to me as follows: Congressman MARION T. BENNETT, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I want to make it clear that while this legislation is helpful, the greatest benefit Congress can assure the serviceman, veteran, and his dependents, is to preserve the Constitution of the United States which assures freedom of enterprise and opportunity. Under our form of government we need only to help the veteran to help himself. A free and prosperous people at peace is the American way. The greatest issue before the American people today is the answer to the question, What will the boys find over here when it is over over there?

OUTLINE OF BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN, VETERANS, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS UNDER EXISTING LAW—COMPENSATION AND PENSION FOR DISABILITY OR DEATH

Service-connected disability: Under the veterans regulations promulgated under the act of March 20, 1933, as amended, honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 are entitled to compensation or pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by such service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10 percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month. While the World War No. 2 veterans were entitled to these rates following the act of December 19, 1941, they were placed on complete parity under the veterans regulations by the act of July 13, 1943, Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, with reference to the requirements governing proof of service connection of disability. The latter act also liberalized the regulation concerning the presumption of soundness upon entry into service. Under Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates based upon service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including special awards and allowances fixed by law, were increased by 15 percent.

In lieu of such pension or compensation, reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, meeting the requirements of the Army regulations pertaining to retirement of officers of the Regular Establishment, are retired by the War Department, certified to the Veterans' Administration, and their retired pay equal to 75 percent of their base pay is paid by the Veterans' Administration out of the pension appropriation.

Nonservice-connected disability: Under Public Law No. 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the rate of pension for permanent and total nonservice-connected disability, applicable to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion, the Philippine Insurrection and World War No. 1, was increased from $40 to $50 per month with an increase to $60 per month where such veterans have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or reach the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. This act also provides that the above pension for non-service-connected disability shall apply to veterans of both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

Service-connected death: The rates of compensation or pension for widows, children, and dependent parents of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans based upon death in service, or service-connected death, are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100)	38
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

The above rates are contained in Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943, and constitute a material liberalization of the prior rates.

Non-service-connected death: The widow, child, or children, of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 are entitled to the following rates of compensation if the veteran at the time of death from a non-service-connected cause had a disability incurred in or aggravated by such war service.

Widow but no child	$35
Widow and 1 child (with $5 for each additional child)	45
No widow but 1 child	18
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	27
No widow but 3 children (equally divided)	36
With $4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).	

Payments are limited to an aggregate of $64 in any one case.

Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, act of May 27, 1944, increased the rates to the above amounts and also included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans, the law previously having applied only to World War No. 1 veterans.

Claims and effective date of awards: Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred to a Veterans' Administration facility, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for adjudication, the applicant should file claim on proper form which will be supplied upon inquiry addressed to any Veterans' Administration facility or regional office, or to the local representative of the American Red Cross or of a veterans' service organization.

Under interagency agreement a person who is to be discharged from military or naval service is in need of further hospital care, prior arrangements are made by the commanding officer to afford him opportunity to file all necessary claims, supply necessary clinical and service data and to send the veteran to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. (Cf. A. R. 615-360, change No. 4, April 16, 1943.) If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

Upon death in service, the service department notifies the Veterans' Administration, and claims forms are sent immediately to all known dependents.

Groups potentially eligible for pensions: All members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the Public Health Service or of the Coast and Geodetic Survey when ordered to active service with the Army or Navy or as to United States Public Health Service while serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, and as to Coast and Geodetic Survey when assigned during present war to duty on business of War or Navy Departments in areas outside continental United States or in Alaska or coastal areas of the United States as determined by the War and Navy Departments to be of immediate military hazard, are potentially eligible for pensions.

The Women's Auxiliary Army Corps was not in the active service; and, while the several Women's Reserve Corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard originally were in the active service, they were by statute precluded from pension eligibility; in lieu thereof, being subject to laws pertaining to employees' compensation. Legislation was subsequently enacted making the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard components eligible potentially for pension benefits—Public Law 110, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 1, 1943; Public Law 183, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved November 8, 1943; and Public Law 214, approved December 23, 1943.

Awards to date: Pension payments to veterans of World War No. 2 and their dependents total $37,760,572.78 through March 1944. In addition, retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration to Reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, totaled $1,020,137.33 from July 1, 1942, through March 31, 1944.

Disbursements for the relief of World War No. 1 veterans and their dependents from 1918 through March 1944 for disability and death compensation or pension, service connected and nonservice connected, totaled $5,007,029,954.54. In addition, disbursements for World War No. 1 Emergency officers' retirement pay through March 31, 1944, totaled $84,889,697.63. Our older veterans are not being forgotten just because there is a new and larger crop, as these figures prove.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE, PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES, AND DOMICILIARY CARE

Eligibility is extended to any veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 honorably discharged, having a service-connected disability requiring such care, treatment, or appliance, or one who was discharged for disability and not dishonorably; also one not dishonorably discharged, who is unable to defray his expenses, has tuberculosis or a neuropsychiatric ailment or disability which requires hospital care.

Dependent upon availability of facilities, eligibility includes any veteran of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, and who is in need of such care and is unable to defray the expenses therefor—regardless of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service.

The service groups included are all components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, the respective Women's Reserves thereof, and United States Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey under the conditions stated for pension purposes.

The Veterans' Administration maintains 94 facilities and has contract facilities with a total of 92,019 beds, distributed as follows (as of March 23, 1944):

Tuberculosis	6,212
Neuropsychiatric	39,417
General medical and surgical	25,658
Domiciliary	16,117
Contract—other governmental	4,227
State and private	388
Total	92,019

Diagnostic centers, with expert specialists available, are maintained at Hines, Chicago, Ill.; San Francisco, Calif.; and Mount Alto, Washington, D. C. Cancer clinics: Bronx, N. Y.; Hines, Chicago, Ill.; Mount Alto, Washington, D. C.; Atlanta, Ga.; Portland, Oreg.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

The present building program will raise this total to more than 100,000 beds. The Veterans' Administration anticipates an eventual need of 300,000 beds to enable veterans of World War No. 2 and of prior wars to receive hospital and domiciliary care to the same extent as is now provided. However, this estimated maximum should not be needed until long after the war or require the eventual additional construction of more than 100,000 beds, since there will be, under present plans, 100,000 beds in Veterans' Administration facilities, and it is anticipated that it should be possible to obtain the same number from the Army and Navy shortly after the termination of the war.

Claims: Any person who is to be discharged from active service and who is in need of and entitled to hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration, is transferred directly to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. Claim for all benefits, and necessary clinical and service data accompany him, or are filed by the manager if the veteran is insane or incompetent.

All others should file claim for treatment or hospitalization directly with the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office—one, or more, in each State in the Union except Delaware.

Sixty-four thousand nine hundred and eighty-two veterans of World War No. 2 have been hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration through April 30, 1944. On April 30, 1944, there were 44,967 World War No. 1 veterans and 12,866 World War No. 2 veterans receiving hospitalization, and 8,477 World War No. 1 veterans and 196 World War No. 2 veterans receiving domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration.

While domiciliary care cannot be said to be a part of the rehabilitation process, it is a valuable benefit for those who have reached a permanent state of disability and have no other means of support.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved by the President March 24, 1943, provides—

First, that any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war;

Second, and who was honorably discharged;

Third, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay;

Fourth, who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement.

Immediately following the passage of that legislation there was created in the Veterans' Administration a vocational rehabilitation service composed of three divisions, namely, the Vocational Advisement Division, the Training Into Employment Division, and the Research Division. The planning and control functions created by the administration of this act are exercised in the central office of the Veterans' Administration. All operations, including determinations of need for training, vocational advisement, induction into training, supervision, as well as the selection of training facilities, are functions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Division in that facility of the Veterans' Administration having jurisdiction of the territory in which the veteran resides. There are 53 such fa-

cilities. These facilities are, generally speaking, bound by State boundary lines. In a few States there is more than one facility. Missouri has one at Kansas City and another at St. Louis. The course of training prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit the veteran for employment may not exceed 4 years and may not extend beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by virtue of a handicap due to service-incurred disability. In performing the functions imposed upon the Administration by Public Law 16, it will be the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to utilize educational institutions and establishments of recognized standing in the training of these disabled veterans into employment and to train each person as near his home as may be possible. In securing employment, a problem which obviously will be very great after the end of the war and perhaps acute after demobilization has been accomplished, every available Federal and State facility will be utilized. Employment of veterans has been accomplished to a considerable extent through the United States Employment Service. It will be the purpose to correlate these activities to the end that those vocationally trained will be graduated into employment opportunities.

While the disabled veteran is in training his pension, unless it equals or exceeds such amounts, will be increased to $80 per month, if single; $90 per month, if married, with $5 additional for each child, and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required.

Claims: Those persons discharged from the service directly to the Veterans' Administration facilities for hospitalization will have their claims filed and processed; and the question of need for and entitlement to vocational rehabilitation may be given consideration as soon as the individual's physical and mental condition make training feasible. Any other person honorably discharged from the service may make claims for vocational rehabilitation in the claim for pension which may be filed at the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office.

INSURANCE

National service life insurance: National service life insurance was provided under the act of October 8, 1940, Public Law No. 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, and liberalizing amendments thereto were enacted during the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses. A number of other liberalizing proposals are pending in the present Congress and the Veterans' Administration has submitted certain proposed changes found to be justified by studies conducted. Application may be made for not less than $1,000 nor more than $10,000 without physical examination prior to the expiration of 120 days from entrance into active service. Thereafter, any such person in the active military or naval service may apply if the application be accompanied by acceptable evidence of good health.

Applications: Application forms are supplied the service departments, and may be obtained from the commanding officer or designated insurance officer. The applicant may elect to pay premiums in cash, or by allotment of pay. Policies are not issued during the war, but insurance certificate is mailed to the address designated by applicant.

The insurance is against death only, but includes waiver of premiums during total disability existing for more than 6 months, and commencing prior to insured's sixtieth birthday. The policy is a 5-year level premium term policy with rate based upon the American experience table of mortality and 3 percent interest— the Government assuming the extra hazard of the military and naval service and the administrative expense. The insurance is payable only to a widow (widower), child (including a stepchild or illegitimate child, if designated as beneficiary by the insured), parent (including person in loco parentis), brother and sister of the insured; and is payable only in monthly installments. The insured may change the beneficiary designation at any time.

After the policy has been in effect for at least 1 year, while in force it may be converted to an ordinary life, 20-payment life or 30-payment life policy upon application to the Veterans' Administration without medical examination.

In cases where the person in service died or became totally disabled, or was captured or isolated by the enemy prior to April 20, 1942, and had less than $5,000 insurance in effect, the law provides that gratuitous insurance to an aggregate of $5,000 shall be deemed in effect. Claims for such gratuitous insurance should be filed as soon as possible, because of limitations. In most of these death cases only a widow, child, or dependent parent can claim such insurance.

As of March 30, 1944, over 14,303,291 applications had been received, representing a total amount of nearly $105,596,766,000 of insurance. The average policy was approximately $7,382.69; the average coverage per life approximately $8,926.74.

The insurance is payable in the event of the death of the insured while the policy is in force to a beneficiary or beneficiaries, which may be designated by the insured, only within the relationship of widow or widower, child, parent, brother, or sister. The proceeds of the policy are payable as an annuity in 240 equal monthly installments of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance to any beneficiary who is under 30 years of age at the time of the death of the insured; otherwise, in continuous monthly installments throughout the lifetime of the beneficiary, with a guaranty of the payment of 120 monthly installments to the surviving relatives of the insured who are within the permitted class of beneficiaries. The amount of the monthly installment under the latter mode of payment is dependent upon the age of the beneficiary at date of death of insured. For example, if the beneficiary is then 40 years old, monthly installment is $4.50 for each $1,000 of insurance; if 50, $5.39; if 60, $6.81; if 70, $8.51.

The beneficiary would receive under a policy of $5,000 or $10,000, for example, monthly payments, beginning at the stated ages, in the following amounts: $27.55–$55.10, $22.50–$45, $26.95–$53.90, $34.05–$68.10, and $42.55–$85.10.

Claims: All claims for insurance benefits should be addressed to the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., but necessary forms may be secured from the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

United States Government life (converted) insurance: This insurance can be applied for only by those who served in World War No. 1. No one may have more than $10,000 national service life insurance and Government (converted) insurance combined.

Insurance premiums are guaranteed by Government under Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended: Any person in the active service having a commercial life policy or policies meeting the requirements of said law, article IV, may, upon application to the Veterans' Administration on form supplied the Army and Navy, secure guaranty of premiums, on amount of insurance not in excess of $10,000, while he is in the service during the present war. The insurance premiums so guaranteed by the Government constitute a lien against the policy and must be paid by the company out of any settlement thereof. In the event of the insured's discharge from service, he has a period of 2 years within which to pay the premiums with interest so guaranteed or otherwise such indebtedness constitutes a loan on the policy with interest and if the amount of such indebtedness exceeds the cash surrender value, the policy is automatically canceled and the Government pays the insurer the difference between such cash surrender value and the indebtedness. Forms for making application for such insurance protection are supplied to the War and Navy Departments and may be secured in person or from his commanding officer or other designated official.

As of March 31, 1944, 72,204 applications with insurance totaling $178,189,853.21 have been approved and premiums guaranteed.

INSURANCE UNDER OTHER LAWS

Old-age and survivors insurance is administered by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; unemployment benefits by Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; retirement by Railroad Retirement Board and Civil Service Commission. Credit for active military or naval service is allowed for civil-service retirement and railroad retirement purposes.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mustering-out pay is provided by the act of February 3, 1944, Public Law 225, Seventy-eighth Congress, and is administered by the War and Navy Departments. The amounts are from $100 to $300.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES

Administered by the War and Navy Departments for dependents of those in the service. Your Congressman can supply many details about this subject and help get delayed allotments straightened out for dependents of servicemen.

DOMICILIARY CARE

United States Soldiers' Home, under jurisdiction of the War Department; Naval Home, under jurisdiction of the Navy Department. This is in addition to that provided by the Veterans' Administration.

GUARDIANSHIP

Supervision is maintained, in cooperation with the State courts, over payments of any benefits made on account of insane or minor beneficiaries to insure proper application of such benefits.

RETIREMENT PAY

Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard: For officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Establishment, and reserve components of Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

TAXES

Bureau of Internal Revenue: All veteran benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration are exempt from all taxation. Special consideration is shown in the income-tax laws for those in the service.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE

Up to the amount of $100 may be paid for any war veteran, honorably discharged or in receipt of pension or compensation, as to any veteran discharged from the armed forces for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

A United States flag to drape the casket, subsequently to be turned over to the next of kin, may be furnished as to any veteran, discharged honorably after active service during any war or after serving at least one enlistment or by reason of disability incurred in line of duty. Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, as to his minor children or adult unmarried daughters. The expenses incident to transporting the body of one who has died while in active service, or of a veteran who has died in a Veterans' Administration facility, to the place of burial, are, within limitations, borne by the Government. Headstone or marker—stone or marble—will be furnished for the unmarked grave of any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who died while in the active service. There is a national cemetery at Springfield, Mo.

Various benefits, rights, and privileges are also provided as to certain veterans, their dependents, and their organizations under State laws, as per the résumé thereof, as published by the House Committee on Pensions, entitled "State Veterans' Laws."

CIVIL, SPANISH, AND OTHER WARS

Pensions on the basis of age, degree of inability to earn a living, and/or length of service for (1) Civil War veterans, in the amount of $75 per month, or $100, if in need of a regular attendant, (2) Indian War veterans, in amounts ranging from $20 to $55 per month, or $100, if in need of an attendant, and (3) veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion, in amounts ranging from $12 to $75 per month, plus varying amounts if in need of a regular attendant, with total not to exceed $100 but only $8 while being furnished hospital treatement or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration if the veteran has no dependents, provided that as to those in a soldiers' home continually since on or before July 15, 1943, the pension of $50 shall be continued.

Pension of $50 per month for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, or World War No. 1, with 90 days or more of honorable service, or, if less than 90 days, if discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, who suffer with permanent total disability, regardless of service connection, if not due to misconduct. Only $8 per month is paid to single men, without dependents, while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by a Government agency.

EDUCATION

Congress provided in 1944 that any veteran who served on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and whose education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service, or who desires a refresher or retraining course, and who served 90 days or more, is entitled to education at public expense. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice, up to $500 per year for tuition and books and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if single and $75 if married, not to exceed 4 years. Any person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service is assumed to have had his education interrupted. Veterans must meet the regular entrance and scholarship requirements.

FARM, HOME, AND SMALL BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

The Federal Government, through the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, will guarantee up to 50 percent and as high as $2,000 of any approved loan secured by a veteran from a private or Government source for purchase or operation of a farm, home or small business. Loans will be interest free the first year and interest will not exceed 4 percent per annum. Applications for this benefit must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs within 2 years after discharge by those who served in the armed forces on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to termination of this war.

JOBS

Congress provided, in 1944, in addition to the foregoing education, farm, home, and small business opportunities, that every veteran of World War No. 2 shall be helped to find a job. The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board cooperate to fill this responsibility. Veterans are to be registered and every effort made to assist them to find jobs. This provision includes veterans of all wars. Information on how to get the benefits of this provision can be obtained by the veteran from his own local United States Employment Office in his home town or county.

Return to the job after discharge is under jurisdiction of Selective Service; placing in other jobs is under War Manpower Commission; veterans' preference is administered by United States Civil Service Commission and various departments and agences; job training, rehabilitation (nonservice disability) is administered by Federal Security Agency.

Certain preferences as to Federal civil service, as to physical and age prerequisites, examinations, ratings, appointments, retentions, and reinstatement of Federal employment, are extended to qualified service-connected disabled veterans, the wives of unemployable service-connected or 50-year-aged pensioned veterans, the widows of veterans, and other war veterans and regulars, supplemented by extensive United States Employment Service and Veterans Employment Service, in every State, for war veterans. Any World War No. 2 veteran who applies therefor, within 40 days after discharge, is entitled to reinstatement to the Federal position held at time of entering service, or to one of equal grade and pay, or to his previous private employment, where at all practicable for employer, enforceable by order of court, if necessary.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Congress provided in 1944 that for the first 2 years after a veteran's discharge he will be entitled to unemployment compensation for 52 weeks if he cannot find a job or the Employment Service cannot find one for him. This allowance is $20 per week, less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of $3. Provisions for unemployment compensation, farm, home, and business ownership and education, are part of the so-called G. I. Bill of Rights, one of many veterans' bills prepared in 1943-44 by the World War Veterans' Committee, of which I am a member. By enacting the G. I. Bill of Rights, and other similar legislation, Congress has established a beachhead in America for all of our returning veterans. I repeat, the serviceman, veterans and their dependents can continue to receive help and information on their problems from their Representatives in Congress, who are in daily touch with such matters. The address for residents of the Sixth Missouri Congressional District to write to is Congressman MARION T. BENNETT, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The Intercoastal Shipping Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I have just received through the mails a reprint of an editorial from the Nautical Gazette, the oldest maritime publication in the United States. The editorial strikes me as being interesting and it is devoted to a timely suggestion. My thought is that other Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might like to read it also:

PLANS FOR RESTORING THE INTERCOASTAL SERVICE

When the subject of post-war plans for American shipping is being discussed and the air becomes thick with theories for developing and protecting our maritime interests, there is never much quibbling over the contention that in the scheme of things to come the straightest road back to sound commercial sea power lies along the established routes of our Intercoastal Service.

Rich in the grandest traditions of our maritime history, the present version of the intercoastal trade dates from the opening of the Panama Canal in 1914. Its foundations, however, were established firmly by the hardy breed of men who operated the Atlantic packets and the clipper ships of '49. The policy of restriction of the coastwise trade to American flag vessels was adopted by statute as early as March 1, 1817, and these coasting trade laws were extended in application later to the Territory of Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii.

The men and the ships engaged in the Intercoastal Service have rated the spot they occupy in the shipping picture for services rendered, and it is in such a spirit—and not with one eye glued to the dollar sign on ships being operated by the Government in this emergency—that we should consider the problems they will face when the war is over.

Signs recently emanating from Washington—many of them discernible in the inspired news stories of the Capital's press corps—indicated that certain spokesmen for the Government were of the opinion that it was about time for authorized representatives of the shipping industry to announce their post-war plans, if any—the implication being that perhaps the shipping men could not agree among themselves as to how normal operations should be resumed. Factually, the latter assumption is erroneous.

Naturally, there are many details about which various shipping company executives do not see eye to eye, but behind the alleged delay—if there has been any—in announcing their post-war plans is a completely warranted reluctance against placing themselves in a precarious position by a premature statement of their aims when they don't even know what their starting position is going to be. Before projecting any elaborate plans for what at this stage are rather nebulous future operations, every man with a dollar invested in the shipping business would like to know the answers to several questions that vitally affect his stake in the post-war world. Boiled down to the bare essentials of the real problems facing the intercoastal operator, some of the questions being asked in the trade are:

"If a requisitioned ship has done ton for ton what a new ship has done—and it must be remembered that the old ship did it when it was most needed—will the post-war policy of the Government be to exchange ship for ship?

"What are the possible earnings of the new ship as compared with the old ship?

"Are the possible earnings any greater because the ship is new, or do the possible earnings depend on other factors?

"Is it not true that a ship-for-ship exchange would be justified if a new ship placed in the intercoastal service had no greater earning possibilities than an old ship?

"If the earnings of a new ship are presumed to be potentially greater than the pre-war ship, does not the difference represent the added value of the new ship over the old ship?

"If an intercoastal steamship company failed to make money with an old ship, should it be presumed that it will make money with a new ship?

"If a long-established intercoastal company is certain that it could not buy a new ship and operate it profitably in the intercoastal service, how could a new operator, facing higher capitalization costs and without experience in the field, enter the service and operate new ships at a profit?

"Looking at the ships, old or new, as instruments of commerce and not as representing so many dollars—dollars which in this case represent an abnormal war cost—the question of prime importance should be, How efficient is each ship as an instrument of commerce? How does one of the old ships compare with one of the new ones as an instrument of commerce?

"Lastly, if an old ship has been properly maintained and can carry the same amount of goods as cheaply as a new ship, is the new ship worth any more than the old ship as an instrument of commerce?"

The five-point program offered to the Maritime Commission for study by its subcommittee on domestic shipping does not answer the major questions that are bothering shipping men today. The subcommittee might have reached more definite conclusions if its recommendations had been based on a greater awareness of the fact that as a result of measures taken by the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, the earnings of steamship companies have been reduced by approximately 66⅔ percent since we became involved in the war.

During this period, as Admiral Land stated recently in commending the shipping industry's record of wartime cooperation, while steamship earnings were being reduced over 60 percent, corporate earnings generally have increased over 40 percent and the earnings of the transportation agencies, such as railroads, have increased over 100 percent. These figures tell a story that must not be forgotten during post-war discussions.

On the issue of ship replacements, the subcommittee recommends that the vessels to be made available from the Government pool should be sold at prices to be determined by a formula set up in the Bland-Bailey bill recently introduced in Congress. This formula presumably has been approved tentatively by the Maritime Commission. The subcommittee also recommends that the Maritime Commission should announce a definite, clear-cut policy with respect to the replacement and maintenance of as many craft as can be economically employed on the intercoastal run. Unless it is unexpectedly granted some superhuman powers of foresight, the Maritime Commission should gracefully duck any such assignment as this, or else be prepared to hear more howls than ever emanated from a Kilkenny cat fight.

The answers to the question outlined by representatives of the intercoastal service should be predicated on familiarity with the traditional importance of this service in the scheme of our national defense. Protected from foreign-flag competition, the intercoastal service must compete against rail and air-borne transportation, but it has no peer as a freight-carrying service. This is its traditional peacetime role, but if we are to maintain a naval force equal to our responsibilities and needs following the end of present hostilities, it is from the intercoastal service that the Government can best requisition vessels for an emergency on short notice.

The naval train must be built up and maintained by the employment of new vessels in the intercoastal service. High-speed ships that might be considered uneconomical or unnecessary under normal conditions would be absolutely essential in wartime. Fast, modern craft, operated by people familiar with the business of intercoastal shipping, should remain the first line of our merchant marine defense. The intercoastal service should be groomed and developed primarily for protective reasons, but the factor of proper utilization in peacetime should not be overlooked.

The intercoastal fleet, as United States Naval Reserve ships, should maintain high personnel standards. They could be detached from time to time to serve in the train during maneuvers. Under this system, the nation would get something permanent for the Government's investment of the taxpayers' war dollars and, if developed properly, the companies which have been engaged in the intercoastal shipping business for generations could maintain operations without being hampered by the constant fear of meeting the hungry wolf of top-heavy operating expenses on their doorstep every month.

Forgetting war-spent dollars for the moment, the intercoastal shipping service if developed along these lines could be made into the finest kind of a training service, a wide avenue for the advancement of our new sea-conscious youth, a feeder for the Navy, and a service where naval men could find places for themselves at the end of their enlistments.

An unholy interest in dollars and cents already spent to meet the challenge of delivering the goods to win the war will not solve the problems confronting our merchant marine. History has demonstrated in the case of Spain, with its slow gold-laden galleons, that pieces-of-eight do not command respect or inspire fear at sea. Fast ships, well-manned, comprise a nation's maritime strength, not bars of gold in the ground vaults at Fort Knox.

No stalemate has been reached on these issues. The Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration have not announced any arbitrary decisions as to post-war policy. The time is approaching, however, when representatives of the Government and the shipping interests should meet and state their views on the problems that are certain to confront them as soon as the war is over. All progress is the result of compromises made by conflicting groups to reach an agreement. In this case, an important factor in the future of the Nation's defense is at stake.

It behooves both sides to assume these responsibilities with dignity and courage. There is no reason under the sun why any details should become an obstacle to final agreement. The post-war plan finally agreed upon for the Intercoastal Service should be the best of all possible plans from the standpoint of the industry, the Government, and the people they serve.

The Mocking Bird, Mississippi's State Bird, Now Demands National Recognition

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is more than fitting that we occasionally have a note of gladness to cheer us in these solemn hours.

Some time ago I called the attention of the House to the fact that the Legislature of Mississippi had selected the mocking bird as the official bird—the feathered emblem of our State.

He seems now to be appealing to Congress for national recognition. Just outside the front door of the Capitol, atop a cluster of shrubbery, there is one that every person in the United States ought to hear.

I believe he is the most irresistible lobbyist I have ever known. Men fairly melt beneath the magnetism of his matchless eloquence. If something is not done about it, he is going to captivate the whole Congress, and have himself unanimously chosen as our national representative of "all the feathered tribe."

Members become so entranced that they have to literally tear themselves away to keep from missing the sessions of the House. You know it is said that Alcibiades once stopped up his ears and fled from the presence of Socrates for fear that he would grow old listening to his eloquence. He afterwards caused the downfall of Greece.

Maybe the country would be better off if more of us would pause and listen longer to the song of this all-American bird.

I have asked that his "remarks be taken down" and transmitted by radio to every home in America, and to our soldiers overseas. What an inspiration it would be for those brave boys from the South who are on the various fighting fronts to hear this familiar note from home.

The average person outside of the South never heard a real mockingbird; and I want them to understand just what temptation we are being subjected to by the wiles of this "amorous sojourner."

He is the most persuasive witness that has yet appeared to testify before Congress in his own behalf.

He seems to know when Congress convenes, and does not waste his time here in the early morning hours; but takes his stand in front of the Supreme Court building. He was there as I came along this morning, perched upon the flagpole, with the Stars and Stripes streaming below, making the welkin ring with his tireless serenade. I wish the members of the Supreme Court could have heard him. Maybe he would have inspired that august tribunal to get back "on the beam."

To me it was a glorious picture—the finest expression of American nature, above the emblem of American authority, enlivening the morning hours with his boundless repertoire, as he repeated the songs of other birds with a musical cadence that should be an inspiration to the gods.

He seemed to lift me from the ground and carry me back across the tide of years, wafted, as it were, upon the wings of memory, to the unforgotten scenes of long ago.

I just want to warn you Members now that if you don't want to be swept off your feet and stampeded into voting him the greatest songbird on earth, and adopting him as our national emblem, you had better use the subway in going to and returning from your offices; for, knowing you as I do, I doubt if a single one of you is so devoid of sentiment that you could hold out long against his entrancing appeal.

For my part, I am already convinced. I am ready to support him now; and I believe if it were put to a vote he would sweep the Congress.

Then he would probably make a drive on the peace conference, and have himself selected as the choice of all the civilized nations of the earth, and given rightful recognition as the greatest feathered songster in the world.

Many years ago I delivered a short address before the Mississippi Society here in Washington on the southern mocking bird. At that time, I was accused of exaggerating by a few realistic representatives of the press. I now call as witnesses every Member of this House.

Just step outside the front door and get, not only the ocular proof, as Shakespeare says, but the auricular proof as well; and I am sure you will return the unanimous verdict rendered by the Queen of Sheba after her visit to King Solomon that "the half has never yet been told."

I repeat what I said at that time, and insert those remarks for you to verify. Here is what I said then:

Mr. Chairman, it has indeed been a pleasure to me to listen to your excellent musical program, and especially to the imitations of bird songs as illustrated by that celebrated writer and naturalist, Schuyler Mathews, in his delightful book on Wild Birds and Their Music.

The only suggestion I have to offer is that before he puts out another edition of his wonderful work that distinguished gentleman should take a postgraduate course in his chosen field of study by going down into Mississippi and reveling in the songs of the southern mockingbird—the greatest singer of them all.

I can understand how one who has never heard him can extol in superlative terms the songs of other birds, for as Shakespeare has wisely stated, "The crow doth sing as sweetly as the lark when neither is attended."

And if, as the poet Burton has said, "A nightingale dies for shame if another bird sings better," then one melodious trill of Dixie matchless songster would put a world of nightingales to instant and shameful death.

He is the master of them all.

The Caruso of field and forest, the Mozart of wild music, the grand opera of Nature, he seems to embrace within his boundless repertoire the songs of all the birds that have ever lived and those that are yet to come.

As courageous as the eagle, he guards with valor and with vigilance his nestlings and his mate, repelling the invasion of the dreaded hawk, and scattering a flock of intruding crows in ignominious flight. As gentle as the dove, he manifests the highest attributes of civilization as prescribed by the golden rule by reflecting in his daily life the sentiments of his song.

It has been said that musical expression is confined to the highest natures, and that therefore birds of prey never sing.

The friendless vulture that waits his way in geometric figures over the sunny landscape, measuring with his fleeting shadow those double circles which meet only at the bedside of death, or on the field of carnage, never sings a song. The weird owl, the nightly terror of all the feathered tribe, the most ghastly and striking emblem of desolation and despair, never warbles a note. The loathsome vampire, that detestable plague of the tropics, that reputed pest to human life, never breathes a tune.

I would rather be the mockingbird which Longfellow has described as "swinging aloft on a willow spray" and shaking from his little throat "such floods of delirious music" that all the world would seem to pause and listen, to live for one short hour, than to be the venomous toad and exist throughout a century, or to be the loathsome reptile and live a thousand years.

We dignify as a national emblem the American eagle that soars and shrieks his screams of defiance from the seclusion of the crags; we perpetuate in verse and story the imaginary song of the mythical dying swan; we praise the inferior songs of other birds—but, in my humble judgment, there is none that deserves more praise, credit, or commendation at the hands of enlightened humanity than the peerless mockingbird, America's sweetest singer, who enlivens the spirit of springtime with his tireless serenade, and thrills every heart with his inspiring note of gladness as he touches the golden harp of Nature's sweetest song and "stirs with joy and hope the languid souls of listening men."

Abolish the Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over the Blue Network, Thursday, June 15, 1944:

The people of the United States will soon be faced with the solemn duty to elect their President and Vice President.

Of such great consequence is this choice of national leader, Chief of State, Commander in Chief of our armed forces that every faculty of mature judgment and of analysis must be brought to bear upon the choice. And yet there are many who have never stopped to consider the machinery of Presidential election. To too many of the voters, the electoral college represents some hazy formula. Not enough is known of its origin, purpose, and function. Its significance as an intermediate agency between the will of the people and the final choice for President and

Vice President, which it is, in fact, is well nigh completely lost. None of you will vote this November directly for Roosevelt or Dewey. You will vote only for so-called electors, who in turn will actually vote for them. Does not this relayed voting shock you?

But the question presents itself time and time again. What is the real necessity for retaining a mechanism that is—at best—a useless, cumbersome, expensive automaton, and—at worst—a dangerous weapon that has within itself the possibilities of thwarting the popular will?

The truth is that the founding fathers did not completely trust the judgment of the common man. Throughout the various proceedings attendant upon the writing of the Constitution, this distrust of the popular will was injected repeatedly into the debates and the discussions. Anent the election of the President and Vice President, Alexander Hamilton writing in the Federalist papers stated, "It was equally desirable that the immediate election should be made by men most capable of analyzing the qualities adapted to the station and acting under circumstances favorable to deliberation, and to a judicious combination of all the reasons and inducements that were proper to govern their choice. A small number of persons selected by their fellow citizens from the general mass will be most likely to possess the information and discernment requisite to so complicated an investigation."

It must be remembered that it was intended that each elector cast his vote according to his own judgment. It wasn't until 1800 that several of the States adopted the unit rule, a rule which still obtains today.

Thus, the electors of a State now cast their votes as one. No individual judgment is expressed in the vote. If a nominee receives a majority in Delaware, no matter how slight, he gets all 3 of Delaware's electoral votes. The favored nominee, if only favored by the smallest possible majority of 1 in New York State, receives the 47 electoral votes of New York State.

I have picked at random various election periods and it is most revealing to note the discrepancies between the popular vote and the electoral vote. For example, in 1900 McKinley received 50 percent of the popular vote, but 65 percent of the electoral vote. In 1940 Teddy Roosevelt received 56 percent of the popular vote, but 70 percent of the electoral vote. In 1928 Hoover received 58 percent of the popular vote and 83 percent of the electoral vote. In 1936 Roosevelt received 60 percent of the popular vote and 98 percent of the electoral vote.

You might say that such discrepancy makes very little difference just so long as the majority vote is reflected in the choice of the candidate receiving it. But that has not been so three times in the history of our country. That which has happened thrice before can happen again. In 1824 a majority of the popular vote was received by Andrew Jackson, but not the majority of the electoral vote. The election was thrown into the House of Representatives and John Quincy Adams was chosen. This was so despite the fact that Jackson received more popular votes than both Adams and Henry Clay. And so John Quincy Adams entered the White House by way of the back door. Again in 1876, Samuel J. Tilden, the Democratic candidate had a majority of some one-quarter million over Rutherford B. Hayes, but did not have the electoral college majority. The House of Representatives chose Hayes. In 1888 Benjamin Harrison received 100,000 less popular votes than the then President Cleveland, but Harrison received the majority in the electoral college and ousted President Cleveland.

The electoral college actually disenfranchises the minority vote. Election campaigns concentrate their heaviest batteries on doubtful or pivotal States. Each State has the same number of electoral votes as it has United States Senators and Representatives combined; each State, then, regardless of population, must have an irreducible minimum of 3 electors, each State having 2 Senators and at least 1 Representative. Thus, the total electoral vote is 531, and 266 of these electoral votes decide the issue. With 12 States—California, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Wisconsin—a Presidential nominee can win the election, regardless of the other 36. It is little wonder then that so much attention is focused on States like New York, California, Illinois, and Ohio. The minority votes in such States, as well as in others, is lost entirely, if indeed, the minority vote is cast. In States where the majority votes are known to be Democratic or Republican, the opposition in most instances will not bother to vote, since it is aware that the entire electoral vote will go to the majority candidate. Multiply such votes not cast in 48 States, since such vote is meaningless, and you can readily see how great a bearing that has on the final choice. Dewey or Roosevelt can win with a popular vote of less than 20,000,000, even though 60,000,000 votes are cast for the opponent. This is a veritable perversion of democracy.

To regard the electoral college as only a mechanical servant is to close one's eyes to its inherent dangers.

Nor are the equities observed in regard to the larger States. Under the electoral college, the votes of those living in small States count for more than the votes of those living in big States, since less popular votes in the small States are needed to represent each electoral vote. For instance, in 1936 Nevada had 1 electoral vote for each 14,616 popular votes cast in that State, while New York had 1 electoral vote for each 112,478 popular votes. Each Nevada voter then, was equal to 8 New Yorkers in electing a President.

Because of this go-between, that is, the electoral college, what is happening in South Carolina, Texas, Mississippi, Virginia, Louisiana, and Arkansas, the solid South has vast national importance. Although the electors of a State are honor-bound, according to time-worn tradition to vote for the candidate who carries the State in the November election, the organizers of the rebelling southern Democrats threaten to instruct their electors to ignore the national nominees for President and Vice President unless the Democratic National Convention, soon to be held in Chicago, complies with their demands. Their terms include a Democratic platform condemning the Supreme Court for its decision permitting Negroes to vote in the Texas primaries, anti-poll-tax legislation, condemning the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee, condemning the nomination of Henry Wallace for the Vice Presidency, and demanding, moreover, the over-all embrace of the theory of so-called white supremacy. It is a case of stand and deliver. In addition, they are insisting on a restoration of the long discarded national convention's two-thirds-vote rule for nominating Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. These terms are repugnant to the President as well as to the rank and file of northern Democrats.

The danger is real, because the useless electoral college gives edge to the ax. Nothing in the Constitution demands that a State vote as a bloc. The individual electors may exercise their independent judgment if they so desire. Thus the fractious elements of the party may cast their votes one way and the regular party supporters another way. Where does the popular will express itself? Whose voice is represented in the event of such a revolt? The 21 Texas votes might be decisive in the electoral college and yet the popular will in and out of Texas may not be reflected. The Texas people may overwhelmingly vote for Roosevelt but the electors whom they actually select may reject the mandate.

If the Philistines succeed in naming uninstructed electors upon the Democratic convention's refusal to bend to their wishes, then their electors, duly elected by votes in the Democratic column, would fling their votes to the Republican nominee or to a Democrat not named by the convention which might result in neither party obtaining the electoral college majority. In that event, the election would be thrown into the House of Representatives for Presidential choice and into the Senate for the Vice Presidential choice. In such event, each State delegation would have but one vote, the votes being by States. Again, the choice is unrepresentative, for the State with the greatest population will have the same small voice as that with the least population. For example, Pennsylvania would have the same one vote as Idaho. If in the fall we are still at war, such an occurrence would be catastrophic. There would be violent controversies and political logrolling. Uttermost confusion would prevail. The prospect is terrifying. Apparently some of these Democratic Bourbons will stop at nothing in order to gain their ends, even bend the weaknesses of the electoral college to their will.

And these dangers exist only because of the inept electoral college, which is like a recalcitrant mule that suddenly kicks up in all directions.

I have today introduced remedial legislation to do away with the electoral college. I realize that such legislation cannot be put into motion prior to the November election, but nonetheless, the matter is important enough to direct the attention of the Nation to the need for its abolition, to the end that there might be some method of more direct election of the President and Vice President.

It is not an easy matter to destroy machinery that has been in existence over 150 years, nor should it lightly be attempted. The mechanism must be surveyed in the light of existing conditions. Suppose the original intent of the constitutional fathers remained in effect; that is, each member of the electoral college were permitted to exercise his own judgment and cast his vote as he saw fit. Would this distrust of the people's judgment be warranted today? The founding fathers could not foresee the development of undreamed-of modes of communication, of the wider dissemination of learning, and more universal public education. They did not anticipate the radio, the syndicated columnist, the commentators. No secrets can be kept from the people concerning the candidates. The people are and shall continue to be thoroughly informed of the habits, notions, policies, and private lives of the nominees. Even President Cleveland recognized this and could not and would not hide the fact that he had a child born out of wedlock.

The distrust of public judgment, I make bold to say, was not warranted in those days, even less so today. There were those who feared unbridled democracy. Yet it has been said and it contains more than the germ of a truth that the weaknesses of democracy can only be cured with more democracy.

To waste votes, to suppress votes, to count votes in such a manner as to include the possibility of deflecting their true expression of choice is to rob democracy of its most cherished and noblest doctrine—that the Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. The unit State voting in the electoral college results in just such undemocratic procedure and individual voting in the electoral college is likewise undemocratic in its belittling of the discernment and of the ability of political appraisal of our people.

A bit of Americana comes to mind. One elector chosen on the Federalist ticket voted for Thomas Jefferson instead of John Adams, as Pennsylvania voters had instructed. Mr. Adams won by just 3 votes. An irate Pennsylvanian broke into print with, "What? Do I choose Samuel Miles to determine for me whether John Adams or Thomas Jefferson shall be President? No; I choose him to act, not to think."

Why the retention of such mischief-breeding machinery?

It can be compared with the appendix, and as such can easily become festering and inflammatory.

Three times in our history it has acted up and threatened the existence of the Republic. Each time the body politic was able to survive. It doubtlessly will be able to avert a crisis such as is threatened now again, but prudence advises the removal of the seat of trouble. Prevention is better than cure. Why invite disaster?

The B–29

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased today with the reception accorded my remarks on the floor of the House in salute to my neighbors and friends who, working for the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, of Paterson, N. J., have designed and constructed the Wright Cyclone engines powering the B–29 bombers which yesterday "told the story" to Japan.

The remarks of my distinguished colleagues, Representative REES of Kansas and Representative JACKSON, of Washington, lauding the developers and builders of the carrying planes, by Boeing, were timely and serve to emphasize the deep appreciation by the people's representatives of the home front's contribution to the winning of this terrible war.

Shortly after I spoke our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] told me that his boy was now flying one of the B–29's. Undoubtedly, more of our sons here are thus engaged and we have reason to be hopeful that these new and powerful weapons of the air will revolutionize warfare and bring about a speedier victory than heretofore anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, writing for today's Washington Times-Herald, describes the Wright Cyclones and Boeing B–29's in the following well-written statement:

Now the Japanese know what Gen. Henry H. Arnold, Chief of the United States Army Air Forces, meant when he said that the Flying Fortress is the last of the small bombers. The Japs have just met up with the B–29, first of the big bombers.

The B–29 is opening up a new kind of warfare, and it was not only the cities of Japan that shook under its blows, yesterday, but also the navies of the world. All of them. Including ours.

When the war's lid of secrecy is lifted and the amazing details about the B–29 are told, people still will be saying about them what the farmer said about the giraffe—that there ain't no such animal.

Elsewhere in this edition you will find some discussion of the B–29, so here we will run on a bit about just one part of it—the engine.

The following facts have been furnished by the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, which made the B–29's engines:

The B–29 has more power in its four 2,200-horsepower engines than the biggest bomber ever sent into action by any other nation in the world. With a total of 8,800 horsepower from these air-cooled, radial engines, the Super Fortress has almost doubled the power of the Boeing B–17 Flying Fortress, long the heavyweight slugger of the Army Air Forces, which has a total of 4,800 horsepower.

It has from 2,400 to 3,800 more horsepower than the biggest British bomber, such as the Lancaster or Halifax.

It tops the largest four-engined bomber of the Germans, the Focke-Wulf Kurier, by 2,800 horsepower, and has more than double the power of the biggest bomber of the Japanese, which, according to the latest published reports, is the Kawasaki T–97, with four engines of only 900 horsepower each.

The scientific meaning of "1 horsepower" is "the energy required to lift 33,000 pounds 1 foot in 1 minute." The engines in the B–29 have the energy to lift 290,400,000 pounds in 1 minute.

A flight of only 20 of the B–29's, therefore, develops the power necessary to drive a 45,000-ton battleship of the *Iowa* class at a speed of 33 knots.

The crew of a B–29 is only 11 men, which happens to be 2 less than the number for the crew of a PT boat, the Navy's little stingers that first showed in the defense of the Philippines and were valuable again in the Solomons campaign.

And so, a flight of 20 B–29's, burning horsepower equal to that of the largest and latest American battleship, and far easier and less expensive to build, can go into action with less than half the number of men required to run 1 destroyer. A modern destroyer's crew of men and officers is about 315.

As for the fire power of the B–29—which is its only excuse for being, after all—that can be only hinted at, but it is something to make your hair stand on end.

Twenty of these machines can lay, in what the censors will permit to be called a very small area from very, very high up, a quantity of high explosives that no battleship built or building can even nearly match.

And, of course, no battleship of the sea can throw shells to Berlin.

From all the foregoing, you may expect to read next that the battleship is dead, again. But not so.

The battleship is simply sliding down the scale of important weapons in war. It has already lost place to the aircraft carrier as the No. 1 striking weapon of sea warfare.

The B–29 is moving up past the aircraft carrier.

It is now the No. 1 offensive weapon of this World War No. 2, for land or sea attacks. It is the paralyzer.

In war there are two main methods of paralyzing, with speed, or with mass. The little PT boats, with their torpedoes, throw a heavy explosive punch with great speed. The battleship is mass.

The B–29 is the nearest thing to an ideal combination of mass and speed yet to come into the world.

Some military heavy thinkers with whom this writer has been talking say they doubt bombers will ever grow as far above the size of the B–29 as the B–29 has exceeded that of the B–17 Flying Fortress. The B–29 is about half again as large as the B–17.

Not that it couldn't be done as a matter of engineering.

They say it simply won't be necessary.

New kinds of high explosive are coming along which they say will be as superior to TNT as dynamite is to the black powder fired in the Battle of Crecy in 1346, when English artillery was first used to scare the horses of the French feudal aristocracy.

That comparison sounds a little fanciful, and it may be, but it is a fact that new explosives are upcoming that will jar Jap and German cities as never before.

The important additional fact is that they are explosives of relatively small bulk. A B–29 loaded with these extraordinarily concentrated cans of violence can do just about all military men think will be necessary to shatter anybody's will to make war.

Thus the B–29 approaches the largest economical engine of war necessary to win—at 11 men per B–29.

Which makes people enthusiastic about the idea of junking large armies just as the world's largest armies—United States, British, German, and Russian—begin a three-cornered tangle in Europe.

We're fighting yesterday's war in Europe and today's has just shown itself over Japan.

And what about tomorrow's? All we can do about that is pour the money into aviation and high-explosive research until we know we've got the best and the most of it.

Democracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "Democracy in Action," delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System last night.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There has been much printed in the newspapers lately about what took place at the Democratic conventions held recently in Texas. The true story in detail has not yet, to my knowledge, been made public. I intend to now give you the true and complete story. I believe the Texas Democratic conventions held this year may go down in history as the turning point in our National Government. I think every citizen of this Nation who recognizes that the New Deal dynasty has almost completely wrecked and ruined our American way of life will take renewed faith in democracy and renewed hope in our future freedom when they hear the true story of what happened in the Democratic conventions held in Texas this year. I think you will realize that democracy in America is not dead, and that the people are still capable of governing themselves, and that true American democracy can spring from the people up when the people become tired of it being imposed from the top down, as it is now.

Texas is doing its share in the present war, but while our brave sons are away from home fighting to maintain liberty, freedom, and democracy in the world, we Texans who remain at home are not going to stand idly by and let a little gang of Communists, Socialists, labor leader racketeers, and fellow-traveling New Dealers scuttle our liberty, freedom, and democracy right here on the home front and have our boys return—those who do return—to find that the dictatorship they were fighting to destroy abroad has been

set up right here in America. In Texas we are just peaceable and peace-loving people. We have a profound and sincere belief in the sovereignty of our Nation, the sovereignty of our State, and, above all, the sovereignty of freemen. We have cherished, cultivated, and kept our sovereignty, our independence, and last, but not least, our pride. We do not intend to let the New Deal dynasty at Washington usurp our sovereignty, shackle our independence, or crush our pride. When a gang of Communists and their fellow travelers steal our Democratic Party and change its name to the New Deal Party, we are going to rise up and protect the honored name of Thomas Jefferson and other real Democrats of the past, present, and future.

So here is the story of the Texas Democratic conventions. In establishing a beachhead of true democracy at Austin, Tex., May 23, this year, the real tried and true Democrats executed a bit of real strategy. The whole maneuvering was negotiated by a group of silent, determined, patriotic Texas Democrats with blood in their eyes, and was the culmination of months of hard work and quiet planning. Many months ago these Democrats commenced to talk with each other about the situation which existed, and over and over again the question was asked: "What can we do?" And the people who were asking that question were not the political bell-wethers, but the great rank and file of Texas Democrats who love liberty and freedom, and who believe in real Jeffersonian democracy and no New Dealism.

This uprising of Texas Democrats originated at the grass roots of democracy. It came from the great rank and file of the common people. In the past the professional politicians always controlled the precinct conventions, picked their delegates to the county conventions, who in turn, stacked the State convention full of the tried and true professional politicians who would go down the line for what the New Deal bosses called for. Things were different this year. These grass-root Democrats in every community commenced to consult with each other. They commenced to organize and to unite on a well-fixed program designed to liquidate the New Deal. Representatives of these groups traveled from one community to another and these red-blooded Texas Democrats by the time the precinct conventions were held were all of one mind, with the result that they elected their delegates to the county conventions and these county conventions sent real Democrats, not New Dealers—to the State convention. What happened in Texas can be summed up in this statement: Instead of leaving the precinct conventions and the county conventions and the State conventions to be run by a bunch of hand-picked patronage dispensing professional politicians, the rank and file of the common citizens took charge and picked the delegates, and they ran the conventions. Of course the professional politicians have tried to create the false impression that the convention was controlled by a few large corporation representatives, but that is absolutely untrue, and merely a desperate alibi to their bosses as an explanation of their defeat.

The whole organization was made up mostly of honest, fearless, common citizens who had never had much, if any, previous political experience. It was an uprising of the common citizens. A ground swell, I might say. After the precinct conventions, and after the county conventions, then came the State convention at Austin. You know, among the professional politicians we have down in Texas there are some who are willing to play the game of politics up to a given point, but they are not willing to completely scuttle the whole system of democratic government. They will fight to the bitter end on State affairs, but when it comes to a vital national issue they will get together and stand shoulder to shoulder to fight for the fundamental principles of democratic government. In other words, they are old-line politicians, but they are also Democrats, and a substantial number of these men are about fed up on this communistic, fourth-term, indispensable-man philosophy, and they rendered valiant service when the time came at Austin to do the maneuvering and help run the convention. But the successful job done was accounted for by the fact that the common citizens were there in droves from every county in the State, and they had the votes. In other words, the great rank and file of the common citizens had sent the right delegates to Austin and these delegates knew exactly what the people wanted, and what they wanted, and they got it. It was not a one-man fight. It was a united effort of all of our people. I know what I am talking about. I have made a number of trips back to Texas since I have been serving in the Senate and both by personal contact and over the radio I have over and over again pointed out to the great rank and file of our people the danger which I think lies ahead.

In these reports I have explained to my friends that most of this rationing business was plain hooey. I explained to them that this gang of blue-sky promoters who are running this Government and who originated the N. R. A. and the old blue eagle back in their heyday, had now simply dug up the remains of the old bird, restuffed him, draped the American flag about him, and remounted him on a new pedestal labeled "O. P. A." It's just the same old bird with new tail feathers. Of course, in the days of N. R. A. and the blue eagle, before the New Deal had sunk its claws so deep, we had a Supreme Court, and that judicial body plucked the tail feathers out of the old blue eagle and threw it out the window. Today instead of the O. P. A. getting thrown out the window, the Constitution of the United States got thrown out. What the Washington bureaucrats did to the people of this Nation under the N. R. A. was only a dress rehearsal of what they have done to us under O. P. A., but it's still the same old New Deal philosophy that you can have more by producing less.

About 2 months ago I made a trip back to Texas during the Easter vacation of Congress and I did not locate myself in a big luxurious suite of rooms and invite the politicians to come up and tell me what the situation was in Texas, but instead I made a complete tour of most of the State. I talked to small merchants, farmers, dairymen, barbers, filling-station operators, and others who go to make up the great rank and file of the common citizens of our State. I gave them my views about the emergency of the situation now facing the American people and asked them for their views, and I was gratified to find that the great rank and file of the people were really doing some serious thinking, and they were ready to take some action. So I will tell you folks that down in Texas we just decided to liquidate the New Deal; and when I say "we," I do not mean any one man decided to liquidate it. I mean the real, patriotic Texas Democrats who love liberty, freedom, and democracy and despise dictatorship in any form, by any name, and by anybody. The Texas Democrats became largely of one mind on this one subject. It was mass think and mass action. It was a spontaneous revolt from political interference and domination. It was democracy in action. When I returned to Washington after my last trip to Texas, just after the precinct conventions, and before the State convention, there was not a doubt in my mind but what the liquidation of the New Deal was going to take place.

When the State convention convened in Austin, the capital city, May 23, the common citizens were there in droves, both men and women, from every one of the 254 counties. They began to make motions, offer resolutions, and demand recognition of the chairman with complete calmness, thoroughness, and determination. This flabbergasted the faithful followers of "Franklin the Fourth." They were not prepared to counteract it. They had not provided the voice from the gutter, as was provided for the Chicago convention in 1940. Instead of the voice from the gutter, there arose the clear, true, determined voice of the people. The stooges of the Washington dynasty could not control those courageous common citizens. And so the inevitable happened. The little gang of baffled New Dealers and their song leaders and banner carriers walked out of the Democratic convention but, by actual count, only 69 wearing delegate badges walked out and went into another room and set up a little pout meeting of their own. But the main delegation, consisting of more than 1,800 true Texas Democrats, unruffled, remained in session, and continued their labors until they nominated the regular Democratic electors, who will do the actual voting for President and Vice President. And—horror of horrors—these common citizens did something never before done in Texas and never even dreamed of before. They nominated these Presidential electors, all 23 of them, and gave them specific authority by resolution to cast their votes for a Democrat of their own choosing, not necessarily for the nominee of the Chicago convention, but to cast their votes for some other Democrat for President, unless the Chicago convention restores the two-thirds rule for nominating candidates and adopts platform planks upholding white supremacy. Thus, my friends, one of the greatest political battles of the century for liberty, freedom, and democracy has just been fought and won in Texas.

Again across the broad plains and rugged mountains of that great empire of Texas the gentle breezes of democracy freely blow. Once again the true Democrats of Texas are holding their chins a little higher. Big, tall, sun-tanned men of Texas now look down from their lofty heights with scorn upon the swarms of Federal flunkies sent thither and yon by the oppressors of democracy in Washington to harass, insult, and embarrass the free men and women of that great and sovereign Lone Star State of Texas. Since this great victory by the real Democrats of Texas, the whole South is taking renewed hope. The whole Nation is taking renewed hope. What has been done in Texas can be done in every other State if the great rank and file of the people will only rise to the occasion.

Now, friends, in conclusion let me say that ever since I came to the United States Senate and found out what the Washington dynasty has been doing to the people of this Nation I have been conducting a campaign to keep my people in Texas fully informed so that they might devise ways and means of recovering our Government and returning it to the people. I have broadcast many programs on the subject, and the campaign has met with such hearty approval that it has practically turned into a crusade. It has been suggested that I make regular reports to the whole Nation by radio at least once each week from now until election time. Not being a candidate for any public office I would have nothing to gain by conducting such a campaign except to help save my country for my children and your children, and their children. If any of you folks listening would like for me to make such a Nation-wide campaign, please drop me a line and let me know, also give me your ideas on the subject. To everybody who writes me, I will be glad to send you a copy of this radio speech, also a copy of a radio speech I made a few days ago about the Montgomery-Ward seizure, titled, "The Crucifixion of American Private Enterprise on the Brazen Cross of the C. I. O. by Decree of a Modern Pontius Pilate." Address all communica-

tions to Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, Washington, D. C. This is your United States Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas, speaking from your Nation's Capital, Washington, D. C., and wishing you all a very pleasant good day.

Platform Issues: Labor and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post under the heading of "Platform issues," by Mr. Wendell Willkie. This morning I want to call especial attention to one paragraph in the article. The whole article deals with the question of labor and industry, and the particular paragraph I have in mind discusses a subject in which I have long been interested and to which I wish not only the major political parties but both labor and industry would give their undivided attention.

This is the paragraph I desire now to read:

Labor also has aspirations which are not only just, but indispensable to the health of a society marked by wide economic fluctuations. For instance, an annual wage to those who work in plants with long seasonal or periodic shut-downs seems fair and necessary.

That is the point I wanted to stress, namely, the necessity for evolving a plan of annual wage instead of an hourly wage. Such a plan has been tried in certain industries and has worked out most successfully and profitably to both employer and employee. I renew my request that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLATFORM ISSUES

(By Wendell Willkie)

LABOR AND INDUSTRY

The problem of labor today is surcharged with emotion and dangerously sharp cleavages. Men more zealous than wise are trying to label the Democratic Party the exclusive friend of labor, and the Republican Party its inveterate enemy. The source of this theory is not difficult to discern. Labor leaders feel that before the advent of the present administration, labor did not get a fair break, and that previous Republican administrations gave consideration solely to a business point of view. Today, on the other hand, many industrialists believe with almost fanatical intensity that the present administration sees everything exclusively through the eyes of labor, and plays politics both with and within labor.

There is considerable truth in the viewpoints of both.

However, nothing inherent in the nature of the two parties justifies the roles that propagandists have sought to assign them. Assuming that there are in the Republican Party a few ninteenth century industrialists who still believe that labor is a commodity, everyone of these has his Democratic counterparts in the SMITH-CONNALLY'S, who devote their energies to baiting organized labor.

But the Republican Party has allowed itself to be put on the spot on the labor question. It has done so by failing to appreciate sufficiently that for labor the essential content of freedom is different in today's industrial society from what it was in the agricultural society of an earlier age. Men no longer able to own, or to aspire to own, small businesses and farms have sought new solutions for a need which all Americans must respect—the need to control for themselves the circumstances which dictate their working lives. However much the present administration has bungled the problem, it has taken cognizance of this historic change.

A 1944 Republican platform should acknowledge the necessary requirements for the protection of labor under conditions existent today—not yesterday. Some of them are: The continuance and improvement of a Federal wage-and-hour law and Federal regulatory machinery for its interpretation and enforcement. However, it should be remembered that no law, sponsored by business or labor, is a good law which creates in the mind of either the justifiable belief that fair and impartial treatment cannot be obtained under it. Compulsory social insurances must be broadened in their base and progressively expanded. Coercive legislation, such as the Smith-Connally Act, which is both unwise and unenforceable, should be repealed, for labor's inherent right to strike, which it has voluntarily abandoned during the war, is the basis of all its rights and must not be outlawed merely because the administration has created an atmosphere in which strikes are inevitable.

Industry must convince labor that it is prepared permanently to accept the basic principles of collective bargaining and unions must be reassured that the period of transition to peace will not be used, as in 1919–20, to destroy the organizations they have built.

Labor also has aspirations which are not only just but indispensable to the health of a society marked by wide economic fluctuations. For instance, an annual wage to those who work in plants with long seasonal or periodic shut-downs seems fair and necessary, and our post-war economy must be built on a high wage level if we hope to furnish a market for the goods of an expanding peacetime production. Our wheels can keep turning only if our workers can keep spending.

Labor-management cooperation has proved fruitful during the war. The more it is continued and developed after the peace, the less necessity there will be for Government intervention in industrial relations. It is time for both labor and management to grow up, to recognize each other as essential factors in the same basic enterprise—United States industry—and to settle their affairs among themselves without recourse to government.

Now that labor is reaching maturity, all labor leaders must recognize what some leaders are saying—witness the recent statements of Mr. Thomas and Mr. Dubinsky—that labor must become responsible, must drive from its midst its racketeers, adopt democratic procedures, and account for its funds and activities both to the public and to its own membership. And if the reluctant few refuse to follow democratic procedures, then under appropriate legislation such matters must be regulated.

Finally, and basic to the whole question of labor in a democratic society, in addition to its part in American industrial life, labor must be made an essential part of government with a real labor representative in the Cabinet. Like other economic groups, it must share in the determination of government's fiscal, domestic, and international policies. Thus it will share the responsibility for the results.

The coming days of demobilization will be difficult, particularly difficult for labor. Millions of men and women will have to take up new forms of work in new localities. Returning soldiers will properly feel that they should have equal, if not preferential, opportunities for jobs. The adjustments of our economy to a peacetime basis will bring a multitude of stresses and strains, and labor is fearful that it alone will be asked to bear the sacrifices. That must not be.

Every thoughtful American knows today that a strong labor movement is one of our greatest bulwarks against the growth of fascistic tendencies and consequently is necessary for our democratic way of life. The Republican Party must demonstrate visibly and tangibly that it appreciates the contribution of labor to our economic well-being. It must leave no doubt that it understands that labor has legitimate grievances and justifiable aspirations toward a more secure place with larger participation in our modern industrial life. Above all, the Republican Party must demonstrate that it can produce a constructive, just, and humane labor program.

Pussyfoot Role Seen by G. O. P. in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Post of June 15, 1944:

PUSSYFOOT ROLE SEEN BY G. O. P. IN CONGRESS—POLITICALLY SAFE SILENCE KEPT ON ISSUES OF DAY, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

The Democratic Party, with 216 Members, no longer has a majority of the House of Representatives, while the Republican Party, with 212 Members, has strength nearly equal to that of the Democrats. Recent elections to fill vacancies have diminished the Democratic total.

But the public would hardly suspect that the two major parties are so closely divided in the lower House of Congress.

Certainly very little has happened since the present Congress took office in January 1943 to indicate that the Republicans as a whole have developed a program that can be readily identified by observers. While there has been opposition from time to time by the Republicans, who voted in a bloc, it would be difficult to discover by the reading of the record just what the Republican Party would do if it had complete control of the machinery of the House of Representatives.

Whether the subject is labor or agriculture or taxation or price control or the Montgomery Ward case or any one of a number of issues that are supposed to be close to the hearts and minds of the people, the Republicans have done little to manifest how they would handle these matters if they really had the majority.

PUSSYFOOT ROLE

The Republican Party in the House has played the same pussyfoot role which has so often been adopted in past years by the minority party on either side of the political

aisle. The strategy is to avoid commitments on major issues and appear to be friendly to all groups in the hope that the minority party will be the beneficiary at the polls of all the protests and dissatisfactions of the people over the legislative acts of the majority party.

Under the existing constitutional system, it is thus possible for a minority party to come within five votes of actually being a majority in the House of Representatives and yet escape all responsibility for the action of the House. That is why the term "responsible government" is so often used to describe a parliamentary system where a powerful minority, or one that almost divides power with the opposition side, has been virtually compelled by public opinion to assume responsibility in the Cabinet. If the parties were almost as equally divided in Canada, Britain, or Australia as they are in the House of Representatives today, a coalition government would be in power in the executive branch. There need then to have been no election in the midst of the invasion campaign.

It is true, of course, that the Republicans have supported the major war programs and particularly the appropriations for military purposes. On these there have been virtually unanimous votes.

SAFE SILENCE ON ISSUES

But on the issues which divide the country, particularly questions arising out of administrative bureaucracy or misuse of public power as in the Ward case, the Republicans have preferred to maintain a politically safe silence. Indeed, to speak out forthrightly is considered unwise on the eve of an election. Governor Dewey's candidacy, for example, has managed to draw support from many elements because the New York Governor has kept his views on specific questions very much to himself.

The party in power, however, has not hesitated to commit itself to particular positions on domestic issues. There is, of course, a possible inference from all this that the Democratic position is much stronger than the Republicans would like to admit.

Certainly if the Republican party is afraid to make an issue on certain domestic questions, it could be construed to mean that the Democratic position has considerable popular support. The behavior of the Republican party in the House of Representatives appears to be more and more an admission that the Democratic positions on various issues is much more likely to receive public support at the polls than the Republicans care to concede at this time.

Some day the idea of responsible Government which enables the people to check both legislative and executive branches as the case may be by compelling or threatening an election at any time—the parliamentary system used in Canada and Australia—may prove even more advantageous than it appears at present. For while the change is fundamental, it may be the only way in the end that the people as a whole can exercise a check upon the growing powers of the central Government.

Keep Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WALSH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Keep Price Control," published in the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of June 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP PRICE CONTROL

One piece of legislation now before the Congress is of particular interest to all American families. That is the price control bill, extending the life of O. P. A. after its present expiration date, which is June 30. If weakening amendments are attached to this renewal, the major control against high prices and rents, and against inflation in general, will be removed.

Price Administrator Chester Bowles puts the situation thus:

"If the present act is renewed without weakening amendments, we in the O. P. A. can continue to protect the American people, the American businessman, and the American taxpayers against the need for paying high wartime prices and the eventual inflation that will follow."

The alternative, according to Mr. Bowles:

"The plain fact is that some amendments already accepted in the Senate and others being seriously considered in both Houses would wreck the present price-control program beyond recognition and create higher prices of every family in this country."

The House last week overrode its Rules Committee which, through a combination of southern Democrats and Republicans, wanted to tack labor amendments to the price-control bill. Whether or not such amendments were germane, their source was suspected—none other than Representative HOWARD SMITH of Virginia, who would like to see wholesale revision of the Price Control and Economic Stabilization Acts.

The Senate has adopted the Bankhead cotton amendment which in Mr. Bowles' opinion, is best calculated to shatter the entire structure of stabilization.

"A frank and open attack on price control should shock the country," Mr. Bowles asserts. "No one has proposed or would dare propose wrecking the stabilization program. But today price control is being killed with kind words."

With kind words or otherwise, the present structure of price control should be preserved. With War bond savings and a modest scale of living, O. P. A. has prevented the wide inflation gap some economists feared. If the Congress wants to consider legislation banning maintenance-of-membership contracts, if it wishes to curb W. L. B. or subject its decisions to judicial review, if it wishes to give profit advantages to the textile industry, those propositions should be threshed out on their merits in separate legislation. To tinker with O. P. A. at this stage of the war, when it is achieving its main object, is to open a path to inflation.

Members of Congress who are hot for removing the controls on prices and rents, while holding wages frozen at present levels, are deluding themselves. If prices and rents rise, no legislative enactment will for long freeze wages.

Anti-Semitism Directly Opposed to Christian Teaching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Archbishop Edward Mooney in an address at a civic meeting paying tribute to the heroes of the Jewish ghetto in Warsaw:

In accepting the kind invitation of your committee to address this meeting, I was conscious of the opportunity thus given me to say in highly significant circumstances some things which I think American Jews may well expect to hear from the lips of their Christian fellow-citizens. From a platform shared by those who bear heavy civic and religious responsibilities in Detroit, one can speak with all the advantages of direct, personal address to an audience that is keenly sensitive to the practical social problems that arise when malevolent emphasis is placed on the things that divide us rather than on the things that unite us as members of the great human family. Nothing in the news today justifies that sensitiveness more completely than the story of the Warsaw ghetto, the details of which are just now seeping through the wall of Nazi censorship which encloses occupied Europe. For that story vividly highlights the inhuman lengths to which men can go when they allow the things that divide us to generate hatred between man and man, and attempt to settle resulting problems on the deadly inspiration of that fanatical hatred.

This meeting affords us occasion publicly to express our admiration of the heroic courage of those who in the last days of the Warsaw ghetto led a forlorn hope in resistance to their murderous oppressors. This they did not with any idea that they could ultimately prevail, but with the determination that they would die, if die they must, like men fighting to defend their rights rather than as abject slaves, and with the thought that their resistance might arouse the conscience of the world. It is pleasing to note that their desperate cry was taken up by the Government of Poland and relayed to the world. In a recent meeting of the International Labor Office, a member of that Government said: "Hitler is using Poland as a slaughterhouse for the mass murder of millions of Polish Jews and Jews of other European countries—a murder unprecedented in the annals of history. Hitler is determined to achieve the complete annihilation of the Jewish people.

"In some areas fighters of the Jewish underground, aided by their Polish brothers-in-arms, rose against the German conqueror. The heroic armed resistance of the Warsaw ghetto will live forever in the story of mankind."

SUFFERED FOR CENTURIES

Not only a sense of brotherly compassion, but even an elementary concern for the moral health of our western civilization prompts our cry of horror at the deliberate and brutal extermination of a race which, more than any other of equally high and ancient culture, has through the centuries felt the flail of man's inhumanity to man. It implies no closing of our eyes to other contemporary instances of unconscionable cruelty in handling problems of racial and religious antagonism to give full play to this salutary sense of horror at the utterly inhuman solution of a problem in human relations which the story of the Warsaw ghetto so repulsively climaxes. A generation which has grown accustomed to read of the systematic suppression of inalienable human rights, of mass deportations of millions of men, women, and children at the nod of a dictator, of the deliberately murderous extinction of whole sectors of populous nations on account of racial, religious, or political antagonism—a generation which, like our own, has had to read of these horrible things in the contemporary history of the establishment of either Communist or Nazi domination, is in danger of losing its capacity of being shocked at the sight of brute force

standing over the trampled form of human rights.

Without the unremitting cultivation of a keen sense of right and wrong, and its objective application to all situations regardless of whether they concern us, our allies or our enemies, there is the further danger that we may almost unconsciously admit into our souls a kind of fatal admiration for the efficiency of brute force instead of persistently retaining our natural abhorrence of its callousness. To give full play, therefore, to our instinctive revulsion of horror against this latest instance of mass cruelty in the story of the Warsaw ghetto, is to serve a salutary purpose in preparing ourselves for the impending task of putting together the shattered pieces of a war-torn world.

NAZIS ANTI-CHRISTIAN

I have no thought of extenuating the lapse from ideals of Christian conduct so often evident in the part which Christians have played in the age-long tragedy of Israel's wanderings through the nations. But we should not fail to note the fact that the Nazi perpetrators of the colossal crime of the Warsaw ghetto are professedly and rabidly anti-Christian as well as anti-Jewish. In Germany itself, throughout occupied Europe and particularly in Poland they have persecuted Christians with a ferocity that is exceeded only by their unparalleled cruelty to the Jews. May we not hope that in the fires of a common tribulation new bonds of human solidarity and mutual good will are being forged between Christian and Jew? In the heroism of Christians who have so often risked and not infrequently given their lives to rescue their even more unfortunate Jewish brothers, may we not find an augury that when the agony is over Jews and Christians will work together to write a brighter page of history in liberated Europe, and particularly in Poland which has, at least, the historic glory of having offered the Jews a haven of refuge when they were driven out of other countries?

PRIESTS KILLED AIDING JEWS

For me it is a matter of pride to recall the memory of the venerable Father Godlewski, a 77-year-old priest who, together with the vicar of Grzybow parish, voluntarily remained in the Warsaw ghetto to alleviate the sufferings of its condemned inhabitants. Even now it is known that the following Catholic priests met their death at the hands of the Nazis for giving aid to hunted Jews: Father Urbanowicz, who was shot in 1943; Father Archutowski, rector of the seminary of Warsaw, who was sent to Majdanek where he died under torture in October 1943; the dean of Grodno and the prior of the Franciscan monastery in that city, who were sent to Lomza and shot there in the autumn of 1943. But it is not a question merely of a few outstanding instances which inadequate information of a detailed kind reveals. There is an organized movement in Poland for the protection of Jews by their non-Jewish neighbors.

A special committee of the Polish underground has for its aim to conceal the Jews who are in hiding among the Polish people and to render them needed assistance. How widespread this movement is may be inferred from the fact that there are in Poland today about 1,000,000 survivors out of a Jewish population of three and one-half million in 1939. That even this number has so far escaped the Nazi terror is largely due to the brotherly cooperation of the Christian fellow-citizens. What this means in terms of heroic human solidarity is clear when we reflect that to conceal a Jew, to give him a night's lodging, to supply him with food or any kind of transportation is punishable by death in Nazi-dominated Poland, and captured Jews are put to torture to force them to reveal the names of those who helped them. Surely those who during these bloody years have suffered together in mutual helpfulness under the very shadow of death will have learned how to work together in harmony for the restoration of their native land in the new day of freedom.

DEPLORES GROUP ANTAGONISM

In all of this there is a deep lesson for us. The horrors of the Polish ghettos under the Nazi terror represent the climax of Nazi anti-Semitism and call attention to the inhuman lengths to which group antagonisms can go when fostered hatred is given rein. It would be a blessed thing, indeed, if our instinctive revulsion against these extreme manifestations of hatred and cruelty were to warn us against incipient and ofttimes covert attempts to stir up or to exploit group antagonisms in our own land. That such attempts have been made it is futile to deny. The A. P. A. movement, the Ku Klux Klan, and our pre-war wave of anti-Semitism were, in fact, more than merely incipient phenomena. How to counter such attempts prudently, indeed, but effectively is something we should all have at heart.

It is easy enough to deal with open manifestations of this kind in their initial stage. When exposed in their true light they wither in the free air of democratic discussion. I think the record will show that they have attained full growth only under the encouragement of a repressive dictatorship. It is not so easy, on the other hand, to deal with covert incitement to group antagonisms—which can, however, produce a noxious undergrowth in the social life of any nation. Anti-Semitism in America is usually of the covert type. It tries to evade the condemnation which recognition of its stark, repulsive reality would immediately evoke by resorting to an unduly abstract definition of anti-Semitism as hatred of the Jew as a Jew. That definition is so close to the metaphysical as to offer too wide a margin of evasion to the covert anti-Semite. To insist on a more concrete description of anti-Semitism with its mean jibes, its vicious innuendo, its vague accusations, its unjustified generalizations, its distorted emphasis—all calculated to foster organized antagonism—is to enable the man in the street to recognize it for the ugly thing it really is and put him on his guard against it.

EXPLOITERS OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Once we are aware of the moral and social evil of anti-Semitism, open or covert, what can we do to eradicate it or to keept it from spreading? Obviously, the responsibility here falls chiefly on the Christian majority, although the Jewish minority has a part to play, and all of us have to be intent on fostering sincere good will, on examining and repressing our own instinctive or inherited prejudices, and on developing an attitude of alertness against the vicious activities of those who would exploit these prejudices for personal profit or subversive propaganda. In connection with this last point it will be helpful for all of us to remember that just as there are professional anti-Semites who exploit the simplicity of emotional Christions, so, too, there are professional opponents of anti-Semitism who exploit the simplicity of emotional Jews. In regard to two publications, which I would place in this second category, it is gratifying to note that prominent Jewish leaders of my acquaintance are working diligently to keep their people—and many sympathetic Christians as well—from being deceived by them. Reason and experience prove, to my mind, at least, that mere denunciations of anti-Semitism, accomplish little; reason and experience indicate, moreover, that each group can act most effectively within the limits of its own membership, and that for one group to tell another what it should do in the matter is generally futile and ofttime positively harmful.

In all frankness, I should here give expression to my deepest conviction that there is no solution for the problem of anti-Semitism or any similar problem in the latitudinarian tendency to brush aside as nonessential the religious differences that divide us. Is the latitudinarian Jew for that reason any less the object of anti-Semitic prejudice? Or is the latitudinarian Christian for that reason any less susceptible to the virus of present-day anti-Semitism? Personally, I do not think so. We should never forget that anti-Semitism developed in Germany in direct ratio to the effectiveness of the official repression of Christianity, and that the Nazis, notorious for their atrocious persecution of the Jew, were branded by Pope Pius XI as the "deniers and destroyers of the Christian west."

TASK OF CATHOLICS

This brings me to the consideration of the positive contribution which Christians can make to the solution of the problem of anti-Semitism. To be consistent with the obesrvation I made a moment ago, I should restrict myself to what I might call the Catholic prophylaxis against anti-Semitism. Briefly, I might say that is to be found in a better understanding of the doctrine the church teaches and a better observance of the moral precepts she inculcates. Catholic teaching formally and explicitly condemns anti-Semitism. To cite an instance from the records of our day I quote a Papal decree of March 25, 1928, which reads: "The Apostolic See * * * condemns most emphatically the hatred directed against a people which was once chosen by God, that particular hatred which today commonly goes by the name of anti-Semitism." Catholic teaching directly and by manifold implication emphasizes the dignity of the human person which anti-Semitism outrages. Catholic teaching exalts the historic religious role of the Jewish people, and glories in the heritage from Judaism which is an essential element in Christianity. This is what Pope Pius XI had in mind when, referring to the words every priest recites daily in the mass, he said: "Abraham is called our patriarch and ancestor. Anti-Semitism is not compatible with the sublime reality of this text. It is a movement in which Catholics cannot participate. We are spiritually semites."

SAVIOUR'S PRECEPT

The moral precept which the Catholic Church considers most distinctively Christian is the command of Christ to love our neighbor. Anti-Semitism is diametrically opposed to this virtue of Christian charity. I shall never forget a comment on Christian charity which nearly 40 years ago I heard from the lips of an old Irish priest in Rome. He said:

"Charity is the virtue which disposes us to do good to all men, especially those who differ from us in religion."

That concept of charity is typically Irish but thoroughly Christian. When Christ Himself wished to illustrate what He meant by love of neighbor, He told the parable of the Good Samaritan. No chasm that divides us today is deeper than the chasm which divided the Jew from the Samaritan of Biblical days. Yet that was pointed out by Christ as the social chasm which the charity He taught should bridge. Evidently that chasm has been bridged in the homeland of that old Irish priest—which, by the way, is one of the few really Catholic states in the world. About 2 months ago a New York tabloid ran a series of articles alleging the existence of an anti-Semitic movement in Eire. A group of prominent Jewish leaders in Dublin and a Jewish member of the Irish Parliament promptly replied. Here is what they said:

"The Jewish Representative Council of Eire repudiates as false, irresponsible, and mischievous any suggestion that the Government of this country is anti-Semitic, or that there is any organized anti-Semitic movement in Eire. The Jewish community live and always have lived on terms of closest friendship with their fellow Irish citizens. No Irish

Government has ever discriminated between Jew and non-Jew."

The Jewish Member of Parliament added:

"As a member of the Irish Parliament and a practicing adherent of the Jewish faith who has represented for 17 years a Dublin constituency 97 percent Roman Catholic, I deny emphatically that the people of Ireland, or the present or any Government of Ireland, are or ever have been anti-Semitic."

This is a tribute not only to Irish justice but to Irish charity as well. In Catholic Ireland charity—love of God and love of neighbor inspired by love of God—has been an effective solvent of racial and religious antagonisms. It can be that everywhere.

MORAL ORDER COMES FIRST

The heartrending story of the Warsaw ghetto told here tonight reveals in all its horror what Hitler's new order really means. Significantly, indeed, our President said 2 years ago: "To the new order of tyranny which the dictators wish to impose with the crash of a bomb, we oppose a greater concept—the moral order." Last October men prominent in Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant religious leadership in the United States summarized in a seven-point declaration the fundamental principles of the moral order and their prime applications to the relations of man to man, group to group, and nation to nation. The first point in that declaration called for the recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and the moral law which comes from God. The second assertion reads: "The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights."

These are foundation stones in the making of a better world—a world that will solve the problems of racial and religious differences by justice and charity and not by hate. On these foundations every group can build higher under the stimulus of all that is best in its own religious and cultural inspiration. But if we disregard these foundation principles that lie deep in man's nature and in his reverence for his Creator, if we undermine these cornerstones of morality in setting the emplacements of the future, the story of the Warsaw ghetto will not be what it certainly should be—the last sad record of mass hatred organized by those who had foresworn the law, God and consequently the prime instincts of their common humanity. The security of Jew and Christian, as well as of those who are neither Jew nor Christian, and the promise of their living together as men and brothers lies in our common devotion to the moral order as a reflection of the mind and will of God our Maker, our Supreme Lawgiver and our Judge.

Ramspeck Committee Urges Army Air Forces to Utilize 10,000 Instructors and Trainees of WTS Program and Curtail Further Expansion of WASP Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a report by the Ramspeck committee in the investigation of the WASP program. This committee report is concise, exact, and to the point. Mr. RAMSPECK, chairman of this committee, is one of the most solid, straightforward, able, and conscientious men in this House. I feel sure that he and his committee, which is one of the most highly respected committees in this House, would not have made such a direct, thorough report of the findings upon complete and detailed investigation of this entire situation had not the situation warranted same. I am therefore going to urge each and every Member of this body to read this report very carefully in order to understand the entire problem when the WASP bill is brought up for consideration Monday or Tuesday of next week.

The report follows:

REPORT CONCERNING INQUIRIES MADE OF CERTAIN PROPOSALS FOR THE EXPANSION AND CHANGE IN CIVIL SERVICE STATUS OF THE WASP

As a result of correspondence and inquiries which were referred to the Committee on the Civil Service by Members of the House and Senate, representatives of civilian aviation organizations, veterans' associations, civilian pilots, and pilot instructors and trainees, the investigating staff of this committee has made inquiry as to the necessity or desirability of the program of the Women's Air Service Pilots (WASP).

The WASP is an organization of women pilots presently engaged on a civilian basis by the War Department for the purpose of ferrying, transporting, target towing, testing, tracking, and other duties within the continental limits of the United States.

Essentially, the mass of this correspondence addressed to the Congress protested that—

1. Army Air Forces had embarked upon a costly and unnecessary program of recruiting inexperienced young women for training as noncombat service pilots.

2. Simultaneously, Army Air Forces was dismissing, or failing to properly utilize, large numbers of male civilian pilot-instructors, who had been trained at a cost of millions of dollars.

3. While insisting upon high qualifications as prerequisite to the retention of these male civilian pilot-instructors, Army Air Forces was lowering the standards for female civilian recruits to an almost irreducible minimum.

4. The program was highly experimental.

5. The alleged manpower shortage given as a reason for the recruiting and training of inexperienced personnel was not, as claimed, being alleviated, but instead was being further confused and aggravated.

COMMITTEE AUTHORIZATION

Under House Resolution 16, the Committee on the Civil Service is authorized and directed to (a) conduct thorough studies and investigations of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment; (b) study and investigate the effect of such policies and practices upon the conduct of the war, with the view of determining whether such policies and practices are efficient and economical; (c) determine the number of employees in each department or agency, whether such number of employees is necessary, and whether their skills are used to the best advantage; (d) study all other matters relating to the recruiting and the efficient and economical use of civilian employees; and (e) make such inquiry as the committee may consider important or pertinent to any matter coming within its jurisdiction.

Therefore, under House Resolution 16, this committee is directed to investigate the recruiting and efficient and economical use of civilian employees within the War Department, of which Army Air Forces is a component.

The young women being recruited for training at public expense as WASPS are civilians, graduate WASPS are civilians and operate under the protection of the Civil Service, and, finally, to a major extent, the overwhelming protest registered with the Congress is from civilians and taxpayers.

Within the purview of this committee there are two considerations of importance:

1. The expansion of any governmental organization is of immediate interest to this committee.

2. Proper utilization of the highest skills of trained personnel is of paramount importance. This is especially true in time of national emergency.

The implication contained in the proposal, that it is now either necessary or desirable to recruit stenographers, clerks, school teachers, housewives, factory workers, and other inexperienced personnel for training at great outlay of public funds as pilots for the military planes of this Government, particularly when there already exists a surplus of personnel to perform these identical duties, is as startling as it is invalid.

If it is necessary at this stage of the war to embark upon this costly and experimental program,[1] then this Nation, insofar as manpower is concerned, is in worse position than any of our allies, and apparently any of our enemies. Fortunately, the evidence presented during this inquiry demonstrates that the implied condition is neither actual nor probable.

SOURCES OF AVAILABLE PILOTS

The proposal to expand the WASPS comes at a time when, because of the curtailment of its training program, the Army Air Forces is eliminating 25 of its primary contract schools and canceling aviation-training programs in 151 colleges.

This releases for other duties the following groups of trained personnel:

1. Civilian instructors, 25 Army Air Forces primary contract schools	2,836
2. Civilian instructors, Civil Aeronautics Administration-War Training Service program	3,046

The cancelation of the Civil Aeronautics Administration-War Training Service program also brought about the dispersal of an additional 4,689 pilot-instructor trainees. These men entered the Civil Aeronautics Administration program as civilians. They were later activated into the Reserve and at the time of their dispersal were being trained as pilot instructors. Only 974 were accepted by Army Air Forces for aviation cadet training. The remaining 3,713 pilot-instructor trainees were assigned to technical, special, and glider-pilot training.

Since these 3,713 pilot-instructor trainees are now military personnel, their disposition and utilization is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Civil Service. However, the dispersal and assignment of this group is of interest for the reason that these pilots are not now being used for the purpose for which they were trained. There has been considerable complaint that the assignment of these men has been negative. Information has been submitted that in many cases duties assigned are trivial and demoralizing. This is not in accordance with the expressed policies of the War Department as to utilization of personnel.

It is a matter of resolute obligation for this committee to point out that proper utilization of the training and skills of these 5,882 civilian pilot instructors alone would ameliorate the need for the recruiting and training of additional WASPS, and to suggest that in

---

[1] Giving as one of the two purposes for the WASP program, the Secretary of War states: "To determine the extent that women pilots can be effectively used in the Army Air Forces for whatever conditions may arise in the future."—Washington Times-Herald, May 5, 1944.

the group of 3,713 pilot-instructor trainees will be found additional potential service pilots.

WOMEN PILOTS

The inquiry and the consideration of this committee were not concerned with and do not resolve any question pertaining to the use of women as aviators.

It is definitely the concern of this committee that the current proposal contemplates the recruiting of inexperienced personnel. It is also definitely the concern of this committee that this inexperienced personnel must be trained at great outlay of public funds at a time when there is already available a sufficient supply of potential service pilots. This available personnel consists of civilian pilot instructors, who for several years have been training pilots for the armed forces. These men have had thousands of air hours and a wealth of experience. The experience and capabilities of these instructors should be fully utilized before any consideration is given to the recruiting and training of inexperienced personnel.

This is not a question of the utilization of male or female personnel, but is a question of the utilization of experience and capabilities before resorting to the use of inexperience and costly training. If a supply of trained women pilots presently existed, and there was a shortage of men pilots, this committee would unhesitatingly insist that the trained women pilots be fully utilized before inexperienced men were recruited for training.

BRITISH WOMEN FLYERS (A. T. A.) CIVILIANS

Utilization of women as pilots has been on a limited scale and of comparatively recent development.

In the early days of the present war the British, then desperately short of air personnel, recruited a group of civilian women pilots to transport and ferry planes. Many of these women were Americans. All were experienced and required only transitional training to familiarize themselves with military aircraft. The British organization, which is composed of both men and women pilots, is known as the Air Transport Auxiliary (A. T. A.) and is not a part of the Royal Air Force but is a branch of the Ministry of Production.

RECRUITING SOURCES

This inquiry has established that the present sources of WASP recruits are essentially the same as those of any other organization recruiting women personnel, and that:

1. The potential supply of qualified female pilots in the United States has long since been exhausted.

2. The recruits now being accepted are (a) selected from those who are too young to be eligible for membership in the already established women's organizations, or (b) being recruited in direct competition with these organizations.

The personnel now being recruited by the WASPS lacks aviation experience. The training necessary to qualify a WASP for even the lighter type of ship extends over a period of many months. One and one-half years is required before the maximum utilization of a WASP may be expected. During this period the WASP trainee is, in effect, removed from direct participation in the war effort. In some instances, the staff noted, trainees were recruited from industry and from war agencies where they were already applying skills vital to the war effort.[1] It was necessary for these recruits to be released or resign from war activities for which they had already received extended training. In several cases releases were refused. It was then necessary, due to War Manpower regulations, for these recruits to resign and remain idle 60 days in order to enroll in the WASP.

SURPLUS TO ADD TO SURPLUS

It is a matter of record that women pilots have served their countries well during periods of emergencies in both Great Britain and the United States. While the number of qualified women pilots has always been relatively small, they have made a distinct contribution to the war effort.

The opportunity for women pilots, even in time of war, has been limited. The United States Navy is forbidden by law to utilize women pilots in Navy, Marine, or Coast Guard planes. It is the policy of the Navy to utilize the experience of their returned combat and over-age pilots as service pilots. More importantly, it is Navy policy to use younger pilots for target towing, tracking, and related duties, so that the recently graduated pilots will gain experience and confidence before being assigned combat duty.

At the end of this war there will be tremendous surpluses of trained and experienced pilots throughout the world. Utilization of these surpluses will constitute an acute post-war problem. To now seek out and train, at Government expense, additional inexperienced personnel would add another surplus to this recognized post-war surplus.

WASP

The civilian organization known as the WASP is a merger of the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron (WAFS) and the Women's Flying Training Detachment (WFTD).

The WAFS were organized in September 1942 for the purpose of ferrying trainer- and liaison-type planes within the limits of the United States. Members were qualified civilian pilots with 500 hours or more of air time and a commercial license of 200-horsepower rating. This group was attached to the Second Ferrying Command and performed outstanding service during a critical period when all competent male pilots were engaged in combat or training duties.

In September 1942 the organization known as the Women's Flying Training Detachment (WFTD) was established for the purpose of training young women who could not meet the qualifications for duty in the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron (WAFS). For this purpose a school was established at Houston, Tex., and later transferred to Sweetwater, Tex.

Merger of the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron (WAFS) and the Women's Flying Training Detachment (WFTD) into the present Women's Air Service Pilots (WASP) was announced June 28, 1943.

NO SPECIFIC LEGISLATION

While there is constituted authority for the Secretary of War to appoint trained civilian personnel to such duties in the War Department as he sees fit, the staff has been unable to find, and, notwithstanding repeated requests, the War Department has failed to produce, specific authorization for the training program previously known as the Women's Flying Training Detachment, now known as the WASP, included in this merger.

It would appear that a program involving 2,500 graduate trainees, at an approximated cost of $50,000,000 of public funds, would have been of sufficient importance to have had the specific authority of the Congress.

The War Department states that in Public Law 108 (78th Cong.) it has found authority within "the general provisions of the 1943 act authorizing expenditures for the training of such civilian employees during the fiscal year 1943." The section quoted is "salaries and wages of civilian employees as may be necessary." The necessity for this training program has not been demonstrated.

STANDARDS LOWERED

A recruiting program to procure WASP trainees is vigorously pursued.

The age limit has been reduced from 21 years to 18½ years.

Required hours in the air have been reduced from 500 to 35 hours, dual or solo.

Smart uniforms, designed by John Fredericks and Carmel Bros., are furnished at Government expense. The War Department is presently encumbered with over one-half million dollars ($505,014.72) for these ensembles.

Salaries of $150 monthly plus overtime are paid trainees. Upon graduation, WASPS are paid $250 per month for services performed for the Army Air Forces.

SWEETWATER TRAINING

According to Army Air Forces, the training course at Sweetwater is somewhat comparable to that given Air Force cadets in early stages of their training. WASP recruits have not attended preflight school, and it is necessary to give them an additional amount of mathematics, physics, and certain other subjects. WASP training does not include physical conditioning to the extent given Army air cadets, nor does it include extended air acrobatic or combat maneuver training.

The Sweetwater course includes 180 to 200 hours in primary trainers of 165–200 horsepower, basic trainers of 200–450 horsepower, and advanced trainers of 450–650 horsepower. Before the completion of the course, some training is given in advanced twin-engine trainers.

Upon graduation at Sweetwater, the WASP trainee is qualified as a class 1 pilot and is ready for assignment to duty in the lighter ships or further training to gain competency in the handling of heavier aircraft.

APPROXIMATELY 80 PERCENT COMPLETE COURSE

Apparently there has been a total enrollment of 1,313 students in the Houston and Sweetwater schools. During training eliminations have been as follows:

Resignations	57
Student fatalities (does not include 2 reported Apr. 16, 1944)	5
Flying deficiencies (wash-outs)	208
Physical deficiencies	7
Disciplinary	4
Total failing to complete course	281

As of March 28, 1944, there have been 541 students graduated from the course. Of this number, 26 have been separated (18 of these resigned for personal reasons and 8 were relieved for inability to maintain required standards).

TRAINING COST: $12,150 TO $20,000-PLUS

At the outset of this inquiry information was sought as to the cost of the Sweetwater course. On February 26, War Department presented this cost as $6,540.90. This same figure had earlier been presented to the Truman committee. However, request for more complete analysis of the cost resulted in the submission, on April 21, of further detailed figures, showing the cost to be $12,150 per graduate. This larger figure includes additional items not previously mentioned:

	Cost per graduate
Original figure (tuition, student salary, plane depreciation)	$6,265.35
Additional costs:	
Maintenance cost, material, labor, gas and oil	3,023.50
Personnel, military and civilian	540.10
Equipment	89.56
Travel	18.00
Uniform	326.06
Medical examination and hospitalization	66.59
Communications	8.80
Amortization, crash truck—link trainer—vehicles	95.60
Maintenance, administrative vehicles	13.64
Adjustment for eliminees	1,703.44
Total additional costs	5,885.35
Total cost per graduate	12,150.70

[1] (a) Motor inspector, aircraft plant; (b) lens polisher; (c) airport traffic control operator; (d) map expert, War Department.

It is important to consider that the $12,150 figure last submitted includes only the cost at Sweetwater, and that graduates of Sweetwater are qualified to operate only the lighter type ships, generally used in training, courier, and liaison work.

Training for operating this faster and heavier equipment is much more expensive than for the lighter types. It is necessary that these fledgling pilots have many hours of dual and solo instructions, which is costly in fuel, equipment, instructor time, and other direct and indirect expenses.

It is the studied opinion of the staff that complete training of a WASP pilot qualified to handle the faster and heavier ships costs a minimum of $20,000 per pilot. This estimate is supported by the considered opinion of highly competent civilian and military authorities.

CASUALTIES—TRAINING AND OPERATIONS

In the course of training and operations WASP fatalities, according to the War Department, have been as follows:

Training	8
Operations	11
Total	19

It is not possible to determine the significance of these casualties. The staff reports that WASP training and operations are not comparable to those of Army Air Forces cadets and combat trained pilots. Neither is it possible to make accurate comparisons with the Civil Aeronautics Administration-War Training Service programs. The objectives of the two programs are not comparable, the training is not identical, nor are conditions under which training is conducted similar. The WASP curriculum contains a minimum of acrobatic and combat maneuver training.

It is authoritatively stated, and there is every reason to believe, that the introduction of additional unskilled personnel into this program will accelerate the accident and fatality record.

The operational program of the WASP is somewhat selective. Flying is confined to the limits of continental United States. There are no long overwater flights. Mountain and difficult terrain is traversed over selected and well-marked routes. The miles-flown basis usually utilized for comparisons cannot apply. Accidents incurred in bomber-crew training and operation frequently cost a number of lives. WASP training and operations generally involve lighter-type ships and a single pilot.

OPERATIONS

As of March 1, 1944, a total of 532 WASPS, former members of the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron, or graduates of the Sweetwater course, were on duty with Army Air Forces in continental United States; 285 are assigned to ferrying, and the remainder to utility flying, target towing, and various other routine noncombat jobs.

For purposes of operational classification WASPS assigned to Air Transport Command are qualitatively separated into five classifications based upon training, experience, and demonstrated efficiency. Because of their significance these classifications, together with the number of WASPS in each category, are shown below:

WASP Class	WASP Pilots	Type planes	Horsepower each motor	Typical plane
1	50	Single-engine trainer	200- 650	PT-19, AT-6, BT-13.
2	125	Twin-engine trainer as above	225- 450	AT-11, AT-17, UC-78.
3	96	Twin-engine transport and cargo (instrument car required)	1,150-1,325	C-47, C-60, P-40, P-51.
4	11	Twin-engine pursuit and bombers	1,425-1,700	B-25, B-26, A-20, P-38.
5	3	4-engine bombers	1,200	B-17, B-24.

The significance of the above table with respect to the war program is all the more potent when the following facts are considered:

(a) After a year of operations, only 3 of the 285 WASP pilots with Air Transport Command are qualified in class 5 (4-engine bombers and transports). It is our information that all 3 of these top-flight WASPS were qualified aviators with more than a thousand hours each before they joined the original WAFS. It is understood that another WASP pilot of long experience is eligible for this class 5 rating. Of the 532 WASP pilots, apparently less than 1 percent are qualified to handle this type of equipment.

(b) An additional 11 WASPS are qualified in class 4; 5 of these are original WAFS and the other 6 had 200 or more hours of flying before they joined the WASPS.

(c) While 96 WASP pilots can handle the twin-engine transport and cargo ships in class 3, this group is said to be in varying stages of proficiency, inasmuch as a number only recently qualified and admittedly need more flying hours.

(d) One hundred and seventy-five of the two hundred and eighty-five, or 60 percent, are in classes 1 and 2, and are qualified to handle only relatively light planes. It is said to take 30 to 60 days for transition from class 1 to class 2, and 3 to 4 months, or longer, to successfully complete transition from class 1 to class 3. A substantial number of candidates for the higher ratings experience difficulties in making the transition, and officers in charge of WASP operations state that there is a lack of sufficient experience upon which to base an estimate of probable results.

ELIMINEES TOTAL LOSS

Authoritative sources are definite in their opinion that a large percentage of the WASPS will never qualify to pilot the faster or heavier class 3, 4, or 5 ships. Increasing apprehension over this situation was expressed. It was also called to the attention of the committee that any elimination of WASPS, or trainees, represents a total loss to the taxpayer. Army Air Forces' cadets found not qualified as pilots are given an opportunity to qualify in other capacities. Eliminees in the WASP program do not qualify for other services.

In the Army Air Forces' estimate of $12,150.70 for each WASP graduated there has been provided $1,703.44 for eliminees. On this basis, with 541 graduates, taxpayers in this country have paid to date $860,237.04 for eliminees alone. No part of this loss is retrievable. It is a total loss.

For 2,500 graduates this figure becomes $3,558,600. Whether the program is civilian or an elite officers' corps, this loss is the same—a total loss.

TRANSITIONAL TRAINING

Transition from class 1 to class 5 is a long, tedious, and expensive process requiring utilization of expensive equipment, proficient, and male instructor personnel. Information furnished the staff by the Army Air Forces has stated the facts found in the following table relative to time and instructions needed for qualifying pilots in the ferrying service for operating the more difficult aircraft:

Class	Hours needed	
	Flying	Instruction
Class 1 to class 2	100	3-4
Class 2 to class 3	60	8-12
Class 3 to class 4	140	6-8
Class 4 to class 5	200	6-8

Thus, approximately 500 hours of ferrying and training with the Ferrying Division is necessary to upgrade WASPS or other Ferrying Division pilots from class 1 to class 5. This can be accomplished in approximately 1 year. The majority of training received by pilots in the Ferrying Division is accomplished during actual ferrying missions; therefore, the upgrading of WASPS varies from group to group, depending upon the class of aircraft that is being ferried by each group.

The statement was repeatedly made that if the fast fighter and heavy bomber load increased, it would be necessary to depend upon already qualified male-pilot personnel. It was bluntly stated by operation officers that with the exception of the few WASP pilots in class 4 and class 5, and a relatively few additional WASPS eligible, or soon to be, for upgrading to these classes, no great confidence was felt in the ability of hastily trained girls to successfully withstand this strain. It was pointed out that under present plans only 75 WASP graduates could be expected from Sweetwater a month; that a substantial number of these would never qualify for the "hotter" ships, and that, because of lack of confidence and reluctance to impose too heavy a burden upon inexperienced air personnel, there was a tendency to overwork the more experienced WASP pilots or to shift the assignments to seasoned male pilots. This was not an isolated viewpoint, but the directly stated or strongly implied opinion of officers who have had immediate contact with the problem and who express grave doubt as to the outcome of an expanded WASP program with its inevitable product of less-experienced pilots.

WASPS ARE CIVILIANS

The proposal to change the civil-service status of the WASP is of concern to this committee. The members of the Women's Air Service Pilots were recruited as civilians. They are under the civil service, enjoy the democratic freedom of civilians, and have won recognition as civilians.

In their civilian status many of these young women, particularly a substantial group of the more experienced, have earned the respect, approval, and confidence of the military personnel at the stations to which they are assigned. In their present civilian status WASP pilots know that no question of rank can arise to mar the present amicable relationships.

CLASSES 3, 4, AND 5 WASPS

In its report to the committee, the staff states that there exists in the present WASP organization a pool of well-qualified pilots whose services should be utilized, and this committee recommends that provision be made to adjust the salaries of these qualified WASP pilots in accordance with their experience and responsibilities. It is also recommended that provision should be made so that these qualified WASPS may obtain insurance and hospitalization.

QUALIFICATIONS DISCRIMINATORY

The training and operations of WASPS brings into focus a related situation of definite interest to this committee. The standards for acceptance for training as service pilots differ for men and women.

In the case of the WASP recruit, the standards have been lowered to 35 air hours (dual or solo). Accepted WASP recruits are given 6 months' training of approximately 200 hours. The graduate WASP is qualified to operate a class 1 plane. It should be kept in mind that the WASP graduate has approximately only 235 air hours.

In view of the above scant requirements, it cannot be understood why a qualification of 1,000 or more hours, 200 of which must be in planes of 200 or more horsepower, is required and insisted upon as a prerequisite to acceptance of the now available male instructors.

This situation becomes more confused when it is understood that many of these civilian instructors could be qualified to fly the heavier and hotter ships with a minimum of transitional training and a significant saving in expense and, more importantly, time. The average civilian instructor can be fully qualified to operate the class 4 and 5 planes months ahead of the WASP recruits now available.

It is not understood why the qualification for both men and women should not be identical, and why the proven experience of this available male personnel is not being utilized. It is impossible to escape the conclusion that this discrimination attempts to demonstrate that the millions of dollars of public funds, spent with the approval and at the insistance of the War Department, to train these civilian instructors has been unwise and unavailing. This committee must reject such reasoning.

TECHNIQUES USED IN SCREENING INSTRUCTORS

Reports received by the staff indicated that the approach made by 45 boards set up to screen civilian instructors of discontinued programs did not consider the experience of those being "screened."

A study of the certificate of acceptance reveals that the civilian instructors and reservists were given three major opportunities:

(a) Discharge from Enlisted Reserve Corps;

(b) Continuance in the Reserve Corps for training and duty with the Army Training Command; [1]

(c) Called to active duty in the Army Air Forces.

The staff stated that this is an elimination technique and does not give proper consideration to training, ability, or experience. Any figure purportedly gathered from this technique invites careful scrutiny. The chance to qualify appears prejudicial. The results of this classification should be reviewed in detail on the basis of House Resolution 16, directing investigation of the effects of such policies and practices upon the war effort.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AVAILABLE

It is suggested to the Army Air Forces that there may be found the required additional personnel, given as the need for expanding the WASP program as a civilian activity, through a careful analysis and proper utilization of the following available groups of trained and partially trained air personnel:

1. Civilian instructors now released, or to be released, through curtailment of the Army Air Forces primary training schools.

2. Civilian instructors now released, or to be released, through the liquidation of the Civil Aeronautics Administration-War Training Service program.

3. Instructor-trainees of the Army Air Forces, either wholly or partially trained for the Army Air Forces by the Civil Aeronautics Administration-War Training Service training program, who, notwithstanding this costly and highly technical training, have been returned to the walking army or to ground crews or assigned other duties having no relation to the training for which millions of dollars of public funds have been spent.

4. Student trainees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration-War Training Service program who, at varying stages of their training, have been returned to other duties not connected with the purposes for which they were trained, and, who, with transitional training, would be more quickly made available than new recruits.

5. Army Air Forces commissioned instructor personnel of the Air Forces Training Command now released for other assignments because of the curtailment of the cadet-training program. Many of these instructors, because of over age, or for other reasons, will not be assigned to combat duty.

6. Commissioned personnel of the Army Air Forces returning from combat areas who have either completed their missions or, having been wounded or otherwise battle-marked, are nevertheless qualified for service pilot duties.

7. Noncommissioned personnel of the Army Air Forces whose experience and performance merits consideration for pilot or transitional training, and whose services would be more quickly available than those of new recruits.

8. Recently commissioned Army Air Force pilot personnel who desire and need further air hours and experience before being sent to combat or foreign operational duty.

9. Army Air Forces personnel now assigned to administrative duties in the United States and elsewhere who, although in flight pay status, are actually engaged in administrative, consulting, liaison, and contact duties for which payment of flight pay was not contemplated and which, in many cases, could well be done by nonflying officers. Air-WAC's, or civil-service personnel.

It is the opinion of the committee that the above categories contain an abundance of pilot personnel susceptible to immediate utilization at less expense than would be possible under the contemplated expansion of the WASP program.

ONE AND ONE-HALF YEARS

Due to the nature of the request, the investigative staff has examined with care and diligence the development of any reason or evidence which might seem to justify this proposal.

If this proposal had been made earlier in the war, when an acute shortage of pilots did exist, it is more than probable that the plan would have met with approval; but at this time, realizing that a year and a half must pass before full utilization may be expected of trainees recruited today, this committee does not consider this experiment justified.

It appears that there exists an available surplus of pilot personnel larger than the stated needs of the WASP program. The opinion of the committee is that this available surplus must be properly utilized to the full extent of its capacities before further recruiting and training of WASPS can be justified.

PUBLIC FUNDS

This inquiry has developed that the Congress appropriated substantial funds for the training of civilian pilot instructors and trainees. It is clear that large numbers of these men are not now being used for the purpose for which these funds were appropriated. Neither are the skills developed during their training being properly applied to the war effort. The reasons advanced for this diversion and dissipation of manpower trained for a specialized purpose is not acceptable to this committee. Army Air Forces is now requesting that additional millions be spent on recruiting and training inexperienced personnel to perform the functions for which these men are now, or could quickly be, qualified. It is stated by the War Department that the transitional training necessary to further qualify these men for the hotter and heavier ships can be accomplished at a fraction of the cost contemplated in the proposed program.

If the number of WASPS were increased, as proposed, to 2,500, the estimated training cost alone would be $50,000,000.

If, as indicated, the WASP program were ultimately increased to 5,000, the cost would be $100,000,000 of public funds.

Public funds are made up of the War stamps of school children, the taxes of the farmer, the savings of the wage earner, deductions from the pay envelope of the laborer, and the earnings of industry.

Congress is the custodian of these public funds, and it is with the full realization of this responsibility that the Committee on the Civil Service presents the following:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proposal to expand the WASP has not been justified. Therefore, it is recommended that the recruiting of inexperienced personnel and their training for the WASPS be immediately terminated.

2. That the use of the WASPS already trained and in training be continued and provision be made for hospitalization and insurance.

3. There exist several surpluses of experienced pilot personnel available for utilization as service pilots.

Therefore, it is recommended that the service of these several groups of experienced air personnel be immediately utilized.

[1] Reservists now include all Army Air Forces, civilian and reservist personnel.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of June 16, 1944:

CONGRESS PRICE CONTROL OPENS DOOR TO INFLATION

You can't expect a boxer to put up a winning fight if his manager sends him into the ring with one hand tied behind his back.

That is the handicap which both Houses of Congress, in a series of amendments to the price control bill, would impose on the Office of Price Administration.

The seriousness of such a situation cannot be exaggerated.

The economic stabilization of the Nation hinges on continued ability of O. P. A. to hold the line against runaway inflation.

It can't be held if Congress deliberately enfeebles that mainstay.

The bill extending the Price Control Act, which expires at the end of this month, is now in Senate-House conference, where it is to be taken up today.

Among obvious inflationary amendments and legal booby traps is the Bankhead Senate cotton amendment which would force an increase of from $225,000,000 to $350,000,000 in the Nation's annual bill for clothing, sheets, towels, etc.

The House rejected that amendment in its original version but inserted an equally dangerous provision which would oblige processors of agricultural products to pay parity prices for raw materials in order to charge full ceiling prices for finished products.

Other tinkerings with our well-functioning O. P. A. machinery are provisions abolishing O. P. A.'s highest price line regulation, requiring upward revision of rents under certain

conditions, removing wage controls from salaries less than $37.50 a week, making ignorance of O. P. A. regulations a defense in civil suits against price-ceiling violators.

O. P. A., while not above criticism, has done a remarkably good job.

It has made the President's anti-inflationary program work.

There has been no recurrence of the disruptive days of World War No. 1, when living costs skyrocketed 107 percent between 1914 and 1920.

The congressional amendments, which would make a mockery of the title of the bill—the price-control bill—would breach the dikes. They would provide special indulgent legislation for some industries and thus, as the President has pointed out, open the door to demands for similar treatment from all industry.

O. P. A. Administrator Chester Bowles has warned that they would wreck the entire price-control program.

The Senate-House conference has a solemn and difficult duty imposed upon it by the failure of both Houses as a whole. It must prune the bill of its inflationary jokers and persuade Senate and House to reconsider.

It would be treacherous betrayal of the public if Congress in the name of price control deliberately legislated inflation on the one hand and on the other destroyed the efficiency of our main bulwark against economic chaos—the O. P. A.

President Roosevelt should not be obliged to veto the entire price-control bill to get rid of these crippling amendments. For it is urgent to get a new Price Control Act on the statute books without delay.

America's Foremost Social Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious and basic problems confronting the American people is the accelerating trend of delinquency in youth. Much has been written and said on this most important subject, but I rather think it has remained for Mrs. Donald D. Conn, of Evanston, Ill., to offer a remedy that can easily be put into force, and I feel, with splendid results.

The motion picture industry confines itself almost altogether to entertaining the public, and we must agree that there is altogether too great a percentage of films presented that have an evil influence upon the young. Mrs. Conn shows how this can and should be remedied:

AMERICA'S FOREMOST SOCIAL PROBLEMS—A SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAM OF EDUCATION TO ASSIST IN ARRESTING THE INCREASE OF DELINQUENCY AND CRIME IN YOUTH

AN APPEAL TO THE PUBLIC

The appalling increase of delinquency and crime in youth throughout America during the past 20 years presents a challenge to every citizen and to the leadership of every community.

As a result of an extensive study of this subject, I published Religion's New Frontier in 1940, urging the adoption of every means at our command to aid in molding the highest standards of character in our children without which we cannot expect this country to continue its spiritual, economic, and social progress, or to assume its position of leadership in the world to come.

I emphasized that the potentialities of one of the most important and far-reaching educational mediums in dealing with this subject—the motion-picture—had not been fully explored and offered the following suggestion: That daily motion-picture performances include a 10- to 15-minute short—a biographical sketch of a true human-interest story depicting actual examples of the influences of spiritual experiences upon lives of individuals who have traveled the same path and have met the same problems as confront the youth of today; such pictures to be dramatized by professional actors and actresses of the screen.

Both our past and present-day civilization is replete with instances where the lives of individuals have been changed or directed by spiritual experiences. My suggestion would dramatize the lessons of such experiences in those places where the great masses of our youth, including the underprivileged, congregate—the motion-picture theaters.

Aside from the home, the church, and the school, the two most influential channels of education are the radio and motion pictures, both of fairly recent origin. Substantial progress has been made in broadcasting religious services—in the use of this instrumentality for the general public good, as well as for entertainment. But the radio can be turned on and off at will, while those who attend motion-picture theaters willingly accept the continuity of the performance because of their particular interest in one of the main features. People of all walks of life, who have never seen the inside of a church, swarm into these theaters for entertainment and relaxation. The gamut of human emotion finds expression in this shrine of millions. People forget themselves. They are carried away in imagination. Their thoughts are stimulated and directed.

According to official publications of the motion-picture industry, between 80,000,000 and 85,000,000 people, well over half of the country's population, attend motion-picture performances each week.

THE REAL DEFICIENCY

It is apparent from the statements of leading crime authorities that the greatest number of our criminals spring from the masses of so-called underprivileged youth. However, the facts also show that crime is by no means restricted to the ranks of these less fortunate children. The files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation abound with instances of criminals who come from average homes but who in early childhood adopted careers of lawlessness. Authorities agree that this great segment of our youth has little, if any, foundation in spiritual education.

This deficiency, they claim, is the primary cause for the development of criminal tendencies in early childhood. Young people, unversed in spiritual education, form their own code of living and invoke self-inflicted penalties for their wrongs—their ignorance of a constructive philosophy of life leading to utter disregard of the rights, property, and lives of other people.

Recently published statistics give the population of children between the ages of 5 and 17 as 30,340,000. The Sunday school enrollment for children between these ages is 11,991,000, or about 40 percent. Even taking into consideration the children reached by the Roman Catholic Church through its parochial schools, and those enrolled by Jewish congregations in Talmud Torah schools, it is probably not far from correct to say that less than one-half of the entire population, or about 15,000,000 children in this age bracket, are not being reached by any type of spiritual education.

The problem presents complexities which require not only renewed effort on the part of all existing groups working for the betterment of youth but also the utilization of every available channel of education for reaching the great number of these young people. We do not meet the issue by assuming that mandatory academic education will suffice. Notwithstanding the combined efforts of the schools, churches, and social organizations of all kinds, delinquency and crime in youth are mounting at a rapidly increasing rate.

I do not offer my suggestion as a substitute for any of the splendid programs now in operation but merely as a supplement to the excellent work being carried on by all organizations.

CRIME MARCHES ON

Long before this country entered the present World War, the increase of delinquency and crime in youth had become a national problem so serious in its implications as to challenge the foremost consideration of the churches of all denominations, social organizations of all kinds, and of the Federal and State Governments. When civilization is faced with war, or unusual disturbances of any kind, the first victims of the resulting chaos are the children. When we relax grown-up authority, or fail to exercise it, then society as a whole pays the penalty.

The following facts are derived from well-known authorities:

The national prison population is increasing at the rate of 25,000 a year. Of the criminals sent to prison, 73 percent are between 15 and 24 years of age.

There are three and one-half times as many criminals in our penal institutions as there are students in our universities and colleges.

Major crimes are committed in the United States on the average of one in every 24 seconds—the majority by boys and girls under voting age.

More than 13,000 families each year are directly affected by criminal homicides, many of which are premeditated murders.

In addition to major crimes, there is a staggering total of 14,000,000 less serious ones during each year. Most of our criminals are boys under 20, many of them barely 16 years old.

Since 1920 the population of reformatories, prisons, correctional schools, and mental hospitals in the State of Illinois has increased by 100 percent. In this same period the State's population has grown 20 percent, one-fifth as much.

The army of criminals contains 1 out of every 29 persons in the United States. Our crime population, if concentrated in one spot, would form a metropolis larger than any city in the United States except New York.

The cost of crime now exceeds $15,000,000,000 each year.

Any person, regardless of his station in life, might become a potential victim of crime.

OUR CRUMBLING DEMOCRACY

Such is our record—the results of our failure to build and protect the spiritual fabric and the character of the youth of the Nation. Through public default, delinquency and crime among our children are gaining the upper hand in this democracy. They now threaten the whole moral and spiritual structure of the country.

We may well defeat our enemies abroad but in the process abandon the very principles which form the foundations of our economic and social order at home. The "catch, convict, and confine" treatment of criminals is not enough. There is a missing link somewhere in this problem—that link is crime prevention. Criminal careers must be checked. Juvenile demoralization must be prevented. It is the social order which produces the problem children—not the children

themselves. They are amenable to such a degree and character of education as we are willing to give them.

MOTION PICTURES AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Essentially the motion-picture industry is devoted to money making through furnishing such entertainment as the people desire. In a broader sense, the exercise of its functions, and the implications of its programs, might well transcend the business motive of the enterprise. Motion pictures are a powerful force in molding the character of youth, whether such is their primary intent or not. Their productions can contribute to, or detract from, the teachings of our churches and the work of our social organizations. The industry is truly "clothed with the whole public interest."

Soon after the publication of Religion's New Frontier I was accorded the opportunity of discussing the proposal with the executives of the Motion Picture Producers & Distributors of America, Inc. While given a sympathetic hearing I was advised that the industry was necessarily responsive to public opinion—that I would be required to stimulate a widespread demand for such pictures before serious consideration could be given to their production. Believing this attitude to be entirely reasonable, I have, during the past several years, presented the idea to outstanding citizens throughout the country, including leaders of our churches, educational institutions, social organizations, and business enterprises. Not only has the proposal been very favorably received but I have accumulated a wealth of worth-while reactions as to the character of such productions which I shall catalog and make available to the organized sponsorship of the program at the proper time.

And, as the next logical step toward challenging public appreciation of the gravity of this problem and to encourage consideration of the proposal by all of the principal social, educational, and business elements throughout the country, I am making a general distribution of this summary—extra copies of which are available upon request.

LOUISE TRASK CONN.

EVANSTON, ILL., *June 1944.*

Corn for Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to put information in the RECORD that was sent to me by the War Food Administration relative to the use of corn for industry because I feel that it is not generally known that of this agricultural product 130,000,000 bushels of corn is needed annually for this purpose. It is another indication as to what the farmers of the country are doing in connection with the prosecution of the war.

Under the permission granted me, I include the statement. It follows:

The war production program of this country is threatened with interruption because of a shortage of corn. Although requirements of corn by war industries are less than 1 out of every 25 bushels grown last year, the flow of corn from farm to factory has fallen off to a mere trickle. Receipts of corn at primary markets have dropped from 10,000,000 bushels a week in January to two and one-half million bushels the last of March. Only part of the little corn being marketed is available to war industries which have minimum needs of two and one-half million bushels a week.

Corn goes into the production of nearly every war weapon. For example, corn is necessary for all foundry work, such as the casting and molding of bronze, steel, aluminum, and magnesium, for all textile production, for all paper manufacturing, for drugs and chemicals, and for adhesive production.

Unlike most farmers who can substitute other grains for corn as feed, the corn processors have no substitute materials for corn. If processors can't get corn, they shut down. And that is what is happening today—corn-processing plants are shutting down; supplies and vital war materials are running short.

The situation is so serious that Secretary of War Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Knox, War Production Chairman Nelson, and War Food Administrator Jones are appealing to United States farmers to sell more corn.

HOW MUCH CORN IS NEEDED

While corn-processing industries generally need 300,000,000 bushels of corn a year for civilian and war uses, around 130,000,000 bushels of this total—11,000,000 bushels a month—are absolutely indispensable to keep our war machine running and to meet essential civilian needs. This 130,000,000 bushels is only 4 percent of the 3,000,000,000 bushels grown by United States farmers in 1943.

The wet-corn-milling industry has been operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, since 1942. Nine wet-corn millers manufacture the starch, sirups, and sugars needed for war products. These are located at Robey and Indianapolis, Ind.; St. Louis and Kansas City, Mo.; Clinton, Keokuk, and Cedar Rapids, Iowa; and at Argo, Pekin, and Decatur, Ill.

Six dry-corn millers manufacture core binders and other industrial products for war. These are in Milwaukee, Wis.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Decatur and Paris, Ill.; Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; and Geneva, N. Y.

A larger plant at Peoria, Ill., makes alcohol and explosives.

HOW CORN FIGHTS

Drugs, vitamins

Thirty to forty million pounds of cornstarch, sugar, and sirup annually. Corn has made it possible to quadruple the production of penicillin, the entire production of which is going to the armed services for treatment of the wounded. Corn also goes into sulfa drugs, aspirin, other pharmaceuticals.

Butyl alcohol

Three million bushels of corn annually. High on the list of critical war materials. Through butyl-alcohol channels, corn is converted to butyl acetate, from which it emerges as lacquer and protective coatings for ammunition, aircraft, aircraft parts, guns, and gun mounts. Converted into dibutyl phthlate, corn emerges as smokeless powder and as plasticizers, vital to the manufacture of many types of coatings. Butyl alcohol flies in the gasoline tanks of our air forces in the form of inhibitors which discourage rust and stabilize the high-octane gasoline and prevent the formation of gummy substances; it goes into the rubber which makes bullet-proof gasoline tanks for planes; it is used in the manufacture of photographic film, most of which is taken by the military.

Chemicals and explosives

More than 50,000,000 pounds of cornstarch and corn grits annually. As starch, corn goes into dynamite, nitrocellulose; soaked with nitroglycerine, flakes of cornstarch fire our fighters' big guns.

Core binders, molders

One hundred to one hundred and fifty million pounds of starch annually. Starch from corn is used in foundry work, in special molds for castings of aluminum, steel, iron, magnesium, bronze, and copper which go into airplane engines, tanks, and other war implements.

Production of aluminum and other critical metals

More than 10,000,000 pounds annually. It would be impossible to produce aluminum without starch which is the only flotation agent capable of transmuting bauxite, the raw material, into alumina.

Paper and paper products

Three hundred million pounds of starch and dextrins annually. V-board containers for overseas shipments to our fighting forces take more than 100,000,000 pounds of starch and dextrins a year. More than 200,000,000 pounds are required for sizing paper products.

Textiles and cotton rayons

More than 300,000,000 pounds of cornstarch, annually for essential uses. Cornstarch sizing makes cloth sturdy. It also is used in finishing denims, ducks, as fiber glass cloth for bomber brake linings, and as camouflage cloth (printed with ink from corn). Surgical dressings are improved by starch treatment, enabling wounded fighters to recover more quickly.

Adhesives

More than 100,000,000 pounds of cornstarch yearly. Used to make airplane parts. The special plyboard veneer wings on newest type planes require corn products. Corn makes watertight and vermin-proof the containers which hold Army supplies.

Corn sirup

Over 25,000,000 bushels of corn annually and dextrose go into emergency ration kits, and into the jams and jellies which provide energy foods for fighters, war workers. In emergency cases dextrose can be injected directly into the blood stream.

CONVERSION FACTORS

On the average, refiners get about 34 pounds of cornstarch from 17 bushel of corn.

If starch is converted into sirup 1 bushel of corn produces 40 pound. of corn sirup.

The Army and Navy require more than 400,000,000 pounds of refined corn products annually for food uses.

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO DATE

Because corn was not moving to refineries in sufficient volume to insure uninterrupted production of essential war products, the War Food Administration conferred with representatives of the corn industry in mid-March to discuss the problem and determine a course of action.

1. As a result, W. F. A. issued Food Distribution Order No. 96, effective March 24, requiring country and terminal elevators to set aside 35 percent of their current stocks of yellow and mixed corn for sale to designated purchasers; requiring country elevators to set aside 35 percent of their future receipts; and requiring terminal elevators to set aside a similar quantity of their future receipts from sources other than country elevators.

2. On April 1 representatives of the corn industry reported that the situation was becoming progressively more acute, with very meager quantities of corn being delivered to the grain elevators. Effective as of that date, W. F. A. increased the set-aside percentage of 60 percent.

The order applies to counties in the five largest corn-producing States:

Minnesota: Blue Earth, Brown, Chippewa, Cottonwood, Faribault, Jackson, Lac Qui Parle, Lincoln, Lyon, Martin, Murray, Nobles,

Pipestone, Redwood, Renville, Rock, Watonwan, Yellow Medicine.

Nebraska: Burt, Butler, Cass, Cunning, Dodge, Douglas, Lancaster, Otoe, Sarpy, Saunders, Seward, Thurston, Washington.

Iowa: Audubon, Boone, Buena Vista, Calhoun, Carroll, Cerro Gordo, Cherokee, Clay, Crawford, Dallas, Dickinson, Emmet, Franklin, Fremont, Greene, Grundy, Guthrie, Hamilton, Hancock, Hardin, Harrison, Humboldt, Ida, Jasper, Kossuth, Lyon, Marshall, Mills, Monona, Montgomery, O'Brien, Osceola, Page, Palo Alto, Plymouth, Pocahontas, Polk, Pottawattamie, Poweshiek, Sac, Shelby, Sioux, Story, Tama, Webster, Winnebago, Woodbury, Wright.

Illinois: Bureau, Cass, Champaign, Christian, De Witt, Douglas, Edgar, Ford, Fulton, Grundy, Iroquois, Kankakee, Kendall, Knox, La Salle, Lee, Livingston, Logan, McLean, Macon, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Morgan, Moultrie, Peoria, Piatt, Putnam, Sangamon, Scott, Stark, Tazewell, Vermilion, Will, Woodford.

Indiana: Benton, Fountain, Jasper, Montgomery, Newton, Pulaski, Starke, Tippecanoe, Vermillion, Warren, White.

WAR INDUSTRIES NEED MORE CORN NOW

Every bomb dropped on Germany and every shell fired in the Pacific contains some refined corn. Every plane blasting the Jap depends upon corn—its engine is cast in a mold made in part from corn starch, and many planes have special ply-board veneer wings made possible only through use of corn products. Our soldiers and sailors wear uniforms treated with cornstarch and eat food shipped in boxes made in part from corn.

Corn fights—and it has no substitute.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1944.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.:

In accordance with the request of the Interagency Corn Committee on April 4, I am transmitting for the War Production Board the list of essential commercial uses of corn and corn products which the War Production Board would like to have you, as Administrator of F. D. O. 96, use as a condition (in the distribution of the end product) to the privilege of becoming a designated purchaser for obtaining corn under the set-aside provisions.

It is our desire to have orders for corn and corn products met on the basis of the priority indicated in the attached list. All the end products listed within each category (i. e., A-1, A-2, and B) are of equal importance for the purposes of administering this list. Priority holds only among A-1, A-2, and B categories. Any industrial product not on this list is considered less essential.

Sincerely,

W. Y. ELLIOTT,
Director, Division of Stock Piling.

LIST OF ESSENTIAL COMMERCIAL USES OF CORN AND CORN PRODUCTS (WET AND DRY MILLING)

(Includes end-products using cornstarch, meal, flour, grits, dextrine, sirup, crude sugar, sugar, oil, fatty acids, oil cake and meal, steepwater, hydrol, lactic acid, butyl alcohol, acetone, ethyl, cobs, stalks, and leaves.)

A-1

1. Abrasives.
2. Airplane dopes.
3. Antiseptics.
4. Anti-oxidents.
5. Asbestos.
6. Batteries, dry.
7. Boiler compounds.
8. Ceramics (spark plugs and electronic insulators).
9. Chemical agents (solvents, detergents, etc.).
10. Chemical raw materials (chloroform, iodoform, etc.).
11. Commercial acids (lactic, ascorbic, etc.).
12. Cordage and twines.
13. Core binders for foundries metal castings and molds.
14. Denatured alcohol (antifreeze, fuel, etc.).
15. Explosives (dynamite, nitrated starch, etc.).
16. Fibrous glass cloth.
17. Hydraulic brake fluid.
18. Inks, printing.
19. Insecticides.
20. Leather tanning.
21. Oil well drilling agents.
22. Oils, penetrating.
23. Ore flotation agents (alumina, etc.).
24. Penicillin.
25. Pharmaceuticals.
26. Rubber goods, substitutes, synthetic, hot patches for tire repair.
27. Sizing for brake lining.
28. Surgical dressings.
29. Synthetic resins.
30. V-board.

A-2

1. Adhesives.
2. Crayons (chalk) (industrial).
3. Dyes.
4. Electroplating and galvanizing.
5. Glass, safety.
6. Gypsum board.
7. Insulating material (wallboard, etc.).
8. Leather products.
9. Matches.
10. Paint, varnish, and rust removers.
11. Paper, paperboard, and paper products.
12. Photographic film.
13. Plastics and molded products.
14. Plywood.
15. Protective coatings (paints, varnishes, shellac).
16. Rayon.
17. Sizing compounds.
18. Shells, shotgun.
19. Textiles (except textile finishing).
20. Tubes, spiral and convolute.
21. Zein and other protein products.

B

1. Cigarette sealing.
2. Cork products.
3. Felts.
4. Laundry starch (home and commercial).
5. Leather (artificial, patent, and enameled).
6. Linoleum.
7. Pastes (wallpaper, poster, etc.).
8. Rug backing.
9. Shoes (counter pastes, polish, etc.).
10. Soaps and cleaners.
11. Textiles (finishing).
12. Tobacco.
13. Window shades and shade cloth.

Important Message to Next of Kin of Men and Women in Armed Forces

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with the invasion now under way on the western front, with the fierce battles raging in Italy and the Southwest Pacific, as our boys on the battle fronts of the world move into the crucial struggle for victory, unfortunately there will come to the people of the Nation and to my district a great many telegrams reporting our soldiers, wounded, missing, or killed in action.

For the benefit of my people in the twenty-third district and for the information of the Members of the House, I want to point out how we can be of service to the people of our various districts in the hope that we can help to alleviate some of their trials and troubles in knowing how to approach the Federal Government in order to settle their claims wherein they are beneficiaries of the men and women now in the armed service.

The next of kin of one who loses his life in the service is eligible for one or more of four different monetary benefits, as follows:

First. A 6-month gratuity payment: This payment is automatically paid to a wife or, if there is no wife, to a child or children. If there is no wife or child, this gratuity goes to dependent parents or other dependent relatives—grandchildren, brothers, sisters, or grandparents—who have been named by the soldier to receive this gratuity pay. If there is no wife or child or dependent relatives named by the soldier, this gratuity is paid to any dependent relative if they are shown to have been dependent upon the soldier before his death. The amount of this payment depends upon the amount of pay the soldier was receiving at the time of his death—not including rental and subsistence pay. The beneficiary receives six times this monthly payment.

Second. Monthly insurance payments: This insurance is not paid in a lump sum. It is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary. The older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy a beneficiary under 30 years of age will receive $55.10 a month for 240 months. A beneficiary over 30 years of age will get a guaranteed 120 equal installments—and if they survive beyond 120 months it is paid for life. The amount of monthly payment, if the beneficiary is over 30, depends on the age of the beneficiary. Under a $10,000 policy a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

Parents and next of kin should check with the men and women in service to see that all insurance policies are in order and a certificate in the hands of the beneficiaries. An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister including those of half blood.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check the insurance policy now. See that everything is in order now. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A little care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen.

Third. A pension: This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children

up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, they are not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased soldier can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month; two parents, $25 each; widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child—subject to apportionment regulations; no widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38—equally divided, with $10 for each additional child—total divided. Total pension as to widow, child, or children not to exceed $100.

Note: The fact that a widow, a child, or parent gets insurance does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect insurance and get a pension besides.

Fourth. Arrears of pay: When a casualty occurs that service man or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. For instance, if the casualty occurs on the 27th of the month he had 27 days' pay coming. If the casualty occurs on the 15th of the month he had 15 days' back pay coming. Then, too, when soldiers are at the front in actual combat they may miss several pay days. All of this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. The nearest heir of the deceased serviceman should inquire about and collect this arrears of pay if the service man or woman becomes a casualty.

SUMMARY

Should there be a death casualty in your family remember there are one or more of four payments due the dependents: First, 6 months' gratuity payment; second, insurance; third, a pension; and, fourth, arrears of pay. If there are any questions, or should you know anyone having difficulty getting their payments from the Government, it would be well for them to take it up with their Congressman. He will be glad to handle the case for them. Citizens of the Twenty-third District of Illinois may write Congressman CHARLES W. VURSELL, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Benefits Provided Under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—S. 1767

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an analysis of benefits provided under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. This analysis was compiled under the direction of Omar B. Ketchum, director of the V. F. W. National Service Bureau and legislative representative of that organization. The members of his staff have made a very thorough study of this legislation and I am confident the analysis will be helpful to returning veterans, and the service officers of all organizations:

BENEFITS PROVIDED UNDER THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944—S. 1787

ELIGIBILITY

To be eligible for benefits under the act—except as to employment—a man or woman must have served in the active forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or one of their components, during the period beginning September 16, 1940, and ending with the termination of the present war. Such person must have served for at least 90 days, or have been sooner discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, and in addition, must have been discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

TITLE I. HOSPITALIZATION, CLAIMS, AND PROCEDURES

The Veterans' Administration is determined to be an essential war agency entitled to priorities in personnel, materials, etc., second only to the War and Navy Departments. State institutions to be built for the care or hospitalization of veterans shall have the same priorities for materials.

The Veterans' Administration shall provide adequate facilities, and an apropriation of $500,000,000 is authorized. The Veterans' Administration and War and Navy Departments are authorized to arrange for mutual use of hospitals, equipment, etc.

The Veterans' Administration is authorized to place employees in Army and Navy hospitals to adjudicate disability claims and give aid and advice to persons about to be discharged from active service.

No person shall be discharged or released from active service until discharge certificate and final pay, or a substantial portion thereof, are ready for delivery to him or to his next of kin or legal representative.

No person shall be discharged from active service on account of disability until and unless he has executed a claim for compensation, pension, or hospitalization, to be filed with the Veterans' Administration, or has signed a statement that he has had explained to him the right to file such claim. Refusal or failure to file a claim shall be without prejudice to any right the veteran may subsequently assert.

No person in the armed forces shall be required to sign a statement of any nature relating to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of any disease or injury he may have, and any such statement against his own interest signed at any time, shall be null and void and of no force and effect.

Paid full-time accredited representatives of recognized veterans' organizations are to be permitted to function in the various discharge centers to aid servicemen about to be discharged in the preparation and presentation of their claims for benefits.

Boards of review are to be established by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, which boards are given authority to review, on their own motion or on request of a veteran or his representative, the type and nature of discharge or dismissal, except one by sentence of court martial, and upon the facts found, to change, correct, or modify such discharge or dismissal. The findings of the board shall be subject to the final approval of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy. Request for review must be filed within 15 years after separation from the service or 15 years after effective date of the act, whichever is the later.

The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to assemble, from time to time, boards of review composed of five members to consider the request of any officer retired or released to inactive service, without pay, for physical disability pursuant to the decision of a retiring board, the findings and decision of such retiring board. Request for review must be filed within 15 years after separation from the service or 15 years after effective date of the act, whichever is the later.

TITLE II. EDUCATION OF VETERANS

This title makes available to eligible veterans courses of education or training ranging from 1 to 4 years, depending on length of service; authorizes payment to the veteran of a subsistence allowance of $50 per month while he is receiving education or training; with an additional $25 per month if he has a dependent or dependents; and grants to educational institutions up to $500 for each veteran enrolled during an ordinary school year to cover tuition, other fees, books, etc.

The veteran's education or training must have been impeded, delayed, or interrupted or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service, or he must show need for a refresher or retraining course. Any person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with. Service under the Army specialized training program or naval college training program or as a cadet or midshipman does not count as qualifying service.

The eligible veteran may attend an educational institution of his own choice in any State for the purpose of taking the course elected by him, for a period of 1 calendar year or the equivalent thereof in part-time study, and upon satisfactory completion of the 1-year course of study, he may continue for an additional period not to exceed the time he was in active service and exclusive of educational courses taken during his active service. However, a refresher or retrainer course may not exceed 1 year.

Part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance, but with payment of tuition and other expenses is permissible.

Books and equipment furnished the veteran may be kept by him if he satisfactorily completes his course of education or training.

Any course may be discontinued if and when the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs decides the conduct or progress of the veteran is unsatisfactory.

The right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities is extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941, thus amending Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress.

TITLE III. LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

This title provides loans for the purposes stated or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000; (a) loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions; (b) interest rate must not exceed 4 percent per annum; (c) the loan must be practicable and suitable to the veteran's circumstances; (d) the loan must be repaid in 20 years; (e) the Government must have the right of subrogation to the extent of any guaranty paid; (f) the liability under the guaranty must decrease or increase with the decrease of the amount of unpaid obligation; (g) the agreement

must permit the Government to protect itself in case of default through the right to bid on foreclosure proceedings or to refinance; (h) the proceeds of the proposed loan must be used for one or more of the purposes specified and the circumstances must meet the specifications of the title.

In the event a principal loan is made—or committed to be made—by a Federal lending agency, or to be guaranteed or insured by such agency, a loan for all or part of the balance of the purchase price may be guaranteed: (a) if it does not exceed $2,000; (b) if it does not exceed 20 percent of the cost or purchase price; (c) if the interest rate does not exceed by more than 1 percent the interest rate on the principal loan; (d) if the conditions otherwise meet those prescribed above.

Any veteran eligible under tile III shall also be eligible for the benefits of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant. Eligibility must be determined (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, (b) by the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE IV. EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

This title sets up machinery for job counseling and employment placement service for veterans so as to provide for them the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment.

It creates a Veterans' Placement Board to cooperate with and assist the United States Employment Service, and the Board shall determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service.

The chairman of the board, who shall be the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, shall have direct authority and responsibility for carrying out its policies through veterans' employment representatives in the several States.

The United States Employment Service shall assign to each of the States a veterans' employment representative, who shall be a veteran of the wars of the United States separated from active service under honorable conditions, who at the time of appointment shall have been a bona fide resident of the State for at least 2 years, and who shall be appointed, subject to the approval of the board, in accordance with the civil-service laws. He shall be responsible for the supervision of the registration of veterans in local employment officers and for their placement in employment; assist in furnishing current information as to the various types of available employment in public works and private industry or business; and otherwise promote the employment of veterans.

TITLE V. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

This title provides for unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed, subject to the following conditions:

The week of unemployment must have begun (a) after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the effective date of the act; (b) not later than 2 years after discharge or release from active service or the termination of the war, whichever is the later date.

The person is not receiving subsistence allowance for education or training under title II of the act or increased pension for vocational training under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress.

To be eligible the person must (a) reside in the United States; (b) be completely unemployed, or, if partially employed, at wages less than $23 per week; (c) be registered with and report to a public employment office; (d) be able to work and available for suitable work.

Any person will be disqualified from receiving an allowance if (a) he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; (b) he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work or to accept suitable work offered; (c) he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; (d) he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

Within the 52 weeks limit the total eligibility is determined by allowing 8 weeks of allowances for each of the first 3 months of service, and 4 weeks of allowances for each month or major fraction thereof of service beyond 3 months.

No allowance may be paid for any period more than 5 years after the end of the war.

The allowance of $20 per week will be reduced by any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation—other than pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration—received by the veteran for the same period of time.

Any person self-employed for profit in an independent establishment, trade, business, profession, or other vocation is eligible for readjustment allowances (a) if net earnings are less than $100 for the previous calendar month; (b) the amount of allowance to be the difference between the net earnings and $100 per month; (c) the conditions as to eligibility otherwise as provided in Title V.

Severe penalties are provided for fraud and misrepresentation in connection with claims for readjustment allowances.

Readjustment allowance claims are to be serviced by State agencies or as to railway employees, by the Railroad Retirement Board.

Right of appeal from any such agency to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is preserved.

TITLE VI. GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND PENAL PROVISIONS

By definition "veterans" are included those who reside within the continental United States, several States, territories, and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable is made a prerequisite to entitlement to benefits under Public Law No. 2, as amended, as well as this act. This will apply to (a) pensions, (b) compensation, (c) hospitalization, (d) domiciliary care, (e) vocational training, (f) benefits provided under this act.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Touchdown Club of Washington, D. C., I have attended several of their very interesting, snappy Tuesday luncheons. I missed out on the luncheon last Tuesday, June 13, 1944, and therefore missed an excellent address made by Maj. O. W. Clark, Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, but one of my fellow members, Thomas J. Kehoe, assistant national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, has been kind enough to furnish me with a copy of the major's talk, and because of the well-coordinated information therein concerning veteran benefits generally I here insert his address as a part of my remarks, as follows:

Public interest in the care of the men and women who have served or are now serving in our armed forces has raised many questions regarding the assistance such persons may expect from the Federal Government after their separation from military service. For many years our only form of relief for disabled veterans was a pension. The history of the rehabilitative measures, adopted from time to time, will provide a better understanding of the Nation's willingness and desire to assist the returned veteran to become a useful citizen.

Pension legislation in this country was first enacted by the different States for the relief of those who were wounded or disabled in service during the War of the Revolution, but in 1789 by an act of Congress the Federal Government assumed the payment of such pensions as had been granted by the States and this provision was continued by subsequent legislation. Throughout our history provision has been made for those who became disabled while serving in our armed forces and for certain dependents of those who died while in the service or as the result of service-incurred disabilities. The care of veterans has become a national responsibility. This is as it should be. In no other way could there exist uniformity of benefits to those who served honorably.

Prior to August 9, 1921, the only provision made for the care of veterans who were in need of medical treatment was that available in the hospitals of the United States Public Health Service and the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. Before that date veterans were forced to contact the Pension Bureau, the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, the Federal Board for Vocational Rehabilitation, the United States Public Health Service, or the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. The uncertainty in the ex-serviceman's mind regarding the agency which might serve him caused chaos and public criticism. Because of the number of World War No. 1 veterans who were, by circumstances, forced to go from one agency to another, the United States Veterans' Bureau was created by an act of Congress. There was transferred to that agency the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, that part of the Public Health Service engaged in the examination and hospital care of World War No. 1 veterans, and that part of the Federal Board for Vocational Education engaged in the vocational rehabilitation of such persons. An act of Congress dated July 3, 1930, created the Veterans' Administration by the consolidation of the United States Veterans' Bureau, the Pension Bureau, and the National Home for Volunteer Soldiers. Subsequent to that date there is but one agency of the Government charged with the responsibility of awarding benefits to veterans.

The Veterans' Administration is organized on a functional basis. There is complete centralization of policymaking, supervision, and control, and generally a complete decentralization of operations. There are 104 field facilities in the several States so as to serve the veterans most expeditiously and economically.

Most persons now in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard have purchased national service life insurance. Life insurance coverage amounts to approximately $114,000,000,000. Deductions from the monthly pay of persons in the service is made in most cases to keep such insurance in force. After discharge from the service an insured may continue the life protection by remittance to the collection subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

Honorably discharge veterans are entitled to hospital treatment in our hospitals regardless of cause or time of disablement except that due to misconduct.

Over 1,000,000 men and women have already been discharged from active service since December 7, 1941, and more than one-half of those on account of disability. Over 325,000 disability claims have been received by the Veterans' Administration, a number not ex-

ment Act of 1944. This analysis was

XC—App.——194

from the service or 15 years after effective date of the act, whichever is the later.

or increase with the decrease of the amount of unpaid obligation; (g) the agreement

ceeded, incident to World War No. 1, until a year and 4 months after the armistice. Our adjudication capacity, early in the war, was only about 6,000 new claims. That was the number of claims we could dispose of currently. We are proud to report that in March 1944 over 45,000 new claims were adjudicated. The pending load mounted at first due to lack of personnel to dispose of it, but in March and April the pending load was reduced by 40,000 claims and now stands slightly over 70,000. Of the adjudicated claims, 58 percent have been allowed, and in March the figure was 71 percent, reflecting the full effect of current legislation. There are 154,056 veterans with service-connected disabilities on the pension rolls, a number not reached in World War No. 1, until long after the armistice. We have every expectation of becoming current in July of this year.

The amount of monthly pension ranges from $10 to $100 per month depending upon the degree of disablement. These rates have recently been increased 15 percent. There are other statutory rates which provide monthly pension for specific disabilities, the maximum of which is $250 per month.

With a view to reducing the time consumed in securing essential service and medical records and adjudicating claims for disability pension to an absolute minimum, the Veterans' Administration with the cooperation of the War and Navy Departments undertook an experiment of establishing groups of Veterans' Administration employees at Army and Navy discharge centers to adjudicate claims for disability pension filed by enlisted men discharged for disability.

Groups, or units, of Veterans' Administration employees were established at Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D. C.; Ft. Devens, Mass.; and United States Navy Hospital, Great Lakes, Ill. These groups were authorized to completely adjudicate claims for disability pension filed by enlisted men discharged for disability at the Army or Navy stations mentioned. However, adjustment of account and authorization of payment of disability pension to the Division of Disbursements, Treasury Department, was accomplished by the regional office or facility with regional office activities having jurisdiction over the territory in which the mailing address of the veteran was located and to which the case folder was transferred.

It soon became apparent that this plan was not feasible because there were approximately 650 Army and Navy stations from which enlisted men were discharged for disability and the number of discharges for disability ranged from four or five to over a thousand a month. To establish a group of Veterans' Administration employees at each of the 650 discharge centers was impossible due to the manpower situation. Furthermore, had it been possible to secure sufficient trained personnel to establish groups at each discharge center, it would have been a flagrant waste of manpower and funds, as the number of discharges for disability per month from the overwhelming majority of discharge centers would not warrant or justify a group even of the minimum number of employees required to adjudicate claims for disability pension.

In view of these circumstances and the increased pressure, both public and private, to expedite the adjudication of claims for disbility pension filed by World War No. 2 veterans discharged for disability, it was imperative that the Veterans' Administration adopt a plan to accomplish the results desired.

After due consideration and study, the plan to establish nine area offices, one for each Army service command area, was adopted by the Veterans' Administration.

It is the function of these nine area offices to initially adjudicate all claims for disability pension filed by enlisted men who are discharged from World War No. 2 military or naval service because of disability and make application for this benefit at the time of or prior to discharge. The adjudication includes adjustment of account and authorization of payment of disability pension to the Division of Disbursements, Treasury Department, for the first and second monthly pension checks when in order. When the claim is adjudicated the case folder with related records is transferred to the Veterans' Administration regional office that has jurisdiction over the territory in which the mailing address of the veteran is located. When notified of the adjudication action taken by the area office, the veteran is advised to address further communications regarding his claim to the Veterans' Administration office to which his claim was transferred.

By greater concentration of employees and specialization in adjudication of a particular class of claims, not feasible in a regional office, the adjudication will be accelerated and the lapse of time between date of receipt of claim and initial payment of pension will be expedited and held to a minimum. In addition, training of new personnel is facilitated.

Reports received from the several area managers indicate that when inexperienced personnel become familiar with procedure and detail and more proficient, the maximum lapse of time between date of receipt of claim and date case folder is transferred will be 1 week. As a matter of fact, one area office reports that cases were adjudicated within 24 hours of date of receipt of claim. A claim adjudicated and transferred within 6 or 7 days of its receipt certainly should be classed as receiving expedited action, and this, of course, was the purpose motivating the creation of the area offices.

In order to provide for the vocational rehabilitation of the service men and women of World War No. 2, the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States extended the rehabilitation activities of the Veterans' Administration by the passage of Public Law 16, which provides for a program to last 6 years after the termination of the war.

The purpose of vocational rehabilitation is to restore the employability lost by virtue of a handicap due to a service-incurred disability.

To be eligible for such training, the individual must have been in the active military or naval service any time after December 6, 1941, and during the present war; must have been honorably discharged; must have a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay; and must be in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap caused by such service-connected disability.

During the training period and for 2 months afterward, the veteran, if single, will receive a pension of $80 a month; and if married, $90 a month, and will receive $5 a month additional for each dependent child and $10 a month for each dependent parent.

In carrying out the rehabilitation program for disabled veterans, the Veterans' Administration will use recognized or accredited schools and colleges and industrial enterprises for training on the job.

To make application for vocational rehabilitation, the veteran should write to the Veterans' Administration and request an application for pension. This will initiate the determination as to whether the veteran has a pensionable disability resulting in a vocational handicap. If a vocational handicap is present, the veteran will be advised that he or she may make application for vocational training. Arrangements for vocational training will be made by the Veterans' Administration having jurisdiction in the territory in which the veteran intends to reside permanently.

Previous to entrance upon a training program, the veteran will undergo a process of advisement in which his abilities and disabilities will be considered in relation to his adjustment in an occupation. This advisement will take into consideration his education, previous vocational training, skills, aptitudes, interests, and personal desires. When the advisement is completed and an occupational objective has been selected, the training program will be carried on by means of existing agencies particularly selected for the purpose. The object of this training is to supply the disabled person with a well-rounded knowledge of the occupation and ability to perform all of the skills, job operations, and work tasks which are essential to meeting employment requirements.

The training will be carried on in the nearest suitable training facility. Training on the job is provided in the veteran's home community whenever possible to avoid unnecessary dislocation. Institutional training is generally provided in the institution nearest to the veteran's residence which is prepared to give the training prescribed. Tuition, books, supplies, and other incidentals are furnished in institutional training and all necessary equipment and supplies are provided in training on the job.

Under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration provision is made for the payment of death benefits to the widows and children and dependent parents of men whose deaths are held to have been in line of duty and not the result of their own misconduct.

Upon receipt of notice of death from the service department, appropriate forms are forwarded by the Veterans' Administration.

Payment of benefits is effective from the day following the date of death if application is received within 1 year from the date of death; otherwise, payments would be effective from date of receipt of the application.

Benefits are payable to the unremarried widow or child under the age of 18 unless prior to reaching the age of 18 such child becomes permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defects. Payments may be continued until the age of 21 if the child is pursuing an approved course of instruction.

Widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65; with $13 for each additional child. No widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38 (equally divided) with $10 for each additional child (total equally divided). Total amount payable to widow and children, $100.

The dependent parents are entitled to $25 each or $45 for one parent.

The father or mother will not be considered dependent if it is shown that they both have sufficient income to provide for their reasonable support and maintenance, including clothing and medical attention for themselves and family under legal age, or any age if physically or mentally incapacitated.

Discussion of the so-called "G. I. Bill of Rights" has not been included in these remarks, as that bill is still pending final action by the Congress.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, this Tuesday luncheon at the Touchdown Club, at which Maj. O. W. Clark, Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, delivered the above-quoted address, was appropriately featured by the presence of several special guests of the club, consisting mostly of amputated veterans of World War No. 2.

Having arranged for their presence at this luncheon, the D. A. V.'s Assistant National Service Officer, Thomas J.

Kehoe, has given me some pertinent information concerning these special guests as follows:

Pvt. Frank S. Meccurio: Sixteen months service; Battle of Salerno; one leg blown off, other amputated. Plans to enter radio work.

Pvt. Vincent A. Kelcoyne: Fifteen months service; cracked up in truck accident; one leg off at thigh. Future plans undecided.

Samuel W. Bachelor: Two years north Africa; ordnance salvage of ammunition; explosion, loss of one eye, impaired hearing, loss of right hand, leg blown off. Not decided what work to enter.

Gunnar Leth: 22 years old; Swedish merchant marine; interned in New York City; released from Swedish Government, became a citizen of the United States, and joined the United States Army; machinist and technician. While at Aberdeen Proving Ground loss of both legs in accident. Does not even use a cane in walking. Future mobile itinerate machine and welding shop, going from farm to farm making repairs.

Maj. R. S. Haggard, Ordnance: Discharge World War No. 1 as private; United States Nitroglycerin Plant, North Carolina; reserve officer 21 years; reported for active duty May 2, 1942; Aberdeen Proving Ground, graduated Ordnance Service School; 1942 attended officers training at Citadel, Charleston, S. C.; R. O. T. C. and A. S. P. T.; assigned to Walter Reed General Hospital. Educational and reconditioning officer, April 1944.

Lt. Courtney Kitchell: Freshman football, Newhall; O. S. U. 1936, 1937, and 1938; Shriner's all-star game, New Orleans, 1939; Green Bay, four games, 1939; enlisted September 1941; flying master sergeant, crew chief, and gunner; wounded Henderson Field, January 27, 1943; Purple Heart; Air Medal with Palms. Southwest Pacific, Midway, and various sorties of the Southwest Pacific; reserve officers training in this country; received his commission as second lieutenant September 6, 1943.

Master Sgt. Samuel S. Barbarino, home Paterson, N. J.: Distinguished Service Cross, Air Medal with Clusters; wounded over Bremen, Germany; radio operator and gunner; loss of left leg.

Message to Parents, Wives, Children, Brothers, and Sisters of Men and Women in Our Armed Forces

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the people of the Twenty-third District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent and the Members of this body, all of whom are interested, I want to briefly point out the benefits which have been written into law which can be obtained by those who are dependent upon the soldier who is in the armed service, and, may I point out, these benefits apply as well to the dependents of women in our service forces.

I hope the dependents in my district will save this article for future use as they may find it will answer questions which may later come to them for decision.

There are three principal classes of dependents to which this dependency benefit law applies and their allowances are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife with one child, $72; a divorced wife with each additional child, $20. Note: A wife separated or divorced from a man in service will get no more than the amount fixed in a court order or decree in case of alimony. If the divorce or separation order does not call for alimony or separate maintenance she will not receive any allowance.

Class B dependents: A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37. Note.—Class B dependents, it must be clearly understood, are dependents who are only partially dependent upon service men and women for support. In other words, if the dependents are dependent upon men or women in service 50 percent or less, but are still substantially dependent, they come under class B. Only $37 is allowed no matter if there are one or even four or five more partially dependent. Those who make application for family allowance, therefore, should be very careful to show the full degree of their dependency. This is important.

Class B–1 dependents: One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $11. Two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $79; two parents and each additional brother or sister, $11; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

HOW TO GET THE ALLOWANCE

Wherever possible as soon as a man or woman enters service his or her application for the allowance should be made immediately when they are inducted. The allowance payments do not go back. The payments begin with the first of the month in which the application is filed. Therefore, if the man or women in service waits a month after induction before an application is filed, 1 month's allowance is lost. The longer they wait to file an application the more money is lost. It is important that they file an application for this allowance within 15 days after they are inducted.

The man or woman in service should submit the application on a form which they can get from the commanding officer. In filling out this form they should be careful to spell all names correctly and give exact information as to marriage, dates of birth, and so forth. Many of the troubles dependents have in getting their allowance are due to the fact that the service man or woman is careless in filling out the blank. An extra minute in filling out the blank may save several months' time in getting the allowance approved. The application should then be handed to the commanding officer.

If the service man or woman for some reason or other fails to make application, or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. If there is any question as to where or how to apply just drop a letter to your Congressman. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out. The Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife, and children, dates of birth, and so forth. Therefore, if any class A dependent does not know for certain just how to apply, he or she could well write a Member of Congress and ask for instructions.

If the man or woman in service with class B or B–1 dependents declines to make an application for a family allowance for them, no other person can apply. Class B and B–1 allowances are granted and continued only at the will of the man or woman in service. They cannot be forced to make application. Wherever the service man or woman with class B or class B–1 dependents is overseas and fails to make application, and these dependents are reasonably sure that he will approve it, they can make application. However, the permission of the man or woman in service will have to be obtained before application for family allowance is approved for class B or B–1 dependents.

Family allowances are compulsory only when applied for for class A dependents.

PARENTS AND BROTHERS AND SISTERS CAN RECEIVE ALLOWANCES AT THE SAME TIME AS WIFE AND CHILDREN

It is also important to know that parents and brothers and sisters can get an allowance even if the serviceman's wife and children get one. In other words, if men or women in service have parents and brothers and/or sisters dependent upon them as well as a wife and children—all of these dependents can get a family allowance. For example: If there is a wife and child dependent on the man in service they get $80. If this same man in service has two parents and a sister, also dependent upon him for chief support, they too, can get $79 a month also. This is important. To get this extra $79 only $5 more is taken out of the serviceman's pay. The balance of the $74 is paid by the Government. If the parents and brothers or sisters are only partially dependent, that is, less than 50 percent dependent but still dependent to a substantial degree, they can get $37. Because a serviceman has a wife and children getting an allowance does not prevent his parents and brothers and sisters dependent on him from getting an allowance also. If you have any question on this write your Congressman and he will explain how to go about it.

PARENTS CAN GET ALLOWANCES FROM MORE THAN ONE SON OR DAUGHTER IN SERVICE

If parents are dependent upon more than one son or daughter or both in service, they can get more allowance. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son in service, they get $68 per month. Now, if another son or daughter in service helped support these same two parents, they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN OFTEN CAN HELP YOU

It is a Congressman's function to help with such matters. He is your Repre-

sentative in Washington. If you have any difficulty at all in this respect, your Congressman is the person to take it up with.

If any questions arise regarding where to get application blanks or how to make an application, write to Congressman CHARLES W. VURSELL, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the St. Lawrence waterway project is now coming up before the United States Senate, and hearings are to be held before the Special St. Lawrence Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence waterway would be of inestimable benefit to the city of South Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, and the entire Middle West, as well as the Nation as a whole, by giving the entire area direct access to the Atlantic Ocean; be it

Resolved, That the common council of the city of South Milwaukee go on record in favor of the St. Lawrence project and its earliest completion; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen and Senators, and one to Senator JOHN M. OVERTON, chairman of the Senate committee and subcommittee above stated, as well as to Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont.

A Message to and Information for Mother Whose Husband Is in Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to explain for the benefit of the wives of servicemen what the Congress has done in order to aid them in maternity cases.

The following facts should be of extreme interest to the women of America whose hubands are in the armed service:

Congress has appropriated $24,200,000 for this maternity care for wives of servicemen of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades. We have made possible through legislation we have passed for the wife of the man in service in these lower four grades to receive medical, nursing, and infant care without cost during that maternity period. In Illinois, our State Department of Public Health, Springfield, Ill., cooperating with the Federal Government's program, directs and administers this service through the division of child hygiene.

Inquiries relative to these benefits and this program may be directed to Division of Maternal and Child Hygiene, Department of Public Health, Springfield, Ill.

Under this plan the wife of the man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

IMPORTANT TO FOLLOW RULES

Wives of servicemen should acquaint themselves thoroughly with the rules set down for this free medical attention. The rules set down in Illinois are clearly stated and must be met in order to receive this care and service. The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service. If the doctor does not have these blanks, write to the Division of Maternal and Child Hygiene, Department of Public Health, Springfield, Ill., and ask them to send a blank to you. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's army serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2 at once, and rush it to Springfield, Ill., for approval.

APPLY EARLY

It is important that wives apply for this in early pregnancy. The State Department of Public Health will not approve payment of the doctor, hospital, or any service before the application is made out. It is important that the application be made out by the wife at the first sign of pregnancy. In case of an emergency be sure that the doctor makes application for you immediately. It is most important to get the application filled out and sent in at the earliest possible time. See your doctor at the first sign of pregnancy and apply for this free service.

Wives can see their regular family doctor for this. It is not necessary to go to a special or certain doctor to get this aid. It is most important that wives of servicemen remember that no payment for any such service will be made prior to the filing of an application. In other words, no application—no aid.

CHARGES PAID THROUGH STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

The charges for this medical, hospital, and surgical attention are paid through the division of Maternal and Child Hygiene, Department of Public Health, Springfield, Ill. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse. No money is given to the wife. No serviceman's wife need worry about proper medical, infant, or hospital care in the event of a birth if she acquaints herself with this free service and makes proper application before the event rather than after. Pregnant wives can get prenatal care as well.

WHAT SERVICE WIVES CAN EXPECT

Complete medical service for maternity patients during the prenatal period, childbirth, and 6 weeks thereafter—including care of complications, operations, post-partum examination—and to the newborn infant.

Health supervision for infants, usually provided in childbirth conferences.

Nursing care, in the home, through the local health department including bedside nursing care as necessary—for the mother, before, during, and after childbirth, and for the baby during the first year of life.

Hospital care, in wards or at ward rates, for maternity patients and infants. Funds cannot be used in part payment for more expensive hospital accommodations. A minimum stay in the hospital of 10 days after childbirth is arranged if possible. Hospital care may be authorized in any hospital, including Army and Navy hospitals, where the maternity and pediatric services have been approved by the State health agency.

CONGRESS SET UP THIS SERVICE

The money for this service is available by acts of Congress passed last year, 1943. Your present Congress has appropriated a total of $24,200,000 for this service. Should any question arise regarding any phase of this aid, or should any wives of servicemen be unable to secure this aid write your Congressman about it. Address your letter: Congressman CHARLES W. VURSELL, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The Democratic Party in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY], who is the New Deal candidate for the United States Senate in Wisconsin, has placed in the RECORD a series of editorials referring to the Republican and Progressive Party Conventions. It is significant that the gentleman has failed to so dignify the "Democratic convention" held in Wisconsin. Perhaps there is a good reason. In order that the full picture may be presented, we desire to include in the RECORD for the information of the public an article recently appearing in the Capital Times, a pro-Roosevelt newspaper published in the city of Madison, Wis. The author of the article is a capable and discerning reporter for the Capital Times. We believe his observations are worthy of inclusion in the RECORD.

ALDRIC REVELL

The Democratic Party of Wisconsin, woefully inept at best, is now being led by the

hand along the political road by our hirsute friends, the Communists. Operating under the banner of labor, these Communists have stepped into the party and are now calling the shots.

The Communists, whose shifts of policy are notorious, are now on the Roosevelt bandwagon and with their customary energy have stepped into the Democratic Party to make certain the boys don't falter.

There was a time when the Communists operated within the Socialist Party. But this party was too cohesive and slow for them, so along about 1936, when the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation was founded they jumped into this organization and started breasting the stream vigorously.

For a long time, although running their own candidates, Communists remained in the Progressive ranks since at that time Progressives happened to be going part way in the direction of the party line.

When Hitler signed a peace pact with Russia the Progressives could do no wrong, since they opposed entering the war and wanted to keep this country free from alliances. The Yanks were not coming then, and the Communists yelled about imperialism.

When Hitler invaded Russia, however, Progressives did not change their position but the Communists did over night.

Then the Progressives became defeatists and the Communists would have nothing to do with them. The Yanks were not coming fast enough then. The Communists swallowed all the nasty things they said about Roosevelt and started to infiltrate into the Democratic Party.

From their strongly entrenched position in the C. I. O. in Milwaukee, which they still dominate, the Communists began to operate under the guise of labor. Their representatives appeared at Democratic gatherings and they yelled the loudest for an amalgamation of all liberals to drive the reactionaries out of power.

This, of course, was Communist double talk for doing everything which would help Russia. The boys, as usual, had their eyes on the ball, but it was out of sight of everyone else.

At every Democratic gathering they introduced resolutions condemning the isolationists and defeatists (the boys always give themselves away by the stock phrases they use) and since the Democrats were opposed to isolationism, these resolutions were adopted.

The stage has now been reached where the Communists get practically everything they want from the Democrats. Thomas King, the susceptible and gullible chairman of the party, would deny that the Communists have been pushing him around, but the facts are plain for all to see.

What gives Communists so much power is the fact that the rank and file of labor, both A. F. of L. and C. I. O., are for Roosevelt and consequently any resolution that would advance and support Roosevelt's beliefs are acceptable to them.

Of course, it makes no difference now, but the Communists are for the same things labor is for. The only danger is that these boys are solidifying themselves in positions of trust and if the party line switches they will break up the labor movement if they can.

The C. I. O. in Wisconsin, the vast majority of whose members are unsympathetic with the Communist ideology, has been dominated by a group of Communists in Milwaukee, who pass resolutions purporting to represent the thousands of C. I. O. members, but which are in reality opposed by the majority.

Having been and now being president of the C. I. O. council in Madison, we know whereof we speak. We have fought this Communist influence in Milwaukee, sometimes with success, but the boys are still in the ascendancy.

It is this clique from Milwaukee which attends the Democratic convention and purports to speak for the C. I. O. Being anxious to get the support of labor, and knowing nothing of the Communist domination of the C. I. O., Democratic leaders willingly seek and follow the advice of this camarilla.

We sometimes laugh when we think of former State Senators Harry W. Bolens, Port Washington, and William D. Carroll, Prairie du Chien, both famous for their "red baiting" in the legislature in 1933 and 1935, being supported by the Communists.

Both men are Roosevelt-pledged delegates to the national convention and both, presumably received Communist support when they ran as delegates in the spring elections.

The Democrats, naturally, can do nothing about their fellow travelers. In a democracy the Communists have a perfect right to support whom they choose and to join any party they desire.

The party line is now dedicated to defeating Germany, which has been a terrific threat to Russia, even if this means supporting free enterprise and heaping encomiums upon Wall Street.

After the boys have gotten rid of the Fascists the party line will veer in another direction. What direction that will be no one can tell. If the direction is opposed to where labor wants to go it will be too bad for labor.

We have simply listed the above facts to show that if you live long enough you will some day have the Communists in your hair. There is no moral to this column except possibly that a rolling Communist gathers mossbacks or anything rolling in its direction.

Wethersfield, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is proud of the accomplishments of the district he has the honor of representing. We have a special pride in the town we call home.

My home town is Wethersfield, Conn. Wethersfield was settled in 1634, more than 300 years ago. It is a beautiful New England town, the home of more than 10,000 people.

On the evening of June 19 the citizens of Wethersfield will assemble in the high-school auditorium for a huge reception and testimonial to Wethersfield's first citizen, Mr. Alfred W. Hanmer.

Mr. Hanmer has served the town of Wethersfield as first selectman for 46 consecutive years. On June 30, he voluntarily retires from office. I believe that his 46 years of continuous service is a national record. Forty-six years of loyal service to the Republican Party and the town of Wethersfield.

When Mr. Hanmer was first elected to the office of first selectman, Wethersfield was a town of less than 2,000 people. It had a grand list of $1,500,000. Today Wethersfield's population is over 10,000 and the present grand list is approximately $19,000,000.

Wethersfield's appearance has changed during the past 46 years. It has many more good streets. Busses have taken the place of the old horse car. Airplanes constantly fly overhead. Radio programs can be heard by those who pass down its quiet streets. Fundamentally, however, the old town hasn't changed. Its citizens turn out each year for town meetings. Its town officials make their annual reports and are reelected on the record they have made.

It is in the old New England town meeting that we see democracy working at its best. Democracy needs a strong guiding hand. Wethersfield, Conn., has been fortunate in having such a guiding hand in the person of Mr. Hanmer.

What an example of unselfish service Mr. Hanmer has given to the youth of his community. We need more men like him today as we never needed them before. Men who can and will sit around a table and solve the problems of our towns, our cities, our States, and, yes, our National Government.

Due to the program here in the House it will be impossible for me to join with my fellow-townsmen next Monday evening. I will, however, be with them in spirit, and I am sending to Mr. Hanmer my best wishes with the hope that he will enjoy many, many years of good health and happiness in the town to which he has given so much.

C. I. O. Political Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD two editorials which are self-explanatory. One is written by Mr. Kyle Palmer, political editor of the Los Angeles Times, and the other editorial is by Judge Harlan Palmer, editor and publisher of the Hollywood Citizen-News. Both of these editorials are on the subject of the C. I. O. political-action group.

[From the Los Angeles Times of June 3, 1944]

THE SHRINKING C. I. O. VIOLET

(By Kyle Palmer)

Lincoln said it.

And the C. I. O. Political Action Committee in California came pretty close in the May 16 primaries to accomplishing the first phase of the celebrated triological homily:

You can fool some of the people all the time.

Now, with the first phase checked off, this same political action committee is taking on the job of accomplishing the second phase:

You can fool all the people some of the time.

The second phase will be a little more difficult, but the C. I. O. is preparing to see what can be done about it under the circumstances.

If by chance you were among those who heard the exuberant remarks of the local C. I. O. spokesman, Philip Connelly, on election night when he used the radio to broadcast the jubilant tidings of "a great C. I. O. victory," you are in for a shock.

If you were among those who received samples of the impressive C. I. O. election literature, or heard the C. I. O.-approved political radio programs, or ran across one or more of the thousands of C. I. O. workers on election day, or encountered any other aspect of the C. I. O. attempt to rule the selection of congressional and legislative candidates in the May primaries, prepare for disillusionment.

The C. I. O. did very little in the primary election. The C. I. O. just went along for the ride. The victory, great as it was, should be credited elsewhere.

Mr. Connelly was two other fellows.

COMMON PEOPLE

According to State C. I. O. legislative director Claudia Williams:

"The job was done by a coalition of the common people."

She is pained no end, and a trifle suspicious, too, that the C. I. O. should be receiving so many bouquets for what the rotund Connelly termed "a great C. I. O. victory."

Mr. Williams is quoted in the C. I. O. newspaper, Labor Herald, as warning the labor politicians to beware of overconfidence and to renew their efforts to pile up the uncontributed balance of a $100,000 "legislative action fund." She reports that all but about $2,000 of $47,000 raised in advance of the primaries has been disbursed.

Unlike Celebrater Connelly, Mrs. Williams has no hymns of victory in her system. In the role of a political shrinking violet she insists that the primary gains cannot be considered solely the C. I. O.'s achievement.

Further, Mrs. Williams warns:

"Reactionary opponents of this growing people's coalition are now attempting to isolate the C. I. O. and the progressive candidates (she terms them the 'win the war candidates') nominated in the primaries by tagging them with a C. I. O. label."

In fact, reports the C. I. O. State legislative director:

NOW FOR NOVEMBER

"With the exception of the removal from office of JOHN COSTELLO in the Fifteenth District and election of certain incumbents, no final results were achieved."

The plain fact is that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee did exert itself to the limit in the primary election in California, and the more important fact remains that the C. I. O. will go forward in full cry to consolidate in the November elections such advances as it may have gained in earlier and inconclusive contests.

True it is, as Mrs. Williams says, that other elements joined with the C. I. O. in attempting to defeat certain incumbents and elect the C. I. O.'s "win the war" preferences.

Potent, indeed, was Dave Beck's teamsters' union.

Also industrious and enterprising was the United American Federation of Labor Political Action Committee, that committee being the agency credited by the editor of the Los Angeles Citizen—official A. F. of L. newspaper—with responsibility for an order suppressing the editor's right to tell his readers about candidates not supported by the U. A. F. L.

Also on the job were the Communists. Very much on the job were the Communists.

Give credit where credit is due. No summary of election kudos given the C. I. O. and affiliated groups would be complete without a handsome tribute to the part played by the Communists.

COMPLICATIONS

Just how this Communist participation in the coalition will work out in November is not clear in view of action by the Washington (D. C.) A. F. of L. in withdrawing from A. F. of L.-C. I. O. joint weekly radio programs because the C. I. O. radio programs have occasionally had "more than a trace of the Communist Party line."

There was "more than a trace" of the Communist Party line in the California primary elections.

But under no circumstances could the C. I. O.-A. F. L.-teamsters-Communist coalition movement be described as a "people's movement."

It was inspired, organized, financed, and directed by a band of union labor politicians who have been and are determined to dominate the political and, hence, the governmental affairs of this country.

Success for the movement was due directly to lack of public alertness, information, and understanding.

Defeat for the movement will follow general public realization of what the movement represents and what it seeks.

None knows this more clearly than the C. I. O. leadership, which has been quick to take alarm at the reaction which followed primary election results here and elsewhere in the country.

If the general public can be persuaded to fall back into its former lethargy—to fall back into the lethargy which gave the C. I. O. and friends the chance to win so many complete or partial primary election victories—then it may turn out that Lincoln was wrong, after all.

Perhaps the opinion of the Great Emancipator to the contrary notwithstanding:

"You can fool all of the people all of the time."

[From the Hollywood Citizen-News of June 1, 1944]

ISSUE

Senator BUTLER, Nebraska Republican, demands a Senatorial investigation of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee as a result of charges hurled by Harrison E. Spangler, Republican national chairman.

In the language of Spangler, the union organization is guilty of "flagrant and bold violation" of the Corrupt Practices and Hatch Acts.

The Corrupt Practices Act outlaws contributions by labor organizations toward the election of Federal officials. The Hatch Act bans contributions in excess of $5,000 by any committee, association, corporation or other agency.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee boasts that it will this year spend $600,000 to elect President Roosevelt to a fourth term and to defeat all candidates for Congress who did not vote in accordance with the wishes of the committee. Slim Connelly, California C. I. O leader, boasts that $60,000 has been spent locally in pursuance of the plan.

Whether or not the committee has or may violate any law isn't nearly so important as it is for the public to clearly understand that the main issue in the national elections this year is whether or not public servants must do the bidding of the men at the head of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee, according to its declarations, is out to teach all Members of Congress that in the future they must vote as the committee wants them to vote. Thus it would seem that there is going to be just one issue in the national elections this year, to wit: Is the control of our President and our law-making bodies by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee approved? or: Shall the powers of making all decisions in national affairs be transferred to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee?

If such issues are made clear and the people vote in favor of a national government conducted in accordance with the demands of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, then considerable expense might be saved by doing away with Congress entirely and installing the three or four men who decide what it is that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee wants.

A congressional investigation might serve to make clear to the voters just what is involved in the committee's campaign program and expenditures of the slush funds.

That the issue be clear is a right of the voters. In the local campaigns of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee on behalf of Ned Healy in the Thirteenth Congressional District, Helen Gahagan Douglas in the Fourteenth District, Hal Styles in the Fifteenth District, Ellis Patterson in the Sixteenth District and Archibald Young in the Twentieth District, the issue hasn't been made clear.

Some voters thought they were voting in an effort to please a motion-picture actress with an attractive pair of legs, others that they were voting racial or religious prejudices, and others that they were voting for a pleasing radio voice. A congressional investigation would serve to make it plain that these were not the real issues at all and that the real issue is whether or not a committee of a few men is going to make all congressional and Presidential deliberations coincide with decisions of the committee—a committee that thus far has not gone beyond reflecting the wishes of some astute Communists.

Effect of Dirksen Amendment on Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of today:

EFFECT OF DIRKSEN AMENDMENT ON PRICE CONTROL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 15.—Those who have been following the proceedings in Congress on the bill to extend price control might fairly assume that opposition by the O. P. A. and others to the court review amendment of Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, is bureaucracy run riot. They might readily conclude that if this amendment survives the House-Senate conference and goes to the President, a veto based upon it would be another proof that the administration wants government by Executive act and order without giving an injured citizen his once inalienable right to legal redress.

CAN PLEAD NOT GUILTY

The administration's record gives ground for this general suspicion. But in the particular instance of its opposition to the Dirksen amendment it can enter and sustain a plea of not guilty.

The provision, which the House made a part of the price control bill yesterday looks innocent of its face. It gives to a seller of commodities on which the O. P. A. has fixed a price schedule, or has otherwise regulated, the right to go into a Federal district court on his own volition and ask for an injunction.

This appears merely to be asserting in law an ancient privilege of freemen, and to say that it might be justification for a Presidential veto seems to be the attitude of an autocrat.

But what the amendment really does is to open the way to the destruction of price control by substituting many courts for the single tribunal—the Emergency Court of Appeals—established in the body of the bill. As Representative VOORHIS of California said in the course of the debate, it creates the probability "of one set of standards and regulations in Chicago and an entirely different one in Milwaukee." He added:

"For if the O. P. A. regulations were upheld in the Milwaukee district court and overthrown in Chicago, prices in the Chicago area might immediately increase, and all the goods affected by the ruling would flow into the Chicago market and out of the Milwaukee market, as I think anyone ought to be able to see."

FULL REDRESS PROVIDED

If the price-control bill did not provide for factual court review of O. P. A. rulings, or if any attempt was being made to close the courts to general pleas of unconstitutionality, there would be both need and justification for amendments to maintain these basic rights. But court review of rulings is in the law without the amendment. And unconstitutionality is a plea open to any citizen against any statute which no law of Congress can abridge.

The Emergency Court of Appeals established in the bill is a constitutional tribunal, though temporary in its nature, composed of judges from the Federal circuit courts throughout the country. It sits whenever protestants against O. P. A. rulings ask it to sit and has never turned down a request. Also the O. P. A. has never asked the Supreme Court to overrule any of its findings which have invalidated acts of the agency; and any litigant, defeated therein, can seek from the Supreme Court a writ of certiorari.

The only requirement is that a seller who objects to an O. P. A. ruling must first file a protest in writing to the agency and, if that is denied, go to the Emergency Court within 30 days. The result is that much of the litigation can be presented in written form and is handled by a single court system.

Mr. DIRKSEN would throw open to this litigation every district court, and the questions are as intricate as those raised in suits over public utility rates. The burden of trying these cases all over the country would swamp O. P. A., since in each instance mountains of statistics are required to prove or disprove such questions as the impairment of peacetime earnings. Conflicting district court decisions would, as Mr. VOORHIS said, be the inevitable consequence; these would first have to be reduced by the Federal Courts of Appeal and then sublimated by the Supreme Court. The process in each instance would take a year and possibly two. And during the interval of uncertainty price control in the affected industries would be destroyed.

INJUSTICES TO NONLITIGANTS

There are other administrative reasons why the Dirksen amendment is a threat to the operation of price control. Above the rank of clerk there are 950 price officials of the O. P. A. in Washington, a comparatively small number since they deal with thousands of industries and many more thousands of commodities. If they are taken from their duties here and sent to trials throughout the Nation, many grave questions affecting industries not involved in the trials must go unsettled for long periods of time. This would work an injustice against these industries as well as to price control as a system.

If, as Mr. VOORHIS said, a Milwaukee court should uphold a regulation and a Chicago court should upset it (on the same goods), the favored area would get all the product during the year or two before the Supreme Court could resolve the issue. And all national sellers would not be in the same boat, as is the present objective.

Price control is an essential wartime measure and cannot be subjected to peacetime procedures and practices without impairing or destroying it—in this instance without the sound excuse of providing court redress where none exists.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein copy of a resolution adopted by the Lowville Kiwanis Club, Lowville, N. Y., urging the enactment of legislation authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway and power development:

Whereas Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, has introduced in the United States Senate, a bill to approve and carry into effect an agreement between the United States and Canada for the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, and the development of 2,200,000 horsepower from the navigation dam near Massena; and

Whereas the two countries have, for 30 years, mutually planned the development of this great international highway from the Atlantic Ocean through the Great Lakes to Duluth, Minn.; and

Whereas said seaway is practically completed with the exception of a bottleneck near Massena, N. Y.; and

Whereas said development is of great importance to the people of northern New York, as well as to the whole United States; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York, in March 1944, unanimously passed concurrent resolutions demanding the immediate development of the hydroelectric power; and

Whereas as a post-war measure or development more than 10,000 men would necessarily be employed in the construction of the works near Massena, N. Y.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this club favors such development and advocates the passage of the Aiken bill and the comparable measure introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, of Minnesota; further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. George D. Aiken, Hon. William A. Pittenger, and to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

Reclassification of Federal Veterinarians and Their Lay Assistants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Personnel Division of the Department of Agriculture, after an elaborate investigation, has worked out a plan for reclassification of veterinarians and their assistants, and this plan has been approved by the Civil Service Commission as in conformity with the Federal Classification Act. The Director of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Food Administration have requested sufficient appropriations to put this plan into effect, and these appropriations have been voted by the Senate.

I support the motion to concur in these amendments because—

First. The hearing records show unmistakably that the employees in this service are underpaid.

Second. As now classified, the prospects of promotion within grades are so uninviting that veterinary schools are advising their graduates "all hope abandon ye who enter here."

Third. The maintenance of this field service at a high rate of efficiency is essential to safeguard the meat supplied to the armed forces and to our civilian population and allies.

Fourth. No service can long maintain its efficiency without replacements, and reclassification is essential to make this service attractive to graduates of veterinary schools.

Fifth. The average salary of the 3,449 employees affected now is $2,573, including overtime under the War Overtime Pay Act. As reclassified they will receive on the average of $2,862.

Sixth. The reclassification is in accord with the Reclassification Act. Keeping faith with the employees now in the service requires concurrence with the Senate amendments in order that each may be placed in the grade to which he belongs under the standards of the present Classification Act.

Agricultural Adjustment Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. JEFFREY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the House a situation in the Third Ohio District that I regard as both deplorable and significant. A few days ago I received a statement signed by 62 farmers of Clay and Perry Townships, Montgomery County, Ohio, describing certain practices of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. I propose to let these embattled farmers tell their own story. Here it is:

We, the undersigned farmers in Clay and Perry Townships, Montgomery County, Ohio, hereby state that we have had the following experience with the A. A. A. in this district:

1. We have been advised by agents of the local office that unless we signed up for the A. A. A. we would not receive a farmer's allotment for gasoline for farm purposes.

2. We have been advised that unless we signed up for the A. A. A. we would not be granted deferments for military service for our sons and employees as farmers.

3. We have been advised that unless we signed up for the A. A. A. we would not be granted priorities for farm machinery needed by us to get the maximum production from our farms.

We believe, therefore, that the A. A. A. has been a serious detriment to maximum production on the farms in this locality and that it has created a feeling of apprehension and disloyalty and are anxious to do all we can for our country, but we are unable to do so because of this impediment.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the situation I wish to bring to the attention of Congress. I also wish to add some facts from my own knowledge and certain affidavits which give specific instances of the practices complained of. In the first place there has been a bitter controversy over the A. A. A. in this section of Ohio for several years. There has been litigation about it, and not long ago in a neighboring county—not in my district—there were threats of violence. As a result there has been great bitterness and hostility between two sharply defined groups.

In spite of all these prejudice-breeding circumstances the authorities in charge of the war effort chose to let one group sit in judgment over the other. Instead of selecting for such responsibilities men who were above suspicion and without connection with either group, those in power closely and deliberately identified the A. A. A. with the rationing program and with the draft. Such a policy is most unfortunate; under it even the most honorable man finds himself inviting suspicion. Presumably the theory existed that the only really expert farmers capable of passing judgment on agricultural matters belonged to the A. A. A. That theory has been hotly contested. But that is not all.

I hold in my hand, Mr. Speaker, three affidavits reiterating in the form of specific instances some of the complaints mentioned in the petition I read to the House a moment ago. The first of these reads as follows:

STATE OF OHIO,
County of Montgomery, ss:

Verne Peters, being first duly sworn, deposes and states that sometime during the month of April 1944 one John Share of the Triple A Office, Dayton, Ohio, told him that he was not entitled to milk-subsidy payments because he was still charged with an unpaid wheat penalty.

VERNE PETERS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me on the 10th day of June 1944.

CECIL E. EDWARDS,
Notary Public, Montgomery County, Ohio.

The second affidavit shows the lamentable link between the A. A. A. and the gasoline rationing system. It is as follows:

STATE OF OHIO,
County of Montgomery, ss:

Charles M. King, being first duly sworn, deposes and states that during the month of March 1944 one George Eck, of the triple A, told him that unless he signed up for the triple A he would not be given gas to operate his farm.

CHARLES M. KING.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 10th day of June 1944.

CECIL E. EDWARDS,
Notary Public, Montgomery County, Ohio.

The third affidavit, Mr. Speaker, is the most amazing of all:

STATE OF OHIO,
County of Montgomery, ss:

Clarence Miller, being first duly sworn upon his oath, deposes and states that during the month of December 1943 George Eck, of the Triple A office, Dayton, Ohio, made the statement to him that if he would sign up for the Triple A program it would have a lot of influence in the keeping of his boy out of the Army; Mr. Eck said the committee who made recommendations to the draft board would take his word for the fact that he was cooperating.

CLARENCE MILLER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me by the said Clarence Miller this 10th day of June 1944 at Brookville, Ohio.

CECIL E. EDWARDS,
Notary Public, Montgomery County, Ohio.

So it appears, at least in some cases, champions of the A. A. A. have put regimentation not only ahead of the war effort but ahead of common justice. Official power in their hands has been employed to advance the interests of a bureaucracy rather than those of a Nation at war. That is a most shameful situation. To have gasoline rationing, or to have machinery rationing, made contingent upon adherence to the Government's farm program amounts to high contempt for democratic ideals Most shameful of all is the statement that compulsory military service may be contingent on the favoritism—or the lack of it—displayed by a part of the Government millions of men are today being called upon to defend.

In effect this statement, supported by the affidavits, makes a most serious charge. It charges that unfairness and favoritism are being permitted to interfere with rationing and with the Selective Service System. Should men connected with the rationing board or draft boards permit money to influence their decisions they would be sent to jail. But is it any less dangerous to have this mania for regimentation accomplishing the same end? Yet that is exactly what all this amounts to.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that this statement and the attending affidavits do not concern an individual or isolated case. Apparently there were sixty-two cases—more or less—that followed an all-too-familiar pattern. So many of them within a comparatively limited area may indicate that this practice prevails elsewhere to an alarming degree. The farmers who signed these affidavits and the statement knew they were taking a risk. Signatures on such documents might mean for them additional hours of grinding labor because of machinery being withheld; they might mean military service for a son or relative. Yet in the interests of justice they assumed these risks. Their cause is entitled to careful consideration by the Congress of the United States.

Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A2783 a speech by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] entitled "Patriotism at a Price," denouncing Walter Winchell. The gentleman from Michigan stated in part as follows:

Winchell, lieutenant commander in the Navy, although not speaking as such, recently threatened that, unless Congress took certain action reducing tax on night clubs, the actors union would forbid members from participating in bond rallies.

This statement, I understand, is based on what purports to be an editorial from the Omaha World Herald, quoting from Mr. Winchell's column.

I have read the quoted portion from Mr. Winchell's column and find nothing in it which indicates that Mr. Winchell advocated any such course of procedure. It seems that Mr. Winchell merely reported that the Night Club Actors' Union planned to take steps against participating in War bond drives unless the 30 percent tax on night clubs was cut. He did not endorse any such contemplated step by the Night Club Actors' Union. He condoned it in no way whatsoever. I am at a complete loss to know how the gentleman from Michigan could possibly infer that Mr. Winchell was advocating any such thing. I believe, in all fairness to Mr. Winchell, this matter should be called to the attention of the Members of the House.

It is my understanding Mr. Winchell himself was responsible for raising so much money for Navy Relief in such a short time that the quota for funds for aid of the families of the boys in our Navy was oversubscribed in a very short time. It is common knowledge that he, like millions of other patriotic Americans, has given unstintingly of his time, his money, and his great energy in the sale of War bonds and other patriotic activities.

Your Congressman Can Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, during these trying times with rules and regulations going out by the hundreds, it is difficult for most people to learn just what they are entitled to and what they are not

entitled to. In this respect I would like to call the attention of my people to the fact that a Congressman's office is the best and surest way of getting help in straightening out Federal matters. It is a Congressman's duty to help in matters of difficulty confronting his people. A Congressman is the people's representative in Washington. He is their agent. If the people have any trouble in collecting their allotment or any benefit due them their Congressman is the best bet to take care of it for them.

In my short experience here I have already helped in the adjustment of many dependency allotment cases. In my short time here I have already helped to straighten out scores of insurance claims.

FINANCIAL CLAIMS ARE BEST HANDLED THROUGH A CONGRESSMAN'S OFFICE

Should anyone have a claim against the Government for a dependency allotment or any war benefit, it is best to first ask for help from the local Red Cross, local veterans' service office, or American Legion. These local agencies will do everything they can. Sometimes, however, something goes wrong, and the claims are not settled, or it takes too much time to get the case settled. If that happens, your best bet is to write your Congressman and explain everything to him in detail.

Your Congressman has a direct connection with all offices in Washington. He can serve his people very effectively in getting matters straightened out. It is his duty to do this, and it costs nothing. In the Twenty-third District those desiring such aid should write Congressman CHARLES W. VURSELL, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Philippine Plank in Party Platforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, as the national conventions of the two major political parties approach, let us remember the Philippines. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a timely statement on the subject:

PHILIPPINE PLANK IN PARTY PLATFORMS

(By Vicente Villamin, Filipino lawyer and economist, Los Angeles, Calif.)

A Philippine plank in the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican parties would be logical, timely, and useful. Since 1900 the two parties have taken different views on the Philippine question, but in 1942 the physical subject matter of the question was lost to the Japanese enemy, a fact that brought them together on a common ground.

The plank would be the unanimous expression of the American people—appreciating the loyalty and cooperation of the Filipinos in the war, vindicating the American Philippine experiment before the world and confirming the assurances already given by the President of the United States that the Philippines would be retaken from the enemy, turned over to the Filipinos in freedom, aided in its post-war reconstruction and protected in its sovereign independence.

Thus conceived, the plank would be a powerful weapon in Allied hands in the psychological warfare in all battlefronts. If there is still any doubt as to the supreme importance of this type of warfare, let it be remembered that if the Japanese-conquered peoples should fail to cooperate with the Allies in their reconquering operations, additional hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of fighters would be needed to overcome the enemy; and if those people should, by Japanese coercion or persuasion, fight side by side with the Japanese, then the job of the Allies would be enormously greater.

The question of Philippine independence is settled. Under the Independence Act, the Philippines will be an independent nation on July 4, 1946, or sooner under a joint resolution pending in Congress, if the war should be won before that date.

The war thus far has wrought destruction in the Philippines and more destruction is forthcoming when General MacArthur functions on the spot to expel the Japanese invaders. The sacrifice is worth the end, which, on the one hand, is to vindicate America's authority and honor and, on the other, to liberate the Filipinos from a medieval-minded nation so they can develop themselves freely according to their native genius and best interests.

The present government in the islands by Filipinos is inevitable and does not necessarily constitute a repudiation of the United States. The alternative would have been a government by Japanese nationals or by Filipinos of lesser caliber, and that would be a calamity to the people. That government is properly called a puppet organization, but its officials—the overwhelming majority of them—could not be, spiritually and intellectually, willing Japanese puppets. They are not free men in a situation where the price of noncooperation would be needless death or unpatriotic indifference to the country's fate.

But, for the sake of tactical clarity, the plank should state the political and legal truism that the only legitimate government in the islands is the one organized under the American sovereignty whose juridical continuity has not been disturbed by the invasion, thereby giving the Japanese enemy no consolation and his puppets no justification.

The Filipinos in the United States, numbering 120,000, support that government, which is now in residence in Washington for 2 years. They are desirous, almost impatiently so, to receive orders from it to further the war effort or to prepare for the rehabilitation of their country after the war.

The Philippine plank might recognize the fact that with the help of the United States the Philippine Government in exile will immediately start the reconstruction program by providing for the training of Filipinos here for technical and specialized work in the islands. The importance of this is emphasized by the fact that the Japanese are losing no time to train Filipinos in different trades and occupations with indoctrination in Japanese ideas, methods, and aims.

While this plan would benefit the Filipino people and strengthen American influence among them, it would also serve to make available for American commerce and industry American-trained Filipinos who can represent them in the islands and promote Philippine-American trade. Such a plan has everything to commend itself to the Philippine government, which knows that technically trained Filipinos are few and that many such Filipinos would be needed in the reconstruction work.

When peace comes, the reconciliation of all Filipinos and the formation of a new government are rendered easier by the provision in the puppet constitution that upon the cessation of hostilities a new election of delegates shall be held to formulate a new constitution and organize the new Philippine Republic.

A generous Philippine plank in the platforms of the Democratic and Republican parties would be a dynamic message of cheer and encouragement to the Filipino people, a formidable implement in the psychological warfare, and a reaffirmation of America's Philippine policy of magnanimity which Bataan has justified and consecrated.

A Brave and Blessed Symbol of Unity Flying Triumphantly on Land, on Sea, and in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "A Brave and Blessed Symbol of Unity Flying Triumphantly on Land, on Sea, and in the Air," which appeared in the Paterson Evening News, Paterson, N. J., on June 14, 1944:

A BRAVE AND BLESSED SYMBOL OF UNITY FLYING TRIUMPHANTLY ON LAND, ON SEA AND IN THE AIR

Flag Day in 1944 has a greater significance than ever before. Not only do Americans this year pay honor to the Stars and Stripes, the symbol of that national unity which has carried the United States to greatness among the nations and is now the chief resource in this mighty peoples' struggle, but the American flag is associated today with the emblems of 31 other nations fighting in the common cause of national liberation. The massed flags of the United Nations symbolize the world unity of the peoples which is being forged in the smithy of war and must become the basis of a just and lasting peace, guaranteed by a renewed march toward the freedom, progress, and opportunity which has been the beacon light of America and her flag.

In honoring the flag today, Americans will also hold to thoughts of the men in the armed forces who are fighting and dying on every battlefield and ocean of this global war in the gallant tradition of those who fought under its folds in the past. The flag belongs to us all, but theirs is a special dedication to the things for which it stands. All Americans must renew the resolve to be worthy of their sacrifice and of the red, white and blue symbol of their valor and our hopes for a future of national and world unity.

There is one aspect of the American flag which those who live and serve under it—as well as their friends and enemies in other lands—are sometimes inclined to forget. Americans are a young people, representing the union of many diverse elements, dwelling in a land which has not known the centuries of cutting and planting, of mining and working, which have marked the soil of other nations, and shaped the characters of their inhabitants. Yet the American flag, and the Government it represents, is older than most of the flags and governments of the world today. When the *Ranger*, commanded by John

Paul Jones, carried the Stars and Stripes to European waters in 1778, it was a royal fleet, flying the lilies of France, which saluted the new emblem. Italy's tricolor is younger than that of France; Russia's flag is the flag of the Bolshevik Revolution; Germany's is as young as nazi-ism, although the swastika is as old as sin. When the eager traders of the young American Republic took their flag to China an emperor ruled there under dragon banners and feudal Japan was remote, untouchable. Some flags are older than Old Glory—Britain's Union Jack, for example (although the St. Patrick's cross was only added in 1801); the flag of the Netherlands and Denmark's ancient Dannebrog.

No, the American flag and the Nation over which it flies are not new things, as human institutions go. They have been tested in the fires of civil strife and foreign war; in the slower processes of peaceful development. Through the years they have meant freedom and opportunity—an inspiration for the world. What they shall mean in the future rests with those who celebrate this Flag Day of 1944, those who shape the Nation's course when the world is malleable in the heat of war. It is no easy task to be worthy of a great tradition, a great Nation, and a great flag.

Flag Day, 1944, is a solemn occasion. Our country's banner leads the way in a struggle against an enemy that threatens every principle for which Old Glory stands. Soon, perhaps sooner than we dare to hope, it will lead us to victory.

"I pledge allegiance to the flag." How often have we repeated those words without realizing all that they mean? "One nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." What better expression have we of the spirit of America? What better answer to the proponents of Hitler's fantastic racial myths, to the hatemongers and bigots who would defame the flag that protects them? What greater hope can we hold out to the beaten and oppressed in other lands?

The conquered people of Europe, the courageous workers of the underground, the weary prisoners of war who languish in Axis prison camps, all look to our flag for deliverance

The leaders of the Axis Nations are well aware of this fact. Cornered, with their backs against the wall, they are now exerting their last desperate efforts to stave off defeat, or at least to make our victory meaningless. If their propaganda should succeed, if they could inspire a movement for a negotiated peace or beguile us into offering soft peace terms; if they could instill into our minds the hated Nazi theories with which they have persistently attempted to divide our people into hostile racial and religious groups—if they could achieve these ends, then they would have won the war in spite of all our military victories.

But they will not succeed. We will not sacrifice the lives of tens of thousands of our bravest men in vain. Today, as our Nation's colors fly from church and school and private dwelling, Americans pledge themselves, with renewed devotion, to "one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Jackson Hole National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me I include in my remarks a very short editorial from the New York Times of June 13, 1944, concerning the effort to destroy the Jackson Hole National Monument. It follows:

Last year President Roosevelt set aside the old trappers' rendezvous of Jackson Hole, Teton County, Wyo., as a national monument—in effect, a park. He did this under authority of an act passed in 1906 under a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, and the public lands thus set aside were free for such disposal because another Republican President, Calvin Coolidge, had withdrawn them from entry. To the public lands designated as a monument there may be added 33,000 acres purchased and freely presented to the Nation by John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

There is now pending in Congress a bill introduced by Representative BARRETT, of Wyoming, to abolish this monument. The bill is not unanimously supported, even in Jackson Hole itself. Many citizens there have expressed themselves against the indiscriminate commercialization which would probably follow the restoration of the area to private entry. The practical interests of Wyoming people lie in preserving grazing rights and in some compensation for lost taxes—in this case, about $10,000 a year. Friends of the proposed monument are quite willing to be fair in these respects. For the Nation at large it is no less fair to preserve forever unharmed, the beauty of a historic spot. The Barrett bill should be killed.

Senator Charles L. McNary

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES LINZA MCNARY, late a Senator from the State of Oregon

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we pause today to pay our last tribute to the passing of a great American. The late CHARLES L. MCNARY, Senator for the State of Oregon, for 27 years has served in the United States Senate.

For 11 years he has been minority leader in the Senate. He has not only been a stalwart Member of that great deliberative body of our Nation in upholding the fundamental principles of our American way of life but he has been an inspiration to all of us who have had the privilege of serving with him. Of a modest and retiring nature, he never thought of imposing himself upon his colleagues but was always ready to give a word of encouragement or lend a helping hand to a friend. No man in the Senate of the United States was more beloved. In our State of Oregon he not only commanded the respect and admiration of our citizens but was the first citizen of this great State which he had the honor to represent so long in our National Legislature.

It has been my great privilege to have known Senator MCNARY from the days of my youth and to have been associated with him in the last 5 years in the Congress of the United States. I always found him to be always ready to assist me in my legislative work, and I know that every new Member in the Congress from the State of Oregon always leaned heavily upon our friend who has now gone to his reward.

Every Member of the Oregon delegation joined the funeral party on its long trip across the continent to Oregon to pay our final respects to our departed friend. As the congressional party, friends, and colleagues of Senator MCNARY wended its way across the continent with heavy hearts we realized that our beloved colleague was making the last long journey into the great West over the old Oregon Trail—a roadway which his ancestors a century ago helped to chart and which with his own long faithful service helped to make possible the building of the old Oregon country into a mighty empire. As we sped across the plains over the great rivers of the Middle West and the far West and over the towering mountain ranges of our own America, we were made conscious of the great contribution Senator MCNARY and his pioneer ancestors had made to the founding and upbuilding of the rich productive States along our Pacific shores which originally constituted old Oregon.

It was his guiding hand, his wise counsel, and his long, faithful service to his State and Nation that made possible the development of the great projects of the West for the improvement of our waterways, the building of the mighty dams and hydroelectric plants, the controlling of the floodwaters of the mountains and plains, and the reclamation of the broad acres of the West, now producing foodstuffs and other supplies to feed and equip the nations of the world as well as to maintain our armed forces in the great struggle for the liberation of the world from dictatorship.

Senator MCNARY has been called to his eternal home, but his work for the upbuilding and preservation of our Nation will live throughout the years to come.

FOR HE WALKED WITH MEN AND UNDERSTOOD

Here was a man whose heart was good,
Who walked with men and understood.
His was a voice that spoke to cheer,
And fell like music on the ear.
His was a smile men loved to see,
His was a hand that asked no fee
For friendliness or kindness done.
And now that he has journeyed on,
His is a fame that never ends
And leaves behind uncounted friends.

Congress Should Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Congress Should Stay" published in the

Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal on June 13, 1944.

I am fully in accord with the views expressed therein, as, in my opinion, Congress should not take an extended recess this summer. There is much important, urgent, and pressing legislation yet to be considered and Congress should stay on the job regardless of how hot, unpleasant, or disagreeable the weather may be in Washington during July and August.

While Congress has reached an agreement on the so-called G. I. bill of rights for the members of our armed forces, and while legislation on the termination of war contracts will be approved before the contemplated recess, there are many other matters including vital post-war legislation, which should be considered by Congress this summer. This is no time for a long summer vacation for Congress.

The editorial in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal is as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY

Congressional leaders in both parties ought to make up their minds to forget about a suggested 5-week recess and use all their power and influence to keep the National Legislature on the job. As matters go, there is a lot of talk about rushing through only measures that might be called "must" in 2 weeks and then taking off for 5, largely for the purposes of attending national political conventions.

On its hands at the moment the Congress has a bill, greatly mixed up in controversy, to extend the Price Control Act that expires June 30. It must make some disposition of appropriation bills that total close to a hundred billion dollars before June 30. It ought to work out the so-called G. I. Bill of Rights to provide a system of benefits for servicemen and women. It needs to do something also about a measure to expedite the settlement of terminated war contracts. There are other matters on the calendar that require attention, but those here mentioned are alone enough to militate against any rush season and recess.

The desire of Members of Congress to attend the party conventions is understandable. A good many fences are in bad repair at home, which is probably a sign that they could and should have been better built in the first place. Unless all signs fail, the total time necessary for holding the conventions will not amount to much more than 1 week of the 5 Congress is talking about taking. Congress is tired, of course, as who isn't? All the same it ought to stay it out just as the rest of us on both the home and fighting fronts.

Latest News of Lindbergh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I am inserting an editorial entitled "Latest News of Lindbergh," as printed in the Washington Times-Herald yesterday morning, June 15, 1944. In view of the fact that the same afternoon announcement was made of the bombing of Japan from 30,000 feet, this editorial is extremely interesting:

LATEST NEWS OF LINDBERGH

The New York Times yesterday published a letter from James G. McDonald on the subject of Charles A. Lindbergh which we think is of sufficient general interest to reprint in full:

"The news that Charles A. Lindbergh, who recently reported to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz for duty with the Navy, is teaching American aviators in the Gilbert Islands phases of high-altitude flying deserves comment.

"It is wholly typical of Mr. Lindbergh that he insisted that no publicity be given to the dangerous experiments in high-altitude flying which he carried on for many months in the Ford Motor Co.'s aircraft operation prior to his present work with the Navy. Those experiments, though privately made, were an integral and most important part of our country's preparation to win and to keep our airmen's present superiority over the enemy.

"Isn't the time overdue for frank acknowledgment that Mr. Lindbergh was cruelly persecuted by large sections of Americans because prior to Pearl Harbor he disagreed with them on questions of American foreign policy? Of course, Mr. Lindbergh then underestimated the danger from Germany and Japan; but do any of us have a clear record of prescience in the pre-war years? I do not know of one public man; no, or one editor, columnist, or commentator who can seriously claim that he was invariably correct in his analysis of the course of world affairs in the thirties.

"Surely Mr. Lindbergh's former critics have an obligation, at least to their own consciences, to admit that they never had any ground to impugn the patriotism or the complete loyalty of this brave and creative American."

We had known about a year ago that Lindbergh was conducting test flights in the stratosphere, and that he wanted no publicity on his part in them. We had also heard, though we cannot vouch for this, that Lindbergh in the course of these experiments had flown higher than any other American up to that time.

What Are Our Post-War Aims?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at no time since we first violated our neutrality to help the Allies, and not even since Pearl Harbor, has there been an attitude of sincerity, honesty, frankness, and candor with the people on the part of the administration in defining either our war aims or our post-war aims. Mr. Roosevelt has led the American people to believe that the Atlantic Charter, with its "four freedoms," was enthusiastically supported by all the Allies, and that the instrument meant exactly what it said. Then, gradually, as has been the technique of the New Deal administration, the American people were allowed to learn, not from our own public officials, but from Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin, that the Atlantic Charter did not mean what Mr. Roosevelt had said it meant, and that its definitions would have to be changed from time to time to suit the changing views of the two nations.

The next Rooseveltian plan seemed to be that all the United Nations would have a voice in post-war plans. Meanwhile, Mr. Stalin suddenly had Russia divided up into 16 commonwealths which would give them 16 votes in any League of Nations arrangement to maintain the peace in the world.

Mr. Stalin is always tight-lipped. Mr. Churchill at least has more recently been frank and outspoken in his views. Mr. Roosevelt has, as some of the correspondents have noted, adopted an indirect and evasive method which, and I quote, "enables him to avoid direct quotation to whatever extent he may choose and, without challenge, withhold enlightening details."

Mr. Roosevelt in his latest change of attitude now appears to be adopting a more nationalistic policy which he and other administration spokesmen have so bitterly condemned in everybody else. This is not unusual, however, because the New Dealers usually condemn in others many of the things they themselves do with much finesse.

It is amazing, and speaks well for the good sense and the patriotism of the American people, that they have cooperated to produce a modern miracle of war production in spite of these misunderstandings, these subterfuges, the lack of frankness on the part of the administration, and the vague and poorly defined statements concerning the war aims and post-war aims of the United States.

Mr. Roosevelt apparently would have the people believe that he is coming around to the position adopted by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives back in 1942. At that time they, in a declaration of policy, in paragraph No. 3 stated explicitly that:

We recognize that the United States has an obligation and responsibility to work with other nations to bring about a world understanding and cooperative spirit which will have for its supreme objective the continued maintenance of peace. In so doing, we must not endanger our own independence, weaken our American way of life, or our system of government.

Mr. Roosevelt on Tuesday, May 30, declared for essentially the same thing when he said in his press conference that his peace project would involve no impairment of independence, integrity or administrative process. This declaration, for the moment at least, would appear to leave the radical internationalists out on the end of a limb. Their position has always been: "We must surrender some of our sovereignty."

The only thing the people know about Mr. Roosevelt's war aims and post-war aims is what he is reported by Forrest Davis as having said in two articles in the Saturday Evening Post recently. According to those articles, the President has a "great design." That "great design," it would seem to appear, originated in the mind of Mr. Roosevelt and calls for a

council of powers and the maintenance of an international military police force, and so on. It would amount practically to a League of Nations backed up by a military force. The plan as outlined by Davis and as commented on by another Saturday Evening Post writer, Demaree Bess, in analyzing the Davis revelations, is identical with the plan of King Henry of Navarre, who flourished from 1553–1610, and his adviser, the Duc de Sully. They even called their specific and detailed plan the great design. So we find that even the post-war aims which Mr. Roosevelt is supposed to have in mind were not made in America in 1944 or 1943 or 1942, but were manufactured by Henry of Navarre back in the sixteenth century.

It is a very remarkable thing that the American people have stood as solidly and unitedly as they have in the war effort in the face of this confusion, contradiction, change of position, and dissembling by the New Deal administration on war plans. Only a people utterly dedicated to freedom, completely devoted to their country, could have gone ahead and, as a free people, met the challenge of the dictators, as the American people have met it.

The American people have been patient and long suffering in this matter, and they are entitled to frankness and fairness on the part of their Chief Executive and the administration spokesman as to what our war aims and our post-war aims are. The blood of American boys is being spilled on scores of battlefields. American women are dying across the Seven Seas, American homes by the tens of thousands are being filled with grief and agony over the loss of loved ones in this war. These people and the men and women in the fighting lines are entitled to know whether we are fighting only to guarantee the perpetuity and prosperity of the British Empire, and to help Joseph Stalin achieve his desires in middle Europe, or whether we are fighting for the great principles and the great human ideals which have always motivated the American people in their wars and in their peace. The Nation is entitled to know, its fighting men and women are entitled to know, its taxpayers are entitled to know, posterity is entitled to know, why we entered this awful war and what we are fighting for.

It is not enough to say that we are in this war because Japan made a treacherous attack on us at Pearl Harbor; we were in this war before that and everybody knows it. We had gone into this war on the side of the Allies long before the Japanese attacked us at Pearl Harbor. We had abandoned all semblance of neutrality long before Pearl Harbor. If we are in this war solely because the President and the clique surrounding him want to play world power politics, the American people ought to know that, and when they find it out, their wrath against those willing to spill rivers of American blood and to load this Nation with an astronomical debt for generations to come for such a gross purpose, will be something terrible to behold.

In the First World War, we were told that we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy. We were cheered on in our sacrifices by the assurance that it was a war to end all wars. The American people fought for those ideals. They asked for no territorial or other gains, and they got none. After the war was ended, we learned that there was not a scintilla of truth in either of these slogans. The nations owing us war debts defaulted on their debts, and called us Uncle Shylock because we even dared to suggest that obligations between nations should be assumed and discharged on the same basis of honor and integrity as obligations between individuals are assumed and discharged.

There is nobody in the United States today who can define, or at least who has defined, our war aims and our post-war aims. As one columnist has said:

> Mr. Roosevelt appears to be fired by a spirit of frankness with the American people only on those occasions when Prime Minister Churchill has made a radio speech or an address to the House of Commons in which he has given in detail important news for the first time. But apparently Mr. Roosevelt very quickly loses the spirit which moves him to tell the people something about the war. The rest of the time his attitude is pretty much that war aims are none of the people's business and that it is "theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do and die."

Much criticism has been leveled at the American people by administration spokesmen because of the alleged complacence which, these administration spokesmen assert, the people feel toward the war. It might be illuminating to some of these administration critics of the people that much of this attitude they complain about has not been complacence; it has been just plain confusion and bewilderment on the part of the American people as to what we are fighting for, as to how the war is going, and as to whether or not it is a war for high ideals or a war for power politics. This confusion and bewilderment are the fault of the administration and nobody else. Losses have been concealed; grievous mistakes have been covered up; waste and even worse have been hidden, all under the old threadbare, shopworn plea of military secrecy. The attitude of the administration has almost continuously appeared to be that it is presumptuous of the American people to want to know anything about the war, and that they should consent to do what they are told by political bureaucrats without asking why, and without objecting to any hardship that may be entailed. Had it not been for the demand of the American people to know some of the facts, and had it been possible for these cunning and conniving bureaucrats successfully to have concealed all the facts, the American people would now know next to nothing about any phase of the war. Administration spokesmen will, of course, never blame themselves.

A day of accounting is coming. There may be some who have been criminally negligent or dishonest or who have been inexcusably secretive, who will escape the public wrath. But the leaders of this administration who have led the people into this morass of bewilderment and confusion will one day have to face an outraged people. Historians of the future will put the blame for all this confusion and bewilderment where it properly belongs—on the New Deal administration—unless, indeed, some Office of War Information historians do the writing.

It is time for the American people to rise up in their might and demand an end of these concealments, and to insist upon a frank statement of the administration's war aims and its post-war programs. It would be a good bet at 10 to 1 that the administration cannot agree among its own bureaucrats as to what the war aims are, or as to what the post-war program is, except that Americans are to give away most of what they now have to other peoples in the world.

Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty in America, and there has been no time since the days of 1776 when the American people were confronted with a greater need for that vigilance than exists today.

Address of Hon. James J. Davis, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1944

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the address of Senator JAMES J. DAVIS, delivered at Grove City, Pa., in my congressional district on the occasion of the Flag Day celebration by the Grove City Elks, and also in connection with the Fifth War loan:

> It is always a source of great pleasure for me to come back to Grove City and Mercer County where I lived in the days of my youth.
>
> This country which boasts almost every type of industrial activity and which is well known for its agricultural pursuits is the home of many hard-working and patriotic Americans who are now devoting their full energies to the winning of the war.
>
> Grove City is indeed a center of American culture. The fine schools, churches, and libraries which you have developed here have stamped your city as one of the most progressive and your people as one of the most advanced groups in the great State of Pennsylvania. The college at Grove City has contributed much to the prestige and advancement of your community.
>
> You citizens may well be proud of Grove City—a real American city—and you may further be proud of the fact that you well oversubscribed your quota for the Fifth War Loan Drive.
>
> The ceremonies which we have observed here in honor of the American flag have been most impressive. The drill by this fine-looking group of marines, the flag ritual of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, and the music rendered by the Grove City Band have all contributed mightily in bringing home to us the full significance of America and its flag.
>
> Today in this grave but determined hour of our history, we pause to commemorate the

one hundred and sixty-seventh anniversary of the American flag.

This flag, which has always flown in the vanguard of freedom and human progress, now flies over the ancient city of Rome and upon the shell-torn beaches of wounded France.

Today this flag, true to its time-honored principles of justice, human decency, and peace, moves inexorably forward in that long, bitter march of liberation which is designed to restore the stricken and to free the enslaved peoples of the world.

This flag which now stands anchored in the soil of France will move across the world until the tides of aggression and tyranny which threaten all freemen have been conquered and dispelled.

But it will move not as the symbol of slavery and servitude which identifies the swastika, nor yet as heralding the dawn of the day of eternal darkness, as does the banner of the Rising Sun. The American flag will move across the world tolling out the liberation and the majesty of all men.

It will proceed in power and in purpose, as it has always done, to strike down the tyrant and the usurper, and to restore the vanquished and the betrayed.

In all the expanse of the world there is no flag more honored, and more esteemed, than this, the American Flag—for it bears legend to all men that in every recess where this flag is flown, right, justice, and human decency prevail.

All freedom-loving, all right-thinking men the world over pay homage to this flag which stands today an unfailing beacon of deliverance to a troubled and tormented world.

As this flag now flies above the shores of France, so, too, shall it fly again over embattled Bataan, over conquered Manila, and over bleeding Guam. This flag shall fly again over every inch of soil that is American; and no force, no power will say it nay.

Those gallant men, living and dead, who carried this flag into battle shall see its every bastion restored and its every desecration avenged.

This flag now flies in all the ramparts of the world—in Tunisia, in New Guinea, in Italy, and in France—and it flies there as a symbol of impending doom for the faltering Axis and all that it entails.

Those brave American men under arms, and those gallant, tireless Americans who labor long hours at home to produce the implements of war, working together in unshakable resolve and unity, shall be the means of carrying this flag to ultimate, complete and final victory.

The day is not far distant when our troops shall be quartered and this flag shall be raised in those rotten cores of Axis debauchery—Tokio and Berlin.

That shall be a day of deep thanksgiving for the world, for it shall make clear to all men that the principles of right, justice, and eternal progress which are woven into this flag are once again restored to all the peoples of the earth.

And as this shall be the flag of victory, so, too, shall it be the flag of peace. For in all justice to those gallant men and women who have served under this flag, in all justice to our own security, and in all justice to the civilized world, this great Nation must lend its full leadership and its full power to the creation of a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world.

This is no flag of conquest, of imperialism, or plunder. This is a flag of liberation, of justice, and of peace. And it is in man's eternal quest for peace that this flag and its principles can play a full and vital role.

If this Nation is to fulfill its international obligations in the post-war world, it must not be averse to full participation in an international organization to preserve the peace. Far from being averse to full participation in such an organization, the American Nation must assume a positive and leading role in its creation.

This organization must be open to the participation and support of all nations, including those nations who now stand pitted against us in this war—after these nations become adjusted to and accept the principles of peace. No organization for peace can possibly endure or succeed which is restricted in membership or which is concerned solely with the negative problems of policing the world.

The type of organization which the world requires is one which will be directed toward positive progress. This organization must foster all the peaceful methods for settling disputes—conciliation, mediation, arbitration, and full judicial process. It must provide agencies for the solution of economic and social problems of world-wide import. It must build institutions that depend upon popular support for their primary strength.

And if it should be found that a proper world organization must be supported by positive sanctions, we shall not fail to encourage their establishment.

Such an international organization as this is not incompatible with the traditional principles of this flag, and the freedom and sovereignty of this Nation.

The history of these recurring world wars has demonstrated the full need for an international agreement among the nations of the world to preserve the peace, as well as the need for a sound and workable organization to carry such an agreement into effect.

This flag has always led this Nation into the vanguard of human progress on all fronts. And it now stands ready to lead this Nation and the world into a freer, more purposeful, and more abundant life in the world of peace which lies ahead.

And while we are extending a helping and cooperative hand to the other nations of the world, we must never forget that this flag represents us and the principles for which we stand—the principles of justice, peace, and liberty for all men.

We must, therefore, never permit this flag to be used as an instrument of conquest to dominate and control the world. If ever such a course were permitted, the honor of this flag would be forever lost.

And as this flag should never be used in conquest, so neither should it ever be abandoned for any other flag—no matter by what name or what description it may be called. The American people shall always remain free, sovereign, and independent, and they should abide by this flag and its principles which have served them so faithfully and well throughout the years.

May it ever be, down through all the centuries of time, that when men inquire after our flag they will always be met with this same, this stirring answer: "'Tis the star-spangled banner and long will it wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Leathem D. Smith Talks Sense for a Post-War America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, we hear much talk these days about post-war America. Many books and pamphlets have been written, many of which are too complicated for ordinary understanding. Seldom do we have a plan stated in simple and practical language and one based on common sense. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a really worthwhile statement made by Leathem D. Smith, of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., about a post-war America in general and Wisconsin in particular.

WE CAN—WE MUST ADOPT A PROGRAM FOR POST-WAR AMERICA

(By Leathem D. Smith)

We hear much discussion these days on the necessity for preserving the free system of American life. We probably have too little conception of just what is meant and just what is required, in view of the changes brought about by the war to preserve this system of free enterprise, with all the freedom and advantages which it gives to the individual.

The great majority of our citizens I am sure are in accord with this desire, but do we all realize the threat to its existence which results from our inability to find a solution to the problem of unemployment prior to the beginning of all-out expenditure of public funds for the war effort? I want to discuss some of the factors which were responsible for the disruption of our economy and also measures which I believe will be helpful in restoring not only normal conditions of employment but also a safer, sounder system, profiting from the tragic depression experience through which we have gone.

There has been one fact clearly demonstrated by this war which should permanently squelch the ambitions of would-be dictators and parlor pink theorists in this country, and that is the definitely proven fact that our people, born and reared under the free system of American life, are superior in fighting, in individual workmanship, and in industrial management production to the mechanized robots trained under the rule of the dictators. Never again do I expect to hear it said that we must imitate the technique of these dictators in order to compete efficiently with them, either in industry or in war. The record of our young men in the fighting services, flying the big planes, navigating and fighting our naval ships, quickly adapting themselves to the art of mechanized warfare, proves the superiority of our system of stressing the training of the individual for himself and not as a cog in a machine.

The second great problem, and the one which I believe is foremost, next to the winning of the war in the minds of our servicemen, our people in war plants, and in fact all our citizenry is "What does the economic and employment situation of the country hold in the future for us all?"

Since real depression hit us in 1931, attempts have been made, largely through Federal spending, to correct the unemployment situation. Little progress was made, in spite of a rapidly increasing Federal debt, toward alleviating the numbers of unemployed.

Not until the country went all-out in spending, first on a defense program and then on a war-construction program, was this situation corrected.

NATIONAL INCOME MUST REMAIN HIGH

It should be apparent, however, to all of us that this program cannot be continued—that, at the rate the national debt is increasing we would be only a short distance in time and amount of expenditures from national insolvency. Rather, steps must be taken toward maintaining a national income from other sources that will meet the carrying charges and the gradual reduction of this indebtedness. We are all coming within the scope of the income-tax collections and becoming tax conscious. Many of us know,

from this new experience, the cost of carrying the burden of national expenditure and debt.

This problem of restoring national prosperity and employment is not so difficult as it may seem if one will not be confused by the conflicting ideas of minority groups and special interests but will seek the basic factors which control and regulate our standards of living and of employment.

Basically, all employment rests upon the serving of the individual human needs of our people. Fifty years ago, before the great advances in mechanized and industrial production, our wants were comparatively simple and very few in number. Barter was used to a large extent for the exchange of goods and services. Farmers traded their products at the stores for their necessities. I can remember the store books issued by the old lumber companies to their workmen. Little money or bank credit was in use or in circulation.

With the development of inventions and mechanized production and the great specialization of employment which ensued, it was necessary to have an ever-increasing volume of money or medium of exchange to handle the increased volume and velocity of trade, so that unemployment would not ensue from an inability to distribute the products of manufacture. To finance the distribution of these products, the American unit banking system was developed. Soon every small town had its bank or banks, operated by men who knew the character, resources, and ability of its citizens, and who were in the best position to judge the ability for repayment of loans requested.

The devolpment of the American banking system, with credit available to the grass roots of the country, was as big a factor in the raising of the standard of living of the American people as all of their mechanical and inventive ability for without this trade-financing system the products of industry could not have been distributed and we would have encountered earlier the situation which prevailed in the 1930's—over-production in every line and under-consumption amounting almost to privation among a large percentage of our people.

WALL STREET MUST NOT RUN COUNTRY BANKING SYSTEM

A weakness of the banking system was that, through the correspondent banking method, it took its advice as to credit policies from a few large banks in New York. These banks were always closely identified with the stock market, and during the boom period of the 1920's many of the officials of these banks found that the easiest way to make money was by gambling on the stock exchange. After the stock-market crash in 1929 the market manipulators made several unsuccessful attempts during the year 1930 to run the market up, or "bull" it, but failed because the public, after their scare in 1929, could not be again interested in speculating in stocks.

Almost immediately after the first of the year in 1931 a decision seems to have been reached by those manipulators to "bear" the market, or run it down by short selling, a method whereby the short seller profits from every drop in price of listed stocks, and apparently to use the banking system of the country to aid this movement.

Word was sent out to every banker in the country, through his correspondent banks in the larger cities, to get himself liquid. That meant calling in his loans. This was promptly acted upon, and borrowers in all of the banks in the country began to feel the pressure to pay up the money they had borrowed. This forced the sale of stocks and bonds which had been put up as collateral for loans, and these were dumped on the stock and bond market, forcing the market down and paying off big profits to the manipulators, who were short-selling.

The result, as we well know, was a strong deflationary movement throughout the country which resulted in the closing of all the banks and the bank moratorium in 1933.

PLEADED FOR CLOSING STOCK MARKET IN '32

In 1932 I started a campaign, which was publicized in the Milwaukee Journal, attempting to close the stock market in order to stop the deflationary spiral and the withdrawal of outstanding working bank credit. This effort was forcibly commented on by the Milwaukee Journal editorially in June 1932 under the heading "Close the stock market."

Outstanding bank credit to individuals and small businesses shrank from about $40,000,000,000 in the 1920's to $20,000,000,000 during the depression 1930's indicating the withdrawal of approximately $20,000,000,000 from circulating credit which had been financing employment.

The banking system as it is now constituted will never again, under its present restrictions, place this credit in circulation. A new system must be devised, either in connection with the existing banking system or as an entirely separate institution, where people will invest their money to earn interest—money which cannot be withdrawn on demand and which can be loaned out safely to persons and small corporations, who have been suffering so acutely for lack of sources of credit since the bank failure. The replacement of this private capital in loans is the only method of curing chronic unemployment in this country.

Since this has loomed as one of the greatest problems in our history, I am stressing this issue, and I have spent a great deal of time, study, and investigation determining the causes of the bank failure and, conversely, the methods by which this credit can be reflated and this working money again put into circulation. The failure of the banks which we did business with and knew was not due to mismanagement by the bankers but to causes entirely beyond their control.

FARM LABOR AND MANAGEMENT MUST WORK TOGETHER

Farmer, labor, and management have all cooperated in a fine manner to insure the success of the war effort. Because of Federal indebtedness Federal expenditures must be cut to the bone for the future, and all of our productive classes must cooperate to solve these problems of the peace in the post-war period. My plea is for farmer, labor, and management to study these post-war problems together.

All of us who have been through the ups and downs of depressions and booms in this country know that there is very little prosperity for any one class when any of the others are suffering. When times are good we all prosper; when times are bad we all suffer.

In my talk on March 4 in Sturgeon Bay I stated that I did not believe in granting favors to any special group but that I was interested in working with the organized representatives of every group of our population, cooperating in a joint effort to increase our national well-being. In commenting on the problems of labor I stated that I wanted to approach the problem on a constructive basis, cooperating with the organized representatives of labor toward the end that there might be continued improvement in real wages and the standards of living, without the losses caused by labor warfare, often without any gain in real wages because of the increased burden put on the costs of production.

Increases in income to labor which do not increase the costs of production do nothing to upset the parity of prices between farm and manufactured products. Such increases, by increasing the buying power of labor, help to maintain a market at good prices for products of the farm.

Since I made this statement I have discussed with top-ranking members of labor organizations more specifically what I had in mind. In industry there has been a healthy development in labor-management relations, bringing them closer together in the study of their common problems. I now believe it is time to get down to specific ways and means of increasing labor income without increasing, and probably decreasing, the costs of production. Increasing continually the hourly rates of labor does not necessarily mean any increase in real wages, for all other costs of production tend to increase proportionately. The farmer is alive to this problem and is demanding parity for prices of farm products as compared to prices of manufactured products based on labor costs.

Since it is absolutely essential that farmer, labor, and all other productive factors in our economy get together on a program to work this country out of its financial and unemployment difficulties by private initiative, we must find a common platform or ground on which farmer, labor, and management can stand. This, I believe, can be brought about by the study between labor and management of methods of incentive pay, by which savings in the costs of production, which may be brought about by increased efficiency of management and increased energy and proficiency on the part of the workers, may be divided between labor and management and also reduce the cost of their product, so that, while labor income may be increased, the cost of the product will not be increased and may be substantially decreased.

I have recommended to my labor friends that they go seriously into the question of studying incentive pay plans, working with the employers and getting into their organizations in increasing numbers men who would be skilled in the analysis of time study labor operations in the various lines of industry. I have found considerable interest and a hearty response to these suggestions by top-ranking labor men who realize that we can accomplish much more working together for the general good of the American people. If this can be accomplished in industry, then truly we shall have done a good turn for the farmer and, in fact, for all classes of our population, for, if labor income is increased, the buying power of labor with which to purchase the products of the farm has thereby increased and that without increasing the costs of what the farmer has to buy.

Our farmers in distress, along with all other classes, because of the losses and unemployment caused by the unnecessary depression, could not be expected to turn down the relief payments in various forms doled out by the Federal Government from taxpayers' funds. There is no doubt, however, that almost all realized that the policy was unsound and could not be continued because of the mounting public debt.

FARMER MUST BE FREED FROM GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

One of the most healthful signs of the present times is to see our individualistic, independent farmer back on his feet because of war-stimulated markets, voicing his emphatic protest against the policy of subsidies. No more unsound policy than subsidies was ever proposed as a substitute for a firm stand against inflationary rises in prices and in all costs.

In talking with representatives of farm organizations and with individual farmers, who are giving more thought to reestablishing their industry on the sound basis of private initiative, I find that their sentiment seems unanimous in favor of being

relieved of Government controls. They, more than any other class, understand that the old law of supply and demand is one that cannot be repealed. Only under emergency conditions, when the law of supply and demand is upset because of artificial scarcities due to wars, panics, or other abnormal conditions in our economy, should the Government undertake to fix floors or ceilings under or over prices.

If we mean what we say when we talk of a free system of American enterprise, we know that that does not mean regimentation or other artificial controls continued after the period of emergency is over. The farmers believe in the self-government of their industry through their associations, cooperatives, and other farm organizations. They realize that, to have a good market for their products, there must be something approaching normal employment of labor, for these are the people who buy the products of the farm.

There is no fear in my mind but that the intelligent farm element in our population will go along with sound economic programs based on the knowledge of practical experience. Under anything approaching normal conditions the farmer is the truest example of what we mean by "independent free enterprise." He works entirely on an incentive basis. He is independent in his method of life and the ownership of his land. He takes the risks of weather, crop failures, and fluctuating markets because he believes above all in this system of free enterprise, which would be lost if regimentation and regulation were to control his activities.

The farmer is vitally interested also in the development of foreign markets for his surpluses, particularly for the dairy prolucts of our State of Wisconsin. He is vitally concerned, too, with the development of economical methods of transportation in all lines—water, rail, and truck—so that he can get his products to market without unfair penalties and costs.

There are many other major questions of vital interest to the people of Wisconsin and the Great Lakes area. One of them is the long-proposed St. Lawrence waterway. At a meeting on this matter in Chicago between the United States Maritime Commission, the Great Lakes Harbors Association, and shipping and shipbuilding interests on the Great Lakes I spoke as a representative of the shipbuilding interests on the Great Lakes. I made the following statement on the St. Lawrence waterway:

"In analyzing the possibilities but also the difficulties and handicaps attendant to confining Great Lakes foreign-ship operation to vessels within the St. Lawrence or New York barge-canal limitations, we cannot help but have our imaginations drawn to the prospect of what the opening of the St. Lawrence deep waterway might mean to a State like Wisconsin.

"It goes without dispute to say that it would remove the only handicap to Great Lakes shipyard construction of ships of any size and type, and as a shipbuilder I am naturally interested in this. If we had had the St. Lawrence open, we would have had hundreds of ships to build, the same as the coast yards, and would have given Henry Kaiser and other great builders a run for their money. Opening the St. Lawrence later will insure more shipyard employment for the future on the Lakes.

"However, I believe that, because of the changes brought about by the war, many new factors have been brought into play to make the St. Lawrence development a vital necessity to the Great Lakes area in a much broader sense.

"The terrific program that the United States has been carrying on in the war effort, not only in supplying its own forces but, through lend-lease, acting as the arsenal of the United Nations, is going to leave a lasting effect on the industries and resources of this country.

"We are using our basic raw materials at a tremendous pace; our best grade iron ore and other ores and our oil supply have moved many years nearer depletion because of this greately accelerated consumption. Our future national policy, for many reasons, should be the greatly increased importation of raw materials from foreign lands and the conservation of our own resources to spread their life over a longer span. National security demands that sufficient reserves of ores and oils be assured to future generations to maintain a war effort if foreign supplies are shut off by hostile powers, as was the case in this war in rubber and tin.

"Secondly, foreign markets can be greatly stimulated for our manufactured products if we will take essential raw materials from the foreign lands which buy our products.

"Thirdly, to operate our new merchant fleet, freight must be provided, and this must be largely in cargoes to and from our ports. We have developed a fine force of merchant sailors, and their continued employment should be a major concern.

"The Great Lakes shipping interests have, as a rule, been opposed to the opening of the St. Lawrence deep waterway, largely because of its bringing foreign ships into competition with Great Lakes American shipping, and I have always partly sympathized with this attitude. However, Great Lakes shipping is largely owned by iron and steel and coal interests, whose major interest should be and is the maintenance of the leadership of the Great Lakes area in the production of steel and the prosperity of the great diversified industry which has grown up here because of steel production.

"We have seen many forecasts of the length of life of the Minnesota and Michigan high-grade ore supplies. It is beyond argument to state that war consumption has rapidly hastened their depletion. It is against all interests of national security to allow this program to continue without taking all reasonable steps to supplement our raw-material supplies on the Lakes with foreign imports.

"There is only one way in which the Lakes can import many war materials without being put to a serious freight disadvantage over seacoast centers, and that is by the opening of the St. Lawrence to deep-draft shipping. It is the responsibility of industry in the Great Lakes area to safeguard their future by long-range planning in this regard.

"The use of the ships of the new American fleet for this traffic would provide employment for many men and keep the supply of essential materials, even from foreign lands, strictly under American control."

I have attempted to touch upon some of the factors which I believe have to be understood to better understand the functionings of our free system of enterprise and the corrective measures which must be taken to save this system. The system can be saved only by holding up national income to a high level after the war by private business so that our whole structure will not collapse because of the overlying Federal debt burden and the loss of national income which would result from a return to depression levels of unemployment. The saving of our free system can be accomplished only by full cooperation of all the productive factors in our economy.

To these ends we must all work together. For these ends we must elect men to Washington with experience and understanding. There is no excuse why these things cannot be done. All that is needed is proper representation in Government circles.

And Now Finland

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, thanks to President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull, the Republic of Finland will shortly be but a glorious memory. These two gentlemen have given the Russians a free hand to invade Finland and wage a war of extermination, which is as savage and barbaric as it is unjustifiable. The Finns are now made to travel a bloody trail blazed by countless thousands of Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, as well as Russians. Those who are not killed will be deported to the wastes of Siberia where they will either be exterminated or assimilated.

Today Finland is without powerful friends, but it was not ever thus. It is not so long ago that the officials of this administration pointed to Finland and the Finns as a shining example of honor, honesty, and rectitude. Of all the nations who owed us money, she was practically the only one who did not repudiate her obligations to this country. Finland met her obligations promptly, proudly, and gladly. Mr. Roosevelt and his administration may hold Finland up to scorn, but millions of Americans who have longer memories than Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull feel humiliated over the shabby treatment that this administration has accorded the Finnish people.

It is not pleasant for red-blooded Americans to reflect upon some of the foreign policies of this administration. It is not so long ago that Roosevelt and Churchill met and formulated the Atlantic Charter and its "four freedoms." Evidently this was not to be a world-wide charter as it placed no restrictions or obligations upon the United Nations. Under it Russia continued to have a free hand in the countries that are so unfortunate as to border on the Baltic Sea, while England will be free to continue her exploitations in India and other oppressed countries.

It is humiliating to Americans to know that Roosevelt and Huli have been most bitter in their denunciation of Finland for her refusal to commit national suicide by attempting to expel the Germans, who occupy the country in force. Just why we should expect greater sacrifices from Finland than from Russia is hard to say. Russia has not declared war on Japan, who is by all odds our most deadly and dangerous enemy. Then why should we insist on Finland declaring war against Germany? Roosevelt and Hull were not always bitter enemics of Finland. We recall what Mr. Roosevelt said when the Russians staged an unprovoked invasion of Finland. With righteous indignation he then said:

> The news of the Soviet naval and military bombarding within Finnish territory has come as a profound shock to the Government and people of the United States.

Despite efforts made to solve the dispute by peaceful methods, to which no reasonable objection could be offered, one power has chosen to resort to force of arms. * * * The people and Government of Finland have a long, honorable, and wholly peaceful record which has won for them the respect and warm regard of the people and Government of the United States.

It would be ironic and tragic if those memorable words were to become Finland's epitaph.

Program for Farm Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the June issue of the Country Gentleman entitled "Program for Farm Stability." The article was written by our colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. Also included in this extension is an editorial from the same paper on this excellent article. Mr. HOPE is the ranking Republican Member on the important Committee on Agriculture. He has spent many years studying our farm problem, and agriculture has already received many benefits through legislation that he has sponsored and favored. His influence for agriculture on a Nation-wide scope will continue to increase as the years go by.

The articles follow:

A SECURE AND PROSPEROUS AFTER-WAR AMERICA

Next in importance to winning the war is the necessity for making this a fully productive and prosperous country after the war. Some of the decisions as to this issue must be made this year. For that reason we wish that the article, Program for Farm Stability, by Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, in this issue of Country Gentleman might be read by more than farm people. It concerns every interest in the Nation as much as it does agriculture.

One may disagree with some of the policies presented by Mr. HOPE, may feel that they go too far or not far enough, or may prefer other methods. But he has set out one basic fact that is vital to the prosperity and well-being of the country. This fact is the unity of our economic system. Neither industry, labor, nor agriculture can prosper alone. We are "every one members one of another" in a literal sense. If we are to go ahead toward a higher national level of living after the war, we must go together.

The memory of what happened after the other war should haunt every conference table. The failure then to count in the 40 percent of our people dependent upon agriculture finally almost wrecked our economy. If we have learned from experience, we should be able to avoid such a disaster after this war.

One practical principle determines whether we have a prosperity in this country that can be maintained. It is the simple principle that those who comprise our major groups must receive enough for their products and their labor that they are able to buy the products of the others on something like even terms. When that condition prevails we have an active demand for goods and food and work. It is the essential for that era of plenty that everybody is anxious to have after the war.

Farmers have always been willing and able to produce their share of such an abundance. But, because of their unorganized state and the long-time risks they must assume, they require a program that will reasonably safeguard them in doing so. This is necessary not merely for the good of agriculture. As Representative HOPE points out, "The future well-being of the Nation itself demands it."

We hope that the principle of economic unity, presented here by one of its leading members, is fully recognized by the Republican Party when it meets in convention at Chicago. We hope that the Democratic Party does the same thing. Whichever wins will then have a common support in establishing the basis for a secure and prosperous after-war America.

PROGRAM FOR FARM STABILITY

(By CLIFFORD R. HOPE, Representative from the Fifth Kansas District)

The United States must have in the post-war period an effective program for maintaining a sound and prosperous agriculture. The future well-being of the Nation itself demands it. Tragic economic experiences which followed the First World War have proved this. After expanding its production sharply to meet the needs of that conflict, agriculture was given little aid in converting to post-war conditions. The result was a serious agricultural deflation that created perhaps the most destructive farm depression in the country's history.

But that depression did not stop with the Nation's farms. It spread to urban areas to destroy jobs, to close factories and to produce bread lines and relief rolls. In forming its policies during the twenties, the country had overlooked the economic fact that it could not maintain prosperity while its basic industry, agriculture, was not prosperous.

So, in drawing its plans for the new post-war period, the Nation must make sure that the same mistake is not made again. The cornerstone of future economic policies must be a program designed to assure agriculture's well-being.

This being the case, what then should be the nature, character, and elements of an effective farm program?

It should, first of all, help agriculture meet its major responsibility—that of supplying the Nation with the food and fiber materials needed to provide all its citizens amply. Too, it should help agriculture supply a world market that has never had enough.

But, in meeting that responsibility, the farmer, in turn, should be assured of equitable prices and a fair share of the national income. A fair share, in simple words, is the same reward for the farmer's labors which society gives to those who perform services of like importance and requiring equal ability, training and skill in other industries and endeavors. Such a reward is not only economic justice to the farmer but an essential ingredient of national prosperity. Industry, business, and labor cannot be prosperous if those dependent upon agriculture have not the income with which to buy products produced by urban society.

Whether agriculture will be given the opportunity to produce abundantly at fair prices will depend as much upon future policies and programs affecting industry and labor as upon anything which can be done directly for agriculture. The war period has furnished further proof of what economists have contended for a long time—that farm prices and industrial pay rolls in this country go up and down together. Even under wartime rationing, the per capita consumption of food in this country has increased because consumers now have money with which to buy. As long as we have full employment at good wages in industry, farm prices will be good. Good farm prices, by maintaining the buying power of agriculture, increase the demand for industrial products and thus contribute to employment. The two go hand in hand.

Only through joint abundant output in both agriculture and industry can the Nation's living standards be raised.

Farmers do not have to be sold on the psychology of abundant production.

Such programs as we have had to restrict or control agricultural production have met with instinctive resistance from farmers, and have been accepted only as a temporary way out of an otherwise insoluble economic difficulty.

Yet, alone of all producers, the farmer has nothing to say as to the price of his product. At best, these prices are fixed by the law of supply and demand; at worst, they are fixed by buyers who are organized to buy as cheaply as they can. Likewise, the price of nearly everything the farmer buys is fixed by others. The transporation charges he pays in sending his products to market are fixed. The manfactured products which he uses for production and living are made by workers organized into unions which fix the price of labor. The industrial plants making these products base their prices on the cost of production, plus a profit.

Furthermore, these handicaps are, to a large extent, the result of governmental action. They are possible because of legislation covering tariffs, transportation, and utility rates; wage-and-hour laws and the legalized use of the corporate structure.

So, in formulating an effective post-war program for agriculture, we will have to consider what will be the general trend of our economic policies. Among other things, we must consider whether we are going to have abundant production in industry; what our labor policy will be; the relations between Government and business; and our general policy on foreign trade.

Fortunately it looks as if we would have some time in which to find the answers to some of these questions. For a year or two following the war we can reasonably expect that domestic and foreign markets will absorb all we can produce—at good prices. In the event that this should not develop, farmers would still be protected by legislation passed by Congress providing price supports for 2 years following the war.

We are fortunate, also, in having the benefit of all the political and economic discussions of agricultural problems which have taken place since the other war, and the programs which have been in effect since 1929. Between 1929 and 1939 we tried just about everything.

Irrespective of the value of any particular program, it is obvious, I think, that we cannot project into the future permanent programs based almost entirely on Government payments, of one kind or another, to individuals. Regardless of temporary results and benefits, the expenditure of billions of dollars and the creation of many agencies with their thousands of employees failed in the broad purpose of bringing about a more equitable relationship between farm prices and other prices.

Cold figures tell their own story as to whether the present administration's programs brought farmers fair returns. In no year before the war launched its demands did these returns achieve parity. They got up as high as 90 percent in 1937, due partly to drought and other factors outside the programs themselves. In August 1939 farm prices stood at 74 percent of parity, which was the average for the year.

All this does not mean that past programs have had no value. We have learned from

them a great deal of what can and cannot be done.

NINE OBJECTIVES

Before discussing specific proposals, it might be a good idea to outline just what should be sought in a comprehensive post-war farm program. To my way of thinking, such a program should have the following objectives: 1. To promote and encourage the family-type farm. 2. To provide for the conservation of soil fertility. 3. To assure ample credit at reasonable rates. 4. To strive for an economy of abundance through expansion of markets at home and abroad. 5. To work toward improvements in marketing and distribution. 6. To make possible to the farmer an income equal to that given others for a comparable contribution to society. 7. To preserve as far as possible the farmer's independence. 8. To provide simple administrative machinery with a minimum of bureaucracy and red tape. 9. To localize control and supervision where possible, with emphasis on cooperation among farmers themselves.

The fundamental principle in formulating any agricultural program is that the basic cause of farm trouble has been price disparity. There is no substitute for fair prices in the market place as a solution for agricultural problems. The need for fair prices prompted the demands for farm legislation during the twenties and the thirties. The failure of the Roosevelt administration to maintain prices higher than 74 percent of parity after 6 years of effort was largely because it did not go straight down the road in the direction of fair prices. Instead it went off on a lot of byroads of social and economic reform.

Some of these social programs were no doubt desirable, but, given fair prices and stability of income, agriculture itself will solve many of the economic and social ills which Government agencies have tried unsuccessfully to cure by means of subsidies, regulations, and plans for remaking farming.

The extent to which the Government will have to use its powers to assure farmers equitable prices will be determined largely by policies adopted by industry and labor. If these policies promote abundance, the Government will need to do little in the field of farm prices. But, because we have no way of knowing the future policies of industry and labor, it is necessary, if we are to be assured of fair prices, that machinery be set up whereby the Federal Government can support and stabilize farm prices, or can assist farmers in doing so.

PLAN FOR PRICE SUPPORT

A price-support program could take various forms. It might consist in simply having the Government take off the market a small surplus which was depressing prices. This surplus might be disposed of in foreign markets or by making some use of it in domestic industry. It could be held until the market was ready to absorb it through normal channels. Or it might be that, through governmental assistance and expansion of markets either at home or abroad, we could absorb the surplus. In some cases price-supporting loans would be the best method. Just what program would be best at any particular time, or on any particular commodity, would depend upon circumstances.

It is well to recognize that any price-support program may reach a stage where some control of production or marketing is necessary. The Government can stabilize price but it cannot guarantee that there will be a market at the stabilized price for all that may be produced. If, for the lack of a market, surpluses pile up, it may be necessary as a last resort to put some restriction on production. We might as well face the question frankly and honestly.

The use of control measures in cases of emergency is not a political issue. Both political parties have advocated their use. After the experience of the Farm Board, the Republican Party, in its 1932 platform, endorsed control of production. The Democratic platform was silent on that subject and Democratic speakers during the campaign denounced control. Yet, when confronted with the responsibility of meeting a surplus problem, the Democratic administration enacted drastic legislation for production control.

Where should the control rest? In my opinion, with few exceptions, it should be placed on the marketing of products rather than on production. There would be less confusion, less red tape, less irritation and less bureaucracy under a system of marketing controls than under production controls, and the latter are bound to hamper individual initiative more than the former. Governmental control of any kind should be invoked only after all other efforts to dispose of surpluses fail.

Expansion of foreign trade may help to avoid the necessity of control. That means, of course, that we must import as well as export. Other countries cannot buy American agricultural products, no matter how badly they need them, unless they sell this country something.

In formulating post-war foreign-trade policies, the Government might well consider a number of proposals advanced in the past for encouraging farm exports—two-price proposals such as the McNary-Haugen and export debenture plans advanced in the past and the newer Pickert-Baerman plan. The McNary-Haugen and the debenture plans offered a means of maintaining export markets without permitting the export price to depress domestic prices. The Pickert-Baerman plan goes further than this in that it sets up machinery to stimulate and promote foreign trade, and to furnish other countries means of paying for our agricultural products. Under this plan foreign countries needing American farm products would be permitted to send to this country specified quantities of designated industrial products and have the tariff duty refunded on condition that they accept payment in American agricultural commodities.

The quantity of manufactured products imported under this plan would be controlled by a quota system. This plan need not frighten American industry, for insofar as it enabled farmers to produce abundantly and sell at a good price, the plan would help give agriculture an increased buying power for industrial products.

We can further avoid necessity for controls by authorizing the Government to give agriculture some assistance and guidance in making its program pattern fit the form of the market. A proper soil-conservation program can be helpful in making necessary adjustments and in preventing the accumulation of excessive surpluses. Land-use studies made by the Department of Agriculture indicate that, if farm lands were utilized as they should be for soil conservation and permanent productivity, the resulting pattern of land use would bring about some reduction in the acreage of crops which have in the past been affected by surpluses. The present soil-conservation programs can be coordinated and expanded to meet such needs. Conservation of our basic resource, the soil, is a national interest.

MORE MARKETING PLANS

One existing program which could very well be more widely extended is that providing for marketing agreements. This is of special value to milk producers, and to those engaged in fruit and vegetable production. These agreements work out especially well where the producers are strongly organized into cooperatives. Too much stress cannot be placed upon cooperative marketing as one way of avoiding the necessity of Government controls over production and marketing.

It goes without saying that the Government should continue and greatly expand its research programs, both along the line of developing new crops and new uses for existing crops.

Finally let me reiterate, we all go up and down together. We cannot have a successful agricultural program if factories are closed and men are out of work. We cannot have a successful agricultural program if our policies toward industry are such that capital will not take the risk of expansion.

Also, if our general post-war economic policy is along the lines of high wage rates, high industrial tariffs, high taxes, the closed shop, and other monopolistic or semimonopolistic practices, a Government-control program may be needed at all times. On the other hand, if the national policy is that of full production and plenty, then abundant and uncontrolled production can well be the policy of agriculture.

With full production on the part of all, the country holds limitless possibilities. We can win the post-war battle against depression, want, and unemployment only by such a policy.

The G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN M. GILLESPIE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1944

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, the G. I. bill of rights is a document almost without parallel in the history of the United States, providing substantial Federal aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans. It represents the carefully considered viewpoint of both Houses of Congress. It is not a hastily conceived document, but, on the contrary, it is the result of more than 3 months of hearings, debates, and conferences which have gone into the shaping of its manifold provisions. It embodies in concrete legislative detail, so far as possible, the intent of Congress to make adequate provisions for all foreseeable problems which may confront the men and women of the armed forces after they have returned to civilian life, which was disrupted completely for them as they went to our Nation's defense.

At no time in the history of other wars, which we were compelled to fight, has the Nation planned so fully and foresightedly and in advance for the welfare of the veterans who put their lives at stake in combat for their country. This time we are not waiting. I feel sure that if word could be flashed to our men on the far-flung battle fronts of the world that the Congress of the United States has unanimously passed the G. I. bill of rights, it would give them hope and encouragement.

When our boys return they will find that the provisions of this act provide hospitalization when needed, assistance in finding a job, resumption of interrupted education, guaranteed loans to give them a new start in business, buying a farm or building a home, and unemployment compensation if it is im-

possible to find a job. But the G. I. bill of rights is more than all this; it is the specific pledge of the Nation to its fighting forces that their country not only stands back of them now but is ready to come to their aid individually and as they may need it.

It is variously estimated by experts that carrying out the provisions of this act will cost somewhere between four billion and six billion dollars for a period of years not extending beyond 7 years after the end of the war. That, of course, is a staggering sum for this Nation to undertake to pay, but that is on the human side of the war ledger. Let us see what the other side looks like.

Our actual expenditures for the war effort from July 1940 through April 1944 amount to $184,000,000,000, as reported officially by the Treasury Department. In addition, probable expenditures of $16,000,000,000 through May and June 1944 indicate the total of almost $200,000,000,000 that the war has cost to date, and the war is not yet over. Experts say the total cost of the war will probably reach the staggering figure of $325,000,000,000, and we in Congress think that if it is prudent to spend that gigantic sum for war, then it is prudent to spend four to six billion dollars to take care of the men and women who are fighting the war.

By comparison, the large expenditures contemplated under the G. I. bill of rights are modest when we think of the total war cost, because the expenditures I have just stated are in money, while the greatest expenditure and waste of all is the loss of young human lives, health, and happiness.

We prepared long and carefully for D-day, the invasion, the final drive on Hitlerism, the bombing of Japan, and the end of the war. Here, in the G. I. bill of rights, is planning for victory—the end of the war. It is the pledge and the machinery to put the pledge into operation. It is not a mere resolution. It means that our veterans can come back home to more than cheers, thanks, and wild acclaim, but will have the feeling that we at home have not forgotten what they did. They will come home with a sense of security and the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in a Nation of opportunity and private enterprise, where ability and peronal effort will allow them to build a free life to their own liking. May God bless them and bring them back to us safe and sound.

Reclassification of Federal Veterinarians and Their Lay Assistants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the effect of the Senate amendments is to approve the action of the Director of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Food Administration in proposing appropriations to pay the existing salary levels to a specific group of essential employees whose present salaries, because of lack of funds are substantially below the standard authorized salary classification.

These appropriations would not constitute favorable discrimination with respect to these employees as compared with the entire group of Federal employees nor bring about justifiable demands for general increases throughout the civil service.

Instead it is a proposal to correct an inequity of long standing by bringing the salaries of this group up to the same level as those of other employees performing work of comparable responsibility as required by the Classification Act of July 3, 1930.

A vote to concur in the Senate amendments is a vote to do justice to these employees which has been delayed too long, and to permit the heads of the department to classify positions in the field service by the same standards as used to classify the departmental service as the Classification Act directed them to do.

I support the motion to concur.

Reclassification of Federal Veterinarians and Their Lay Assistants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, the chief objection so far raised to concurring in the Senate amendments is that Congress by so doing will become obligated later to increase the salary of other field employees similarly situated.

The compensation of other groups may well be left for consideration when the facts regarding them are brought to our attention.

It is my judgment that all employees should receive equal treatment, and that was the judgment of Congress in the Federal Classification Act upon which the reclassification of the doctors of veterinary medicine and their lay assistants in the field is predicated.

Here we have a situation in which we have a request supported by the Director of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Food Administration for enough funds to finance the reclassification which has been worked out by the administrative officials to which Congress delegated the authority to do so.

The facts presented at the hearings show conclusively that these employees are underpaid as compared with other employees performing duties of the same class involving like responsibility.

The average salary of the 3,449 employees involved in this reclassification including overtime under the War Overtime Pay Act is $2,573. They have been reclassified to receive on the average $2,862 as against the average of $2,573 they now receive.

These field employees perform the duties required to carry out the mandates of Congress as expressed in the meat-inspection law, the animal quarantine laws, and other laws passed for the prevention, eradication, and control of the diseases of food animals. Their duties are exacting and require constant vigilance of doctors of veterinary medicine and assistants trained by them and operating under their supervision and direction.

We owe it to the armed forces and the civilian population as well to make it certain that the inspection of meats and the control of animal diseases is maintained at the highest level of efficiency. Without reclassification the entrance salaries and prospects for promotion of these employees in the field service does not offer fair compensation for services rendered, and therefore are not inviting to young men who must replace those who must eventually retire with advancing years or for other causes.

Having held out to the men now in the service the promise of equal pay for equal work through reclassification, it is unfair to them now that this work has been done to refuse to appropriate sufficient funds to make the reclassification effective.

I support the motion to concur in the Senate amendments.

There Is Only One Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the world's bitter experience in dealing with the German Empire in modern times, many thoughtful people are seriously considering ways and means of dealing with the German people at the conclusion of the present conflict that will prevent future wars and provide for peaceful and constructive advancement of the people of the several European nations.

One of the best qualified Americans to present a true picture of the German people and the German ideology is the eminent lawyer and diplomat, James W. Gerard, the former ambassador of this country to Germany, and the author of a number of illuminating books on the German Government and the German people.

There is submitted herewith an article entitled "There Is Only One Germany," by Mr. Gerard, taken from the May issue of the Monthly Bulletin of the Society for Prevention of World War No. 3:

THERE IS ONLY ONE GERMANY

(By James W. Gerard, former Ambassador to Germany)

There are still people who believe in the myth of the two Germanys.

Rot!

People who believe that there are two Germanys—good and bad—tend to overlook the fact that, historically speaking, the country is not far from primitive. We think of German mechanical ingenuity and German music and forget that as late as 1817, when a man bought land in Prussia he became not only its owner but the owner of the persons who lived on that land. As time is measured Germany is not far removed from its days of serfdom.

The descendants of men who once owned their own white countrymen as slaves still rule Germany. The succeeding years seem to do little to temper their arrogance.

The German people are united as never before in their history—united for cruelty and conquest, with a whole generation educated in the belief that the Germans are the Herrenvolk, the lords of creation who are destined to enslave all other nations. The German people themselves are a hopeless problem for the world. Their progress toward a state in which they will no longer be a menace to civilization is as slow as evolution itself. They must be constantly watched or they'll follow new leaders into another war.

After the last war those who believed in the two Germanys prevailed. We kissed the Germans and gave them enormous sums of money, some of which they used not only to build all sorts of public improvements in Germany, but even to buy into American companies and make us a debtor nation to Germany, the original debts for money received from this country being, of course, repudiated.

I'm certain that this time the Allies will not make the mistake of stopping their armies at the German borders. Germany must be broken up into a series of independent states, but mere separation won't be enough. The separation must be permanent. This time we must certainly eradicate the Prussian ruling class, and continue the extermination well on down the line among the Nazis, and stop kissing the remainder, if we are going to render Germany too impotent to start another war.

I hope, also, that the Allies will not weaken and listen to the blandishments of such men as old Dr. Schacht, who is certain to tell the world that millions of decent Germans were terrorized and led into the war by the cruel Nazis. Hitler is a much more independent man than was the Kaiser, but Hitler in turn is now dominated by the General Staff, just as was the Kaiser, and the General Staff is always made up of Junkers who are descendants of the Teutonic Knights. The Junkers are the real power behind Hitler. The beer-drinking old-school German is just about as bad as the most fanatical young Nazi because both will eagerly follow any leader who promises them world domination. They have the common national trait of militarism. The women are as bad as the men. All Germans consent to be ruled from the top, instead of from the bottom.

The following sentences are from a book that I wrote in 1917, when we had just entered World War No. 1, and these sentences apply today with equal force:

"There must be no German peace. The old regime, left in control of Germany, would seek only a favorable moment to renew the war, to strive again for mastery of the world. This is the Germany that we face and will face after the war. Our great problem is how to change this Prussian militaristic state into a peaceful member of the family of nations."

Requirements for a Healthy Local Air-Line Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, before the Feeder Airlines Association, Washington, D. C., June 15, 1944:

In his article in the June issue of Flying, which I am going to recommend that you read, if you have not already done so, George Burgess closed with the following paragraph:

"The benefits of expanded local airline service to the entire economy of the country, and to the public in jobs, convenience, and time, can be of tremendous post-war importance and are well worth every promotional effort on the part of the Government and of private operators and capital."

This goal is a challenging one and a real one—we all know the traffic is there—but it will not be easy to get costs down and the convenience of service up to the point where we can reach it.

It seems to me that there are four main lines of attack on the problem:

1. We must reduce the cost of local airline service.

2. We must increase its convenience to the passenger—which means higher door-to-door speed and great reliability.

3. We must establish the policy that reasonable Government financial assistance will be available for local services.

4. We must then concentrate the early development of local airlines in areas where they seem likely to become self-supporting in a reasonable period. (This does not mean that experimental operations on a limited scale should not be carried out in less promising areas.)

Although the economic development of local service is the province of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the provision of the ground facilities required is to a considerable degree the responsibility of C. A. A. and which matter is of such vital importance to American aviation as a whole that I am sure my friends and colleagues on the Board will not feel that I am stepping out of my normal role in speaking of it tonight—particularly as I am going to start by quoting their vice chairman.

The great possibilities of local air-line operation and the technical obstacles which it must overcome are outlined at some length in Dr. Warner's admirable paper in Aeronautical Engineering for February 1944.

You will remember that he stresses that the two greatest technical economic hurdles are:

1. The loss of time and increase of cost which frequent stops involve.

2. The tendency of unit-operating cost to rise with decreasing size of aircraft.

Taking everything into account, Warner estimates that with present equipment under present methods of operation it will cost 25 to 35 percent more per mile to operate a service which stops every 30 miles instead of every 300. He further figures that every minute saved per stop on a service stopping every 30 miles is equivalent to an increase of 20 miles per hour in cruising speed. Present air-line schedules are three to four times as fast as trains over distances of 1,000 miles or more and it is common to visualize that the local air-liner will have the same advantage of surface common carriers, but Warner estimates that allowing for substantial improvements over present practice, we will do well to average 95 miles per hour, airport to airport, with a 150-mile-per-hour airplane on a route where stops are 30 miles apart. If we add a substantial amount of airport to city time to this figure, we will find that our door-to-door time will be little faster than the busses. Obviously, besides improving runway design and airplane design, we must do a great deal of work on the airport problem.

Probably one of the most constructive promotional policies that the Government can and should pursue has to do with airports, for the accessibility of local air-line service is the most difficult hurdle that must be surmounted in order to capitalize on the one great advantage of transportation by air—speed.

Never in the history of aviation has there been such interest in airports, and we must not only encourage it but also must do everything we can to lend a guiding hand to prevent the morning-after effects of overindulgence that comes from lack of experience. For instance, in every "Middlesex village and farm" the chamber of commerce is "ready to ride and spread the alarm for the country folks to be out and to arms" for fear someone else will build a bigger and better airport. The country does not need a very large additional number of bigger airports for the exigencies of war have diverted all Government funds to just that kind for the last 5 years. In consequence, there are now some 750 class IV airports with runways of 4,500 feet or longer, as compared with 3 in January 1939.

In this regard the C. A. A., as you probably know, will soon issue its national airport plan which calls for the construction of some 3,000 new airports, doubling the number now in this country, and for the expansion of 600 of the existing ones. Upward of 2,900 of the new airports are class I and II, having maximum runway lengths of 3,500 feet.

There should be provision in the plans for these airports for the necessary zoning and for options on sufficient additional land to allow for future expansion. Where the convenience in location can be materially improved by using a site for the initial airport which is satisfactory except for limited possibilities for expansion, the possibility of constructing a second larger airport later rather than expanding the first one built should receive serious consideration.

A great difficulty facing all planners is the proper size of airports for various purposes. Unfortunately, contradictory advice is often given on this subject by people who are supposed to know the answers. Insofar as scheduled air-line operations are concerned, the plane manufacturer wants runways five to six thousand feet in length so that he can design for the maximum economy and speed possible in the state of the art without having undue restrictions imposed upon him by limitations in take-off run. Airline operations men have a similar generous approach to airport specifications for the same reasons. The traffic man, however, the man who is looking at the matter primarily from the point of view of how many people he can get to use the service, has a different approach; he wants to have the airport as close as possible to the town so that it may be convenient for the traveling public. His requirements must be given great weight in final selection, particularly as far as local service is concerned. If it takes a half to three-fourths of an hour from airport to town at each end of the trip, there just won't be any local traffic of distances of a hundred miles or less. The primary requisite for an airport to be used by a local short-haul air line—and this goes for

the private flyer, too—is that it be not more than 15 minutes from the center of town, be served by some means of public transportation, and be convenient to residential sections.

In the case of local service, it is unlikely that the designers can save enough cents per mile in operating costs by using very long runways of offset the loss of traffic due to inconveniently located airports. In this connection, evidence was submitted at the Civil Aeronautics Board local air-line hearings last fall that while a local air-line transport would have the lowest operating costs possible in the state of the art if it were designed for 5,000-foot runways, the difference between 4,000 and 3,000 feet would add relatively little per mile in operating expenses.

However, the curve of operating costs per mile starts its upward course at a fairly steep angle as runway lengths decline below 3,000 feet. Thus it appears safe to say that airports for local air-line operation need have no more than 3,000-foot runways. They must have clear approaches permitting a 30–1 glide path. They must be drained but not necessarily paved.

We do not yet know the extent to which Congress will appropriate funds to implement the national-airport plan nor the extent, to which States and municipalities will be expected to participate in the expenditures. We do know, however, that without these airports no local air-line system of any size, and no personal plane industry of any size can exist.

I want to take this opportunity, therefore, to point this out and to solicit your cooperation, for your own sakes and the sake of the entire industry. While you are here, go in and see Charlie Donaldson and Bud Bayard, who have spearheaded the working out of this airport plan with the communities and States through our regional and district offices. Then when you get home, go to the C. A. A. regional and district offices and find out from there how you can best cooperate to get the communities and States which you individually serve to proceed with their plans and if necessary alter or expand them so that they will better fit into the service you are proposing.

Another major way on which the Government can assist in the development of local air lines is by the establishment of nonpremium air mail.

The carriage by air of all first-class mail, the delivery of which can be expedited thereby, would probably result in three or more times as much air mail for local air lines as with 6-cent air-mail postage, not to mention 8 cents. The air lines are currently carrying about 15 percent of all first-class nonlocal mail, although (excepting pick-up service) they serve only about 500 cities in the country. If 10 times as many points had pick-up or regular air-mail service and the postage differential was eliminated, there would almost certainly be an over-all increase of mail poundage carried by air to a point where roughly 50 percent of all nonlocal first-class mail would go by air.

The average haul of nonlocal first-class mail is about 500 miles as compared with nearly 1,400 miles for air mail. Obviously, if one-half of nonlocal first-class mail, or about 3 times the present amount, were carried by air the average haul would decline to probably less than 900 miles, while the average haul by surface carriers would decline to about 300 miles.

Giving effect to these two factors, it has been estimated, and I believe on a reasonable basis, that with (a) three times the current poundage of mail carried by air (b) some reduction in the standard three-tenths of a mill per pound mile paid to the tank lines, and (c) an extensive system of local lines being paid 1 mill per pound mile, the profit margin of the Post Office Department on air mail alone would change but little from the 1943 level, and the profit of the Post Office on first-class nonlocal and air mail together would be about equivalent to the record one in 1942 of $137,000,000.

In the years 1935 to 1942 air mail has resulted in deficits to the Post Office Department ranging from $6,000,000 in 1935, up to $9,000,000 in 1940, from which peak they declined to $3,000,000 in 1942. The trend was sharply reversed in 1943 to a profit of some $17,500,000. For the current fiscal year, the profit of the Post Office Department from air mail will probably exceed $30,000,000. Thus, the profit from air mail for the last 2 years after all terminal and distribution expense, applicable railway transportation costs and over-all, will approximately equal the losses of the previous 7 years. It is also significant that the estimated profit for fiscal year 1944 is sufficient to pay 25 cents a mile for 2 round trips per day on 80,000 miles of routes.

As you know, the C. A. B. examiners in their report on local airlines recommended an initial temporary mail rate of 25 cents per plane mile. This recommendation was based on the assumption that with two passengers and some express a line could break even with expenses of 35 cents per plane mile, which in turn coincide with estimates of expenses made by local line applicants at the hearings. In this way an opportunity would be provided to develop mail and express pick-up and passenger traffic to and from a large number of our smaller towns. At the end of, let us say a 3-year period, we would have definite information as to the rate at which passenger traffic was growing and further expansion might then be justified. It is quite conceivable that a local air-line system which could prosper and expand on a 1 mill per pound mile average would be well on the way to development, and advanced types of aircraft meeting the special requirements of local service be available in quantity.

The stakes are high for those who undertake the establishment and operation of local air lines and the responsibility heavy. It is a totally new type of transportation service embracing, as I see it, areas comparable to the 14 aeronautical trade areas of the country, as outlined by Rand McNally, rather than a relatively small retail or wholesale trade area.

If it can be made successful, it will provide tens of thousands of aviation jobs in the local air-line companies themselves, in manufacturing concerns, in the construction of airports, and perhaps most important of all in small sales and service businesses at the airports, once they are constructed. In many cases, local air-line service will be the primary motivating force in getting an airport built, in countless others it will be a contributing cause. In either case, the airports will stimulate or create private as well as local air-line flying and patronage and roll up a demand for more airports and aviation markets of all sorts.

Like every industry in this country that has grown, whether it be transportation, manufacturing, or wholesale and retail distribution, independent initiative and capital with faith in its powers to create a profitable business must be given the chance to develop and expand.

Many of the larger air transport companies have evinced little faith in the local air-line business except as a skip-stop service set up primarily to connect the small city of ten to twenty-five thousand with the big city and with the long-distance trunk air-line service.

This pessimism seems justified only if one assumes that local air lines of the future will be operated according to past trunk-line standards; that is, on personalized luxury basis with 20- to 30-passenger airplanes. It overlooks the fact that the past record on very short distance local services (30 to 100 miles) connecting sizable towns indicates that from 50 to 75 percent of the passengers have been local passengers.

Many air lines claim—and rightly so—that their figures demonstrate that, with marked exceptions, small towns do not use air-line service to any significant degree. It is true that the traffic potentialities of small towns remain to be proven. This is one reason for establishing experimental local service as soon as practicable and giving it a fair opportunity to build up traffic over a period of years.

In many cases the service now rendered to the 100 towns of 25,000 or less on the present trunk-line system consists of a very few stops per day at inconvenient hours. To date and almost inevitably so, small cities and towns have never had a set of air-line schedules designed to meet their particular requirements and no wholehearted attempt to do just that is likely to be made unless there are lines wholely or largely dependent on small-town patronage and operated by people who have enough courage, independence, and faith in the prospects of such service to bet their money and business careers on the outcome.

The years of most rapid growth of the intercity bus business were those during which it was claimed that the private automobile was ruining the railroad passenger business, particularly its short-haul and branch-line business. Actually, the private automobile and bus merely proved that the railroad train was not a unit adaptable to the small town short-haul surface-transport market. It is conceivable that the same may prove to be true of trunk-line type of service and equipment as applied to local needs.

The facts insofar as there are any that bear on the case, and the potentialities of local air-line service all point to independent companies which one would like to think of as the little fellow. As a practical matter, however, if costs are to be reasonably low, each one must be big enough to operate and finance a good many hundreds or even thousands of route miles of operations in order to keep 10 or more planes flying 8 to 10 hours a day on 2 or more round trips. Each operator must be prepared to face several years of tough going while he develops his market and demonstrates to the C. A. B. that the business can be brought to a point where it is practically independent of subsidy. If successful he will probably be required to increase schedules to 5 or more per day depending on the demands of individual routes whenever he begins to show a profit and before he really gets over the hump.

All this appears to suggest an operating organization that might combine the airport, and flight contractor, and pilot and mechanic training operator, and the progressive small town and city investor and banker in the territory.

We must not fail to get such people into local air-line operation and provide them with every opportunity within the power of Government and business to furnish. Such encouragement is essential to the establishment, growth, and prosperity of this new type of transportation service.

Leathem D. Smith in 1932

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, things started to go bad for this country in

1929 to 1932. It is interesting to note just who the people were who knew who and what was responsible for this national catastrophe. There were few leaders in our national picture who had the courage to expose those plotters in those dark days. For that reason I ask unanimous consent to insert an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal which tells of the fight Leathem D. Smith waged to save this country from unscrupulous manipulators:

LEATHEM D. SMITH IN 1932

With picturesque clarity, Leathem D. Smith, of Sturgeon Bay, speaks up for the "little fellow" in business, demanding the closing of the stock market to divert the Nation's credit resources back to the legitimate "little" businesses of the country. The market is primarily a shearing pen for the inside speculators, anyhow, as Mr. Smith sees it.

"The country has been run by the speculators and for the speculators," he says. They "let the little fellows grow a crop of wool—that is the inflation period. Then they drive 'em in and shear 'em down to the skin—that is the depression period. Then they start 'em growing another crop of wool."

It is a picture that will be approved by many a worried American who cannot fathom what has happened to him but who knows that, suddenly, without apparent cause, his income went down, his wages were cut, or he found himself without a job. Why, in a land of plenty, with high-geared factories, hosts of labor, and a Nation-wide desire to buy, should this be so? Why a sudden stoppage of everything when apparently business could be about as good today as it was a few years ago? Why this debacle, when people want as much as they ever did and as willingly would work for it? Why this sudden credit shrinkage when there must be, somewhere in the country, as much money as there ever was, since money doesn't evaporate or disintegrate or vanish into thin air?

Why? asks the average American, and Mr. Smith gives this answer: Because "industries have been bought out and expanded and securities sold simply for the bankers' profit." Because "the bankers held up foreign bonds on the market long enough for them and their friends to unload on the public, and then let them drop." Because this Nation is in the hands of speculators so unscrupulous that "now they are forming a $100,000,000 bond pool as a 'relief measure' to buy distress bonds that they've shaken their customers out of. The only relief that pool will give is to relieve their customers of good bonds at bargain prices."

The whole major financial structure in the United States, as Mr. Smith pictures it, is designed to let men make money out of fictitious values, forcing these values up or down by manipulations and bleeding white the arteries of real industry, which is the industry of the thousands of little fellows who run productive businesses or work in them. So, "close the stock market" demands Mr. Smith, on the theory that by shutting down this arena of schemes and scheming the money and credit of the country would be forced to the factories, warehouses, shops, and stores where men toil honestly and constructively.

Well, as the average American takes stock—realizes that he willingly worked until, suddenly, somebody told him that there was no more work to do; realizes that he was glad to earn and to pay until suddenly there was nothing more to earn and nothing left to pay with; in fact, as this average American dizzily shakes his head, trying to determine from whence came the blow that knocked him dizzy—he will be disposed to agree with Mr. Smith. Somehow, tricky speculation does seem to divert the fruits of American industry into the coffers of a few financiers. Somehow, the stock market, with its intricate systems of manipulation does seem to confuse, baffle, and ultimately mulct the American worker and the American businessman out of much that he toils for.

And the man facing modern realities, like the loss of his home or the problem of a next meal, certainly will be disposed to ask: "Why not close the stock market? What major effect could it have, except to stop the racket of the gamblers and turn the country's attention back to a resumption of constructive work?"

European countries do not hesitate to suspend the operations of their market on far less provocation than America has had. Perhaps it is too late now to close the barn door. Nevertheless, it is inconceivable that we shall come out of this mess without changing the market from a manipulator's heaven to something nearer a bona fide mart to which honest investors can go with their savings.

Reclassification of Veterinarians and Lay Assistants, Bureau of Animal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the provision of funds for this reclassification of employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry would not constitute a discrimination as compared with the entire body of employees in the Federal service. Neither would such action justify demands for general increases throughout the Government. The estimated salary changes are not based on cost-of-living adjustments or any other wartime price-wage relationships. It is rather a proposal to correct an inequity of long standing by bringing the salaries of this group of employees up to the same level as that of other employees of the Government performing work of comparable responsibility, as recognized by the Classification Act.

Pay increases provided in the form of overtime under the War Overtime Pay Act have not improved the unfavorable salary situation of these employees but have in some respects served to heighten the basic inequity, since the overtime pay is provided for all employees on the basis of a sliding scale according to the original salaries.

Federal meat inspection and animal-disease control, the work of these employees, demands exacting performance of professional skills for long hours under trying and adverse conditions. Whether this work is done well or badly is of the greatest importance to the health and welfare of the people of the United States, for upon the quality of the inspection depends the healthfulness of the meat and dairy products supply of the Nation.

These employees have not and do not now threaten the Congress with desertion of this important work if the reclassification is not approved. They do ask that their loyalty and efficiency in carrying out congressional mandates to protect the health of the people be recognized with just compensation according to the pay scales prescribed under the Classification Act which have already been applied to other employees of the Federal service.

The long-range effect of paying these employees less than the grade to which they are entitled under the Classification Act has been to discourage doctors of veterinary medicine and well-qualified laymen from seeking employment in the Federal service. Unless the meat-inspection and animal-disease-control services are placed in a position to obtain well-qualified personnel as replacements for experienced employees who leave the service by reason of death, retirement, or otherwise, the inevitable result will be an impairment of the efficiency of these vital services.

I urge that the House adopt the motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendments.

A Way To Avoid Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I inclose herewith a most excellent editorial from the Ouachita Citizen, West Monroe, La., under date of May 19, 1944:

The subject of the editorial is, or should be, close to the heart of every thinking man and woman in these United States, and I sincerely hope that this Congress and the citizens of this great country will weigh well the words of this outstanding editorial:

THE WAY TO AVOID BANKRUPTCY

More people would take more interest in the problem of the growing Federal debt if they were told frankly that unless the solvency of the Government is maintained, every War bond will be worthless. They should be told frankly that buying bonds will not save the country from bankruptcy. But there is a way to keep out of bankruptcy—by paying taxes and by rigid Government economy. Everyone who owns a War Bond, a life insurance policy, or a dollar of savings has a direct interest in this problem. It is no longer a matter for the other guy to worry about.

It is now estimated that before the present war is over the Federal debt may reach the staggering sum of $300,000,000,000. If this could be divided equally and spread over the entire population, it would mean a debt of about $2,300 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, a debt of about $4,700 for every person gainfully employed, and based on four persons to the family, a debt of $9,200 for each and every family of the United States.

This debt cannot be passed on to the other fellow or evaded. It can be paid by inflating the currency, and that would utterly ruin men and women with fixed incomes, but if

the American people value their freedom, they will insist upon meeting the debt squarely—the hard way—by taxation, and frugality in Government.

Induction of Premedical Students for Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the ruling made by General Hershey, of the Selective Service Office, which denies deferment from induction into the Army of premedical students will have a far-reaching effect upon the health of the country. His order will place practically all premedical students in the Army as of July 1, 1944. The only individuals left in premedical training will be IV–F's, women, or individuals who are not now citizens of the United States.

Recognizing the seriousness of the problem, I have appealed several times to General Hershey for a modification of his ruling. To date there has been no change.

If no premedical students are permitted to remain in school, it will mean that no physicians will be graduating in the classes 5 or 6 years hence. It would seem imperative, Mr. Speaker, that the country ought to take steps to safeguard the future health of its citizens. If no students are permitted to take medical training, it will seriously cripple the vital affairs of science and imperil the health of our citizens. It is quite possible for another epidemic of influenza to appear which would kill and maim more people than is being killed or disabled in the many war zones in which we are now engaged.

There are some 4,000 physicians in the United States who die each year. There are about 6,000 premedical students who enter school. Does it not seem that these 6,000 students, as long as they meet the requirements of their several colleges, would be of more service to their country as trained medical men than serving in some branch of the military service?

It suggests a very serious problem. I am, therefore, inserting into the RECORD a letter which I sent to the President of the United States and Gen. Lewis B. Hershey in which I point out the threatened dangers to the health of our citizens by depriving them of needed medical care because these medical men of the future are now being inducted into the military forces:

JUNE 16, 1944.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT: I hesitate to bring before your busy office a problem which should be solved by the Director of Selective Service, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey. I refer to General Hershey's order of April 11 which, in effect, will induct practically all premedical students into the Army by July 1.

I have had several conversations with General Hershey and his staff and it does not seem likely that they are willing to accept the responsibility and order a temporary deferment of men of military age who are now in our colleges as premedical students.

As a physician and surgeon of 25 years' experience, it is my considered judgment that men now in medical school should be deferred as long as they pass the required grades in college in order that the needs of society in the years to come will be fully met. If no premedical students stay in school it might have a serious effect upon the health of this country because of the lack of students graduating 4 or 5 years hence. The Army now has absorbed a large number of physicians to the extent that should an epidemic occur it might mean that lives would be lost because there would be a shortage of physicians. There are some 4,000 physicians who die each year in the United States.

It seems imperative, Mr. President, that the country take steps to safeguard its future. If the present rule of inducting premedical students stands we will be in imminent danger of undermining the health of this country.

Other countries, including Russia, England, and Canada, have recognized the problem and are keeping these premedical students in school. There are only about 6,000 premedical students. Surely they would be of more service to the country as trained medical men than serving in the Infantry or some other branch of the military. If they are taken from school it may well cripple the vital affairs of science and the country would lose their medical service. It certainly would not guarantee a safe future for science and for the citizens of the country.

Under the present ruling the draft boards are not permitted to consider a premedical student as exempt from military service.

I am appealing to you and to General Hershey because I feel it is imperative that we not make the blunder of permitting such a drastic regulation to continue in force and thus deprive this country of adequate medical care in the future.

Respectfully yours,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
Fourth District, Nebraska.

A Memorial We Must Build

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Morgan, from the Boston Sunday Globe of May 28, 1944:

A MEMORIAL WE MUST BUILD—IT MUST BE A COUNTRY WITH A PLACE IN IT FOR THE UNWANTED YOUTH BEFORE THE WAR AND SUCH A PEACE AS THEY WILL BE PROUD TO HAVE WON

(By James Morgan)

On this Memorial Sunday we could not do better than recall to our thoughts the noblest of memorial addresses, delivered by Lincoln over the yet newly made graves at Gettysburg. He dismissed the suggestion that he and those gathered with him were endued with the power to hallow a ground already consecrated by those who had poured out upon it the last full measure of devotion. Rather, he dedicated the living to the great task remaining to be done, with the high resolve that "these dead shall not have died in vain."

That is the least and the most we can do in this memorial season for the thousands of Americans who have fallen in another war which is testing the endurance of a nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," under a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Many of them lie in the seas and in far fields of white crosses, where their graves may not be decked with flowers by loving hands. They will not fail of remembrance in the bruised hearts of those dearest to them and in the sorrowful pride of their friends, their communities, and their comrades. It is for us all, for this whole country to strive to achieve and establish a peace that shall be worthy of the sacrifice we required of them and of the still heavier sacrifices we are about to ask of others whose numbers we dread to guess.

WHAT ONE FRONT SHOULD KNOW ABOUT OTHER

A rising tide is reported of dissatisfaction at the front with us at home. It is a pity if the men who are bearing for us the burden of battle should have to bear also the bitter suspicion that we at home are careless and forgetful of them. That their country is not ungrateful to them they would know if they could but search our hearts. Pains should be taken to make and keep them aware that never for a waking moment are they out of our minds. We are prouder and more confident of them than this people ever have been of any Army and Navy in our history. Nor have the American people ever been so united as they are behind them today.

In the inexperience of youth, the G. I. cannot suspect how distance distorts the view. Anyone who has traveled much in foreign lands can understand what a weird perspective the overseas servicemen get of their homeland.

I recall a visit to Europe while Dillinger was on the rampage over here. An innocent abroad would have got the impression from the cabled news that nothing else was happening in the United States and that all its millions of people were being held up by that lone gunman.

As it was in those lurid days of Dillinger, before he was trapped and shot in an alley like a rat, the G. I. should know that there has been something else going on at home besides strikes and profiteering and bootlegging in a new criminal underworld which the black market and its customers are breeding. A shabby fringe of chiselers, backbiters, and idlers, we have always with us, as the services also have their due share of shirkers and gloomy malcontents, despite martial discipline.

Nevertheless, the home folks are supporting the largest armed force ever martialed under the American flag, twice and a half larger than in the other World War. They have equipped, clothed, and fed it better than any other military establishment, and better cared for the health and diversion of its personnel. In consequence, their pay envelopes are carrying the heaviest load of taxation ever levied by Uncle Sam. They are doing eagerly everything asked of them, from donating their blood to oversubscribing bond issues and quotas for the upkeep of the Red Cross and the U. S. O. Men and women by the millions are giving their time to the volunteer, unpaid civilian services.

WHERE WE ARE FAILING THE FRONT

The country has not failed the servicemen in any material way. They have been trained to fight as no American troops ever were in the past. But we are hearing that they have not been told what they are to

fight for. Insofar as that is true, they have been left at a cruel disadvantage in a combat with foes indoctrinated with a fanatical faith in their cause.

The great authorities on the subject agree that the moral element in war is three times more important than the physical. This expert testimony happens to corroborate Shakespeare's estimate that "thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just."

The efficient Army Medical Department is testifying to the same effect.

The psychiatrists have given the scientific name of "battle neurosis" to what was called cannon fever in days of old and shell shock in World War No. 1. They diagnose the ailment as a conflict within the soldier between his sense of duty and his normal instinct of self-preservation. This conflict, the doctors report, can be eliminated by instilling in the patient a knowledge of the cause he is asked to fight for and perchance die for.

We have trained the arms and hands and legs of the serviceman, but not his spirit. That instruction was omitted, it seems, out of fear of criticism for introducing controversial subjects into the training. This is a plain case of political or ballot neurosis, and the psychiatrists should prescribe a cure for such a lack of nerve among the higher-ups.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL CHASM

If those in authority are leaving our fighting men in ignorance of why they fight, it is all the more incumbent on the home front to demand that the victory they win shall bear fruits that will justify the war to them. We must not forget the psychological chasm that already divided the younger and older generations before this global war placed oceans between them. The servicemen grew up in the era of the great disillusionment after the other war and of the great depression that next smote them.

Really, this is another 30-year war for those whose only experience with life has been since 1914. Hard bitten by an economic system or economic chaos where youth has been unwanted except to fight unwanted youths of other lands, they accept few of the premises and slogans of those of us who looked upon the cardboard world at the end of the nineteenth century, saw that it was good, and thought the job was all finished. What is sentiment to the old is spurned as sentimentality by the young. These also have their brands of "bunk" and "hokum" to be sure, but they want to roll their own baloney, and they will have none that is handed out to them.

TWO GENERATIONS TO BE RECONCILED

The reconciliation of these generations is the most urgent and the most delicate of the problems that beset us. Shut up 10,000,000 young Americans in the regimentation of military discipline, to say nothing of plunging them into the savagery of battle, and it must affect their thinking and feeling ever afterward. Some of them have been overseas 2 years and more, and long are the years of youth when the boy goes to bed at night and wakes up in the morning a man. Distance and time and the problem of shipping have made furloughs difficult for them. Home recedes to a dim, far-off place.

An American flyer in England has been confessing that he has a kind of dread of coming home, and he explained, "I feel different inside. I suppose I've grown up rather suddenly. I've known fear. I've felt flak and panic. It does something to you. Back home, thank God, they've not been touched by war. But it worries me that they will be unchanged, and that I am not the same person—how could I be? They won't be expecting the difference and they may not understand."

There we have a pathetic gulf, and we must do our best to throw a bridge of understanding across it. It was by exploiting just such a division in their countries after the other war that enabled Mussolini and Hitler to rise to their evil power. That must not happen here, but it might unless we take care to prevent it.

With the cooperation of the censors we can combat the further estrangement of the two fronts in the war. Meanwhile we should be setting our house in order that those who are spared to return shall not meet us or we them as strangers. The best welcome we can plan for them is not a noisy hour of bands and banners. What these toughened realists will want to find is a country with a place in it for them and a peace that they can be proud to have won. That would tell them at least what the war was about and somewhat justify to them what they shall have endured and dared. It is the only adequate memorial we can build for the unreturning who shall have died that their comrades might come home.

The Electoral College Plot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 14, 1944, suggesting an amendment to the Constitution relative to the electoral college. It follows:

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE PLOT

Because Americans have failed to insist that one section of their Constitution be revised to keep up with the actual procedure in the Government's functioning, they are now faced with the threat of a scheme to defeat the popular will in the coming Presidential election.

This scheme grows out of that anachronism of American government, the electoral college, set up by the founding fathers for election of the President, but long ago reduced to uselessness.

Since, technically speaking, it is not the voters but the chosen electors who select the President, fourth-term opponents in several Southern States, notably Texas, have worked out a devious plot.

If the platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention does not contain certain planks demanded by these politicians, or if the nominations for President and Vice President do not suit them, the electors are to vote for some other person than the convention nominee, and thus disregard the mandate of of the people. Under the Constitution, there is no device, save their own sense of honor, to prevent such a course by the electors.

The possibility of such a weird happening comes about as follows:

The framers of the Constitution decided against direct election of the President by the people. Communities were isolated in those days, communication was slow, and it was feared the citizens could not become sufficiently informed on the candidates to vote intelligently.

Hence arose the ingenious plan for indirect election, "by judicious persons, specially chosen by the people for that purpose," as James Bryce explained it. Outstanding men were to be chosen as electors in each State. They were then to meet and, from the fullness of their knowledge, agree upon a President. It was provided that each State have a number of electors corresponding to the total of its congressional delegation.

The plan never was really used. In the first two elections, Washington was the unanimous choice. By the third election, party lines had developed, and the voters were thinking of the leading candidates, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, not of the electors.

In most States the names of electors were long ago dropped from the ballot for the sake of simplification, though they still function in an obscure and purely ceremonial way. There is no longer any need whatever for the device, since the public now is fully enlightened about candidates and issues. Election of the President by State units is, of course, still a feasible plan. The provision for electoral votes as a handy means of tabulation might have been kept, while eliminating the electoral college rigamarole.

Yet, because this deadwood was never removed from the Constitution, a thoroughly unscrupulous scheme can be concocted for misrepresenting the people and causing strife in a wartime election.

Southern politicians have the privilege of opposing a fourth term if they wish to do so, or of repudiating the choice of the party convention. The legitimate way to do this is to form their own party, as the Theodore Roosevelt faction of the Republican Party did in 1912, not to depend on such a shyster conspiracy as this.

It is inconceivable that the plan can succeed. Citizens of Southern States will surely demand that their votes be counted as they cast them. And even shady politicians should find it difficult to find men to run as electors for the avowed purpose of misusing the election machinery.

Now that this peculiarity of our system has been fully brought to light, there should be no delay in starting the process of bringing the Constitution into accordance with usage.

What Is This Free Enterprise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I have heard and read much on the subject of free enterprise, and I am a firm believer in the American competitive free enterprise system.

Probably one of the most human and clear articles written on the subject was published by the State Labor News, of Columbus, Ohio. This is a well-known labor paper and it gives the workingman's viewpoint. The article follows:

WHAT IS THIS FREE ENTERPRISE?

Joe Jones is my name, and I've got a question.

It's about this thing you call "free enterprise."

I go home at night and read my paper—much closer than you think. The editorials drone, "free enterprise." Some politician speaks and the headlines thunder out, "Free Enterprise." Big, full-page advertisements (nice pictures and words like honey): They're singing, too, about free enterprise.

I know you want it, boss. I know all industry wants it. The drums are beating and I don't have to put my ear to the ground to know the powers are rallying for a fight—for this thing called free enterprise.

I went to my union meeting just the other day and the big shot leader talked free enterprise. He was for it, too.

Then I wondered.

Industry wants free enterprise. My boss wants it. And the politicians who want high office.

But so does my union leader.

Maybe I do, too, but I want to ask my question, first.

The music's all the same; the harmony's swell. But how about the words?

My boss, my union leader—are they all singing the same song?

Or does the music drown out the words they sing?

That's all I want to know. I'm not suspicious, you understand. I just want to know some things, that's all.

It seems like yesterday that I went down the street and asked for work. "I need so much," I said. "I've got three kids and I can't live on less."

Industry laughed then, and said a thousand other guys named Jones would work for half of that, and twice as long. My friend, Bill Smith, could work for half of what I asked. He had no kids, and he could take the job. And so he underbid me.

We bid our labor, and Bill won out, but we knew we both were losers in the end.

Is this free enterprise?

The 30-cent wage, the 10- or 12-hour day? That wasn't long ago, you know.

If this is what it means, boss, then I'm against it.

I remember when first I joined my union. It was near treason then. My boss, he didn't like the unions, and he told me so.

There were labor spies beside my bench, and men were fired for saying what they thought. We met in secret. There was talk of union agitators and stories in the papers. Some men were beaten and some were driven from the town. There were alley fights and sluggings.

There wasn't any bargaining, men to men. The blackjack was the answer to a union from some industry.

And when we struck, we fought a civil war. There wasn't any peaceful picketing. There wasn't any management offers.

But there were strikebreakers by the carload, and sheriff's men with little, sawed-off guns. There was the militia at the factory gate, and machine guns on the roof.

This was free enterprise of a sort for certain kinds of industry, too.

But is this the kind you want? If it is, then count me out.

How about the blacklist? It branded union labor with a secret mark of Cain. Do you want it back?

How about the crooked piece-work systems and the speed-up it forced upon us? And the phony prices at the company stores?

How about monopolies which drove the worker's dollar down? How about the trusts and those bigger things they call cartels? You don't call those free enterprise, do you, boss?

There were many other things: The child workers, long hours for women, unhealthful shop conditions, a carelessness for workers' lives. * * *

This was freedom for enterprise, I guess, but for none other.

If this is industry's song, then I won't sing. Just dock my check, boss, and count me as an absentee.

What's that, boss? You say I'm off the beam? You say that you want none of that?

All right, then, tell me what you want. Tell me about your free enterprise.

Free enterprise, you say, is not against our humane labor laws; my right to organize; my right to bargain for my wage; my right to strike; my rights to hold by labor faith.

You say it stands against a bureaucratic theft of Congress power; against those who dream to fix your prices, profits, and my wage; against a govern ent where pressure yields the greatest good; against a loss of our democracy; against a power which would destroy us both.

It sounds good boss—tell me more.

Free enterprise, you say, wants no monopolies to fix an artificial price; to squeeze out the weaker plant; to conspire in restraint of trade; to enter into wage pacts; to use its greater strength to crush my union.

You say it wants only free and open competition for all business; that it believes monopoly is the death of competition; that it asks freedom only to open new markets, create new products, produce its goods in uncurbed volume and let the people fix its worth.

Well that's reasonable and I'll back you up.

Free enterprise, you say, wants lower taxes on its profits—but not for dividends, alone, not for the chairman of the board and 10 vice presidents. Nor does it want to shift the tax upon the worker, but to cut the spending.

You say that taxes must not bleed away all profits; you talk of "seed money" and you say that industry is like the farmer who must save seed to grow another crop—who must have a crop to give a harvest hand a job.

I can't deny it, boss, let's shake on that.

Free enterprise, you say, must have the "profit motive"; but does not seek to cut the worker's wage; it knows the workers must consume the goods they make; it knows there never was prosperity without high wage.

You say in profit lies our hope for progress, that chance for fair profit is all that brings investment into industry. Let's not divide the jobs, you say—let's multiply the jobs and thus make work for all. You want profit for your new machines, for your vital research, for new products. Better tools, you say, will lighten labor, will do more work in half the time, will leave more leisure for the worker—he'll have more time for better living, more time for education, more time to be a better citizen.

Profits? If profits do that for me, I'll help you make 'em, boss.

Free enterprise, you say, wants no high prices. It wants no long hours and tired workmen to run its cost list up. It doesn't want to ask, "What will the traffic bear?"

You say free enterprise thinks the lower price is best; that the faster it can make, distribute, and deliver goods to me, the lower price that I must pay. You say that then I'll have some money left for other things—and better living. You say that lower costs mean higher wages, incentives for invention and for leadership, inducement for more capital to start the cycle over again.

Then go ahead—I'm for it.

Free enterprise, you say, does not want the bureaucrat as his sole planner; it has no faith in public works and public spending; it wants no post-war W. P. A.; that milk delivered free to every Hottentot will bring no progress to the world.

You say it does want planning of another sort; plans for permanency by private capital and not by Government loans with money taken from the people; plans for jobs at honest pay and not a Government subsistence dole; plans to teach the Hottentot that by initiative and by enterprise he'll get his milk and progress, too.

So that's free enterprise.

Well, Boss, my question's answered—I guess we're not so far apart.

I want to call no bureaucrat my boss. I'll fight for your free competition; it sounds American to me. Your seed money is a fair request—I'll help you get it. I'll help you with your profit motive; if it means a better living. And, like you, I want my destiny planned by my own hands.

We know America got its freedom by placing Government in its peoples' hands. And together we can keep our freedom in our hands—the hands of those who work and those who want work done.

So call me if you need me, Boss. Just call Joe Jones.

Beaverhead County, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House the sound thinking and forward looking plans of one of the counties in the district I have the honor to represent.

While we are talking back here the people of Beaverhead County are planning and acting. All groups in the county have worked together to bring into existence a post-war plan which will assure the returning veterans and war workers that when this war is over and they come back to the Beaverhead that there will be work and jobs for them.

I commend the following editorial and news story concerning this activity to you for your most earnest consideration. They are taken from the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of May 22, 1944:

BEAVERHEAD READY

In an interview with O. A. Bergeson, of Dillon, the Tribune learned Saturday that Beaverhead County is doing some practical, realistic post-war planning. They have more than a list of things they would like. They have made a survey of improvements actually planned and financed, both public and private, which will be started as soon as the men begin to come home from the war asking for jobs. Their plans are analyzed as to cost and the man-hours of work that they will furnish. The size of the employment problem has been set against the work available and the businessmen and ranchers there are confident that they will take care of their own people with the 2-year program they have worked out in detail. And there will be no leaf-raking expenditures in doing so. That is the kind of planning more counties in Montana should be getting under way right now.

BEAVERHEAD'S POST-WAR PLAN MOST DETAILED—RANCHERS, BUSINESSMEN JOIN IN SURVEY OF COMMUNITY NEEDS

Beaverhead County has submitted one of the most detailed post-war planning reports yet compiled in the State to Montanans, Inc., O. A. Bergeson, of Dillon said while here Friday and Saturday attending the air clinic sessions. Bergeson, who is chairman of the State welfare commission, headed the Beaverhead subcommittee on public works planning.

Ranchers and businessmen, Bergeson explained, joined in forming committees which studied in detail the post-war business and agricultural situation in Beaverhead. Lists were compiled of private plans for new buildings, improvements and purchases of durable goods, with careful estimates of the employment that would result, the probable expenditures and the bank financing needed. The bankers of the county assured the availability of funds for that purpose. The number of men who had left the county and of those who will probably return, were carefully estimated and a clear picture was obtained of the jobs needed outside of private employment already assured.

Actual local public works needs were surveyed for a 2-year period. County and city

plans actually in the blueprint stage now and for which funds are available immediately when the war ends were listed and broken down into probable costs and man-hours of labor required. Other public works for which detailed engineering and financing plans are not completed, but for which the local authorities are getting ready, were also broken down into costs and man-hours of employment they would furnish.

The county, city, and school authorities would be ready tomorrow to start work on this 2-year improvement program if the war should end so suddenly, Bergeson said.

Other subcommittees are in touch with the State and Federal authorities, getting definite information on new road, water conservation, and reclamation projects that will be allocated to the county in the near future. These have also been analyzed as to the employment they will furnish and the portion of cost allotted to the local people. They believe, Bergeson explained, that they are down to brass tacks in their plans in Beaverhead County and can assure the people, whom war service or employment have taken from there temporarily, that there will be work and jobs for them when they return.

He's My Dad—And I Love Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Dorothy Gilligan Bennett, from the Washington Post of June 17, 1944:

HE'S MY DAD—AND I LOVE HIM

He's happy or friendly, serious or gay,
A splendid companion on bright days and gray.
He's my dad—and I love him.

I'm his child, and I know he understands me well,
My dreams, my heartaches, my zeal to excel.
He's my dad—and I love him.

He knows my failings, my every temptation,
He counsels me, guides me without condemnation.
He's my dad—and I love him.

He's patient, long-suffering, discerning, and wise,
He fathoms my faults with soul-searching eyes.
He's my dad—and I love him.

He's deep and he's thoughtful, he's earnest and kind,
He feels a real kinship with all mankind.
He's my dad—and I love him.

He's sometimes discouraged, and he gets angry, too;
Oh, he has his faults, as all of us do—but
He's my dad—and I love him.

When he knows disappointment or worry or care,
I want to be with him, his troubles to share.
He's my dad—and I love him.

He's a Christian—the dynamic, practical way;
He tells me of God, he helps me to pray.
He's my dad—and I love him.

He's a real man, a good man, he's genuine and fine,
He's tops as a father, I'm proud that he's mine.
He's my dad—and I love him.

An Invasion at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1944, the United States Supreme Court handed down a decision which upset a 75-year precedent. The question involved was the right of Federal authorities to prosecute insurance companies for alleged violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act. It is of considerable significance, Mr. Speaker, that the decision was actually entered by a minority of the court. The Congress is now faced with an absolute mandate to correct this situation. For many, many years the States have exercised the right to legislate in matters pertaining to insurance companies and they have established workable rules and regulations governing them. If this decision is permitted to go unchallenged it will mean the start of another regulatory body under Federal contact—just another bureaucratic agency.

Mr. Speaker, Raymond Moley, in Newsweek for June 19, has hit the nail on the head in discussing this subject, and under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AN INVASION AT HOME

(By Raymond Moley)

Feebly competing for attention with the tremendous news of the invasion was the account of a Supreme Court decision which, in peacetime, would claim first place. This decision, handed down June 5, involved an invasion of the right of the States to regulate insurance. It affects every American who is protected by any kind of insurance.

In 1869, in the famous case of *Paul* v. *Virginia*, the Supreme Court declared that the insurance business was not interstate commerce. Hence, it was subject to regulation by State law, not by Congress. A long train of decisions since has reenforced that position. Meanwhile, the States have slowly and effectively built up an enormous number of laws and regulations to protect holders of insurance policies. All this State machinery is endangered by the new Supreme Court decision.

The facts of the particular case are of small importance compared with the constitutional issue involved. They concern the Federal indictment at Atlanta, 2 years ago, of some 200 fire-insurance companies and individuals for a violation of the Sherman Act. The violation charged was an agreement on rates which, the defendants claimed, was directed by the insurance officials of the State governments. Such agreements under State direction are common and essential to the orderly conduct of the business.

The nature of the arguments as well as the circumstances in the case make it clear that certain New Deal lawyers, who tried futilely 5 years ago to make a case for Federal regulation in the T. N. E. C. investigation and who had no chance to get such regulation through Congress, decided to accomplish their purpose through the Department of Justice and the Supreme Court.

The majority decision was written by Justice Black, the dissent by Justice Stone. Justices Douglas, Murphy, and Rutledge agreed with Black. Justices Frankfurter and Jackson agreed with Stone. Justices Roberts and Reed took no part in the case. It might be remarked that the Justices with the most extensive legal experience in private practice are Roberts, Reed, Stone, and Jackson—all of whom either dissented or declined to participate in the case.

The precedents of 75 years were thus overturned by a minority of the Court—by judges whose experience in the practice of law before their appointment to the Nation's highest Court was exceedingly brief.

This case strongly illustrates how the Court can step, outside the law, into matters of public policy. In Black's opinion, he indicates that the States are not fully capable of governing insurance. In what way can a judge of the Court, on the basis of a single case, thus pass judgment on the effectiveness of the insurance laws and departments of 48 States? In the T. N. E. C. investigation, New Dealers tried, and utterly failed, for more than a year to prove that life insurance was not adequately regulated. The vast preponderance of evidence is that the States have fully protected policyholders. Millions of policyholders know that. Justice Black's statement is not an expression of law; it is an attempt to impose his own private and unsupported view of fact. This is not the exercise of judicial power; it is legislation by the judicial branch.

This decision breaks not only the 75-year insurance precedent, but a vastly more important one, which goes back 155 years to the foundation of the Republic. In all that time, no decision prior to this one has ever been made by a minority of the Court on a constitutional issue involving the overruling of a previous decision. During his tenure Chief Justice Marshall repeatedly refused to take up constitutional cases in the absence of a full Court.

The remedy for the new Supreme Court decision lies with Congress. A bill sponsored by Senator BAILEY is before it, which declares that insurance is a matter for State regulation, that there is no need for the displacement or encumbrance of the State laws by a Federal bureau or otherwise, that insurance is not interstate commerce and, so, as a result, is not subject to the Federal antitrust laws. This bill would reverse the decision. It should be passed.

In the old days the Court protected the States from Congress. Now, apparently Congress must protect the States against the Court.

Maurice Martin, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 1939, I appointed a young man by the name of Maurice Martin, from my home city of Bluefield, W. Va., to the United States Military Academy at West Point. He entered the academy in the month following his appointment, was graduated in due course, and is now with our fighting forces overseas.

Within the past week, and for the first time since his graduation and entry into active service, I heard from Maurice Martin. There was no message direct

from him, but my news came from a mutual friend who forwarded to me a clipping of an Associated Press release published early in the week in the Roanoke (Va.) Times. This item tells its own story of the daring, resourcefulness, and effective efforts of two typical American flyers, one of whom, I am proud to say, is a native son of West Virginia. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the news item from the Roanoke Times:

BLUEFIELD PILOT AND WING MATE KILL 200 NAZIS

Lt. Maurice Martin, 908 Highland Avenue, Bluefield, was one of two Thunderbolt pilots to trap a German column on a road south of Bayeux with well-placed bombs, according to an Associated Press release yesterday.

The other pilot was Lt. E. W. Sanders, 1034 North Shepherd Drive, Houston, Tex., and the two pilots estimated they killed about 200 of the Nazis in strafing attacks.

They dropped two 500-pound bombs in front of the column and then two in the rear, trapping the soldiers between two big craters.

"They tried to run for it, but couldn't get out," said Sanders. "We flew up and down over them, strafing with our machine guns. Very few got out alive."

Other pilots reported the Germans were using horse-drawn artillery.

Lieutenant Martin is the son of Mrs. Roger Martin, Highland Avenue, and the late Roger Martin, whose death occurred a few weeks ago. His father was formerly connected with the coal business, and Lieutenant Martin is well known in and around Bluefield.

Postal Employees Buy Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, feeling that it was an outstanding achievement, I am calling attention to the fact that the employees of the St. Louis post office, whose quota in the present bond drive was $170,000, purchased $204,000 of these bonds. The quota was oversubscribed on D-day. As a result of this achievement, the Postmaster General wrote the acting postmaster in St. Louis the following letter, which I am including as part of my remarks under the permission granted me:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 13, 1944.

Hon. BERNARD F. DICKMANN,
Acting Postmaster, St. Louis, Mo.

MY DEAR MR. DICKMANN: The remarkable record of the St. Louis post office in exceeding its quota before the fifth war loan was well started calls for my heartiest congratulations to you and all of your supervisors and employees. St. Louis was the first large office to report raising its quota in the fourth drive. Then about a month was required to reach the goal. In the fifth drive a week sufficed. I am certain that other comparable offices will find that record hard to beat. It indicates an alert, enthusiastically patriotic organization. The entire Postal Service had an opportunity to read of this accomplishment in the Postal Bulletin of June 9 and beyond a doubt share our pride in this outstanding demonstration of a desire on the part of your employees to back the attack.

With best wishes to you and the entire personnel of your office,

Sincerely yours,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

Bradley Taylor Explains in Detail the Whole WASP Situation—Says W. T. S. Men Got Raw Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have received from Bradley R. Taylor, vice chairman, Department of Wisconsin Legion Aviation Committee, which reads as follows:

RHINELANDER, WIS., *June 13, 1944.*

Hon. JAMES MORRISON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Appendix of the RECORD, on page A2937, carries the extension of remarks by the Honorable JOHN COSTELLO, of California, on H. R. 4219—a bill to commission women fliers—a group of women called WASPS.

As you know, for the past 2 years I have made a very thorough study of this problem of civilian pilot training, and War Training Service, a program designed by the Army and the C. A. A. to train men fliers for the armed forces. As the Congressman's discussion of the WASPS also carries a discussion of these men, I feel that I should point out some of the errors in his statements. I do not believe that Congressman COSTELLO has been informed by those who asked him to sponsor the bill.

As you will recall, on or about May 10 of 1943, a bill was passed under Public No. 50 for the payment of men in C. P. T. at the rate of $50 per month. This was called by the men the "McCarran pay bill." A special report went with this bill, this report is Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, Senate, Calendar No. 317, Report No. 311, to accompany H. R. 2397. This report states that "The committee was not willing to continue such a procedure (paying men on inactive reserve) throughout another fiscal year, and had numerous conferences with the military authorities and with the officials of the C. A. A. in an effort to reach a solution."

The solution, the report goes on to state, would leave funds enough to graduate some 7,200 pilots. The report continues, "That all of these men be brought into the Army by September 1, 1943, so provision is made that after September 1, 1943, no reservist on inactive status will be paid."

The report goes on to say that "The committee requests that the Secretary of Commerce make a report to the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, respectively, not later than October 1, 1943, the number of enlisted reservists called to active duty."

By October 1, 1943, some 5,000 former C. P. T. men had been called to active duty. These men were called to various induction centers, they were activated and they were given basic training, their I. Q. was taken, and records from various induction centers show that these men had the highest I. Q. of any group passing through the induction centers.

Congressman COSTELLO would like those who are interested to believe that when these men of C. P. T. went through the induction centers that they were not given a physical examination. If this be true, then the Army, in its induction centers was more than derelict in its duty. On the other hand, we are more than glad to state, every man who went through the induction centers was given an Army examination by Army doctors, and those of the 4,687 men that the Congressman talked about were then certified to noncombat flying programs. The examining boards found some 4,687 men fit for the programs of flying in which they had enlisted and for which training they had been called to active service, by Public, No. 50, passed by the Senate and the House and approved by the President.

Now Congressman COSTELLO would like the public to believe that the first medical examination these men had was after January 14, 1944—or at the time the training program was discontinued.

Either the Army Air Forces have not told the truth to Congressman COSTELLO or he is not familiar with the program. I have a copy of the medical break-down of the men who were examined after January 15, 1944. This report comes from Fort Worth, Tex., and it shows that a number of men were disqualified for flying because of flat feet. These men must have had the flat feet at the time they were examined by Army doctors prior to October 1, 1943. The report shows that men were thrown out of these flying programs because they were too tall or too short. The report shows that some men were over or underweight—these conditions must have been apparent at the time the Army doctors examined the men as of October 1, 1943.

Every man that the Congressman talks about in the group of 4,687 had also been given a medical examination by duly certified doctors of the C. A. A. If they could not have passed this examination by C. A. A. they could not have gotten into the program in the first place. Each individual man that the Congressman talks about had more physical examinations, by Government doctors than the average soldier would get in 3 years. These men got all of their examinations in a period of less than a year.

If this is not true and the Army took some 4,687 men into the Army and through regular induction centers at which basic training was given—then the men in charge of the induction centers should be relieved of their positions for taking a chance of loading the pension rolls with some 4,687 men who were not properly examined.

The public knows too well that this is not the case—the Army knows that they are not taking in any men without a physical—Congressman COSTELLO should know this—unless the Army has kidded him. We cannot believe with him that the men had no physical examinations from October 1, 1943, until after January 14 of 1944—a period of 3½ months.

These men were not called to active duty on January 14, 1944, as the Congressman states—they were called to duty on or before October 1, 1943, as a direct demand from the Congress of the United States, of which the Congressman is a Member. He must have voted for this, as did others, or the men of C. P. T. would not have been paid nor would this problem have come up.

I want to repeat again that the records of the various induction centers will show that the mental examinations of this group showed them to have the highest I. Q. of any group passing through any of the induction centers.

It is more than clear to me who prepared the material that the Congressman put into the RECORD on the date of June 10, 1944, page A2937. During the past year and more so in

the past few months I have attended some hearings on the problem of these stranded fliers. Each time the Army Air Forces have the same story—the Air Force story is the story that the Congressman tells you in his defense of his program of the WASPS.

For example he tells you of the Chinese interpreter—I have heard this story a dozen times, given by the Army in testimony. The truth of it is that this man was a former employee of the Chinese Embassy—he earned $12,000 a year—he had had private flying experience—he wanted to do his part—he got into C. P. T.—where he thought that his experience in flying would be of help to the war effort—he was promised a chance at a commission—he never got the chance for when the program of W. T. S. broke up he was assigned as a Chinese interpreter. The man is now a private in the Army in Florida. He is 36 years old and too old for overseas service, yet the man was a volunteer and his enlistment was for flying, not Chinese interpreter.

Records also show what happened to some of the instructors who were released at the time the program of W. T. S. was discontinued. One contractor—who had run and owned a contract-flying school—took the Army at its word; they needed men for the A. T. C. This man and 44 others were sent to Memphis, Tenn., for training in the transport section. They were sent in early February to this station. Now it is found out that after 4 months at this station these men have had 4 hours of ground school, not a single hour of flying, and their pay has been $300 per month. For what? For doing nothing. Now these men are to be rescreened to see if they are fit for the transport section.

Any member of the trainee group could have picked the misinformation that the Congressman has given out. In fact the Congressman should have had the C. A. A. go over his report before presenting it, for any informed person would have told him of the untruths that the Army, in preparing his statement, have used. It is impossible for any person who has not followed this program to know all of the facts, but what I have stated is a matter of public record and can be proved without trouble. I might also call to the attention of any one who wants to know all of the real facts and history of this problem to consult hearings on House Joint Resolution 115, Public Record No. 85548, dated Monday April 10, 1943, or Report No. 311, Calendar No. 317, of June 14 (legislative day, May 24, 1943).

I agree with the Congressman that we should not "force" the Army to do anything, but we should "force" the Army to take care of its promises. Why is it that the Navy has had no trouble with the same program? The reason is that the Navy has kept its word to every man that they enlisted. The mistake was made in Public, No. 50, in forcing the Army, by legislation, to take these 4,687 men. The Army knew at that time that it would find some way to get rid of them. The Army has found this way. They found it on January 14, 1944, when they discontinued the program and forced these patriotic men into work that they had not enlisted for, work for which they were not trained, and work which they do not want.

In talking with these trainees and with the instructors, I do not find any great objection to training the women—but only when and after the men have been used and used in the capacity for which they were trained.

Congressman MORRISON, I want you to know that I have no quarrel with Mr. COSTELLO, but it does seem to me that an article that enters into the lives of some 10,000 trainees and instructors should be verified before it is published. Congressman COSTELLO should take the Army Air Forces to task for "ghosting" such an article that is filled with so many untruths. Any member of the groups that are under discussion could have pointed out the errors to him; it is unfortunate that those who wrote the article for him should "kid" the Congressman who is sponsoring legislation for them.

I trust that you will be able to put this into the RECORD so that those who know the problems and the truth of the programs may have some defense.

Sincerely yours,

BRADLEY R. TAYLOR,
Polar Bear Association.

Overtime Pay for White-Collar Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's edition of the Washington Post for June 17, 1944, it is reported that—

President Roosevelt has described as fundamentally sound a recommendation that white-collar Federal employees be paid true time and a half for overtime work. His views were expressed in a letter to the National Federation of Federal Employees which was released yesterday by the white-collar union. These people now get 21.6 percent additional for a 48-hour week but they'd be paid 30 percent if they were paid true overtime.

The statement of President Roosevelt refers directly to an inequitable situation which prevails in the computation of overtime pay for thousands of Federal employees who receive their pay on a per annum basis. I have introduced H. R. 4406 to provide for the payment of true overtime compensation to Government employees. The main reason why the white-collar employees now receive 21.6 percent additional pay for a 48-hour week when other Federal employees who are paid on a per diem or per hour basis are paid 30 percent for their overtime work is because of a provision in the existing public laws.

Today, the basic week is 40 hours before overtime pay starts. Forty hours represent a work week of 5 days of 8 hours each day. Based upon 52 weeks in a year, there really are 260 work days. Unfortunately, under the present law and practice, overtime pay is, in fact, based upon a fictitious basis of 360 days in a work year. In the same Government building we now find some employees working overtime, and doing practically the same work as all other employees in the building, receiving overtime pay computed on a basis of 260 work days in the year, while others have their overtime pay computed on a basis of 360 days. My bill seeks to correct this inequity.

I am glad to note that President Roosevelt favors this legislation. I also wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House in support of this bill the report secured by Chairman RAMSPECK from the United States Civil Service Commission in which President Mitchell of the Commission reports that the Commission definitely favors the change proposed by H. R. 4406 with respect to the divisor to be used in converting annual rates to daily and hourly rates for overtime pay computation purposes.

During the entire period of the present war while the employees of the United States Government have been engaged in overtime work, the white-collar workers on annual salaries have been the victims of an unjust, unfortunate and inequitable discrimination in their overtime pay.

I have brought my bill, H. R. 4406, to the attention of members of the House Committee on the Civil Service and I am hopeful that the committee will grant a hearing upon it in the near future. I do not know of anyone who opposes the passage of legislation which will correct this inequity and I will be pleased to agree to any amendments to the bill which I have offered which will restrict its application to the elimination of this inequity in the present law. I will appreciate the active support of all of my colleagues in the passage of this legislation.

The provisions of my bill and the terms of the report from the United States Civil Service Commission indicate clearly the means and need for this remedial legislation. They are as follows:

H. R. 4406

A bill to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That public law No. 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 93, first session, is amended by striking out all of section 2, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3, officers and employees to whom this act applies shall be paid overtime compensation for work in excess of 40 hours in any administrative workweek at a rate of one and one-half times their basic rates of compensation: *Provided*, That in computing the overtime compensation of per annum officers and employees, the base pay for 1 day shall be considered to be one-two-hundred-and-sixtieth of the respective per annum salaries, and the base pay for 1 hour shall be considered to be one-eighth of base pay so computed for 1 day.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1944.

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman, House Committee on the Civil Service, House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request of March 17, 1944, receipt of which was acknowledged March 20, we are presenting to the House Committee on the Civil Service our comments on H. R. 4406, a bill to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes. This bill proposes a substitute for section 2 of the War Overtime Pay Act of May 7, 1943, Public Law 49, Seventy-eighth Congress. If enacted into law, it would—

1. Repeal the present provision that overtime pay shall be computed on only so much of an employee's annual salary as does not exceed a rate of $2,900 per annum.

2. Repeal the present provision that departments and agencies may elect to grant employees compensatory time off from duty in lieu of overtime pay for work in excess of 48 hours in any administrative workweek.

3. Substitute a divisor of 260 in lieu of the present divisor of 360 for converting annual

rates into daily rates for overtime pay computation purposes.

The discontinuance of the existing ceiling of $2,900 for overtime computation purposes is primarily one of legislative policy. However, the discontinuance of authority for compensatory time off from duty in lieu of overtime pay for work in excess of 48 hours a week would remove an item of flexibility in the administration of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943 which we believe should be retained.

The Commission definitely favors the change proposed by H. R. 4406 with respect to the divisor to be used in converting annual rates to daily and hourly rates for overtime pay computation purposes.

Government employees generally are paid at basic annual, daily, or hourly rates. There is no statute establishing a uniform rule for converting these basic pay rates into overtime pay rates. In fact, existing law requires inconsistency.

In order to compute overtime earnings, it is first necessary to determine the overtime rate per hour. Under Public Law 49 and under daily and hourly wage schedules, the overtime rate per hour is one and one-half times the straight-time hourly rate. An inconsistency occurs, however, in computing the straight-time hourly rate.

The statutory method for computing straight-time hourly rates from annual rates is first to divide the annual rate by 360 (to give the straight-time daily rate) and then to divide this daily rate by 8 (to give the straight-time hourly rate). This formula is predicated on the theory that annual workers are paid for 360 days' work in the year, or 2,880 hours. At present, however, the basic workweek for annual-salaried workers is 40 hours a week. Work above that is overtime service. The year's work corresponding to the year's basic salary thus in fact consists of a basic work period of 40 times 52, or 2,080 hours, or 260 days.

Although the same basic workyear of 2,080 hours is recognized in computing overtime pay for wage-board employees, it cannot be recognized for employees under Public Law 49 without new legislation.

An illustration will show the effect of the difference in the two methods.

A mechanic whose basic workweek is 40 hours works 48 hours in 1 week. For the 8 hours of overtime service he receives the equivalent of 12 hours' (8 times 1½) pay at his straight hourly rate, or an increase of twelve-fortieths of his basic weekly earnings. This is a 30-percent increase.

A stock clerk in the same plant whose basic workweek is 40 hours works 48 hours in the same week. For the extra 8 hours of overtime he is paid one-three hundred and sixtieth of his annual basic rate (1/360 times ⅛ times 8), times one and one-half. This is equivalent to a weekly increase of one-two hundred and fortieth of his basic annual earnings, or a weekly increase of fifty-two two hundred and fortieths of his basic weekly earnings. This is a 21.67-percent increase.

Thus the mechanic and the stock clerk under the same circumstances receive a 30-percent and a 21.67-percent increase, respectively, over basic weekly earnings.

This difference is also clearly illustrated in the case of employees whose annual earnings are substantially the same without overtime, e. g., a mechanical employee, paid at $1.20 an hour and a salaried draftsman paid at $2,500 a year. For working regular 40-hour schedules for 52 weeks, the mechanic would be paid $2,496 and the draftsman $2,500. For each hour in excess of 40 hours a week the mechanic is paid one and one-half times $1.20, or $1.80. The draftsman is paid $1.30 ($2,500 divided by 360, divided by 8, multiplied by 1½) for each overtime hour, or 50 cents per hour less than the mechanic, although their straight-time annual earnings are substantially the same rate.

We believe this inconsistency should be corrected. Consequently, irrespective of the retention or repeal of the $2,900 limitation on overtime pay computation, if H. R. 4406 were modified so as to retain the option of compensatory time-off for work in excess of 48 hours a week, we would recommend favorable action.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that any proposal to repeal the present $2,900 ceiling for overtime computation purposes would not be in accord with the program of the President. In other respects the Bureau of the Budget advises that there are no objections to the submission of this report to your committee.

By direction of the Commission:

Very respectfully,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

Why Spend $100,000,000 on the WASP Program?—Read What Miss Cassini Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, entitled "These Charming People," by Austine Cassini. When you consider that the WASP program will cost $100,000,000 for 5,000 WASPS, notwithstanding the fact there are 10,000 men already trained in the C. A. A.–W. T. S. program, many of us wonder why such an expensive program of duplication.

Miss Cassini has her version, which is as follows:

THESE CHARMING PEOPLE

(By Austine Cassini)

The little people are the Irish ancestors of the more recent English gremelins. Right here in Washington, pattering around in places like the Pentagon, are plenty of little people. They know more than anyone suspects and sometimes open valves letting leaks out into Washington. Some of the best inside news comes from irked or mischievous little people:

Miss Jaqueline Cochran, flying organizer and head of the the WASPS, has been trying for some time for a commission as colonel, which would equal Oveta Hobby's. Up until recently the slim, brown-eyed "Jackie" kept two telephones busy from her suite in the Statler Hotel, rushed around hopefully, but not very successfully. Although there was much talk and even printed publicity her chances looked skimpy.

However, in Washington it isn't how you win friends and influence people, it's how you or your friends win influential people. Meeting the right person can help even the most lost or strayed causes.

In the last week the shapely pilot has seen her coveted commission coming closer and closer. * * * One of the highest-placed generals, it seems, gazed into her eyes, and since then has taken her cause celebre very much "to heart" * * * She's such an attractive composition of wind-blown bob, smiling eyes and outdoor skin nobody blames him.

It's whispered he's battling like a knight of olde, or olde knight, for "the faire Cochran." So the announcement can be expected any day that Jackie's commission has been approved, if the captivated general is victorious in his tournaments.

Bees to Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the late Frank Bacon in Lightnin' used to assure us that he had herded a swarm of bees across the plains from St. Louis to California and "never lost a bee."

That is not the way we bring bees to Alaska, but we bring them just the same, as indicated by the following news release of June 16, 1944, of the Pan American World Airways:

BUSY BEES WING WAY TO ALASKAN NORTHLAND

The bees are winging to Alaska.

A major achievement in air cargo operations was scored by the express department of Pan American World Airways' Alaska sector when 10,000 bees were flown successfully from Seattle to Fairbanks, Alaska, recently.

Transported from California more than 2,270 miles in 3 days by railway express and Pan American Lodestar plane in special containers the bees were delivered to a prominent Fairbanks attorney, Julian Guy Rivers, whose hobby is bee raising.

It was one of the few successful attempts ever made to ship bees to Alaska. En route, utmost care was required to hold to a minimum the loss of life among the bees, highly sensitive to rough handling, changes in climate, and high altitudes.

The shipment, weighing 37 pounds, consisted of three fine-screen cages constructed to provide a maximum of fresh air and feeding facilities for the thousands of winged "passengers."

Now Alaskan sourdoughs can enjoy their hotcakes with honey from local hives and the new bee population will aid materially in the pollenization of Alaska's plants and flowers.

The Citizen's Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if there is one branch of government in which more than any other the people have had confidence, upon which they have relied for protection, it is the judicial branch. The right to a trial by jury, in a court

presided over by a judge who was respected for his ability and integrity, we thought would never be taken from us.

Perhaps unconsciously but indubitably in the back of our minds has always been the thought that here we were certain of "equal justice under law"; that every citizen would be judged by and in accordance with the law, rather than by an arbitrary administrator. Between the dictator—the petty official or the exalted administrator or executive—and the citizen, protecting him, was the court.

More than 700 years ago, in June of 1215, in the meadows of Runnymede on the Thames River, the barons by force won from King John Magna Carta the great charter of human liberty. Not until our forefathers were some 3,000 miles from their home did George III forget the lesson.

The Declaration of Independence called his attention to his denial of justice through an accessible and impartial court. By 8 long years of cruel warfare the right was reestablished. The Constitution was written, once again guaranteeing to citizens government by law, trial by a free and an independent judiciary.

For 160 years, the citizen was safe, secure in the exercise of his rights and privileges. Not until the coming of the New Deal did anyone attempt to interfere with the integrity of our courts. Then an impatient President, determined to impose his theories upon the people, surrounded by advisers who brazenly proclaimed that our form of Government was outmoded, that America should be remade, attempted to pack the Supreme Court.

Although thwarted in that plan by an outraged public sentiment, the President has appointed 296 of the 318 sitting Federal judges. Many of the appointments were political, were undoubtedly made with the idea that the judges held, and would in their opinions, give expression to, at least some of the political and economic theories held by the President.

Next, Congress fell under the Executive influence to such an extent that it was known as a rubber-stamp Congress. Laws were enacted and so construed as to give administrators the power to govern the daily conduct of millions of our citizens by directives, each order but another name for decree; each in effect a law promulgated, not by the legislative, the lawmaking, branch; enforced, not by the courts, but by the executive, or law-enforcing, branch.

Boards and administrators have usurped the functions of the legislature, the judiciary. By Executive order, the plant of Montgomery Ward is seized, a railroad is taken over, and for more than a year has been operated, by the Government, as have industrial plants.

Within the past few days, the War Manpower Commission has told the citizens that hereafter men will be required to work where told. W. L. B. has told employers what wage they should pay. Workers, like employers, are no longer free. W. M. C. classes their labor as merchandise. Merchants have been told at what price goods must be sold, even though the order was oppressive upon the consumer. Farmers have been told how much wheat to grow; fined for every bushel produced in excess of the Administrator's limitation. Eggs are sold by the Government at $30 a carload—one-sixth of a cent a dozen—for hog feed.

Last week, when the continuation of the O. P. A. was before Congress, it required a bitter struggle in the House to incorporate in the act a provision giving the individual citizen the right to a court appeal from the arbitrary order of the Administrator. That law has many an amazing and incredible provision. Let me cite just one: The Administrator charging a citizen with a violation of an order or directive may make his own independent investigation, and the citizen is denied the right to prove the inaccuracy of the data which it is said shows his guilt.

Not only is the citizen denied his day in court; he is not even given the privilege of knowing what evidence has been adduced against him. It remains to be seen, when the bill comes back from the upper branch, whether Congress will insist that the rights gained by Magna Carta, won by the Revolutionary War, guaranteed by the Constitution, will be restored to our citizens.

Unless the Members of the present Congress protect the rights of the citizen, they should be replaced by representatives who will carry out, no matter what the cost, the people's will, in accordance with constitutional provisions.

Representative Fish Meets His Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 15, 1944:

REPRESENTATIVE FISH MEETS HIS OPPOSITION

The Rockland County Republican Committee in New York endorsed the candidacy of Representative HAMILTON FISH by a vote of 127 to 63 the other night, but only after a bit of maneuvering that illustrates how desperately the internationalists and New Deal fellow travelers would like to remove Representative FISH from Congress. A group of so-called Republican leaders who oppose Representative FISH tried to get the committee to endorse the candidacy of Augustus W. Bennett, a Newburgh, N. Y., lawyer. After Representative FISH won the Republican endorsement, the Rockland County Democratic Committee endorsed Bennett as the Democratic candidate.

Representative FISH has earned the undying hatred of a small group of people in his own party because he believes that America ought to be governed by and for Americans and not for the benefit of European aristocracy. These people hate him so much they would try to ring in a Democrat on the Republican ticket if it would displace him. This dodge, of course, was no more successful than any of the other conspiracies and smears of which Representative FISH has been target.

Representative FISH returned from the First World War with a remarkable battle record. He kept a reserve commission in the intervening years and was ready to set forth again in this war. He even took a refresher course at an Army camp a few months before Pearl Harbor. Representative FISH has been a congressional leader in the move to keep American attention focused on American interests. It is hard to traduce the patriotism of a man like Representative FISH, but the internationalists haven't failed for lack of trying. They failed because the people know how dishonest and despicable their attempts were. Representative FISH was returned to Congress in 1942 and there is no reason to believe he won't be reelected this November, the antics of Rockland County's pseudo-Republican minority notwithstanding.

Sense in Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is food for thought in a booklet that has recently come to the desk of the Members of Congress from A. W. Lafferty who I am told was a former Member of Congress who now resides in the historic Calvert mansion at Riverdale, Md., suburban to the city of Washington. This mansion was one time owned by the late Senator Caraway. Mr. Lafferty has a novel way of presenting his views on national and international issues. There is inserted herewith an article from his book on current topics:

WINGS WIN!

(Peace conference, ad interim, before Chief Justice Hughes, wherein Churchill and Hitler have it out.)

DRAMATIS PERSONAE

High Cockalorum	Churchill
Low Cockahirum	Hitler
Chief of Protocol	Daladier
Horse Sense	Hull
The Chairman	Chief Justice Hughes

AGENDA

1. Money.
2. More money.
3. Much more money.

ROUND 1

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, you birds; and no punches below the equator.

Mr. CHURCHILL. Mr. Chairman [takes long drink of water]. The war may be long, and it may be short; it all depends on General Gort.

Mr. HITLER. Herr Chairman, I would not deceive for the world, but Herr Colonel-General Wilhelm Goering has told me, confidentially, that it will be a blitzkrieg.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Colonel-General disclose the winner?

Mr. DALADIER. Oh, Monsieur Chairman, you have placed one digit directly on the point!

Mr. HULL. Brass tacks, gentlemen, what's the row all about?

Mr. HITLER. England has it. Germany wants it.

Mr. CHURCHILL. Englishmen must make money or perish.

Mr. HITLER. Germans must make geld or they die.

Mr. DALADIER. Frenchmen must make argent or croak.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, your crystal logic and keen analysis has clarified the atmosphere.

Mr. HULL (in aside). (The most sensitive nerve in the human body is the one leading to the pocket book.)

(Bell.)

ROUND 2

The CHAIRMAN. What is this, a sit-down war?

Mr. CHURCHILL. It might be so designated, Mr. Chairman, for both sides expected to sit pretty and let the aviators fight it out.

Mr. HITLER. And when the first British airmen fell, German aviators buried them with full military honors, draped in the Union Jack, hastily fashioned by the nimble and sympathetic fingers of German hausfraus.

Mr. CHURCHILL. And British airmen immediately reciprocated.

Mr. DALADIER. It seems, Monsieur Chairman, that there is a deep fraternity between men of wings, which has not been taken into full account by any general staff. The hazard of flying satisfies their chivalry. Their heroes are the great civilian fliers.

Mr. HULL. Is it not off-color, gentlemen, for any belligerent to expect its naturally chivalrous airmen to drop death bombs upon defenseless men, women, and children?

Mr. CHURCHILL. In the long stretch of human experience many things go by contraries——

Mr. DALADIER. Plans back-fire, so to speak, Monsieur.

Mr. CHURCHILL. And while the world predicted that this war would be fought from the air, it now turns out that the boys who go up into the clouds in ships may make it a "blitz peace" instead of a "blitzkrieg."

(Bell.)

The CHAIRMAN. Wings win, in this round.

ROUND 3

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, the subject is still money.

Mr. HULL. And how to make it without murder.

Mr. HITLER. Germany must have living space. Even the caveman had a little privacy——

Mr. DALADIER. And he needed it, Monsieur.

Mr. HULL. Politicians, the world over, are barely tolerated. Do you gentlemen realize that?

Mr. DALADIER. True, Monsieur Secretaire, whilst constructive men, the world over, are venerated.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you're getting somewhere. Let me read you from Two hundred and eighty-five United States Code, page 262: "The advances in the exact sciences and the achievements in invention remind us that the seemingly impossible sometimes happens. * * * To stay experimentation in things social and economic is a grave responsibility."

Mr. CHURCHILL. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree, in principle, with the text just read.

Mr. HITLER. Ja, here too, Herr Chairman!

Mr. CHURCHILL. The British Empire has always held that sympathy and understanding come from concerted effort in solving mutual difficulties.

Mr. DALADIER. Bravo, Monsieur Churchill!

(Bell.)

Mr. CHURCHILL. After a cup of tea, I move that we take up the Yankee proposal for a uniform world money.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROUND 4

The CHAIRMAN. The subject is still money.

Mr. HULL. Latin America has recently proposed a common money for the Americas, and it is under study.

Mr. CHURCHILL. Why can't we better commercial welfare for all by an identical world monetary unit, a coin of gold and silver, at a fixed ratio of silver to gold?

The CHAIRMAN. The Republicans professed to favor silver's remonetization by international agreement in the Bryan campaign of 1896.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Borah introduced a proposal January 5, 1932, for a universal silver ounce coin, to be called the quanto, divided into 100 quantimes.

Mr. DALADIER. Monsieur Chairman, the fees of money changers, plus the hazards of exchange fluctuations, constitute what seems to be a removable drag on twentieth-century trade.

Mr. HITLER. Some travelers by air now need to get their money changed several times daily——

Mr. DALADIER. And they get gypped with every change, Monsieur!

Mr. HITLER. The airplane, in utter disregard of distance, has already crowded all countries together as neighbors, in a geographical sense.

Mr. CHURCHILL. And the impact of the airplane's influence on civilization may yet force all countries to be neighbors, in a real sense. Only recently did God trust this mighty power to the hand of man.

Mr. DALADIER. Monsieur Chairman, it is obvious that we must all henceforth reside together, as neighboring states, on one very small planet, whether we like it or not. And the Paris modes next year will be irresistible!

Mr. HITLER. Herr Chairman, I am an artist. I can visualize the wings of peace fanning the fingertips of the world!

Mr. CHURCHILL. A good reach for that bird would be a grand finale.

Mr. HITLER. Where there is a will there is a way, Herr Churchill!

(Bell.)

The CHAIRMAN. Ladies and gentlemen, meet the winners! Wright brothers, of the little bicycle repair shop, Dayton, Ohio!

(Curtain.)

4–H Clubs and O. P. A. Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter containing information of interest to 4–H Club members, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1944.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your personal interest in the correspondence you received from Ed F. Stout, county extension director, Maquoketa, Iowa, in which he inquires as to whether or not there has been any change in the regulations governing the sales of 4–H and F. F. A. groups.

Many of our regulations have been amended so as to provide certain advantages to 4–H Clubs which have not been made available to others. For example, M. P. R. 469 which establishes maximum prices for live hogs specifically exempts 4–H Club hogs from the maximum-price provisions of that regulation. Likewise, R. M. P. R. 169 which imposes a liability on slaughterers who custom kill animals purchased at excessive prices excludes 4–H Club cattle from these custom-slaughter restrictions. Moreover, the ceiling prices prescribed by the cattle-stabilization program do not apply to 4–H Club animals.

It is not anticipated that there will be any change in the handling of 4–H Club sales. You may wish to advice Mr. Stout that the situation remains the same as it was last year.

Assuring you of our desire to be of assistance whenever possible, I am,

Very truly yours,

JAMES L. HARRISON,
Congressional Liaison Officer,
Office of Price Administration.

Church's Challenge to Totalitarianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I am inserting a copy of a speech made by John Towle, Topeka, Kans., to the members of the St. Paul's Lutheran Men's Club. Mr. Towle is State historian of the American Legion, a prominent and patriotic citizen of Shawnee County. I know others will be interested in this fine address:

Members of St. Paul's Lutheran Church Men's Club, I wish to thank Rev. Mr. Biel for his invitation to address this gathering this evening. I assure him and each of you present that I am happy to be here and to speak to you on matters which you, as good Americans and good citizens, hold dear.

Religion and patriotism—two virtues essential for man—one for the salvation of his soul and the other for his existence upon this earth; these two influences, which should be dominant in the lives of all of us, seem to be on the wane, on a decline. Godlessness has taken the place of religion in America today, and selfishness, a desire to put a few days or months of false prosperity to the front and to relegate real patriotism, a real love of country, to the background.

In a country scourged with the virus of Nazi-ism, the world has for its example that outstanding Lutheran minister, Niemoller, the Catholic archbishops of Cologne and Munich, and the bishop of Berlin, men who have brought upon their heads the vengeance of Hitler and his cohorts because they refused to beckon to expediency, because they put justice in its proper place, and that, of course, is in the first place; because principle to them was more than the smile of friendship of tyrants. The need for men of courage such as these men have exemplified in the face of persecution during the past several years is needed in our own country.

Our soldiers have it, our sailors have it, in fact all members of our armed forces have it—they are displaying it daily—the invasion

of Europe which began early Tuesday morning of this week will prove to us that we need never be ashamed of the gallantry of our boys. June 6 this year will go down into history as the momentous day of our century; it will leave its niche in the annals of the human race because it will be the dawn of liberation of the conquered peoples; however, as Milt Tabor stated in the Capital editorially on Wednesday morning, the elation over our initial success should be tempered with the sobering thought that this is a time to pray, and not a time to cheer—Americans, our own flesh and blood, are fighting in the air and on the sea and on the beaches—men who were boys only yesterday are enduring a fiery baptismal which civilians at home can never have the capacity to understand. We can only pray that the Lord God of Hosts will be with them, giving them strength to sustain them during the ordeal—we on the home front must not fail them by not possessing the same qualities of courage which they have.

Abraham Lincoln once said, "What is morally wrong can never be politically right." It never pays to adopt the expedient attitude because one might suffer politically or otherwise who adopted an attitude contrary to the dictates of his conscience. Someone once said, "Expediency is the wisdom of man. Doing right is the wisdom of God."

Perhaps never before in our Nation has the need been so great for outstanding leadership—men who put first things first and there is no reflection on us when we put our religion and our country in those places.

When we do so, when we put religion in first place we are ridiculed by these so-called modern pagans—when we put our country next to our faith we are called isolationists, by the same clique. They are more concerned about establishment of a world empire—and it matters little to them whether that superstate will be controlled by Communists or imperialists; perhaps because there is so very little difference between these two theories.

We have all been touched by the Biblical account of Christ who went to one of the hills bordering Jersualem and there wept for the unfortunate inhabitants of that city who were steeped in sin. While Jesus loved all mankind—and was weighted down by the sins of the entire world—yet we read, "And He wept." He would today be branded as an isolationist because He wept over the sins of His own—He should, according to the New Deal crowd, have been more concerned about the sins of Rome and Babylon. There is an old axiom, "Charity begins at home." That is true, and I challenge these new false patriots to show us why we should be more concerned about another nation than our own. If they are right, then Washington and Jefferson were wrong.

In an address delivered before the Young Men's Lyceum, at Springfield, Ill., Abraham Lincoln said, "If danger is ever to reach us it cannot come from abroad." "If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all times or die by suicide." The Great Emancipator surely uttered prophetic words in that memorable address. We do not stand at the crossroads any longer—we have already gone down the road to the left leading to chaos and destruction—we now have to turn back—that is the challenge confronting us today. Do we lack the courage, are we entirely devoid of principle? If we still possess these virtues which made us a great nation, we will demand a halt and a backward course on the road so that we can again enter the road which will lead us to a free nation—to a nation envisioned by the founders of our country and given us through their blood; unless we again assert our rights, we have allowed them to have bled and died in vain. We have allowed the millions of our boys who have died in the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, World Wars No. 1 and No. 2 to have died ignominiously.

I appeal to you as good Christians and loyal Americans to take a firm and positive stand for justice and to see that the isms which have ruined practically all of Europe are not allowed to do the same to our beloved land. Encroachment upon our liberties has already gone too far; are we going to allow this evil to slowly creep upon us until it has finally strangled us, or are we going to see that bureaucracy is abolished? It is not the American way of life; it is to our country what communism is to Russia, what nazi-ism is to Germany, what imperialism is to England, and what fascism was to Italy. We know what these tyrannical systems have accomplished in those unfortunate countries; we know the havoc and destruction they have wrought; are we going to profit by asserting our rights to see that we are not shackled by a system just as vicious, because it is identical, or are we going to allow ourselves and our children and their children to exist, not live as we have known life, in a vast country where liberty and freedom once our happy possession were? If we fail, we will have brought shame upon our heads and the malediction of all future generations. These are somber thoughts, and we must realize that to our generation has befallen the lot to choose the heritage we must give our children; will it be the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and the Bill of Rights guaranteeing to them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, or will it be a despotic, tyrannical government—a government not by the people and of the people and for the people, but a centralized government, existing for the exploitation of the masses, a government not deriving its powers from the governed, but a government existing for the few at the cost of enslavement of the many; a government which undertook to destroy hogs about to give birth to a litter of pigs, a government which plowed under every third row of crops while starvation ravaged the land—a land which had so-called overproduction while the people throughout the land were starving, a government which sanctions the starving of Hindus who worked for 6 cents a day as agricultural workers in India, and 12 cents a day as skilled workmen and mechanics in Bombay, Singapore, Calcutta, and other great oriental cities?

The anger of God will descend upon us unless we work and strive as Christians and Americans to correct injustice and alleviate suffering. The starvation of millions of children in the occupied countries of Europe will be a stern rebuke to us; while some effort has been made to send food to these unfortunates, Churchill has not consented to this humanitarian act. Our Lord Himself spoke in the deep anger of love of those who abused children. "Better a millstone around his neck," He said, "than that anyone injure one of His little ones." Unless we as a nation act to feed these poor starving children of Europe, can we hope to have His blessing? This is the only kind of interventionism that Washington and Jefferson and Madison would approve.

Clif Stratton, the able Capital's Washington correspondent, described the situation in our country in a few words when he stated May 8, 1944, that we do not want the lives of our boys divided into three pens—breeding pens, feeding pens, and slaughter pens—and that the nationalization of youth can be carried too far.

Our Nation today is infested with modern Judases and Pilates—men who are willing to sell the birthright of posterity for a mess of pottage for themselves. These betrayers of Christianity and civilization are in high places. They exist in both church and state. No church is blessed to the extent that it cannot say it has none of them. Every political subdivision has more than its share of these contemptible rascals.

These things should not dishearten us but should give us greater impetus to see that wrongs are corrected. We have to fight only harder when we are betrayed. Christ had twelve apostles—one sold Him for 30 pieces of silver, another denied Him, another had such little faith that he would not believe in the Risen Saviour until he could touch the wounds in His side, His hands, and His feet; none would pray with Him in His hour of agony at Gethsemane.

While the future looks dark, we must not despair; we have in our country, in our midst, men who are courageous and who are willing to sacrifice political gains for principle. A great statesman once said, "I would rather be right than President." Harry Woodring has exemplified that by rather being right than Secretary of War.

While some of you may not always agree with our Congressman, the Honorable WILLIAM F. LAMBERTSON, we must all admit that he has consistently fought the nullification of our Constitution and those who wish to make us a part of a vassal state, knowing that he would lose a few votes—our present Governor, Mr. Schoeppel has displayed the same virtue—and so we can derive some strength in the knowledge that all men in public office are not corrupt; that we still have many who are for our Nation first, last, and all the time. Both political parties have enough courageous men in their ranks to lead our country to sanity if only the masses will follow. We must see that the two tickets this fall when Presidential election will be held will be men of higher caliber than 4 years ago.

We must see that on one ticket a man is nominated who will not make solemn promises that will not be kept and who will defend the Constitution and the Bill of Rights instead of using every means to nullify them.

On the other ticket we must see that the man who receives the nomination will not travel the length and breadth of the land, making long and loud promises and then later say with a shrug, "That was only campaign oratory."

Woodrow Wilson was elected President on the promise that he would keep us out of war, and his Fourteen Points went out the same way the "four freedoms" are disappearing today. "With what little wisdom the world is ruled," Oxenstiern said about 300 years ago. If true then, it is never so true as now. Milt Tabor last Sunday stated, "As we interpret the stories now being printed about the Teheran Conference, Churchill and Stalin whittled down Mr. Roosevelt's 'four freedoms' until they disappeared. They substituted 'one freedom'—freedom for Britain and Russia to do as they please after Germany and Japan are licked. Looks as if we were taken upon a mountain and shown green fields, and instead of resisting the temptation we fell down and worshiped the wrong gods."

Congressman SHORT, of Missouri, in an address in Chicago last week, stated that we are fighting a war both here and abroad, but that the domestic foe will be the hardest to lick. We must have a reformation in our country or revolution will be inevitable.

The encroachments upon personal liberty have only started; consider the proposals now in the minds of the "brain trust" for the federalization of schools, the socialization of medicine; in fact, the usurpation of power to control the hands and minds of all—consider these facts and then resolve to see that you and your children and your children's children will live as freemen; unshackle the chains of slavery which are already being felt around our necks; break these chains while yet breakable. Unless we do so now, the links of that chain of bondage will become so strong they will be unbreakable and we will fall under the yoke of serfdom.

Chester Bowles on Post-War Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Chester Bowles to the New York Times on post-war price policies:

[From the New York Times of June 18, 1944]

POST-WAR PRICE POLICIES—FLEXIBLE RECONVERSION CONTROL IS HELD NECESSARY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I must express my appreciation of your recent editorials concerning extension by Congress of the Emergency Price Control Act. I am confident that this country will never abandon price stabilization and embark on an inflationary course with its eyes open. The danger that it would make this decision with its eyes closed has been significantly diminished by your stand.

In the editorial of June 6 you expressed some concern about the problem of reconversion pricing; that is, the pricing of peacetime products which will become necessary as plants are converted to peacetime use. You are fearful that a policy of tight pricing by the O. P. A. might, on many products, seriously hamper the resumption of peacetime production.

During the past 2 years our primary attention has necessarily been given to current pricing problems. We have also, however, considered at great length the problems of price control that will emerge during the reconversion period, problems that must be solved wisely if our economy is to make a smooth transition from war to peace. Although it has been impossible to prepare an exact blueprint, I think we know pretty well the general principles along which our future pricing policies must develop.

MUST CHECK INFLATION

Our first objective obviously must be to continue to hold inflation in check. Both in the months which lie directly ahead of us and in the months of reconversion which follow we must see that the general price level does not get out of hand. We will be wise not to forget the fact that 40 percent of the inflation during the period of World War No. 1 actually occurred after the armistice. The price rise did not reach its peak until May 1920—18 months after the guns ceased firing in Europe.

War Production Board officials have stated that reconversion on any major scale will be impossible until after the defeat of Germany. This means that our present manpower shortage and the general shortage of goods will continue to cause heavy pressures on the present price level until after the European armistice.

It seems essential to me that this pressure be met and the present price levels maintained. This will require a continuation of tight pricing in the immediate future.

RECONVERSION PROBLEM

When reconversion really begins in earnest, however, we will be confronted with a quite different situation. Billions of dollars of Government war contracts will be eliminated. Purchasing power will begin to drop. A return to a normal work week averaging 40 hours will itself through the elimination of overtime, cut purchasing power by $12,000,000,000 a year. This reduction of twelve billions is wholly apart from any changes in current levels of employment and wage rates or from current concentration in the heavy and high-wage industries.

If we are to avoid a serious dislocation of our economy it is obvious that our pricing policies during this difficult reconversion period will call for skillful handling. Our pricing policies must be designed to encourage the fullest possible employment and quick transition to full peace-time production. If we are to avoid a further dangerous drop in producing power they must also encourage the continuation of high hourly wage rates.

As quickly as supply in each field now covered by price control comes in line with demand, price ceilings must be eliminated. In the final analysis, it is only through adequate supplies that we can hope to eliminate the forces which seek to push prices upward.

PRICE-CEILING ADJUSTMENT

There are, however, many industries in which, during the reconversion period, price ceilings must be adjusted upward. For example, there are many industries whose peacetime goods have been out of production for 2 years or longer. In many cases these goods cannot profitably be brought back into production at the same prices which prevailed in 1941 or 1942. Costs have not stood still and prices cannot ignore the movement of costs. If we were to insist upon holding to the prices of 1941 or 1942 for these goods there is no question but that production would be hampered, unemployment increased, and wage rates lowered. This is a relatively simple case and one in which there would be no question on the part of O. P. A. as to how we should proceed.

Let me take a somewhat more difficult case. There are many industries which are operating today under very favorable profit conditions, largely because of the war business they receive. The wide margins on these war items enable these industries to operate with low margins on civilian goods. Sometime or other these industries must convert back to peacetime production. When they lose their profitable wartime output, prices of their civilian-type items must be increased. If this is not done the result will be powerful deflationary pressure upon wages and upon prices of the raw materials purchased by these industries.

In this case, too, our position is quite clear. There will, of course, be some question as to exactly when the adjustments must be made and just how much prices are to be increased. But when the time comes we must move to adjust prices where necessary and to avoid bringing positive deflationary pressure to bear upon prices and wages.

In other words, our price policy in the reconversion period must be a flexible policy which will foster full production and full employment at high wage rates. It is our hope that during this period our basic supplies of food and textiles will be sufficient to allow us to remove ceilings on these items with reasonable speed without resulting increases in the retail prices. It is also our hope that with increased building construction and the gradual redistribution of war workers it will be possible for us to eliminate rent control, area by area, as tenant vacancies begin to increase.

There are certain areas in our economy, however, where inflation will continue to be a serious threat. I am thinking of consumer durables, such as vacuum cleaners, washing machines, and automobiles, where supplies for a considerable period will be running far behind. If price controls are removed too quickly from these items we would soon see a repetition of the dangerous inflationary boom that we experienced in 1919, perhaps on a far greater scale. I am also thinking of the building industry, where millions of citizens with substantial savings accounts will be only too willing to bid high for the materials and the equipment to create the homes to which they have long looked forward. In other words, I see in this period a system of selective price control in certain areas, with relatively rapidly decreasing controls on easy-to-produce consumer items and on rent.

MASS PRODUCTION NEEDED

There is one final principle involved in our reconversion and post-war pricing problem which lies very close to my heart. During the war our economy has demonstrated more convincingly than it ever did in times of peace how magnificently it can mass produce. It is a primary and fundamental requirement of this characteristic of our economy that industry price its output low enough to tap mass markets, for it is only these markets that can keep our vast productive capacity in operation.

Unless industry follows this policy vigorously there is very little prospect of maintaining the level of national income and production whatever we may do in other directions.

This will take courage and vision on the part of industry, but it is utterly essential. If industry as a whole or any significant industrial sector is going once again to price on the basis of breaking even at 50 percent of capacity, we are going to find ourselves operating at just about 50 percent of capacity. I think we are all agreed that that is an intolerable condition and one which the country will never accept. But, in my opinion, if industry is to recognize this fundamental requirement and is to price for mass markets and full production, there must be firm guaranties provided that the bottom will not be permitted to drop out of the price and wage structure. I hope those guaranties will be forthcoming.

What I have said falls far short of a blueprint, but I believe the principles themselves are clear and that they will be widely accepted. We must continue to seek stabilization of the general price level. But this does not mean stabilization of every individual price. There must be flexibility in the price structure.

Today, I believe, the price level as a whole is in reasonable balance with costs. If this balance is maintained during the reconversion and post-war periods, production can go forward on a profitable basis. This is what we have been seeking all through the war years, and in achieving it I think we have helped to lay the basis for a sound economy in the years that lie ahead.

CHESTER BOWLES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 12, 1944.*

Analysis of Vote in General Election of 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, the following material was prepared by W. L. Forrest, of Madison, Wis., and, at his request, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

The material for this analysis was taken from the Congressional Directory of January 1943 and the material dealing with the vote cast in the general election of 1940.

The columns under No. 1 show the standing of each State based upon the number of Congressmen elected, population, and vote cast. The columns under No. 2 show the standing of each based upon the total vote cast in each State and the unfair representation in Congress by the poll-tax States.

NUMBER 1

States	Congressmen	Population	Votes
1. New York	45	13,479,142	6,093,202
2. Pennsylvania	34	9,900,180	4,003,590
3. Illinois	27	7,897,241	4,008,860
4. Ohio	24	6,901,612	3,068,195
5. Texas [1]	21	6,414,824	1,019,417
6. California	20	6,907,387	2,714,754
7. Michigan	17	5,256,106	1,986,752
8. Massachusetts	15	4,316,721	1,964,538
9. New Jersey	14	4,160,165	1,862,396
10. Missouri	13	3,784,664	1,816,729
11. North Carolina	12	3,571,623	797,655
12. Indiana	12	3,427,796	1,761,624
13. Wisconsin	10	3,137,587	1,268,693
14. Georgia [1]	10	3,123,723	271,523
15. Tennessee [1]	10	2,915,841	417,157
16. Kentucky	9	2,845,627	890,898
17. Alabama [1]	9	2,832,961	267,145
18. Minnesota	9	2,792,300	1,205,754
19. Virginia [1]	9	2,677,773	316,576
20. Iowa	9	2,538,268	1,114,963
21. Oklahoma	9	2,336,434	766,041
22. Louisiana [1]	8	2,363,880	321,044
23. Mississippi [1]	7	2,183,796	146,219
24. Arkansas [1]	7	1,949,387	208,890
25. Kansas	7	1,801,028	787,652
26. West Virginia	6	1,901,974	870,115
27. South Carolina [1]	6	1,899,804	99,672
28. Maryland	6	1,821,244	586,418
29. Washington	6	1,738,191	744,286
30. Connecticut	6	1,709,242	780,646
31. Florida	5	1,897,414	380,252
32. Nebraska	5	1,315,834	575,316
33. Colorado	4	1,123,296	522,815
34. Oregon	4	1,089,684	461,902
35. Maine	3	847,226	246,673
36. Rhode Island	2	713,346	314,023
37. South Dakota	2	642,961	298,551
38. North Dakota	2	641,935	211,889
39. Montana	2	559,456	237,975
40. Utah	2	550,310	246,881
41. Idaho	2	525,873	231,636
42. New Hampshire	2	491,524	218,206
43. New Mexico	1	531,818	182,057
44. Arizona	1	499,261	139,784
45. Vermont	1	359,231	140,477
46. Delaware	1	266,505	134,778
47. Wyoming	1	250,742	106,888
48. Nevada	1	110,247	50,746

NUMBER 2

States	Congressmen	1940 vote by States	Population
1. New York	45	6,093,202	13,479,142
2. Illinois	27	4,008,860	7,897,241
3. Pennsylvania	34	4,003,590	9,900,180
4. Ohio	24	3,068,195	6,901,612
5. California	20	2,714,754	6,907,387
6. Michigan	17	1,986,752	5,256,106
7. Massachusetts	15	1,964,538	4,316,721
8. New Jersey	14	1,862,396	4,160,165
9. Missouri	13	1,816,729	3,784,664
10. Indiana	12	1,761,624	3,427,796
11. Wisconsin	10	1,268,593	3,137,587
12. Minnesota	9	1,205,754	2,792,300
13. Iowa	9	1,114,963	2,538,268
14. Texas [1]	21	1,019,417	6,414,824
15. Kentucky	9	890,898	2,845,627
16. West Virginia	6	870,115	1,901,974
17. North Carolina	12	797,655	3,571,623
18. Kansas	7	787,652	1,801,028
19. Connecticut	6	780,646	1,709,242
20. Oklahoma	9	766,041	2,336,434
21. Washington	6	744,286	1,736,191
22. Maryland	6	586,418	1,821,244
23. Nebraska	5	575,316	1,315,296
24. Colorado	4	522,816	1,123,296
25. Oregon	4	461,902	1,089,684
26. Tennessee [1]	10	417,157	2,915,841
27. Florida	5	380,252	1,897,414
28. Louisiana [1]	8	321,044	2,363,880
29. Virginia [1]	9	316,576	2,677,773
30. Rhode Island	2	314,023	713,346
31. South Dakota	2	298,551	624,961
32. Georgia [1]	10	271,523	3,123,723
33. Alabama [1]	9	267,145	2,852,961
34. Utah	2	246,881	550,310
35. Maine	3	246,673	847,226
36. Montana	2	237,975	559,456
37. Idaho	2	231,636	524,873
38. New Hampshire	2	218,206	491,524
39. North Dakota	2	211,889	641,935
40. Arkansas [1]	7	208,890	1,949,381
41. New Mexico	1	182,057	531,818
42. Mississippi [1]	7	146,219	2,183,796
43. Vermont	1	140,477	359,231
44. Arizona	1	139,784	499,261
45. Delaware	1	134,778	266,505
46. Wyoming	1	106,888	250,742
47. South Carolina [1]	6	99,672	1,899,804
48. Nevada	1	50,746	110,247

[1] Poll-tax States.

Texas drops from fifth place to fourteenth; Georgia from fourteenth to thirty-second; Tennessee from fifteenth to twenty-sixth; Alabama from seventeenth to thirty-third; Virginia, nineteenth to twenty-ninth; Mississippi, twenty-third to forty-second; Arkansas, twenty-fourth to fortieth; South Carolina, twenty-seventh to forty-seventh.

The material for this analysis was taken from the Congressional Directory of January 1943, and is based upon the votes cast in the general election of 1940 for Congressmen from congressional districts in various States.

For this group comparison, the 8 poll-tax States, with their 79 congressional Representatives, is the first consideration, then the vote cast by each and the total vote cast by the group. The population is secondary.

GROUP 1 (POLL-TAX STATES)

States	Congressmen	1940 vote by States	Population
Texas	21	1,019,417	6,414,824
Georgia	10	271,523	3,123,723
Tennessee	10	417,157	2,915,841
Alabama	9	267,145	2,832,961
Virginia	9	316,576	2,677,773
Mississippi	7	146,219	2,183,796
Arkansas	7	208,890	1,949,387
South Carolina	6	99,672	1,899,804
Total	79	2,746,599	23,998,109

GROUP 2

New York	45	6,093,202	13,479,142
Massachusetts	15	1,964,538	4,316,721
Connecticut	6	780,646	1,709,242
Florida	5	380,252	1,897,414
Maine	3	246,673	847,226
Rhode Island	2	314,023	713,346
New Hampshire	2	218,206	491,524
Vermont	1	140,477	359,231
Total	79	10,138,017	23,813,846

GROUP 3

Pennsylvania	34	4,003,590	9,900,180
Ohio	24	3,065,195	6,907,612
New Jersey	14	1,862,396	4,160,165
Maryland	6	586,418	1,821,244
Delaware	1	134,778	266,505
Total	79	9,655,377	23,055,706

GROUP 4

Illinois	27	4,008,860	7,897,241
Michigan	17	1,986,752	5,256,106
Missouri	13	1,816,729	3,784,664
Indiana	12	1,761,624	3,427,796
Wisconsin	10	1,268,593	3,137,587
Total	79	10,842,558	23,503,394

GROUP 5

California	20	2,714,754	6,907,387
Minnesota	9	1,205,754	2,792,300
Iowa	9	1,114,963	2,538,268
Oklahoma	9	766,041	2,336,434
Washington	6	744,286	1,736,191
Nebraska	5	575,316	1,315,834
Colorado	4	522,815	1,123,296
Oregon	3	461,902	1,089,684
South Dakota	2	208,551	642,961
Utah	2	246,881	550,310
Montana	2	237,975	559,456
Idaho	2	231,636	524,873
North Dakota	2	211,889	641,935
New Mexico	1	182,057	531,818
Arizona	1	139,784	499,261
Wyoming	1	106,888	250,742
Nevada	1	50,746	110,247
Total	79	9,810,638	24,150,897

The remaining 5 States have only 42 Congressmen, but let us compare the vote cast.

GROUP 6

States	Congressmen	1940 vote by States	Population
North Carolina	12	797,655	3,571,623
Kentucky	9	890,898	2,845,627
Louisiana	8	321,044	2,363,880
Kansas	7	787,652	1,801,028
West Virginia	6	870,115	1,901,974
Total	42	3,667,364	12,484,132

The two top States that have the largest block of Members in Congress and the largest population:

GROUP 7

State	Congressmen	1940 vote by States	Population
New York	45	6,093,202	13,479,142
Pennsylvania	34	4,003,590	9,900,180
Total	79	10,096,792	23,379,322

We have heard a lot of talk about minority representation for minority groups in our Nation and if you will compare the various States and the group of States with the poll-tax States on the basis of the votes cast in the general election of 1940 you will find that the minority voters of the several States have representation in a very big way.

The repeal of the poll-tax law will be a step in the right direction but not the solution of the small vote cast in the elections.

I would like to offer a few suggestions that would help to improve our understanding of political democracy and our complicated election machinery. (1) Amend the provision of congressional representation and instead of using the population of the State as the basis, use the vote cast for Congressmen in the Presidential election year as the basis for State representation in Congress; (2) reduce the age of voting to 18; (3) simplify our election ballots by confining the election to legislative, executive, and judiciary; (4) by State law make it a mandate upon all public and private grade and high schools to teach political democracy in the schools and upon each election day there shall be created from and by the school children the complete election machinery as used in the adult elections, and that each city or county furnish to each school district duplicated ballots to be used by the school only and to be so marked and printed on paper different in color as a safeguard.

By and through our school we should be able to teach the children of this Nation the value of safeguarding the privilege of political democracy.

Food Distribution by Food-Stamp Plan and Direct Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following is the official table No. 603, page 521 of the 1943 Agricultural Statistics:

TABLE 603.—*Estimates quantities and Federal cost of food distribution through the food-stamp and direct-distribution programs, fiscal year ended June 30, 1942*

Commodity	Unit	Food-stamp plan		Direct distribution [1]		Total	
		Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost
		Thousands	*1,000 dollars*	*Thousands*	*1,000 dollars*	*Thousands*	*1,000 dollars*
Butter	Pound	24,919	10,246	6,194	2,134	31,113	12,380
Eggs	Dozen [2]	58,805	20,176	14,480	4,455	73,285	24,631
Dried skim milk	Pound			3,341	409	3,341	409
Evaporated milk	Pound			35,555	2,604	35,555	2,604
Frozen egg yolks	Pound			1,387	524	1,387	524
Cheese	Pound			35	9	35	9
Flour	Pound	416,886	17,442	241,820	6,000	658,706	23,442
Other cereals	Pound	121,963	4,292	162,309	3,748	284,272	8,040
Dry beans	Pound	75,074	6,119	54,106	2,297	129,180	8,416
Irish potatoes	Bushel [3]	6,325	8,728	1,346	957	7,671	9,685
Other fresh vegetables	Pound	374,515	15,323	77,049	1,150	451,564	16,473
Fresh fruits	Pound	168,052	6,603	271,004	7,221	439,056	13,824
Dried fruits	Pound	29,108	2,908	61,802	2,935	90,910	5,843
Oranges and grapefruit	Box [4]	2,424	8,015	1,284	2,359	3,708	10,374
Grapefruit juice	Pound			35,372	1,300	35,372	1,300
Canned fruits	Pound			10,946	735	10,946	735
Pork lard	Pound	7,041	885	24,336	2,443	31,377	3,328
Pork	Pound	47,156	10,813	15,894	1,845	63,050	12,658
Other meats and fish	Pound			663	139	663	139
Miscellaneous	Pound	140	22	12,145	2,046	12,285	2,068
Canned vegetables	Pound			57,586	2,695	57,586	2,695
Total 1941–42 [5]	Pound	1,926,482	111,572	1,276,744	48,005	3,203,226	159,577
1940–41	Pound	1,372,050	82,816	2,509,839	79,803	3,881,889	162,619
1939–40	Pound	229,190	16,413	1,787,794	61,642	2,016,984	78,055
1938–39	Pound	1,457	125	1,964,806	[6] 67,589	1,966,263	67,714
1937–38	Pound			1,045,065	[6] 35,950	1,045,065	35,950
1936–37	Pound			621,381	[6] 21,376	621,381	21,376
1935–36	Pound			930,705	[6] 32,016	930,705	32,016

[1] School lunch distribution included.
[2] Eggs, estimated weight 1.5 pounds per dozen.
[3] Irish potatoes, estimated weight 60 pounds per bushel.
[4] Citrus fruits, estimated weight 80 pounds per box.
[5] Total includes all commodities reduced to pounds; conversion-factors are shown in footnotes 2, 3, and 4.
[6] Estimated cost.

Source: Food Distribution Administration

There has always been an effort to mislead the farmer into thinking that this plan was a method of disposing of his surplus. The amounts of food involved by this method of distribution has been insignificant when compared to the total United States production, and also when compared to imports of agricultural products. Without going into the merits, demerits, or needs of such a program, I wish to call your attention to the fact that the economic conditions of the people do not appear to be factors taken into consideration. Part of this program has been used intentionally or unintentionally to depress farm prices. When the first Price Control Act was under consideration Milo Perkins, chief food distributor of that period, said in answer to a question propounded by Representative MERLIN HULL of Wisconsin, that they bought butter at the cheap summer prices, and put it on the market when it got up toward 30 cents per pound. This 30 cents per pound was below cost and the result was that butter prices were adversely affected during the entire year. It has always appeared to me that it did not make sense having one agency of this administration giving out Federal checks to farmers as parity payments because the products did not bring enough in the market place and then see another agency of the same administration carrying on bucketshop operations with the farmers' surplus and really preventing the farm products from reaching the much acclaimed goal of parity in the market place. I also again remind you that thousands upon thousands of farmers lost their farms from 1930 to 1940 at a time that Milo Perkins and his little helpers were spending their time and someone else's money in their attempt to show the great humanitarianism of the present administration. This humanitarianism was not evident to the countryside. In fact, in many cases, the Federal agencies were the toughest collectors at that very time.

When you realize that the United States Department of Agriculture reports show that over one-quarter of the producers in many sections received less than $300 per family total gross income in 1939, I am sure you see why all programs should have careful scrutiny or we will see a program of Santa Claus to the few but Shylock to the many.

The merits of a food distribution program that would provide this food to foster homes would be above all criticism. This food could be distributed on the basis of enrollment. There are 2,240 foster homes with an enrollment of 240,000 children in the United States. Accusations of using these food commodities for political purposes could not be made as the foster homes would have no votes and would control practically no votes.

Corp. Raymond Schammel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Baltimore News-Post regarding one of my constituents, Corp. Raymond Schammel, of Baltimore, Md.

Corporal Schammel, with Yankee ingenuity and his own brand of psychological warfare, routed six Nazi tanks on the Italian battlefield, despite the fact that the tanks were out of range of his shells. We have every reason to be proud of our boys.

The article follows:

YANK FROM HERE ROUTS NAZI TANKS

WITH THE FIFTH ARMY, ITALY.—Using his own brand of psychological warfare on the enemy, a Baltimore gunner routed six Nazi Mark VI tanks, despite the fact they were out of range of his new weapon.

Corp. Raymond Schammel, son of Mr. and Mrs. George Schammel, 2437 East Federal Street, Baltimore, is No. 1 gunner on a massive tank destroyer now making things miserable for the enemy on the Allied Fifth Army's Anzio-Nettuno beachhead south of Rome.

The situation which gave the corporal the opportunity to wage his own psychological warfare was this:

The tank destroyer was hidden in dense foliage and the job was to protect an infantry battalion command post. Suddenly, far in the distance, the six Nazi monsters came lumbering along and headed in their direction.

OUT OF REACH

Sgt. Lawrence Rhoads, of Columbus, Ohio, and the gun crew were amazed to find such a good target in front of them. But the sad part was that they couldn't reach the tanks with their own gun.

Sergeant Rhoads gave the order to fire, anyway, and Corporal Schammel went to work.

He purposely fired a few rounds short of maximum range. Then he increased the range slightly and dropped a few more shells in the direction of the Nazis. He kept up this creeping fire until he fired 22 shells and his gun had reached maximum range.

MAKE FAST RETREAT

The last shells fired still were far short of their targets, but Schammel's psychology worked. The enemy tanks saw the shells bursting in front of them, each one getting closer. As they could not see the well-hidden tank destroyer, they had no way of knowing that it had exhausted its range possibilities. They stopped, turned around quickly, and high-tailed it back to their own lines, hastened on their way by 12 more shells belched from the tank destroyer.

The rest of the crew who aided Schammel were Pvt. (1st cl.) Peter Castellano, assistant gunner, of New Haven, Conn.; Pvt. Albert Brousseau, driver, of Nashua, N. H.; and Pvt. (1st cl.) Albert Povlina, radio operator, of Whiting, Ind.

Corporal Schammel has one brother in the service. He is Pvt. John F. Schammel, now stationed in California.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas hearings are to be conducted by the special St. Lawrence subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee May 15 or thereabout for the purpose of hearing all matters pertinent to the development and completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

Whereas this matter is now before Congress for their consideration and decision; and

Whereas this development will open up a new shipbuilding resource of great capacity in Manitowoc, which is in close proximity to raw material and will make it possible to turn out large numbers of naval craft, merchant vessels, and auxiliaries of all types on the Great Lakes. Likewise, it will provide low-cost water transportation for the agricultural and industrial produce of the Middle West and thereby open new markets in Canada, Europe, and Latin America; and

Whereas we likewise deem this development to be of paramount importance and to the best interests of our Nation for defense and commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council of the City of Manitowoc, That we go on record unqualifiedly in favor of this development, satisfied that it will result in great and lasting benefits to the Nation as a whole; be it further

Resolved, That we earnestly recommend that construction of this waterway be commenced as soon as labor and materials are available; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. John H. Overton, chairman of Senate Finance Committee; Senator George D. Aiken, Senator Robert M. La Follette, Senator Alexander Wiley, Congressman La Vern Dilweg, and H. C. Brockel, secretary of Great Lakes Harbors Association.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1944.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: I was greatly disturbed to learn yesterday that, before the renewal legislation has even come out of conference, a new and sweeping restriction upon the Administrator's powers to control prices has been attached to the O. P. A. appropriation for the coming year.

The restriction, as approved by the Appropriations Committee, is as follows: "*Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person fixing maximum prices for different kinds, classes, or types of a commodity which are described in terms of specifications or standards, unless such specifications or standards were, prior to such order, in general use."

In the more than 2 months of hearings and debate on the renewal of the price-control acts, no such proposal as this was advanced or considered. The effects of the rider, if approved, would be far-reaching, and of the utmost seriousness. I am writing this letter as the only available way of explaining what these effects would be in the hope that you will make the facts known to the House.

I am sorry to say that it is going to be necessary to burden you with a long letter. The simple truth is, however, that the proposal touches upon such a complex problem that it cannot be explained briefly. Something of what is involved is indicated by the fact that more than three-fifths of the outstanding maximum price regulations—to be exact, 322—make use in some way of specifications or standards; and that the validity of at least 70 of these would be put into question if the proposed rider became law.

First of all, let me make perfectly clear that the proviso has nothing whatever to do with grade labeling. The Administrator is now prohibited by law from requiring grade labeling, and no price regulation does so or will do so as long as the prohibition remains in the law.

The proviso deals with the fundamental question of how you go about describing the commodity for which a maximum price is being established. Obviously a maximum price does not have any meaning unless the article to which it applies is properly identified. Frequently it is impossible to do this without making use of specifications or standards.

Congress considered this question last year when it approved the Taft-Andresen amendment which is now section 2 (j) of the Emergency Price Control Act. That subsection authorizes the Administrator to make use of specifications or standards in three types of situations:

1. When the specifications or standards were previously in general use in the trade or industry affected;

2. When their use has previously been lawfully required by another Government agency; and

3. Where the Administrator finds that there exists no practicable alternative for securing effective price control of the commodity involved.

The proposed rider would allow O. P. A. to refer to specifications of standards for the future only in the first type of situation—where the Administrator was able to find that the specifications or standards had been in general use in the trade or industry affected. Perhaps it would not invalidate outstanding regulations of the second or third type but obviously it would raise a serious question whenever a change was made in the existing prices established in such regulations.

It may seem at first blush that O. P. A. ought never to make use of specifications or standards which the industry itself has not generally used. It takes only a little reflection, however, to realize that this is a tremendous oversimplification of the problem. Take, for example, the frequent situation in which wartime scarcities—requiring changes in materials and methods of manufacture—have made pre-war standards obsolete. In these cases O. P. A. has no alternative but to devise, in conjunction with industry, new standards to meet present conditions, or to make use of standards newly devised by the War Production Board or some other Government agency. Often industry itself has come in and asked O. P. A. to do this. Obviously, this problem is going to continue to be of the utmost importance in the reconversion period as industry returns to the manufacture of durable goods similar to pre-war models but differing more or less materially. Again, it will be of major importance in connection with forthcoming War Production Board programs for increasing the production of critically needed low-cost clothing items.

Another extremely common situation is that in which O. P. A. bases ceiling prices upon standards or specifications which have long been in use by industry but which cannot be said to have been in general use. This happens whenever there are several sets of standards familiar to the trade and a choice has to be made among them. Another closely related situation is that in which the trade standards are too informal or general for use in a maximum price regulation and have to be developed and made more precise.

I wish to make very clear that O. P. A. does not concern itself with setting up specifications or standards to replace those used by industry. The specifications used in price regulations are based as closely as possible upon the standards that are already found in business life. They reflect, therefore, the varieties of products being produced. They do not, as has sometimes been suggested, result in a deadly uniformity of products. Pricing on the basis of standards and specifications is in no sense a new development in American business. It permeates the business world.

The disastrous effect which the proposed rider would have can perhaps best be illustrated by a mere list of the regulations which could not have been issued under it. Time does not permit the preparation of a complete list. As of last September, however, there were at least 57 such regulations. A list of them appears on the attached press release on pages 7 and 8.

In my best judgment very nearly all of the industries affected by these regulations would rise in almost unanimous protest if it became necessary to rewrite and reissue them.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Communist Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a statement taken from the column of Frank R. Kent in the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., of June 16, 1944.

It will be noted that in a speech made on October 29, 1934, by William H. Murray, Communist leader in the State of Washington, the claim is made that they had infiltrated the Democratic Party. It should be further noted that Mr. Murray claimed then that the Communist movement was receiving so much help from the chief aides of President Roosevelt that he advised his Communist Party to put aside their desire to achieve their program at one major stroke and cooperate with the Democratic organization.

The satisfaction expressed by the Communists with the present administration's policies undoubtedly accounts for the fourth-term endorsement by Earl Browder and the Communist organization.

The statement follows:

The fact is that the New Deal spending policy always has been dearer to the heart of the Communist than to that of the New

Dealer, because, as the former's leaders so frequently declared, it leads straight toward their goals—one of which is economic chaos.

But, what especially grieves the New Dealers is the charge that the immediate objective of the Communists is to do to the Democratic Party what they already have done to the American Labor Party and the C. I. O.

Nevertheless, that has been true for a long time. In support thereof is offered here extracts from a speech by William H. Murray, Communist leader in the State of Washington, made on October 29, 1936, and published in the Seattle Times. Mr. Murray, addressing his fellow Communists, was urging the election of the Democratic candidate for Governor, whom he declared, "while not an ideal candidate, will, if elected, be compelled to yield to the support which he will receive from the entire progressive movement."

In this speech, Mr. Murray made these interesting statements:

1. "We are making real progress in this State, but we must not be impatient. We must avail ourselves of every forward-looking movement that leads in the direction of the ultimate Marxian goal."

2. "The recent success of liberals and progressives at the Democratic State convention is of tremendous significance. The Democratic Party adopted there the entire program of the Washington Commonwealth Federation."

3. "Only through much effort has it been possible to revitalize the Democratic Party in this State, where it is now recognized, because of many Marxian principles, as a real progressive movement. Many of the Democratic candidates are either members of the Washington Commonwealth Federation or its parent organization, the Communist Party."

4. "I recommend to all progressives and liberals in this State to register a consistent vote for the entire Democratic ticket. This, in fact, is what Earl Browder, our candidate for President on the Communist ticket, has repeated on many occasions."

5. "We are not going to elect the Communist ticket here or in the Nation, but just as the movement is receiving so much help from the chief aides of President Roosevelt, so must we in this State realize that the Marxian goal can be reached only by furthering just such progressive movements. As Communists, we must put aside our desire to achieve our program at one major stroke and cooperate with the Democratic organization in building a real people's front. Let no one divert us from our real objective."

ILLUMINATING WORDS

Now, these earnest words of a leading Communist are genuinely illuminating. They prove that the infiltration of the Democratic Party has been a settled and consistent Communist policy for 8 years. The facts attest the progress made and make it clear the 1944 effort is the strongest yet made—and with the best prospects.

It is true, of course, that the Russians are our valued allies and we intend to live amicably with them after the fighting is over, but that should not blind us to the beautiful boring-from-within game, which American Communists have been playing here for 8 years, and the degree of success which they have achieved.

Perhaps it is all right to regard this lightly and to dismiss those who do not so regard it as having political nightmares.

Nevertheless, these facts cannot be disputed—to wit, that in some States, like Washington, the Communists have successfully infiltrated the Democratic Party; that in New York they control the American Labor Party, which claims to hold the balance of political power and polls as high as 400,000 votes; that they have great influence in the C. I. O., whose leaders are closely linked, personally and politically, with Mr. Roosevelt; that Browder, the Communist leader, is the original fourth termer, and a Roosevelt reelection would rejoice every Communist in the country.

Nine Companies Sued Over Navy Cable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of June 18, 1944:

NINE COMPANIES SUED OVER NAVY CABLE—UNITED STATES NAMES SIX OFFICIALS ALSO IN RECOVERY ACTION, CHARGING COLLUSIVE BIDDING

United States Attorney James B. McNally filed civil suits in the Federal Court yesterday against nine corporations and six individuals who, he said, submitted collusive bids to the Government in the sale of patented cable used in the construction of ships for the Navy.

Although Mr. McNally seeks to recover for the Government $2,000 damages for each sale based on alleged collusive bidding, the total amount of possible recovery, he said, "might run into millions." He said the sales were made under approximately 365 contracts with the Navy Bureau of Supply and Accounts.

The suits are against the Rockbestos Products Corporation and Arthur G. Newton, its president; General Electric Co.; Okonite Co., and Frank C. Jones, its president; Collyer Insulated Wire Co., and Robert C. Moeller, its secretary-treasurer; Phelps-Dodge Copper Products Corporation; the American Steel & Wire Co. of New Jersey; General Cable Co. and Dwight R. G. Palmer, its president; National Electric Products Corporation and William C. Robinson, Sr., president; Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. and W. E. Sprackling, vice president.

According to Mr. McNally, the civil suits grew out of an action, brought in 1942, in which the corporate defendants paid $77,500 to the Government. Mr. McNally added that he filed the suits to forestall an informer suit brought against the same defendants by Israel Beckhardt, of 12 East Forty-fifth Street, who filed a complaint in this district on August 26, 1942. Mr. McNally added he would file soon a formal motion for a stay of the Beckhardt suit.

The complaint of the Government in the present action says that the Rockbestos Co. licensed the other defendants to sell an insulated electric cable, on which the Rockbestos held a patent and "did conspire and agree to submit collusive bids for A. V. C. cable at predetermined and unreasonably high prices."

The Government alleges also that when questions arose among the defendants as to prices contemplated, said questions were submitted to the defendant Rockbestos for its decision. The complaint charges that the defendants received contracts from the Navy Department in excess of $40,000,000, and that the defendants used bills and receipts knowing they contained fictitious statements and entries.

How Women Shall Share in Post-War Policy Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by me at the White House, June 14, where representatives from womens' organizations over the country and especially appointed observers from Government departments and agencies met to discuss how women shall share in post-war policy making:

If post-war planning was ever academic, it certainly has become a realized necessity since D-day, June 6. Now that the second front has been established and the liberation of Europe started, there is less time for post-war planning. This is the real beginning of the end, which is not so distant that we can leisurely prepare for post-war problems.

With this in mind, this particular meeting should be aimed at having women at the peace table and at the many important conferences of the future. Women should be at these conferences from a standpoint of practical necessity rather than the insistence of a fair share of influence. The desire of women to help solve these problems is much deeper than self-interest.

In the past women's rightful participation has been denied through sex discrimination. This war has exposed the fallacy of such discrimination for women have filled innumerable jobs traditionally occupied by men.

Women should be called in to assist in post-war planning—not just because they are women, but because of the knowledge and understanding that they have of certain problems.

As a member of the House Naval Affairs Subcommittee on Congested Areas, I have had an opportunity to observe personally the accomplishments of women everywhere. I have been amazed to learn the high percentages of women workers. I saw them in hospitals, in shipyards, aircraft plants, torpedo factories, and many other war activities all over the country. All of this has made an indelible impression upon me. Many of these women have become experienced and skilled workers and have replaced men who are fighting the war.

There will be the problem of readjustment when these people return from the congested war areas to take up normal activities, all looking for work which will not be of a war nature. This presents a very difficult problem.

Time is short. We cannot be leisurely in finding a solution for these complicated problems. As the men who have been fighting the war return there will be some inevitable conflicts as to whether the jobs are to be retained by the women or returned to the men. In order to approach the solution of such a problem with proper balance and equity it will obviously be necessary to have representatives of women as well as men to make final decisions.

It has been my privilege as a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee to visit naval establishments over the country, to see the work the women in the services—the WAVES, the SPARS, the MARINES, the

WAC's, and the nurses. Here, again, is a problem—the orderly demobilization of these women from the services and their return to civilian life.

It was my recent work at the I. L. O. conference which gave special emphasis to my study of post-war problems. While I was greatly honored in being the only Representative from the House, it was a greater satisfaction to me to see proper recognition given to women. Women from several nations were representing government, industry, and labor.

I believe that splendid progress was made not only in crystallizing the rights and duties of labor, but in maintaining the right of women to equal opportunity and reward, and in cementing the international friendship that comes from personal meeting between people of different countries.

Actually, it was a conference attended by officially appointed representatives of each member government, and each country's organized workers and organized employers. The I. L. O. was founded in Washington just 25 years ago, and its purpose has been to standardize and improve protection which can be given by local and national legislation to workers, especially women and children.

The Philadelphia conference went into new territory and recognized the importance of international cooperation to meet the common, social, and economic problems of ordinary people—all men, women, and children in this country and all over the globe.

An I. L. O. recommendation of great importance deals with the organization of employment in the transition from war to peace. It directs attention to the problems involved in the redistribution of women workers in each national economy which has been disrupted by the war.

This broad recommendation is intended to promote full employment with a view to satisfying the vital needs of the population and raising the standard of living throughout the world. It points out that the redistribution of women workers "should be carried out on the principle of complete equality of opportunity for men and women in respect of admission to employment on the basis of their individual merit, skill, and experience, and steps should be taken to encourage the establishment of wage rates on the basis of job content without regard to sex."

As a primary responsibility in carrying out the objectives set up at the Philadelphia conference, it is our duty to see to it that women have a share in transmitting these ideals into practical action. Our women have shown that they can make a valuable contribution in setting up the program. It ought to be obvious that the execution of the program needs their thought and action.

The foundation on which the peace will be built is being laid in these international conferences, the I. L. O. at Philadelphia, the Food Conference at Hot Springs, the Monetary conference to be held in Bretton Woods, N. H., in a few days, and others.

The presence of women at all of these conferences illustrates the increasing participation which women are taking in the planning of a post-war world. More than that, they are evidences of a recognition that women have much to contribute to that planning.

The recommendations and plans made at these conferences can be translated into positive action only through the legislative and executive branches of the various governments of this world. Obviously such recommendations and plans will include problems best understood by women. Because of this it is of the utmost importance that women be adequately represented in Congress and in the Executive Department.

We shall need women who have been trained in special fields, to sit on decisive bodies, and that is where a list of women whose backgrounds fit them for various services will be helpful. At least this would eliminate the excuse that appointing officials didn't know where to find competent women.

There are many varied fields in which women's influence should be felt, and there are many qualified women in these fields. While qualifications gained from training and education are of great value, it is experience in the field of human relations that is the most valuable asset of women.

Most women are wives and mothers, and their great demand is for a Nation and a world in which their families may be prosperous and live happily. That demand should be represented at every meeting in which decisions are made—but the demand should be made by women of intelligence, courage, and experience or their cause is lost in sentimentality.

It is not enough to have the desire to help. Women must be qualified to serve well, because unqualified and incompetent women forfeit their own opportunity and discourage the appointment of other women.

We must be constructive in our cooperation and as we continue to urge recognition we must at the same time realize that we are asking for jobs that carry with them tremendous responsibility. Women are ready and willing to accept the resulting burdens along with the privileges of the authority.

Wasted Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a large brown envelope 12 inches by 16 inches, made of heavy good-quality paper. This envelope containing a single small thin sheet of printed information relative to patents listed with Office of Alien Property Custodian. Any regular-sized letter envelope should have sufficed very efficiently.

I quote part of a letter from a businessman. No wonder he was incensed:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing herewith a large expensive envelope that was received in our office this morning; and also a very small thin circular that was enclosed in the large envelope.

Just after this envelope, with enclosure was received, a representative from the carton manufacturer from whom we obtain our supply of shipping cartons, called on us to explain a recent ruling that was made by a department in the War Production Board whereby the allotment on shipping containers was cut a further 15 percent due to shortage of materials of which cartons are manufactured.

Both in our factories and in our office we have been saving every scrap of paper that we could accumulate and delivering it to our local junk yard with a view of making an effort to increase the supply of scrap paper.

It certainly burns one up to be doing all of this and be deprived of cartons in which to ship your products and then to find out the very great extravagance and waste that some of our very unimportant bureaus are practicing as in the case that I am referring to you. We can understand waste and extravagance in the prosecution of the war when it saves the lives of our young men in the services, but for unimportant bureaus of our Government to practice such extravagance and waste as is shown in the instance I am calling your attention to—we cannot understand.

Protein Feed Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, so many inquiries have been made regarding the distribution of protein feeds that I include a table showing the War Food Administration and trade distribution of oilseed meals for the first 5 months of 1944, together with the official list of the value of livestock food products in 1943:

State	Distribution of oilseed meal Jan. 1 to May 31, 1944—Total of distribution trade and W. F. A. allocation (tons)	Value of sales of agricultural commodities, 1943 [1]—Livestock food products [2]
Alabama	54,099	$72,792,000
Arizona	12,226	42,427,000
Arkansas	46,373	115,170,000
California	136,403	442,590,000
Colorado	23,009	169,421,000
Connecticut	6,165	67,994,000
Delaware	10,645	63,942,000
Florida	18,735	51,946,000
Georgia	61,402	97,849,000
Idaho	5,245	102,845,000
Illinois	191,399	739,858,000
Indiana	105,161	477,196,000
Iowa	153,421	1,272,319,000
Kansas	59,303	472,236,000
Kentucky	28,217	191,546,000
Louisiana	35,113	58,569,000
Maine	1,723	45,515,000
Maryland	22,782	90,124,000
Massachusetts	12,030	88,249,000
Michigan	23,239	306,988,000
Minnesota	94,584	681,533,000
Mississippi	75,454	76,205,000
Missouri	104,848	539,212,000
Montana	5,410	96,313,000
Nebraska	58,538	473,710,000
Nevada	1,218	18,826,000
New Hampshire	3,715	32,344,000
New Jersey	14,844	101,891,000
New Mexico	29,661	58,945,000
New York	166,630	397,260,000
North Carolina	62,170	99,510,000
North Dakota	3,314	150,754,000
Ohio	125,716	489,929,000
Oklahoma	75,165	257,845,000
Oregon	19,848	123,593,000
Pennsylvania	68,231	369,130,000
Rhode Island	1,058	11,297,000
South Carolina	34,853	41,060,000
South Dakota	10,075	242,472,000
Tennessee	75,760	158,758,000
Texas	262,026	529,161,000
Utah	10,078	63,659,000
Vermont	15,686	63,041,000
Virginia	26,023	140,373,000
Washington	30,740	147,456,000
West Virginia	3,420	63,040,000
Wisconsin	69,557	632,611,000
Wyoming	9,366	55,418,000
Total	2,495,608	11,084,912,000

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Includes cattle and calves, hogs, sheep and lambs, milk, chickens, eggs (chicken), turkeys, and gross income from commercial broilers.

While there appears to be a rather questionable distribution it must be borne in mind that many factors are involved. Soybeans were sent to cotton-

seed mills for processing, but the resulting meal was not returned to the point of origin or where grown. The imports were not included which might have been beneficial to border States such as Texas, close to the cottonseed-meal supply of Mexico.

In addition: Wisconsin is now receiving sufficient urea (made from the nitrogen of the air) in a quantity that is equivalent to make 1,000 tons per month of protein feed, according to the letter of transmittal accompanying the data obtained from the War Food Administration.

One fact is evident. This protein feed was not diverted nor was it allocated in keeping with the livestock food produced in the various States.

Development of the St. Lawrence River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] before the Lions and Rotary Clubs of Rutland, Vt., on May 8, 1944, in relation to the St. Lawrence waterway.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad of the opportunity to talk to you folks in Rutland tonight about the world's greatest natural; undeveloped resource and the bill which I have introduced into Congress, which would develop it for the benefit of the people of the United States and Canada.

Interest in the St. Lawrence seaway dates back 300 years. Way back in colonial days a canal 2 feet deep was dug around part of the International Rapids section to facilitate canoe transportation. Later a 6-foot canal was dug and still later on one with a depth of 9 feet. Finally the Canadian Government constructed a canal with a depth of 14 feet so that ships could bypass the International Rapids between New York State and the Province of Ontario.

Most of the shipping on the Great Lakes, however, is now carried in ships that draw a depth of 20 feet or so and, likewise, most of the ocean shipping is carried in ships of greater draft. Therefore, only a limited amount of freight tonnage is carried through the present 14-foot canal.

A generation ago officials of the United States and Canada began to talk about the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. In 1909, the Boundary Waters Treaty was negotiated by Elihu Root for the United States and Ambassador James Bryce for Great Britain. This treaty provided for an investigation and report on projects for the further improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system. It also provided means by which special agreements regarding the improvement of this great water system might be effectuated by concurrent legislation of the United States Congress and the Canadian Parliament.

Although every President from the time of Woodrow Wilson has recommended the improvement of the St. Lawrence waterway, yet it remained for our own President Calvin Coolidge to make the first earnest request of Congress for the development of the great power and navigation project of the St. Lawrence River.

As an effective reply to those who say that we cannot afford the money for this project, I wish to quote further from President Coolidge's message to Congress on December 6, 1923:

"This is not incompatible with economy, for their nature does not require so much a public expenditure as a capital investment which will be reproductive. * * * Upon these projects depends much future industrial and agricultural progress. They represent the protection of large areas from flood, and the addition of a great amount of cheap power and cheap freight by use of navigation, chief of which is the bringing of ocean-going ships to the Great Lakes."

The reference to protection from flood evidently refers to the program for the improvement of the Colorado and Mississippi Rivers, which President Coolidge urged in the same message.

President Hoover and President Roosevelt have both consistently recommended the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway to the Congress, but opponents have so far been strong enough to prevent the approval of this development.

Three years ago, the House Rivers and Harbors Committee approved the project by a two to one vote, but we got into the war about then and before action was taken by the House that Congress expired.

The bill which I have introduced is now considered purely as a post-war proposition and, I may say, appears to have a better chance of being accepted by the Congress than it has had up to this time. Several Members who have previously been unalterably opposed to the seaway have indicated to me their intention of supporting it now. Therefore, it is well that everyone should know just what the seaway development is and what it will mean to us here in northeastern United States.

The bill which I have introduced gives the approval of Congress to an agreement entered into on March 19, 1941, between the United States and Canada. This agreement provides for the construction of a large dam at Massena, N. Y., and locks and canals which will provide a minimum depth of 27 feet. This will permit all but the largest ships of our Navy and merchant marine to pass to and from the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean. This, of course, will permit ships to load at any of the ports on the Great Lakes and to transport their cargoes to the markets of the world without the necessity of unloading these cargoes, transporting them overland, and then reloading them at seaports on the Atlantic coast.

It will also mean that raw materials and other goods used in the great industrial and consuming areas of the Great Lakes Basin can be loaded on ships at any port in the world and brought through the St. Lawrence River and canal to the Great Lakes ports at the same saving of time and expense which would otherwise be lost in the unloading, transshipment, and reloading procedure.

I will not attempt to go into detail tonight concerning the saving which would be effectuated in transportation costs. That is a highly technical matter. Midwest shippers testify that there would be a saving of 8 to 10 cents a bushel on grain shipped to the export trade, and a corresponding saving on many other classes of freight.

The St. Lawrence waterway would be used largely for the transportation of bulk cargoes consisting of grain, meats, oil, coal, automobiles, iron and steel products, and other goods and crops produced in our great Midwest area. Imports using the canal would very likely consist of coffee, rubber, citrus fruits, cottonseed meal, lumber, sulphur, and other items imported from other parts of our country and other countries of the world.

The maximum additional increase in the amount of United States freight which could be borne through the canal is approximately 10,000,000 tons a year, which, as I will point out later, is only a very small part of the anticipated increase in the amount of freight tonnage for which transportation must be found in the near future.

The dam at Massena, besides being used for the improvement of water transportation, would also be used for the development of electrical energy. The installed capacity of the power development will be 2,200,000 horsepower, one-half of which would belong to the Province of Ontario and the other half to the State of New York.

There is no question of States' rights involved in the St. Lawrence development because the right of New York and Ontario to this power is clearly recognized.

Army engineers tell us that because of the even flow of the St. Lawrence River, the production of electrical energy at Massena might reach a total of over 13,000,000,000 kilowatts a year or three times the capacity of the great Dneiper Dam in Russia.

The power development, when completed, will be turned over to the State of New York and the Province of Ontario to be operated by them. In return for this, the State of New York will be required to repay to the United States the sum of $93,375,000, with interest at 3 percent, over a 50-year period. I presume that the Province of Ontario will be required to do the same for the Dominion of Canada.

The total cost of the seaway and power project, as estimated by the War Department, is $421,474,515, of which the United States is to pay $277,056,515 and Canada $144,418,000. Deducting $93,000,000 chargeable to the State of New York, the estimated cost of the project to the United States would be approximately $184,000,000.

The reason for the United States being required to bear the greater share of the cost of the project in this. It appears that back in 1926 American and Canadian officials entered into a gentlemen's agreement concerning the improvement of the St. Lawrence seaway. By this agreement, which, so far as I know, was never authorized by the legislature of either country, each country was to match dollar for dollar the cost of improvements which might be made by the other country. Canada reconstructed the Welland Canal and is being given credit for that in the agreement signed March 19, 1941, to the amount of $133,000,000.

Thus, by constructing the seaway and power development at the same time, the great inland empire of the United States is furnished with access to the sea for ocean-going vessels, while New York and Ontario will get harnessed the largest undeveloped water power in all North America, but which they will have to pay for over a period of years.

The greatest objective of the St. Lawrence development is the elimination of the 48-mile bottleneck which landlocks our inland empire with its 45,000,000 population.

The second objective is the development of 2,200,000 horsepower to be used for the benefit of people and industry here in northeastern United States and adjoining Canada.

Now, some of you may ask why the people of Vermont should be interested in this great development when we have so little water shipping and when New York and Ontario are to own all the power that is developed.

There are many reasons why Vermont should be interested in the St. Lawrence seaway. First and foremost is the over-all fact that it is the creation of great wealth for our entire Nation and that, of course,

helps every State. But, to be a little more specific, I will say that my bill provides that inasmuch as the power development is to be constructed by the Federal Government in connection with the seaway development, New York must agree to share that power with neighboring States and those neighboring States would be Vermont and New Hampshire.

Northwestern Vermont is within the hundred mile radius of Massena. All Vermont, except Brattleboro and a few towns in Windham County are within a hundred and fifty-mile radius. All of Vermont, nearly all of New Hampshire, nearly half of Massachusetts, and a portion of western Maine are within the 200-mile radius. In fact, all of our State is nearer to the great power development than is the city of Buffalo or the city of New York.

St. Lawrence power will probably be the cheapest power in the world. It will be developed for about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour. It can be delivered in Burlington and St. Albans for about 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, and in any place in Vermont for approximately 2½ mills.

It would enable the northeastern part of this country to hold or attract industry which we are otherwise surely going to lose. During the war, we have had to use all industrial facilities wherever located, but after the war industry will be found principally where it can produce cheapest and best.

We have had a shortage of electricity here in the north country and industrial plants in the St. Lawrence Valley have had to use steam power generated on the Atlantic coast and transmitted 300 miles to the very place where two and a quarter million horsepower rushes by unharnessed. This electric power used for the manufacture of aluminum at Massena, N. Y., costs between 6 and 7 mills per kilowatt-hour as compared with 2.2 mills per kilowatt-hour which the aluminum plants on the Pacific coast pay.

We also loaned to the Aluminum Co. of Canada a hundred million dollars for the construction of a power plant and aluminum plant on the Shipsaw River in Canada.

We often hear it said that we will not need this power after the war. I want to call your attention to what happened after the First World War.

In 1915 the total production of electricity in America amounted to 16,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1916, when we were preparing for war, the production jumped to 21,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1918 this had increased to 33,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

The war ended that year. Did the use and production of electric power decrease It most certainly did not. In 1919 it increased still further to nearly 39,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1920 it went up to 43,000,000,000. It dropped slightly in 1921 and then shot up to 47,000,000,000 in 1922. From then on production increased steadily until in 1929 it had reached the enormous total of 95,925,000,000 kilowatt-hours. There was a slight drop during the great depression years when our industrial plants were idle and then production climbed upward again. By 1940 it had reached the total of 144,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours and in 1943—the latest figures availablee show that the United States produced a grand total of 220,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity or nearly 10 times the amount which was used during the First World War.

There isn't the slightest doubt but that this power will be needed and used at the close of this war provided it is made available to the American people at reasonable rates.

We are becoming more and more dependent on electricity with each passing year, and there is no indication that the saturation point is yet in sight. Every farm, every home, every industry in America will use more and more as time goes on.

We are entering the age of nonferrous metal production and use. The production of aluminum is now measured in billions of pounds. It requires 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity to produce a pound of aluminum.

Magnesium has entered permanently into the field of commercial metal production and will be used more and more where the lightness of the metal used is important. We have plenty of material with which to manufacture magnesium right here in Vermont if cheap electric power is available in quantity.

The electric torch will be used on public works, shipbuilding, and construction projects to an extent not dreamed of before the war. The tremendous chemical industry with its scientific advances necessitated by war will continue as the peacetime servant of the people.

Farmers today are using low-cost nitrate fertilizer as a result of new discoveries which can only be utilized if electric power is plentiful and cheap. The farmers of America will never willingly go back to the days of high-priced nitrogen. If perchance they are forced to do so, then they will be unable to compete with the rest of the world in the production of crops.

Since the war began thousands upon thousands of farms in our north country have been equipped with electric milking machines and water coolers. Barns have been wired for lighting. Only through this increased use of electricity has the American farmer been able to produce the enormous crops which have been demanded of him. During this past year, in spite of the scarcity of material, the emergency has been so great that the War Production Board has authorized the extension of electricity to 78,000 farms on the rural electrification systems alone. How many more farms have been connected by the private utilities I cannot say, but the number must be very great.

There are still millions of rural homes and farms in America that are not served by electric light and power. We cannot consider our rural life in America very near perfect so long as this condition prevails. Many countries of Europe are far ahead of us in this respect. The countries of South America and other parts of the world are rapidly catching up. We must not be content until every farm home in America is equipped for electricity.

As I look into the future I see millions of rural homes where farm families live richer and happier lives because of new electrical appliances. I see electric hay dryers making the farmer independent of weather conditions. I see on every farm and in every village home and even in the apartment houses of the cities quick freezing facilities and storage which will tremendously cut the cost of living.

Farmers will be living on fruit and vegetables and meats of their own production the year around. Town and city people will be buying food in quantity in surplus seasons at low prices and storing it to use in seasons of low supply and high prices. They will use a great amount of electrical energy in doing this.

There will be no surplus of power for long after this war. There may be a year or a year and a half when consumption of electric power will drop. Then history will repeat itself and consumption will become greater than ever before. We will need not only all that is being produced now, but a great deal more that must be secured from new sources.

Now, I want to say just a word about Vermont and water transportation. You all know that most of the gasoline and oil used in Vermont is brought in by water via the Hudson River and Lake Champlain. Because we have a lot of storage for oil and gas is one reason why Vermont farmers did not suffer from a shortage a year ago as did the farmers of some other States.

Lake Champlain is connected with the Hudson River by a canal of 12-foot depth. It is also connected with the St. Lawrence by canal, but this canal part of the way has only 6½ foot depth thus being usable only by light draft boats and barges.

Since I have been in Washington, I have been very seriously urged to request legislation authorizing what is called the Champlain cut-off. That would consist of deepening channels and reconstructing canals so that vessels of greater draft might navigate from New York to the St. Lawrence River.

I have not introduced such a bill for the simple reason that it could not be passed through the Congress at this time, but if the St. Lawrence seaway is developed, the Champlain cut-off will inevitably follow. My Midwest colleagues assure me that they would not only support this Champlain cut-off, but insist upon it because it would add 1 month to the open water season for shipping from the Great Lakes to the sea and would also save some 1,100 miles in distance in shipping from New York City to points on the Great Lakes. I have no hopes of the Champlain cut-off becoming a reality until the St. Lawrence seaway development is completed.

Opponents of the St. Lawrence development have employed the usual arguments against it. I will not attempt to answer them here, although none of them which they offer are very sound.

We hear most frequently the objection that the St. Lawrence development would injure the railroads and private utility companies. Instead of answering this charge myself, I will read to you a statement made by Leo T. Crowley, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, testifying before a House committee on July 3, 1941. Mr. Crowley said:

"It has been contended that the opening of this seaway would harm the railroads and public utilities of the Northeast section of the country. If this were true in any appreciable degree, the security obligations of these businesses would suffer. Since the banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation hold about $850,000,000 of railroad security obligations and $625,000,000 of public-utility security obligations, I could not support this legislation if I thought that the railroads and public utilities would, on the whole, be affected adversely. Fortunately, the evidence indicates that the great advantages of opening up the Great Lakes to ocean traffic will not bring corresponding harm to the railways, and that the energy developed in the St. Lawrence will not hurt the utilities but will rather fit into the long-term growth of our need for power.

"There is, therefore, little possibility that the investment character of railroad and public-utility security obligations will be harmed by the legislation under consideration. Indeed, it may well be that their investment quality will be enhanced. * * *

"It is entirely reasonable to conclude that the eastern roads will be gainers rather than losers on balance."

Then Mr. Crowley goes on to say:

"What I have said relative to the effects of the St. Lawrence project on the railroads applies equally well to the public utilities. The power development will not hurt them and may indirectly benefit them. I have already pointed out that according to the predefense estimates some 2,500,000 more horsepower of energy will have to be made available to the people of New York State in the next 10 years. Inasmuch as the American share of St. Lawrence power, about 1,100,000 horsepower, would provide less than half of this increase in anticipated demand, it is obvious that the hydroelectric development at the International Rapids constitutes no competitive threat whatever to existing public utilities."

These remarks which I have quoted are not taken from the speech of any Socialist orator, but from the statement made by one of America's hardest-headed businessmen and who is responsible for the protection of billions of dollars worth of bank deposits, a large percentage of which are invested in railroad and public utility holdings.

The arguments used to kill the seaway project are quite ingenious. One of the latest is to refer to it as President Roosevelt's baby. It is true that President Roosevelt has indorsed my bill. It is true that Secretary Hull emphatically approves it as does Secretary Stimson and other members of the cabinet, but it is equally true that among its enthusiastic supporters are found such prominent Republicans as Herbert Hoover, Alf Landon, Harold Stassen, Governor Dewey, and others.

It is not a partisan effort in any sense of the word, nor are all utility and railroad interests opposed to it. Many of them see clearly the great advantages which would come, not only to their country, but to themselves and to their businesses as a result of this great development.

Years ago Henry I. Harriman, then president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and formerly president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, had this to say about it, and I quote:

"I am convinced that the St. Lawrence seaway is of the greatest possible importance to the entire North Alantic seaboard as well as to the Middle West, and that New England should unitedly and heartily support the project because it means—

"1. Lower transportation costs on food supplies, hence a lower cost of living;

"2. Lower freight rates on many of the raw materials required by New England's industries; and

"3. Lower freight rates to many markets for New England finished products."

Nobody ever accused Mr. Harriman of advocating any development that would injure New England industry.

I said a short time ago that the capacity of the seaway would be 10,000,000 additional tons of United States freight a year. Based on a study made in 1940, the Department of Commerce estimated that the "average tons of freight originating in the decade of 1950 will probably be between 242,000,000 and 374,000,000 greater than the average of 1930–39. The 10,000,000 tons of additional American traffic which may use the St. Lawrence at maximum utilization would be but a fraction of the expected increase in railroad activity."

This estimate of the increase in freight tonnage was made in 1940 and based on a normal peacetime increase in freight tonnage. Since that estimate was made, America has engaged in the greatest war in history. As a result of this war, there will be an expansion in world commerce that defies the imagination.

I would like to talk to you about this some day, but I know I should not take time tonight, but this estimated increase of between 242,000,000 and 374,000,000 tons of freight in the decade of 1950 will fall far short of the actual increase.

To handle the tremendous volume of national and international trade, America must have a coordinated transportation system consisting of airways, highways, railways, and waterways.

The 10,000,000 tons of additional bulk freight carried through the St. Lawrence canal will be a great help in meeting our problem, but it will not be enough. We must have expansion of other forms of transportation, including railway transportation.

Let us not be blind to the fact that here in New England and New York we can share in this great increase of national and international trade. We shall have to get it from a competitive world, however. It will not be handed to us on a silver platter. The St. Lawrence seaway and power development can be the biggest factor of all in helping us to maintain our economic balance.

America's Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "America's Opportunity," which I delivered at the fifty-seventh annual convention of the Oregon Newspaper Publishers' Association at Eugene, Oreg., June 17, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America's opportunity is at hand. It is a priceless opportunity for helpful leadership in the world's greatest war and the world's greatest peace. Our success in meeting this opportunity will be the measure of our fitness for the destiny to which our forefathers so nobly dedicated this Nation. I welcome, therefore, this chance to discuss it with you newspapermen, whose constant duty it is to discover opportunities and to help your communities, your States, and your Nation to rise to meet them.

We are at the crisis of this war. We and our allies must win this war completely in both hemispheres as quickly as we can. All that we say or do must be so said and done that it will help to win this war At our firesides, on our farms, and in our factories, as well as on every fighting front, each of us must do his full share. Our fighters have set the standard at perfection. Our farms and our factories must equal or exceed their already extraordinary records. No hour of production can be spared. Each hour must be a tribute of service worthy of the high price of our front-line victory.

Our first opportunity is to bring into our own homes a unity of spirit worthy of America's highest hopes and dearest dreams. Sound homes are a nation's greatest strength in war as well as in peace. It is for us to develop the full wartime value of cordial, vigorous helpfulness in our homes and of cheerful, frequent, personal letters to the front. The heartbeat of the home makes the pulsebeat of the world.

Winning the war calls also for unwavering unity throughout our Nation and among all of our allies. As long as the peace-loving nations were divided they were losing the war. As long as they faced the Axis separately the Axis crushed them. Almost at the last possible moment they joined hands and the tide of battle turned.

The United Nations are winning today because of their unity everywhere—on the battle fronts, economic fronts, political fronts, and within their own borders. The principal problem of the peace will be to preserve and extend this war-born unity with the greatest possible fairness, freedom, and stability for all.

While America is fighting this war it must also prepare the way for the peace to follow. A just and lasting peace calls for at least as many months of planning and preparation as does a major military victory. While our soldiers fight for us at the front, it is our duty to make sure that when this war is won it shall stay won. To use a military term, it is for us "to consolidate the gains" they shall have made.

TWO FUNDAMENTAL NEEDS

In America's opportunity to help establish and maintain such a peace, there are at least two propositions that should be made clear:

1. That international peace and stability is a domestic necessity—for America's own recovery and progress.

2. That America's recovery, progress, and cooperation is an international necessity—for the peace and stability of the world.

The important thing is to look squarely at the facts of the post-war world and to act on those facts with the same speed, intelligence, and cooperation as that with which we fight the war.

Looking at the facts, we see that America will face post-war recovery under the greatest handicap of taxation in her history. We shall have to convert our wartime economy of governmentally financed and dominated industry to privately financed competitive enterprise under a debt 10 times what it was before the war. This debt of $300,000,000,000 will be evidenced by bonds of the United States held by every church, trustee, insurance company, and practically every family in America. Defaults on them or their interest are unthinkable. Such defaults would mean an economic collapse in America that would make the last depression look like prosperity. It would lead to such scarcities and to such a regimentation of our lives that we would wonder whether we had lost, instead of won, the war against totalitarian government. There must be no such defaults. Yet, so as to pay the taxes to meet the interest on these bonds, our taxpaying public will need to earn a national income far greater than before the war. To do this we must produce, distribute, and sell more useful products than before the war. I am confident that if American industry, labor, agriculture, and government work together this income can be earned, this interest can be paid, and America's program of increased and fairly distributed opportunities for all can and will survive.

We can do all this because we now have the plants, the machines, the skilled workmen, the skilled supervision, the record of wartime production, the raw materials, the transportation, and the demand for the goods that make it possible. This new wealth is available in such new developments as those in aviation, radio, electric power, Diesel power, automotive power, electric welding, plastics, chemistry, electronics, new uses of wood and glass, housing improvements, sulfa drugs, and countless other developments that have sprung from recent research.

This program calls for the intelligent handling of Government contract terminations and for the prompt clearing out of wartime machinery and materials to make room for peacetime production. It calls for easy financing of the reconversion and for prompt disposal of Government surplus property. It calls for reasonable unemployment compensation and for the well-planned direction of war workers and soldiers into new work in which they are needed.

It will not be easy, but such a well-ordered program will be possible on one condition. That is the all-important condition of international peace, international stability, and a reasonable assurance of international stability for a substantial number of years ahead. If there be no such stability, we shall be forced into deficit financing of armaments instead of balancing our Budget. When private capital should be moving into creative industry, it will be drained off in

taxes. Individual initiative will be training troops in mechanized maneuvers instead of plowing the productive fields of peaceful prosperity.

THE SENATE'S RESOLUTION

Our own domestic recovery, therefore, calls for vigorous American leadership in helping to establish international stability. To this call, the Senate of the United States has responded with its resolution on international policy. This resolution was adopted last November 5, by a vote of 85 to 5. It was adopted so as to advise our President, our people, and our allies of our policy.

I invite your attention to four points connected with it: First, it speaks not only for the Senate of the United States, it also has the official approval of Great Britain, Russia, and China; second, it calls for action at the earliest practicable date; third, it calls for the inclusion of all peace-loving states, large and small; fourth, it calls for the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. It thus provides for a living and flexible organization of all peace-loving states, rather than for a static alliance among a few of them to the exclusion of the rest.

Let us be true to it, for peace and stability depend as much upon the integrity and firmness with which nations keep faith with one another as upon the terms of the policies they adopt. It was upon his integrity and firmness that George Washington established our Nation. It is upon our integrity and firmness that the peace of the world will now depend.

The language of the Senate which states our policy is as follows: "*Resolved*, That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The phrase, "based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states" refers to a condition familiar to Americans. It is illustrated by the sovereign equality of the States of New York and Rhode Island. They are equally sovereign but quite differently represented in one of the Houses of Congress which determine the policies of common concern to both.

From the point of view of the simplest common sense, the first step to maintain international peace and stability will be to keep together the combination that made it possible.

This does not mean that any superstate must be organized. It does not mean that there must be a single "superarmy." We know this because it is not taking such a superstate nor such a superarmy to win the war.

It does mean, however, that our minimum degree of post-war unity should at least equal that which shall have won the war.

ONLY A FAIR DEAL IS A GOOD DEAL

The problem will not be the creation of a particular form of union as much as it will be the retention of that all-inclusive world-wide unity of purpose that the war has given us. It must be cordial, practical, and fair. Only fairness to all can be supported by all.

Only a fair deal is a good deal.

While the separation of any one of the United Nations from the rest probably would not at once mean war, it would at once substitute uncertainty for certainty. It would mark a point where a break might later come. It would suggest the pattern of another war.

From two world wars in one generation should come at least one great benefit. We who have been forced into this second and greater war at least should agree not to take again the same road that led us from the first war to the second. Millions of dead hands warn us away from that road of attempted retirement from the responsibilities of modern civilization. However attractive its entrance may appear, we now know that it leads only to war.

MILITARY POINT OF VIEW

From the military point of view, the first condition of allied stability is that the championship military team of the United Nations remain readily available. This team will not need to be something strange and new. It will not be a Gestapo nor a force of men separated from their usual citizenship and loyalties. Its members must not be separated from ready resources of food, equipment, and supplies behind them.

The size of our present military forces will be greatly cut down to match the needs of peace. As long as the Allies all remain on the same side they can well afford to reduce their forces to those needed only to insure the maintenance of international order against gangsters of the future who may violate the terms of the peace.

Such international police power is an essential arm of international law. The enforcing officers will not be making war. They will be maintaining peace. They will be "peace officers" on an international scale. They will make the inspections agreed upon by the treaty of peace. In some fields they will be authorized to act at once on the basis of overt acts violating the peace. The safety of the world will be increased by enabling these forces to extinguish international blazes while those blazes are small. In other fields they will need the order of an international court, board of arbitration, or policy-forming body to put them into action.

ECONOMIC POINT OF VIEW

From the economic point of view, international stability will call for a program of access, on reasonable terms, to the trade and raw materials of the world. It will call for orderly encouragement and development of such world-wide activities as those of civil aviation, cable and radio communication, water transportation, petroleum supply, availability of funds for international trade, and some restriction of armaments. There will be need for protection against economic dictatorships as well as against political dictatorships. There also will be need to recognize the value of certain home industries to the respective nations, especially in fields affecting national defense and some such essential commodities as those of food, clothing, and shelter.

POLITICAL POINT OF VIEW

From the political point of view, the simplest common sense calls for the decentralization of as many as possible of our international problems. If afforded the opportunity to do so, many nations will be attracted to one another within the natural regions of their common interests. The Pan American Union represents our attempt to separate the problems of our region from those of the Eastern Hemisphere. Such a policy removes many conflicts of interest from a global to a regional area. It further reduces the need for an administrative superstate to administer the affairs of the 2,000,000,000 people of the world.

This program encourages nations to use their sovereign powers to enter into regional agreements with one another to their mutual advantage and at the same time establish the all-important world-wide international organization, with specific and limited authority, which is the central feature of our Senate resolution.

Such a use of sovereign contracting powers corresponds to the use which individuals make of their individual powers to enter into mutually beneficial contracts. This is the foundation of civilization. The underlying ethics of it are those of the Golden Rule, "Whatsoever ye would that others should do to you, do ye even so to them."

AMERICA'S INTERNAL POLICIES

Turning to our second proposition, America's recovery, progress, and cooperation is an international necessity for the peace and stability of the world.

Assuming that we shall secure the international stability necessary for civilization to survive, America still will face the critical problems of her own internal recovery and development. Our success is vital to our allies and theirs to us. No nation should forget the world, for the economic recovery of the world is essential to the survival of peace and stability.

Within America, there are at least five lines of progress calling for our vigorous support. These are those of greater production, fairer taxes, fairer relations with one another, better standards of living for all, and deeper faith in God and man.

GREATER PRODUCTION

Greater production and sale of American products is the key to the greater national income we must have to pay our post-war debt and taxes. A successful program of great production will mean prosperity in place of depression. It will call for the development of improved sources of mechanical power, improved means of transportation, and the study of every field of new productive knowledge—from the spaceless range of the radio to the invisibly small electron. It will encourage small business and large. It will restrain the abuse of monopoly. It will guide our national transition from our economy of war to our economy of peace. It will reduce the hardships of unemployment by providing employment. It will lessen the present restrictions on agriculture.

FAIRER TAXES

As to fairer taxes, our first need is to stop governmental waste. Our second is to adjust the Federal, State, and local tax burdens to a fairer distribution of them. Our third need is to announce a proposed schedule of Federal tax reductions in ample time so that it may be made the basis of production schedules.

FAIRER RELATIONS

Fairer relations with one another have to do with teamwork in industry, in agriculture, and in our lives in general. Fairness is the key to all sound human relations. It should apply to the relations between labor, management, and the public. Equality of opportunity is the answer to most complaints of economic discrimination. A widespread purpose of mutual helpfulness is essential.

BETTER STANDARDS OF LIVING

Better standards of living for all will come from such greater production, fairer taxes, and fairer human relations. There is need, however, for governmental understanding that the best road to better standards of living is the road of increased earnings rather than that of increased subsidies. The Government, however, should continue to recognize the value of insuring its people against major losses in their earning capacities. Old age, social security, and unemployment compensation are well worth the payment of advance premiums both by the individual employee and the Government. The needs of the returning veteran and of his family are a special trust of the Federal Government. The veteran's service was rendered to the Nation as a whole and should entitle him to equal recognition everywhere in the Nation.

DEEPER FAITH

Deeper faith is needed in God, our fellowmen, and ourselves. Our Nation was founded upon faith in the fatherhood of God and the

brotherhood of man. We need to guide our increasingly important policies toward humanity by the will of God in its broadest application. The nearer we can see with His perspective the clearer will be our view.

Our Government was founded also upon firm faith in the people of America. We need to practice that faith today. This means full faith in the ability of the people of America to choose their own public representatives. It means faith in the devotion of those representatives to the public interest. It means observance of the constitutional reservation of certain powers to the people and to the States. It means recognition of the distribution of all Federal powers among the three branches of our Government. It means an increased faith in the loyalty and dependability of American citizens whether they be at the front, in the factories, on the farms, or at the firesides of this Nation. "America is not so much a place as it is a people." Its people have come from all over the world to make America the realization of their hopes for humanity. Faith in the people of America is the key to the understanding of America.

LINCOLN'S ADVICE

Finally, let us turn to Lincoln for advice in this time of crisis, for he faced issues comparable to ours and we can learn much from him.

He stated his governmental philosophy in these words: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy." He thus set up a true test of faith in self-government. No one wants to be the slave of another but until he also reaches Lincoln's conviction that he does not want to be the master of someone else who shall be his slave, he has not caught the spirit of America.

America is dedicated to the principles that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. America should remain so dedicated. It should be careful, therefore, to see to it that its Government be always a Government of, for, and by all the people. It never should accept a dictatorship by any minority or by any group of minorities or even by any majority seeking to govern the Nation for themselves rather than as trustees for all the people. Our Government should be a representative government freely chosen by the people under their constitutional processes and serving as a trustee for all the people, rich or poor, employer or employee, farmer or office worker, regardless of race, color, or creed. There must be fairness to the minority, even though it be a minority of one, as well as fairness to the majority. America to be true to her purpose must be a Nation dedicated to a fair deal to all.

As we face these critical days of war we turn instinctively to the words of Lincoln in 1865. These words from his second inaugural address are cut into the eternal stone of the Lincoln Memorial and have become a part of the creed of America. His determination to press the war to a decisive conclusion was as fixed then as ours is fixed now. Yet through it all he held clearly before this Nation its fundamental faith in God and man, and he gave to America this statement of America's eternal post-war policy, to which I now urge all to repair:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Address by Hon. Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana, at Economic Leadership Conference, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a speech delivered by me at the economic leadership conference and dinner in New York City on June 15, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUND AMERICAN POLICY

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a distinct honor to have been invited to speak before this economic leadership conference and dinner, sponsored by the American Tariff League. After all, it is no secret that I am regarded by some people in this country as a provincial from the back country, a man of narrow nationalistic views, an isolationist. It may even be that the thought behind my being invited here was to look over a specimen of genus Americanus. But let me assure you that more than a quarter of a century's experience in public life convinces me that not infrequently I react to public questions in pretty much the same manner as do very substantial numbers of plain American people—people who do little talking or writing, but whose franchise is largely determinative of what final American policy shall be.

This evening I intend to speak to Americans about American policies—foreign and domestic. I fully realize my shortcoming in this field—I am not a silk-hatted, spat-wearing diplomat; I do not speak a half-dozen foreign tongues; I do not agree that fascism is good in some places and bad in others, or that communism is fine when its adherents are our friends and dangerous only when they are our enemies. I think both are bad for the people's liberties and freedoms. I am just a plain American citizen whose ancestors have lived here for more than 300 years, and I confess that in my old-fashioned way I believe that this country and its Government and institutions are better than any other on earth. I shall try to express to you how I see the problems that now face the American people.

You people here, of course, are interested vitally in American foreign policy because today our domestic policies are so dependent upon our present and future foreign policies. Ours is the greatest industrial nation, and I understand that your organization represents those industrial interests in our land who are concerned with selling American goods and services. I have read, with a great deal of interest, your declaration of principles. I doubt if there can be any basic disagreement with its four major tenets. But the problems of unfair competition, monetary policy, international exchange stability, the provisions of the reciprocal trade agreements, or tariff rates—all these sink into insignificance compared with what we do in the way of a foreign policy.

These matters can be adjusted to the betterment of national welfare when a secure and stable peace comes to the world; without such a peace they are merely words on the sands of a beach washed away with each rise of the tide.

Since America's entry into the war, I have not taken part in much public speaking. I have felt that the first job was to win the war—to win it fast with the least expenditure of life and treasure.

But now it is time that the United Nations did something definite and concrete in the way of hastening the end of the war by diplomatic as well as military measures—and something definite and concrete in the way of planning for the peace.

And if the United Nations cannot at the moment reach complete agreement, that fact should not deter our Nation from itself doing something.

The foreign policy of a Nation is ordinarily dictated and motivated by the national aims of that state. This being so, it is relatively clear why Germany fights, or England fights, or Russia fights, or why Poland and Finland and Greece fought. What are our national aims and what are we fighting for? It is not enough to answer—kill or be killed. That, like all half-truths, is misleading. We stultify our national heritage if we regard this merely as a war of survival. We betray our sacred honor and the lives of thousands of our countrymen if we admit for one moment that our objective is solely to whip the aggressor. That theory leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable. It may be—none of us can be certain about that—but surely the military subjugation of the enemy must be only a means to an end if this Nation's principles and objectives are not to become suspect all over the world.

Are we spilling blood of American boys up and down Europe to crush national socialism, or monarchism, or limited democracy, and pave the way for the establishment of communism? Have we changed our role from that of protector of the weak to destroyer of minorities? What do we demand of the enemy before we stop killing him? What kind of governments do we want in Europe and Asia after the war? Are we to continue to fight interminably—exhausting our financial and economic and natural resources—and even more important, the flower of our young manhood, until we have become a nation of women, old men, and cripples, bankrupt in men and materials? Isn't it time that we should do as Pope Pius said last week, and I quote:

"It is * * * of the greatest importance that this fear (of a war of extermination) should give way to a well-founded expectation of honorable solutions; solutions that are not ephemeral or carry the germs of fresh turmoil and dangers to peace, but are true and durable; solutions that start from the principle that wars, today, no less than in the past, cannot easily be laid to the account of peoples, as such."

These questions bring sharply into focus, it seems to me, the fact that we have failed to exploit a means of speeding the successful conclusion of the war.

It is the absence of a simple, clearly understandable policy of what we fight for—what are our peace aims. Our war aims are clear enough—to destroy the enemy's will to resist—to uproot Hitlerism. Fears exist that new dictatorships will replace the old. What everyone desires is the disappearance of all forms of autocracy. That is the earnest prayer of distressed and police-ridden Europe! It is the prayer of the people of the United States as well. But it must be evident that there is no coordination between these war aims and the peace aims, and that lack of coordination may cost this Nation and our allies precious lives that need not be lost.

It must be realized, of course, that it is no easy thing to bring quickly into being agreements on such major matters as the future fate of a conquered enemy. I am not unmindful that the leaders of the Allied governments face tremendous difficulties in

solving mutually acceptable compromises. But throughout the world, among friendly and enemy nations alike, it is the United States of America which is regarded as the leader, the pace-setter, the arbiter, and above all, the friend of the down-trodden and the enslaved. We have a duty therefore, I believe, to speak—in concert with our Allies if possible, alone if necessary—but to speak forcefully and unequivocally on what our policies are and will be for victor and vanquished alike.

Regardless of the outcome of the war, there still will be German people in Europe, probably a German state. The war is not going to bring death to 65,000,000 Germans. A very substantial number of that German people are probably no more in favor of fascism than we are. The last free elections in Germany proved that conclusively and everything that Hitler has done since must have convinced many millions of Germans that he has brought them to disaster. Just as in France, Poland, Italy, Rumania and all the countries in Europe, there is doubt and worry and wonder as to their post-war government—so in Germany there must be ten times that sort of speculation.

Will there be a nation? Who will govern it? What territories will it comprise? Who will control its political and economic and social policies? What will be expected of the people after the war? These are only a few of the questions that come instantly to mind. And from the Allies, the liberators from the yoke of fascism, are heard two words—"unconditional surrender." Beyond that—ominous silence. What choice do many of these enslaved people have under those circumstances, except to fight on, bitterly and endlessly?

And what will happen in Europe the moment hostilities cease? Will there not be a vacuum—the most tremendous vacuum in government of all recorded history? Most governments in Europe are puppets. They will fall with Hitler, and even the others will totter in the political convulsions that will follow. What an opportunity for power-hungry men—either within those lands or from other lands—to seize control. Under such a situation, war will never end; there will be revolution after revolution; the life and treasure we have expended so fabulously to end dictatorship may well result in the creation of a series of dictators all over Europe, if for no other reason than to bring stability.

That is a result that we must at all costs avoid. We can do much to avert its initial coming into being by taking action now—which will make clear to all the people of the world—the occupied lands, the enemy himself—what we propose to do. And the first immediate effect of any such action will be a definite weakening of the enemy's will to resist, despite all of Hitler's and Goebbels' propaganda.

That is the first problem. Now, what about the second—what do we expect in Europe—what kind of governments can reasonably be established with a chance of successful survival? It is not a question of what we desire—we may desire much, but we must face practical realities of what is possible, what will work in that conflicting religious, social, political, and economic cauldron which is Europe.

It must be abundantly clear that, as Mr. Sumner Welles has said, the future of Europe is something which affects the future of every country. And it also follows that to bring stability, continental Europe must be represented in the decisions which affect the future of Europe.

What we in this country are most interested in is the establishment of some kind of world order in which it will be difficult—I do not say "impossible"; because nothing is impossible—the establishment of a world order in which it will be difficult for nations to become enbroiled in warfare with each other.

Today the United States still is the most powerful Nation on earth—militaristically, economically, financially. Six months ago we had the unquestioned power and prestige to formulate the kind of peace program which we believed would stabilize Europe. Some of that authority and prestige has been frittered away, but it is not yet too late for this Nation to use its authority to convince our Allies of the kind of peace we want.

There are honest and conscientious people here and abroad who believe that such a world order is possible only through a single world government.

But I do not believe that the American people will yield their sovereign right as a free people. I do not believe we want to be ruled, directly or indirectly, by any person, or any council, or any world government not under our direct control. The price we paid for our own freedom was too dear for that.

There are also other honest and conscientious people here and abroad who believe that a stable world order that will keep us out of future wars is possible only through a military alliance of the large allied nations—Britain, Russia, possibly China, and the United States.

But alliances of major powers in all history, and particularly since the Holy Alliance, clearly negates any such contention. Alliances, if history is any judge, tend rather to breed wars. Moreover, an alliance is bound inevitably to involve us more and more deeply in European and Asiatic power politics.

The answer in my opinion, is a federation of European states, a sort of United States of Europe. It is an answer that is buttressed by experience both in the United States and Europe; it is an answer that is practical and workable for Europe and holds out the best guaranty against future involvement in European affairs by this Republic.

Let us explore this idea of an economic federation of Europe—a United States of Europe; let us understand why it is necessary, and why it is more likely to work than any other plan yet considered.

When I returned from a European trip in 1923, after 5 months, I said that the solution for the problems of Europe rested in the establishment of a European federation patterned after our own Government. I thought then that it was an original idea—I learned later that many statesmen had advocated it—notably Briand of France. Today I find myself in the company of such men as Winston Churchill, Anthony Eden, Clement Atlee, and Sir Archibald Sinclair, all of whom both before and after the war, have strongly urged the creation of a federated European state.

Before we look at Europe, let us consider these United States. What do you suppose would have been our history if each of our 48 States maintained exclusive sovereignty with the tariff barriers and business restrictions that flow from sovereignty. We have here the peoples of all Europe; we have customs, religions, social problems and ideas, economic and industrial situations varying from State to State, and certainly from region to region. Yet, we have made a success of union largely because the social, political, and economic problems are considered and treated as national problems.

Basically the problem in Europe is not greatly different. The geographical area is far smaller; the agricultural and industrial problems are more homogeneous; even the ethnic and religious differences are no greater than in our own country.

I see here in America the faces of people from all European countries. I cannot believe that only the good people from those countries have come here and only the bad remain there. I believe these people can get along with each other as well on European soil as they do on American soil. I want to see them try to do so. I want to help them do so for the good of the peoples of Europe and for the good of the peoples of America.

I said a moment ago that we had experience to guide us in Europe as well as in the United States. The future organization of Europe could well be patterned after that of Switzerland. It is well to understand this seeming miracle of Switzerland—a nation made up of 25 little states with different nationalities, languages, traditions, customs, and religions united into a pacific and democratic union in the very heart of boiling and exploding Europe. Like Switzerland, there is no basic reason why the countries of continental Europe cannot be united democratically into a single political and economic entity. I have said this before and I shall say it again—the stabilizing effect upon a world that would be created by a great free-trade area in Europe as a counterpart to the great free-trade area of our own country cannot be overemphasized.

Such a federalized Europe would negate the possibility of a new and resurgent Germany threatening the weaker neighboring states or even obtaining hegemony in Europe.

In such a state, Germans would make up scarcely 20 percent of the total voting population; within it the vast majority of non-German Europeans would be an effective democratic check against Prussian or Yonker control of national policies. Moreover, neither the army, the armament industry, the foreign policy, the currency, nor the national economy would be Germany's, nor that of any other single European state. Germany, or any other European state, would cease to be a threat to the peace and security of the continent and of the world.

Men of great vision have dreamed for years of collaboration between nations—of peaceful adjudications of their differences. How better can this be achieved than through the creation of a great federalized state within Europe, which may bring peace to lands—soaked for centuries with the blood of mankind in futile wars? When the European state reaches stability and strength and experience but not before then possibilities will then ensue for the formation of an international organization of nations juridically able to maintain world peace simply because the hothouse of most wars will have been eliminated.

The longer we wait to openly espouse the idea of such a democratic federation or United States, the more difficult and dangerous will the situation become. Already there are evidences that this policy of wait and see will bring us into troubled waters by war's end. While we wait and see, Russia has not remained idle. I should, perhaps, interpolate here, that I am not criticizing Russia or its leaders. They are pursuing policies which they deem best for the welfare of the Soviet Union. From a purely Russian standpoint, its policy of a weak and disunited Europe with many of its states leaning heavily on the Soviet for economic and military support is readily understandable. What Russia's policy will finally be—whether a Soviet-dominated federation, or an alliance of the border states with Russia, or complete integration within the Soviet of many of the smaller nations may depend largely upon whether we exercise the power we now have to bring about a peace that is in the interest of our people.

Britain's problem is not dissimilar to that of Russia's, although in England there is already a substantial body of public opinion which favors a sort of United States of Europe. Britain, like Russia, throughout her history has been threatened by continental nations. And throughout history she has used the balance of power and disunity in Europe to save her. In Britain, as in the United States, there are men who oppose the impairment of British sovereignty by

membership in a European union. The idea of the British Parliament being under the direction of a majority of continental nations is repugnant to them. And there is the even more ominous argument that such an involvement would lead to dismemberment of the Empire, simply because Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa are unwilling to bind themselves to the European continent. These men in Britain are not unwilling, however, to sponsor a European federation which would not include Britain. There are, of course, others in Britain who fear the future with a united Europe and prefer a post-war Europe divided by a new balance of power. It is this segment of British public opinion which, if followed, must inevitably lead to a clash with Russia over the extent of the balance of power to be exercised by these two great States.

Unless the people of Europe are willing to accept some form of federation and work together for a solution of their own economic, social, and political problems then I see no reason why we in the United States should be called upon every 20 years to give of our material resources, feed them, and soak their lands with the blood of American boys.

But there is hope in Britain for the more realistic and practical course. A year before the outbreak of the war, Churchill wrote:

"Why should Europe fear unity? As well might a man fear his own body. * * * I believe that Europe will be driven, sooner or later, to question the monstrous absurdity of her own organization. * * * The conception of a United States of Europe is right. Every step taken to that end which appeases the obsolete hatreds and vanished oppressions, which makes easier the traffic and reciprocal services of Europe, which encourages its nations to lay aside their threatening arms or precautionary panoply, is good in itself, is good for them, and good for all."

Mr. Atlee, leader of the Labor Party, has said that "Europe must federate or perish."

It does not take a prophet to see that the situation being what it is in Europe, Britain cannot go it alone. Mr. Churchill made this clear when he said, speaking of the idea of a European federation:

"All this will, I believe, be found to harmonize with the high permanent interests of Britain, the United States, and Russia."

Unless the United States takes an active and forthright part in pushing the idea of a democratic union of Europe, we face at the end of the war what will amount to a partition of the Continent into British and Russian spheres of influence.

Is it so difficult to realize what a return to this balance of power means? Isn't it clear that regardless of Germany's military defeat, she will have won the war politically? For it must be plain that both Britain and Russia will woo the new Germany in an effort to keep her out of the other's sphere of influence. In effect, Germany will hold the balance of power. Am I conjuring up spooks and goblins? Well, then, has not this bidding for Germany's favor already begun? How interpret Russia's Free German Committee, already functioning in Moscow? How interpret the shrewd Russian propaganda which tells the German people that Russia does not seek the dismemberment of the German Reich? How far and how long can Britain remain quiet and not make counterbids unless a definite European policy is decided upon now?

Do you believe that the American people are fighting the war for a new balance of power in Europe? Do you believe the American people are fighting the war to restore rubber, oil, tin, and copra exploitations to a few individuals who have become members of the peerage through use of slave labor? Do you believe that the American people are fighting the war to establish communism in Yugoslavia or the other Balkan states? Do you believe the American people are fighting the war to give Russia a slice of Finland? Do you believe the American people are fighting the war to give trucks and tanks and railroads and airplanes to one nation so that it in turn can give them to another nation to build good will between these second and third recipients of our substance?

Do you believe that the American people are fighting the war to wash every coral beach in the Pacific with their sons' blood for the right in the post-war world to pay rent for the use of airfields on such islands? Isn't it a sad commentary on affairs when, in this democratic Republic, the people do not know their own country's foreign policy?

War, it has been said, is but an instrument of foreign policy. Therefore, when foreign policy loses direction, war loses its meaning. The contrasts between the powerful military might of Britain and the United States and their unimpressive political effort, between their military resolution and their political irresolution, are significant. Both here and in England people are asking, "What is the war about?"

I quote from an editorial appearing in the May issue of The Nineteenth Century and After, a conservative and well-edited British magazine:

"It is being said, more and more, that 'Uncle Joe is out for Russia.' It is said, not in criticism but with respect, even with envy. The English are asking 'Where do we come in?' No answer is given. And as declared principles have become so elusive, and as others get the applause, and will, it would seem, carry off the prizes, people are asking, 'What is the war about?'

"To defeat the Germans is necessary, there are few, if any, who doubt it. But that alone is not enough."

That is right. To defeat the Germans? Of course—that is our immediate objective. But that alone is not enough. The defeat of the foe is a necessity, but something far more fundamental must be accomplished for the security, the well-being, the honor, the prestige, and the principles of this Nation are at stake.

Now, any consideration of foreign policy and the stabilization of Europe to prevent future wars must necessarily include a consideration of our domestic post-war problems. They will be many and they will require the best efforts of every thinking American lest we lose here in this country the freedom, the economic security, the liberty, and the kind of Government we are fighting for.

If it is sound judgment in time of peace to prepare for war, it is equally good sense in time of war to prepare for peace. We have much to learn from Britain on this score—the English are not idle. Even in the darkest days of the London blitz, English merchants and exporters continued zealously to guard their markets. Nor have they failed to take advantage of every opportunity since to prepare the way for British trade in the post-war world.

What have we done? Our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is still law. We are continuing to foster a good-neighbor policy in Latin and South America. But I sometimes have grave doubts of the degree of success of these programs to date. This may be due to lack of proper administration or to the exigencies of war.

But it seems to me that the situation which will face us economically in the post-war world will be vastly more complicated than before the war, while the policies and the plans which guide us are of a pre-war vintage.

It may be well to examine briefly the facts that have added to the complexity of the economic position in which the United States will find itself in the post-war era. For the past generation United States exports, expressed as a percentage of national income, have progressively decreased. Only during periods of war, or reckless foreign loans, have exports reached relatively high figures. But in many foreign countries exports constitute as much as 40 percent of their national income. It is obvious, therefore, why such countries seek to broaden their markets by every means, including propaganda directed against all American tariffs. It may not be realized, but it is a fact nevertheless, that in the pre-war period United States tariffs on the average—and I desire to emphasize that word "average"—were among the lowest of the major exporting and importing countries. I have in mind, of course, that the word "tariffs" include such devices as quotas, exchange controls, and embargoes.

In recent months this propaganda stemming from abroad and echoed here for the elimination of tariffs has been replete with the words "equal" and "free" access to raw materials by all nations. Frankly, I do not know, and have not been able to learn, just what is meant by this "equal access to raw materials" theory.

Again we hear some of our superinternational "do gooders" say that because we are—they should say we were—the richest nation in the world we should enter into some kind of a "share the wealth" agreement with the other countries of the world. We should lend-lease, never to be returned, our manufactured goods as well as our raw materials.

Our country has about 6 percent of the world's population, but in normal times possesses and produces about one-third of the world's income. Even if we were to redistribute our wealth and our income on a come-one come-all basis, the percentage increase for the remaining 94 percent of the world's population would be fractional. And what would happen to our own standard of living? I am not ashamed to argue that we owe our first duty to our own people—although it has become fashionable in some quarters to deprecate such a philosophy.

I fail to understand these men who on the one hand openly admire and praise Stalin for looking out for Soviet Russia first, and who regard Churchill as the world's foremost figure, because he says plainly that he has not become the King's first minister to liquidate the Empire and, who, on the other hand, sneer at those whose primary concern is the well-being of their fellow Americans. To me, it is self-evident that if we reduce living standards appreciably here, we jeopardize not only the national well-being of our population—but bankrupt our own Government. I should like to impress upon you as forcibly as I can that dictators are but the receivers of bankrupt nations.

In analyzing this problem we must recognize first that we already have owed to us some thirty billion dollars' worth of reciprocal lend-lease—and that we also possess the bulk of the world's merchant shipping. And speaking about lend-lease, while coming here on the train today, I read in the London Economist an article titled "Plain Speaking." In this article we learn the English feel they will have trouble with American lend-lease because Congress has taken over authority on the approval of settlement agreements. From the British point of view lend-lease settlements will be similar to those of World War debts.

The article says, and I quote:

"Can there be any harm in continuing to say that British opinion will not be content with any ultimate settlement which fails to take into account the dollars spent by Great Britain in supporting American munition factories in the days of cash and carry? Or can there by any harm in making it plain that, since America has not handed over in lend-lease any of her capital assets but only the current output of her factories and farms, there can be no question of any handing over in return of any British capital assets, whether they are strategic islands, or oil

reserves, or industrial securities, and that repayment—if any material repayment is made at all—can only be in the current output of British factories?"

We must also realize that up to recent years our greatest imports in value were such things as silk, rubber, sugar, wood pulp, and the like. We have now developed nylon out of coal, air, and water—which even before our entrance into the war was threatening to displace silk almost completely. And there are many other competing fibers of a more or less similar sort, waiting to find their way into the market.

The cost of nylon is, for most purposes, well below that of the natural imported silk, and this cost is continually declining. Never again will the American consumer have to pay $5 or $6 a pound for silk or its equivalent. Some other products that have also felt the hand of science include newsprint, wool, rayon, vegetable oils, aluminum and the even lighter magnesium metals, laminated wood, tin, lacquers, plastics, dehydrated and frozen foods, drugs and synthetic products of all kinds. Never again should there be great fluctuations in the price of rubber. Whether or not the United States continues to import a certain quantity of crude rubber, the very fact that we have the artificial product which can be made at a competitive price, will put a ceiling on the price that can be charged for the crude. Thus the American manufacturer will be saved the losses and grief arising from speculation in vast inventories at rapidly fluctuating prices, and the American consumer will get his rubber tires at a price which can largely be predetermined.

A third factor involves the extent of our foreign trade. A recent careful examination of all imports into the United States during the year 1939, which were of an annual value exceeding $10,000,000, leads to some conclusions which may surprise the uninformed. It appears that such progress has already been made that, if it were necessary, the United States could get along very comfortably under its own steam, importing not more than one-fourth or one-fifth as much in value as it actually imported in the year, 1939. Under urgent war conditions, the figure of necessary imports could even be cut to a substantially lower point, provided we were importing only for the purpose of taking care of ourselves, and not for lend-leasing to the rest of the world.

I am not recommending as a policy, that the United states try to restrict its imports in this manner. I am merely stating that all the figures and facts, when properly analyzed, indicate that in normal times the rest of the world is not likely to have a great supply of commodities which we urgently need, and which could be counted upon to be used in payment for heavy exports from the United States.

These, then, are facts which would seem to compel a nationalistic, self-sufficient economic policy for the United States. Added to them is the sharply evident desire on the part of the American people to cease all squandering of our money and material resources.

On the other hand, do we want to revert to the policy of China and Japan prior to the nineteenth century when commercial contact with the outside world was forbidden? In the true meaning of the word we have never been a Nation of isolationists.

It would seem desirable to have sufficient competition from foreign sources to insure at all times reasonable prices on all commodities for our consumers and insure efficient operation of our domestic production.

It is therefore imperative, it seems to me, that we avoid extremes. Let us exercise study, deliberation, and caution in arriving at conclusions. Americans have never lacked in initiative or enterprise. If these are coupled with careful analysis plus a continued investigation of the facts not only by our Government but by each individual I have no fear of the outcome.

When our boys who are scattered throughout the world return they will come back with first-hand knowledge of every country on the globe. They will, I feel certain, come back with the knowledge of what they do not want the United States to be like. This information alone will be invaluable. Armed with complete data and exercising the cautious courage which is attributed to all Yankees, we can follow victory at arms with victory at home.

A Serious Reversal on the Farm Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an able article on the subject A Serious Reversal on the Farm Front, written by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SERIOUS REVERSAL ON THE FARM FRONT

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.)

For 7 years Congress and the Federal Government have been endeavoring to reduce interest rates on farm loans. Excessive debt and burdensome interest rates brought ruin to thousands upon thousands of good American farmers in the years following the last war. This was true even during the 1920's when the rest of our economy was allegedly entering upon a new era of prosperity.

One of the first significant recovery measures of the New Deal, when it came to power in 1933, was the revitalization of the national farm credit system and creation of the Farm Credit Administration. New credit was made available to the farmers, to save them from foreclosure, and steps were taken to reduce interest rates.

The Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 authorized the reduction of interest rates on outstanding Federal land bank loans to 4½ percent. In 1935 the effective rate of interest on these loans was still further reduced to 3½ percent, and it has been retained at that level up to July 1 of this year. The interest rate on Land Bank Commissioner loans originally set at 5 percent was reduced to 4 percent in 1937, and to 3½ percent in 1940. It has remained at this level up until the present time.

A SHOCKING REVERSAL

But now the Democratic administration is reversing itself in this, as in many other vital phases of the original New Deal program. The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, backed by the Department of Agriculture, has recommended that on Federal land bank loans the interest rate be allowed to go back up to 4 percent, and on land bank commissioner loans up to 5 percent beginning the 1st of July of this year.

This recommendation, coming as it does when the farmer is beset with frozen prices and rising costs, is a shocking reversal of both the previously established farm credit policy and the economic-stabilization program. It comes at a time when farmers are admittedly selling many of their products at prices which do not provide a fair return in comparison with the cost of production.

The economic stabilizers refuse to grant price increases to correct these situations. Instead, they have set up elaborate machinery and complicated rules and regulations to dole out agricultural subsidies of one kind or another in an effort to make up the difference between the frozen prices of these farm commodities and the return the farmer needs in order to continue production on an economic basis.

Certainly agriculture is entitled to expect that the Federal Government will use the same vigor in stabilizing farm production costs that is employed in stabilizing farm commodity prices. Interest is part of the farmer's cost of production. But the administration chooses to look the other way when an increase in the farmer's interest charges is proposed.

There are approximately 800,000 farmers who still owe on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans. The total amount of these loans outstanding on January 1, 1944, was approximately $1,760,000,000. This amounts to approximately 30 percent of all loans outstanding on American farm land, including the loans advanced by the insurance companies, the banks, and other private sources.

The significance, therefore, of an increase in interest rates on these Federal land bank and Commissioner loans is inescapable. The proposed increase from 3½ to 4 percent on Federal land bank mortgages is an increase of 14 percent. The proposed increase from 3½ to 5 percent on Commissioner loans is an increase of 42 percent.

In terms of actual dollars, it means the farmer who has a $3,000 Commissioner loan outstanding would have his annual interest charge raised from $105 to $150. The farmer with a $4,000 Federal land bank mortgage outstanding will have his interest charges raised from $140 to $200.

Can anyone deny that these additional interest charges amount to an increase in the farmer's cost of production? If he was breaking even before, this added expense will put him in the hole. If he was in the hole before, it means he will go in still deeper. The Government will not let him adjust his prices because it is bound and determined to hold the line on farm commodity prices even in instances where the price admittedly does not provide adequate compensation for the cost of production without some form of subsidy.

THE JOB CAN BE DONE

If the Federal Government is going to hold the price line against the farmer it certainly ought to hold the cost line for him.

In the matter of interest rates on Land Bank and Commissioner loans, holding the line for the farmer is simply a matter of deciding to do it. It lies entirely within the power of the Federal Government to do the whole job without asking anybody's cooperation. It does not have to worry about enforcing the law against recalcitrant violators. All that is required is an act of Congress, approved by the President, extending for another year or another 2 years the present effective rates on these loans.

The future stability of agriculture will depend in large measure upon the Federal Government's success in working out a farm credit program which will relieve agriculture of the excessive debt it acquired during and after the last war, and at the same time providing adequate sources to meet current and long-range credit needs at as low a rate of interest as possible.

Such farm-loan programs as the Bankhead-Jones tenant purchase plan and the Farm Security Administration's farm-land loans have operated on an interest charge of only 3 percent. There is no reason why all farm loans backed by the Federal Government

should not ultimately be made available to farmers for the same rate of interest.

Fortunately, Congress has not followed the Farm Credit Administration all the way in its recommendation to allow interest rates to go up to 4 and 5 percent on their loans. The Pace bill as it passed the House of Representatives would fix the effective rate of interest on Land Bank Commissioner loans at 4 percent for the coming year, instead of allowing it to go to 5 percent as the Farm Credit Administration and the Department of Agriculture have recommended.

Nevertheless, even the Pace bill provided for an increase in interest rates for 800,000 farm borrowers, at a time when they have every reason to expect the protection of the economic stabilization program. The farmer is entitled to a continuation of present rates without any increase at all.

Economic stabilization, if it is to be successful and win the confidence of the American people, must be applied without discrimination, and with equity for all. In too many instances, as applied by the present administration, it has been a lopsided club used to crack down on those who could not protest effectively. The American farmer has felt its weight many times in the past 2 years.

If the Government itself will not enforce fair play, if the Government will not act justly unless forced to do so by outside pressure, it is not surprising that organized groups of American citizens undertake to use their political and economic strength to win their demands. The technique of force and pressure is easily taught and quickly learned. Every instance of administrative discrimination for one group or against another brings fresh converts to the pressure technique. A stabilization program, if it succeeds, must be a stabilization program for all on equal terms.

Service of Disabled American Veterans Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on Monday evening, May 29, 1944, an old friend of mine, William E. Tate, past national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, and at present special claims officer of the Disabled American Veterans in the Washington office, delivered a radio address over Station WINX on the subject Why Disabled Veterans Need D. A. V. Service. This very able address shows the need of the national service officer to aid the Veterans' Administration and its representatives in assisting the disabled veterans of the United States. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DISABLED VETERANS NEED D. A. V. SERVICE

Each day of war new recruits are added to the wheel-chair brigade, the blind, the maimed, the diseased, the helpless. These men gave their rich young blood, their youth and health, their promise and high dreams of the future. They made these priceless sacrifices for us, for you and me, for the present generation, and for generations yet unborn, and for the high hopes of mankind. They offered all freely. Any claim for benefits for any of these men is a special claim and handled as such by the D. A. V.

Most citizens insist that the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders should be borne by the Federal Government, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were caused by military service. However, the disabled veterans have learned through sad experience that there is a vast gap between the enactment of beneficial legislation and the application of the law to the individual case. To prove service connection of a disability is not an easy thing to do unless official records show its inception in service.

The Government, functioning through the Veterans' Administration, acts as judge and jury, so to speak, of all veterans' claims. Government cannot, in addition, act as counsel for the plaintiff or prosecute a claim against itself. It is the responsibility of the individual claimant to see that his equitable rights are protected, and in this he has the able assistance of the D. A. V.

The D. A. V. acts as attorney for plaintiff in legal and technical matters and helps the veteran to establish the basic factual evidence of his claim. Government is not interested in anyone's opinion or conclusions. Suppositions are not acceptable. Only on the basis of facts does the Government determine a veteran's rights. Often the veteran is misinformed or does not understand the value of technical evidence to substantiate claims.

It is up to the disabled veteran to establish that his disability occurred in military service or was aggravated by such service. If, in order to remain with a particular outfit, a man didn't want to complain, or if his symptoms didn't show up until after his discharge from service, his chances for disability compensation are poor, unless he has the assistance which the D. A. V. is peculiarly qualified and equipped to render.

As to veterans of World War I, about 90 percent of those for whom the D. A. V. procured service-connected disability compensation had had their claims denied previously by the Veterans' Administration. As to veterans of the present world conflict, 70 percent of those who come to the D. A. V. have had their claims denied; the other 30 percent have not prosecuted their cases.

As Prof. Charles A. Beard, of Columbia University, has pointed out, "Rights are not self-enforcing and we must keep battling for them to make real in life any rights proclaimed on paper." It is obvious, therefore, that the expert assistance extended by the D. A. V. service officers is invaluable to our maimed fighters.

The D. A. V.'s work is not only humanitarian, but truly American, efficient, and economically wise.

The majority of the members of a rating board may be convinced by circumstantial evidence that a disability existed while the man was in service, but they must depend upon factual evidence to establish the claim. The D. A. V., which enjoys the full confidence of the Veterans' Administration, endeavors to fill the breach and helps the veteran to fight for his equitable claim every inch of the way.

The D. A. V. makes the disabled veteran understand that Government officials are not autocratic in their decisions but that primarily they must adhere to the limitations and restrictions of the law. They cannot grant benefits to a man just because he asks for them, but only because his claim, supplemented by the evidence, measures up to the requirements of the law. The D. A. V. enlightens him as to what constitutes proof of his claim and helps him to establish all the pertinent facts in the case.

All service officers are themselves disabled veterans who have been "through the mill". They have the necessary patient understanding and good psychological approach to the problems of all disabled veterans. The first requisite of a national service officer is social consciousness. He has a real sense of values and is able to visualize what a disabled veteran is going through. He can make the veteran understand what he has to do to establish the technical and legal merits of his equitable claim.

The Veterans' Administration is vested by authority to tell a man that he is not eligible but not to point out wherein his evidence falls short. Once an affidavit is on file it cannot be taken out again by the applicant, but the D. A. V. service officer tells the claimant truthfully what his shortcomings are and encourages him to get more detailed factual reports.

Many veterans do not show signs of physical impairment and do not become disabled until a long time after their release from service. This will be particularly true of those who are serving in the South Pacific where malaria is rampant. Medical discipline is rigidly enforced among all troops in this section of the world, and every member of the armed forces takes a required amount of quinine every day. It may be 3 months or longer from the time of his discharge before the man first shows signs of malaria, and unless his case is properly presented to the Veterans' Administration his claim is apt to be rejected, even though his disability was incurred while he was in service.

Records, if any, which were made during the time of his service may have been destroyed or lost or may be incomplete. "Buddies" with whom he served may have been killed in action, may since have died, or possibly their memories have faded with the passage of time. Again, the veteran may no longer remember the names or addresses of those with whom he served, possibly having been in each outfit only a few weeks, and therefore becoming acquainted with "buddies" only by their nicknames of "Mack" or "Bill" or "Ed."

A hundred and one different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though they actually were service-incurred or service-aggravated.

The fight for justice, however, must still be carried on for such disillusioned disabled veterans and for their dependents.

To sum up, our Government has established hospitals and other agencies for the physical care and protection of our ex-servicemen but the channels through which an applicant has to follow are bewildering, complex, and often misleading for the uninformed. This predicament is not by purposeful design but due to the preponderance of prescribed regulations that add up to an almost insurmountable barrier of red tape.

During time of war, all patriotic citizens sincerely and freely promise that "nothing will be too good for those who return." Unfortunately, many disabled veterans have become so disappointed by their abortive efforts to secure gainful employment or adequate compensation as to believe that the cheering patriots safe at home literally meant "nothing," for nothing has been their reward in too many meritorious cases. We cannot permit such a feeling to prevail.

Continued maintenance and further expansion of its vital service is the D. A. V.'s program to insure prompt, free, and unstinted help to America's service-disabled veterans.

Irrigation and Navigation in the Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "T. V. A. Is Not the Answer," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 12, 1944. The editorial deals with irrigation and navigation in the Missouri River Basin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

T. V. A. IS NOT THE ANSWER

There is ample water in the Missouri Basin for both irrigation and navigation. This is the substance of the report made public by the engineers subcommittee of the Missouri River States Committee and it substantiates the verdict of the United States Army Engineers.

Representatives of all of the nine States in the Missouri Basin participated in the study of the engineering subcommittee, so that no charge can be raised as to partisan interest. The subcommittee's report shows that there is available at Sioux City, Iowa, the head of navigation on the Missouri, an annual flow of 22,473,000 acre-feet. This is in excess of the 22,445,000 acre-feet needed for the irrigation proposals of the Bureau of Reclamation and the navigation requirements set out by the Army engineers.

The findings of the subcommittee should settle the current arguments in the Senate as to whether there is sufficient water available for all purposes projected in the Pick plan as it is incorporated in the pending flood-control bill.

The only controversy which remains is the question of the proper Federal agency to control the Missouri Basin program. On this question the logical solution is the one proposed by the Army engineers and incorporated in the Pick plan. This solution would give to the Army engineers control over the multiple-purpose reservoirs and other river works on the main stem of the Missouri which are primarily for flood control and navigation, and delegate to the Reclamation Bureau control over the reservoirs in the tributary streams constructed primarily for irrigation.

One thing is certain. The Missouri Valley does not want a T. V. A. The example of what has happened in the Tennessee Valley under the T. V. A. is sufficient evidence to convince the people of the Missouri Valley of the danger of this type of bureaucratic control.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was created originally as a power and navigation agency. Flood control was never a serious problem in the Tennessee Valley and navigation under the T. V. A. has become secondary to power. But the T. V. A. has extended its other activities far beyond the original purposes for which the Authority was created.

The United States Chamber of Commerce in an appendix to its current referendum on National Water Resources Policies, lists 30 activities of the T. V. A., which include a number of manufacturing projects, large farm operations, food processing, socialized medicine, the operation of schools, retail stores, recreational facilities, the loaning of money, and operation of numerous police powers.

As the appendix points out, "Regional authorities have a much larger significance than the administration of water resource benefits. Authorities are, in fact, the operators as well as administrators and they carry their operations into almost every detail of community life."

The United States Chamber of Commerce sets out as a declaration of its proposed water resources policy the support of a program of development wherein the purpose or purposes of each project, especially multipurpose projects are clear and declared in advance. The best way to insure this is to have the projects assigned to an organization that is devoted primarily to the major purpose of the project. Thus the Bureau of Reclamation should handle all reclamation projects and the Army engineers should handle all flood-control projects and continue with navigation.

The Power of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able and instructive address delivered by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief, Farm Journal, at the Economic Leadership Conference and dinner, New York City, on June 15, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Agriculture is in favor of international trade. Agriculture is in favor of tariffs. Contrary to what appears to be widespread belief, there is no necessary conflict between these two positions.

Farmers in certain sections of the Nation still produce quantities of certain commodities in excess of the effective domestic demand. They would like to have profitable export markets for some of their output. As consumers, they desire certain agricultural products from other parts of the world. They have been accustomed to using coffee, tea, cocoa, spices, and rubber among the many agricultural materials which they do not produce. They believe that trade in such commodities is of mutual advantage and thoroughly sound.

Farmers are keenly aware, in addition, that the great market for their output is within the borders of the United States. They desire to see American industries prosper and commercial enterprises active. They have observed that well-paid workers who are busy the year around are much better customers for food than ill-paid part-time workers. Therefore, they are anxious that those industries partially dependent upon export sales shall be able to send their goods abroad. They are perfectly willing that both their own goods and the exported industrial commodities shall be paid for by the customary procedures which make American dollars available to foreign buyers, including the reception of imports into this country.

Farmers are not willing, however, that industrial exports shall be paid for principally with imports which compete with what American farmers produce.

The plethora of propaganda and the bitterness of controversy have tended to obscure some of the simple truths about trade among nations, as well as about the essentials of domestic prosperity. There appear to be those among us who have come to believe that "tariffbarrier" is one word. Propagandists for political theory and for foreign or selfish interests seldom mention tariff without describing it as a barrier. They have persuaded many against their own and the national interest that tariff is a barrier to trade and injurious to the national well-being.

Ill-advised tariff schedules can be barriers. They can be so high or so low as to diminish commerce and reduce advantage. That, however, is far from being the whole story.

Correct tariffs are a fertilizer for international trade. Wisely applied, tariff can be a stimulus and a lubricant as easily as no tariff or an incorrect tariff can be a barrier. The most universal barrier to trade is lack of purchasing power. Lack of purchasing power is generally synonymous with lack of production. The most universal ailment of the human race is want. Want can be overcome only by production. When production reaches a level high enough to supply a people with necessities, whether by direct use or by exchange, then further production can be applied to greater increase the standard of living.

The United States stands as the supreme example among nations of a high standard of living. The American people outproduce every other people in the world. Having larger means, they therefore constitute the most envied and desirable market in the world. Since they create for themselves an extraordinarily high percentage of the goods they desire, their high degree of purchasing power is a magnet which attracts competition.

It may be a fantastic but is nevertheless a useful illustration to assume for a moment that after the war nearly everything used by Americans might be produced more cheaply in some other country. If our Government were therefore to assume that it would benefit Americans by permitting them to buy all goods from the cheapest sources, the consequence would be disastrous. Obviously the result would be the prompt destruction of the purchasing power of Americans. Since all goods would then come from abroad, no means of earning and acquiring purchasing power would remain. We would produce little or nothing. The American people promptly would be plunged into poverty and want. And the once highly attractive American market would have disappeared.

A basic principle of prosperity and well-being is that production has two distinct functions. One is to supply goods. The other is to create purchasing power. When a nation's economy is so balanced as to engage its working population in profitable production, and employment is therefore widely diffused, that nation can have a high standard of living. The slight additional cost which a tariff rate may imposed upon a customer may well be the insurance premium he pays for maintenance of his purchasing power.

The best consumers the United States has had for its exports have been those nations with the highest purchasing power. The largest volume of imports has been obtained by the United States in those years such as 1929 when domestic prosperity was at high levels. It is at such times that our people can most readily satisfy their demands for foreign luxuries and at such times that they require the largest imports of raw materials.

I have referred to the fact that agriculture desires export markets for commodities such as cotton and wheat. It is pertinent to point out that agriculture's most critical problems arise among the producers of these commod-

ities. They are problem commodities because the price is not determined by what a prosperous domestic American market can pay. Their prices are determined by what a less prosperous foreign consumer can afford to pay. It might be said that the price of cotton is ordinarily determined by what a coolie in Penang can afford to pay for a shirt or by what a coolie in some backward colony will accept for a day's work. Coolie standards are not American standards.

We have trouble with wheat and cotton simply because they seldom can be directly benefited by the kind of tariff protection which has so succcessfully been used to moderate the effects of world competition upon many of our other products.

Probably no nation can expect to erect a stable structure of prosperity upon exports of raw materials. To do so exposes it workers and farmers to the competition of the cheapest of wage workers anywhere. Should the United States adopt as its future policy one of encouraging unlimited export of raw materials from other nations, it would inflict injury rather than benefit upon the people of those nations. It would tend to encourage them to continue upon the low level of raw material prosperity.

A far more generous policy would provide first for the maintenance of prosperity in the United States by adequately protecting the purchasing power of Americans. Then it would, in addition, encourage the people of less fortunate countries to produce not for sale abroad but for consumption at home. Whenever other countries advance in the prduction by themselves of the things their people need for themselves, international trade itself will expand. There will be more demand and more capacity for the exchange among nations of the goods one or another may need to obtain.

There is one approach by which the correct use of tariff can contribute constructively to the solution of cotton and wheat surplus problems. That this can be true may not seem likely in view of our general acceptance of the idea that there must be cotton and wheat surpluses and that commodities in surplus cannot be benefited by the use of tariffs. Cotton and wheat surpluses come into existence because farmers in the great one-crop cotton and wheat areas do not have other crops that are normally more profitable. If they could grow other equally satisfactory crops, certainly they would not take the continuous risk of low prices for excessive production of cotton and wheat.

In the Corn Belt a new crop has been added. It is the soybean. In 1914 about 50,000 bushels of soybeans were harvested. By 1935 the total has grown to 45,000,000 bushels. The last 2 or 3 years have seen production in excess of 200,000,000 bushels. The soybean has been a highly satisfactory new cashable crop in the Corn Belt States. Having industrial as well as food uses, its price has been fairly stable.

More genuine and effective agricultural adjustment was accomplished during the past 12 years in the Corn Belt through the addition of the soybean crop than by all the laws adopted by the New Deal, or by all the millions paid out from the Federal Treasury.

Almost within sight are new crops for the cotton States, crops which can help to prevent cotton surpluses in future years. If the cotton States were to begin producing quantities of vegetable oils equal to the quantities normally imported, the acreage required would be in excess of that normally devoted to cotton for export. This is significant since, of course, not all cotton grown for export is necessarily surplus cotton—not when the export prices are profitable. The South can grow peanut oil, soybean oil, tung oil, with certain other possibilities such as okra and perilla, and, of course, cottonseed oil. Many of these oils are interchangeable in their industrial uses.

Protective tariffs correctly applied so as to encourage the domestic production of vegetable oils in the South by preventing low-wage competition from the tropics, can hasten the day when southern soils will be freed from their dependence from the uncertainties of foreign markets and the low purchasing power of foreign customers, to say nothing of the low wages of foreign competitors.

Not within the visible future but neither a wholly improbable concept is that cotton production on a domestic basis might eventually itself desire the protection of a tariff.

Vegetable oils, of course, are not the only alternative to cotton. Southern soils and climate are well adapted to the production of starches to replace the 400,000,000 pounds normally imported each year from the tropics. Cotton is not the only fiber that southern farmers can produce. As by-products of vegetable-oil production and of starch crop production, there will be both protein and carbohydrate feeds now lacking in the southern agricultural economy. The availability of satisfactory all-year feedstuffs will improve the southern capacity for local production of meat, milk, and eggs.

Prospective new crops to prevent the creation of surpluses in the one-crop wheat area are not quite so readily pointed out. However, our crop practices have developed through habit as much as through experience. Mankind has not yet tried very hard to try out what the plant resources of nature are good for. We grow only about 200 commercial crops in the United States, although 15,000 special plants are indigenous to this country. Botanists have identified more than 200,000 species of plants on the face of the earth. The new sciences of organic chemistry and plant genetics will in time enable man to adapt hundreds of additional plants to his uses and to establish them as commercial crops. Among them certainly will be other plants than wheat that will flourish on the Great Plains, add stability to the incomes of farmers in the one-crop wheat areas, and improve the prosperity of the entire Nation.

Agriculture is the fundamental economic enterprise. One-fourth of Americans are farmers and depend directly upon the land for their incomes. Another fourth, in the towns and small cities, never have a dollar until a farmer brings a new dollar or a dollar's worth of new wealth into town. Thus half of the Nation's population is dependent, first hand or second hand, upon what farmers produce and upon how that production is priced. If it is priced so low as to prevent farmers from having profits and spending money, depression affects the entire Nation. If the income of the rural half of America is generous, there are eager buyers for the products of the urban industries, employment runs high, and the whole Nation flourishes. The cities cannot afford to be misled into destroying tariff protection for agriculture. They will pay high for making such a mistake.

Agriculture is by no means an isolated enterprise. No one realizes better than do farmers how much they depend upon widespread employment at good wages. Busy and well-paid cities are the primary market for agriculture's primary output, which is food. Farmers are against policies which may diminish the effective demand for food anywhere in the Nation. They want to see labor fully employed and adequately paid.

Consequently, agriculture generally favors whatever protective methods are necessary to insure full activity by industry. Likewise agriculture looks unfavorably upon some of the erroneous thinking that directly affects both rural and urban prosperity.

Farmers have been assailed for wanting a tariff on sugar at a level that will permit profitable production of sugar beets in the United States. Lower sugar schedules have often been advocated on the theory that more American automobiles and other items might be sold in Cuba. In the first place, it is pertinent to remark that a tariff of 1 cent costs American consumers about $1 per year, assuming that the full rate of the tariff is added to the cost of their sugar, and assuming that they receive no benefit whatever from the rate. Per capita sugar consumption runs around 100 pounds a year.

Any good sugar-beet county will be found to buy automobiles at a rate equal to or above the average national rate. There will be 1 car for each 4 or 5 people in the county. I understand there is about 1 automobile in Cuba for each 175 people. Is it fair to ask which place is the better market for American automobiles?

Agriculture has a definite interest in the future arrangements for the American rubber supply. Farmers would like to grow some of the post-war rubber or some of its ingredients. They have definite opportunities, providing research is vigorously pursued. They may produce latex from the guyaule or Russian dandelion plants. They may provide raw material for rubber by way of alcohol from carbohydrate crops, vegetable oils, or even from the whey, which is a byproduct of milk.

They figure that if all the rubber of our future is grown by American farmers on American land at American prices, or produced at American wages by American workers, they will have additional demand for food. They have never sold much of anything to the coolies of the rubber plantations. They also figure that the American rubber producers will be more active customers for American manufacturers of all kinds and that the whole national economy will thereby profit.

Nor are our farmers oblivious of the fact that we have once been caught in costly unpreparedness. If the rubber is produced within the United States, it will be here when needed. In South America it would still be 4,000 miles distant, and in the Orient the same old risk would be repeated.

The challenge at once comes up that this policy will be unfriendly to improved international trade and other relationships. To that I would first declare that it has yet to be demonstrated that international trade has ever prevented a war, nor even that it has not been the active cause of many a war.

Then I would return to something I said some moments ago. Peace and plenty are closely related. Peoples who are kept in dependence upon their production of a raw material for a distant foreign market never live in plenty. They live hazardously at low and uncertain wages. Far better would it be to assist such peoples to produce the things they need for themselves. The Malay coolie never had any use for the rubber he produced. He bought no automobiles, no tires, and probably not even a raincoat. But he does have need for better food, better clothing, better sanitation, better education and recreation, and a hundred things that he could be producing for himself if he were freed from the slavery of international trade.

Raising the standard of living begins at home, wherever home may be. To help others to help themselves—and in the process to help ourselves—may well be the most profitable of post-war policies for American relationships with the less fortunate peoples of the earth.

Certainly the prime point of American policy must be to build this Nation stronger and stronger. Only through its own strength can the United States hope to influence the rest of the world for peace. Strength has to be produced. It has to be produced by a busy and prosperous people. The

Irrigation and Navigation in the Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "T. V. A. Is Not the Answer," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 12, 1944. The editorial deals with irrigation and navigation in the Missouri River Basin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

T. V. A. IS NOT THE ANSWER

There is ample water in the Missouri Basin for both irrigation and navigation. This is the substance of the report made public by the engineers subcommittee of the Missouri River States Committee and it substantiates the verdict of the United States Army Engineers.

Representatives of all of the nine States in the Missouri Basin participated in the study of the engineering subcommittee, so that no charge can be raised as to partisan interest. The subcommittee's report shows that there is available at Sioux City, Iowa, the head of navigation on the Missouri, an annual flow of 22,473,000 acre-feet. This is in excess of the 22,445,000 acre-feet needed for the irrigation proposals of the Bureau of Reclamation and the navigation requirements set out by the Army engineers.

The findings of the subcommittee should settle the current arguments in the Senate as to whether there is sufficient water available for all purposes projected in the Pick plan as it is incorporated in the pending flood-control bill.

The only controversy which remains is the question of the proper Federal agency to control the Missouri Basin program. On this question the logical solution is the one proposed by the Army engineers and incorporated in the Pick plan. This solution would give to the Army engineers control over the multiple-purpose reservoirs and other river works on the main stem of the Missouri which are primarily for flood control and navigation, and delegate to the Reclamation Bureau control over the reservoirs in the tributary streams constructed primarily for irrigation.

One thing is certain. The Missouri Valley does not want a T. V. A. The example of what has happened in the Tennessee Valley under the T. V. A. is sufficient evidence to convince the people of the Missouri Valley of the danger of this type of bureaucratic control.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was created originally as a power and navigation agency. Flood control was never a serious problem in the Tennessee Valley and navigation under the T. V. A. has become secondary to power. But the T. V. A. has extended its other activities far beyond the original purposes for which the Authority was created.

The United States Chamber of Commerce in an appendix to its current referendum on National Water Resources Policies, lists 30 activities of the T. V. A., which include a number of manufacturing projects, large farm operations, food processing, socialized medicine, the operation of schools, retail stores, recreational facilities, the loaning of money, and operation of numerous police powers.

As the appendix points out, "Regional authorities have a much larger significance than the administration of water resource benefits. Authorities are, in fact, the operators as well as administrators and they carry their operations into almost every detail of community life."

The United States Chamber of Commerce sets out as a declaration of its proposed water resources policy the support of a program of development wherein the purpose or purposes of each project, especially multipurpose projects are clear and declared in advance. The best way to insure this is to have the projects assigned to an organization that is devoted primarily to the major purpose of the project. Thus the Bureau of Reclamation should handle all reclamation projects and the Army engineers should handle all flood-control projects and continue with navigation.

The Power of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able and instructive address delivered by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief, Farm Journal, at the Economic Leadership Conference and dinner, New York City, on June 15, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Agriculture is in favor of international trade. Agriculture is in favor of tariffs. Contrary to what appears to be widespread belief, there is no necessary conflict between these two positions.

Farmers in certain sections of the Nation still produce quantities of certain commodities in excess of the effective domestic demand. They would like to have profitable export markets for some of their output. As consumers, they desire certain agricultural products from other parts of the world. They have been accustomed to using coffee, tea, cocoa, spices, and rubber among the many agricultural materials which they do not produce. They believe that trade in such commodities is of mutual advantage and thoroughly sound.

Farmers are keenly aware, in addition, that the great market for their output is within the borders of the United States. They desire to see American industries prosper and commercial enterprises active. They have observed that well-paid workers who are busy the year around are much better customers for food than ill-paid part-time workers. Therefore, they are anxious that those industries partially dependent upon export sales shall be able to send their goods abroad. They are perfectly willing that both their own goods and the exported industrial commodities shall be paid for by the customary procedures which make American dollars available to foreign buyers, including the reception of imports into this country.

Farmers are not willing, however, that industrial exports shall be paid for principally with imports which compete with what American farmers produce.

The plethora of propaganda and the bitterness of controversy have tended to obscure some of the simple truths about trade among nations, as well as about the essentials of domestic prosperity. There appear to be those among us who have come to believe that "tariffbarrier" is one word. Propagandists for political theory and for foreign or selfish interests seldom mention tariff without describing it as a barrier. They have persuaded many against their own and the national interest that tariff is a barrier to trade and injurious to the national well-being.

Ill-advised tariff schedules can be barriers. They can be so high or so low as to diminish commerce and reduce advantage. That, however, is far from being the whole story.

Correct tariffs are a fertilizer for international trade. Wisely applied, tariff can be a stimulus and a lubricant as easily as no tariff or an incorrect tariff can be a barrier. The most universal barrier to trade is lack of purchasing power. Lack of purchasing power is generally synonymous with lack of production. The most universal ailment of the human race is want. Want can be overcome only by production. When production reaches a level high enough to supply a people with necessities, whether by direct use or by exchange, then further production can be applied to greater increase the standard of living.

The United States stands as the supreme example among nations of a high standard of living. The American people outproduce every other people in the world. Having larger means, they therefore constitute the most envied and desirable market in the world. Since they create for themselves an extraordinarily high percentage of the goods they desire, their high degree of purchasing power is a magnet which attracts competition.

It may be a fantastic but is nevertheless a useful illustration to assume for a moment that after the war nearly everything used by Americans might be produced more cheaply in some other country. If our Government were therefore to assume that it would benefit Americans by permitting them to buy all goods from the cheapest sources, the consequence would be disastrous. Obviously the result would be the prompt destruction of the purchasing power of Americans. Since all goods would then come from abroad, no means of earning and acquiring purchasing power would remain. We would produce little or nothing. The American people promptly would be plunged into poverty and want. And the once highly attractive American market would have disappeared.

A basic principle of prosperity and well-being is that production has two distinct functions. One is to supply goods. The other is to create purchasing power. When a nation's economy is so balanced as to engage its working population in profitable production, and employment is therefore widely diffused, that nation can have a high standard of living. The slight additional cost which a tariff rate may imposed upon a customer may well be the insurance premium he pays for maintenance of his purchasing power.

The best consumers the United States has had for its exports have been those nations with the highest purchasing power. The largest volume of imports has been obtained by the United States in those years such as 1929 when domestic prosperity was at high levels. It is at such times that our people can most readily satisfy their demands for foreign luxuries and at such times that they require the largest imports of raw materials.

I have referred to the fact that agriculture desires export markets for commodities such as cotton and wheat. It is pertinent to point out that agriculture's most critical problems arise among the producers of these commod-

ities. They are problem commodities because the price is not determined by what a prosperous domestic American market can pay. Their prices are determined by what a less prosperous foreign consumer can afford to pay. It might be said that the price of cotton is ordinarily determined by what a coolie in Penang can afford to pay for a shirt or by what a coolie in some backward colony will accept for a day's work. Coolie standards are not American standards.

We have trouble with wheat and cotton simply because they seldom can be directly benefited by the kind of tariff protection which has so succcessfully been used to moderate the effects of world competition upon many of our other products.

Probably no nation can expect to erect a stable structure of prosperity upon exports of raw materials. To do so exposes it workers and farmers to the competition of the cheapest of wage workers anywhere. Should the United States adopt as its future policy one of encouraging unlimited export of raw materials from other nations, it would inflict injury rather than benefit upon the people of those nations. It would tend to encourage them to continue upon the low level of raw material prosperity.

A far more generous policy would provide first for the maintenance of prosperity in the United States by adequately protecting the purchasing power of Americans. Then it would, in addition, encourage the people of less fortunate countries to produce not for sale abroad but for consumption at home. Whenever other countries advance in the prduction by themselves of the things their people need for themselves, international trade itself will expand. There will be more demand and more capacity for the exchange among nations of the goods one or another may need to obtain.

There is one approach by which the correct use of tariff can contribute constructively to the solution of cotton and wheat surplus problems. That this can be true may not seem likely in view of our general acceptance of the idea that there must be cotton and wheat surpluses and that commodities in surplus cannot be benefited by the use of tariffs. Cotton and wheat surpluses come into existence because farmers in the great one-crop cotton and wheat areas do not have other crops that are normally more profitable. If they could grow other equally satisfactory crops, certainly they would not take the continuous risk of low prices for excessive production of cotton and wheat.

In the Corn Belt a new crop has been added. It is the soybean. In 1914 about 50,000 bushels of soybeans were harvested. By 1935 the total has grown to 45,000,000 bushels. The last 2 or 3 years have seen production in excess of 200,000,000 bushels. The soybean has been a highly satisfactory new cashable crop in the Corn Belt States. Having industrial as well as food uses, its price has been fairly stable.

More genuine and effective agricultural adjustment was accomplished during the past 12 years in the Corn Belt through the addition of the soybean crop than by all the laws adopted by the New Deal, or by all the millions paid out from the Federal Treasury.

Almost within sight are new crops for the cotton States, crops which can help to prevent cotton surpluses in future years. If the cotton States were to begin producing quantities of vegetable oils equal to the quantities normally imported, the acreage required would be in excess of that normally devoted to cotton for export. This is significant since, of course, not all cotton grown for export is necessarily surplus cotton—not when the export prices are profitable. The South can grow peanut oil, soybean oil, tung oil, with certain other possibilities such as okra and perilla, and, of course, cottonseed oil. Many of these oils are interchangeable in their industrial uses.

Protective tariffs correctly applied so as to encourage the domestic production of vegetable oils in the South by preventing low-wage competition from the tropics, can hasten the day when southern soils will be freed from their dependence from the uncertainties of foreign markets and the low purchasing power of foreign customers, to say nothing of the low wages of foreign competitors.

Not within the visible future but neither a wholly improbable concept is that cotton production on a domestic basis might eventually itself desire the protection of a tariff.

Vegetable oils, of course, are not the only alternative to cotton. Southern soils and climate are well adapted to the production of starches to replace the 400,000,000 pounds normally imported each year from the tropics. Cotton is not the only fiber that southern farmers can produce. As by-products of vegetable-oil production and of starch crop production, there will be both protein and carbohydrate feeds now lacking in the southern agricultural economy. The availability of satisfactory all-year feedstuffs will improve the southern capacity for local production of meat, milk, and eggs.

Prospective new crops to prevent the creation of surpluses in the one-crop wheat area are not quite so readily pointed out. However, our crop practices have developed through habit as much as through experience. Mankind has not yet tried very hard to try out what the plant resources of nature are good for. We grow only about 200 commercial crops in the United States, although 15,000 special plants are indigenous to this country. Botanists have identified more than 200,000 species of plants on the face of the earth. The new sciences of organic chemistry and plant genetics will in time enable man to adapt hundreds of additional plants to his uses and to establish them as commercial crops. Among them certainly will be other plants than wheat that will flourish on the Great Plains, add stability to the incomes of farmers in the one-crop wheat areas, and improve the prosperity of the entire Nation.

Agriculture is the fundamental economic enterprise. One-fourth of Americans are farmers and depend directly upon the land for their incomes. Another fourth, in the towns and small cities, never have a dollar until a farmer brings a new dollar or a dollar's worth of new wealth into town. Thus half of the Nation's population is dependent, first hand or second hand, upon what farmers produce and upon how that production is priced. If it is priced so low as to prevent farmers from having profits and spending money, depression affects the entire Nation. If the income of the rural half of America is generous, there are eager buyers for the products of the urban industries, employment runs high, and the whole Nation flourishes. The cities cannot afford to be misled into destroying tariff protection for agriculture. They will pay high for making such a mistake.

Agriculture is by no means an isolated enterprise. No one realizes better than do farmers how much they depend upon widespread employment at good wages. Busy and well-paid cities are the primary market for agriculture's primary output, which is food. Farmers are against policies which may diminish the effective demand for food anywhere in the Nation. They want to see labor fully employed and adequately paid.

Consequently, agriculture generally favors whatever protective methods are necessary to insure full activity by industry. Likewise agriculture looks unfavorably upon some of the erroneous thinking that directly affects both rural and urban prosperity.

Farmers have been assailed for wanting a tariff on sugar at a level that will permit profitable production of sugar beets in the United States. Lower sugar schedules have often been advocated on the theory that more American automobiles and other items might be sold in Cuba. In the first place, it is pertinent to remark that a tariff of 1 cent costs American consumers about $1 per year, assuming that the full rate of the tariff is added to the cost of their sugar, and assuming that they receive no benefit whatever from the rate. Per capita sugar consumption runs around 100 pounds a year.

Any good sugar-beet county will be found to buy automobiles at a rate equal to or above the average national rate. There will be 1 car for each 4 or 5 people in the county. I understand there is about 1 automobile in Cuba for each 175 people. Is it fair to ask which place is the better market for American automobiles?

Agriculture has a definite interest in the future arrangements for the American rubber supply. Farmers would like to grow some of the post-war rubber or some of its ingredients. They have definite opportunities, providing research is vigorously pursued. They may produce latex from the guyaule or Russian dandelion plants. They may provide raw material for rubber by way of alcohol from carbohydrate crops, vegetable oils, or even from the whey, which is a byproduct of milk.

They figure that if all the rubber of our future is grown by American farmers on American land at American prices, or produced at American wages by American workers, they will have additional demand for food. They have never sold much of anything to the coolies of the rubber plantations. They also figure that the American rubber producers will be more active customers for American manufacturers of all kinds and that the whole national economy will thereby profit.

Nor are our farmers oblivious of the fact that we have once been caught in costly unpreparedness. If the rubber is produced within the United States, it will be here when needed. In South America it would still be 4,000 miles distant, and in the Orient the same old risk would be repeated.

The challenge at once comes up that this policy will be unfriendly to improved international trade and other relationships. To that I would first declare that it has yet to be demonstrated that international trade has ever prevented a war, nor even that it has not been the active cause of many a war.

Then I would return to something I said some moments ago. Peace and plenty are closely related. Peoples who are kept in dependence upon their production of a raw material for a distant foreign market never live in plenty. They live hazardously at low and uncertain wages. Far better would it be to assist such peoples to produce the things they need for themselves. The Malay coolie never had any use for the rubber he produced. He bought no automobiles, no tires, and probably not even a raincoat. But he does have need for better food, better clothing, better sanitation, better education and recreation, and a hundred things that he could be producing for himself if he were freed from the slavery of international trade.

Raising the standard of living begins at home, wherever home may be. To help others to help themselves—and in the process to help ourselves—may well be the most profitable of post-war policies for American relationships with the less fortunate peoples of the earth.

Certainly the prime point of American policy must be to build this Nation stronger and stronger. Only through its own strength can the United States hope to influence the rest of the world for peace. Strength has to be produced. It has to be produced by a busy and prosperous people. The

United States will be incredibly foolish if it refuses to use the tariff, and any other honest device of the prospective system, to husband and nourish that national strength.

We shall have to produce enough to pay our huge debt. The only honest way to meet that will be to pay it. We want to maintain and increase the high public and private standards of living which are an inspiration to all the world. We want to produce enough that we can be generous with the needy, enough that we can be strong, and enough that we can forever keep the light of freedom burning high.

Only by producing abundantly can we afford to buy freely of the raw materials and luxuries of other countries. There is no sense in failing to fight for such a reasonable level of tariffs as will aid us to produce the earning power our people must have, help to establish the new agricultural or industrial activities which research may reveal, and help us toward a constantly expanding volume of production.

Here in free America we have for the first time shown the world that power over nature pays better than power over men. Power over nature constantly increases our capacity to produce.

There is no ceiling over the potential consumption of goods by the human race. Exceedingly few are those who have ever been able to buy all the things they want.

And finally, the best of all protective devices for any form of production, is higher efficiency and lower costs than any competitor. Tariffs in the past have helped American industries to reach that point. They can do so in the future. Sight must not be lost of that objective.

Disunity at Home—Letter to His Son From Frank Colby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a splendid letter on the subject of disunity at home, written by Mr. Frank Colby to his son, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of June 18, 1944.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LETTER TO MY SON

(By Frank Colby)

MY DEAR SON: We are being told that you and your fellows in arms are seriously disturbed by reports of disunity here at home. It is said that many of you believe that we are not giving full support to the war effort, and are bearing with reluctance the few small sacrifices and inconveniences of our wartime economy.

"Right, dad. Frankly, some of the things we are hearing and reading simply do not add up to our idea of America."

My son, to begin with, you are, for the first time in your life, looking at your country through an inverted telescope. That which you see is strange, unreal, and disquieting, for only the abnormalities stand out. It is as if you were looking down upon America from a place so high that all familiar landmarks have vanished. But that which is good and beautiful in America still is here, and you will find it so when you come back to us.

"But all these strikes and threats of strikes—labor leaders sticking a gun in Uncle Sam's ribs and saying, 'Your money or your life!' That burns us up, what are you folks thinking of to allow such things to happen?"

Son, our indignation, too, runs high; and we are seeking ways to restrain the few who would threaten our security and nullify your sacrifices. But, if we are to preserve our democracy, we must solve these problems by applying the principles of that democracy. You and I would have it no other way.

We are a free people—yes, even free to close a coal mine, to stop a railroad, to shut down a war plant. We are free to challenge the President of the United States—yes, and even to denounce him and repudiate his official acts. Such are the ways of a democracy. But it does not mean that we are demoralized. The measure of our strength has ever been the freedom to speak our minds without fear of the headman's block or the concentration camp. That is the way we want it to be, and you are fighting to keep it that way.

Agitators and strikers are not America. The real America is going about its work in quiet determination that no son of this soil shall ever weigh his country in the balance and find it wanting.

"But what about the big money everybody is making and throwing away on night spots, horse races, liquor, and high jinks? That kind of news isn't funny to a $50-a-month G. I. Joe rotting somewhere in a jungle."

You are right of course. There have always been wasters, cheaters, and cheap, noisy, foolish men among us, and there always will be, for we are but human. There are no perfect races and no nation is free from failings. But these irresponsible ones are not America, son. America is 10,000,000 homes where a boy's room is vacant—some to remain forever so. America is a blood bank that begins at Main Street and reaches out to where a stricken soldier lies. America is a mighty heartbeat of anxiety for the sons she has sent to the wars. America is an organism so complex that it cannot possibly work but which somehow does work.

"But we hear of people complaining about rationing; we hear of bickerings between Congress and the White House; we even hear of civilians criticizing the way the war is being fought. I don't get it."

Son, it is quite American to be eternally dissatisfied, to seek always a better way of doing things.. Our untiring quest forward and upward has been and will be the source of our strength. True, some of us resent wartime restrictions; some of us are selfish and unpatriotic. But these are not America. To judge this land by the delinquencies of the few is to point to a prison and say that all men are craven.

Americans are an exuberant race. We like to let off steam by rooting for the home team, by shouting instructions to the batter, by hurling jibes at the visitors, by screaming, "Kill the umpire." It makes a better game that way. Remember?

"But, Dad, we keep hearing about confusion and bungling in Washington, of bureaucrats shoving people around, of political maneuverings, of waste and extravagance. Don't people know that we are at war, and that some of us are being killed and maimed, and that others are dying in prison camps?"

Oh, yes. We know that, though we have never heard the whine of a sniper's bullet, or the shattering burst of a bomb, or felt the thrust of a bayonet. But we know * * * for you are our gallant sons whom we cherish.

There is confusion here at home. We are making mistakes. We do have misfits in high places. Our hands have been trained for peace, and, when we are forced to stand and fight with strange machines of death, our hands are very clumsy. But only at first * * * for somehow we always manage to win our wars.

There are charlatans, incompetents, and dishonest men among us. But these are not America. America is the same sweet land that you went forth to protect. America is the doctor, the farmer, and the small businessman, laboring beyond their endurance. America is a new cruiser launched by the mother of five sailors lost at sea. America is the little girl next door in the uniform of a nurse's aid. America is a rescued seaman shipping out on another tanker.

"If all this is true, Dad, why is it that the papers and the radio keep harping on the things which you say are the exception and not the rule?"

My son, in asking the question, you have answered it. These things that disturb you are exceptional; they are abnormal; therefore, they are news. Remember the old cliche about the man biting the dog?

Well, it isn't news that most Americans are patriotic and decent. That most workers are loyally meeting production schedules doesn't make headlines. There is nothing dramatic in the fact that most Congressmen and Government leaders are men of ability and integrity.

"Keep talking, Dad. I think I'm beginning to get the point."

Son, you cannot see a true image of your homeland through an inverted telescope. You are so far away from us. You are completely out of your own natural environment. Our greatest fear is that these distorted images will cause you to lose faith in your native land.

I do not say that the impact of war has not uncovered our weaknesses and our follies. I do not ask you to believe that all is well here at home. Nor do I seek to minimize your own fears and sacrifices for the country you love.

But I do want you to believe that, despite its faults, whatever its shortcomings may be, there is no fairer land than America in all the world.

We are striving to keep our house, your house, in order against the day of your return. We shall make many more mistakes. And when we seem to falter, try to understand that no one has ever taught us how to run a nation at war.

When you come home you will find your America very much as it was when you went away. You will see that we have been neither indifferent nor complacement. Oh, please, please, believe that this is so! Many great tasks lie ahead for which we shall need your youth, your strength, and your wisdom. And we want you home with all our hearts.

May God keep you safe.

YOUR DAD.

Platform Issues: Tariff and Trade and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in pursuance of the policy I have heretofore announced, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of

the RECORD the last two articles written by Mr. Wendell Willkie on platform issues.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 17, 1944]

PLATFORM ISSUES

(By Wendell Willkie)

VI. TARIFF AND TRADE

If after the war the industrial and commercial life of most of the countries of the world is either State-owned or controlled, then the whole problem of the survival of a free economic system, even in the United States, will be complicated.

Certainly the pattern of our foreign trade policy will have to be fashioned to Government supervision, allocations, and perhaps even price fixing. For State-controlled economies can sell without regard to costs. In other words, prices can become political.

Therefore the type and kind of economy which exists in other countries is important to us. Obviously we cannot interfere in the economic life of other nations. There is much, however, that we can do to create an atmosphere conducive to the development and growth of free economy in the rest of the world.

Among the measures which are indispensable to the development of such an atmosphere are revision of our tariff and cooperation in a policy of international currency stabilization. To these problems the Republican Party must address itself.

In the minds of generations of Americans the Republican Party is associated with a high protective tariff. Yet already at the turn of the century, such Republican leaders as McKinley, Taft, and Root, sensing the inevitable interdependence of the twentieth century world, were urging modification of the tariff through reciprocal trade agreements.

In the nationalistic swing that followed the last war, however, Republicans, ignoring the fact that America was for the first time a creditor nation, and that other countries must sell to us if they were to buy our goods, passed successively the two highest tariff bills in our history, the Fordney-McCumber and the Hawley-Smoot. The repercussions of the latter were world-wide. Within 2 years, 25 countries had established trade barriers against us. Everywhere nations turned to higher tariffs, tightened exchange control, import quota systems, and barter agreements.

When in 1933 the present administration dumped the London economic conference the world inevitably turned to more intense nationalism.

We are now faced with the urgent post-war economic problem of reestablishing a healthy, world-wide trade. In our present powerful economic position we must lead the way. In order to do so we must have the realism and good sense to face the fact that tariffs are no longer a purely domestic problem. Our tariff measures vitally affect the economic well-being of nations throughout the world, and theirs affect us no less.

We must take positive steps to revive the world economically by opening up international trade. Otherwise the countries of the world will seek to establish separate trading blocs as a way to provide employment for their people. Thus trading areas will be narrowed and mutually antagonistic. Under such circumstances we shall have to reorganize our agriculture and industry for defense rather than prosperity and the fiber of our free economic system will be weakened. Other nations will be forced along the road to totalitarianism. A solution of international economic problems is as indispensable for future peace and security as political and military solutions.

To this end the Republican Party should propose that through the United Nations Council an attempt should be made to reach general agreement on a clear and uniform code for international economic relations.

Likewise, the Republican Party should propose that the United States proceed to get rid of the complexities and absurdities of our present tariff. Of course, we cannot and should not go overnight from extreme tariff protection to free trade. Nor does any sensible person advocate this. But many tariff items could be swept away in the readjustments which will occur after the war without substantial injury to any American industry and with great gain to the consuming public. And many more could be lowered by effective and mutually beneficial reciprocal arrangements.

The Republican Party should propose another vital step for world economic revival. Former arrangements for international finance and trade are today in chaotic confusion, and steps toward stabilization of the currency exchange are indispensable. If the exchanges are kept relatively stable, short-term credits and possibly a new kind of intermediate, semi-long-term credits to finance international purchases over a period of, say, 10 years, can be handled by our existing financial institutions.

There is, of course, also the question of long-term investment, particularly in the development of those countries which have not kept pace with industrial progress. The startling contrast between the level of comfort in our modern industrial countries and the hard struggle for bare subsistence in technically undeveloped countries is one of the most painful—and most dangerous—aspects of international relations. Here is a great field for constructive long-term investment. Our private investors, however, as well as our Government, must make their plans with full recognition that the day of economic imperialism is over.

In addition to financial investment, valuable as that is, we can offer to the peoples of industrially undeveloped countries something more important. We can offer the investment of our great technical know-how to stimulate them on the road to economic development. There is no more fruitful way to the solution of the world's economic problems.

Some, of course, believe that the economic and industrial development of other nations is a threat to our further development. But the Republican Party, under whose leadership America made its amazing industrial strides, should have the imagination to recapture the vision of its earlier days and to realize that the wider the spread of economic prosperity the higher will be our own standards of living.

[From the Washington Post of June 18, 1944]

PLATFORM ISSUES

(By Wendell Willkie)

VII. FOREIGN POLICY

The administration has made many protestations of noble aims in foreign policy, but when the moment came to act on them, it has hesitated and compromised. Its foreign policy has not been to support American principles of freedom. It has dealt with the Fascist elements in conquered countries; it has stubbornly and incredibly refused to acknowledge the Committee of Liberation as the provisional French Government. It has been canny and personal and subjective. It has called this policy expediency. But since the policy has produced little but dislike, distrust, and loss of prestige for the United States without achieving the intended political aims, it has not been even expedient.

The formulation of an affirmative foreign policy by the Republican Party is thus a particularly important task.

There have been sharp divisions within the party concerning the extent to which it is desirable for the United States to maintain and develop relations with other nations. But surely the long debate, the events through which we lived before the war, and the war itself have made plain that American policy cannot be separated into two unrelated compartments, one labeled foreign policy and one domestic policy. The two areas of action are inseparable; what happens in either immediately affects the other.

We are not living in several worlds. Our small American farms, our huge American factories, have close bonds with what is produced in the Andes and the hills of Szechwan, with the complex trade mechanism of London, with the cargoes that sail from Bombay and Oslo and Melbourne. Whatever we do at home constitutes foreign policy. And whatever we do abroad constitutes domestic policy. This is the great, new political fact.

Furthermore, we have learned conclusively that in the modern world the United States cannot survive militarily, economically, or politically without close and continuing cooperation with the other nations of the world.

In stating its foreign policy platform the Republican Party should reflect the twentieth century knowledge.

1. Its platform should demand the immediate creation of a functioning council of the United Nations as a first step toward the ultimate formation of a general international organization, in order that directly, or by representation, all the peoples of the United Nations may have voice in the political decisions that are already being made in the world. So far these decisions are being made—or, in some cases, sidestepped and postponed—by Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, with China brought in as a "courtesy member" of the group where Asia is concerned.

Naturally the task of safeguarding the world from aggression will have to rest mainly on the shoulders of the great powers, since they alone possess the necessary military force. But the peoples of the small nations, and others not so small, whose political status and economic welfare are deeply involved in the decisions to be made, will not and should not permit three or four great powers to continue to dictate destiny. They must have a voice not only when decisions are made affecting their own fate but in shaping the world in which they will live. This is right; it is what will prove necessary in practice; and in the long run it will be advantageous to the national interest of a people with ideals like ours.

2. The platform should be clear and unambiguous in its attitude toward sovereignty. It should not adopt narrow nationalistic interpretations of the term; nor should it substitute quibbling words like "integrity." It should emphasize that our sovereignty is not something to be hoarded, but something to be used. The United States should use its sovereignty in cooperation with other powers to create an effective international organization for the good of all. History should have taught us that we gain more by cooperating to protect the general interest than by working alone for some imagined separate interest.

3. It should declare for a revision of the country's tariff policy. The United States, by reciprocity arrangements, should lower tariffs with break-down trade barriers. This should be done in consultation with other nations. For no longer can tariffs be arbitrarily determined by one nation without damaging the interest of others and provoking reactions that damage its own interests.

4. The Republican platform must recognize the fact that world currency stabilization is indispensable to the revival of world trade. At the same time it should recognize realistically that the requirements of the period of transition from war to peace and of the long years that will follow are quite different. The chief need of the transition period will be relief, rehabilitation, and the liquidation of foreign-owned balances—in other words, the problem is how to carry lend-lease to its logical conclusion. The long-term problem is the maintenance of as even balances as possible. The procedure for the first problem is relatively simple, and in any case lies largely in the control of the United States. For the second it is intricate. In its essence it must be based upon a relationship between the American dollar and the British pound, though cooperation of the nations of the world will be required.

5. Finally, the Republican platform should state the conviction that, Mr. Churchill to the contrary, the ideologies for which we fight have not become blurred for us in the course of the fighting, but have become clearer every day; and that, Mr. Roosevelt to the contrary, in becoming wiser we have not become more cynical. We know that the sacrifices of our men and women in this war has not been made simply in order to defend ourselves against brute force. We are fighting a war for freedom; we are fighting a war for men's minds. This means that we must encourage men's just aspirations for freedom not only at home but everywhere in the world.

Today all Americans watch with anxious hearts, and with pride and gratitude, the accomplishments of our armed forces in the far Pacific, in Italy, in Russia, and now on the shores of France. But while they are winning the armed victory for us, we have already begun to lose the things that victory could bring. Three years ago, 2 years ago, the United States had the material, the political, the moral leadership of the world. Today we have only the material leadership. We have lost political leadership through ineptness and delay. We have lost moral leadership through attempted expediency.

The Republican Party should frame and pursue a foreign policy that will recapture America's lost leadership.

Wanted: 3,000,000 Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Wanted: 3,000,000 Jobs," written by Rex L. Nicholson, managing director, Builders of the West, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: 3,000,000 JOBS

(By Rex L. Nicholson, managing director, Builders of the West, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.)

The No. 1 objective of the American people today is to out-produce, out-build, and out-fight our enemies on every front until finally, in sackcloth and ashes, they capitulate in complete and unconditional surrender. While the task yet remaining before us is gigantic in scope, much has been accomplished since December 7, 1941. If we can continue to concentrate our combined resources and strength on the objective, a final victorious outcome is assured.

The second most important problem confronting us is to make the necessary advance preparation to protect and retain the things we are fighting for. The period following the war will be fraught with confusion and mass unemployment unless something very concrete is done to prevent it—now. Of all the questions being asked by our men on the fighting fronts, the one they are most interested in, and the one that is asked more often than any other, is "What are we coming back to when the war has been won?"

They want to know whether there really will be opportunities for good jobs at good wages on important work, or whether they will be returned to another leaf-raking program or be given a box of apples to sell on some street corner. Our Government has promised them there will be good jobs waiting when they return. We must keep faith with this promise. Next to winning the war, providing those jobs is our number one responsibility.

Twice during the past decade the American people have come face-to-face with major national problems with little, if any, advance preparation to cope with them. The first instance was the great depression of the 1930's; the second, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. In each of these cases, some of the outstanding leaders of our country warned the people well in advance that difficulty lay in the immediate future. But all to no avail.

After Pearl Harbor, I reviewed the history of all the wars that had been fought by the American people since the Nation was founded. The record reveals that, without exception, history has repeated itself to the extent that developments preceding each of our wars, and conditions following them, have formed a complete cycle that is repetitious in every respect. We never have been prepared to fight when the time came. In each case we declared war, rushed out, and frantically marshalled our manpower and productive strength after the fight had started. This, in spite of the fact that ample advance warning was given time and time again.

Another very interesting phase of this cycle was the effect each war had on the peacetime economy of the country following the war. After the battle was over and war contracts had to be canceled and fighting forces demobilized, the country went into a tremendous industrial slump which lasted, in some cases, from 18 months to 2½ years. This slump was then followed by a major industrial boom which lasted from 4 to 7 years, depending on the size and length of the war that had been fought. Then the industrial boom was followed by a major depression that lasted about the same length of time as the preceding prosperous period.

The autobiography of the late Theodore Roosevelt was one of the books reviewed in this study. One of his chapters interested me particularly. It was captioned, "The Wars of America, the Unprepared." Mr. Roosevelt opened the chapter with this statement, "I suppose the American people will always be unprepared for war, and as a result will be exposed to very great expense and to the ultimate danger of complete defeat. But this is no new thing. The American people learn only from catastrophe, and not from experience."

I would like to underscore and repeat his last statement, "The American people learn only from catastrophe, and not from experience." This is a sad commentary, indeed, on the foresight, the initiative, and the willingness to face facts on our part.

We have reached a point in this war where we think we foresee the end. We also foresee some of the major problems that will confront us when that end finally arrives. These problems become more significant each day, because up to now the major portion of our so-called post-war preparation to meet these issues has been conducted either from a speaker's platform or through the press. And this, in spite of the fact that next to winning the war, they are the most important problems confronting the American people today. The big question before us is, "What are we going to do about them?"

Will we continue to make speeches and argue among ourselves about what should be done and how to do it, until the storm breaks in our faces? Or, will we step out now and face this problem and find a solution for it? If we follow the former course, we will have leaf-raking programs again and our war heroes will be forced to sell apples on some street corner. But the pitiful part about it is there will be no one to blame for it but ourselves.

No; I believe we have in this present generation of Americans the necessary initiative to break this repetitious cycle, but we must will jointly to do it. The one great lesson learned from the depression of the 1930's was that mass unemployment on a prolonged basis is a parasitical growth on a free economy that is insidious in its every aspect. It never must be tolerated again in this country if we expect our system of private competitive enterprise to survive.

Good jobs in this country are the results of a high, well-balanced industrial and agricultural production for active consumer markets. Such markets can exist only when the masses of the people have the purchasing power with which to buy. The program of the Builders of the West for the stimulation of total employment after the war is built around three basic requirements. They are:

1. Industry and agriculture must have the necessary incentive to stimulate the development now of comprehensive plans for a quick conversion to peace production when war contracts are canceled.

2. There must be developed a close working relationship between the four major forces—industry, agriculture, labor, and Government—for an all-out effort to provide full employment during conversion.

3. A concentrated drive must be made for an early stabilization of industry and agriculture at production levels high enough to insure the steady employment of the major portion of our people who are able and willing to work. Salaries and wages must be compatible with the highest standard of living possible of attainment.

A well-planned program of much-needed private and public construction should be planned and made ready now to facilitate employment and help sustain purchasing power during conversion.

The suggestion that the four great forces—industry, agriculture, labor, and Government—could get together on a peacetime program would have been given the horse laugh a few short years ago. But the war has changed all that. It has been demonstrated conclusively that we can get together in this country, and when we do, there is simply no limit to what can be accomplished.

It has been said again and again that we shall come out of this war with a tremendous national liability, and certainly every thinking person agrees with this statement. But our leading financiers tell us that there is no particular need to worry about liabilities as long as there are sufficient assets to offset them. If properly harnessed, we have sufficient assets to offset the liabilities of this Nation. We have the space, the fertile soil, the natural resources, and the manpower.

But the most important asset that we have is our power and ingenuity to produce. There is no power under heaven to compare with it when it is in full swing. Therefore, we have a right to assume an optimistic view. If this productive power is harnessed for peacetime purposes, we can produce our way out of debt. This is the only way it can be accomplished in our lifetime.

There are pessimists who say it will be impossible for us to consume what we produce, because the American people cannot afford it. But good common sense tells us that, without exception, a people can afford anything and everything that they can produce. We need to ask and attempt to find the answer to three major questions. They are:

These are the job makers: Agriculture, industry, construction.

These things must be done now: Crop planning, reclamation, soil conservation, modernize equipment, rural electrification, preserve present gains, develop new products, build wider markets, improve labor relations, revise freight rates, selection of projects, engineering design, prepare specifications, secure rights-of-way, plan financing.

1. What are we fighting for?
2. What do we want for post-war America?
3. How do we propose to get it?

An answer to the first question was provided by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill in their Atlantic Charter, wherein they declared the main objective of the Allied Nations in this war is to preserve and make available to all nations who desire them the advantages of the "four freedoms." Certainly every real American will subscribe wholeheartedly to this objective.

The answer to the second question covers a combination of desires and objectives for post-war America. First, we want a lasting peace that is protected in such a way that we will not have to fight a similar war during this century. We want to retain our system of free competitive enterprise, because it is our firm belief that it is the best system yet devised by man for the production and distribution of the goods and services necessary to provide the high standard of living to which we aspire. American labor must have the assurance of steady employment at wages compatible with a high standard of living, with the hope of attaining a standard that is even higher than anything yet experienced. We want a richer, deeper, cultural, and social life for our people, with broader opportunities for education and the enjoyment of the better things of life.

There is only one answer for the third question. We can accomplish all these things if we will jointly to do so. But they never can be accomplished as long as the four major forces in this country stand in their respective corners and regard each other with distrust. An honest willingness to meet the other fellow halfway in the solution of mutual problems will get the answer. No other system will.

There is a great need for common-sense leadership that understands and appreciates the significance of this statement. We need leaders with the pioneer spirit who believe in the future of this country and its people. Leaders who have vision, initiative, determination, stamina, and optimism. The late Will Rogers said, "In my opinion, a real optimist is a man who can enjoy the view after having been treed by a bull." This is the kind of optimistic leadership needed to solve our problems after this war—a leadership that can see beyond the obstacles that are in our immediate way, the tremendous possibilities for the development of the West and that can work to accomplish all of these things.

The average enterpriser is vitally interested in two questions. First, he wants to know what else he can do to help win the war. Second, he wants to know what will happen to his business or industry when the war is finally won. In order to provide a cushion of employment and an assurance to private industry that the purchasing power will be sustained during the conversion period, there is an immediate need for the planning of a huge construction program. The plan should include all types of industrial construction, office buildings, hotels, apartment houses, and other business and industrial establishments; preparation for the continuous rebuilding of our urban centers with special emphasis on modern layouts and designing; development of programs for the financing and construction of new homes and community centers, and the remodeling and modernizing of the older homes in the community.

The municipalities should be encouraged to plan for the provision of additional necessary domestic water supply and sewer systems and sewage-disposal facilities; street construction and improvement programs; freeways and parkways to alleviate traffic congestions, where necessary; schools, hospitals, health centers, playgrounds, recreational areas, parks, and airport facilities. The communities should be encouraged to prepare working plans, specifications, and contract documents; to select rights-of-way, determine their cost, and prepare for prompt acquisition; to complete the legal and financial arrangements for immediate construction when the time comes.

The county and State governments should be encouraged and assisted in the preparation of detailed plans and specifications for the construction and improvement of county roads and State highways, farm- and mine-to-market roads, county and State institutional buildings, conservation, flood control, land usage projects, etc. The Federal agencies should prepare plans now for the construction of Federal buildings, such as post offices, banks, Federal office buildings; interstate and transcontinental highways; large-scale soil and water conservation projects; flood control and channel stabilization for our larger rivers and streams; reclamation of arid lands, land-use programs, reforestation, irrigation, and power development; slum clearance; malaria control; and large land-drainage projects.

The leading men of the construction industry in the 11 Western States are fully aware of the problems confronting us in the next decade. They know the No. 1 requirement for any post-war preparedness program is that it be so organized and so executed that it will not detract at any time or in any way from the main war effort. If properly executed, the morale of our fighting men and our war workers can be boosted tremendously through the knowledge that the necessary advance preparations are being made.

To accomplish this, they have set up the Builders of the West, Inc., a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization that has been financed in its entirety with private capital and dedicated to the development of the West. Its objectives are threefold:

1. An all-out drive will be made to accomplish the preparation of plans and specifications for a huge construction program comprised of both public and private projects, such as those listed above, that will be ready to go when the fighting ceases and the boys start coming home.

2. The entire weight of the organization will be thrown into the fight for the retention and expansion of the industrial gains experienced in the West during the war. Also, every effort will be made to assist the communities in attracting new industries and business.

3. The third objective will include a determined effort to stabilize the construction industry during the post-war adjustment period.

In spite of the fact that it is the third largest industry in the United States, the construction industry is the most unstable of them all. It always has been either a feast or a famine. The contractor, the material, and the equipment manufacturers either find their organizations completely swamped with work and orders, or they have no work or orders at all, and their equipment and plants sit idle and deteriorate. By working jointly with the several levels of government, much can be done to help stabilize construction and facilitate total employment through the various public works programs of the country. In most cases, the release of public-works projects for construction can be controlled in a given locality and used as a cushion to balance employment. When private construction needs the workers, public projects can be held up and released during slack periods of private construction, thus serving to level the peaks and valleys in the entire industry. This form of control is highly desirable, and would have a much-needed stabilizing effect on the peacetime economy of the country as a whole.

To help accomplish this, Builders of the West have established a regional office in San Francisco that is being staffed with specialists in these respective fields of operation. A fact-finding division has been created that will gather and correlate all information possible pertaining to the private and public construction needs of the various communities, counties, and States throughout this area. This information will be tabulated for reporting purposes and made available to all of the interested groups.

Its second function is to assist in every way possible in bringing about a closer cooperation between the existing agencies and groups concerned with the problem of post-war preparedness in all of its ramifications. Third, a common mouthpiece for informing the public by radio, newspapers, and other media is being set up.

The specialized staff of the organization will assist the smallest communities, the largest urban centers, and county, State, and Federal bodies concerned with planning, with their problems of manpower, finance, legislation, coordination, and the preparation of their respective plans. The organization will work also toward the establishment of a close relationship with the Western Conference of Governors, Congressional delegations, the various State commissions on interstate cooperation, and all civic and professional groups now set up and dealing with the question of conversion and employment following the close of the war.

There are those who contend that this advance planning cannot be accomplished without detracting from the war effort, but such contentions are fallacious. Most of the larger industrial organizations are in the process of preparing their post-war plans now, or have pretty clearly in mind what they want to plan for. With the establishment of the incentives enumerated earlier, they will proceed with the completion of their plans and maintain their war production schedules simultaneously. The middle-sized and smaller enterprisers, farmers, and local governments can and will develop plans for their post-war operations without lessening their contributions to the war effort in the least, if they are furnished the proper encouragement and assistance.

It is entirely logical for the construction industry to take the lead in this regard, because, in the main, the major portion of the required war construction is completed, or is now in the process of completion. Therefore, the industry is ready for its next big assignment. There are a sufficient number of engineers, architects, and construction specialists available now to undertake the preparation of the plans and specifications for the suggested construction program and complete them on schedule. It shall be understood

clearly that all projects to be constructed must pass the test of genuine need for the structure, and not merely to furnish employment.

The financial position of many of the States and governmental units has improved materially because of wartime activities. Others have suffered financially because of labor migration to war production areas. For those units not financially able to accomplish adequate advance planning, assistance should be provided from State or Federal funds.

The first objective is to effect a complete transition from war to peace without widespread unemployment and dissipation of the now-accumulated purchasing power. A consistent effort to stabilize industry and employment should follow.

The Lawyer of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an address delivered by me to the graduating class of the Washington College of Law on Thursday, June 15, 1944:

You, who are graduating from this college of law, deserve sincere congratulations. You are to be congratulated upon the years of effort and energy which you have put forth in order to secure a degree in your chosen profession, and you are to be congratulated upon your choice of a profession. In my opinion, no profession is more honorable or offers greater opportunities for service than does the law. You will have an opportunity of service, not only to your clients whom you will represent, but as a citizen in a great democracy. You will have an opportunity of service in taking an interest in, and participating in, public affairs.

In every country, throughout the ages, it has been the members of the legal profession who have furnished the leadership. It is the lawyers who have led public opinion in meeting every crisis which has confronted this Nation. And it is the lawyers who will lead the people of this Nation in meeting the present, most complexing and difficult problems which ever faced our society.

For years, I am sure, every graduating class has been told and impressed with the fact that they are finishing college and entering their chosen fields of endeavor at the most complex and difficult time of history. And they have been told that never before has any class had more responsibility of government and leadership than the members of the class just then receiving degrees. And yet, I am sure that this year this statement which has been so frequently repeated is in fact true. You are graduating and are entering your profession at a time when this Nation is in the midst of the greatest struggle of history—a struggle for survival.

As citizens, everyone's paramount job is, of course, to bend every effort toward carrying the war to a complete victory. You are, I know, doing your bit today. But as graduate lawyers and members of the bar you will be called upon, and I am certain you will seek more active and more useful ways to do your part. This gigantic struggle, you may be sure, is one that will require the utmost cooperation and effort on the part, not only of our fighting forces, but on the part of every one of us at home. Our fighting men cannot carry on to victory unless we furnish them the tools and equipment with which to fight and, perhaps more important than that, unless we furnish them unity of backing and of purpose here at home. They must know and it is up to us to see that they know that the cause for which they are offering to give their lives is just, and that we will see that the purpose for which they are offering their all will not be forgotten in the years to come.

When victory is won the paramount question in the minds of the American people, and indeed of the peace-loving people all over the world, is how to make peace secure. Today the world's teeming millions are looking to us—to the great and mighty United States of America—for leadership and for a clear indication of the course to be followed in the future. I think we have made a decision that we will not again forsake the world and that we will not again turn our backs on our plain responsibility, but this decision must be protected with eternal vigilance and we must not let any other issue arise which will divert us from our course.

There was a time when we felt that we were insulated from foreign aggression by friendly neighbors on the north and south and by wide oceans on our east and west, but this conception has necessarily undergone a complete change. No part of the world can be at war without our security being imperiled. The rapid development of air warfare gives each nation a contiguous frontier. Attack and destruction can be literally rained upon a people without notice and their capacity to make war can be critically crippled.

As every lawyer knows, from the earliest days of history mankind has found some form of collective action necessary. Unfortunately, in every society there are criminals and desperadoes and in every city and community we must have law enforcement officers to keep the peace. It is the same with nations. Criminals may grow up because of heredity, environment, or because of the lack of medical care or proper food. We do what we can to eliminate these causes but even so we must have police to protect the law-abiding citizen in his rights and safety. Among the nations of the world, trade, improved living conditions, education, and religion can do much to lessen the tendency toward national aggression but, as in the case of the local communities, this is not enough. It is plain that we must have an international agency to protect the peace of the world. It must now also be plain to most Americans that this country must keep its position as the No. 1 nation of the world and must do its share in joining with other peace-loving nations in preventing the repetition of this devastating horror.

The people of the older generation have not done a very good job in operating this country or in meeting their responsibility. The errors of the older generation allowed World War No. 1 to occur. They led us into the boom days of the twenties, with the resultant unemployment and social and financial depression. And then the greatest error of all was in failing to do our part to prevent the occurrence of World War No. 2. For that error those of my age must take their share of the blame. Thus, it is not a pretty picture that confronts us.

Ninety percent of the money collected by the Government since the beginning of this Republic has been spent on arms and armament. This has been necessary, but think of the great good this money could have accomplished if spent for other purposes. Surely history must have taught us our lesson. Surely we must now see that the nations of the world must band together as the States of this country have banded together in creating a bulwark of security and in advancing our civilization. A big part of the responsibility for doing this falls upon those graduating here tonight and in other colleges and universities at this season throughout the Nation. I know that the average person would say, in answer to my plea that you assume a part in doing your bit in preventing a reoccurrence of this kind, that there is very little that one person can do. That is quite true, but if every person took that attitude think of the decadent condition his country would be in.

Furthermore, let us always remember that our foreign policy, our international security, is tied up directly with the problems of the home front. We cannot have international security unless we work for it, and we work for it or against it by the little things we do here at home. Whether we have international trade is a decision that we make here and that decision will rest primarily upon public opinion, which you can do a great deal to influence. Whether we have international security will depend to a great extent upon understanding and cooperation with our allies. Therefore, it would be well to try to find avenues of friendship with the Russians, with the British, and with the Chinese, and with the other peoples of the world, rather than adding fuel to class and race hatreds. A few people cursing the British or expressing suspicion of the Russians is doing much to lessen our chances of world peace. You, if you will do so, can negative many of those ill influences.

Then, too, on the home front, where matters of meeting our post-war domestic obligations, we must have a healthy democracy—one in which the citizen takes his place. I think that every young lawyer should identify himself with one of the political parties, he should vote, and he should express himself on public issues. He should help to make the democratic process work.

There are those who say that democracy is inefficient, that it cannot meet modern tendencies and conditions. I do not agree with these pessimists. But if democracy is to work, the individual citizen must keep it virile and vigorous.

Then, too, in this country we must prepare for the post-war period. We must use intelligence in reconverting our industries back to peacetime production. We must find jobs and employment for returning veterans and dislocated war workers. These are matters in which you have a responsibility.

I know that I have talked at too much length about the duties of a lawyer in public affairs, but perhaps young lawyers cannot be too greatly impressed with the fact that in this Nation lawyers at the present time and lawyers in the future are the political, economic, and social leaders of the country. The very nature of the legal profession makes this true, and the success with which lawyers discharge their obligations of leadership will mark the success that our Nation and the world will have in the future. But I feel that I should also say a few words about the future of your profession and give you some advice that may be of benefit to you in successfully following your profession. There are those who have expressed fear that in the years to come the legal profession may practically be abolished and that lawyers will no longer be needed. This fear is entirely groundless. The next generation will have a greater need of lawyers than we do at the present. As long as we are ruled by laws, lawyers will be necessary in the protection of the rights of individuals. As long as we operate under a democratic system lawyers will be necessary in adjusting relations between the individual and his Government.

The profession of the law is one of the fruits of civilization and will endure as long as civilization lasts. Legislative bodies deal with the rights of the public. Lawyers deal with the rights of individuals. Lawyers have also played a conspicuous part in the framing and maintaining of our Government. To me there is no higher service and more sacred

duty than defending the rights of the individual citizen and protecting him in his life, liberty, and property against invasion, either by another individual or by his Government. All honor to the great profession which throughout the centuries has stood guard in the defense and the preservation of the rights of their clients and of their country. While there may have been some members of the bar who have rendered a disservice and have not reflected credit upon the profession, yet the legal profession as a whole has made a notable contribution to the civilization in which we live.

You who are about to identify yourselves as members of this great profession need have no apprehension that there will be no work to be done. There will be plenty of work for lawyers to do, and if you are prepared, and well prepared, to do it and give the best that is in you, you will not want for clients.

As I visualize the lawyer of tomorrow, and I mean by that term the lawyer who will succeed and leave his imprint upon the generation in which he lives, these are the characteristics which will form the foundation not only of his success but of his service to the country.

He will revere the past and the precedents established by our jurisprudence, and will preserve inviolate the fundamental principles upon which the science of the law is built. He will realize the wisdom that comes from experience, and he will delve into the history of the past and will look to these principles enunciated by the fathers for a solution of the problems of the present.

While revering the past, he will adjust himself to the changing world in which he lives. He will grow and expand, and will not remain static.

He will play his part in the changes that take place, either in jurisprudence or in government. He will be a factor in helping to preserve an even balance between the clash and conflict of antagonistic interests. He will be a tower of strength in assisting in the preservation and the maintenance of constitutional government, and his influence will always be opposed to revolution, overthrow, or the impairment of our democratic form of government. His education, background, experience, and reverence for law and order will splendidly equip him for this task.

The lawyer of tomorrow, as in the past, will be independent. His profession enables him to be so. There is one thing about the legal profession that has always appealed to me—that a lawyer more so than those engaged in business pursuits can think and act independently. Those engaged in business who have competition, by force of necessity cannot be outspoken and independent for fear of driving their customers to their competitors, but the lawyer sells his services and his legal ability. He does not depend on favoritism or fawning, but upon sheer ability and service performed. The lawyer sells his services to his clients, but the real lawyer never sells his conscience, his conviction, or his soul. These he does not have to sell, if he has the ability to achieve results.

The lawyer of tomorrow will be a worker. No lawyer in the past has, and no lawyer in the future will, achieve success unless he gives unremitting toil and persistent labor to his work. At a commencement exercise a few years ago, in one of our eastern colleges, one of the lawyer graduates, in considering what would be the subject of his address first chose one dealing with some theoretical question of law, but upon second thought he decided to speak upon a more practical question, and the subject of his address was We Want Jobs. A member of one of the largest firms in Chicago was present and heard this young man's plea for a job, and was impressed, not only with his earnestness but his willingness to pay the price of success by hard work, and on the same day, after the address had been delivered, the Chicago lawyer approached the young man and offered him a minor position with his firm, which the young man immediately accepted, and he is today one of the senior members of that great firm.

He will be true to his clients. The fidelity with which attorneys have remained steadfast and loyal to their clients' interests is an outstanding characteristic of the legal profession. During my entire life I have never known more than two or three lawyers, notwithstanding their other faults, to be lacking in fidelity to their clients.

He will realize that character counts, and that no legal career can permanently succeed that is not built upon honesty and fair dealing. No law can endure which is not founded upon justice, equity, and right, and no lawyer can succeed and attain a real measure of permanent success unless these principles are woven into the warp and woof of his very life.

And so the future is difficult, but it is also bright. There is a lot to do. This is an exciting, a challenging period in history.

The Fate of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, various matters have prevented my comment on the recent action of the State Department in asking the Minister to Finland, the Honorable Mr. Procope, to leave this country. It may be that the State Department is running true to form, but I do not follow their type of activity. Not only Finland, but other small countries of Europe, and I have talked about them in other remarks I have made to the House, are entitled not only to our sympathy, but also to our active support. I want to say frankly that I am not one of those that believe in the lease-lend for Russia, and at the same time favors the extermination of the small and defenseless countries in the Old World. I think this disgraceful episode is well expressed in an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald on Saturday, June 27, 1944, which editorial is as follows:

DEATH OF FINLAND

WE GIVE RUSSIA A FREE HAND

Now Finland is really finished. The Russians have been given a free hand by the United States of America to wade right in and carry on their routine of extermination. It is a savage, barbaric routine.

It calls for the firing squad, the secret police, and the transportation of people by the thousands to the void of Siberia. They are never heard from again.

And it is an old, old routine in Russia. The Finns will now travel a bloody trail blazed by countless thousands of Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians—yes, and Russians, too. It is a disohnorable routine, but it works.

The Russians can use it to make an end to Finland forever. Then the world won't have to be bothered any longer by that wonderful little country which has set such a hard example of integrity and decent conduct.

It will be no problem at all for Russia to swallow Finland without trace and do away with the last of its men.

There were only slightly more than three and a half million Finns in 1939—a population about equal to that of Chicago and its main suburbs—and, in the 4 years of war that have followed, they have suffered heavy loss.

Their last hope of a savior was the United States of America, and yesterday our State Department ordered Finland's principal diplomats here to pack up and get out and take their families with them.

They were accused of acts "inimical" to our interests.

FINLAND ALWAYS PAID; WE PLEASANTLY ACCEPTED

Perhaps those "inimical" acts included their insistence on Finland's paying the regular installments of her debts to the Government of the United States of America whenever due.

For it is certainly true that 2 days ago, on June 15, Finnish Minister H. J. Procope paid his country's debt installment right across the counter to the Treasury Department, which pleasantly accepted the money. That act of Finland's is certainly one of which none of the other nations owing us is guilty.

And just about all the other nations in the world, including our great Allies, England and Russia, owe us.

The Finns have always insisted on living up to their obligations and minding their own business, a contrary example in the modern world. So, they go.

But the story of their going is a sorry chapter in world history, and our own part in it is sorriest of all.

For we are the ones who were, verbally and emotionally, the most bellicose when Finland first defied Russia. Our own President led us in this. And the Finns listened to us. It was a fatal error on their part.

Let's trace out this unheroic story of our behavior from the beginning.

THEY WON THEIR FREEDOM IN 1917

For centuries the Finns were a football of war between Russia and Sweden, but they never really submitted to Russia any more than they did to Sweden. The Finns are a people wholly different from the Russians in language and customs, just as they are different from the Swedes.

Finally their chance came when Russia turned in 1917 from war with Germany to civil war and a Bolshevik dictatorship The Finns proclaimed their independence on December 6, 1917, and were promptly recognized by the world powers—including the United States of America.

They joined the League of Nations, followed all the rules, and really lived the quiet life of a small neutral democracy with no interest in war.

The big test of their neutrality came in May of 1939 when Hitler offered a nonaggression past to Finland, Norway, and Sweden. All three firmly rejected it.

They were just little nations and didn't have much insight into the ways of the great powers.

They were shocked when Germany unveiled, in August of 1939, a nonaggression pact with none other than Russia. Then they were staggered when Russia, jointly with Germany, proceeded to destroy Poland. And then they were stunned. For next Germany went into a sitzkrieg while Russia swallowed Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—and, without provocation, attacked Finland.

ROOSEVELT'S PRAISE FOR FINLAND IN 1939

Have you forgotten about all that? Well, maybe these words of President Roosevelt will remind you:

"The news of the Soviet naval and military bombarding within Finnish territory has

come as a profound shock to the Government and people of the United States.

"Despite efforts made to solve the dispute by peaceful methods, to which no reasonable objection could be offered, one power has chosen to resort to force of arms. The people and government of Finland have a long, honorable, and wholly peaceful record which has won for them the respect and warm regard of the people and Government of the United States."

Those words were the keynote of a unanimous American feeling about Finland. We loudly urged the Finns to fight and promised help.

The misfortunes of the Finns that have followed all date from Russia's unprovoked and inexcusable attack in 1939. And now the Finns are in ruins.

Shortly they are going to die.

And we, who saw them so noble in 1939, are turning our faces away from them in their last days. Is there any of us who can be proud?

We Need Constructive Labor Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, if the superstate, already sketched by the New Deal, triumphs—then there will be only one "boss"—the Government—and all of us, labor and management alike, will have to obey or perish. Already our Government has made inroads on our American way of life.

The Republican Party, in its determination to protect American industry and the American farmer, has also served to protect the American workingman against competition from slave labor abroad.

The New Deal administration, which only recently tried to draft labor over the protest of all trade unions, offers imported theories of the crackpot variety. The New Deal has prospered by setting group against group and class against class.

The Republican Party has been fighting for the program set out by William L. Hutcheson, head of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America and first vice president of the American Federation of Labor. His program is as follows:

First. The preservation of free enterprise.

Second. The abatement of bureaucracy.

Third. The halt of paternalism.

Fourth. The creation of post-war jobs through private industry.

Fifth. The maintenance of labor's social gains.

Sixth. The protection of our national interest.

One more example of the need of adopting the second plank in Mr. Hutcheson's program, which is the abatement of bureaucracy, is well illustrated by the following editorial by Mr. Douglas Larsen in the June 15 issue of the Washington Daily News:

TOP MEN GIVEN BIG RAISES WHILE LOWER PAID WAIT FOR THEIRS

(By Douglas Larsen)

While United Federal Workers of America struggle desperately to get hearings on a bill to effect wage increases for the mass of Government clerks and stenographers, records reveal that some big shots have had phenomenal raises since getting on the Government pay roll during the war.

This situation as it exists in certain war agencies has recently been brought to the attention of Congressmen and is the subject of much discussion on the Hill.

Here are cases which have caused comment among persons trying to help lower-paid Government workers:

A 38-year-old announcer and writer, before joining the Government in March 1942, was making $1,400 a year. He had two college degrees. He went on the pay roll at War Relocation Authority at $6,500 and in 14 months was making $8,000 in a job unrelated to his experience.

In his job as a college professor a 39-year-old man was making $2,000 a year. When the war broke out he got a job as an administrative officer with W. R. A. for $4,600 a year, then went to $5,800 to $6,500 and finally to $8,000 as a business specialist. This in spite of the fact that he hadn't had a shred of actual business experience.

LAWYER ROCKETS TO BIG DOUGH

A young lawyer with 6 months' legal experience that would have given him about $3,000 a year was hired by a Government agency at $4,600 and within a year was a $6,000 legal light, after which he switched to a second agency at $6,750 until W. R. A. came along. It paid him $8,000.

Typical of how permanent departments have been raided by the war agencies is revealed in the case of a man making $3,200 as a social economist at the Department of Agriculture. After 16 months with a war agency he is making $2,400 more.

Another man with 2 years' teachers college training was hired by Government in June 1942, for $2,900. He has since been promoted to $5,600 a year.

A professor with law and philosophy degrees was earning $2,600 teaching. He got a job as soil conversationist with Government at $3,800, switched to a different agency as a social science analyst for $4,600, and is now in W. R. A. making $8,000 a year.

A high-school grad with 1 year in business school was making $3,700 a year in private business. He came with the Government as an assistant project manager for $5,600 and in 5 months was earning $6,500.

SITUATION BAD FOR MORALE

A comment was made on this subject of raises for big shots in New York recently. Speaking before the University Club June 9, Joseph L. Borda, staff director of the Byrd committee said:

"On the basis of an analysis by the committee, Federal employees in the upper brackets are getting substantial raises in salary. In one agency several persons who are now receiving $8,000 a year received an average increase plus a salary boost at the time they entered that agency of $2,650. I personally know many Government employees who haven't received wages like that over a period of 10 years. In the same agency those persons receiving $6,500 a year had salary increases on the average of $2,840. This is bad for morale."

In light of this remark, and the fact that Congressmen are doing a lot of talking about it, leads to the assumption that something might be done soon, possibly by the Byrd committee.

It must be remembered that these employees in the lower income brackets receive less than one-half the overtime cost-of-living bonus that is being provided for the bureaucrats in the higher income brackets.

Sound Insurance Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to reprint an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun, June 17, 1944.

In a previous address to the Congress I sought to point out that the Walter bill, H. R. 3270, is not sufficient to cover the present situation in the field of insurance. The decisions of the Supreme Court that insurance is interstate commerce and affects interstate commerce require that the States take immediate notice and seek to safeguard the State regulation of insurance business. It is not enough to declare that antitrust acts do not apply to it for when the Supreme Court held the business of insurance to be an interstate commerce it brought before every company, every State official, and every policyholder the possibility of Federal regulation under the commerce clause of our Constitution.

If we repeal every antitrust law on our statute books we would not have done away with the possibility or, if you prefer, the threat of Federal regulation. That only disappears when the State itself actively and constructively operates in that field. The best way to avoid Federal regulation is to have good State regulation which every policyholder and every purchaser of insurance can trust, respect, and find to be in his interest.

I therefore renew my plea to this Congress not to pass the Walter bill but to go further and to declare that the regulation of insurance practices, the licensing of agents, the requirements for financial stability, the provision of standard policies and forms remain the responsibility of States and that these important functions should not be sidetracked by groups of insurance executives who seek to avoid an antitrust prosecution. Not a line in H. R. 3270 touches these important questions of State regulation and we would only delude the insurance-buying public to pass the bill H. R. 3270 in its present form and tell them that it would preserve State regulation of an interstate commodity.

The editorial from the Chicago Sun is as follows:

SOUND ADVICE ON INSURANCE

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners, meeting in Chicago, is trying to decide what to do about the Supreme Court decision holding the insurance business subject to the Federal antitrust laws. The best advice the commissioners have received came from Representative ANDERSON

of New Mexico, who in a House speech invited them to help Congress draft a sound national insurance law.

The commissioners did not like the court decision. Many of them supported the Bailey-Walter bill, sponsored by insurance firms to forestall the Court's ruling. But Mr. ANDERSON warned them that faith in the Bailey-Walter bill is now a delusion. Congress cannot permanently evade responsibility for protecting our people from any abuses discovered in the risk business. The State officials, if they approach the problem constructively, can materially assist the Federal Government. This viewpoint, it is satisfying to see, is endorsed by the association's president, Charles F. J. Harrington, of Massachusetts.

"Plant a Rose for Me"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded to a young man who lived in my district. His name was Bill Bordelon.

Frances Bryson, of the staff of the New Orleans Item, wrote a story about this heroic boy which is as fine a piece of human interest newspaper reporting as I have read in a long time.

Frances Bryson is that kind of a newspaper woman reporter that those of us who have been in the newspaper business like to refer to as a good newspaperman.

This is a mighty pretty little piece which I am sure will tug at your heart strings. It unfolds the beautiful simplicity and sweetness of thought which so many of our American boys carry into battle with them and on the spot where they fall and their blood spills on the soil I am sure nowhere else is so red the rose.

Here is Frances Bryson's own story of this gallant lad:

"PLANT A ROSE FOR ME"
(By Frances Bryson)

"Would you somewhere, in some garden," Bill Bordelon wrote home, "plant a rose for me?"

Bill was a gentle boy, serious, polite and quiet. His brother is a priest, and his aunt was a nun here in New Orleans. He lived here before he joined the Marines.

Then he became a one-man war—and so valiant was his death that he is being posthumously awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor on Saturday.

Only one other New Orleans resident, the gallant Commander Gilmore, whose last words "Take her down" are now famous, has received in this war this highest award that the United States can bestow.

Bill's grandmother, Mrs. A. L. Bordelon, 327 South Solomon Street, has gone to San Antonio for the ceremony, as his parents live there now.

The sergeant's heroism at Tarawa, where he was killed after ignoring at least three serious wounds to hold almost single-handed a part of the beach, saved the lives of two of his comrades.

One of them, Sgt. Elden Beers, told the story.

"Bill and I were together in the Marines for 2 years, through basic and advanced training and fighting on Guadalcanal and Tarawa," he said. "We were in the same landing craft as we headed for the beach, Bill as platoon leader and myself as a squad leader.

"Only five of us got out of that boat and made the landing alive, I think. The rest were killed or fatally wounded by snipers and machine gunners who hit us about 50 yards from shore. As the boat stopped Bill and I jumped over the side and immediately got tangled in barbed wire.

"We freed ourselves and by some miracle made it to the beach. Bill took some demolition charges and exposed himself to fire by standing up while he pitched two packages of dynamite at the snipers. That eliminated those Japs, but Bill was hit by a bullet which made a hole through his left arm. He also received two small shrapnel wounds in the face. We bandaged him and tried to quiet him but he refused and ordered us to make up our last two demolition charges. The most damaging gun was about 200 yards back from the shore. Bill took the last two charges and started to crawl toward the enemy emplacement. He insisted on going alone. He knocked out that gun, too, but got another bullet hole through his left arm. All he would let us do was apply a tourniquet.

"We decided to attempt to rescue some of the wounded men, and Bill went to look for a Hospital Corps man at another beach but all he was able to find was a rifle grenade. He was approaching the machine-gun nest when one of our wounded fellows floated in with the tide. Bill went to help him and was again wounded, this time in the shoulder, and knocked down.

"Later some of the men told me Bill was killed. I think he was the bravest marine I ever saw."

What Beers didn't know was that one of Bill's wounds was caused by a demolition bomb exploding in his hand, but he grabbed a rifle and kept firing to cover a group of marines scaling a sea wall.

He again made up demolition charges and singlehandedly assaulted a fourth Japanese machine-gun position, but was instantly killed when caught in a final burst of fire from the enemy.

Bill's father, W. J. Bordelon, wrote Representative HÉBERT in Washington, urging that "such of the Pacific Islands as may be deemed important and necessary to the defense of our homeland, be held, especially if these areas were redeemed by American blood.

"I have in mind," he wrote, "particularly the Gilbert Islands, where there is a mound of sand covering the remains of a marine sergeant, our son, who gave his life in the engagement which resulted in the capture of these islands from the Japs.

"I hereby lay claim to at least that part of the island where his remains lie."

Bill has two aunts, Mrs. Ethel Bordelon Cooper and Mrs. A. D. Allen, living in New Orleans, as well as his grandmother, and an uncle, Byron B. Bordelon, of 3520 Banks Street.

The message about the rose was written underneath a picture of himself that Bill sent to his sister, Mrs. Peggy Sink, of San Antonio. Her captain husband is overseas. Bill is survived by his parents, his sister, and three brothers, Rev. Bro. Thomas Bordelon, Dayton, Ohio, and Raymond and Bobbie Bordelon, of San Antonio.

The ceremony will take place at a formal sunset review, and will be attended by the Governor of Texas, the mayor of San Antonio, and officials of all branches of the service.

Bill would have been 21 on last Christmas Day. He was killed November 20.

A rose has been planted for Bill.

But his memory will stay fresh in the hearts of his countrymen longer than any rose bush will live.

Now Is the Time To Consider Legislation for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a time in the history of our Nation when we ought to be selling the virtues of democracy to the rest of the world it is right now. We think we have the form of government best suited to meet the needs of the common man, but unfortunately we have not eliminated certain grave defects in it. Until these defects are eliminated it is going to be difficult for us to persuade other peoples to follow our example. Hitler and Mussolini arrayed their people against us by pointing out the facts that we did not offer equal opportunity to all men as we boasted; that the poverty in our great metropolitan centers was as sordid and beastly as could be found anywhere in the world; that monopoly rode roughshod over many types of industry in this boasted land of the free; that education of the masses was a haphazard affair resulting in shameful illiteracy; that the elder veterans of labor who had reached the age of helplessness were accorded less consideration than retired Army mules, and many other shortcomings in our political system.

We, to our sorrow and shame, cannot deny that they partially told the truth about us, and when these national faults of ours are paraded before the world and nothing said about our virtues, it makes our boasts about democracy seem pretty nauseating.

Just now the world is diligently seeking some formula which can be set up as a beacon for all nations to follow that will start mankind upon the upward road toward international fellowship and cooperation leading to a world of permanent peace on earth and good will among men.

I believe that if we analyze the defects of all governments that we will find one fundamental wrong back of them all. That wrong lies in permitting the human hogs among us to build legal protection for themselves which fortifies them while they take an undue share of the wealth as it is produced. If some equitable system of wealth distribution could be provided for by only one nation, an example would be furnished that other nations would be likely to follow.

Distribution is the key word which will unlock the prison of poverty for the masses. Free the masses from poverty,

give them homes and possessions of their own and it would be impossible to stir them up to a frenzy of hatred and bloodthirstiness. We can totally obliterate the spirit for war when we establish justice in the matter of distributing the world's goods. But under our profit system, the only way we can distribute our wealth of things equitably is to provide our people with the means of buying them. The ability to buy must precede the ability to produce and to possess. Wages and salaries constitute the main dependence of the masses for obtaining food, clothing, and shelter. Whenever those who control the flow of money wish to do so, or when they are impelled by fear to do so, whether they wish it or not, they can close banks, shut down production, stop the movement of money through the wage and salary channels and thus deprive the masses of a means of making a livelihood for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, a new system of money flow must be had for the nation that will not depend upon the whims or fears of a small coterie of financiers. Such a system must be national in character, governed by the Congress of the United States. It must be basically established as the foundation of our monetary system. Obviously if every community in the land is to be liberally supplied with food, clothing and shelter—all of which we know we are amply able to supply—money must be made available to every community with which to buy these necessities. How shall we pipe line money into every community continuously in quantity sufficient to keep business thriving? Today when wages and salaries stop, business stops and depression starts. It is apparent that a new distribution of money—buying power—other than wages and salaries will have to be set up if we are going to insure ourselves against the recurrence of depressions.

Well, if we need insurance against depressions, let us have insurance. Let us set up a national, mutual, endowment, citizens insurance against the hazards of sickness, accident and old age and pay with money at monthly intervals all those citizens who are unable to make a lving for themselves because of these afflictions. Our census statistics tell us that about 10 percent of the adult population are incapacitated for making a living for themselves by reason of decrepitude resulting from old age, sickness and accidents. When physical disability puts 10 percent of the population out of the working class, it also puts them out of the buying class, and when panic and depression assail the business world the jobless workers are added to the permanent 10 percent of nonbuyers. That paralyzes business. Now when business is paralyzed wealth production stops, and everybody suffers.

By setting up our national mutual insurance and operating it on a nonprofit basis and paying all the incapacitated members of society at monthly periods a liberal percentage of the wealth dividend created by the entire population, on condition that each recipient would have to spend his entire allowance each 30 days, we can have a money flow into all communities that will not depend upon wages and salaries, and that will sustain business when wages and salaries fall off. Let us assume that our national insurance is in force. Let us assume that we have geared the payment benefits to the productive ability of the Nation and that it has been decided that we can safely set aside 3 percent of the current national income for the payment of these benefits. It has been estimated by competent economists that at the present high level of production 3 percent of it, measured in dollars, will pay monthly $100 to 16,000,000 people, 12 percent of the population.

Now if a community of a thousand souls had but 10 percent of its people drawing from the Government a hundred dollars each, every 30 days, $10,000 would flow into that community each and every month. Could any other stabilizer of business be devised that would be more dependable? Would not that money turn over several times during a 30-day period? Would not several times the original $10,000 be reflected in the actual business done as a result of starting the money flowing in that community?

Let us think how we shall insure business. We cannot insure business unless we insure the supply of money which creates the market for goods and services. Industry cannot insure the flow of money into every community. When industry lags, the flow of money through wages also lags. To insure business we must first insure the flow of money. With the flow of money insured, business is bound to thrive. Nothing can stop or retard it.

This insurance of money flow has never been tried because until this new era of machine production arrived, there was never enough goods to go around, the hand methods used could not supply enough for all to live well. There was always scarcity. Now, in this new machine age, our ability to produce has run away ahead of our ability to buy. We must build our purchasing capacity up to a level with our producing capacity and hold it there—by insurance.

I urge upon all my colleagues the importance of giving careful study to House bill 1649, now in the hands of the Ways and Means Committee. This bill offers the type of national insurance under discussion here and if adopted by the Congress will do more toward removing the fear of after-the-war collapse than any other measure that I know of.

The Veterans' Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, Congress has passed by a unanimous vote the act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans. This is a timely and urgent recognition of the Nation's obligation to the more than 11,000,000 young men and women who have responded to their country's call in this hour of its peril. They gave up the comforts of home, the companionship of fathers and mothers, wives and children, kindred and friends, the safety and profits of peacetime pursuits for the hardships and the dangers of warfare. They have been built into a living wall of offense and defense in the protection of their country and for the preservation of civilization. The heads of families have left a vacant chair in the family circle. Boys and girls in their teens and early twenties have left their studies in school for the stern and exacting training of the camp, the dangers of the sea, the hazards of the sky, the shock and roar of battle. On land, on the sea, in the air, on every battle front they have covered themselves with glory. They have written chapters, in their own blood, in the history of American arms that will live forever. Thousands of them have passed on to—

> Fame's eternal camping ground
> Where glory guards, with solemn round,
> The bivouac of the dead.

Other thousands have come back, maimed and crippled for life. Other thousands have returned with shattered nerves. Other thousands have come home only to find the doors of opportunity shut in their faces.

The Representatives in Congress of these boys and girls and their loved ones have not been slow to acknowledge the Nation's debt of gratitude to them. And in this act, popularly known as the G. I. bill, we have put into practical and substantial form our acknowledgment of the people's everlasting determination to put their feet firmly in the pathway of readjustment and rehabilitation.

The American soldier has always been endowed with marvelous powers of recuperation and readjustment. Our soldiers and sailors and marines of every war speedily, on their discharge from the armed service, have melted back into civilian life like the waves subside into the surface of the sea. They have taken front rank in business, in the professions, and in posts of honor and trust in the Government.

We are determined that under this act, which we believe will speedily be signed by the President, the doors of opportunity will swing wide for our returning heroes and heroines.

For those who are in need of it, hospitalization will be afforded. They will be aided by representatives of the veterans' organizations. Their claims for benefits will be carefully, liberally, and sympathetically considered. Those who desire to do so, can complete their education at the Government's expense. Loans to help purchase or construct homes, to buy and equip farms, and to acquire business houses can be obtained up to 50 percent thereof.

Aid in obtaining employment is provided by law. Unemployment benefits

are provided. Provisions are made for adequate hospital facilities.

It afforded me great pleasure to support and vote for the enactment of this measure. The Nation that in time of peace or war does not make adequate provision for its defenders is not fit to live and cannot long endure. And the American people are determined to preserve on the home front the liberties that its youth is so nobly fighting to save. We intend to help them to help themselves when they come home. This act, we believe, will accomplish this purpose.

Chicago Lake Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, one of Chicago's greatest claims to fame is her magnificent Outer Drive. Visitors from all over the world have acclaimed the splendid water-front boulevard of the city of Chicago. Now comes a native Chicagoan with a post-war plan to substitute a great lake-front harbor for the great Chicago highway. For 40 years Maj. Henry W. Lee, engineer and publisher of the Calumet Record, an industrial newspaper in Chicago, has advocated use of more of Chicago's lake front for harbor purposes. Editor Lee has recently revived his plan and those engaged in post-war planning are giving more consideration to his program than they have heretofore. For two score years he has never faltered in his advocacy of a lake-front plan, although many of the champions of the city beautiful vigorously oppose such a movement.

As an evidence of the revived interest in the program of Major Lee, the following editorial taken from the Chicago Times is herewith presented:

TRADE—OR BEAUTY?

For 40 years Henry W. Lee, engineer and industrial publisher, has been, like the Biblical prophet, the voice of one crying in the wilderness. Few Chicagoans have heard, and fewer have heeded, his message to the city.

Today, as Chicago and the Nation grapple with plans for post-war reconstruction, Prophet Lee is redoubling his plea to be heard. The Times believes his plan at least makes sense enough to merit serious consideration among the projects to keep Chicago ahead in the post-war era.

So here it is for the consideration of all who are interested in the future of the city. But we warn you, it will seem a little shocking at first if you are one of those who take pride in Chicago's unparalleled Lake front.

LINKING CHICAGO TO THE SEVEN SEAS

Henry Lee proposes that the city recapture the 4 miles of Lake front parkway on the South Side between Grant Park and Thirty-first and convert it into a vast deep-water harbor, at whose piers ships of the seven seas can discharge and take on cargoes in world trade.

Of course, the idea that Chicago might become the terminus of a through-the-Lakes deep-water shipping route depends upon adoption by Congress of the long debated St. Lawrence deep waterway plan.

But even without a deep waterway to the sea Mr. Lee believes a big Lake-front harbor would do great things commercially for Chicago. Lack of such a harbor already has cost Chicago "untold millions in lost Lake commerce, population, and prosperity," he argues. Much of this business has gone to Milwaukee and the rapidly growing ports of northern Indiana—Gary, Buffington, and Indiana Harbor—which were willing to sacrifice scenic beauty for industrial growth.

WE ALMOST HAD A HARBOR IN 1911

Henry Lee doesn't claim to be the daddy of the lake-front-harbor idea.

The plan was recommended by a special board of the United States engineers as early as 1867, and was O. K.'d from time to time during the next 50 years by other United States officials.

The council unanimously adopted the plan in 1911, along with four other harbor proposals, but Mayor Harrison vetoed it "because it would interfere with the Chicago Beautiful plan." Henry Lee was in the thick of the fight to block the South Side lake-front-park project because it spelled the doom of his harbor dreams. He fought a losing battle in the courts; succeeded in blocking it temporarily by an appeal to the Secretary of War—but lost out when Secretary Garrison, who had upheld his objection, resigned and was succeeded by Newton D. Baker.

Baker approved the park plan, but inserted a clause into the agreement providing that the South Park commissioners would release the land upon demand of the city in the event it was needed "for purposes of commerce and navigation."

"And this (says Henry Lee) is our ace in the hole. Whenever the city council wishes to create a lake-front harbor, it is merely necessary to pass an ordinance. The city will then immediately come into possession of 4 miles of lake front with a depth of 900 to 1,300 feet, ideally adapted for harbor purposes in the opinion of every United States engineer stationed in Chicago since 1867. Uncle Sam will build a breakwater a mile from the shore; the factories, terminal facilities, coal, oil, cement, stone, grain, ore, passenger boat or miscellaneous package freight docks will build their own piers and wharves. It will not cost the city one cent."

CALUMET-SAG CANAL IMPROVEMENT DUE

So there is the picture as Prophet Lee sees it. The question is, Do we need expanded harbor facilities badly enough to sacrifice our lake-front park to get them?

At present our harbor facilities are limited to the Calumet River and Lake and the Chicago River. These are essentially shallow water harbors. Congress is expected to approve soon a $30,000,000 program for deepening Calumet Lake and improving the Calumet-Sag Canal link of the waterway to the Gulf of Mexico.

This project, when completed, will greatly improve Chicago's position as a waterway city. But is that enough to meet the city's needs in the post-war world—to keep us in the vanguard of progress? Henry Lee thinks not.

Already we are the world's greatest railroad and trucking center. We are well on the way toward being one of the world's greatest aviation centers. We need, contends Mr. Lee, to become a great navigation center, too.

How about it Chicago? Should we trade our South Side parkway for a bigger slice of the world's trade?

Address by Peter H. Bergson, Head of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have before me an address delived by Peter H. Bergson, who heads the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, at a testimonial dinner tendered to Senator GUY M. GILLETTE and former Representative Will Rogers, Jr. It is directed to free men everywhere and stresses particularly its belief that the present day heirs of the American Revolution will understand, recognize and support them in this mortal struggle for their life and liberation. Mr. Speaker, I believe it proper and fitting that this strong and moving address be printed in the RECORD.

The most dastardly thing about the 2,000,000 Jewish dead of Europe was not so much the fact that they are dead, but the manner of their dying.

This applies both to their German murderers and to the strange silence with which it was received by the United Nations.

We of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, as servants and representatives of the Hebrew people of Europe, transmitted their cry of agony and protest to the American nation. We shall eternally remember the magnificence of America's answer.

Today, with an indignant and clamoring American public opinion on their behalf; with a special war board created by the President of the United States to save them, the silence has definitely been broken.

This could not have been achieved without the penetrating understanding, the eagerness to be of solace and aid, and the brilliant statesmanship of Senator GUY GILLETTE and Congressman Will Rogers. It was their leadership in our struggle in Washington which has created for my forlorn and hapless people the machinery of action charged by your mighty Nation with the responsibility of doing all possible in a concentrated effort for their salvation.

On behalf of my people, on behalf of our tormented millions in Europe, I wish to thank these courageous and noble American statesmen and their colleagues in the Senate and in the House, and the many other leading Americans of all creeds and national extractions who have heeded our call and joined efforts with the crusading Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe. I wish to thank America for its great help and to thank God for America's greatness.

But unfortunately the job is not completed; it is merely begun. We still need your help and need it desperately. The Hebrew people of Europe have still to be saved. We must be saved first of all from the shame and humiliation into which we have been driven. Our dead must no longer be considered merely as useless victims of Nazi bestiality. They must be considered as honored casualties of the United Nations' common onslaught for freedom.

We must not distinguish the Hebrew people of Europe merely as 4,000,000 human beings marked for slaughter by the barbarous Nazis. We must distinguish and recognize

them as a positive entity; as a fellow partner in the world struggle for decent humanity.

There are several United Nations whose total population is but a fraction of the number of casualties which the Hebrew people of Europe has suffered in this war—yet they are honorable and equal partners. We are miserable and pitiful victims.

The Hebrew people of Europe today appeal to America for dignity and honor. It requests to be recognized as an ally. Our soldiers have fought and killed Germans and died in some of the epic battles of this war. The 38-day battle of the Warsaw ghetto ranks with Dunkerque, Stalingrad, and Tarawa, and this is not my appraisal but that of an editorial in the New York Times. The ghetto of Bialystok was another heroic battlefront. There were many other battles. Some of Europe's bitterest, most indomitable fighters today are Hebrew guerrilla bands, daily harrassing German battle lines and communications. Should they not be recognized merely because they are outnumbered by the Nazis a thousand to one? And then there are the fighting Hebrews of Palestine—30,000 of them fought and died in Greece, in Egypt, in Libya, in Tunisia, in Abyssinia, and are today fighting with your gallant heroic Fifth Army in Italy.

You are all aware of the gruesomeness of the disaster that has befallen our people. You also know that it has not come suddenly out of a clear sky, but that it culminates long decades of persecution and pogroms; yet nothing really complete and drastic has been suggested as a remedy. All the Jews the world over had, to counteract Germany's savage might, was confusion and wishful thinking. If I may on this somewhat festive occasion utter bitter words of criticism, let me say that it was the Jews that have clung to the status quo, and let me say further that it was the so-called leaders who have lulled us from disaster to disaster by silver-tongued oratory about the unity of the Jewish people and who kept pointing out to us that we survived all tyrannies before. Let me say quite frankly that I condemn these easy-going preaching leaders; I condemn them for they were never there. They preached status quo not from the ruins of Warsaw but from the safety and happiness of New York or Philadelphia or Cleveland. Yes, there has always been a Jewish people and there always will be one, but this is an abstract spiritual term which will never revive the millions of our dead nor save those remaining. The ease with which these American Jews, who because of wealth, position or fame occupy positions of leadership in American-Jewish communal life, are permitting themselves from the comfort and luxury of this blessed land to be the spokesmen of and to set the pace for the rescue and way of life of people with whom in reality their life has nothing in common is beyond my comprehension. I certainly do not even begin to doubt their sincerity and integrity. And I of course agree with them that spiritually and academically we are all Jews. But practically, all of these American Jews of fame and position, and all of you here, my friends, are members of a great, mighty, and free nation, the United States of America, while the Jews of Warsaw, as I myself, are members of another nation. For the Jewish people of Europe and Palestine have been molded into one entity and are in fact one nation—the Hebrew Nation. It is because this nation was not formally established and recognized that the disaster which has befallen the Hebrew Nation has been so vast, and the way for remedy blocked.

We should not let inertia and confusion stand in the way. Let it be stated clearly that the Hebrew people of Europe and Palestine mean precisely that. It does not mean Englishmen who practice the Jewish religion and it most certainly does not mean the millions of Americans here, commonly referred to as Jews, who are actually Americans of Hebrew descent and of the Jewish religion. They do not belong to the Hebrew nation any more than President Roosevelt belongs to the Dutch nation or Mr. Willkie belongs to the German nation. They are Americans first, last, and always. Their ancestors, way back 2,000 years ago, were Hebrews.

Justice Frankfurter is not a Hebrew. He is an American of Hebrew descent, practicing the Jewish religion, exactly as Justice Murphy is an American of Irish descent, practicing the Catholic religion.

This might be an abstract and academic problem as far as Justice Frankfurter and the other millions of Americans of Hebrew descent are concerned. To the Hebrew nation in Europe this is a problem of the gravest urgency and reality, for today without recognition as a nation we have no representative to speak for us. Having no national institutions we cannot get representation on international conferences or commissions. Thus the one flag and one voice conspicuously and tragically missing amongst the 42 United Nations' banners is the Hebrew banner. Thus our flag does not wave over the Palestine regiment when it marches into battle, and the graves of Hebrew heroes who died fighting Nazis are not marked with the insignia for which they lived and died but are marked with the insignia of a foreign nation—the Union Jack. Furthermore, thousands upon thousands of Hebrews now referred to as stateless Jews are still forced to sit idly by and have no opportunity at all to fight our Nazi enemy.

It is because the Hebrew nation is not recognized that its representatives were missing from the 42 nations that gathered in Atlantic City to map plans for United Nations relief and rehabilitation. It is this lack of recognition which is responsible for the paradoxical situation of our not being represented on the United Nations Commission in London, which is investigating and mapping plans for the punishment of those guilty of war atrocities, although it was against us that 80 percent of these atrocities have been committed.

It is because of this that our problem has never received any international consideration which was in any way commensurate with the magnitude of the problem.

The Hebrew nation has had 3,000,000 casualties. This is 35 percent of its entire potential population. To the British this would mean 20,000,000, to America this would mean 45,000,000. In the face of such a disaster we have no right to be timid and frightened to face new realties and formulae. If 3,000,000 casualties out of 8,000,000 are not enough to mold the surviving 5,000,000 into a nation, then there are no nations in the world.

It is for these reasons that the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation launches a new appeal to your mighty and generous Nation: Understand us. Help us. Help us regain our dignity and honor. Help us avenge our dead. And, above all, and first of all, help us prevent the steady and frightful additions to our casualty lists. This is the first problem of the Hebrew nation. This is our first task as their spokesmen—preservation and survival.

The Nazis are shaky in the knowledge that they are losing the war. Their satellites are still shakier. Let all the United Nations and the neutrals, on whose territories live 1,700,000,000 human beings, proclaim that they shall give shelter and harbor to every and all of the Hebrews who can be evacuated from the hell of Hitler's Europe.

America has already assumed historical leadership in this battle against massacre and for salvation, by the setting up of the War Refugee Board. In doing so your great President has stated that he "expects to obtain the cooperation of all members of the United Nations and other foreign governments in carrying out this difficult but important task."

We know that Soviet Russia has managed, amidst a bloody war for her own survival, to organize the saving and harboring on its territories of close to a million of my people from Rumania, Poland, and the Balkan states.

We can therefore feel confident of her future help, but we are still waiting to hear of the cooperation of the other nations, particularly those near to Europe or bordering on it.

We propose that Turkey proclaim that its borders are wide open to all Hebrews fleeing German death and that Great Britain join the United States in guaranteeing to Turkey the immediate and steady evacuation of these people into other close neighboring territories such as Cyprus, north Africa, and particularly Palestine. And to this neither we nor anybody else should dare attach conditions. If there are difficulties to solve the political problem of Palestine during this war, let it wait until after the war.

But let us not permit these political difficulties to stand in the way of the saving of countless of thousands of human lives. Though we appreciate the differences in the motives, we must condemn the advancement of political arguments on the road of rescue whether it comes from the British Colonial Office, from Arab politicians, or from misguided Zionists.

Let the doors which have for years now been steadily slammed into the faces of death-fleeing people be made wide open. This is not a political demand. To keep them shut is politics, and vicious politics at that. To permit the sturdy Hebrews of Palestine to give food and shelter to their escaped European brethren is not politics but an elementary dictate of humanity and justice.

It is because the Hebrew people in Palestine have been forced to be passive onlookers to the daily crucifixion of their brethren that their repeated and ignored protests are now assuming serious proportions in Palestine.

Rising to speak in the House of Commons on this problem several years ago, Winston Churchill began by saying, "Mr. Speaker, this is a melancholy occasion." It is today, ladies and gentlemen, much more than a melancholy occasion. It is the greatest disaster that has befallen any people, even amidst this frightful and bloody war. It cannot possibly be tackled by the slow and dreary status quo formulas. We, the Hebrew Nation, refuse to continue as the guinea pigs at whose expense daydreamers, wishful thinkers, and silver-tongued rabbis preach the unity of the Jewish people and the arrival of better days where, in a democratic and free Poland and Rumania, we shall be restored to life and liberty. The desperate, melancholy Hebrew Nation needs help and solace today. It needs recognition. It needs dignity. Without these it loses a chance for life and survival.

If the Americans of Hebrew descent in this country will give this problem bold, courageous consideration, if they give us as spokesmen for the Hebrew Nation their help, if they at least cease to put obstacles in our road, I feel fully confident that the day is very near where the Hebrew banner will proudly wave over the headquarters of our national representatives in Washington and over the columns of the Hebrew fighters who will participate in the forthcoming march to Berlin. Thus, and only thus, can the Hebrew people of Europe be restored to full and dignified human existence.

National Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief by William H. McMasters:

The question of an adequate national pension to be awarded to all American citizens has been before the public, the Congress, and the legislatures of all the States for many years. It is still unsettled. It is still being discussed. This brief is written to set out, once more, my own views on this question. These views have not changed during the years. Rather, they have been strengthened and confirmed, as I have come into contact with many public officials who are afraid to say openly that they are opposed to the idea of a national pension, but who have covertly attacked and delayed its adoption. They have done this by introducing objections to minor points and by questioning the advisability of some small feature or other. This underhanded conduct savors of hypocrisy, but it has been most effectual. These saboteurs of a national pension in any form may have fooled the general public, but they have never fooled me or many others who are familiar with this brand of political trickery.

Either a national pension is right in principle or it is wrong. If it is right we ought not to waste time in discussing whether or not the age should be 60 years for pensioners. We ought not to be talking for years at a time over the amount to be allotted to each pensioner as though the monthly amount had something to do with the pension principle itself. We could well forget the question of the tax method that would finance the pension proposition. This question of taxation is one that always brings on acrimonious debate. If our Government cannot handle its own tax problems today, without endless debate, when the fate of the Republic is at stake in the present war, surely there is nobody who could satisfy all the Members of the Congress as to a method of taxation that will finance a matter which many of the Members are secretly opposed to. Opponents to any legislative proposal dearly love to see tax ideas introduced for the very practical reason that tax ideas are always debatable. The opponents look very seriously down their noses as though mentally troubled over the said fate of the old folks of the Nation and then they shake their heads and say to one of their colleagues: "Too bad that the pension advocates cannot get together on a sound and workable-tax plan to handle this worthy pension cause in which all of us are so deeply interested. It grieves me. I'm fearfully disturbed over it. I would gladly vote for a suitable pension for our aged citizens if we could only devise some tax plan that wouldn't cost anybody anything. Too bad. Too bad."

My idea of a national pension is this. It should come each month, directly from the United States Treasury. The present old age assistance laws should be repealed when the new pension becomes effective. These laws are doing more harm to the morale of the American people than any other influence that I know. The pension should become available to every American citizen, on application, at the age of 60 years. It should be enough on which to live, even if the applicant has no other means of support. There should be no investigation of any kind into the financial circumstances of those who apply for this pension. The only restriction I suggest is that the recipient should not receive any other public pension or be a public employee of any kind. As to other kinds of employment, I have never believed that a pensioner should be compelled to retire from active work in order to receive his or her pension. Any provision of that nature is sure to involve trouble. The average man or woman at 60 who feels like doing productive work in the community ought not to be discouraged from working. The prevailing idea of employment is just one of the many strange fallacies that have grown up during recent years. In my opinion, we can never have too many persons employed. But we can have too many folks idle. Workers produce wealth. The more workers, the more wealth. We surely need more wealth in the country. The more wealth that we produce, the more there will be for all.

While that covers the problems so far as I am concerned, there is still the tax question. As to the best method, I feel that our entire tax system is bad in principle. It is accepted only because there has been no better method tried out. After faithfully working for years for the passage of various Townsend bills, I wrote a simplified bill which is now before the Congress. It carries number H. R. 1281, and is titled "National Pension Act." In this bill, I advocate the use of a transaction tax as a proper method to raise funds to carry out the provisions of the act.

My idea of a transaction tax is that it will be assessed equally against every transaction, big or little, that goes to make up the vast economy of the Nation. Every business or professional or salaried transaction, will have just so much deducted in taxes, at the end of each month. This money will be collected by the internal revenue collector. At the present enormous rate of business transactions in the country, the levy of 2 percent would produce about $2,500,000,000 per month. As every tranaction will be assessed the same amount, there will be no actual changes in the relative values involved. The retail business will not suffer at the expense of the wholesaler; the big man will not be asked to pay more or less than the small man. So far as the economy of the entire Nation might be altered, it would not be changed any more than though the whole business were to lose exactly 2 percent in volume in every part of it. Nobody would know the difference. Any economist who says this system of taxation would be a drain on the economy of the country is merely talking to hear himself talk.

Thirty billions of dollars per year can thus be taken out of the turn-over of our national business today and used to finance our national requirements. If pensioners get a part of it, then it will be serving a most desirable end. Whether pensioners get so much as $1 of it the principle of a transaction tax is fundamentally sound because it neither favors nor works against any type of business or person, corporation or industry. Every tax system ever designed, up to the present moment, has been faulty in one respect. It took revenue from certain sources but failed to take revenue from all available sources. Thus the economic values were changed by the tax system. Relative values were not maintained. A universal transaction tax does not produce this unbalanced result.

Copies of H. R. 1281, National Pension Act, may be had by writing to any Congressman whose name is familiar to you. Any United States Senator will be glad to send you a copy on request. It attracts attention to a bill when Congressmen receive requests for copies of it.

This bill asks for not less than $60 per month for every American citizen on reaching the age of 60 years. There is nothing in the bill about retiring from employment, nothing about the financial status of those who ask for the pension, nothing is said as to whether they have relatives who can support them. There is nothing in the bill about spending the pension during the following month or putting it into the saving bank. If anybody over 60 years of age wishes to live on less than $60 per month, he is not much of a charge on his community, so why worry over him? We have far too many regulations of the habits, lives and even the thoughts of our American citizens, today. I am suggesting that we stop all this regulating and let the men and women who have helped to bring America up to its present state, be allowed to conduct their own lives in their own way. These intelligent, elderly people do not need any regulations. All they need is what everybody else seems to need, enough money to take care of their wants, without privation and stinting.

I could write an entire book on this subject but it would not make by position any clearer. I suggest, once more, that you write to your United States Senator or Congressman and ask to have a few copies of H. R. 1281 mailed to you. There is no charge for these copies and you can send your request on a postal card, if you feel like it. This is your country my friends; the men in the Congress are your servants; you pay their salaries, and the pension bill that I filed is your bill. It's about time to have it enacted into law. Thanks for reading this brief. If you care to write me, my address is:

WILLIAM H. MCMASTERS,
President, National Old Age Pensions, Inc.
BOSTON, MASS.

California Legislature Protests Proposed Mexican Water Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Governor of California, transmitting a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California protesting the proposed treaty between the United States and the Republic of Mexico disposing of waters of the Colorado River:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
SACRAMENTO, *June 16, 1944.*

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
Member of the House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The California Legislature at its special session which adjourned Tuesday, June 13, 1944, adopted Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 urging that the Colorado River Treaty be not ratified by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Pursuant to this resolution I am enclosing a copy for your attention and request that this matter be given your most careful consideration.

With best wishes and kindest regards, I am
Sincerely,

EARL WARREN,
Governor.

Senate Joint Resolution 4

Resolution relating to the statutory compact between the United States and the State of California, evidenced by the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the California Water Limitation Act, and opposing ratification of the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, and pending before the Senate of the United States, on the ground that such treaty would constitute a breach of the said compact

Whereas the United States of America and the State of California heretofore entered into a certain statutory compact, which compact was made in the manner following:

The Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057) provided that if, in consideration of the passage of said act, California should within 6 months adopt an act limiting her use of Colorado River water to certain quantities, and of California and certain other States should ratify the Colorado River Compact, then said Project Act and all the provisions thereof should become effective, but otherwise should not become effective.

California did, within said time, expressly in consideration of the passage of said Project Act, adopt such a limitation act (Cal. Stats. 1929, 38), and did ratify the interstate compact, known as the Colorado River Compact (Cal. Stats. 1929, 37), all in precise conformity to the requirements of the Project Act. The President thereupon proclaimed the Project Act effective; and

Whereas California by the adoption of said limitation act did subject herself, her lands and people to a drastic reduction of the amounts of water of the Colorado River otherwise available for use in California; and did by the adoption of said Ratifying Act subject herself, her lands and people, to the burdens imposed by the Colorado River Compact; and

Whereas said Boulder Canyon Project Act contains the following provisions, a part of said statutory compact, which were intended to protect and safeguard the availability to California of the quantity of water to which California limited herself, to wit, provisions: (1) That the water of the Colorado River to be conserved by Boulder Dam should be used "exclusively within the United States"; (2) that no person should have the use of the water conserved by Boulder Dam, except by contract made by the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the United States; and (3) that such contracts should be for permanent service; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States, has entered into contracts authorized by said project act with public agencies of the State of California for the delivery to them, for domestic and irrigation uses, of large quantities of water of the Colorado River conserved by Boulder Dam and for other rights and benefits authorized by the project act; and

Whereas said limitation act and said ratifying act were adopted by California and said contracts were entered into by California's public agencies in absolute reliance upon the full performance and observance by the United States of the above-mentioned protective provisions of the project act and this legislature declares that it would not have adopted said limitation act nor said ratifying act, nor would said contracts have been executed by said public agencies, had not said project act contained said protective provisions; and

Whereas there is pending before the Senate of the United States a treaty, signed February 3, 1944, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, whereby the United States would guarantee to Mexico delivery annually and in a certain prescribed manner of a quantity of the water of the Colorado River, which quantity cannot be delivered to Mexico in such manner without delivering to her water conserved by Boulder Dam; and

Whereas said treaty, if ratified, would impair the ability of the United States to render permanent service of water under said California contracts and otherwise perform said contracts; and

Whereas said treaty, if ratified, would create a right in water conserved by Boulder Dam, by means other than by contract with the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas said treaty, if ratified, would make it impossible for the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill the contracts which he has executed on behalf of the United States under the authority of the Project Act and would make it impossible for the United States to observe and perform its obligations under said statutory compact, to wit, the above-mentioned protective provisions of said Project Act; and

Whereas said treaty, if ratified, would cause the consideration for the adoption by California of said statutory compact to fail and said statutory compact would be thereby breached by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California urgently represents to the President and the Senate of the United States that the ratification of the pending treaty would constitute a breach of the solemn statutory compact entered into between the United States of America and the State of California and evidenced by the above-mentioned statutes, to the great and irreparable damage of California; and be it further

Resolved, That said Legislature urges that the pending treaty be not ratified; and further urges that in any treaty that may be entered into between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, the rights of the State of California under said statutory compact and the contractual rights of her public agencies be fully protected; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor is hereby requested to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate, the Chairman and each member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, also to each of the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.

Price Balance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post on the O. P. A. bill now in conference:

PRICE BALANCE

The tumult and shouting over the price-control extension bills have died down momentarily, but the fate of O. P. A. still hangs in the balance. For both House and Senate have sent to conference bills studded with amendments of a potentially destructive character. Contrary to expectation, the controversy over subsidies has not been a delaying factor, either in floor debates or in conference. Indeed, House and Senate conferees speedily reached an agreement that will permit continuation of the present food consumer subsidy program for a year. Thereafter subsidies will not be paid except out of money appropriated by Congress. This compromise will enable Congress, albeit belatedly, to reassert its right of control over expenditures of this kind. At the same time it avoids the unpleasant political and economic consequences entailed by suddenly upsetting the existing subsidy program.

No decisions have yet been reached on the two proposals that have deservedly attracted the lion's share of adverse criticism. They are the Bankhead amendment to the Senate bill, tying textile prices to parity prices for raw cotton, and the Dirksen amendment to the House bill permitting Federal District Courts and Circuit Courts of Appeals to rule on the validity of O. P. A. regulations.

As previously stated in these columns, acceptance of the Bankhead amendment would threaten the whole system of price control, since it would signify willingness on the part of Congress to yield to demands of special groups. The Dirksen amendment is even more dangerous, because it would have a paralyzing effect upon the enforcement machinery of O. P. A. For example, Representative VOORHIS has pointed out that by throwing open the District Courts to review of O. P. A. regulations, conflicting decisions as to validity might result in one set of standards and regulations prevailing in Chicago, and an entirely different set in Milwaukee. Obviously such conflicts would spell utter confusion and collapse of orderly price control. Various other changes in procedural methods incorporated in the House bill have also come in for severe criticism as imposing obstacles to prompt and effective enforcement of price regulations. In respect to procedural changes, the Senate bill is much more conservative and appears to be acceptable—although with some reservations—to O. P. A. officials.

A host of other highly mischievous provisions ought to be eliminated before the O. P. A. extension bill goes to the President. Prominent among them is a provision of the House bill that would compel processors of agricultural commodities to pay parity prices for their raw materials or else reduce their selling prices at least 10 percent below O. P. A. maximum ceiling prices. This amendment would create serious administrative problems for O. P. A., apart from the fact that its probable effect would be an increase in food and clothing prices. The Senate bill, on the other hand, contains a provision that would weaken the wage stabilization program by exempting wage increases up to $37.50 per week from W. L. B. control, provided employers and employees agree on the increase.

Fortunately the chances seem better than even that the conference members will be able to eliminate the most objectionable features of the House and Senate bills by mutual concessions. The Senate Bankhead amendment might, for example, be omitted in return for a House agreement to drop the Dirksen amendment. Such a compromise should be facilitated by the knowledge that inclusion of either amendment in the bill finally passed by Congress might result in a Presidential veto. Most of the other damaging amendments to existing price-control legislation are to be found in the House bill. But the Senate, as indicated, has also made mistakes that it might be willing to rectify in exchange for House concessions. In short, the conferees are in a good position to effect compromises that would enable the O. P. A. to carry on its work without being hampered by changes in legislative instructions and prohibitions that would add to enforcement difficulties and gravely weaken existing controls.

Why Roosevelt Can Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, it is now generally assumed by voters of both major political parties that President Roosevelt is today an active, albeit anxious candidate for a fourth term. Many in both parties even accept as significant the abortive statement of National Democratic Chairman Hannegan that there is a strong probability that the President will seek a fifth term in 1948 should he be reelected in 1944.

Consequently many citizens are wondering, "Can Roosevelt be defeated?" and others are wondering, "Can Roosevelt be elected?" These are natural questions to apply to any Presidential candidate and the following editorial is therefore interesting since it emphasizes points which many political analysts and prognosticators have failed to examine carefully as they confront the coming Presidential campaign.

For example, Mr. Speaker, few citizens realize that on the basis of the vote for Members of the House of Representatives in the last election—held while war was raging—it should be remembered President Roosevelt would have been defeated by a vote of 176 in the electoral college to 355 votes for his Republican opponent had he been a candidate 2 years ago. It is also true that if the States now having Republican Governors vote for the Republican candidate for President, as seems probable, Franklin Roosevelt will go down in history as a man finishing his career in public office with an emphatic and humiliating defeat. These are hard facts taken from the book of records and are consequently much more significant than political polls or prophetic predictions.

Fred C. Christopherson of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., editor of the Daily Argus-Leader of that city, has made an interesting analysis of past records and present conditions in the following editorial entitled "Why Roosevelt Can Be Defeated." Believing that both the Congress and the country will be interested in reading this analysis I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point as a part of these remarks:

[From Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader]

WHY ROOSEVELT CAN BE DEFEATED

Whether President Roosevelt will be reelected in November or not is something for the future to reveal.

But any assumption now that his position is so impregnable that the Republican cause is hopeless is ridiculous.

To appreciate this, one need only study the figures of 1940—the most recent Presidential election. Roosevelt got 27,000,000 votes in that year and Wendell Willkie, his Republican opponent, 22,000,000. That seems to be a broad spread, but, in considering the 1944 possibilities, the study should be restricted to States that can be regarded as Republican prospects.

Let us consider then the 38 Northern States which represent a majority of 150 in the electoral college. In these States, Willkie lost by 2.7 percent of the vote. Therefore, a change in the political thinking of 3 voters out of each hundred would be sufficient to swing the electoral majority away from Roosevelt.

Has there been such a change? The only record available is that of the elections of Senators, Representatives, and Governors. But this is an important indication.

The State-wide returns on the election of Representatives in Congress in 1942 showed a strong Republican trend. Republicans were dominant in States having a total electoral vote of 355. As the total electoral vote of all the States is 531, this figure represents a substantial majority.

Now to consider the picture as a whole in the 38 Northern States that command considerable more than a majority of the electoral vote. These States today have in the House of Representatives 208 Republicans and 123 Democrats. They have 37 Republicans, 38 Democrats, and 1 Progressive in the United States Senate. Of these States, 26 have Republican Governors and 12 have Democratic Governors. The State legislatures in 27 of them are controlled by Republicans with 9 dominated by the Democrats and 2 with a divided control.

This represents a sharp swing away from the Democratic banner since 1940. It also means that the dominant political organizations in many of these States are Republican.

Obviously there is little reason to assume now that the Republicans are doomed to defeat in the national election. In fact, the statistics provide ample reason for concluding that they have something better than a fighting chance to defeat Roosevelt in November.

IS DIXIE HOPELESSLY TRAPPED BY ONE-PARTYISM?

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing editorial, with its statistical analysis, is based on the supposition that the "solid South" will continue to conform to tradition and vote the party line, regardless of who are the Democratic—that is, New Deal—candidates for President and Vice President. In a belated effort to regain some of their lost control over the old-time Democratic Party some of the Southern States, such as South Carolina, Louisiana, Texas, and Mississippi, are threatening to select Presidential electors who will vote their convictions rather than their compulsions. What will come of these threats remains to be seen, but on the basis of past records it seems doubtful whether the States of the so-called solid South will recapture their old-time independent spirit in time for them to have much effect upon the November elections.

One-partyism has pretty well trapped the Southern States in its vitiating coils. Many able Members of the House and Senate from the States of the old South have come to realize that by permitting ancient prejudices and traditions to influence voting to the point that practical New Deal political operators have come to consider the votes of these States as permanently and indisputably "in the bag," the good people of Dixie have lost their influence upon the destiny of the Democratic Party, but the tremendous population of New Deal appointees in these States will doubtlessly continue to dominate the political thinking of the South until a change of administration deprives them of their profitable and patent political positions.

A NEW INVASION OF "CARPETBAGGERS" HAS OVERRUN THE SOUTH

The hundreds of thousands of political appointees, owing their jobs and maintaining their allegiance to the New Deal, who now travel the streets and highways of the South as political missionaries for the Roosevelt-Wallace partnership have captured the political decisions of Dixie as firmly as did the carpetbag politicians of long ago. In both instances, politicians from the North, in violation of the interests and ideals of the South, moved into positions of influence and manipulated the outcome of elections to suit their own fancy and inflate their own profits. The obvious remedy of developing a "party of opposition" in the South will some day apply an American remedy to an un-American situation, but the New Deal political bigwigs are openly boasting—and probably with accuracy—that such a reform cannot come in time to deprive them of the "money in the bank" votes which they always consider "in the bag" long before election in tabulating probable election returns.

WHY WOO WHAT IS ALREADY WON?

The old notion that "Dixie will go Democratic regardless—why grant it any concessions?" still prevails in New Deal circles and the technique of using surefire southern votes to help elect candidates and adopt policies which work to the ultimate disadvantage of the South will probably succeed in the next election. The South is growing rebellious in spots, but it would appear that the combination of patronage, pap, and purging will hold it in line again.

MARSHALL FIELD, OF PM, MAY BE A SUCCESSOR TO JEFFERSON AND FARLEY

A recent editorial in the Chicago Sun indicates that perhaps Marshall Field, of Chicago, of PM, and of the Chicago Sun, may be the successor to Jefferson and Farley as the patron saint of the Democratic Party as it is today being manipulated by the city bosses and professional New Deal politicians of the North. Certainly the State's rights doctrines of Thomas Jefferson have been too completely scuttled by the New Dealers to find any practical place in the program of New Dealism. It may be given a plank in the platform, but it would be a gullible voter, indeed, who could vote for the fourth term on the basis that in so doing he was helping to restore States' rights.

A recent editorial in the Chicago Sun, which is increasingly assuming its place as the spokesman for the New Deal version of what was once the Democratic Party, provides a harbinger of what is to come. The editorial is directed against what it called the reactionary Democratic politicians of the South and it points out that an effort may be made at the Democratic National Convention to restore the two-thirds rule in Democratic conventions, to write into the Democratic platform provisions against repeal of the poll tax and in favor of the elimination of the Fair Employment Practice Committee, which latter is a Roosevelt brain child of the first order. The editorial discusses other measures in which the South is interested and then calls upon the New Deal politicians who today control the Democratic Party to hold the

line against southern reactionaries and to beat down at the national convention every effort to permit control of the destiny of the party to return to the South.

Undoubtedly the city machine politicians who hold key New Deal positions in the party will succeed in defeating the move to restore the two-thirds rule. They will also succeed in defeating southern efforts to curtail or stop the moves of Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt with regard to the repeal of poll-tax legislation and in favor of the expansion of the activities and authorities of the Fair Employment Practice Committee. Where will this leave the South? It will leave it just where, about where, the New Deal manipulators have left Jim Farley, Woodrow Wilson, and Thomas Jefferson. It will leave them holding an empty sack decorated with the label of the Democratic Party but dedicated to the policies of New Dealism, which are more foreign by far to traditional democracy than they are to Republicanism.

Jim Farley may respond to patriotic impulse, put principle above party, and refuse to support the fourth-term blitzkrieg, but whether he does or not, the hopes of defeating this administration must be based upon such statistics as revealed in the foregoing editorial and not upon the ability and determination of the right-thinking folks in the South to shake off the shackles of one partyism in time to redeem the Republic next November. Once more the voters of the North will have to try to save the South from itself.

REFORM COMES SLOWLY IN THE SOUTH

Every encouragement should be given the brave and independent citizens of Dixie who are now exploring every possibility of saving the South from the bitter consequences of too long playing the part of tail to the dog that bites them, but too much cannot be expected in the nature of reform too soon.

It is possible, of course, that the South in 1944 will do as it did in 1928, and refuse to permit Northern "carpetbag democrats" to dominate their destiny. It may vote Republican. It is also possible an independent "Dixie party" might be formed down South to nominate its own candidate for President and thereby give the South a balance of power in national elections by which it could successfully insist on a recognition of its principles and ideals. Other possibilities exist for a citizenry once aroused sufficiently and able to develop the leadership to protect itself and its own interests.

It is inconceivable that Americans of the high type and great ability of those so prevalent in the Old South should surrender supinely to the type of economic suicide and political disaster which faces them if they continue to support, blindly, parties and personalities who use their influence to foist excesses upon a section of the country whose only sin is with docility to deliver its vote each 4 years to a label on a party rather than to a set of political principles.

Col. Henry Fairchild DeBardeleben

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a broadcast over WAPI on March 18, 1944, concerning a colorful figure in the early history of Birmingham, Ala., Col. Henry Fairchild DeBardeleben:

We are so accustomed today to the blatant whistles—the belching stacks and humming wheels of industry—that it is almost impossible to picture Birmingham without this teeming enterprise. Yet had it not been for the vision and ingenuity of our pioneers—coal and iron might not be the lifeblood of the magic city. Sometime ago I promised to tell you about a colorful figure in the life of Birmingham—one who was closely identified with the discovery and development of our mineral deposits. I am speaking of Col. Henry Fairchild DeBardeleben. Tonight let us turn back the pages of history to the early beginnings of the coal and iron industry—and then see the vital and dramatic part Colonel DeBardeleben played in making Birmingham what it is today.

Strange to relate—the first settlers in Jones Valley did not care anything about the coal they found here—they had such plentiful supplies of wood—why should they go digging about the hills for what they called "black rocks"?

The first blacksmith shops even burned wood until it became charcoal—and used it instead of coal. These blacksmith shops formed the cradle of the early iron industry in Alabama. There is an old tradition that the first Alabama iron was used for shoeing Gen. Andrew Jackson's horses when he and his soldiers came down from Tennessee to drive out the Indians.

Some will recall that symbolically the first building in B'ham was a blacksmith's shop. It was located on First Avenue and Twenty-first Street, on the lot now occupied by the Steiner Bros. banking house. But this blacksmith shop was not built until 1871. Long before Birmingham was born many men—some of whose names are now forgotten—had dreams and plans about the rocks that lay asleep in our rich earth.

Two of these were the Mahan brothers—who came into our State with General Jackson's soldiers. They thought enough of the coal they found here to load it on flat boats and drift with it down the rivers to Mobile. Once there, they were not able to find a purchaser for their coal—no one wanted it. Finally, the blacksmiths began to use the coal for their fires. Mr. John Hanby was one of them, and he decided to try his hand at interesting the people of Mobile in the coal he found so useful. Mr. J. A. Mudd and Mr. J. H. Hewitt assisted him in preparing two flatboats on which to load the coal—and long poles to be used in guiding the boats on their long, perilous journey to Mobile.

When he finally arrived in Mobile, Mr. Hanby proudly displayed his coal—but no one wanted to buy it. So Mr. Hanby took buckets of coal from house to house and showed the mistresses of the lovely homes in Mobile what wonderful fires the coal would make. The ladies were so pleased they bought every lump of coal and asked for more. Then the terrible War between the States broke out—and everyone forget about Mr. Hanby and his coal. Since iron was badly needed by the Confederacy for the implements of war, two furnaces were started in Jefferson County for this purpose: Ironton, now called Oxmoor, and the Cahaba Iron Works at Irondale. These were very small, crude furnaces built of stone—but they were the rudimentary beginnings of our modern type. The Irondale furnace was abandoned in the seventies—and is now a picturesque ruin on the farm owned by the late George Gordon Crawford. An arsenal was erected at Selma, and iron was carried from the two Jefferson County furnaces to be converted into cannon there.

The Oxmoor furnace was soon discovered by the Northern soldiers—who tried to destroy it. After the war—and the Southern soldiers came back to their homes—they tried to make iron there again.

It was at this time, about 1872, that there appeared upon the industrial scene two men who did much to promote the iron industry in Alabama. The elder of the men was Mr. Daniel Pratt, Alabama's first great captain of industry. He had already distinguished himself by building the largest cotton-gin plant in the South, at Prattville, the city he founded. With him was his young superintendent—a striking figure—who is the hero of our story tonight—Henry Fairchild DeBardeleben. Up to this time little was known of our young man except that he had helped run Mr. Pratt's gin factory—and had married his only child, Ellen Pratt. As a matter of fact, his own father, having died when he was 10 years old, Mr. Pratt had become his guardian, had brought him to Prattville when he was 16 years of age and had sent him to school.

On account of the young people listening in—I should probably not tell you that young DeBardeleben had a great dislike for discipline and the four walls of the schoolroom—and that he led his elderly guardian a merry chase. Mr. Pratt determined to make a man of the ward he loved as a son by imposing early responsibilities upon him. He made him the boss of his teamsters and lumber yard, and Henry developed an understanding of, and command over, his fellowman at an early age. As long as he lived he never lost his love of the woods and a free way of life. At one time he said, "I had rather be out in the woods on the back of a fox-trotting mule—with a good seam of coal under my feet—than to be President of the United States. I never get lonely in the woods—for I picture as I go along—and the rocks and the forests are the only books I read."

Mr. Pratt and Henry DeBardeleben had already become interested in the mineral resources of our State when they entered the Birmingham scene in 1872. From that time on the real history of the greatness of this section began. For 38 years thereafter—until his death in 1910—Colonel DeBardeleben lent all his boundless energy and rare genius to developing the Birmingham district on a tremendous scale. He never lost faith, and was never discouraged. Though he had many obstacles to overcome—they but inspired him to geater effort.

They say he was dashingly good-looking, 6 feet tall, well proportioned, athletic, with a ruddy complexion, black hair and mustache, and black eyes, as quick and as keen as a bird's. They tell that he had the appearance of always having one foot in the stirrup, ready to ride. He could leap his horse, or favorite mule, Ready, clear from the ground. But I am getting so charmed with the picture of Henry F. DeBardeleben, I'm ahead of my story.

We are still back in 1872—and just taking over the old Oxmoor furnaces—with Mr.

DeBardeleben as general manager. In fact, our two trail blazers acquired controlling interest in the Red Mountain Iron & Coal Co., changed the name to the Eureka Mining Co., and began reconstructing and rejuvenating the Oxmoor furnaces. Here in 1876 with Milton H. Smith and Colonel Sloss as onlookers, Henry DeBardeleben made the first coke-iron in Alabama. The converting of coal into coke, and the making of the first iron with coke gave great impetus to the iron industry in our State. People had found the three necessary constituents for iron and steel—coal, lime-rock, and iron ore—lying side by side in our mountains. Now that it had been proved by our young genius at the Oxmoor fournaces that iron could be made of B'ham ores, it seemed that almost everyone began buying and selling pig-iron. The period between 1880 and 1890 is known as the golden age in furnace building. Numerous companies were organized, the Alice Furnace Co., the Woodward Co., the Sloss Co., the Tennessee Co., and others. The Alice furnace—jointly owned by Mr. Hillman, for whom the Hillman Hospital is named, and Colonel DeBardeleben—was the first merchant pig-iron furnace in the vicinity of the city. To Henry Debardeleben also belongs the distinction of mining the first coal in the district, for he opened the Pratt coal vein at Pratt City. He literally had his finger in every coal and iron pie in this section, and was always the first to taste it.

In 1887 Colonel DeBardeleben organized the Bessemer Land & Improvement Co. and founded the town of Bessemer. The DeBardeleben Coal & Coke Co. and the DeBardeleben Coal & Iron Co. followed quickly after. Perhaps of all his grand achievements the greatest was the Alabama Fuel & Iron Co., the second largest commercial mining concern of the Southern States.

I am aware that for the sake of brevity I have oversimplified the career of a dramatic and lovable character and a great developer. Henry F. DeBardeleben was a poet—a practical dreamer. Before our district was spotted with factories, he would take his pick and shovel and his favorite mule, Ready, and lose himself for days at a time prospecting in our hills and valleys. The smoke that hangs a haze over our mountains today and the bright flares of the furnaces that light up our skies at night are a monument to this man's greatness.

Colonel DeBardeleben's sons, the late beloved Charles Fairchild DeBardeleben and Henry Ticknor DeBardeleben, have caught the gleam of the torch their father lifted and developed many of his undertakings. Charles DeBardeleben was first general manager, and then president, of the Alabama Fuel & Iron Co. Henry T. DeBardeleben heads a long list of services to iron and steel, and is now president of the DeBardeleben Coal Corporation. There are, lastly, six grandsons: Charles Fairchild, Jr., Prince, and Walker Percy, the sons of Charles F. DeBardeleben, and Henry F., Bailey T., and Lt. Newton H., the sons of Henry T. DeBardeleben. They are carrying on with real distinction the broad vision and intensive application of their famous grandfather.

Baccalaureate Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent address delivered by Chancelor Samuel P. Capen, of the University of Buffalo, to the class of 1944:

Americans are by habit aggressive. Push and drive are national characteristics. Individually they are not disposed to let things happen to them. They want to make things happen. To most Americans, the good life is a life of energetic grappling with difficulties, a life of movement and of change, a life of achievement which brings them increased possessions or recognition. As sportsmen they play to win, not just for the pleasure of the game. As workers they work to get on, not merely to keep the wolf from the door.

These characteristics have certainly been fostered, if they have not been bred, by the system of free enterprise to which the Nation has always been committed. They have been fortified by the fluidity of the class structure of the United States. At all times it has only been one jump from obscurity to high distinction in business or the professions, one jump from rags to riches, and at most two jumps back. The success of the father has not assured perpetual prestige to his descendants. The modest position of the father has never prevented a son or daughter from rising to eminence.

By and large Americans are individualists; pushing, striving individualists. They expect conflict. They expect opposition and do not resent it. Finding the way to beat it adds zest to life. They are ready to combine with one another for a common cause. But they insist that the combination be voluntary and not permanently binding. They resist social regimentation. This attitude is the despair of those who believe in a planned society.

In the midst of a war more nearly total than any in which the Nation has ever been engaged it is salutary to remind ourselves what we Americans are really like, and what peace really means to us. Peace to us is no bovine Utopia. Peace is a condition in which we can be free to mind our own business, and the business of our families and communities, in which we can build and contrive and invent and organize and press for individual and group advancement and match our wits and our strength against each other or against the inherent obstacles that nature or our own limitations place in the way of accomplishment. A peaceful national life, as we see it, is a life of competition between groups and parties, of conflicting schemes and ideas and policies, of compromises in the interest of action, but without the surrender by either side of principles or beliefs. It is a life of give and take based on the recognition of the right of individuals and of groups to hold different opinions and to pursue different, even diametrically opposite, purposes.

It is plain that there is nothing absolute about American life. Individuals, and even groups, may be convinced that there is only one way—their way, of course—to remedy the defects of society or to conduct an industry or to train the oncoming generation or to gain eternal salvation. But other individuals and groups are sure to hold contrary views; and both the constitutional provisions of American government and the social tradition of the country permit the two sides to fight it out. Perhaps a group is strong enough to get its pet project enacted into law. But that does not prevent the other side from working for the repeal or the amendment of the law, often with success. More and more as time has gone on Americans have grown distrustful of absolute solutions of social problems, distrustful of panaceas, distrustful of schemes that are too perfect or too final.

Although we are an aggressive, we are not a warlike, people. It takes a tremendous provocation to induce us to wage war. The reason is clear. War is the contradiction of our national habits and of our instinctive beliefs. For war is a matter of absolutes. It permits of no individual dissents, no factions, no resistances, no compromises. It is a matter of stark antitheses: Friend or enemy, the absolute right of our side as against the absolute wrong of the other, absolute authority at the top and unquestioning obedience to that authority. War seeks the absolute destruction of the enemy and his possessions. Through censorship and official propaganda it imposes an absolute doctrine. The citizen is expected to believe whatever the supreme authority—and it is necessarily an authority—hands out concerning the progress of hostilities, concerning the country's enemies, concerning its allies, concerning military policy. The citizen's questions do not need to be answered and are not. His criticism, if he ventures to offer it, may even be considered obstructive or disloyal. It cannot be otherwise. This is the inherent nature of war.

War is also a matter of short cuts. Violence is a short cut, the shortest way to settle any issue; and war is violence. It is likewise an affair of desperate haste. Success in modern war generally demands the application of the utmost possible force in the shortest possible time. Therefore, armies have to be raised and trained and mobilized under a relentless pressure that exacts the last ounce of strength from those who compose them. Military materials have to be secured without regard to cost. Waste is ignored if only speed is attained. Property has to be commandeered for military purposes and must be instantly surrendered. No individual's comfort or convenience can be allowed to interfere with the purpose which the military authorities wish to accomplish.

The necessities of war and the psychology of war affect all members of the population. All citizens who are able to do so are called upon to work to the limits of their endurance in the vast enterprise of production and distribution and training upon which the fleets and armies depend. A sense of rush, a feeling of pressure pervade the atmosphere. Everyone lives under an emotional tension such as is not experienced in time of peace. Nearly everyone suffers from anxiety for the safety of some relative or friend. There is anxiety about the progress of the Nation's arms. Thousands know grief for the loss of loved ones.

It is, of course, a patent fact that the emotions aroused by war produce a kind of intoxication. In the great majority of the population, fortunately, this intoxication takes the form of sacrificial ardor, releasing the noblest and most unselfish impulses. But in many it induces sheer recklessness, a disregard of all restraints which normally control conduct. Under the feverish excitement which war breeds it seems to be easy for all types of people, even those who are at other times kindly and tolerant, to fall victims to the ugliest sorts of prejudice. Race prejudice, religious prejudice, and class prejudice, which are always latent among parts of the population, flare up. In our saner moments, when our emotions do not dominate our reason, we call these attitudes un-American. Why? Because they are totally at variance with the principles of live and let live, of compromise and adjustment, of equal rights by which members of all races and creeds and nations have been welded together to form the American Nation. They are the attitudes of fanatics. And fanaticism of any kind is an absolute formula for belief or action. It is wholly incompatible with democracy. But it is an almost inevitable outgrowth of the absolutism of war.

As a people we are, with unparalleled unanimity, committed to the war in which we are now engaged. We are convinced not only of the justice of our cause, but also of the necessity for our complete and whole-hearted

participation in the conflict, in order to preserve for ourselves and our children the things that we most deeply cherish. We know there must be no turning back, no let-up in our effort, no shrinking from the sacrifices. We are resolved that there shall not be.

But this does not mean that we should refrain from analyzing war as a social phenomenon, even while we are in the midst of it. On the contrary, we especially, the citizens of a nation with no militaristic traditions or leanings, should take particular pains to examine the anatomy and physiology of war. For if we understand it thoroughly we shall be the more determined individually and collectively to take whatever action may be necessary in association with other nations to banish it forever from the world.

The appalling misery that this war has brought to the peoples of the conquered countries, and also of the unconquered nations in and over which the fighting has taken place, is indelibly in the record. We should never let our memory of it grow dim. Through the accident of geography America has escaped these horrors. Our civilian population has had to face nothing comparable. Nevertheless, it is important for a full comprehension of the nature of war that we should observe what it is doing to us too, a people remote from the area of combat. We should observe what it is doing to our individual rights, to our customs, to our standards, to our feelings. We should not fail to note that modern war, even when waged by the most democratic nation in the world, tends to be a totalitarian undertaking. Not the army alone but also civilian life has to be regimented. The more intense the struggle becomes—and the longer it lasts—the greater the degree of regimentation. It is actually a paradox to say that a democratic nation wages war. For to wage war with any hope of victory a democratic nation must in many vital respects cease to be democratic for the duration.

Indeed, for a nation such as ours war is like an acute illness. The regular bodily functions are thrown out of their normal rhythm. Some of them are for the time being suspended.

It is easy to recognize the current effects of a war which has now lasted long enough to enable the Government to mobilize the Nation almost completely. It is less easy to anticipate some of the results of it that we shall soon have to face. I think, however, that we can forecast a few of these results with fair accuracy. And it is the part of wisdom to attempt to do so in order that we may not be taken by surprise when they appear.

After a serious illness there cmes a period of convalescence. It is a trying period, sometimes almost as dangerous to the patient as the illness itself. We are approaching the period of convalescence. How soon it will begin no one knows. But when it comes it will be critical for America. Not since the close of the Civil War will America have experienced anything remotely to be compared with it.

When the war stops 10 percent of our population will be under arms. A considerable number of these men and women will undoubtedly have to remain in service if we are to preserve the fruits of victory. But millions of them will no longer be needed for any military purpose. The demobilization of this enormous force cannot be the affair of a moment. No matter how efficiently it is managed it will take many weary months. Meanwhile the impatience of soldiers and sailors to resume their peacetime activities will mount. When finally they are discharged their reabsorption into civil life will be attended by many difficulties and disappointments. But I shall not dwell on this aspect of the transition from war to peace. Although it is the most important of all, it has been so much discussed that it is in everyone's mind. I choose rather to suggest to you certain other problems of demobilization that have received much less public attention.

The war will stop, but the civilian contrivances for waging it effectively will remain; and so will the war psychology. The vast and complicated Government machine for controlling the daily lives of the citizens will still exist and its powers will remain intact. The mammoth industrial establishment for producing the materials of war will remain. Mountainous stocks of military supplies will be on hand, some of them useful to civilians, most of them valuable only as junk.

And our emotions will remain overcharged. Some of us will have grown accustomed to the absolute solutions which war provides and to its short cuts, and will be impatient of the normal democratic processes of proposal and counterproposal and compromise. Suspicions and prejudices and hates will continue to possess some of us. Since there will no longer be an enemy against whom these evil impulses can be partly discharged, they are likely to be directed still more violently against groups of Americans. The mood of exalted idealism which has led the majority of our fellow citizens to rigorous self-denial and to painful sacrifices for the national cause will be suddenly deflated. For these people the world will seem pretty drab and uninspiring until they have found a new focus for their energies and their devotions.

In short, the civilian demobilization of the United States will have to be both physical and psychological. In both spheres it promises to be a slow and stormy process.

Thoughtful persons are agreed that the sudden lifting of all wartime Government controls, if it could be brought about, would cause economic and social chaos. But everyone who understands the genius of American institutions believes that the controls should be progressively relayed as the instruments of production and distribution resume their normal functioning, and that they should disappear altogether at the earliest safe date. We should remember, however, that no one who has acquired power ever voluntarily relinquishes it. Therefore, we can expect that most regulatory agencies of the Government will endeavor to become permanent and to continue to exercise as much as possible of their wartime authority. We can expect likewise that every nongovernmental group which has won special concessions, because its services to the life of a nation at war were thought to be indispensable, will seek to retain its immunities and extend still further its privileges. Whichever party is in power we can expect mistakes, injustices, and intolerable delays in dismantling the war plant and in disposing of the surplus war materials. We can expect many painful dislocations in the field of employment, and at least some temporary unemployment, as the war industries are reconverted to the production of civilian goods.

These are a few of the obstacles that must be surmounted in the task of physical demobilization. But there is nothing about the task that needs to daunt us, if we keep our heads. The problems will not be different in kind from those that America has faced over and over again. They will only be larger in scale.

Ever since the days of George Washington there has been conflict among us concerning the appropriate powers of the Federal Government. We shall probably go on disagreeing with one another about what the Government should be authorized to do as long as the American system survives. Certainly the tenacious hold on life of bureaucratic agencies is no new thing. Neither is the effort of groups of citizens to gain and hold special privileges. Finding the ways to check privilege and to preserve equal rights has been the perennial assignment of the American people. They have often been temporarily outwitted. But in the long run they have mastered group after group of would-be exploiters. They can do it again. For at least a century the imagination and the creative ability of Americans have been most conspicuously displayed in industry. The almost miraculous achievements of the last 4 years, which have never been equalled in our own or any other land, justify the belief that American industry can meet the demands of reconversion and of greatly increased peacetime production, if we the people and our elected representatives have intelligence enough not to throttle it with too many artificial restrictions.

No; it will not be the enormous size or the complexity of the task of reorganization for peace that will carry a threat to our institutions and our traditions. It will be rather the hold-over of the war psychology. Inevitably there will be confusion in the early days of reconstruction. Many people, still overexcited and unsettled, will expect a brave new world to be born ready made on the heels of war. When it does not at once appear they will be disillusioned and resentful. They will have been conditioned to violence and to quick action. They will be disposed to seek scapegoats whom they can blame for situations which dissatisfy them. They will be ready to listen to anyone who offers some absolute scheme for reforming society and making everybody happy, prosperous, and safe. The demagog with a panacea will have an enthusiastic following.

If these seem like improbable predictions we should recall what happened in nearly all countries, our own included, following the First World War. We had the Ku Klux Klan. In several localities we had what amounted to armed persecution of unpopular minorities. Eventually we had Huey Long.

The European countries furnished much more striking examples. Before the Italian people had recovered from the emotional debauch of the war Mussolini offered them an absolute scheme of national reform that was accepted with acclaim. Hitler, the greatest demagog of our time, presented the Germans with the panacea of national socialism. These may sound like far-fetched parallels. But would-be Mussolinis and Hitlers have existed in the United States, as the investigations of the F. B. I. reveal; and others are undoubtedly waiting in the wings for their cue to step upon the stage.

The war is not yet won; the severest fighting, the greatest sacrifices lie ahead. Nothing must divert our energies from the immediate obligation of seeing it through to complete victory. But wars have a way of ending without warning. Against the new exigencies of that unknown terminal date, be it near or remote, it is well for us to be forewarned and forearmed. For then the Nation will need, as perhaps it has never needed before, the militant championship of those who truly understand the principles and traditions that have given America its unique place among human societies. It will need men and women who believe passionately in the rule of law and the equal application of the law to all; who are determined that the Government shall be at all times the servant of the people, never their master; who will stand up for the rights of minorities against all attacks from whatever source; who are convinced that the slow and often halting processes of democracy offer the surest road to individual and social improvement.

Ladies and gentlemen of the class of 1944, what I am saying is that then, as now, America will need especially you and your kind—you who have had peculiar opportunities to grasp the broad sweep of our country's history and to analyze its current problems, you who have lived in the environment of a university that is dedicated to the cultivation of

the freedom of the mind and to the daily practice of individual responsibility.

America calls on you now to bear the heaviest burdens that are laid on any of its citizens. By reason of your youth and strength it summons you to undertake the most arduous and most thankless tasks, to fight the most dangerous battles in the greatest of its wars. It will call on you with equal insistence when the fighting is over to continue to defend what your ancestors have won through a century and a half of struggle, what you will have won again, "the last, best hope of earth." I am persuaded that it will not call in vain.

Why the St. Lawrence Seaway Power Project Is Inimical to the People's Best Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Labor Record, New Orleans, La., of May 1944:

Once again they are trying to push through the fantastic bill for the erection of the St. Lawrence seaway power project, in spite of the fact that in 1941, after many months of debate, it was proven inimical to the interests of the people. Now, 3 years later, when the same people are going through the most trying times in the history of the country, willingly standing the burden of heavy taxes necessary to carry on this grueling war, at such a time, how in God's name can any Representative of the people bring to light a bill already once soundly beaten, to erect a project that will cost the people close to a billion dollars. Before placing the solid reasons to you why we oppose this fantastic project once more, we wish to make an emphatic statement that we defy any proponents of this bill to refute—it seems to us that certain Senators and Congressmen should devote more of their time in seeing what can be done to bring this war to a quicker ending, so that our boys, who are really sacrificing the most, can come back home once more. What do you think our fighting men would say if they heard the Senate was devoting their time debating a bill to erect a project that will take from 7 to 15 years to erect, instead of trying to use that billion dollars to give them more planes, guns, and ammunition so that they can finish the job they are so bravely doing as quickly as possible.

Under the treaty of 1814 complete American sovereignty over Lake Michigan was established, our claim to this body of water being just, inasmuch as no part of same lies in adjoining Canadian territories. Under the treaty project Canada would have absolute authority to recognize water diversion for use in this water shed. The observer cannot fathom why Canada should be granted such authority when, under the treaty the Dominion has the right to divert for its sole use all the water it needs for power or other uses through the Ottawa River, from Lake Huron to Montreal. This diversion would also most certainly affect the flow of Niagara Falls.

Our country, the United States of America, should protect the interests of their people first, last, and always, and should not even contemplate nor sanction any project which would prove injurious to any of our people. The friendship now more than ever existing between the United States and Canada is one held dear in the hearts of every American, but the American people desire to retain their present land and water rights, but gladly give their services and monetary wealth to their friends in distress.

Statistics have proven that 81 percent of the American cargo vessels or tankers and 90 percent of the passenger cargo ships engaged in intercoastal trade, could not possibly use the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project. With these facts and figures at hand it is proven that our country could not even receive a minimum benefit from the seaway's operation, yet, the taxpayers of the Nation would have to yield upwards of a billion dollars for construction. Allotment of individual State taxation for the project would fix a debit for Louisiana in the region of $7,000,000.

Just as an example let us take the case of Louisiana into consideration. In New Orleans it is a known fact that in normal times out of every dollar's revenues in the city close to 70 percent is derived from its water transportation. A close study of this fantastic bill shows that between 40 and 50 percent of the business of the port of New Orleans would be diverted to other ports.

What is to become of the millions of dollars invested in New Orleans directly and indirectly in water transportation business? What is to happen to the thousands of men and women employed by these concerns? We were put under the impression that our Senate and Congress were devoting their efforts in trying to create new industries to create jobs for our returning heroes, not trying to put into effect bills that would throw workers into the streets. What would happen to New Orleans would also be duplicated in the entire Mississippi Valley.

This country is provided with many accessible ports to accommodate all the ocean-going vessels of the world. With these ports spread over a wide area as at present, general prosperity is not restricted only to a small area, as it would be should the seaway project be put into operation. Wholesale unemployment throughout the country would be inevitable, and the influx of migratory workers to the Great Lakes regions and result in a panic and endanger the well-laid foundation of our mighty Republic.

The proponents of this seaway project have not considered the various angles as the more cautious men that constitute the opposition. Let us study another angle. The proponents of the bill have the audacity to claim that it would result in an economic boon. Shall we just to humor them and to bring home our point say, "You are right"?

Now everyone with any intelligence knows that the waters of the Great Lakes are only navigable 7 months of the year. Would the other transportation interests be content to lie idle 7 months while the seaway interests reap the golden harvest? The truth of the situation is if they tried to do so they would not be able to stay in business, and if they are forced out of business, how are you going to be able to transport your goods the remaining 5 months?

We would appreciate very much if the illustrious Senator AIKEN from Vermont would answer this question directly to us. Yes, Senator AIKEN, again we repeat, let us forget about bills that increase the taxes on the people and let all of us place our entire efforts to winning this war as quickly as we can.

In behalf of the American people, we unreservedly condemn and oppose the treaty project, and entreat our Senators and Congressmen to do likewise, and by so doing, preserve the security of the Commonwealth.

Jewish National Home in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join in the effort to provide a measure of justice and relief for sufferers from oppression by securing the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine.

The Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, enunciated the profound and just principle that the ancestral land of the Jews should be made available for their immigration with the ultimate goal of achieving a national home. The mandate for Palestine was confirmed by the Council of the League of Nations in 1922 and embodied the Balfour Declaration. It would therefore appear that the principles of the declaration would have the effect of law confirmed by international approbation. In reliance, more than 300,000 Jews immigrated to Palestine and the Jews constituted more than one-third of the entire population. As a result great improvements and developments occurred.

The termination of such immigration taking effect March 31, 1944, has resulted in a grievous disappointment to the refugees from cruel and intolerant oppression.

If there was need for a Jewish national home in Palestine in 1917, how much greater and more appealing is the need today? It was well said in the British Parliament in May 1939:

> You cannot ignore the fact that this is the cradle of two of the greatest religions of the world. It is a sacred land to the Arabs. It is also a sacred land to the Jew and the Christian.

The Zionist movement is in keeping with the Balfour Declaration and with the terms of the mandate for Palestine confirmed by the League of Nations and awakens a responsive chord in the hearts of all lovers of justice and humanity.

The B-26 Marauder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article published in the Washington Evening Star, on Monday, June 4, 1944, concerning a safety record set in the B–26, manufactured by Glenn L. Martin Aircraft Co., of Baltimore, Md:

SAFETY RECORD SET IN B–26 TRAINING, AIR FORCES REVEAL

DODGE CITY, KANS., June 5.—The Army Air Forces Training Command School here, noting that the B–26 Marauder was once dubbed "the widow maker" by student pilots, declared in an announcement yesterday the Marauder is now regarded by qualified airmen as a plane to be feared only by its enemies.

The two-engine pilot school revealed that in a 6-month period its Marauder trainers had not had a single fatal accident through flights totaling in distance more than 20 round trips to the moon.

This, along with reports of combat success, the A. A. F. training command says, has blasted the accusation that the bullet-shaped medium bomber is temperamental.

WASPS graduated from the A. A. F. training command's Women's Airforce Service Pilots' School at Sweetwater, Tex., the statement revealed, have completed transition training at Dodge City and some are flying the B–26 out over the Gulf of Mexico, towing targets.

The new success is attributed to teaching pilots to "know the airplane" in an intensive 10-week course. Before transition schools were established, green pilots were given on-the-job training overseas.

"Every operational trouble the student might meet in training or in combat becomes a familiar problem to him, almost an old friend," said Col. C. B. Root, commanding officer of the school and native of Madison, Wis.

The plane has two 2,000 horsepower engines, weighs 20 tons, and takes off and lands at well over 100 miles per hour. It has four separate hydraulic systems and 21 instruments and 69 controls in the cockpit. Students have learned to hold altitude, execute turns, and maintain heading—all on one engine. And they have learned to land the plane in one-half the distance once considered safe. The specified figure is a military secret.

Termination of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the bill to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts resulted from the recommendation made in the Baruch-Hancock report. No less than six committees of the House considered legislation of this character. It was argued that only in this way could industry bring about reconversion that would result in employment being available to those in the armed forces on their return. That was strongly pointed out and was one of the outstanding factors that caused many Members to support the measure.

It is beyond anyone to even estimate what this will cost, but one thing is certain—in trying to reach an estimate, think not of millions, but of billions.

No one will dispute the responsibility of the Government to assist industry in reconversion.

To my mind there are several classes of contractors. First comes the group that immediately responded to the call of their country, dismantled their plants, and converted from peacetime to wartime activities. This not only applies to the parent contractor but also to some subcontractors.

You have other contractors and subcontractors who are not in this class. For instance, as I pointed out Saturday, you have many corporations not in existence prior to Pearl Harbor who leased Government-owned and Government-equipped plants. These corporations will be liquidated as soon as wartime production is curtailed.

The corporations whose wartime activities did not require conversion of their plants is another class. No hardship will result when they return to peacetime activities.

The outstanding discussion centered around the part the Comptroller General would play in the settlements. Under the terms of the bill, the preaudit of the Comptroller General is out of the picture. He will be confined to a post-audit and only where there is evidence of fraud will he have a voice. When we recall what happened in World War No. 1 and the scandals that developed, the wisdom of eliminating the Comptroller General is debatable to say the least. We likewise recall at the end of World War No. 1 we had 21,000 new millionaires. No one wants that to be repeated.

Following those scandals the Congress passed the Budget and Accounting Act in 1921 creating the office of Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office. The Congress made the Comptroller General its agent to see that money was spent for the purpose for which it was appropriated. The law provided for preaudit of accounts before final settlement. The wisdom of passing that law has been demonstrated. Under that law the Comptroller General was not confined solely to fraud as he is under the provision of this bill. In the auditing of accounts very frequently unethical business practices result in overcharges. Under this bill the Comptroller General cannot take exception unless he can prove fraud.

For the sake of argument let us admit there is justification for immediate settlement after termination of contract with those in the first class I mentioned, still I doubt it is wise to do the same for those in the other classes, especially when no hardship is involved nor will immediate settlement result in jobs.

The taxpayers are at least entitled to that much protection.

In Commemoration of Eddie Savoy, a Trusted and Faithful Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that Eddie Savoy's memory and long and faithful service as a messenger to various Secretaries of State since 1869, when he was appointed by my grandfather, Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State for 8 years, 1869–77, is to be honored and commemorated by naming a Liberty ship after him.

I know of no Government employee who has had a longer or more faithful record of Government service than Eddie Savoy, the trusted and well-liked colored messenger of numerous Secretaries of State.

It is fitting and proper that his memory and services should be honored by naming a Liberty ship after this trusted and faithful colored messenger, known and liked by every Secretary of State for the past 64 years.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of June 14, 1944, pertaining to the launching of the vessel at Baltimore on July 8:

LIBERTY SHIP WILL BEAR NAME OF "EDDIE," COLORED MESSENGER

The name of Edward Augustine Savoy, colored messenger to Secretaries of State for 64 years, will be borne on the seven seas by a Liberty ship, the Maritime Commission announced yesterday. Launching of the vessel at the Bethlehem-Fairfield yards at Baltimore is tentatively set for July 8.

"Eddie," as he was familiarly known to three generations of diplomats and officials here, died last summer at the age of 88. He had been retired from the State Department in 1933 after two Secretaries, Frank B. Kellogg and Henry L. Stimson, had personally interceded with the Civil Service Commission to keep him on duty for 8 years beyond the date of his statutory retirement in 1925.

The diminutive "Eddie," a master of tact and diplomacy, was known to statesmen throughout the world. It was he who took their hats and coats when they called to see the Secretary of State, politely bowed them into the diplomatic waiting room and escorted them—always at precisely the right moment—into the Secretary's inner office. The ancient messenger at the time of his retirement had a collection of valuable gifts, a reward for his courtesies from many foreign lands.

When, in 1933, "Eddie" finally left the State Department, a White House official car called for him and brought him to receive a personal farewell from President Roosevelt.

"And," the delighted "Eddie" told reporters when he left the Executive Mansion, "he told me to come back and see him any time."

A native of Washington, "Eddie" was born here and became a messenger in the State Department under Secretary Hamilton Fish. In all, he served under 22 Secretaries.

Who Is Entitled to the Benefits of Public Housing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today the armed forces of the United States are making glorious strides toward victory. The welfare of these fighters and their families ought to be the first considera-

tion of a grateful Government. Other workers in the United States are doing a good job, but the most consideration should be given "to him who is bearing the battle" and to his loved ones.

The National Housing Agency has provided certain housing at the Harvard Army Air Base at Harvard, Nebr. A part of these housing units have been occupied by the families of flyers, so that these men could be with their wives and children before they left for overseas. The Harvard Air Base is a final training base for men going overseas. Some of them will not come back. The American public will not permit their families to be evicted by the United States Government to make room for anyone else. Military men and their families should have first opportunity to use public housing, regardless of the rules and regulations of any agency.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a telegram received from the wives and families of the servicemen at the Harvard, Nebr., air base. This is dated June 15, 1944, and is as follows:

Preliminaries for action have been taken by Federal housing authorities for this area to evict Harvard Court military personnel families. Our situation is desperate since we have no other homes. Many of our men are in the overseas training group. Preservation of the American way of life and homes means little to men who are going to lay down their lives if their own homes are taken away. Immediate action necessary to preserve morale.

I also wish to include a telegram, dated June 19, 1944, from H. H. Rauscher, mayor of Harvard, in behalf of the city officials and interested citizens of the community. This telegram is as follows:

We urge immediate action on your part against the proposed eviction of service families from the Harvard Courts. Forty units are not in use at present and have been reserved for civilian defense workers. We urge that these units be furnished and used to relieve critical situation here. No other housing facilities are available. The housing facility has never been fully used since its completion. Why not finish and use these units before evicting the servicemen. This is a final training base for men going overseas. We feel that these families should be allowed to be together until the man receives shipping orders. We earnestly ask your immediate consideration of this matter. Thanking you in advance for anything you can do.

The End Begins for Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Owen L. Scott, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, June 18, 1944:

THE END BEGINS FOR GERMANY

(By Owen L. Scott)

A deep-seated, although not publicly expressed, feeling exists among those competent to judge that Germany will be forced to surrender within the next 6 months, if not sooner.

At the same time, there is a growing belief that Japan can be forced into defeat within a year of the time that Germany goes down. This belief is based upon expectation that public pressure will force a speed-up in the tempo of this war. This pressure will grow from the fact that demobilization will start with the end of the German war and the millions of men who must stay in the Army and Navy to fight the Japanese war will become very impatient to join the other millions of men in the Army who will go back to civilian life with defeat of Germany.

The intent of the Army is to release from service first of all those men who have been mobilized for the longest time and who have seen the hardest fighting. Even so, it is going to be difficult to sell the country on anything less than an all-out use of available materials to get the Japanese war won so that men can get back to their peacetime pursuits.

At the moment, the German situation appears increasingly hopeless, with basic German weakness more and more apparent.

The German Air Force is so weakened that it was unable to take advantage of its great opportunity to strike at invasion ports when the move on Europe began or to strike at landing beaches when actual invasion occurred. The Germans never again will enjoy a comparable opportunity to make decisive use of their air force.

The German Army is so strained for manpower that it is using young boys and impressed troops including Czechs, Poles, Russians, and French who obviously cannot make the most effective soldiers. German transport was so upset that a major counterattack in France was delayed long enough to permit American, British, and Canadian troops to become firmly established.

German industry no longer is able to keep the German Army supplied as it must be supplied if it is to stand up to the lavish use of weapons that can be made by our side. German oil supplies definitely are being strained. German air losses cannot be replaced. The German Navy has failed to show anything impressive.

Despite the fact that German Armies still fight desperately and with skill, the fact of basic weakness in the whole German war machine cannot be concealed longer. When the collapse does come, it probably will be discovered that Germany had become pretty much of an empty shell with its industry, its transport, and its manpower badly blasted.

These other points are becoming clear.

The great German manpower and material losses in this war have occurred and probably will occur on the Russian front.

American and British airpower in the west has done and is doing just about all that was claimed for it by responsible air officials. The airplane has just about knocked the heart of German industry and German transport. In the period ahead the airplane probably will play a major part in knocking the heart from German armies in the west.

Casualties on our side, although they will be heavy, will not be as heavy as some officials have warned that they would be. It is notable that casualties in almost every theater of war have been under official estimates. This is due to the fact that the United States is able to throw in machines and metal in such lavish quantities. American industry is enabling the Nation to win this war with a minimum expenditure of life. It is improbable that the mass casualties, the casualties in the millions, that have occurred on the eastern front will occur in the west.

At some point these and other facts will impress themselves upon the Germans. When that point is reached, with Russian armies pressing from the east and American-British forces driving from the south and west, the Germans probably will be ready to give us. The next few months are expected to be the decisive months when Germany will be hit with all of the allied power that has been built up during 2½ years of effort.

Once German defeat occurs there will be release of naval and air forces for operations against Japan.

In fact, a vast quantity of war material and a navy of a size four to five times greater than the Japanese Navy even now is in the Pacific. When the British Navy can shift units to the Indian Ocean and Pacific areas the way should be opened for decisive action. It is true that this war could be turned into a very slow type of naval war in which years could be taken up with slow-motion jumps and maneuvers. That type of war, however, is unlikely. It now has been proved possible to strike directly at Japan itself by air and to force the Japanese Navy to fight or to be rendered impotent.

Japan is just a group of small islands, dependent for life upon imports of all basic materials, including food. Naval and air action can be used to destroy the war-making ability of that island in much less time than the last 2½ years of slow-motion warfare suggests.

As the situation now appears, 1946 may turn out to be the first full year of peace following what will have been a 6-year world war.

Contract Termination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 17, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I voted in committee for S. 1718, as amended, which is the so-called Walter bill embodied in H. R. 4789. This bill provides for settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts.

However, this bill only attacks one phase of the all-embracing problem of transition from wartime to peacetime industry. It only takes care of stockholders and principals of entities whose wartime contracts are terminated and takes care of them whether they are prime contractors or subcontractors. It is primarily concerned with fiscal arrangements between the Government and contractors. It leaves untouched the momentous questions of reemployment of discharged employees as a result of such contract termination.

Frankly, I am naive enough to believe that these fiscal problems are not unrelated and should not be considered without reference to problems confronting the employees who are bereft of jobs and who may be left stranded as a result of contract cancelation and termination. I am interested in the human side of this problem as well as the material side. Involved in the human and labor aspects are the speedy reconversion of war plants to civilian production or the reutilization of these plants to other war production.

The contract-termination bill only deals with one sector of this difficulty, namely the financial liability of the Government to the war contractors.

We all agreed that there should be a peacetime economy of full employment. We may differ as to which path should be trodden to reach that goal. I would like to have a peacetime economy that would produce as much, if not more, than was produced in our highest level of wartime production. If we fall short of that goal, we invite bristling difficulties.

To divorce the problem of reemployment from the problem of satisfying financially the contractor is equivalent to a half-hearted solution of this vast field of view.

In addition, there are the questions of disposition of surplus property, the stimulation and furtherance of activity in agriculture. There are various bills being considered by various committees dealing with war production, reconversion, post-war adjustments, expansion of foreign trade, taxation, and social-security measures, public works employment, and enhancement of agricultural pursuits. To my mind this seems like taking 17 bites off a cherry. All such well-intentioned and well-meaning inquiries by these various committees should be under some over-all umbrella-like supervision, but that supervision apparently is lacking. It is true that the House Post-War Planning Committee is considering all these factors, but when it comes to bills involving remedies four or five committees are at work. This is a piecemeal approach to a gigantic problem that requires a coordinated approach.

There is need for speedy action on cancelation and satisfaction of fiscal claims, but that proposition cannot be considered in a vacuum. See what happened in the Brewster case. Thirteen thousand workers were suddenly catapulted out of their jobs by a summary cancelation of contracts for the manufacture of planes. No notice of cancelations was given. The facilities and manpower of the Brewster plant remain idle. Unless drastic steps are taken, we have the disturbing spectacle of a waste we can ill afford. The Navy Department, apparently, did not consider the use of that plant for other war work despite the fact that Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, urges greater war production as April records fall below March. The Brewster facilities and 13,000 workers are rather hors de combat because no plans had existed for continued use of such man and material power.

The Brewster fiasco highlights the need for integrated remedies. It clearly shows the fallacy of thinking it is possible to deal with one aspect of demobilization without, at the same time, considering other aspects. We can see the importance of the labor side of this situation. It is clearly discernible when we realize that the President has interested himself and has promised personally to investigate the Navy's abrupt cancelation of the Brewster contracts and to find other means of reemployment for the discharged employees. He recognizes the hardship visited upon these men and women. He recognizes the hardship resulting from lack of planning and that others besides stockholders must be considered in these contract cancelations.

It has been said that the workers could pack up and go to other areas just as a soldier does. That is rather a cavalier answer. It is not very easy for these employees to assume the roles of a civilian pup-tent army. There are questions of housing and transportation, all vital to migrating workers. Furthermore, these workers do not know where to go where work may be found. There is no effective directing agency to tell them where to go. There are no effective signposts to guide them.

There will be many Brewster cases. The instant bill does not help in that regard. It only helps those with financial interest in war contracts.

Furthermore, in this particular Brewster plan, there was a $6,000,000-housing project built for the workers. These houses built at the public's expense may now become vacant. If these and many other tragic mistakes are to be avoided, an over-all mechanism must be set up and guiding principles laid down to utilize facilities which become available and to utilize the skilled and unskilled labor who find themselves without jobs. Machinery must be provided for cut-backs or lowered production schedules, for increasing essential civilian production, for training displaced workers, for maintaining their purchasing power, and above all, for maximizing the use of their skills and abilities to achieve greater production in the war effort and in peacetime as well.

In addition, thereto, provision may have to be made for emergency unemployment compensation benefits to tide the worker over from unemployment to employment. Every worker is entitled to preserve intact his family life. It may be necessary for the Government to step in to help. Preference in that regard must be accorded ex-servicemen.

Provisions may have to be made for a suitable job or "interim placement benefits." Benefits may also have to be paid in general for service as well as non-service men and women and benefits paid for partial unemployment and partial disability. It will be incumbent upon any work administrator to provide free vocational education and training to ex-servicemen as well as to civilians for stated periods, during which time, whether they be family or single men, maintenance allowances will have to be provided.

In all this speed is necessary.

The primary purpose of this statement is to spur on or "needle" into action the committees which now have jurisdiction over these matters. I would prefer one committee to consider these various factors and facets of this problem in an over-all remedial manner, but since these four or five committees have already been given jurisdiction, it is hoped they will not delay in giving us the benefit of their research and deliberation.

The Time Has Come To Break With Franco and Aid the Spanish Republican Guerrilla Forces, Franco's Enemies and Our Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1936, the first shots of World War No. 2 were fired in Europe. German Army transport planes, flown by Nazi officers, flew an obscure Spanish general and his mutinous troops from Spanish Morocco to Spain. At the other end of the Mediterranean, the jackal Mussolini called up his troops and put them on transports bound for Spain. For a few hours, the world thought that the shooting was merely a civil war in Spain. But it did not take very long before the troops of Fascist Germany and Fascist Italy were fighting in Spain. From the very beginning, the war in Spain was a German show.

When the war started, Herman Goering declared, at a meeting of German military leaders involved in the Battle of Spain, that "Spain is the key of two continents." He made it very clear that Germany proposed to seize this all-important key.

The guiding genius of the battle for Spain, the man who planned and ran its military and political strategy, was Nazi Gen. Wilhelm von Faupel. In 1938, during the Pan American Conference at Lima, General von Faupel traveled from the Spanish front to Berlin, where he delivered a speech before the German Academy. And in this speech Von Faupel minced no words. He said:

> A victory for Fascist Spain will cement our relations with Latin America and will be a rude shock to the good-neighbor policy of President Roosevelt.

Yet, Spain is truly the key to two continents. With Spain in Axis hands, France was outflanked before the Battle for France ever reached the shooting stage. And with Spain as an Axis nation, Hitler had a powerful grip on Latin America—aimed, as Von Faupel predicted, primarily against the United States of America.

This is no longer an official secret. A few hours before we invaded France, the War Atlas prepared with the aid of the Office of War Information reached the public. On page 5 of this atlas, in reviewing the steps by which Hitler prepared for war against us, the atlas declares:

> German and Italian troops spent 3 years (1936–39) helping to install the Franco regime and incidentally testing Axis weapons and tactics. Confident of an obligated Spain, Hitler and Mussolini could now threaten France with a two-front war. The British position in the Mediterranean, particularly Gibraltar, was placed at a further disadvantage.

A few months ago, I brought before this House some examples of what we have had to pay in lives and territory because of the obligations Franco Spain has toward Hitler Germany. I pointed out at that time that Jose Luis Aranguren, secretary of the Spanish Legation in La Paz and chief of the Spanish Falange of Bolivia had transmitted the funds and orders from the Nazis in Buenos Aires to the leaders of the revolt which overthrew the Government of Bolivia. I called your attention to the stream of raw materials Spain was and is still sending to the German war machine—materials produced in Spain and materials brought to the Nazis from the oil fields, the soil, and the industry of the New World via the Spanish merchant marine. I told you about the secret submarine and refueling bases the Nazis maintain on Spanish soil. I reminded you of Franco's series of disgusting and still unfulfilled pledges to withdraw his troops fighting as part of his master Hitler's armies on our eastern front. I cited instances of how the Spanish Falange and the Spanish diplomatic service are doing Hitler's work of propaganda, espionage, and sabotage in Latin America—and I offered to produce further evidence of this drive against our security.

Well, that was on February 24, when our troops were still on this side of the English Channel. A few weeks after that, I was visited by a distinguished United Nations official who read that in this speech I had also referred to the treacherous role the Spanish Falange had played in the Axis fifth column in Manila—a stab in the back, by the way, for which the Japanese Imperial Government decorated the Spanish Falange leaders. This distinguished gentleman told me that after the Japanese took Manila, all the foreign diplomats—including himself—were herded into a room by the conquerors and asked to prepare a list of Americans most dangerous to Japan. All but one of the diplomats refused. The only man to prepare such a list for the Japanese was Jose del Castano, Spanish Consul General in Manila and chief of the Spanish Falange of the Philippines. Need I add that every American on del Castano's list who was subsequently caught by the Japs was executed?

I cannot get del Castano's act out of my mind. It was not the act of an irresponsible individual who hates Americans. As long as Spain remains in the Axis, del Castano's action will serve as the prototype for all acts of Spanish officials in Spain and Spanish diplomats abroad. The "obligated" Spain of Hitler and Franco is an enemy nation—and her acts will continue to remain those of an enemy.

Now that we have invaded France, Franco's day of judgment is near at hand. His crimes against the Spanish people, against the people of the United States of America, against the democracies of the world have not been forgotten. On February 24 I told you in some detail about the activities of the Spanish republican underground armies now battling Hitler and Franco in Spain. The Spanish underground has now served notice to the world that they plan a full-dress uprising in the very near future to drive the Nazis and Fascists out of Spain.

The Spanish republican underground fighters are now fighting our battle in Spain. They are blowing up trains carrying food, oil, and war materials from Spain to Germany. They are sabotaging factories producing uniforms, small arms, and machinery for the Nazi Army. They are killing Nazi pilots and Gestapo officials inside of Spain. They are sabotaging German coastal fortifications all over Spain. Against tremendous odds, handicapped by tragic shortages of arms and equipment, they have been waging this type of warfare against Hitler since 1939.

Now, as the armies of liberation reach France, the Spanish republicans are preparing a major blow for the United Nations on Hitler's Spanish front.

When this front is opened, are we to play Pilate again? When the Spanish people, for the second time in a decade, rise in a war against Hitlerism, are we again going to declare "neutrality" toward both sides? Can we really hope to again arrogate to ourselves the right to be neutral in a war between our Nazi enemies and our democratic Spanish allies?

The government of the Fascist Franco is run by our Axis enemies. Its neutrality is the spurious neutrality of fascism—a sharp-clawed ersatz dove created to help Hitler in his war against the United Nations. Time and again Franco has openly called for the defeat of the United Nations and the triumph of the Axis armies. The Spanish press, controlled by the Fascist Spanish state, consistently sneers at the democracies and praises the leaders, the government, and the armies of Nazi Germany.

The menace to us of a Fascist Spain will not be lessened by ignoring it. We are now at war because we refused to believe that the guns pointed at our heads by Italian, Japanese, and German fascism were loaded. The gun Hitler's puppet Franco points at our head is also loaded. Unless we take the only logical steps called for by this situation, the first shots of World War No. 3 will be fired in Spain within a generation. For if fascism survives in Spain when this war ends, it will be a fascism controlled by the German cartels who today run Spain.

The Spanish republican underground, in taking to battle for Spanish freedom, will also be fighting for the freedom of the United States. The men of the Spanish underground mean business. They are tired of facism, and they propose to fight Hitler with or without the blessing of any other nation—even if some United Nations leaders see fit to praise the fascist Franco in public.

When the republican uprising in Spain begins, the first square mile of Spanish soil to be liberated from the Nazi overlords will become the capital of one of the countries which have—in the blood of their best people—won the right to call themselves one of the United Nations. When that rising begins, it will be our clear duty to welcome the long-suffering republican armies of Spain to our camp as allies, and to extend to them our full aid in their fight against the common enemy.

Because this rising is coming soon, and because it is now evident that this war cannot end until the Nazis and their regime are driven out of Spain, and because the military and political strategy of this war demands that the people of Spain know now that this time we shall not fail them in their battle against our common Axis enemies, I am at this time offering a resolution dealing with our policy towards Spain. In making this resolution, I urge debate and the consideration of testimony both for and against the course it advocates. I am prepared to present a vast body of evidence in support of the resolution. It is evidence which should be in the hands of all Americans who want to win this war and prevent the outbreak of a third world war which must inevitably take American lives.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

Whereas the United Nations' invasion of Europe is the climactic military stroke of the war to end fascism; and

Whereas it has become clear that the United Nations' deaths of this war will have been in vain if German fascism is permitted to exist anywhere in the world when the war ends; and

Whereas the present Fascist government of Spain was created by the governments of Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini, became a formal signatory of the Axis pact in 1939, has maintained troops in the Axis army on the United Nations' eastern front since 1941; and

Whereas Francisco Franco, the nominal head of the present Spanish Government, has at all times openly and flagrantly called for a German victory over the United Nations in this war; and

Whereas Spain, under Franco, has become in effect a colony of the Third Reich, her factories and her soil devoted to producing cloth, guns, and food for the Nazis; her merchant marine devoted to carrying Nazi spies to the New World and oil, wheat, cotton, and arms from the Americas to the German Wehrmacht; her wolfram, copper, iron, and coal mines devoted to producing the raw materials for the German weapons which kill American and all other United Nations' soldiers; her shipyards devoted to repairing German warships damaged in engagements with American and British forces; and

Whereas the controlled press and radio of Fascist Spain are overwhelmingly devoted to spreading the propaganda of the Axis and painting a false, derogatory picture of the United Nations and their leaders; and

Whereas the Falange, the official and sole political party of Fascist Spain, whose 26-point program is officially the program of the present Spanish Government, is openly Fascist and anti-United Nations in its program and philosophy; and

Whereas the third of the 26 points of the Falange declares, in part, that "We have the will of empire and assert that the historic legacy of Spain is the empire * * * Regarding the Latin-American countries we intend to tighten the links of culture, economic interests, and of power"; and

Whereas in pursuance of the third point of the 26 points of Falangism herein cited, the Falange has been openly working to reclaim the Philippine Islands, Puerto Rico, and Cuba for the Spanish Empire and working actively against the United States of America in the Latin-American nations; and

Whereas the Falange maintains cells and organizations in 20 Latin-American nations

devoted to furthering the cause of the Axis, and whose members are called upon to act as military spies and propagandists of the Axis; and

Whereas the Falange chiefs of the Latin-American countries have been empowered by the Falangist Spanish Government to control the Spanish legations, embassies, and consular offices in the Americas; and

Whereas the overwhelming majority of the Spanish people, who fought valiantly in the tragic years 1936 to 1939 against the Axis invaders of their democratic republic, and who warned the world that the Axis conquest of the Spanish Republic was actually the first battle of the Axis world war against the democracies, have now given notice that they intend to rise up against the Axis regime of Spain; and

Whereas the Spanish Republican underground has since 1939 been sabotaging mines producing coal and ores for the German war machine, blowing up freight trains carrying Spanish and Latin-American raw materials to Germany via France, wrecking Nazi-run airfields and naval installations in Spain and the Spanish possessions; and

Whereas the expressed and open aim of the Spanish Republican underground is to drive out the Nazi overlords and to destroy fascism in Spain and to then throw the full weight of the Spanish Nation into the common struggle of all the democracies of the United Nations against the Axis; and

Whereas the existence of a sound Republican government of the people, such as the Spanish Republican underground is fighting for, in Spain will be both a guarantee of peace in Europe and a profound deterrent to the rise of anti-United States Fascist nationalism in the Latin American nations; and

Whereas the continuation of fascism in Spain is an automatic guarantee of a third world war within a generation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States urge it upon the President of the United States that it is the will of the American people, expressed through their elected representatives, that the Government of the United States can speed our victory and guarantee a lasting peace by immediately breaking all diplomatic relations with the Nazi-Falangist Government of Spain; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States urge it upon the President of the United States that it is the will of the American people, expressed through their elected representatives that the breaking of diplomatic relations with the Axis Government of Spain should be followed by the appointment of a military commission which will be charged with the task of getting arms, ammunition, and medical supplies to the heroic Republican guerrilla armies of Spain when their revolt, timed to weaken the Nazi armies in their moment of greatest crisis, creates in Spain one of the active and decisive battlefields of this global war.

The Underpaid Worker Is Forgotten by the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, after listening so many times and reading so many printed pages about the one-third that are poorly housed, fed, and clothed, it is interesting to note the present attitude of the New Deal. The New Deal has always been a Santa Claus to the few and a Shylock to the many. More and more people realize the real attitude of the New Deal which really is all for me and nothing for you.

We have just had a week's discussion of hold the line and inflation. Each day it is more apparent that the only time that inflation is really discussed is when the low-income groups are involved or when the American farmer is in the picture. Here are a few examples:

Last summer the railroad men asked for an increase of 8 cents per hour but were flatly refused by the Director of Economic Stabilization, Fred Vinson, because it would cause inflation. This inflation scare was all the more questionable when one realized that one-third of the railroad workers received 57 cents per hour or less and a total average income of less than $2,500 per year. This was done a few weeks after Mr. Vinson himself had obtained an increase in salary from $12,500 to $15,000, or $2,500. In addition to this increase in salary, he also was and is receiving a $628.32 overtime bonus, which is more than the base pay of a soldier.

The 1943 overtime pay bill provided $200–$300 for Federal employees in the lower income brackets but provided over twice as much, or $628.32, for the bureaucrats receiving $10,000 to $15,000 per year.

During the consideration of the O. P. A. bill this week we first saw the New Dealers on the floor protesting a provision that would give farmers a parity price for their product which would be a guarantee of some 20 cents to 40 cents per hour. Then as a climax we saw these leading New Dealers on the floor telling the Congress that if the low-income groups of our Nation should receive up to $37.50 per week upon agreement with their employer, inflation would prevail.

The following excerpts from an editorial by Mr. Fred W. Perkins in the June 15 Washington Daily News gives further evidence of the drift of sentiment for the few at the expense of the many:

HOPE FOR UNDERPAID

(By Fred W. Perkins)

Hopes of low-paid and unorganized white-collar workers of getting out from under the wartime wage freeze rest today on the slender chance that House and Senate conferees on the O. P. A. bill will O. K. a Senate amendment intended to exempt raises up to the $37.50 weekly level—the raises to be agreed upon by employer and employee and the total to include payment for "usual" overtime.

The House rejected such an amendment yesterday. There was considerable debate and a vote in the House on the subject, while there was neither in the Senate when that body accepted the proposal. That sets up a parliamentary situation which seems bad for the "white-collar amendment."

Republicans furnished nearly all the support in the House, and most of the opposition came from the Democrats. Battling an apparent trend toward the proposal, Majority Leader MCCORMACK, Democrat, Massachusetts, took the floor to call it "dangerous and highly inflationary." Other Democrats joined in the attack, and Speaker RAYBURN voted against it. It went down in a 98-to-70 count by tellers, preventing a roll call which Republicans asserted would show a 2-to-1 majority in favor.

Note the editorial comment regarding the position of the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, author of the amendment:

Representative ANDRESEN, Republican, Minnesota, who offered the amendment, charged that "thousands of applications for approval of raises for low-paid workers are now before the War Labor Board and not receiving any attention. Many employers," he said, "want to raise wages, but cannot do so because of the War Labor Board's cumbersome regulations."

The statement of the Honorable FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan:

Representative CRAWFORD, Republican, Michigan, denied in the House that prices of commodities would be affected, because the amendment carried no authority for employers to seek price relief on this account from O. P. A. He stated: "If we turn down this amendment, I hope we will have to answer to every white-collar worker in the country."

Mr. Speaker, here then is one more concrete example of how the New Deal is so vocal for the underprivileged at election time but when in action they really do not wish to provide $37.50 per week to the average man although they are willing to provide the biggest of the bureaucrats over $300 per week without one evident objection so far as inflation is concerned.

Who can say that the New Deal is not Santa Claus to the few and Shylock to the many? The white-collar people of our country were not even allowed to be benefited by a single simple amendment in their behalf. The New Dealers are trying to rock the underpaid workers to sleep, by providing a 3-cent-per-day subsidy on their grocery bill, instead of a proper increase in salary.

Cleveland O. P. A. Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am just back from a Sunday in Cleveland where I found a completely demoralized situation in gas rationing due to the lack of thorough airing of the facts relative to the scandal in Ration Board 6. As a result other boards have lost heart. Honest people are disgusted, and one cannot blame them.

Many feel the situation as it is being handled opens the door to black markets and increased dishonesty. Cleveland wants F. B. I. investigation. The Feighan resolution would make that possible.

We are told the traditional policy of the F. B. I. is to confine itself to such matters as are definitely within its own jurisdiction. Other governmental agencies are vested with specific investigational authority in their respective

fields. For example, counterfeiting goes to the Treasury Secret Service, as do alcohol and customs matters, but kidnaping, and so forth, belong to the F. B. I. In the matter of the O. P. A., Congress created a special investigating agency in this office with some 3,000 agents. Inasmuch as this agency exists, F. B. I. would need special instructions to move into the Cleveland situation. The Feighan resolution would constitute such instruction.

There is a point, however, where the F. B. I. could well enter the picture, for the O. D. T. does not have an investigating agency, and the O. D. T. is definitely involved. Inasmuch as it is gas rationing that is in question, the P. A. W. also may have certain responsibilities.

Local authorities feel the situation has gone beyond the local boards involved. The practical effect has been to discourage other rationing boards, to encourage black markets and general dishonesty. It is difficult to gauge the far-reaching effect of the ineffectual O. P. A. investigations. Local police are unquestionably doing their utmost, but cannot go into it as the Justice Department could.

Let me reemphasize the wider aspects of this local scandal and urge immediate action on the Feighan resolution. It has become incontrovertibly evident that irregularities, inconsistencies, and black markets have reached proportions beyond the ability of the local authorities to cope with.

Some will remember that several years ago the State of Maine had great irregularities in the gas-rationing field. At that time the Governor refused to have State officials handle it, holding that it was very definitely a Federal matter.

The people of Cleveland want Federal investigation, and they remind us that this situation reaches out into every gas-rationing board of the country. I trust we may have action.

At a regular meeting of War Price and Rationing Board 34-18-13 held at Cleveland, Ohio, June 15, 1944, the following resolution was adopted by the entire volunteer staff:

"The people of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, and the entire Nation have been literally shocked into a state of insensibility by the revelations, during recent weeks, of the irregularities, illegal operations, and evident criminal acts that have taken place in Ration Board Six of this city and all of these officers of the Government of the United States in their several capacities as sworn representatives of law and order.

"These revelations have profoundly affected public morale in its adhesion to and support of the entire price-control and rationing program as operated and being executed through the O. P. A. as the public agency of our Government and have lessened the confidence of the public in such a sound national program against inflation and its multiplied and attendant evils.

"These revelations have and continue to have a growing injurious effect upon the entire program in that the loyal, faithful, and honest people who are serving the Government voluntarily without pay are being subjected to abuse, their work is brought into contempt, and a terrific opposition arises everywhere as a result of this public scandal.

"Officers of the O. P. A. have repeatedly requested the direct, immediate, and effective assistance of the Government, through the F. B. I., to trace these brazen criminal acts and bring the guilty to justice, but that to date these requests have not been met with anything other than innuendos, false claims that separate groups are powerless to set or that the case is outside their jurisdiction, a multitude of shifting alibis of one kind and another, all of which gradually demonstrates to the American people that our Government is either not interested in this public scandal or is powerless and weak to protect the inner defenses of our public economy.

"We, therefore—

"Affirm in no measured terms our continued confidence in this national program of price control and the wise policies of the O. P. A. as a part of the all-out war program of our Nation.

"Deplore and condemn the shifting policies and attitudes of high-ranking Government officials whose positions mean delay, confusion, and the final defeat of the entire program of rationing and price control.

"Support the efforts of local officials in their repeated requests to the Government for help and assistance that the full power of law and order be employed to clear up this scandal and thus to strengthen the hands of loyal citizens everywhere, and particularly their request for the F. B. I. agency of government to reach such a goal.

"Urge and implore the President and the Attorney General, our Representatives and Senators in Congress, and other persons in positions of influence and power to throw the weight of their offices into this situation without delay to secure positive action and immediate results and that they be urged to take the necessary measures to realize this goal.

"Commend all honest, faithful, and loyal citizens in every community of the country and especially those who are giving free of charge their time and talents to the rationing and price-control program in an honest manner to execute the laws, rules, and regulations thereof in the face of this shameful situation and the hesitant, do-nothing policy of the Government to date to prosecute this case to a just conclusion. And most especially do we commend the local leaders of O. P. A. who have shown genuine interest and taken effective leadership in the effort to bring this case to a just decision as quickly as possible.

"Call upon all loyal citizens further to cooperate in this splendid program in spite of the break-down of the machinery in one situation to the end that all might be spared the ugly repercussions that are bound to come in the wake of the collapse of the rationing and price-control program.

"Mileage Panel: Harry R. Best, Sam H. Coddington, H. H. Clayman, Fred C. Klawon, Thomas H. Reid, Wm. F. Gottshling, James F. Wilson, Henry Kassigkeit, Edward C. Stoer, August F. Svetek; Commodities Panel; George F. Dort, Lillian M. Kern, Dr. Richard N. Fluent; Price Panel: Janet M. Gross, Irene Thomas, E. J. Freer, Ruth E. Leathem, Leroy Hensel, S. A. Helsel; Frank E. Dempsey, chairman."

Resolution of the Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 5, 1944, I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A2736, copy of a resolution either offered or presumed to have been offered at the recent Polish-American Congress at Buffalo, N. Y., May 28–30, 1944. This was sent to me by the Rev. John Z. Jasinski, bishop of the Polish Church at Buffalo, N. Y., and inserted at his request. I find that it was not an official resolution of the congress at that time, and if offered, it was not adopted.

Since then, on last Wednesday, June 14, 1944, my colleague from Michigan, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A2998, the official resolution of the Polish-American Congress signed by Mr. Charles Rozmarek, chairman.

I make this statement to correct any misunderstanding which may thereby have existed and I have informed Mr. Charles Rozmarek accordingly.

Report of Foreign Relations Committee of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the membership of the House the following report of the foreign relations committee to the executive committee of the American Legion at its regular meeting held in Washington, D. C., April 28–30, 1944.

The developments of the past few years have proven the recommendations of the American Legion on both foreign relations and national defense to be far seeing and sound.

Col. Anson T. McCook, who served as acting chairman of the Legion's foreign affairs committee, is a sound student of our country's foreign relations:

REPORT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 28–30, 1944

Your committee presents this report on the eve of far-reaching developments. All look for an allied invasion of Germany, while by land, sea, and air our forces are closing in upon that other arch aggressor, Japan. These events bring into sharper focus those policies on foreign relations which the Legion has enunciated. Because of their special bearing on the problems of this moment, we are restating them in outline.

From its very organization, the American Legion constantly insisted upon adequate preparedness as the surest means of preserving peace and preventing aggression. After the Battle of Britain, resolutions were adopted at the Boston convention in 1940, placing the Legion on record as condemning aggressor nations and extending the assurance of our friendship "to the people of the great British commonwealth who are so heroically defending their shores and their freedom, and to the gallant Republic of China." Even more specifically, foreseeing that the unembargoed oil and scrap-iron then flowing towards Japan would some day spell death to many young Americans, we urged: "That the

Government of the United States exercise all lawful means to prevent shipment of war materials to the aggressor nations."

And then, turning towards our good neighbors of the Americas, we adopted one of the Legion's most constructive and most reiterated statements of policy in these words:

"We recommend that every effort be made * * * to strengthen the bonds of friendship and good will with our pan-American neighbors."

At Milwaukee, after declaring that "we believe in our constitutional form of government and are determined that it should be maintained as a beacon light of freedom for all nations and peoples," the convention minced no words in its declaration that—

"We are opposed to any * * * appeasement toward the aggressor nations, Germany, Italy, and Japan, toward whom we demand a policy of stern and exact justice."

That resolution is as vital today as when enacted, since the hateful and dangerous doctrine of appeasement, although under a different name, is raising its head once more, both in Britain and in the United States. Some war-weary persons are now proposing that we should bargain with the enemy in the hope of shortening the war. But the shortsightedness of anything except unconditional surrender must be clear. Looking back 25 years, it is plain that any weakness or softness would merely condemn the next generation of Americans to another war. Indeed, the executive committee at its last meeting emphasized the Legion's duty of making certain that our people should not be deceived again, as they were before, by false representations and the secret plotting of the German people to rearm for another war.

Another present-day problem was squarely faced at that same convention, in a resolution which called for the freedom of the seas. Your committee is convinced that the legitimate interests of the United States, when peace arrived, will require a healthy foreign trade if our factories, farms, and workers are not to suffer. Therefore, it is clearly essential to our foreign trade that the United States shall not only have full freedom of the seas, but also full freedom of the air for peaceful traffic. Laying to one side any question of regulation of warships and war planes, certainly the seaports and airports of the world must be open to American commerce and, indeed, to the commerce of all law-abiding nations.

The Kansas City convention declared our unswerving determination to win the war, insisting that "only total victory can be considered; only total peace can be tolerated." Then looking forward, we demanded that this Nation assert its leadership in the establishment of a just and enduring peace by which the aggressor nations should be disarmed "and made impotent to provoke another world conflict" and that conditions provocative of war should be eliminated. We insisted further "that the peace once written by fully enforced" and declared:

"No peace, however welcome, however promising, can long endure unless it be made secure by the Nations which have won it * * * We cannot escape, we will not evade, our own responsibility for the maintenance of that peace."

Again at its Omaha convention the Legion asserted that "No peace shall be made with our enemies except on the basis of their unconditional surrender" and it further declared that

"Our Nation can best serve and protect its national interests * * * in the establishment and maintenance of an association of free and sovereign nations, implemented with whatever force may be necessary to maintain world peace and prevent a recurrence of war * * * No peace can be lasting and secure for nations that are not fully prepared to maintain peace."

All these resolutions, taken together, embody the Legion's existing policy on foreign affairs and provide a broad foundation for solving some of these vast problems relating to peace which will become daily more urgent as the end of the war approaches.

It would be impossible at this stage to state what the details of that peace should be, since rapidly changing conditions constantly bring new problems, and therefore the methods of meeting these problems must be elastic. Two things, however, are sure: First, that there cannot be a moment's relinquishment in the war effort until complete victory has come through the unconditional surrender both of Germany and Japan. Second, that the people of the United States must give to this vital subject of peace all the thought and effort which they are giving now to the successful prosecution of the war.

Vast and complicated questions cannot be solved by wishful thinking. And certainly peace cannot be made enduring by any agreement with those nations who have already proved that their most solemn agreements are valueless. Moreover, if the terms of peace are to be effective they must have facts as their basis, and those facts must be accurately compiled and thoroughly reliable.

In all the conflict of opinion which is bound to occur, and which is wholesome when it is honest and unbiased, certain basic principles are clear and must be adhered to. It must be a just peace, since no peace can be enduring unless it is just. It must be a real peace, and there can be no real peace unless first there is complete victory. There can be no selfish aggrandizement, since we have fought the war solely for our own defense and to liberate oppressed peoples. It must, above all, be based not upon words alone but a sincere spirit of fair dealing and mutual understanding. In his farewell address, Washington spoke with patriotic directness and deep feeling when he adjured the United States to "exert good faith and justice towards all nations, cultivate peace and harmony with all," and pointed out that, "In public as well as private affairs, honesty is always the best policy."

Your committee adds three practical recommendations: Since no expediency can ever justify any breach of faith, let us as a nation make a few promises, but fulfill what we make. Strong as we are, there is a limit to our strength, and we have no right to promise beyond our strength. Again, we should not neglect our own proper interests. Thus, as already pointed out, communication by sea and air throughout the world must be kept open and maintained for the United States, and full economic freedom assured us in dealing with other nations. Legitimate self-interest is entirely compatible with friendly relations and fair dealing. And the third is this: No peace, however, carefully prepared, can be stronger than those who make it and stand behind it. Therefore, it must be followed by perpetual vigilance on the part of our citizens in the discharge of their political, military, and civic duties. It is forever true that vigilance and sacrifice are the price of liberty and peace. Only through a strong and free America can we as Americans fulfill our duty to ourselves and to the world.

The complex nature of these plans for the peace, involving the future security and liberty of the peoples of the world, will tax the capabilities of our best minds; and all of these efforts may prove futile unless we recognize our dependence upon the guidance and wisdom of Almighty God.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram of June 14, from Mr. Abraham Heller, executive director of the Chicago Association of Dress Manufacturers:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 14, 1944.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The practically unanimous opinion of directors of the Chicago Association of Dress Manufacturers is that there should be no relaxation to price control generally and specifically to the regulations pertaining to the manufacturing of women's outer apparel. The overwhelming sentiment of our directors in which I fully concur is that any relaxation of price control would not only create an inflationary condition detrimental to our economy but also would make it more difficult to revert to peacetime economy once our armed forces succeed in destroying the enemies of civilization. We feel that it is the duty of the Congress to resist strenuously all efforts to secure amendments to the new price-control bill which would pave the way for higher prices. Only in that way can Congress perform a vitally needed service on the home front that will match the sacrifices our fighting men are making on the battle fronts.

ABRAHAM HELLER,
Executive Director, Chicago Association of Dress Manufacturers.

My Friend, Tom Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article by Hickman Powell, from Collier's magazine, for June 24, 1944:

MY FRIEND, TOM DEWEY
(By Hickman Powell)

When the editor asked me to write this piece, I had no idea how difficult it was going to be. I was born and raised a Democrat. Counting a couple of State elections, I have voted for Franklin D. Roosevelt, not three times, but five. Eight years ago I was a convinced New Dealer. And now it looks as though I'm going to work my heart out to help elect a Republican as President of the United States.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, is an old friend of mine, and everybody is saying the Republicans are going to nominate him. If they do, I'll vote for him.

If you have worked with and for a man close up for many years, not continuously,

but from time to time, so that you have seen him grow by stages from a promising young fellow in a big job into bigger and bigger responsibilities; if you have been through crises and worked through the night together and gone home after dawn; been cussing mad under tension and got over it—then probably you know the worst about him, and possibly the best. If then you support him for President, any talk seems pale.

But what I have to say may be important. I suppose it is the basic reason why I, still thinking of myself as a liberal Democrat, have been glad to work so closely with the man who was rebuilding the Republican Party. And the election this year is going to be decided by people like me.

Long years before he became Governor of New York, young Tom Dewey was sitting one evening with a half-dozen advisers discussing a knotty, controversial problem, deciding what to do.

"Before we leave here," he said, "let's agree on this—unanimously."

He has said this often in the years since, for it worked very well. They did agree, as men usually do when they sit down to face facts with good will and common sense, intending to agree rather than to justify their own isms and prejudices.

This kind of give-and-take has been a habit of Governor Dewey and the always increasing circle of able men who have gathered around him. The art and practice of bringing people into agreement, not through control or controversy, but through their own reasonable free will, has been the basis of virtually all his accomplishments.

Of course, the Republicans are seeking Dewey's leadership largely because they want a hard fighter, a finish fighter, with the habit of victory—for the winning of the war and the winning of an election. It is less obvious but more important that Governor Dewey has functioned primarily as a crystallizer of agreement, a catalytic agent in bringing people together for effective purpose.

Agreement—often unanimity—has followed him like a shadow. There were all those jurors in the racket cases years ago, who always agreed with one another and with him. There have been all those able men and women in the ever-widening circle of his staff, people with strong egos and variegated beliefs, who came from East Side, West Side, the ghetto, the social register, and Negro Harlem, and up-State and the Middle West—all working together with a common passion for the job well done.

THE CHOICE OF ALL PARTIES

There was the time when everyone but Tammany Hall, from the left wing labor unions to Wall Street inclusive, insisted that Dewey could not go to work for himself but had to be district attorney. And there was the unanimity in which even Tammany joined, agreeing on his successor.

Twice Dewey was nominated for Governor, by acclamation. If the Chicago convention follows the predictions and nominates him on the first ballot, without his declaring himself a candidate, that will be unusual in national politics. But it will be just another item in a Dewey habit.

There must be reason behind this pattern, some reason why the people now look to Albany, why the diverse voters of industrial Pennsylvania and agrarian Nebraska went to the primaries this spring and individually wrote in the name of Dewey, why they seek him when they reject others. Maybe they sense an uncommon kind of leadership.

Tom Dewey is the least opinionated, least intolerant man I know. He has certain simple, basic beliefs. He is death on crime, corruption, and crookedness; he has no patience with incompetence; but if he encounters a good man, the sky's the limit.

When he started the crime investigation nine summers ago, hundreds of unknown young lawyers applied for jobs by letter. Dewey saw one of them, looked him over, looked him in the eye.

"So you're a Democrat from Jimmy Hines' district," he said. "If I were prosecuting Jimmy Hines, where would you look for orders?"

Hines was the biggest Tammany leader, dispenser of New Deal patronage, known protector of the Dutch Schultz mob. Dewey was talking to Frank S. Hogan, one of the four assistants who 3 years later helped him send Hines to prison. Today Hogan is Dewey's successor as district attorney of New York County.

Dewey likes initiative, and opposes any attempt at monopoly of it, whether by Washington or anyone else. Ironic critics have said he is against sin; but in a sense they exaggerate, for he is not puritanical. He has eliminated the word "tolerance" from his vocabulary, because it implies disapproval of somebody's peculiarity or peccadillo. He thoroughly hates intolerance.

Dewey has been an effective accuser, but he hates a smear. You have heard of all the convictions he got, back in the racket-smashing days, but you have heard less about the indictments he didn't get. In a way, they are even more important. If you consider what happened in other investigations, that means that a lot of presumably innocent men were spared the smearing of accusation and acquittal. For in all those big cases you could count the acquittals on the fingers of one hand. He didn't move until he was sure he could convict. That was one thing I liked about him. It was an indication of the sure-handed way he would later take over in Albany. It is one reason people unite behind him now.

A bigger reason is the way he takes a licking.

One day in August 1938, Dewey was prosecuting Jimmy Hines. It was his biggest case, product of 3 years' work, of spectacularly successful investigation. His hand was shown, his case was in. A defense witness was being cross-examined when the judge, taking exception to a question, called a mistrial.

The boys on Broadway were laying odds that night that Hines would never be tried again. But they lost their bets.

That afternoon, Dewey and his assistants walked back to his office, grim, indignant, and dazed. Dewey disappeared alone into a little cubbyhole room he had. Hogan and Sol Gelb and several others lounged around outside, hardly knowing what to do. But only for a minute or two.

Dewey's door flew open, and there he stood, grinning.

"What's everyone looking so glum about?" he said. "Come on. We're going to start all over again."

Hines was convicted 5 months later, and it was several times the triumph that it would have been. But meanwhile Dewey had been licked again.

They nominated him for Governor that year, and it was the time he nearly won, nosed out by a mere 64,000, after Roosevelt came to New York, spoke against him and tipped the scales. I remember him that election night going through the crowd out to face defeat and thank the throng of supporters. Then I went and folded up, exhausted. It was several days before I found what he had been up to.

He was down at his office the next day, starting out to reorganize the Republican Party. It was then that Edwin F. Jaeckle, of Buffalo, became chairman of the State executive committee. Then began the victory of 4 years later, when they carried the State by 600,000 votes.

Coming back from Bermuda some weeks after the 1938 defeat, Dewey's plane was 5 hours overdue, while an anxious group waited at the airport without news.

"What if the plane's gone down?" asked someone.

"Don't worry," cried the late Mike Claffey of the Journal-American. "Thomas E. Dewey will have something to say about that."

But it was others who had something to say. Dewey got back safely to find that he, a defeated candidate, had been invited to speak to the Gridiron Club in Washington while a half-dozen victorious governors were passed over. And then the public-opinion polls began coming in, with his name leading all the Republicans for President. He took the challenge, stumped the country against Roosevelt; and, you remember, that led up to his big defeat in the Republican convention of 1940.

The point in all these stories of defeat is this: Every time Thomas Dewey has taken a big beating, it has, sooner or later, turned into his biggest triumph yet.

Governor Dewey produces around himself a wide area of agreement, a small area of disagreement. In New York State, for instance, his program in social, economic and labor matters is simply a continuation and development of that which gave preceding governors the name of liberal. There have been some new twists and emphasis on improved administration. After 20 years of Democratic outcry over protecting the people's ownership of waterpower, Dewey started collecting rent for Niagara Falls.

A CLEAN-UP OF THE STATE

Ten years after the bank collapse and the New Deal produced bank-deposit insurance, Dewey shepherded the State's savings banks into the protective system for the first time. Dewey cleaned up a ring of scoundrels who for years had been permitted to prey on workmen's compensation at the expense of injured workers. Social welfare laws were liberalized.

Nurseries were established to care for children of women in war work. Decaying docks on the barge canal, found lying idle in the midst of war and costing $126,000 a year, were put to work. Unemployment insurance has been extended to cover all returning war veterans. A $163,000,000 cash surplus has been socked away to help care for post-war needs of returning troops.

Those are just a few of the things that have been done. Dewey has believed in this sort of progress for a long time, and so has nearly everybody else. But until he assumed leadership 6 years ago, there was a good deal of bickering over it, largely through force of habit. Back in Roosevelt's day, some Republican leaders would take the bait every time the Democrats wanted to pick a fight with them.

Ever since Dewey took titular leadership in 1938 he has had frequent conferences with Republican legislative leaders over the party program. When he has legislative proposals to make, he goes over his message with the leaders first, and in advance they iron out their points of difference. Strong men always do have differences, but though the conferences may take days, it usually is possible to agree. It was thus that New York obtained a reapportionment of legislative districts, overdue for nearly 20 years.

It has infuriated the left-wing journalists that the Governor hasn't turned out to be a reactionary whom they could attack every day, and they have been reduced to spreading insinuations again his sincerity. But everybody else seems to like it pretty well.

Conversation with Dewey tends to dwell on matters of agreement rather than controversial subjects. We have had plenty of differences of opinion, and probably will have more, but the funny thing is, I've been sitting here trying to think something we really disagree about, and I can't remember any, except—oh, yes; Roosevelt.

In 1940 I thought he went after the President a bit too hard. When he went campaigning that year, on the biggest venture of his life, I refused to join up. But it never interfered with our friendship. That's another thing about the man.

Governor Dewey always has the best men working for him that he can get, gives them full responsibility, and lets them develop in their jobs. He doesn't need to be told that the task of public leadership today is so vast, intricate, and varied that no man can be much better than the advice he considers in making up his mind, or more competent than the men he chooses to share his responsibilities. He would never leave mediocrity in his wake.

As district attorney, he gave New York better prosecution than it ever had before. The year after his retirement and again the second year, the work had improved still more. They are getting 97.7 percent convictions now. He had built an organization which had so much vitality that it kept on getting better after he had left. That's why he is important, and it all goes back to this ability to get people together.

None of the men around Dewey have ever been able to outwork the boss. But none of them have ever been quite able to give a good explanation why they work so hard—especially to their wives. I have yet to see the dervish's gleam in the eye of any Dewey man. They are utterly without fanaticism. But they seem united in a common passion for the good job well done.

They like their jobs and they like one another. One reason is that you are no more likely to find a quarrelsome person in the Dewey outfit than a hero-worshiper, a yes man, a backbiter, or an office politician. They respect one another's competence and opinions and if differences arise they get together and iron them out. Their responsibilities are so well defined that there is little occasion for jealousy. Dewey has sometimes picked the wrong man, but when that happened he was one of the first to find it out, and quietly corrected it.

A Dewey appointee has undivided responsibility but sometimes the interests of State departments conflict or overlap. The Governor has worked out a system of cabinet committees to take care of that. For instance, a program of occupational therapy and rehabilitation for institutional inmates is now being developed by the commissioners of correction, mental hygiene, social welfare, and purchase. The purchasing agent is in on this because the Dewey administration discovered that prisoners were getting industrial training with equipment most of which had been built back in the 1890s. New machinery is being bought, so that prisoners can be trained to return to the society of the 1940s.

You will be hearing plenty about Dewey and his men because it is impossible to draw a line between them. He has been getting the credit, all these years, for the good work done by loyal appointees. This works two ways. One reason they are loyal is that when somebody pulls a boner, Dewey takes the blame himself. He never had a whipping boy.

It's not my business to tell the Republicans whom to nominate. It's not my business to blow a horn for Dewey. I haven't been writing an inspirational piece. I haven't talked about issues. If the occasion arises, Dewey will state the issues and supply the inspiration.

He has always risen to every occasion in such fashion as to enhance the dignity and vitality of the position he holds. If he can get the people of this country to bury their little hatchets and pitch in together like his men in Albany, I can think of nothing that could be more inspiring either for the winning of the war or for the conquest of the challenging frontiers in America's industrial future.

I have here merely been trying to set forth simply one of the least conspicuous but most characteristic things about a remarkable man, which may be of importance at this time.

ASSET FOR THE PEACE TABLE

As we have been glad to rediscover, fighting well is a common American trait. The ability to bring people into agreement is much more rare. It is never so dramatic as a battle or a crusade. But it is a quality which, if exercised successfully on a large scale, can be very precious in the coming years.

On a local scale it means teamwork, efficiency, harmony in an organization. On a national scale, its successful practice may mean great political leadership, the reconciliation of group and sectional differences, the unity of a people. On a world scale, the man who creates agreement is a statesman. He produces peace.

The war will give a great solemnity to this election, conducted with our men on the beachheads.

Not long ago I flew home from England, filled with a momentous sense of the vastness of it all, and very soon went up to Albany to have dinner alone with Governor Dewey It was the day after Wisconsin counted its primary vote, and the newspapers were all saying he was going to be nominated. Having established themselves by electing governors in a majority of the States, the Republicans were asking him to become the head man.

For a long time before dinner we just sat there reading the evening newspapers, not saying anything. The papers had an item about another friend of mine. He had been shot down over Germany.

The Governor hadn't gone out hunting for this thing which was happening to him. When we had said goodbye months ago out by the vestibule (I to join a convoy, he to go to Mackinac), I had remarked, somewhat jocularly, "You know, it looks as though, before I get back, this breeze may be blowing up into a draft."

And he had turned very seriously and said, "I want to be reelected Governor in 1946; that's what I want."

Of course, there wasn't any doubt of that. Otherwise I wouldn't have been going away.

But in the intervening months, leaders from all parts of the country had been beating a path to that same door, seeking leadership. And now I could see that he was going to take command. Of course, there never could be any doubt of that. If the nomination came, no leader, if he was a leader, could refuse.

If fate will have it that I was dining that night with a future War President, I shall be hard to put to it in writing my memoirs; for I can't think of a single memorable phrase that either of us said. We talked largely in monosyllables and broken sentences. The so-and-sos had lost their baby. I had taken off a lot of surplus fat. The dog was grown up now.

We were both thinking of the same thing, of course. But there was no sense of elation, or even much surprise. People in the Dewey circle used to laugh about the Dewey luck. But not for a long time now. Instead, men have gone busily about the tasks in hand, with a dead-pan sense of fatalism, while events beyond anyone's control seemed to shape themselves in a certain inevitable way.

There was a task in hand that night. After dinner, Governor Dewey asked me to look over a speech which he had had in preparation for some weeks. This speech had nothing sensational about it. It set forth somewhat more explicitly than before the view that he had been expressing for a long time—the obvious fact that we must collaborate with our present allies after this war to keep the peace.

The only question was whether he should make the speech now. For some months he had been keeping his mouth shut. He had not gone out seeking or asserting national leadership. But still there was a great hullabaloo and worry over isolationism. He was getting a lot of free advice, of various kinds, from jittery people.

PLANKS FOR A FOREIGN POLICY

You will remember, he did speak to the publishers late in April. He proposed three fundamental principles of foreign policy:

"To carry on the war to total crushing victory, and in so doing drive home to the aggressor nations a lesson that will never be forgotten.

"To organize in cooperation with other nations a structure of peace backed by adequate force to prevent future wars.

"To establish and maintain in our relations with other nations conditions calculated to promote world-wide economic stability not only for the sake of the world but also to the end that our own people may enjoy a high level of employment in an increasingly prosperous world."

When that speech was made, you will remember, something suddenly happened in this country. Surface tension vanished, like a pricked soap bubble. America suddenly discovered that her people were together on a fundamental decision. Obviously they were going to try to get along with the rest of the world. And they were not going to cut one another's throats at home over the question whether they could agree with people abroad.

Dewey had pricked the bubble. Fundamentally America was agreed and relaxed. We were going to have international cooperation, certainly. And probably it would be Dewey on the first ballot.

Things had traveled a long way since that night, years ago, when I had thought Dewey was too persnickety over a petty detail.

"The trouble with you," I said, "is that you take yourself too damned seriously. However, I must admit—"

"I can read your mind," he interrupted me. "You are going to say that if I didn't take myself seriously, I wouldn't have been nominated for district attorney."

I agreed, "Exactly."

Watch this strange chemistry of bringing people into agreement. For the fundamental purpose of politics, the ultimate aim of popular government is not the clash and fury of conflict. It is getting people together. Governor Dewey never had to be told that. He has it in his bones.

Another $50,000,000 Year in Missouri River Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 1, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, for 2 years hand-running, floods in the valley of Missouri River are causing direct damages in the neighborhood of $50,000,000. The total for the 2 years will exceed $100,000,000 which is one-fourth of what has been recommended by the Army engineers as needed in additional authorizations to put the Missouri River under control and end these flood damages for all time.

The total damage from this year's floods cannot be fully told at this time,

because right now the second great flood of the year is taking lives, isolating towns, flooding half a million acres of crop land, tying up trains, sweeping out highways and imperiling war industries in many cities. A news report for June 16 placed the damage thus far this year at $44,000,000, taking the figures of the district engineer, which counts direct dollar damage only. And that does not take into account the emergency flood control funds the Congress has appropriated nor the relief funds that have been made available.

The damages from the 1943 floods were $47,000,000 and more than $3,000,000 were expended in emergency repair work which did not, as the Chief of Engineers has testified, and as the situation this year proves, give any additional protection.

The Chief of Engineers' testimony on this point was given in the hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department on the annual bill for Civil Functions of the War Department, as follows:

General REYBOLD. We had three serious floods on the Missouri River last year.

Mr. CASE. How much did it cost the Government to meet the emergency; that is, how much of the $1,000,000 fund augmented by the special $10,000,000 emergency fund did you find it necessary to spend on the Missouri?

General REYBOLD. A total of $3,014,000.

Mr. CASE. Will this work prevent similar floods in the future?

General REYBOLD. No, sir; this work will only afford the same degree of protection provided when the works were originally constructed. The fact that these levees were unable to withstand the recent floods is a definite indication that they are inadequate.

Mr. CASE. What did you find the damages to be in dollars?

General REYBOLD. The total damages in the basin due to 1943 floods are estimated at $47,383,000.

Mr. CASE. Does that figure include both direct and indirect damages?

General REYBOLD. That figure covers direct tangible damages only.

Mr. CASE. Did you determine what is needed to prevent such damages?

General REYBOLD. Yes, sir; we have made investigations of the entire basin which indicate definitely the additional measures needed.

So there is pending, Mr. Speaker, proposals of the Army engineers to stop these floods. It is embodied in House Document No. 475 of this Congress, approved in H. R. 4485, which passed this body on the 9th of May and is now pending in the other body. My comment on that bill has been given in the House and before the committees of both House and Senate dealing with the bill.

For the purpose of getting into the RECORD, however, a little history about the proposals and my interest in them, under permission granted by the House on April 1, 1944, I insert at this point the remarks I made at the sixth annual convention of the South Dakota Reclamation Association, held in Huron September 13, 1943, as reported in the records of the association:

Mr. SVENBY (presiding). Congressman CASE was elected Congressman from the Second District perhaps the driest years we have experienced in South Dakota and in my opinion he has already rendered an invaluable service to the State. He has worked in the interest of reclamation in Congress. It is with pleasure I introduce to you Congressman FRANCIS CASE.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman and friends, I have enjoyed the talks today. No one need to have expressed disappointment in a small attendance this morning. We have a large attendance this afternoon and after all, when you are working on things like reclamation you don't expect a mass meeting. You want people present who are definitely and specifically interested. They are here today. It has been said that the most resultful committee meeting ever held in South Dakota was one held in Yankton once, when out of a committee of five, two members were absent but the other three planned the first bridge across the Missouri River—the bridge at Yankton, and mapped the program that got it built. So when I look about here today and see that those here are builders, everyone, I am satisfied.

And here comes Scotty, with whom I rode to Casper, Wyoming in 1937 to attend the National Reclamation Convention, the session at which this South Dakota State Reclamation Association was born.

KARL MUNDT has given you a good picture of the water meetings up and down the Missouri valley and what they have accomplished I think I should mention to you a job of "unwatering" that Karl did down in Washington last winter. He educated the Lend-Lease officials and others on the possibilities of saving shipping space through dehydration. The space saved was equivalent to building a great many ships. That was done by taking water out of things; now he wants to do something by putting water into something—by putting it into dams, in fact. And it's what we all want to do. We want to store up water that is worse than wasted—flood water, and put into the growing of vegetables and crops that the country needs. That's reclamation.

A few years ago a book with a South Dakota setting, achieved considerable fame. The book was entitled "Giants in the Earth." It was a story of the people who settled eastern South Dakota, who battled the elements, the grasshoppers, the drought and the storms and established the communities we now enjoy. The people who came and conquered were called "Giants". They met the challenge of their day and won.

All of us here in one way or another, have had our own education in South Dakota's water problems. Mine came in the drought of 1910. I had been born in Iowa and knew little about farming or homesteading when we came to South Dakota in 1909. The next spring, however, I helped Dad establish residence on the homestead. I remember the day we set up our tent and prepared to build a house. First, we planned to drill a well for water. It was all new to me. I was the cook. We had brought some water from town; it went fast the first night and then I learned I would have to practice a little water conservation. Dad and the carpenter claimed afterward that I made the coffee out of the water in which I had cooked weiners and then used the left-over coffee for washing dishes. That summer and the next, however, I learned even more about water conservation. We drilled 3 different wells trying to keep enough water for the house in 1910 and 1911 and wound up by driving stock several miles to the ponds of a creek that stopped flowing, and hauling water in barrels on a stone boat. Those years, 1910 and 1911, gave me an early education in South Dakota's greatest economic problem—water. I have never forgotten it.

What was the story Mr. Eberle told us today? A story of a State crippled by lack of water in the 30's. Between 1930 and 1940 we lost 1 person out of every 14 in this State. The reason was drought, a lack of water. Yet if we could store up the water when it comes and when we have it, to use when it does not come and when we need it, South Dakota would grow in population.

The water problem is being attacked in many ways. I see Ross Davies here. His people, the Soil Conservation people, are really water-conservation people. They preach and practice contour plowing, building of check dams and storage dams. Since 1930 over 20,000 stock water dams have been built in the western part of the State, under the range program. That kind of water conservation should not be overlooked when we talk about reclamation. I used to carry this slogan in my editorial column: "A dam, some trees, and an irrigated garden for every farm in western South Dakota." Hundreds of ranchers and ranchers' wives have them today—not because I talked about them, but because some of our hard-working people got busy and built them.

We have in South Dakota one major reclamation project, the Belle Fourche, built under the general reclamation law. That is the program under which the water users are expected to repay in 40 or 50 years the entire cost of a project, except interest on the money. The original reclamation fund was established by the proceeds from the sale of public lands. After the experiences of 1934 and 1936 it was apparent that we needed more reclamation projects and it was also apparent that on some streams the water users could not be expected to pay back the entire cost of the dams and the canals. At the same time, the Federal Government was spending millions and millions of dollars in an effort to relieve the distress caused by the drought. So we worked out a program to put the relief money to work in building reclamation projects and get double duty from the relief dollars. We proposed a program which could use the water from streams of intermittent flow. Most of our rivers in western South Dakota are of that sort, as they are throughout the Great Plains States. They carry a lot of water when we can't use it and very little when we need it most.

So we worked out, and Congress approved, a type of project for the Great Plains, officially known as the Water Utility and Conservation Act but more commonly called the Wheeler-Case Act. A large number of Wheeler-Case projects are now under construction throughout the West, and more would be had it not been for the war. In our State the Deerfield unit of the Rapid Valley project is being constructed as one of these projects, and an allotment of more than $4,000,000 was made for the Angostura which would have been under construction had the war not come when it did. Over 18,000 acres were bought for the Angostura project, however, and we are hoping that it will be among the first undertaken after the war. The Angostura is on the Cheyenne, below Hot Springs.

Two other Wheeler-Case projects have been proposed in South Dakota and definite progress has been made in preparation for them. I refer to the surveys and studies of the combined Shadehill and Blue Horse project on the Grand River and the Thunder Butte-Green Grass project on the Moreau. The engineering studies have gone far enough on both of these to permit consideration for construction. Both are badly needed. In 1934 I saw horses on the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation stagger to the Missouri River to get a drink and getting it, lie down—too weak to rise again. A good project can be built on the Moreau, through the heart of this reservation, providing water for 23,000 acres strung along in little pockets and giving a small but steady flow for livestock, the entire distance from the dam to the mouth of the stream. The Grand River project is similar. Both of them are badly needed.

And when I mention these I am not overlooking what can and should be done on the Bad and the White Rivers.

It may be that all of these will have to be worked out individually, but personally I am

hoping that they can be tied in with the Missouri River program, about which we have been hearing a great deal and about which I want to talk in more detail at this time.

As you know the Army Engineers have been studying the Missouri River off and on for a great many years. For the past 3 years they have been charged with making a report on certain resolutions adopted by the House committees dealing with rivers and harbors. Last spring the Committee on Flood Control, shocked by the disasters caused by the Missouri's two big floods, adopted a resolution calling for a comprehensive program of flood control. As a matter of fact, the Army engineers had been working on the problem and a resolution was adopted in a form which would bring together the several problems they had been studying and permit the filing of a comprehensive report. That report was prepared and is now in Washington; Colonel Pick, the division engineer, having filed it with the Chief of Engineers on the 23d of August.

Colonel Pick has put his soul into that report. Last winter, a month or more before the flood—in fact, between Christmas and New Year's, at an informal dinner in Rapid City, Colonel Pick told a group of us that he saw the next quarter of a century as the time for the development of the Missouri Valley. He reminded us that the Missouri was the one great and the last great undeveloped river basin in the United States. Later he told me of his determination to propose a development of the river that was to affect the economy of the entire Northwest. He came to Washington, got the approval of the Chief of Engineers and started on his work. That was all before the floods came along and made his work perfectly timed.

The Pick report has not been released for publication and cannot be until it is transmitted to Congress. Before it is transmitted it must be passed upon by the Board of Engineers and commented upon by several Federal agencies, including the Bureau of Reclamation. Members of Congress, however, are permitted to examine the report; so I asked my secretary to examine it the other day and send a digest of the report, which I have here and will now review for you briefly. (Reads from notes.)

So you see that there is now in Washington for the first time in history, a concrete proposal, a favorable report on a plan of development for the Missouri Valley, a program of flood control by the building of some huge reservoirs, multiple-purpose reservoirs that will provide water for irrigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and navigation. The report does not propose to authorize all the development works at this time, but it does propose the building of the reservoirs and the payment for them by the Federal Government as a matter of flood control, which is thoroughly in keeping with the established and authorized policy of flood control for the country. The program, if adopted, would mean the building of the reservoirs upon which every plan for water utilization must be bottomed.

Once, many years ago, Senator Norbeck said to me that if I ever expected to get the Angostura project built, I would have to find some way to get the dam built and paid for without having its cost charged into the cost of irrigation to be repaid by the farmers. The Pick proposals for the Missouri River are in keeping with that idea. They offer a chance to get the dams on the Missouri built for and charged off to flood control; but being built to utilize the water for all the many beneficent purposes to which the water can be put. And, personally I am hoping that some of the storage will be placed on the tributary streams.

Those purposes, the picture of a great Missouri Valley development, were first painted publicly in a comprehensive way, I believe, by Mr. W. G. Sloan, of the Bureau of Reclamation, in a meeting of this association at Belle Fourche 2 years ago. He had the vision—he has the vision of what can be done with stored water—and since he is to follow me on this program, I am not going to trespass on the possible scope of his remarks to say more on that score. I do want, however, to give him credit for a vision and a knowledge of what can be done with the Missouri's wasted water. I recall saying 2 years ago that despite all that was going on at the State fair at Huron that day and at some other much-advertised event, that the greatest thing that happened in South Dakota that day was Glen Sloan's talk in Belle Fourche.

Back in 1936, I believe it was, I wrote a letter to one of the State's daily newspapers in which I spoke of the Missouri River as the State's greatest undeveloped resource. The thought was not original with me. Many men here and many not here had said that before, and had given months of their time to its study.

Today, however, we are in the position of having two great agencies of the Federal Government, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, joining with us and saying that the Missouri River should be harnessed, that its wasted waters should be put to work and changed from instruments of destruction into mighty agents of good. We can do this in our day. We should get our plans ready to provide jobs for the returning soldiers; we should create in the Missouri Valley, the homes and the opportunities they are fighting for. If we do our part, if we convert flood waters into irrigation waters, if we reclaim this good earth of ours in South Dakota and conquer both flood and drought, some later-day author will write another book about today's Giants in the Earth.

Address Before Pioneers of Todd Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at a banquet given by Pioneers of the Todd Co., of Rochester, N. Y., at the William Mann branch of the Todd Co., in Philadelphia, June 15, 1944:

Ladies and gentlemen, may I grasp this opportunity to inform you employees of the William Mann Co., now known as the division of Todd & Co., that I considered myself singularly privileged when I was asked to attend the dinner here this evening. I fully appreciate the splendid contributions you people have made to the war effort and the unusual significance attached to our gathering is so obvious that lengthy comment on my part is entirely uncalled for. By virtue of the fact that you are conspicuously identified with the Todd Co., of Rochester, N. Y., I thought it would be fitting and appropriate if I would give you some idea of the companies' background and of the achievements of the founders of the company, namely, Mr. G. W. Todd and Mr. L. M. Todd. You all know that it was through the efforts of these two outstanding American gentlemen that the Todd Co. was founded in the year of 1899. At this point I might state that Mr. George Todd had previous to 1899 engaged in several business enterprises throughout the then known part of the country as the "wild and wooly West." G. W., as he was affectionately known to all his friends in Rochester and throughout the country, was born on February 29, 1860, and as you read the biographical sketches of his life one is thoroughly impressed because of his rugged physique and determination and his tremendous capacity for work. G. W. was a man of vision and I state emphatically that those qualities have been handed down to his two sons, namely, Walter Todd, the head of the Todd Co., and George Todd, his brother and very able assistant. I have known Walter Todd for the past 25 years and realize his profound modesty. No one has ever heard him or his brother extoll the virtues of their Dad only in a quiet and private manner, therefore, I am going to do it.

In 1899 began the romance of the Todd Co., a romance comparable to the opening and settling of the West. I wish to state that in all of G. W.'s undertakings he was ably assisted by his brother for whom he had a great affection, also known in the City of Rochester as L. M. Todd. The Todds met with unusual success in the making of their checkwriter, and it was through the efforts of G. W. at a convention of the American Bankers Association at Richmond, Va., that he sold the idea he had perfected a machine that would frustrate counterfeiting, which was flourishing throughout the country during that period.

In 1905 the G. W. Todd & Co. moved to their own factory on West Main Street. The business grew rapidly and in 1909 they were forced to construct a new and bigger plant at 1155 University Avenue, where they are now located. We will all admit it is a long road from a woodshed and 100-machine annual output to 2 large factories and an organization of 5,000 people—that is romance, that is determination, that is vision.

G. W. Todd was born in New York State but during his travels through the middle west he helped build the town of Gettysburg, S. Dak., and it was in this town that Walter Todd, the present president of the company, was born. In 1915 G. W. became the president of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce and during his administration a splendid chamber of commerce building was constructed. G. W. was instrumental in having Mr. George Eastman exert his generosity in the direction of its construction and at the present time we have possibly one of the finest chamber of commerce buildings in the United States for a city of its size. G. W. Todd and George Eastman were very close friends and remained very intimate until Mr. Eastman's death. It was G. W. Todd who in 1918 conceived the idea and formed the Community War Chest, this was one of the first if not the first Community Chest, of this kind in the United States and it is certain that today it is by far the most successful. The Community Chest of Rochester, through the people of Rochester, has contributed more than $39,000,000 to the various agencies—now totaling 62 which benefit from these funds.

I know it will be most interesting to the men of the William Mann Co. division of the Todd Co., to know that George Todd was directly responsible for the present location of the University of Rochester. G. W. worked with the Rockefeller Foundation, and let it be known that the university was to have a medical school as part of the program. Consequently G. W. was instrumental in getting a substantial contribution from this organization for the University of Rochester. It took years of untiring effort on his part, but under his leadership it reached and exceeded all expectations. No man in the city of Rochester ever gave so much of his own personal life to public welfare and community effort and asked nothing in return.

Mr. Todd's philosophy was not, "how much can I make" but "how much can I give." He labored for the people of the community and because of his numerous activities this necessarily placed a tremendous strain on his physical strength and as a consequence his health was affected to such an extent that he never regained it fully.

In appreciation of the work he did for the University of Rochester one of the principal buildings at the university is named the George W. Todd Union. Further evidence of his interests in education are his generous contributions to Cornell University and the endowment of the chair of chemistry, now held by one of the country's leading scientists, who last year won the prize awarded annually for the greatest achievement in chemical science.

He was director of the Eastman School of Music and also a director of the Eastman Kodak Co., the Stromberg-Carlson Co., and the Rochester Capital Corporation. One would naturally conclude a man of national importance, yes, of international repute, would be so busy that he could give very little attention to the personal welfare and individual needs of his employees, but the contrary is true. He did that and did it well. G. W. and L. M. were men of forward-looking character; they pioneered in making group insurance available to all of their employees. They were the first company in Rochester to adopt the 5-day week and second to adopt the 13-month calendar.

I have said that L. M. Todd was a close partner in all things with his brother, G. W. Their interests were different to some extent, nevertheless their objectives were the same.

I would feel as though I would be doing a great injustice to you and members of the Todd Co. if I were to neglect to mention the name of Charles Tiefel, now deceased, and also the name of Walter Payne, who is now chief designer of machine products.

L. M. Todd was trustee of several Rochester banks and director of the Rochester Gas & Electric Co., and always interested himself in civic affairs to the same extent as his brother, G. W.

I have touched briefly concerning the founding of the Todd Co. and have only scratched the surface in mentioning a few of the accomplishments of G. W. and L. M. Todd, and, regardless of Walter's profound and sincere modesty, let me give you some high lights concerning him.

Walter is a trustee of Cornell University, a director of the Rochester Gas & Electric Corporation, treasurer of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce, a trustee of the Rochester Savings Bank, a director of the Security Trust Co., and a member of the executive committee of the Industrial Management Council. These are just a few organizations with which Walter is identified. Walter is a true philanthropist, generous and kind; above all, the president of your company is sincere, honest, loyal, and patriotic. He is soft-spoken and has a conscientious regard for all those with whom he comes in contact and is held in the highest esteem by every employee of the Todd Co. Walter is a true friend and is referred to by all who know him as one swell fellow.

George, the executive vice president, is a director of the Lincoln-Alliance Bank & Trust Co. and of the Stromberg-Carlson Co., member of the board of the Rochester Civic Music Association, member of the board of the Hochstein School of Music, a director of the Council of Social Agencies, a member of the executive board of the National Council, Boy Scouts of America.

Both of these gentlemen are active in community chest work. In their plant every modern plan involving employees' welfare is in effect. Again I might mention the Todd Co. has group insurance, pension plan for those who have been employees 10 years or more. All employees, both factory and office, are given paid vacations, based upon the length of service—and here is a startling fact, the Todd pioneers, composed of people who have been with the company 25 years or more, now number 136.

May I respectfully call to your attention this evening that effective leadership has been a major factor in the success of the Todd industrial organization, and efficient workmen must know that by hard work and diligence and through personal initiative they can obtain good results and become a supervisor or foreman. They must also know how to handle people and obtain from them maximum efficiency while at the same time maintain amiable relationship. The Todd Co. is now devoting all its energies to war production. The company is making a camera for the Navy which, according to reports obtained by me, has astonished the Navy personnel and at the same time directly complimented your organization because up until the present time there have been no reports of any mechanical failures. True, trained technicians are playing a significant role in the production of war materials, and the Todd technicians and employees are no exception in maintaining the high standard of equipment produced by your company. Enthusiasm in the Todd Co. is demonstrated by your ability to produce and render services which cannot be computed on a cold, hard basis of dollars and cents.

Money can not win this war. Money, of course is absolutely essential, in fact it is imperative, but we must convert money into equipment and place that equipment in the hands of our well trained military forces. Then and only then, having these instruments of war effectively used by well trained men, can we be victorious. Victory, I hope will be in the very near future. This will be accomplished because those who produce on the home front will patriotically supply those gallantly fighting on the war front. Our American determination and our great fighting and productive powers will make possible the all out victory and unconditional surrender, a reality. In closing, I wish to salute the American working men and women for their glorious achievements at this critical time. The dictators thought it would be impossible for us to out-produce them. Yes; we have out-produced them and we are now out-fighting them. We are fighting to preserve our ideals and traditions and every red-blooded, hard-hitting, patriotic American who appreciates the privileges of our great Republic can thank divine providence for all the blessings and benefits we have received in this great country.

Remember, my friends—this is your country, this is my country, above all it is God's country and we intend to keep it such.

It Depends on You and Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, before the Massachusetts Retail Grocers Association, Boston, Mass., on Sunday evening, June 11, 1944:

In time of crisis such as our Nation faces today, it is instinctive to turn to those basic fundamentals of our national character that have seen us through other crises in the past. It is a time to rededicate our national consciousness to some of those first principles that have made our country great.

It is especially appropriate to think of these principles today here in Massachusetts where so much of the foundation of our national way of life was laid so long ago.

Out of the Mayflower Compact and the town meetings of New England the principle of democracy took root on this continent 300 years ago. In that early time the actual practice of democracy in action was not ideal. In the town meetings some of the harder-fisted individuals and the more vocal citizens had their say, and there were those who suffered from local inequities. The practice of democracy was not ideal, but it was the reliance of that day, and it was the root from which our system of government stems today and has flourished through the years. It is our reliance still. It is our hope today.

The basic principles of democracy in the hands of a people who have made it work for two centuries of amazing progress results now in a dynamic force, which we know as democracy in action, against which no other force can long prevail. While those principles survive, so will the Nation which rests on them survive. And the further the Axis or any other group strays from those principles to oppose us, the more certain is their defeat.

On these principles our people have acted through many crises in the past. It was the people themselves who sponsored the famous tea party here nearly 175 years ago. It was the embattled farmers of Lexington who fired the shot heard 'round the world. It was the people who have guarded this principle through the years who have met all our national crises and have seen us safely through them.

It was the sons of Lexington and Bunker Hill who acted on this principle and plowed the Boston Common and planted it to Victory gardens last spring.

It was this same principle which caused the grocerymen and food retailers, represented by this group here today, to write their splendid record of results in connection with the recent no-point-low-point food program. Our reports show that in this important Nation-wide effort to conserve our food supply, to prevent waste and to make the best use of all our food resources in the emergency, by encouraging housewives to use those foods that are most plentiful, New England did an outstanding job. This program of marketing abundant foods has been highly successful. It has been successful largely because of the efforts of the food retailers represented here today.

We, in the Government, are frank to admit, because we fully realize it, that in the many war programs of this kind we in Washington can do but little—while the minutemen on whom the burden really falls, and on whom the success or failure ultimately depends, are those like you here today—the people of every village and farm. We in Washington can read the messages that flash like the signal lanterns in the old North Church and we can point the way. And fortunately we can do this with all the assurance that Paul Revere had that the people can be depended upon to do the rest.

"For, borne on the night-wind of the past,
Through all our history, to the last,
In the hour of darkness and peril and need,
The people will waken and listen to hear
The hurrying hoof-beats of that steed,
And the midnight message of Paul Revere."

The Government can plan general food programs and the broad allocations of food to our armed forces, to our civilians, to our allies, and to the liberated areas, and we can outline some of the rules to bring about the fairest distribution for all, but the job does not end there. The American housewife who buys the three-fourths of all of

our enormous food supply which our civilians consume depends on her grocer and butcher for much of her first-hand information.

That makes the nation's food dealer responsible for selling across his counter today not only food but also the Nation's food program itself to the 30,000,000 housewives.

It is the grocer's job today to help the housewife understand why she should conserve foods that are plentiful, why she should use those foods in greatest abundance, how this prevents waste, and how she can cooperate in many other ways. The grocer who does this fully and fairly and objectively is supporting his sons and his neighbors' sons in the fox holes and on the battlefields; the grocer who fails to do this fairly is not fully aware of his obligation and is weighing his responsibility with a heavy thumb.

The grocer is the quartermaster officer who is responsible for our enormous civilian food supply. The Nation's grocers handle three times as much food in a year as all the food for our armed forces and lend-lease combined. It is a serious and a sobering responsibility.

To meet this responsibility the Natich's grocers have done their best. They have adjusted their operations in many ways. They have economized on manpower and materials. They have drastically curtailed home deliveries, and have done away with unnecessary wrapping of parcels and nonessential promotional efforts. They have changed their hours so that women war workers can buy their groceries in the evening.

They have shouldered the added work of handling food coupons. They have met the difficulties if irregular deliveries of supplies to them, and, finally, they have done all this while hiring and training inexperienced help. The list of their achievements is too long to detail here.

Because of this splendid showing which you as food dealers have made, both individually and through your associations, we in the War Food Administration will continue to depend on you as we have in the past.

While we are discussing problems, it is a paradox of war that occasional surpluses of certain foods can prove to be nearly as difficult to meet successfully as the problem of short supply. In our all-out effort for production, with all the uncertainties of weather and of war, there are bound to be occasional oversupplies of some foods sometimes.

The only way to be sure to have enough is sometimes to have too much. The problem is to handle these occasional abundances so that waste is avoided, and also so that the farmer has a market that will encourage him to continue to produce. That problem will continue so long as we have war and so long as we are straining every effort to have enough.

Our whole food program, including support prices adjusted for various products in order to secure the desired balance to meet the demands, has stimulated our national food production to record levels. This has worked because of the untiring efforts and patriotism and genius of the American farmer and his family. The combination has resulted in a food-production accomplishment which we would not have thought possible a few years ago. It is natural that this tremendous production power cannot be turned on and off like a faucet and controlled so exactly that there are never any shortages and never any surpluses of particular foods. In this connection I want to go on record and say that in time of war I would rather be accused of missing the mark by occasionally having too much of some foods than too little. I believe we can all agree on that.

Let me mention one example to show how difficult is the task of balancing food supply with demand when we have the uncertainties of weather and other factors on the production side, and on the demand side the many unpredictables that are inherent in war. For example, this year the Government requires 86,000,000 cases of the major canned vegetables, which is more than 70 percent more than were asked for last year. Thus, if our civilian supply is to be adequate, it will be necessary for producers, processors, victory gardeners, and housewives with their canning to continue their outstanding effort. I mention this to illustrate the tremendous adjustments that must be made continuously to cope with the tremendous propositions and the swift tempo of war. I suggest that in these circumstances only a magician could maintain perfect balance between food supply and demand.

In connection with these temporary surpluses of some foods, let me sound a solemn warning. A food supply is a continuous thing. Food begins to disappear the moment it is produced. You cannot eat a record. We cannot supply our future enormous demands for food with current and past supplies. The temporary and local abundances of some foods which we are fortunate to enjoy now are the direct result of the fact that our farmers produced it, and our distribution programs conserved it—and that many more of the unknowns such as weather and other factors operated in our favor than in our disfavor. But we can't always depend on that. The only way, then, to insure this same fortunate position for next year is to continue all our efforts for maximum production and efficient distribution.

This means more Victory gardens than we had last year. Last year 20,000,000 victory gardens produced 8,000,000 tons of food. They helped to make it possible to remove point values recently placed on canned vegetables This year it is vitally important that we produce ever more food in victory gardens. The question of next year's food situation is being answered now.

We cannot afford to live in a fool's paradise in the midst of a temporary abundance of some foods that is more apparent than real.

I want to make one other statement about our large supply of food. Sometimes the Government agencies have more of one food or another than is needed. It is important to release these foods whenever it can safely be done. We have already resold canned goods to the trade for resale to civilians. We constantly review our inventories and release these stocks when they are not needed for known requirements. We are as careful as we can be in regard to stockpiling food so that we can come out as even as possible at the end of the war. That means matching our buying as closely as possible with our changing needs. But we know it is also part of our job to plan, as best we can now, for an orderly and practical release of stocks on hand when the fighting is over. We want to avoid the food dumping and disruptive trade which happened after the other war.

I believe that these post-war stocks can be handled best by reselling for distribution through the regularly established channels. Let me assure you here today that we will attempt to handle these operations through the established trade channels as fully as possible and with the least disruption to normal wholesale and retail markets.

In war or peace we know that the people themselves are the Nation's final reliance. That principle, established so many years ago, has become firmer through the years as actions by the people have dramatized it in times of crisis. The plowing of the Boston Common is simply a modern version of the historic stand at Lexington. And when Paul Revere galloped down the moonlit road from Boston, he carried, not simply the current message of that night, but he carried the principle of the strength of united action by the people. And he became something more than simply a dramatic figure in history—he became a symbol to which his countrymen have turned through the centuries for their faith and inspiration.

Keynote Speech at the Indiana Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following keynote speech delivered by me at the Indiana Democratic State convention, held at Indianapolis, Ind., on June 16, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen: Indiana democracy is meeting today in convention for the second time since our Nation has been under the sadness and sorrow of World War No. 2. Great and historic events have taken place since we gathered here 2 years ago. At that time, the future of world liberty was hanging in the balance but through the indomitable courage of our fighting men and spirit of our people, today we can see victory on the horizon.

The eyes of America are riveted on every headline that brings news of the progress our heroes are making on the shores of France and in every other battle area of this war. Every heart is beating in unison and sympathy with the spirit and valor of our brave boys who are fighting to preserve our freedom. Our prayers are offered daily with the hope of an early victory and safe return of our loved ones. Our war aims are clear-cut and definite. Until the end, we must fight fire with fire until mass murder, mass brutality, and tyranny are no longer a threat to our freedom. Our Commander in Chief has told us that the price will be heavy and the way long and hard.

We are gathered here today to adopt a platform, select nominees and carry out duties which our Constitution imposes upon us as citizens. We should realize in our deliberation that there are two gigantic problems facing the American people today:

No. 1. Our most important duty is to bring about the rapid winning of this terrible war so that our men and women who are in their country's uniform can return home to their firesides where they may again enjoy life's peaceful pursuits.

No. 2. To prepare now for our post-war problems and to bring about an understanding and agreement between nations which will assure permanent peace to all mankind.

The election to be held on the 7th day of November will be the most important referendum in the history of our Nation. The men who head our National Government in the next 4 years will decide the destiny of America and the world for generations to come. The outcome of this election will determine whether the children or the grandchildren of the boys who today are on the beachheads of France and Italy, or in the South Pacific will be called upon to engage in another bloody world conflagration 25 years hence.

It is highly practical and necessary that the people of Indiana devote considerable study to the qualifications, experience, and past records of the officials upon whom they impose this solemn responsibility.

LEST WE FORGET

I believe it is proper on this day for us to briefly refresh our minds on a few of the accomplishments which are outstanding in the record of the Democratic Party during the past 11 years. On the 4th day of March 1933 a man of destiny became the President

of the United States. The greatest economic crisis in the history of the Nation had our people in its grasp on that fateful day. Every man who labors for a living will retain that date indelibly in his mind because over 13,000,000 of his brothers were walking the streets and highways of this country looking for work.

Every farmer in Indiana and in America should remember 1931 and 1932, because their farms were being foreclosed by the thousands; corn was 15 cents a bushel; wheat, cattle, and other products were at rock-bottom prices. Some farmers were traveling the highways in trucks with pitchforks and ropes, defying sheriffs and threatening to hang the judges of our courts. The life's savings of our people were being wiped out overnight, and both the large and small businessman was bankrupt and despondent.

How proud I was on that inauguration day to hear this man of destiny say that he realized the plight of the common man and was going to do something about it. How proud I was that he was a Democrat when he promised to banish the disciples of special privilege and plunder and drive the money changers from the temples—the money changers who, under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, had exploited the farmer, the laboring man and the small businessman of America for the special privilege of a few, and the oppression of the many. We all remember that fear clutched at the very heart and soul of this Nation. Communism and revolution were knocking at the door of America. It was at that hour that our Government was saved from communism and internal destruction by the Democratic Party under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

RECORD OF PROGRESS

Let us briefly review this great record of progress:

Through weak banking and security laws during the 1920's, unscrupulous promoters were robbing and plundering the American public. The Democratic Congress passed legislation, for the first time in our history, to protect and guarantee the savings of the public

The Securities and Exchange Commission was created to protect small stockholders against the bold and merciless Wall Street manipulator.

I will not take up the time of this convention by enumerating the numerous other progressive enactments similar to the home owners' loan, unemployment and old-age insurance, rural electrification, etc.

AGRICULTURE

The farmers of Indiana should not forget the total neglect of their interests during the long Republican years from 1921 to 1932. No other administration has done so much toward the economic strengthening of agriculture and particularly the small and medium sized farmer. The farmer should also reflect back to a former Democratic administration when Woodrow Wilson, against the bitter opposition of Republicans in Congress, passed the Federal Farm Loan Act. This act freed the farmer from the grasp of the financial buzzards and released him from paying a high interest and bonuses on mortgage renewals which in some instances went as high as 20 percent.

Our agricultural workers should not forget that under Republican rule from 1921 to 1932 annual farm income dropped from eleven billion to three billion. The farmers of America can thank the Democratic Party for the progressive farm legislation on the statute books today.

LABOR

For months Republican politicians and subsidized radio commentators have been trying to scare the voters—with the bugaboo of regimentation and communism. The greatest antidote against communism is employment, good wages, and security for the family. The Democratic Party has been the greatest barrier in America to protect us against the onslaught of communism.

Another red herring the Republican leaders are dragging over the political trail is the complaint that the labor organizations are organizing to inform their members what is going on in their Government. The real investigation should be centered on the stupendous slush fund which is now being gathered by the Republican leaders for this fall campaign.

Preliminary indications point to the fact that the Republican politicians, both State and National, will this year have a campaign slush fund which will make the money barrel of the Mark Hanna days and the millions Will Hays spent in 1920 look like chicken feed. The Democratic National Committee and the Democratic State committee must exert every effort when this campaign gets under way to prevent this reckless attempt to corrupt our electorate. These forces are trying to drive a wedge of political hatred and bitterness between organized labor and the farmers of America. The progress and welfare of the American farmer and the American consumer is interdependent. Prosperity for one means prosperity for the other.

The Wagner Act, which is labor's first bill of rights, was passed by this Democratic administration to protect our workers, and this legislation, more than anything else, has made America the industrial giant of the world. The Smith-Connally antilabor bill, which was enacted last year, has been responsible for most of the industrial unrest which we have experienced in the last 6 months. Man-hours lost by strikes since Pearl Harbor have been less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total man hours. There is an element in our Congress which continually asks for legislation which would shackle the progress of American labor and rob it of its gains. It is indeed unfortunate that the great majority of Republican Representatives in the House and Senate have been giving their support and vote to this group. This same group combined their votes against the legislation which would have given our soldiers overseas an opportunity to cast a Federal ballot in the coming election. Since Pearl Harbor, the accomplishments of American industry and labor have been nothing short of a miracle.

INDIANA DEMOCRATIC LEADERS

Hoosier voters this fall should call to mind the deeds of some of our great Indiana statesmen like Marshall, Ralston, and Vay Nuys of former years, McNutt, Townsend, Minton, Schricker, and Sam Jackson of today. It is leaders of this type that Indiana and the Nation needs in this dark hour and crisis. People of Indiana must realize it is not only their solemn duty to inform themselves as to State issues and elect an outstanding Governor and State ticket but also to send to Washington a Congress which will uphold the hand of our Commander in Chief to bring about a rapid victory and a permanent peace. Our Governor especially should be complimented for the foresight and sound judgment he exercised in replacing our esteemed and beloved late Senator Van Nuys with an outstanding Democrat and statesman of the caliber of SAM JACKSON.

Our State has been fortunate in having as its Governor during these trying times a leader and statesman of outstanding quality whose common sense, good judgment, and a spirit of justice have made him beloved by all. Indiana can ill afford to lose the services of this brilliant, honest, and sincere public official, and I have no hesitancy in predicting that this convention will nominate him, and this fall the voters of Indiana will send Henry Schricker to the United States Senate.

Americans everywhere must guard against overconfidence and against becoming victims of well-organized propaganda which will destroy our unity. Selfish and misguided influences are at work not only in Washington but throughout the country in an effort to divide our people by arousing political bitterness, religious prejudices, and economic turmoil.

INDIANA REPUBLICAN LEADERS

The people of Indiana, regardless of party, were shocked and humiliated when they read the news items exposing the manipulations of Republican leaders who secured control of the party 2 weeks ago. Cherishing as we have since the days of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson the two-party system for selecting our public officials through democratic processes, we deeply deplore the rape of the Republican Party committed at the recent State convention by sinister individuals.

We, in common with all citizens who take pride in the traditions and accomplishments of our great State, condemn as an affront to good government the reversion to Ku Klux Klan tactics employed by the so-called leaders of the Republican Party, who seek, by resurrecting bigotry and intolerance, to rise to positions of power in our national and State government. We had hoped that those methods which once bred scandal after scandal and which had been overwhelming and repeatedly repudiated by the people, had been buried forever.

We have heard with growing alarm and concern for the future of our democratic institutions the charge made by our Republican brethren that an unconscionable amount of money was used before and during the Republican State convention in the interest of the nominee for United States Senator. We look upon the office of Senator of the United States as one that should and must be free of taint and suspicion and hope that the great State of Indiana need not face the prospect of again bowing its head in shame because men selected for high places had followed false ideologies.

HOME FRONT

Ninety percent of the trouble, grief, and criticism which our President has endured on the home front war program has been caused by his desire to carry out his promise that there will be no war profiteers or blood millionaires created by World War No. 2. His policy of price control has kept down the cost of living and has saved us from runaway inflation. Two years ago, over 60 new Republican Congressmen were elected, largely through their party's program of creating bitterness and dissatisfaction against rationing and price-control regulations. The Bureau of Labor Statistics recently released the following information: "Between March 1943 and March 1944, the cost of living index increased less than 1 percent." This week when the price-control legislation was up in Congress for renewal, a number of Republican Members who last year fought this necessary war measure, reversed themselves and voted for price control. Could it be that victories at special elections and primaries are convincing them that the President was right?

Uncontrolled inflation would be almost as disastrous as the losing of the war. When the history of this war is written, the American people will know that the stupendous task of home front planning was as important as the military strategy on the field of battle. Thirteen million soldiers, sailors, and marines on the battle fronts of the world require food, clothing, weapons, ammunition, medicine, doctors, nurses, shelter, and a hundred other essentials. Thousands of ships, planes, tanks, trucks, and so forth have been built and sent in all directions. Millions of gallons of gas and oil have been shipped to operate this equipment. We have accomplished more in 2½ years than the Japs have in 35 years and the Nazis in 15 years.

Somebody had to ration; somebody had to curtail; somebody had to sacrifice; somebody had to regulate prices; somebody had to prevent inflation; somebody had to regiment; somebody had to take the selfish criticism of partisan newspapers and subsidized radio commentators. America and the world today can thank God that the Commander of the Ship of State during our darkest and most critical hour has been Franklin D. Roosevelt.

MEN OF DESTINY

Destiny has always provided America with great leaders at the time of its greatest need. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson were given to the American people by divine providence to save and perpetuate this great free Government. In 1933 our President guided and lifted us from our greatest economic depression. In 1937, he warned our country against the coming onslaught of the tyrants and dictators. History will record that his foresight and preparation saved the world from slavery.

On that Sabbath morning, December 7, 1941, when the radio waves carried the news of the Jap's violent and malicious attack, we were unprepared for war both from a military and naval standpoint. Immediately, political differences disappeared and we became united overnight.

SMALL NATIONS

A number of opposition newspapers and politicians are now endeavoring to create political capital and disunity by agitating at this time the future internal problems of the smaller countries of Europe. These same obstructionists contended up until the very hour of Pearl Harbor that America could not be attacked. Twenty-four years ago our present Commander in Chief was working side by side with Woodrow Wilson to effect the same principles as were later outlined in the Atlantic Charter. After victory, America will guarantee justice to smaller nations. Agitators are more interested in winning an election than winning the war.

FUTURE PEACE

General Arnold has said that no country on the globe is farther away than 60 hours by airplane. Sixteen years ago it took 33 hours to cross the Atlantic. Today, bombers fly in one-fourth of that time. Twenty-five years from now we will fly to Europe in 4 or 5 hours. Today, words spoken into a microphone can circle the earth in a fraction of a second. This fact should bring to our attention that we are no longer an isolated nation. These great accomplishments of modern invention and science should serve notice upon the people of the world that another war would destroy civilization.

There are empty chairs in millions of homes throughout the country today which were vacated by boys whose fathers 27 years ago went forth to defeat the aggressor and preserve world freedom. In 1919 these heroes returned, proud of the great victory which they had won. Their slogan was "We have won a war which will end all future wars." In 1919 they did not realize that bitter partisan politics would lose the peace and that their sons would be on another world battlefield a generation hence.

The great majority of Americans 25 years ago advocated and supported Woodrow Wilson in his program to preserve the future peace. Let us today recall the warning he gave America in 1919 in his last speech at Pueblo, Colo., the night before he was stricken with his fatal illness. He said: "I am representing the infants in the cradles of today, that they not be called upon to fight a world war 25 years hence. I would rather lose in fighting a cause that some day will succeed than win in a fight for an unjust cause which will some day terminate in failure."

I could go on indefinitely with statements from great Americans who were at that time fighting side by side with President Wilson. Among them were former President William Howard Taft; former Secretary of State, Elihu Root; Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University; former Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, and our present Commander in Chief, who was then Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Had the United States Senate cooperated with Woodrow Wilson 24 years ago and joined with other countries in a League of Nations, the league would have succeeded and been forceful and Hitler and the Japs could never built their gigantic war machine. This great international forward step was sabotaged by partisan politics under the leadership of the Republican bosses in the United States Senate of that day. These Republican bosses were more interested in defeating Woodrow Wilson and the Democratic Party and placing Warren G. Harding in the Presidential chair than they were in the welfare of humanity and the future peace of the world. Had Senators Lodge, Watson, Penrose and other Republican bosses cooperated with our war president, on a world peace program, we would not have had a Dunkerque, Stalingrad or a Pearl Harbor.

Every American should read the book As I Knew Them, written by Senator James E. Watson in 1935, where he tells in detail the regrettable tactics and strategy used by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Republican Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to defeat the League of Nations program 24 years ago.

The Republican platform in 1920 contained a plank advocating international cooperation with other nations to preserve the future peace of the world. When Harding assumed office, this plank was thrown out of the window. In fact, Senator Borah, in an interview the day after Harding's election, said: "This ends the League of Nations." I am today refreshing the minds of the delegates to this convention and the voters of Indiana, that the Republican Party cannot be trusted on international affairs, and any peace plank they adopt in their 1944 platform will meet the same sad fate as the peace plank met in their 1920 platform.

I believe the greatest single accomplishment of the Seventy-eighth Congress was the passing of the resolution which called for an international organization setting up machinery to assure future and permanent peace to mankind. When this resolution passed in Congress, notice was given to the nations of the world that America will, in the future, cooperate at the table of arbitration to settle international disputes and outlaw war. If this great forward step can be accomplished World War No. 2 will not have been fought in vain.

POST-WAR

While this, to my mind, will be our greatest peacetime goal, it by no means is the only problem which will confront the American people when the boys return home. We must not allow ourselves to be as unprepared for peace as we were unprepared for war. After victory, we must demobilize the greatest armed forces ever assembled in the history of America; we must reconvert to peacetime production the largest industrial set-up ever constructed in our history; we must find jobs for millions of dislocated men and women—our Government, organized labor, and private industry must cooperate in the performance of this task.

The returning soldiers must not be compelled to sell apples on the streets as they did in the 1920's, or take part in bonus marches to Washington as they did in the ill-fated Hoover regime. We must provide for the stabilization of the greatest debt in the history of our Nation; we must take care of and rehabilitate those who are injured and incapacitated in this war and for their dependents; we must provide for greater security from fear and want among the aged and the unemployed; we must aid in the speedy reconversion of our industrial structure from war to peace; we must cooperate with other nations in the reestablishment of international trade and credit so as to provide an outlet for our goods to the nations of the world. America needs everybody to aid in these tasks.

SPIRITUAL AID

We have found that progress in science, the wisdom and foresight of statesmen, and the mastery of military art has failed to keep the world from hatred and war. As a result we have reaped the whirlwind and now stand in the midst of a ruthless conflagration that is searing the souls of men and consuming their very lives. The world has placed too much confidence in its civic leaders and statesmen to protect it from struggle, strife, and war. In the future we must have the active cooperation and guidance of our Christian and spiritual teachers to help inculcate in the hearts of men and governments the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Expediency and temporary advantage must disappear from the plans of statesmen, and a new international relationship will have to come into being, based upon the broad concepts of humanity and justice.

This will be a different and difficult task, to control a world surcharged with hatreds.

With the callous cruelties of the aggressor still fresh in the minds of the victims—the determination of the victims to reap vengeance—the priests, ministers, rabbis and teachers of all faiths will have to hold out the hands of guidance and lead the people back to the ways of peace.

Hatreds born on the battlefield where men violently kill each other will not be washed away by the simple declaration of peace. The souls of men that have been tried and seared will have to be healed, and in the post-war world America will need its churches to help do the healing.

We pray that when these marching men return to their homes, we will be equal to the task of helping them again to respect and love their fellowmen. We must teach them to cooperate rather than compete. It will be our duty to convince those who have survived the destructive institutions of war, that there are greater glories than international combat and that the creations of science were intended for a society of men in which each can live ethically, morally, and at peace with each other. International understanding and tolerance must be the corner stones upon which the post-war world will be rebuilt for progress, security, and permanent peace.

What Shall We Do About Oil?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a very interesting address entitled "What Shall We Do About Oil?"

delivered by Judge J. C. Hunter, of Abilene, Tex.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Texas is in the oil business in a big way. Information developed by the Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association discloses that 174 counties of the State are now producing oil or gas, and leasing and development are being carried on in the remaining 80 About 50,000,000 acres, or approximately 28 percent of the area of the State, are now under lease. We have approximately 100,000 oil wells from which nearly 600,000,000 barrels were produced last year and from which our daily production is now more than 2,000,000 barrels, about 44 percent of the Nation's daily 4,400,000 barrels. Since Colonel Drake first discovered oil at Titusville, Pa., in 1859, about 28,000,000,000 barrels have been produced in the United States. Texas has produced more than 8,000,000,000. We have more than half of the Nation's proved reserves. The 1943 expenditure of the Texas industry was well over $1,000,000,000. The oil industry pays about 53 percent of all State business and property taxes. In 1943 it paid 23⅓ percent of the total cost of operating the State's public school system. Texas refineries process about 85 percent of the total quantity of oil produced in the State. The industry is a very large employer of labor at high wages.

Naturally we are concerned about the immediate and long-range future of oil. We want to continue actively to search for, discover, develop, produce, and refine it; and in the process, we want the industry to be economically strong and healthy so that it can perform adequate and efficient service. We want to produce oil and gas without waste and use them beneficially and wisely. We want to know what Government is going to do for and to the oil industry. We do not want Federal control—we want our conservation program and production regulations to be permanently under State jurisdiction and direction. We want the present limitations and restrictions which have been imposed upon the States and their regulatory agencies by the Federal Government, due to war necessities, relaxed, released, and returned to the States just as rapidly as war conditions will permit. We want the Federal Government, since, necessarily, it has assumed broad jurisdiction over all industry during wartime, to see to it that the oil industry is given the opportunity now to receive an adequate price for oil and its products, and require price-fixing agencies to give due consideration to the cost of finding, developing, producing, and conserving oil, including the replacement cost thereof, in order that the industry can render its full measure of public service in the war, and also in the peace to follow.

The Army and Navy are concerned about oil. The industry has and will continue to make available all petroleum products necessary to win this war. The military authorities do not doubt this. Apparently, however, they, and other high officials of Government, have become a little jittery about oil if we should have another war in 20 or 30 years. They have created the giant Government-owned Petroleum Reserves Corporation, with powers as broad and extensive as our western prairies, and announced that they propose to spend $150,000,000 to build, own, and control operation of a twelve-hundred-mile pipe line from Arabia to the Mediterranean Sea. Time does not permit detailed discussion of that project, nor opportunity to point out how it would put our Government directly into the oil business in competition with American citizens as well as friendly and presently allied nations. No to show how it would more likely be a stimulating cause of another war rather than serve as a safeguard to us if one should occur.

Some high officials have suggested that the Government condemn and buy many of our great producing oil fields, such as east Texas and many others, with the purpose of closing them in and hoarding the oil against the eventuality of another war. Secretary Ickes made a public statement not long ago in which he suggested that the Government buy and buy, store and store oil, in order that we might be prepared for any future war. He also stressed the oil policy of some foreign nations who have become participating partners of oil companies, and suggested that such a policy might be desirable for this country.

A very realistic and practical response to that suggestion is that while other countries had that policy they did not produce the oil, but the United States, through the skill and effective action of private enterprise, with a minimum of Government interference, is furnishing the oil to save the freedom of the world from demoniacal Axis destruction.

Congress is concerned about oil, and the United States Senate has created a special committee to explore the whole subject and formulate a Government policy on oil, both foreign and domestic.

The people generally are concerned and confused. They are inconvenienced and burdened by ration restrictions on gasoline and heating oil. They get many conflicting stories through the press and over the radio. They are probably wondering whether the United States is about to run out of oil or whether we have an abundance.

It is timely for all of us to ask: "What shall we do about oil?" It is not possible to formulate a sound answer to that question without knowing something about the industry's history and past experiences, and where it actually stands today. It is not my purpose to present a technical discussion but to state as simply as possible the course of action that is indicated by the trials and errors, and experiences of the past.

Let us begin with Colonel Drake when oil was first discovered by him 85 years ago. In the light of present-day knowledge it is obvious that he did not really know what he had discovered. He did not know that oil could be used in the multitude of ways that later experience has demonstrated. He did not know how it had been created; why nor how it was accumulated at that particular place; what were its characteristics and behavior in its underground prison; why it would flow through the pores of the sandstone into his well. He could not visualize any manner in which it could be wasted until after it had been lifted to the surface.

In that day the mind of man did not conceive of the natural accumulation of any liquid except at the lowest level of basin-like containers, comparable to pools of water on the ground. Of course, it is now known that oil is usually accumulated under great pressure in upside down containers, commonly designated as geological structures, or traps.

Colonel Drake was not concerned about these matters. Nor conservation, nor a possible shortage of oil. His problem was to find a profitable market for a new substance. In the early days "rock oil," or petroleum, was used for medicinal purposes. It was soon discovered that crude oil could be distilled and would thereby produce what was called kerosene, which was superior to whale oil, for illuminating purposes. This afforded a market and brought on the kerosene period of the petroleum industry which lasted well beyond the turn of the twentieth century.

In the years from 1910 until the early 20's the industry was in what we would now consider its fuel-oil period.

During the First World War, the amount of gasoline consumed for military purposes was relatively small, for the automobile and airplane were in their infancy at that time. Yet it has been said that even in that great conflict the allies "floated to victory on a sea of oil," produced, incidentally, largely by the United States.

The gasoline period of the industry followed quickly after the war in response to the rapid development of the automobile. Serious concern develeoped about whether we were about to run out of oil. At that time the industry's known reserves were only about one-third of what they are today. President Coolidge appointed a commission to study the problem and make recommendations on what should be done.

Looking back, we can well appreciate why Government officials and the industry, as well as the public, should have been worried and asking, "What shall we do about oil?"

Fortunately the industry found a solution and found it very quickly. Stimulated by a favorable price, they inaugurated a campaign of bold and aggressive wildcat drilling in search of oil, employing all the known techniques. This resulted in discovering oil in large quantities within a very short time. It was not long before we were talking not of shortages—but of a surplus of oil. Large reserves of oil were discovered in Oklahoma, followed by the Yates and Winkler fields in west Texas. The market could not absorb all of the oil that could be produced under the open-flow method that had always prevailed. In desperation the industry, to solve the problem, entered into voluntary agreements to limit the amount of their daily production. This met with only limited success because many producers would not cooperate.

To further complicate the situation, Dad Joiner made his famed discovery in east Texas. As the magnitude of that giant field was disclosed the lid blew off in earnest and the entire industry was plunged into chaos. Supply was so much greater than market demand that the price of oil dropped to disastrous levels and waste of oil was prevalent, both above and below ground.

That was a time to really ask, "What shall we do about oil?" Both industry and Government concentrated on the solution of the problem. We went through the hectic period of martial law in east Texas and Oklahoma, coupled with a measure of Federal regulation. Out of it all there slowly evolved a program of conservation and waste prevention, both physical and economic. There developed a public consciousness that oil and gas are irreplaceable natural resources and must be produced without avoidable waste.

The process was slow and difficult. Laws were enacted in Texas and other oil States invoking the police power to prevent waste to protect the general welfare. Engineers and experienced production men contributed their knowledge concerning behavior of oil underground. Production was limited to prevent physical waste and in the light of later experience it was limited to conform with market demand. Oil fields became great laboratories and the petroleum engineers, aided by the conservation authorities of the States, have developed an amazing amount of scientific information and regulations which have effected a high degree of waste prevention, and at the same time demonstrated that good conservation is also sound economics. The State Governors and legislatures have made the program possible through their leadership and action in the enactment of essential legislation. The courts have sustained the laws and regulations.

The Federal Government has helped by the passage of the Connally hot oil law and approval of the interstate oil compact which the States created as a necessary fact-finding, educational, and coordinating agency. It has also benefited the movement through the activities of the Bureau of Mines. This era

might be referred to as the period of conservation and waste-prevention development.

The petroleum industry has made tremendous strides not only in the production of oil but also in the technology of how to use it. Twenty years ago very little was known about the quality of the products made from a barrel of crude oil, and the equipment was such that we were forced to take certain amounts of different products and try to find a market for them. Research engineers have not only learned a great deal about petroleum but they have put it to practical use in manufacturing better products and designing equipment which permits us to obtain more of the products we want and less of others not so important.

Technological progress has been so rapid in the industry that it is making products today in large quantities that only a short time ago were at the laboratory stage. Outstanding among these products are synthetic rubber, toluene, and 100-octane gasoline. Toluene has been produced in tremendous quantities by the petroleum industry for the bombs now being dropped on Europe and in the Pacific. It is the final "T" in TNT.

Probably the most important of these products is 100-octane gasoline which gives our planes that decisive margin of superiority over those of the Axis. This powerful gasoline provides quicker take-off, greater speed, longer distance, and improved maneuverability. Our production, now 400,000 barrels of 100-octane gasoline daily, is nearly 10 times the volume at the time of Pearl Harbor. The lack of 100-octane gasoline is probably one of the major handicaps of the Axis air force.

Technology is the great multiplier of our petroleum resources. The petroleum industry will probably continue indefinitely in the period of multiple products.

The dramatic story of the industry's achievements and contribution during the present war can hardly be appreciated by one who is not well acquainted with the record. We have changed our transportation system of oil to the Atlantic seaboard from a movement of ocean-going tankers to an overland movement by rail and two recently constructed big transcontinental pipe lines, as well as numerous other pipe-line construction. We have supplied the military forces with all their petroleum requirements, including 100-octane gasoline, toluene, and other critical products. We have supplied the railroads with their greatly augmented fuel-oil requirements. We have increased our daily production of crude oil 900,000, bringing it up to an all-time high of 4,400,000 barrels per day. We have carried on an active wildcat drilling, development, and production program under the handicap of shortage of manpower and materials, coupled with an abnormally low price ceiling imposed by the Government.

The great increase that has occurred in the cost of exploration, development, production, conservation, and replacement of oil has not been given adequate consideration by the Government in refusing to approve the Petroleum Administrator's request for a general advance in the price of petroleum and its products. As a result, thousands of small stripper wells face abandonment with the loss of their underlying reserves.

If the oil industry is to do an adequate and satisfactory job in searching for new fields, developing proven acreage, and preserving stripper-well reserves, it is imperative that the Government, through Congress and the administrative agencies, face this issue squarely and take immediate appropriate action to solve it through adequate price increase.

There is much confusion in the public mind about the extent of our petroleum resources. Undue emphasis has been placed upon the 20,000,000,000 barrels commonly referred to as our proven reserves. This takes no account of the natural gas of the country which can be converted into liquid fuel at slightly higher cost than gasoline from crude oil; it disregards the billions of barrels of crude oil that can be produced by secondary recovery methods, and it does not give recognition to the millions of acres of highly potential oil lands that have never been tested.

The truth of the matter is that we are nowhere near running out of oil, and but for the inordinate demands of war, we would today have a surplus of producing capacity that would have to be restricted in order to prevent physical waste and to conserve the supplies for the time when they would be needed. There are those who believe that this country should begin to hoard its oil, either in underground reservoirs or in storage tanks above ground. They question the ability of the country to meet its oil problems for the future and have a mistaken belief that we can protect the security of the Nation by freezing the situation we have today in terms of oil resources. This has never been the way to solve the problems of the petroleum or any other industry. We live in a dynamic and constantly changing world, and we only learn to deal with its problems by allowing them to allow them to develop in their normal and natural course. We are not in danger of running out of oil overnight. We are certain that we have supplies for many years to come, and that in the interval we will find more supplies, and if given opportunity, we will develop new techniques that will provide additional supplies from other sources.

The fortunate position we have occupied with regard to oil in this war was not achieved by attempting to build up a reserve for national security. It was achieved, instead, by allowing a free and dynamic industry to build its markets and to find the resources to supply its customers.

In the very process of using oil in ever larger quantities, we have discovered better methods of finding it and of supplying consumers with better products at lower prices. We cannot hope to solve the problems of the future by stopping progress and development as of this, or any other date. We can find the answer only if we go on in our normal evolutionary course of development as we have throughout the entire history of the oil industry. If we do follow the experience of the past and permit the industry to work out its own problems, we need have no fear of running out of liquid fuel.

Our country is particularly dependent upon oil for its way of life. We have by far the greatest proportion of the automobiles in the world, and we use 30 times as much oil per capita as the remainder of the world. This oil is a tremendous source of energy that carried us around the country in automobiles and railroads, and that drives thousands of machines in power plants and factories. It does work for us that could not be done if the rest of the world's population were our slaves, and it does that work very cheaply. The public has reason, therefore, to be tremendously interested in an abundant supply of petroleum as cheaply as possible and in the advantageous use of those supplies without waste. In this the industry and the public are in complete accord. Our task is to utilize petroleum efficiently to maintain and improve the standard of living with which it is so intimately related.

We have had an abundance of oil, not because this country was blessed with greater resources by nature than others, but because of the inherent initiative of the people and the freedom to carry on their business as they chose. Foreign countries are known to have larger potential reserves of oil, but due to government restrictions and other handicaps, they have not developed their resources to the same extent that we have. We were first to learn how to find oil efficiently and use it effectively, and Americans carried that knowledge to the far corners of the globe. As their resources are developed, they, too, may gain the benefits of this black gold that provides such tremendous amounts of energy at low cost. They will need the major part of their own resources, if they are to develop progressive economy and better standards of living.

In part, some of their reserves may be available to us, if needed, but we cannot depend on foreign reserves as a safeguard in time of war. Unless we can insure access to reserves by military control, ownership will be of no benefit whatever. If the United States Government, instead of American companies, had owned the oil resources in the Dutch East Indies and Saudi Arabia, those resources would not have been any more accessible today.

The way to insure sufficient oil for this country is to allow the industry to find its own methods of meeting the large normal civilian demands. In the very processes of carrying on its normal business, the industry will automatically insure sufficient oil for military purposes, even if there should be another war. The technologists already know methods for making liquid fuels from other products than petroleum. They know how to make gasoline out of natural gas and out of oil shales and coal that are found in such abundance in this country. At the present time, the cost of making substitutes is such that they are not competitive with gasoline from petroleum, but they are not so much higher that consumers would find it impossible to pay the additional cost. It is reported that synthetic gasoline could be made for 5 to 15 cents more per gallon than the present cost from petroleum. Such increases in prices would not be prohibitive, particularly if taxes on gasoline were eliminated. Furthermore, the constant improvements being made in these processes may in time reduce the cost to the point where it is actually competitive with gasoline from petroleum. We know also that we can make liquid fuel from agricultural products, at higher cost, and could fall back on this source permanently if cheaper sources run out.

In concluding this discussion of, What shall we do about oil? it seems apparent from the experience of the past that we should continue to depend upon developments of a free and competitive industry. We have passed through many successive stages, and the industry has always found an effective solution to its problems with the assistance of the States and the support of the Federal Government. In the process, a rather unique system of cooperation and teamwork has been developed to prevent waste and promote conservation and must be continued; and, indeed, it should be expanded so that new producing States will improve their conservation laws and practices and join the ranks of those already providing for effective utilization of our oil resources.

It is apparent that the solution of our oil problem requires constructive action on the part of the industry, the States, the Federal Government, and the public. The role that each of these should undertake can be summarized briefly as follows:

The industry must do the following: (1) explore for and discover new fields and develop them in an orderly fashion, so that the public will be assured of an ample supply at reasonable prices, (2) produce oil efficiently and without preventable waste, and (3) improve technology to secure more valuable and better products from crude oil and to manufacture low-cost synthetic substitutes as the need for them arises.

The States must contribute to the industry's efforts in the following manner: (1) Adopt adequate conservation laws and provide for effective administration, (2) protect private property rights correlatively, so that orderly development of all properties will be possible, (3) regulate production to market demand, in order to avoid economic as well

as physical waste, and (4) maintain a sound and fair level of taxation upon the industry.

The Federal Government should support the program of the industry and the States by the following methods: (1) Establishing a firm policy that the Government will not enter into the oil business competitively with private industry, directly or indirectly, at home or abroad; that it will safeguard our domestic industry against undue encroachment by foreign oil, and that it will give strong diplomatic support to the end that our nationals shall have the assurance of operating in the petroleum industry abroad on equal basis with the nationals of other countries; (2) relax wartime restrictions as promptly as possible, and remove them entirely when the war ends so that the States will again have full jurisdiction over conservation and production regulations, and normal economic forces will again control the operations of the industry; (3) support and encourage conservation on the part of the States through such measures as the Connally Act and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission; (4) provide for an adequate price for petroleum and its products during the war emergency; and (5) maintain a sound and fair program of taxation upon the industry.

The public also has a vital role in bringing about sound oil policies. In this connection the most important measures are: (1) The creation of public opinion in support of sound policies of conservation and development; (2) the development of an appreciation of actual conditions in the industry and knowledge to determine what is sound policy; and (3) the realization that we are not going to run out of oil overnight and that ample supplies of motor fuels will be assured by one method or another, if private enterprise is allowed to continue its normal development and technological progress.

The public must realize that our oil resources do have some limit, however large, and that the time will come when new substitutes must be developed. The transition can be facilitated to the point where the consumer will hardly notice it, if public opinion is exerted in support of having industry find the solution to our problems as they arise. We do not need Government participation nor control in development of domestic or foreign oil reserves; and, in fact, such participation would prove, in the light of experience, to be a hindrance to discovery and development of additional oil. Government does have a proper function in domestic oil operations, but that function is to promote conservation and encourage development, rather than to enter into the business itself. The solution to our problem is right here at home and will be found in following the same policies that have placed this country in the fortunate position of being able to supply the oil; one of the major elements contributing to the victory of the United Nations.

Address of Hon. Winifred C. Stanley, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. WINIFRED C. STANLEY at the New York State Conference of Mayors and the New York State Federation of Official Planning Boards, held in Syracuse, N. Y., on June 8, 1944:

The distinguished men and women who are participating in this conference are leaders in the complicated economy of our great Empire State, leaders whose policies and plans may well decide the future prosperity of New York. My pleasure in accepting the honor of addressing you today is accordingly accentuated by knowledge of the valuable service you are rendering in the interest of post-war planning. You are to be commended especially for the coordination and dispatch with which you are proceeding. The agenda of this conference presents a strikingly comprehensive program on the subject of planning for the period following cessation of hostilities. It is interesting to note that in addition to city planning there are included discussions on the vital subjects of post-war transportation, water routes and harbors, superhighways, air travel and airport development, municipal cooperation, and housing.

In Washington so many post-war plans have been submitted that we are reminded, a trifle ruefully, of the cartoon depicting a woman telling her friends of her chagrin because her husband is the only man at the dinner party who doesn't have a post-war plan to discuss. Many governmental agencies are working on the problem. Several congressional committees are also working on the problem. Since it seems sensible that creation of a single committee would economize on the time and effort both of Members of Congress and witnesses, your Representative at Large has introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of one joint bipartisan committee to plan post-war economy.

It is particularly appropriate that this conference should be held in the city of Syracuse, in which has been organized the widely publicized Syracuse plan. The citizens of this typical American city have wisely decided to replan their community so that it will be one of the most livable, functional cities in our vast Nation. It was only natural that Syracuse, established in 1825 as a village, would, in the course of time, and because of the tremendous increase in population to a new high of more than 200,000, outgrow itself. Residents of Syracuse are determined to do something about the overcrowding, the blighted areas, and the fiscal headache of tax delinquencies. When the plan is perfected, as without question it will be, the high economic potential of Syracuse will be utilized for post-war employment and city planning. Probably the most encouraging phase is the enthusiasm with which the general public is participating in the project. Members of the Syracuse-Onondaga Post-war Planning Council have displayed vision and foresight in fostering this enthusiasm.

When I think of Syracuse, Schenectady, Utica, New York, and all the other cities of our State, including, of course, my beloved home city of Buffalo, in which our distinguished chairman, Mr. Bertram Tallamy, and other members of the Niagara-Frontier Planning Board, are doing such effective work, I feel great faith in the future of our State.

You are more keenly aware than any other group that one of the most pertinent questions before this country—in fact, next to winning the war, probably the most important question, is the problem of post-war economy. It is a problem intimately associated with the winning of the peace. Able minds are concerned with the broad principles of this economy as it has to do with the world outside our shores. They are discussing our relations with foreign countries, the planning of world trade, and other related subjects. This question in its entirety is as complex as the world itself. It is obvious that all this activity designed to improve the condition of the world in which we live is admirable. Of necessity, however, there must be a logical approach to this tremendous problem.

As practical men and women, your activities and achievements as members of the New York State Federation of Official Planning Boards and the conference of mayors represent the most realistic approach yet made to the whole situation. There isn't any better place to initiate an answer to the question of world betterment than right here in our own realm of effort. To phrase the idea in a homely way, the first step in the plan for a program of world improvement is to give our own backyard some much-needed attention. To phrase it in another way, "post-war plans begin on Main Street."

It is encouraging to note, in the well-written pamphlet issued by the State Division of Housing, Governor Thomas E. Dewey's statement that "planning for peace is an important wartime job." That seems to be the theme of this entire conference. The Governor goes on to say: "We can set new and higher living standards for the people of this State through the building of large and small scale housing developments by private enterprise supplemented by State aided projects for families of lower income. To do the job well, we must enlist the full energies of both private and public endeavor.

"It rests with every community to foster collaboration now for post-war civic reorganization and to build an even better State in which to live."

We pride ourselves as New Yorkers upon our leadership in the vanguard of progress. Our huge State with its population of 13,500,000 people represents one-tenth of the Nation. In the matter of post-war planning, you who represent us in this vital field are making it possible for New York to live up to her reputation as a leader. Our State cash surplus of $163,000,000, earmarked for rehabilitation and reemployment purposes, as well as your effective, practicable ideas, and those of the New York State Post-war Planning Commission created by our brilliant Governor are the most tangible, concrete examples of planning recorded thus far. Certainly coordination and cooperation between municipalities, agencies, and State government are the most effective means by which to implement the need for a smoothly-functioning post-war economy. This conference is an indication that New York State officials and executives recognize this fact.

Another quality which will be of invaluable assistance in coping with this subject of post-war economy is a sense of perspective. Rather difficult to illustrate, it is reminiscent of the anecdote set forth in Reader's Digest, wherein a woman is riding on the Fifth Avenue bus in the teeming metropolis of New York, scanning a map of Manchuria. A fellow traveler, under the influence of some strong beverage, takes a seat next to her, observes the map, gazes upon Fifth Avenue, and inquires in patent confusion, "Are you sure you're on the right bus, lady?" The New York State representatives here assembled are not only "on the right bus," but are forging forthrightly ahead in the interests of community and State improvement.

Turning to the national picture, we find that many of the subjects in which you are interested are now before congressional committees in the form of proposed legislation. For instance, several bills dealing with aviation have been introduced. We have studied not only the bills but the letters expressing opinions on them as well. Some who write to us share an Utopian view of what has variously been called "Tomorrow's World," "a brave new world," etc. They seem to believe, quite naively, that immediately upon the cessation of hostilities, we will step into this new era, with the ease displayed by the fabulous Alice in Wonderland, as she stepped through the looking glass. The hard work which all of us must continue to do is forgotten. This is especially true in reference

to the helicopter. One of Washington's many ingenious, intelligent newspaper women, recently spun a hypothetical yarn about a woman living in Florida, who uses a helicopter for little shopping jaunts. To the writer's amazement, people began telephoning to ask where such a little helicopter might be purchased.

Seriously, however, on the subjects of aviation, housing, transportation by rail, highway, or water route, we who represent you in Congress welcome the opinions and comments of the members of an audience such as this, composed of experts on these matters.

Presently Congress faces many grave problems. The House conferees have agreed to accept the Senate's decision to increase the debt limit to $260,000,000,000 from the present ceiling of $210,000,000,000. This brings to mind the weighty problem of taxation. There seem to be two critical questions involved. Do we possess the determination and good judgment to stop continued deficits after the war? To do so will be difficult. But unless we follow this course, it seems an impossible task to keep our currency sound. Next, what will fe do about carrying the debt? At present rates, interest on the debt might amount to $6,000,000,000 a year. It seems to many of us that every new proposal for Government spending must be scrutinized with an eagle eye.

Then there is the vital subject of government by law, as opposed to government by men. That is an issue which constantly engages our attention. In a recently decided case involving an appeal by the Motor Freight Carriers, Inc. (representing about 200 truck-operating companies in New England) the United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, has ruled that orders of the War Labor Board are not subject to judicial review. It is the considered opinion of many men and women that there should be access to the courts for redress of grievances such as those expressed by the Montgomery Ward Co. and the Motor Freight Carriers. It is the conviction of many of us that despite the emergency which necessarily entails the delegation of many important powers, due process should not be suspended as to orders of the War Labor Board and other executive agencies. It was Charles Evans Hughes who said during the First World War: "While we are at war, we are not in revolution. We are making war as a nation, organized under the Constitution. The Constitution is as effective today as it ever was and the oath to support it just as binding."

And in one of the most famous Supreme Court cases in history, the Milligan case, this doctrine was set forth by the learned Associate Justice Davis:

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people equally in war and in peace; and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented * * * than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine would lead directly to anarchy or despotism."

Many are asking the question: What will the pattern of our future economy be? Whether we call it capitalism or free enterprise, there seems to be an increasing trend among the American people expressing the desire to return to that typically American system which rewards individual efforts and free competition. Business men and women in this country do not want any planned economy, which would preclude opportunity to choose one's occupation or career, to begin a new venture, to develop new inventions and products. The pioneer spirit which made this country the greatest in the world still exists, stronger than ever. Americans are used to the right to invest their money in a business, and they are ready and willing to run the risks involved. They don't seek a sure thing. They do ask the right to make a choice and take a chance, according to their good judgment. Every survey shows that the wish of the majority is for relaxation of Federal control. If we expend as much time and effort on the problem of encouraging private enterprise and reconversion to peacetime economy as we have in building up our gigantic war production, we need never return to the excessive Federal control employed during the emergency times through which we are passing.

Nevertheless, we must have cooperation between the Federal and State governments in the difficult adjustment period. There is no quarrel as to this need. But there is a definite feeling that the emphasis of recent years has swung too heavily to the side of Federal control. Better coordination and understanding between Federal and State governments are undoubtedly the answer.

An example of conflict over State and Federal control arises in the Supreme Court ruling on June 5, 1944, holding that insurance is in interstate commerce and, therefore, should be under the regulatory powers of the Federal Government. There has already been approved by the House Judiciary Committee a bill which would continue State control. The Supreme Court's decision concerns antitrust proceedings against 196 stock fire insurance companies operating in 6 Southeastern States. The majority opinion states that to say insurance is not commerce would be to set it apart from all other business in the Nation. On the other hand, Chief Justice Stone, in the minority opinion, has expressed the belief that the immediate effect of the decision is to withdraw from the States the regulation of insurance, and to confer it on the National Government, which has adopted no legislative policy and which has evolved no scheme of regulation with respect to insurance.

Thousands of letters addressed to Members of Congress deal with the desire of all Americans for a "just and lasting peace." Many of the communications ask what Congress had done to help implement the attainment of this ideal state. The passage by the Senate of the bipartisan Connally resolution, the overwhelming adoption of the streamlined Fulbright resolution by the House of Representatives, the creation of the United Nations Rehabilitation and Relief Administration, the continuation of lend-lease, and the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements are results of congressional action.

It is true that whenever the subject of peace is mentioned, the air positively glitters with generalities. Everyone has a pet theory or notion. In my humble opinion, the maintenance of peace, once it has been attained, will demand the same constant attention which we must devote to the preservation of good government or friendship, or of any other desirable state or relationship. Peace has often been symbolized as a dove, but nevertheless it cannot be captured by any "net" of blueprints or peace plans, no matter how cleverly drawn.

One of the most memorable events during the term of the Seventy-eighth Congress was the address delivered by the brilliant representative of our brave ally, China. Her exquisite beauty, to which no camera has ever done justice, her flawless diction, and her melodious voice constitute sufficient reason for the welcome which she received. But these were not the attributes which won her the acclaim of the House of Representatives. It was rather the passionate sincerity with which she voiced her convictions. Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, conceded to be the best speaker ever to address the Congress, said these words concerning peace: "We of this generation who are privileged to help make a better world for ourselves and for posterity should remember that, while we must not be visionary, we must have vision so that peace should not be punitive in spirit and should not be provincial or nationalistic or even continental in concept, but universal in scope and humanitarian in action, for modern science has so annihilated distance that what affects one people must, of necessity, affect all other peoples."

As for the subject of peace treaties, there has been considerable discussion as to whether the rule that treaties must be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the Senate should be changed. There are some who believe that the Members of the House should have a voice in the adoption of treaties. It has been suggested that a majority vote in each House be required. My own opinion favors leaving the vote in the Senate, but providing for a reasonable factor of safety. Under such an amendment a treaty could be adopted by a vote of seven-twelfths of the Members of the Senate present.

Concerning all these problems, the key is public opinion. It is public opinion which constitutes the dynamo of our democracy. Undoubtedly the most encouraging sign in these troubled times is the keen interest in public affairs, in legislation, and in world cooperation, presently displayed by the American people. The mail a Representative receives in this year 1944 is as varied as the types of trees in verdant Washington.

The task of providing adequate hospitalization, rehabilitation, and educational opportunity for returning servicemen and servicewomen is well under way. Popularly referred to as the G. I. bill of rights (H. R. 1767), the National Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944 is being considered by the conferees and is almost ready for further action. It contains provisions for unemployment benefits, employment centers, and loans, as well as for the benefits mentioned above.

Veterans' preferences will be enacted into substantive law by passage of the Starnes bill (H. R. 4115), reported favorably by the Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, and passed by the House. We now await a report from the conferees on this legislation.

No other legislation receives more careful attention and consideration than that providing for benefits for our gallant service men and service women. The letters they write from far-flung military theaters are extraordinary. They reveal intelligence of the highest order, adaptability, and that keen sense of humor which is so typically American. A boy stationed in England sent us a notice that he had been awarded a good-conduct ribbon. "But don't be surprised," he wrote modestly and humorously, "Over here we maintain that any fellow who can eat Spam can win a good conduct award. We call them 'Spam ribbons.'" And young, heroic Major Richard Bong, visiting the halls of Congress, carried his countless medals and ribbons in his pocket, rather than displaying them on his uniform. Said one of our colleagues, "Well, it's evident that he isn't a politician."

Judging from observations gleaned from the voluminous mail we receive, it is my opinion that today we need a renaissance of respect for the Constitution of the United States. Those who disregard that great document forget that it is not entirely the foundation stone of all our cherished rights and liberties, but also the only real protection afforded to minority groups. No thinking person should enter the cool and cloistered serenity of the exquisitely beautiful Lincoln Memorial without reflecting upon the obligations we owe our country in exchange for the privileges we enjoy by virtue of our citizenship.

And yet, we have taken those rights and privileges far too frequently for granted. We have forgotten that the Constitution wasn't created easily and quickly, but rather was the result of 4 long months of discussion and debate in the heat of the convention at Philadelphia. We have forgotten that we

should be as eager to accept civil responsibility as we are anxious to enjoy the blessings of American citizenship.

"It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished Government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of Constitutional liberty?" We owe it to ourselves to protect the "glorious edifice of Constitutional American liberty."

There should also be an increase of respect for the Congress of the United States. It has been my privilege, one deeply appreciated, to serve as a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress. My brief service has convinced me that there are nowhere to be found more intelligent, earnest, and conscientious men and women than those who serve the people of our Nation as their duly-elected Representatives. Considering the size of this great legislative body, the multiplicity of problems faced by its Members, and the diversity of opinion on every subject which exists among the millions of citizens in our vast country, it is amazing with what efficiency Congress transacts the tremendous business of legislation on a national scale. My admiration is expressed impartially, since reapportionment in New York State has abolished the position of Representative-at-large. My experience has convinced me that today Congress constitutes the greatest bulwark of our Constitutional form of Government.

Undoubtedly, you remember the striking scene in The Memphis Belle when the young aviators are receiving their last instructions before leaving on a dangerous mission. The commentator's voice throbs with tension as he relates how these boys, the richest cream of American youth, who just a few months before were perhaps inattentive in school rooms, listen alertly to every word. "Their very lives," he says, "may depend on how well they learn this last lesson."

Today we realize poignantly that the life of our republic itself may depend on our ability to learn and retain the lessons of citizenship. Our priceless heritage isn't a gift to us, but a lifetime job, and surely there is no better time than these dramatic hours following D-day to rededicate ourselves anew to those principles and ideals we hold so high.

It was Pitcairn who expressed the idea so eloquently, "America expects knowledge—knowledge of our history, knowledge of our literature, knowledge of our ideals. America expects faith—faith in its form of Government and faith in your own capacity to be part of that Government. America expects effort. In America the key to opportunity bears the label "work." And, above all America expects patriotism. Patriotism in word and thought and deed. It expects you to so live that America will be a better place because you are part of it."

You are helping constructively and intelligently to make America a better place. New Yorkers may well repose confidence in the leaders participating in this conference. Under your wise guidance, our State will continue to advance.

This is the second day since D-Day marked the beginning of the long-awaited invasion. In years to come we may read in American history books the classic words spoken by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower as the most tremendous military invasion of all time began: "Great battles lie ahead. I call upon all who love freedom to stand with us. Keep your faith staunch—our arms are resolute—together we shall achieve victory."

The men and women of the Empire State join in the prayer for victory every lover of freedom breathes today.

Recognition for the WASPS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times on June 16, 1944. All of us hail the gallantry of our American men who serve in the greatest air force of all time. It seems equally fitting that tribute should be paid to the members of the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots' organization:

RECOGNITION FOR THE WASPS

The Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots—WASPS—have performed valiantly in many types of war service, including ferrying planes, towing targets, carrying out searchlight and radar missions and meteorological flights. They have been supporting the combat services at nearly a hundred different stations. They are an outgrowth of the Fifinellas, a name designating the female "Gremlin," and the WAFS, meaning Women's Auxiliary Ferry Service. Many of the original women pilots who have been in the air since 1942 are still active among the WASPS. Their accident rate has been low. They fly the equivalent of more than 7 times around the earth every day and pilot planes of many types and capabilities, from trainers up through the Thunderbolt, Mustang, Marauder, and Fortress.

Thus far these able and patriotic women have not received the award they desire and deserve—namely, military status. Both the Secretary of War and Gen. H. H. Arnold have urged this. A bill now before Congress to achieve it merits passage. The WASP has every right to be as much a part of the military machine as the WAC or the WAVE.

Address at Thirty-ninth Annual Convention of Brith Sholom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the thirty-ninth annual convention of Brith Sholom at Atlantic City, N. J., June 18, 1944:

I am especially happy to be here today. First of all because the occasion is such an important one in the life of your organization, and secondly because it gives me the pleasure of meeting personally the men of Brith Sholom who are carrying on its fine work.

As an active fraternalist myself I can understand and appreciate your interests and activities and the opportunities which they offer for the performance of humanitarian service. In its own field of endeavor Brith Sholom has established a notable record and I want to extend my congratulations to this thirty-ninth annual convention upon the achievements of the order and the various lodges.

From intimate personal contact with many individual members in Philadelphia I am somewhat familiar with the aims and accomplishments of Brith Sholom and hold in high regard those spiritual and philanthropic ideals which motivate its being. I join you in the sincere hope that present events may hasten the day when the people of all the world again may live under the "covenant of peace."

Until that day comes, however, and until we rid the world of the disturbing forces which have brought upon humanity the havoc and suffering it now endures, we face grave issues of conflict and restoration abroad and internal unity and post-war readjustment at home.

Even as we are gathered here our armed forces in France, in Italy, are engaged in bitter struggle, carrying out the long-planned assault upon Hitler's fortress Europe. And in the far-off Pacific, Japan itself feels the first of a series of terrific air blows on their own homeland while our Navy points a spearhead toward the Philippines.

The greatest concentrations of ground, air, and naval might ever conceived or thought possible are participating in these efforts by our armies of liberation. Upon the outcome rests the answer whether the future is to be ruled by agencies of aggression, brutality and barbarism or whether freedom and the God-given rights of human beings are to prevail.

This is a time of test, of trial, and of faith for the people of America—a test of our mettle, our courage and endurance; a trial of our breadth of vision, our statesmanship, and our ability to concentrate on the paramount objective of victory above other, lesser, issues; and a time for humble renewal of our faith that the Lord who made possible this Nation will give it the strength to survive this crisis in our history.

In this grave hour none may count himself a patriot worthy the name who puts personal greed or partisan gain before the cause for which we fight and the unity which that cause requires and demands.

Yet, even under these extreme conditions, calling for the utmost reasonableness and restraint, for fair consideration of the other fellow's point of view, there are some persons who either cannot or will not cast aside the old habits of internal political feuds and of social and economic rivalries of the past. And even religion is not exempt from their intolerance.

I mean those who mistake liberty for license.

I mean those who insist upon full exercise of their own rights, privileges, and immunities, but at the same time encourage the denial of them to others.

I mean those blindly bigoted who exalt religious or racial prejudices above the common good of the whole country to buttress their own political position or to advance selfish, sectional ends.

I mean those who substitute a policy of obstruction for one of deliberative legislation.

I mean those who, although they are close witnesses to the effective marshalling of America's tremendous might under the guiding genius of the President yet deny their own eyes, preferring picayune fault-finding and political bickering to wholehearted cooperation.

But we must not let the destructive delay of the pettifoggers stay our march toward the day of peace with victory, nor permit the peddlers of poison whispers to divide our ranks.

The path of progress has never been smooth. In spite of self-imposed obstacles America is making headway and will continue to advance toward its ultimate goals. When the record of this crucial struggle

comes to be written, history will recognize the constructive deeds—and the doers—while the "little group of willful men,' the time wasters, the puny politicians who could not rise to the needs of the hour, and the demagogues, will be lost in obscurity.

In our indignation of the moment we must not lose the long perspective of the historic drama in which we are all playing a part. We can take comfort from the wisdom of the ages handed down by generations of your own faith in the Old Testament where it was written:

"The memory of the righteous shall be a blessing; but the name of the wicked shall perish. The lip of truth shall be established forever; but a lying tongue is but for a moment."

There have been periods in our past when unscrupulous men have sought to fan the flames of religious bigotry, or race hatred, or national animosities for their own political profit or to achieve some economic or social advantage. Many other groups too have felt its pangs.

But always the sound judgment of the great mass of Americans has seen through these schemes and the noxious and deadly poisons have been washed away in the clear, clean spirit of brotherhood which is the foundation stone of this Republic.

This, our way of life, which makes it possible for people of different faiths and varied origins to live together in mutual self-respect and good will, is the way we want to keep America.

This is the thing for which your brothers and sons are fighting—just as their fathers fought 25 years ago. Just as today so there were then efforts to malign the Jews here. But as Ray Murphy, past national commander of the American Legion, said back in those days:

"One need not raise his voice in defense of the American Jew in the World War. He needs no defense. History will ever speak for him in words that none may controvert.

"It is only human to forget, but as long as America is truly American, neither our country nor our people will fail to remember the part our Jewish boys played in that war. The gallantry of their service is written in the records of our Government.

"Those written records may perish, but if time should ever dim the memory of that service in the hearts of the American people, there will yet remain a record that neither time nor tempest may destroy * * * the American cemeteries in France where, side by side—one beneath the Cross of Christianity, one beneath the Star of David—gentile and Jew lie pillowed in eternal glory."

Now, again, the soil of France is hallowed with the blood of American youth.

They come from every part of this broad land, from the farms and the wheatlands, teeming cities, the mining towns, the rural villages. They spring from myriad races and varied nationality backgrounds—but they are all American boys, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews.

Fighting shoulder to shoulder, united in the faith of American brotherhood, in common love of God and country, they seek to preserve each their own individual right to be what they are.

We, here at home, can do no less than to make certain that their sacrifices in our behalf shall not be in vain. Our Army, Navy, and Air Force will win the war abroad but they depend upon us to see that it is not lost at home.

Security after the war can come about only through intelligent exercise of citizenship in the selection of those whose power it will be to build the peace. But neither a President nor Members of Congress can do the job alone. It is up to you and all Americans to make certain that they feel the pressure of the great masses of people everywhere to carry out the universal aspirations of mankind: to enjoy in peace his inalienable rights in a world cleansed of economic and social oppressions and exploitation, of the spirit of nationalism in its narrowest sense, and of the prejudices of racial and religious bigotry.

It is for you and our neighbors, for the great mass of average men and women, who do the most suffering in war, to have something to say as to how we shall do our living afterward.

Only in that way can we assure a future when peace shall bless the people of the world with none to make them afraid.

Evidence Against the Insurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been assumed by many Members of Congress that people engaged in the insurance business are generally in favor of H. R. 3270. I can testify to the House that this is very far from the case. The insurance agent who attempts to maintain any degree of independence in his business is against this bill. From a very large file of letters which I received commending me upon my first speech against this bill I have selected one, the substance of which I quote herewith:

I have been in the insurance business for many years and have had many scraps with the Bureaucratic Board of Underwriters. In fact I was one who was fined for using my own judgment as to the company in which to place a policy. It's needless to tell you, I did not get scared nor have I ever ceased to tell them of their unfair methods. I place my business where I please but if this legislation should be passed, with the present set up in California, I and other independent agents may be in difficulties. It would take too much space to say what I think of these bureaucrats who are always criticising and calling their Government officials, bureaucrats.

Furthermore, it has been contended that small business would be in favor of the bill because of the false claim that its passage would work against Federal regulation, but I am able to quote one of the most active small businessmen in America as follows:

May I express my hope that you will oppose the passage of H. R. 3270—which would exempt fire-insurance companies from the antitrust laws.

This clearly is a proposal which if enacted would have several evil results.

It would continue the present system under which big industrial and commercial concerns get their fire insurance at less than cost; while the huge profits and salaries of the stock fire-insurance companies are collected from the small commercial and industrial concerns, and small householders and small farmers, by means of rates far above cost.

The very smallest concerns are the hardest hit, by this present, and past, special privilege to the big commercial and industrial concerns.

Finally, from citizens generally there is constant reiteration of the knowledge that the fire-insurance companies pay back to their policyholders in losses considerably less than half of the amount of money they collect in premiums. In this connection I quote a paragraph from a letter received from a citizen of my own State:

Some 20 years ago I spent a year of my time and my own money, along with a Mr. Lange, in attempting to secure fire-insurance-rate regulation here in California. The rates on fire insurance here are notoriously high. Much higher than the so-called national rate accepted by the fire-insurance companies. It amounts to a ratio of approximately 65 percent for expenses and 45 percent for costs. The total amount of overcharge in this State must be now running about twenty-five million annually.

Post-War Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Roads has been working for many months on a road bill. Involved in the new bill is a change in formula whereby the most sparsely settled States with relatively large areas will get a little less proportionately than they have heretofore received.

However, the Western States are not going to be too disappointed with this decision. They realize that the chairman of the Roads Committee, the Honorable J. W. ROBINSON, of Utah, has long understood the problems of the West and has been and is now the chairman of the caucus of the Western States of the House of Representatives. While this committee has not reported out as favorable a bill as he might have liked and as some of us might have desired, it is probably the best bill that can be obtained and as good a bill as any Western State has a right to expect.

As evidence of the public acceptance of this bill in the Western States themselves, I present an editorial from the Albuquerque Tribune of Wednesday, June 14, 1944, entitled "A Break for New Mexico," which expresses approval of the new bill. The editorial follows:

A BREAK FOR NEW MEXICO

New Mexico and other public-land States will get a break in post-war highway construction if the recommendation of the House Committee on Roads is followed.

This committee has recommended a sliding scale of Federal highway funds apportioned on the basis of the amount of Federal land within State boundaries.

Sparsely populated States, of which New Mexico is one, lost heavily by one change made in the basis of apportionment. Under the old allotment system funds were made available on the basis of one-third for population, one-third for area and one-third for post road mileage. Under the new basis the allotment is one-half for population, one-

fourth for area, one-fourth for post road mileage.

To compensate for the fact that Federal lands cannot be taxed by the State, the public-land States will get a much larger share of Federal funds than those States having less than 5 percent of Federally held land. The Federal allotment will be increased by a percentage of the remaining cost equal to the percentage that Federal lands in the State is of the total area.

Under the bill as reported out by the committee New Mexico would have to provide about 24 percent State funds against 76 percent Federal funds for the first year of highway construction after the war and about 30 percent against 70 percent Federal funds for the next 2 years.

New Mexico's tentative share of the $1,500,000,000 authorized in the bill for 3 years' construction has not yet been computed.

A sobering thought is how to raise the money to match Federal funds and at the same time pay interest and principal instalments on the State's present highway debentures.

Electricity Used and Overcharges, by States, in 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues confronting the American people today, and especially for the post-war period, is the power question—how they are to secure an ample supply of electricity at rates they can afford to pay. We are in an electric age and this issue vitally effects us all, from the largest manufacturer to the remotest tenant farmer.

I have devoted years of work and study to this question. As co-author of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, as a leader of the fight in the House for rural electrification, and as chairman of Public Power Bloc in the House for years, I have witnessed, and in my humble way have contributed to, one of the greatest economic improvements the world has ever seen.

With the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, providing the Nation with a yardstick showing the American people what electricity should cost them, with the developments on the Columbia River, and with the development of rural electrification, demonstrating to the world that electricity can be supplied to every farmer in America at rates he can afford to pay, our country has leaped forward into the electric age, a new civilization, if you please, the like of which our people has scarcely dreamed.

If we men in public life will only carry on the fight with the same devotion and determination our brave men are displaying on the various fighting fronts, when this war is over and our victorious troops come marching home they will not find this a land of depression and despair, but they will find it a land of hope and opportunity with the most "high, exciting, gratifying prospects" spread out before them and their children this world has ever known.

If we do our duty, they will find an electrified America showering its blessings alike upon the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor, supplying the energy to transform our unlimited raw materials into finished products, supplying employment to untold millions, and stimulating and enriching every commercial enterprise. They will find it lightening the burdens, supplying conveniences, and improving the health in every home, taking light and life and hope and relief from drudgery to the farm homes of the Nation and making them the most desirable places on earth in which to live.

But this cannot be done, and it never will be done, if we permit selfish interests to monopolize the power business, squeeze production, and raise rates in order to pay enormous dividends on watered stocks.

This is one of the greatest economic issues on earth today, and no Member of Congress can dodge it long. As I have said before, electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. The cheaper the rates the more freely it flows, and the more freely it flows the greater are its benefits to mankind.

The power business is a public and not a private business. Electricity is now a necessity of our modern life, and it must be handled by a monopoly of some kind either public or private; for no community can afford to have a half dozen, or a dozen, or more, different concerns supplying electricity to its citizens. The overhead expenses would be too great. And, besides, the water power of this Nation already belongs to the Government. It is public power to begin with.

When I began this fight the American people were using only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Last year, 1943, they purchased and used 184,000,000,000, to say nothing of the amount generated and used by those concerns that make their own power, such as the Ford Motor Co. For that 184,000,000,000 the American people were overcharged more than $1,200,000,000, as you will see by examining the tables I am inserting as a part of these remarks.

When we created the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1933 there was no rural electrification in America, and the domestic consumers of the Nation were paying an average of 10 cents a kilowatt-hour. Today they are paying an average of 3.57 cents a kilowatt-hour, or about twice the rates now paid in the T. V. A. area.

Today we have a system of rural electrification that covers practically the entire country, and, as soon as materials are made available, we expect to extend that service to reach every farm home in the Nation. The farmers are demanding it, and they are going to get it.

In 1933 the domestic consumers in the T. V. A. area were paying an average of 10 cents a kilowatt-hour for their electricity; today they are paying an average of 1.86 cents a kilowatt-hour—although at that time the power company was buying the power produced by the Government at Muscle Shoals for less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale, while the municipalities and cooperative power associations are paying the T. V. A. an average of 4.25 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale for that same power today.

At that rate every dollar expended on the T. V. A. will be paid back within a generation—with interest. Remember that while the private power companies were paying less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale for this power at Muscle Shoals, they were charging residential consumers 10 cents a kilowatt-hour for it; and now when the municipalities and cooperative power associations are paying the T. V. A. 4.25 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale for this same power, they are selling it to the residential consumers for an average of 1.86 cents a kilowatt-hour.

The same thing is true of the vast development on the Columbia River and the Colorado. Nothing has ever done so much for the people of the far West as has the Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Boulder Dams, as you will see from the tables I am inserting.

What is being done in the Tennessee Valley and the Columbia River areas can be done for the entire Nation. It must be done, and it will be done; and the sooner the better.

While there were 184,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours generated with coal, gas, oil, and water power and sold in 1943, there were 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of undeveloped water power going to waste every year. It should be harnessed and used to help rebuild America after this war.

Look at the figures for California. The people of that State were overcharged $48,955,147 last year, in spite of the cheap rates in the Los Angeles area provided by Boulder Dam. If it were not for Boulder Dam, the people of California would be overcharged more than $100,000,000 a year.

And if we could get the power generated at Shasta Dam and Hetch Hetchy distributed at yardstick rates, it would just about wipe out that $48,955,000 annual overcharge the people of the State are now paying, which falls largely on the people of the San Francisco area and the rest of northern California. That is the reason the private power interests are turning heaven and earth to get control of the Shasta Dam power, just as they are now monopolizing the power from Hetch Hetchy, in flagrant violation of the Raker Act.

Look at the State of New York, overcharged $217,543,269 for electricity last year, according to the Ontario rates just across the line, and yet many of the Representatives for that State oppose the development of the power on the St. Lawrence, which would provide 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year of the cheapest electricity on earth and furnish a yardstick for New York and New England that would likely result in a reduction of rates in that area of more than $340,000,000 a year. Oh, I know the opposition will say that the Ontario system pays no taxes. I have shown before that the taxes paid by private power interests in New York amounted to only about $47,000,000 a year, which taken from $217,000,000 the people of the State were overcharged for electricity last year would still leave an overcharge of $170,000,000.

The taxes paid annually by private power interests in that area, including New York and all the New England States, amount to only about $87,000,000 a year, which taken from the $340,000,000 overcharges they paid last year would still leave a staggering burden of net overcharges in New York and New England amounting to $253,000,000 a year, according to the Ontario rates.

All this means higher rates, smaller consumption, and less of the benefits of electricity—one of God's greatest gifts to man.

While we are taking civilization to the rest of the world, we might do a little missionary work here at home.

Personally I have done it; I began at home. The people I represent enjoy the benefits of the cheapest electricity in America. They get their electricity cheaper than do the people of Buffalo, N. Y., in hearing distance of Niagara Falls, where a large part of Ontario's cheap electricity is generated, and cheaper than do the people of San Francisco in sight of Hetch Hetchy, or the people of Sacramento, in reach of Shasta Dam; and cheaper than do the people of Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, or West Virginia, where they have the cheapest, finest coal on earth, as well as gas, oil, and water power; and cheaper than do the people of Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, or Louisiana, where they have enough natural gas going to waste to electrify the entire South at rates cheaper than we are now paying in the T. V. A. area, and cheaper than the people of Ontario now enjoy.

The people of Ohio were overcharged more than $91,000,000 for their electricity last year, according to the Ontario rates, as you will see from the attached tables; which, after deducting the $16,000,000 taxes paid by private power companies in Ohio, left a net overcharge of $75,000,000, or about $15,000,000 more than the entire wheat crop of the State would have brought if the farmers of Ohio had shipped every grain of it to Chicago and paid the freight themselves; while the extra burdens of overcharges paid by the people of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and other Southern States from Virginia to Arizona outside the T. V. A. area, equaled, on an average, the value of from 1,000 to 2,500 bales of cotton to the county. And in Pennsylvania, Illinois, Virginia, and West Virginia, where they have an abundance of the finest, cheapest coal on earth, as well as gas, oil, and water power, the conditions are just as bad, or worse.

Electricity can be generated with coal, gas, oil, or water power anywhere in the United States and distributed at the T. V. A. yardstick rates, the Tacoma rates, the Bonneville rates, or the Ontario rates without loss on legitimate investments.

Read the tables below, look at the overcharges for your own State, and ask yourself what you have done to relieve the situation. Ask yourself what you have done to extend this service to the toiling farmers of your State.

These are questions the people are going to ask you. Do not wait for your successor to answer them. Look over these tables, take a day, a week, or a month off to study them, and then tell the people you are sent here to represent what you have done and what you propose to do in order to relieve them of this enormous burden.

Tell them what you propose to do in order to provide the blessings of cheap electricity to every human being in America and make this the richest, the brightest, and the most prosperous country in all the world—now and for generations to come.

At this point I am inserting tables showing the number of kilowatt-hours used by the residential, commercial, and industrial consumers of electricity during the year 1943, together with the cost thereof and the overcharges paid; and also a composite table showing the totals.

I hope every Member will study these tables carefully.

The matter referred to follows:

Here is the table showing the amount of electricity used by the residential consumers in every State in 1943, the amount paid for it, and the overcharges according to the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario, Canada rates:

TABLE 1.—*Residential electric service, 1943*

State	Estimated sales data for 1943			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
				Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	281, 798	394, 111, 000	$10, 333, 200	$6, 995, 576	$3, 337, 624	$6, 313, 585	$4, 019, 615	$5, 776, 259	$4, 556, 941	$5, 455, 930	$4, 877, 270
Arizona	97, 746	130, 058, 000	4, 744, 709	2, 101, 902	2, 642, 798	1, 897, 880	2, 846, 820	1, 736, 560	3, 008, 140	1, 641, 666	3, 103, 034
Arkansas	159, 298	134, 173, 000	6, 109, 100	2, 920, 150	3, 188, 950	2, 639, 131	3, 469, 969	2, 413, 095	3, 696, 005	2, 278, 694	3, 830, 406
California	1, 865, 006	1, 890, 582, 000	59, 666, 600	39, 678, 289	19, 988, 311	35, 859, 627	23, 806, 973	32, 756, 963	26, 909, 637	30, 966, 965	28, 699, 635
Colorado	219, 706	213, 411, 000	8, 635, 500	4, 714, 983	3, 920, 517	4, 257, 302	4, 378, 198	3, 894, 611	4, 740, 889	3, 678, 723	4, 956, 777
Connecticut	469, 694	545, 560, 000	20, 255, 300	10, 755, 564	9, 499, 736	9, 702, 289	10, 553, 011	8, 871, 821	11, 383, 479	8, 385, 694	11, 869, 606
Delaware	61, 465	65, 136, 000	2, 832, 600	1, 359, 648	1, 472, 952	1, 226, 516	1, 606, 084	1, 121, 710	1, 710, 890	1, 062, 225	1, 770, 375
District of Columbia	68, 415	225, 516, 000	5, 475, 263	4, 538, 993	936, 270	4, 100, 972	1, 374, 291	3, 745, 080	1, 730, 183	3, 542, 495	1, 932, 768
Florida	360, 618	476, 725, 000	18, 669, 700	8, 214, 668	10, 455, 032	7, 430, 541	11, 239, 159	6, 795, 771	11, 873, 929	6, 422, 377	12, 247, 323
Georgia	385, 207	539, 539, 000	16, 154, 700	9, 773, 394	6, 381, 106	8, 836, 621	7, 318, 079	8, 077, 350	8, 077, 350	7, 641, 173	8, 513, 527
Idaho	108, 078	216, 873, 000	5, 393, 709	3, 121, 027	2, 278, 673	2, 818, 643	2, 581, 057	2, 581, 057	2, 818, 643	2, 435, 265	2, 964, 435
Illinois	1, 359, 886	1, 883, 083, 000	72, 051, 100	41, 213, 229	30, 837, 871	37, 250, 419	34, 800, 681	34, 008, 119	38, 042, 981	32, 134, 791	39, 916, 309
Indiana	781, 325	798, 651, 000	30, 944, 200	17, 143, 087	13, 801, 113	15, 472, 100	15, 472, 100	14, 141, 499	16, 802, 701	13, 367, 894	17, 576, 306
Iowa	476, 813	440, 114, 000	18, 208, 100	9, 541, 044	8, 667, 056	8, 612, 431	9, 594, 669	7, 865, 899	10, 342, 201	7, 447, 113	10, 760, 987
Kansas	340, 275	329, 200, 000	13, 308, 000	6, 920, 160	6, 387, 840	6, 254, 760	7, 053, 240	5, 722, 440	7, 585, 560	5, 403, 048	7, 904, 952
Kentucky	355, 609	326, 880, 000	11, 944, 900	7, 178, 885	4, 766, 015	6, 486, 081	5, 458, 819	5, 924, 670	6, 020, 230	5, 602, 158	6, 342, 742
Louisiana	296, 134	256, 969, 000	11, 415, 600	5, 525, 150	5, 890, 450	5, 000, 033	6, 415, 567	4, 566, 240	6, 849, 360	4, 315, 097	7, 100, 503
Maine	197, 278	177, 996, 000	7, 708, 800	3, 546, 048	4, 162, 752	3, 199, 152	4, 509, 648	2, 929, 344	4, 779, 456	2, 767, 459	4, 941, 341
Maryland	474, 558	387, 300, 000	14, 149, 337	8, 277, 362	5, 871, 975	7, 470, 850	6, 678, 487	6, 834, 130	7, 315, 207	6, 466, 247	7, 683, 090
Massachusetts	1, 147, 066	952, 764, 000	44, 098, 700	21, 211, 475	22, 887, 225	19, 182, 935	24, 915, 765	17, 551, 283	26, 547, 417	16, 581, 111	27, 517, 589
Michigan	1, 352, 437	1, 789, 568, 000	53, 794, 800	34, 052, 108	19, 742, 692	30, 716, 831	23, 077, 969	28, 080, 886	25, 713, 914	26, 574, 631	27, 220, 169
Minnesota	553, 398	630, 424, 000	22, 052, 200	12, 856, 433	9, 195, 767	11, 599, 457	10, 452, 743	10, 607, 108	11, 445, 092	10, 033, 751	12, 018, 449
Mississippi	151, 917	159, 133, 000	5, 055, 300	2, 810, 747	2, 244, 553	2, 537, 761	2, 517, 539	2, 320, 283	2, 734, 917	2, 194, 000	2, 861, 300
Missouri	708, 820	799, 731, 000	25, 824, 600	15, 004, 093	10, 820, 507	13, 532, 090	12, 292, 510	12, 369, 983	13, 454, 617	11, 698, 544	14, 126, 056
Montana	96, 883	116, 813, 000	4, 140, 400	2, 103, 323	2, 037, 077	1, 900, 444	2, 239, 956	1, 738, 968	2, 401, 432	1, 643, 739	2, 496, 661
Nebraska	231, 358	228, 182, 000	9, 184, 300	4, 996, 259	4, 188, 041	4, 509, 491	4, 674, 809	4, 123, 751	5, 060, 549	3, 903, 328	5, 280, 972
Nevada	26, 188	36, 936, 000	1, 371, 000	634, 773	736, 227	573, 078	797, 922	523, 722	847, 278	494, 931	876, 069
New Hampshire	132, 354	118, 106, 000	5, 549, 200	2, 436, 099	3, 113, 101	2, 203, 032	3, 346, 168	2, 014, 360	3, 534, 840	1, 903, 376	3, 645, 824
New Jersey	1, 134, 759	978, 187, 000	46, 406, 000	22, 274, 880	24, 131, 120	20, 093, 798	26, 312, 202	18, 376, 776	28, 029, 224	17, 402, 250	29, 003, 750
New Mexico	60, 127	52, 478, 000	2, 506, 800	1, 030, 296	1, 476, 505	930, 023	1, 576, 777	852, 312	1, 654, 488	804, 683	1, 702, 117
New York	3, 473, 685	2, 916, 891, 000	129, 982, 300	65, 381, 097	64, 601, 203	59, 141, 947	70, 840, 353	54, 072, 637	75, 909, 663	51, 083, 044	78, 899, 256
North Carolina	415, 967	497, 366, 000	16, 090, 891	9, 384, 487	6, 712, 404	8, 466, 965	7, 629, 926	7, 742, 605	8, 354, 286	7, 324, 085	8, 772, 806
North Dakota	73, 750	75, 347, 000	3, 165, 200	1, 522, 461	1, 642, 739	1, 376, 862	1, 788, 338	1, 259, 750	1, 905, 450	1, 190, 115	1, 975, 085
Ohio	1, 695, 587	1, 903, 324, 000	64, 259, 400	41, 126, 016	23, 133, 384	37, 206, 193	27, 053, 207	33, 903, 223	30, 286, 177	32, 129, 700	32, 129, 700
Oklahoma	304, 760	261, 492, 000	12, 325, 200	5, 854, 470	6, 470, 730	5, 287, 511	7, 037, 689	4, 843, 804	7, 481, 396	4, 572, 649	7, 752, 551
Oregon	281, 531	606, 344, 000	12, 094, 800	8, 599, 403	3, 495, 397	7, 764, 862	4, 329, 938	7, 099, 648	4, 995, 152	6, 712, 614	5, 382, 186
Pennsylvania	2, 179, 379	2, 237, 889, 000	83, 855, 600	46, 791, 425	37, 064, 175	42, 263, 222	41, 592, 378	38, 573, 576	45, 282, 024	36, 477, 186	47, 378, 414
Rhode Island	186, 055	137, 647, 000	7, 034, 600	3, 228, 881	3, 805, 719	2, 912, 324	4, 122, 276	2, 666, 113	4, 368, 487	2, 518, 387	4, 516, 213
South Carolina	200, 280	239, 443, 000	7, 333, 809	4, 458, 956	2, 874, 853	4, 026, 261	3, 307, 548	3, 681, 572	3, 652, 237	3, 483, 559	3, 850, 250
South Dakota	76, 628	74, 132, 000	3, 239, 900	1, 532, 473	1, 707, 427	1, 383, 437	1, 856, 463	1, 263, 561	1, 976, 339	1, 195, 523	2, 044, 377
Tennessee	384, 832	643, 401, 000	13, 038, 600	10, 522, 150	2, 516, 450	9, 505, 139	3, 533, 461	8, 696, 746	4, 341, 854	8, 214, 318	4, 824, 282
Texas	928, 421	845, 686, 000	35, 278, 700	18, 097, 973	17, 180, 727	16, 369, 317	18, 909, 383	14, 958, 169	20, 320, 531	14, 146, 759	21, 131, 941
Utah	141, 384	182, 801, 000	5, 694, 600	3, 245, 922	2, 448, 678	2, 932, 719	2, 761, 881	2, 682, 157	3, 012, 443	2, 534, 097	3, 160, 503
Vermont	76, 035	79, 949, 000	3, 339, 200	1, 499, 301	1, 839, 899	1, 355, 715	1, 983, 485	1, 238, 843	2, 100, 357	1, 172, 059	2, 167, 141
Virginia	416, 161	486, 216, 000	18, 146, 500	9, 835, 403	8, 311, 097	8, 891, 785	9, 254, 715	8, 129, 632	10, 016, 868	7, 675, 970	10, 470, 530
Washington	497, 832	1, 158, 250, 000	20, 307, 800	15, 657, 314	4, 650, 486	14, 154, 537	6, 153, 263	12, 936, 069	7, 371, 731	12, 225, 296	8, 082, 504
West Virginia	273, 081	236, 546, 000	9, 500, 100	5, 206, 055	4, 294, 045	4, 702, 550	4, 797, 550	4, 294, 045	5, 206, 055	4, 066, 043	5, 434, 057
Wisconsin	651, 863	755, 428, 000	24, 775, 000	14, 072, 200	10, 702, 800	12, 709, 575	12, 065, 425	11, 619, 475	13, 155, 525	10, 975, 325	13, 799, 675
Wyoming	42, 537	40, 112, 000	1, 801, 800	848, 648	953, 152	767, 567	1, 034, 233	700, 900	1, 100, 900	663, 062	1, 138, 738
United States	26, 753, 864	28, 621, 403, 000	1, 029, 259, 700	579, 794, 479	449, 465, 221	523, 826, 361	505, 433, 339	478, 774, 675	550, 485, 025	452, 609, 149	576, 650, 551

Here is a similar table on commercial consumption, and overcharges, by States:

TABLE 2.—*Commercial electric service, 1943*

State	Estimated sales data for 1943			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	38,050	219,876,000	$5,744,900	$3,309,062	$2,435,838	$2,705,848	$3,039,052	$2,585,205	$3,159,695	$3,125,226	$2,619,674
Arizona	15,389	238,602,000	4,427,700	1,965,898	2,461,802	1,602,827	2,824,873	1,536,412	2,891,288	1,855,206	2,572,494
Arkansas	34,962	147,407,000	5,187,400	2,199,458	2,987,942	1,794,840	3,392,560	1,711,842	3,475,558	1,654,781	3,532,619
California	353,073	3,790,809,000	60,765,300	38,464,435	22,300,865	31,415,660	29,349,640	29,957,293	30,808,007	36,276,884	24,488,416
Colorado	37,623	267,034,000	7,439,200	3,570,816	3,868,384	2,908,727	4,530,473	2,767,382	4,671,818	3,362,518	4,076,682
Connecticut	61,132	436,650,000	13,272,200	5,547,779	7,724,421	4,525,820	8,746,380	4,326,737	8,945,463	5,229,247	8,042,953
Delaware	8,909	49,613,000	1,467,400	661,797	805,603	540,003	927,397	516,525	950,875	623,645	843,755
District of Columbia	10,963	243,858,000	4,718,811	3,718,426	1,000,388	3,038,914	1,679,897	2,911,506	1,807,305	3,515,514	1,203,297
Florida	70,173	502,394,000	15,788,200	5,936,363	9,851,837	4,831,189	10,957,011	4,610,154	11,178,046	5,589,023	10,199,177
Georgia	63,177	483,792,000	13,666,300	6,587,157	7,079,143	5,370,856	8,295,444	5,138,529	8,527,771	6,218,167	7,448,133
Idaho	20,166	131,587,000	3,218,800	1,596,525	1,622,275	1,297,176	1,921,624	1,236,019	1,982,781	1,499,961	1,718,839
Illinois	246,735	1,439,936,000	48,638,200	23,249,060	25,389,140	19,017,536	29,620,664	18,239,325	30,398,875	21,984,466	26,653,734
Indiana	106,517	666,851,000	18,840,300	9,608,553	9,231,747	7,837,565	11,002,735	7,498,439	11,341,861	9,062,184	9,778,116
Iowa	94,397	553,565,000	16,858,300	8,665,166	8,193,134	7,080,486	9,777,814	6,777,037	10,081,263	8,159,417	8,698,883
Kansas	57,960	487,478,000	10,988,500	5,527,216	5,461,284	4,505,285	6,483,215	4,307,492	6,681,008	5,219,538	5,768,962
Kentucky	47,669	213,676,000	6,715,200	3,545,626	3,169,574	2,894,251	3,820,949	2,766,662	3,948,538	3,344,170	3,371,030
Louisiana	48,909	335,594,000	10,290,900	4,126,651	6,164,249	3,354,833	6,936,067	3,210,761	7,080,139	3,889,960	6,400,940
Maine	29,766	115,906,000	3,649,500	1,682,420	1,967,080	1,368,563	2,280,937	1,302,872	2,346,628	1,580,234	2,069,266
Maryland	76,046	418,800,000	12,194,489	6,694,774	5,499,715	5,475,326	6,719,163	5,243,630	6,950,859	6,328,940	5,865,549
Massachusetts	166,223	720,949,000	26,653,800	10,368,328	16,285,472	8,449,255	18,204,545	8,076,101	18,577,699	9,781,945	16,871,855
Michigan	165,888	1,365,815,000	37,022,800	18,881,628	18,141,172	15,401,485	21,621,315	14,735,074	22,287,726	15,993,850	21,028,950
Minnesota	100,877	517,739,000	17,915,000	8,330,475	9,584,525	6,789,785	11,125,215	6,467,315	11,447,685	7,846,770	10,068,230
Mississippi	30,029	170,432,000	5,145,600	2,197,171	2,948,429	1,790,669	3,354,531	1,708,339	3,437,261	2,068,531	3,077,069
Missouri	123,288	678,445,000	19,808,100	10,280,404	9,527,696	8,398,634	11,409,466	8,042,089	11,766,011	9,705,969	10,102,131
Montana	21,191	100,839,000	3,066,900	1,456,778	1,610,122	1,183,823	1,883,077	1,128,619	1,938,281	1,367,837	1,699,063
Nebraska	41,021	234,894,000	6,565,200	3,446,730	3,118,470	2,809,906	3,755,294	2,691,732	3,873,468	3,249,774	3,315,426
Nevada	5,014	85,539,000	1,441,000	642,686	798,314	524,524	916,476	501,468	939,532	606,661	834,339
New Hampshire	17,303	59,249,000	2,254,000	996,268	1,257,732	813,694	1,440,306	777,630	1,476,370	939,918	1,314,082
New Jersey	183,982	864,421,000	24,352,600	12,882,225	21,470,375	10,511,896	23,840,704	10,030,959	24,321,641	12,160,820	12,191,780
New Mexico	12,261	110,252,000	3,715,000	1,400,555	2,314,445	1,140,505	2,574,495	1,092,210	2,622,790	1,322,540	2,392,460
New York	585,392	3,895,735,000	128,904,100	51,303,832	77,600,268	41,893,833	87,010,267	40,218,079	88,686,021	48,467,942	80,436,158
North Carolina	70,516	468,559,000	11,906,947	6,620,263	5,286,684	5,393,847	6,513,100	5,155,708	6,751,239	6,239,240	5,667,707
North Dakota	21,626	76,677,000	3,135,700	1,307,587	1,828,113	1,063,002	2,072,698	1,019,163	2,116,597	1,229,194	1,906,506
Ohio	208,617	1,277,545,000	36,806,800	20,317,354	16,489,446	16,599,867	20,206,933	15,900,538	20,906,262	19,213,150	17,593,650
Oklahoma	53,772	224,326,000	7,917,000	3,562,650	4,354,350	2,897,622	5,019,378	2,763,033	5,153,967	3,348,891	4,568,109
Oregon	42,275	442,976,000	7,414,600	4,389,443	3,025,157	3,581,252	3,833,348	3,425,545	3,989,055	4,137,347	3,277,253
Pennsylvania	303,951	1,494,384,000	44,059,100	22,029,550	22,029,550	18,020,172	26,038,928	17,227,108	26,831,592	20,795,895	23,263,205
Rhode Island	24,099	90,602,000	3,902,900	1,588,480	2,314,420	1,291,860	2,611,040	1,229,414	2,673,486	1,490,908	2,411,992
South Carolina	33,952	225,602,000	5,424,853	2,913,146	2,511,707	2,376,086	3,048,767	2,267,580	3,157,264	2,744,976	2,679,877
South Dakota	21,295	80,106,000	3,054,700	1,295,193	1,759,507	1,056,926	1,997,774	1,008,051	2,046,649	1,221,880	1,832,820
Tennessee	54,679	353,136,000	7,045,700	5,249,047	1,796,653	4,283,786	2,761,914	4,093,552	2,952,148	4,953,127	2,092,573
Texas	156,194	1,289,092,000	30,502,800	14,854,864	15,647,936	12,109,612	18,393,188	11,591,064	18,911,736	14,000,785	16,502,015
Utah	17,161	1,020,578,000	10,343,800	4,747,804	5,595,996	3,868,581	6,475,219	3,692,737	6,651,063	4,468,522	5,875,278
Vermont	11,373	50,158,000	1,617,700	721,494	896,206	587,225	1,030,475	558,107	1,059,593	679,434	938,266
Virginia	63,136	561,413,000	13,172,000	6,177,949	6,994,051	5,045,106	8,127,494	4,834,344	8,338,256	5,835,462	7,337,138
Washington	62,493	939,980,000	13,579,800	9,383,642	4,196,158	7,659,007	5,920,793	7,333,092	6,246,708	8,854,030	4,725,770
West Virginia	37,173	153,759,000	5,227,800	2,650,495	2,577,305	2,164,309	3,063,491	2,091,120	3,136,680	2,504,116	2,723,684
Wisconsin	104,692	723,383,000	18,729,000	10,038,744	8,690,256	8,203,302	10,525,698	7,847,451	10,881,549	9,476,874	9,252,126
Wyoming	7,156	50,599,000	1,670,100	734,844	935,256	597,896	1,072,204	571,174	1,098,926	691,421	978,679
United States	4,168,245	29,071,012,000	776,227,600	377,426,808	398,800,792	308,073,172	468,154,428	294,722,167	481,505,433	353,916,890	422,310,710

Here is a table on industrial consumption and overcharges, by States:

TABLE 3.—*Industrial and other electric service, 1943*

State	Estimated sales data for 1943			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	39,773	4,006,794,000	$27,170,700	$19,997,635	$7,173,065	$12,498,522	$14,672,178	$14,726,519	$12,444,181	$18,584,759	$8,585,941
Arizona	1,777	486,701,000	4,566,400	2,301,466	2,264,934	1,438,416	3,127,984	1,694,134	2,872,266	2,137,075	2,429,325
Arkansas	22,434	738,534,000	8,869,900	5,800,915	3,068,985	3,627,789	5,242,111	4,275,292	4,594,608	5,392,899	3,477,001
California	309,013	8,297,051,000	102,553,400	88,887,429	6,665,971	59,993,739	42,559,661	70,659,293	31,894,107	89,118,905	13,434,495
Colorado	19,543	472,885,000	7,142,600	4,299,845	2,842,755	2,685,618	4,456,982	3,164,172	3,978,428	3,992,713	3,149,887
Connecticut	7,843	1,630,020,000	22,067,200	13,924,403	8,142,797	8,604,477	13,372,723	10,261,248	11,805,952	12,931,379	9,135,821
Delaware	1,643	280,215,000	3,138,000	2,080,592	1,057,708	1,299,380	1,839,220	1,531,637	1,606,363	1,933,378	1,205,222
District of Columbia	3,694	1,123,459,000	8,848,485	6,335,515	2,512,970	3,955,273	4,893,212	4,663,152	4,185,333	5,884,243	2,964,242
Florida	4,213	555,949,000	9,344,800	5,092,916	4,251,884	3,177,232	6,167,568	3,747,165	5,597,535	4,728,469	4,616,331
Georgia	1,350	1,837,578,000	16,309,600	11,725,714	4,673,886	7,330,621	9,068,979	8,642,789	7,757,011	10,889,334	5,510,266
Idaho	5,165	466,033,000	3,247,200	2,471,119	776,681	1,545,667	1,701,533	1,818,432	1,428,768	2,295,770	951,430
Illinois	85,192	8,431,312,000	96,722,500	55,615,438	41,107,062	34,820,100	61,902,400	41,010,340	55,712,160	51,649,815	45,072,685
Indiana	79,045	3,673,072,000	43,975,300	27,704,439	16,270,861	17,326,268	26,649,032	20,404,539	23,570,761	25,725,551	18,249,749
Iowa	42,124	1,119,169,000	13,329,800	8,557,732	4,772,068	5,345,250	7,984,550	6,304,995	7,024,805	7,957,891	5,371,909
Kansas	27,043	679,365,000	9,171,800	6,135,934	3,035,866	3,833,812	5,337,988	4,521,697	4,650,103	5,695,688	3,476,112
Kentucky	18,850	1,534,754,000	16,650,200	10,972,482	5,677,718	6,859,882	9,790,318	8,075,347	8,574,853	10,189,922	6,460,278
Louisiana	4,577	1,572,423,000	13,307,900	8,690,059	4,617,841	5,429,623	7,878,277	6,401,100	6,906,800	8,077,895	5,230,005
Maine	7,257	704,260,000	7,565,200	5,000,597	2,564,603	3,124,428	4,440,772	3,684,252	3,880,948	4,645,033	2,920,167
Maryland	25,625	1,929,419,000	22,866,515	13,834,242	9,032,273	8,643,543	14,222,972	10,175,599	12,690,916	12,850,981	10,015,534
Massachusetts	7,508	3,018,712,000	47,050,100	27,947,759	19,102,341	17,455,587	29,594,513	20,560,894	26,489,206	29,971,055	21,078,445
Michigan	19,739	5,429,339,000	60,234,800	33,249,610	26,985,190	20,781,006	39,453,794	24,455,329	35,779,471	30,800,452	29,334,348
Minnesota	21,769	1,267,917,000	17,647,300	11,047,210	6,600,090	6,900,094	10,747,206	8,135,405	9,511,895	10,253,081	7,394,219
Mississippi	14,103	467,998,000	5,895,300	3,743,516	2,151,784	2,340,434	3,554,866	2,753,105	3,142,195	3,472,332	2,422,968
Missouri	28,082	2,412,548,000	30,864,100	21,635,734	9,228,366	13,518,476	17,345,624	15,925,876	14,938,224	20,092,529	10,771,571
Montana	2,177	1,690,172,000	9,092,900	7,628,943	1,463,957	4,764,680	4,328,220	5,619,412	3,473,488	7,083,709	2,009,531
Nebraska	11,463	394,688,000	5,172,400	3,532,749	1,639,651	2,208,615	2,963,785	2,601,717	2,570,683	3,279,302	1,893,098
Nevada	123	35,876,000	500,800	410,155	90,645	256,410	244,390	301,982	198,818	381,109	119,691
New Hampshire	2,928	330,219,000	4,907,200	3,331,989	1,575,211	2,080,653	2,826,547	2,453,600	2,453,600	3,096,443	1,810,757
New Jersey	4,758	4,193,649,000	46,111,400	27,159,615	18,951,785	16,968,995	29,142,405	20,012,348	26,099,052	25,222,936	20,888,464

TABLE 3.—*Industrial and other electric service, 1943*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1943			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
New Mexico	2, 258	35, 751, 000	$672, 800	$321, 598	$351, 202	$201, 167	$471, 633	$236, 826	$435, 974	$298, 723	$374, 077
New York	22, 458	15, 132, 909, 000	126, 814, 500	73, 806, 039	53, 008, 461	46, 160, 478	80, 654, 022	54, 403, 421	72, 411, 079	68, 606, 645	58, 207, 855
North Carolina	24, 991	2, 724, 762, 000	24, 940, 848	19, 054, 808	5, 886, 040	11, 896, 784	13, 044, 064	14, 041, 697	10, 899, 151	17, 708, 002	7, 232, 846
North Dakota	1, 152	35, 298, 000	853, 100	466, 646	386, 454	291, 760	561, 340	343, 799	509, 301	433, 575	419, 725
Ohio	94, 686	10, 271, 126, 000	102, 352, 800	65, 505, 792	36, 847, 008	40, 941, 120	61, 411, 680	48, 208, 169	54, 144, 631	60, 899, 516	41, 452, 884
Oklahoma	22, 388	996, 760, 000	12, 346, 100	8, 234, 849	4, 111, 251	5, 148, 324	7, 197, 776	6, 074, 281	6, 271, 819	7, 654, 582	4, 691, 518
Oregon	12, 881	1, 963, 943, 000	10, 323, 600	9, 167, 357	1, 156, 243	5, 729, 598	4, 594, 002	6, 751, 634	3, 571, 966	8, 816, 970	1, 806, 630
Pennsylvania	93, 740	13, 750, 380, 000	157, 655, 000	96, 771, 465	40, 883, 535	60, 430, 545	77, 224, 455	71, 305, 290	66, 349, 710	9, 888, 715	47, 766, 285
Rhode Island	1, 467	621, 539, 000	9, 806, 400	6, 011, 323	3, 795, 077	3, 755, 851	6, 050, 549	4, 432, 493	5, 373, 907	5, 589, 648	4, 216, 752
South Carolina	12, 033	1, 311, 923, 000	11, 363, 152	8, 692, 811	2, 670, 341	5, 431, 587	5, 931, 565	6, 397, 455	4, 965, 697	8, 079, 201	3, 283, 951
South Dakota	2, 064	83, 655, 000	1, 749, 200	927, 076	822, 124	578, 985	1, 170, 215	682, 188	1, 067, 012	860, 606	888, 594
Tennessee	14, 513	4, 498, 239, 000	22, 495, 700	20, 088, 660	2, 407, 040	12, 552, 601	9, 943, 099	14, 802, 171	7, 693, 529	18, 671, 431	3, 824, 269
Texas	77, 324	3, 518, 456, 000	37, 830, 200	24, 930, 102	12, 900, 098	15, 586, 042	22, 244, 158	18, 385, 477	19, 444, 723	23, 152, 082	14, 678, 118
Utah	555	50, 207, 000	806, 300	575, 698	230, 602	359, 610	446, 690	424, 114	382, 186	534, 577	271, 723
Vermont	6, 223	169, 058, 000	2, 950, 600	2, 145, 086	805, 514	1, 342, 523	1, 608, 077	1, 581, 522	1, 369, 078	1, 994, 606	955, 994
Virginia	13, 352	1, 385, 691, 000	15, 475, 800	10, 864, 012	4, 611, 788	6, 793, 876	8, 681, 924	8, 000, 989	7, 474, 811	10, 090, 222	5, 385, 578
Washington	27, 028	5, 907, 920, 000	24, 472, 900	20, 434, 872	4, 038, 028	12, 774, 854	11, 698, 046	15, 050, 834	9, 422, 066	18, 990, 970	5, 481, 930
West Virginia	24, 304	2, 733, 568, 000	26, 208, 900	17, 612, 381	8, 596, 519	11, 007, 738	15, 201, 162	12, 973, 406	13, 235, 494	16, 354, 354	9, 854, 546
Wisconsin	79, 612	2, 480, 426, 000	32, 166, 900	19, 428, 808	12, 738, 092	12, 159, 088	20, 007, 812	14, 314, 271	17, 852, 629	18, 045, 631	14, 121, 269
Wyoming	1, 427	63, 124, 000	999, 800	558, 888	440, 912	348, 930	650, 870	411, 918	587, 882	518, 896	480, 904
United States	1, 354, 267	127, 214, 217, 000	1, 266, 699, 000	851, 714, 323	414, 984, 677	532, 396, 051	734, 302, 949	627, 403, 225	639, 295, 775	791, 324, 060	475, 374, 940

Here is a composite table showing amount of electricity purchased and used for all purposes in 1943, together with the costs and overcharges, according to the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario, Canada, rates, together with the totals:

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1943*

State	Estimated sales data for 1943			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	359, 621	4, 620, 781, 000	$43, 248, 800	$30, 302, 273	$12, 946, 527	$21, 517, 955	$21, 730, 845	$23, 087, 983	$20, 160, 817	$27, 165, 915	$16, 082, 885
Arizona	114, 912	855, 361, 000	13, 738, 800	6, 369, 266	7, 369, 534	4, 939, 123	8, 799, 677	4, 967, 106	8, 771, 694	5, 633, 947	8, 104, 853
Arkansas	216, 694	1, 020, 114, 000	20, 166, 400	10, 920, 523	9, 245, 877	8, 061, 760	12, 104, 640	8, 400, 229	11, 766, 171	9, 326, 374	10, 840, 026
California	2, 527, 092	14, 687, 442, 000	222, 985, 300	174, 030, 153	48, 955, 147	127, 269, 026	95, 716, 274	133, 373, 549	89, 611, 751	156, 362, 754	66, 622, 546
Colorado	276, 872	953, 330, 000	23, 217, 300	12, 585, 644	10, 631, 656	9, 851, 647	13, 365, 653	9, 826, 165	13, 391, 135	11, 033, 954	12, 183, 346
Connecticut	538, 609	2, 612, 230, 000	55, 594, 700	50, 227, 746	25, 366, 954	22, 922, 586	32, 672, 114	23, 459, 806	32, 134, 894	26, 546, 320	29, 048, 380
Delaware	72, 017	394, 964, 000	7, 438, 600	4, 102, 337	3, 336, 263	3, 065, 899	4, 372, 701	3, 169, 872	4, 268, 728	3, 619, 248	3, 819, 352
District of Columbia	83, 072	1, 592, 833, 000	19, 042, 559	14, 592, 931	4, 449, 628	11, 095, 159	7, 947, 400	11, 319, 738	7, 722, 821	12, 942, 252	6, 100, 307
Florida	435, 004	1, 535, 068, 000	43, 802, 700	19, 243, 947	24, 558, 753	15, 438, 962	28, 363, 738	15, 153, 190	28, 649, 510	16, 739, 869	27, 062, 831
Georgia	449, 734	2, 860, 909, 000	46, 220, 600	28, 086, 465	18, 134, 135	21, 538, 098	24, 682, 502	21, 858, 468	24, 362, 132	24, 748, 674	21, 471, 926
Idaho	133, 409	814, 893, 000	11, 865, 700	7, 188, 671	4, 677, 029	5, 661, 486	6, 204, 214	5, 635, 508	6, 230, 192	6, 230, 996	5, 634, 704
Illinois	2, 191, 813	11, 754, 331, 000	217, 411, 800	120, 077, 727	97, 334, 073	91, 088, 055	126, 323, 745	93, 257, 784	124, 154, 016	105, 769, 072	111, 642, 728
Indiana	966, 887	5, 138, 574, 000	93, 759, 800	54, 456, 079	39, 303, 721	40, 635, 933	53, 123, 867	42, 044, 477	51, 715, 323	48, 155, 629	45, 604, 171
Iowa	613, 334	2, 112, 848, 000	48, 396, 200	26, 763, 942	21, 632, 258	21, 038, 167	27, 358, 033	20, 947, 931	27, 448, 269	23, 564, 421	24, 831, 779
Kansas	425, 278	1, 496, 043, 000	33, 468, 300	18, 583, 310	14, 884, 990	14, 593, 857	18, 874, 443	14, 551, 629	18, 916, 671	16, 318, 274	17, 150, 026
Kentucky	422, 128	2, 075, 310, 000	35, 310, 300	21, 696, 993	13, 613, 307	16, 240, 214	19, 070, 086	16, 766, 679	18, 543, 621	19, 136, 259	16, 174, 050
Louisiana	349, 620	2, 164, 986, 000	35, 014, 400	18, 341, 860	16, 672, 540	13, 784, 489	21, 229, 911	14, 178, 101	20, 836, 299	16, 282, 952	18, 731, 448
Maine	234, 301	998, 162, 000	18, 923, 500	10, 229, 065	8, 694, 435	7, 692, 143	11, 231, 357	7, 916, 468	11, 007, 032	8, 992, 726	9, 930, 774
Maryland	576, 229	2, 735, 519, 000	49, 210, 341	28, 806, 378	20, 403, 963	21, 589, 719	27, 620, 622	22, 253, 359	26, 956, 982	25, 646, 168	23, 564, 173
Massachusetts	1, 320, 797	4, 692, 425, 000	117, 802, 600	59, 527, 562	58, 275, 038	45, 087, 777	72, 714, 823	46, 188, 278	71, 614, 322	52, 334, 711	65, 467, 889
Michigan	1, 538, 064	8, 584, 722, 000	151, 052, 400	86, 183, 346	64, 869, 054	66, 899, 322	84, 153, 078	67, 271, 289	83, 781, 111	73, 468, 933	77, 583, 467
Minnesota	675, 984	2, 416, 080, 000	57, 614, 500	32, 234, 118	25, 380, 382	25, 289, 336	32, 325, 164	25, 209, 828	32, 404, 672	28, 133, 602	29, 480, 898
Mississippi	196, 049	797, 564, 000	16, 096, 200	8, 751, 434	7, 344, 766	6, 668, 864	9, 427, 336	6, 781, 827	9, 314, 373	7, 734, 863	8, 361, 337
Missouri	861, 190	3, 830, 724, 000	76, 496, 800	46, 920, 231	29, 576, 569	35, 449, 200	41, 047, 600	36, 337, 948	40, 158, 852	41, 497, 042	34, 999, 758
Montana	120, 251	1, 907, 824, 000	16, 300, 200	11, 189, 044	5, 111, 156	7, 848, 947	8, 451, 253	8, 486, 999	7, 813, 201	10, 094, 945	6, 205, 253
Nebraska	283, 842	857, 134, 000	20, 921, 900	11, 975, 738	8, 946, 162	9, 528, 012	11, 393, 888	9, 417, 200	11, 504, 700	10, 432, 404	10, 489, 496
Nevada	31, 325	158, 351, 000	3, 312, 800	1, 687, 614	1, 625, 186	1, 354, 012	1, 958, 788	1, 327, 172	1, 985, 628	1, 482, 701	1, 830, 099
New Hampshire	152, 585	507, 574, 000	12, 710, 400	6, 764, 356	5, 946, 044	5, 097, 379	7, 613, 021	5, 245, 590	7, 464, 810	5, 939, 737	6, 770, 663
New Jersey	1, 323, 499	6, 036, 257, 000	126, 870, 000	62, 316, 720	64, 553, 280	47, 574, 689	79, 295, 311	48, 420, 083	78, 449, 917	54, 786, 006	72, 083, 994
New Mexico	74, 646	198, 481, 000	6, 894, 600	2, 752, 448	4, 142, 152	2, 271, 695	4, 622, 905	2, 181, 348	4, 713, 252	2, 425, 946	4, 468, 654
New York	4, 081, 535	21, 945, 535, 000	385, 700, 100	190, 490, 068	195, 209, 932	147, 196, 258	238, 504, 642	148, 694, 137	237, 006, 763	168, 157, 631	217, 543, 269
North Carolina	511, 474	3, 690, 627, 000	52, 944, 686	35, 059, 558	17, 885, 128	25, 757, 596	27, 187, 090	26, 940, 010	26, 004, 676	31, 271, 327	21, 673, 359
North Dakota	96, 528	187, 322, 000	7, 154, 000	3, 296, 694	3, 857, 306	2, 731, 624	4, 422, 376	2, 622, 652	4, 531, 348	2, 852, 684	4, 301, 316
Ohio	1, 998, 890	13, 451, 995, 000	203, 419, 000	126, 949, 162	76, 469, 838	94, 747, 180	108, 671, 820	98, 101, 930	105, 317, 070	112, 242, 766	91, 176, 234
Oklahoma	380, 920	1, 482, 578, 000	32, 588, 300	17, 651, 569	14, 936, 731	13, 333, 457	19, 254, 843	13, 681, 118	18, 907, 182	15, 576, 122	17, 012, 178
Oregon	336, 687	3, 013, 263, 000	29, 833, 000	22, 156, 203	7, 676, 797	17, 075, 712	12, 757, 288	17, 276, 827	12, 556, 173	19, 366, 931	10, 466, 069
Pennsylvania	2, 577, 070	17, 482, 653, 000	265, 569, 700	165, 592, 440	99, 977, 260	120, 713, 939	144, 855, 761	127, 105, 974	138, 463, 726	47, 161, 796	118, 407, 904
Rhode Island	211, 621	849, 788, 000	20, 743, 500	10, 828, 684	9, 915, 216	7, 960, 035	12, 783, 865	8, 328, 020	12, 415, 880	9, 598, 943	11, 144, 957
South Carolina	246, 265	1, 776, 968, 000	24, 121, 814	16, 064, 913	8, 056, 901	11, 833, 534	12, 287, 880	12, 346, 616	11, 775, 198	14, 307, 736	9, 814, 078
South Dakota	99, 987	237, 893, 000	8, 043, 800	3, 754, 742	4, 289, 058	3, 019, 348	5, 024, 452	2, 953, 800	5, 090, 000	3, 278, 009	4, 765, 791
Tennessee	454, 024	5, 494, 776, 000	42, 580, 000	35, 859, 857	6, 720, 143	26, 341, 526	16, 238, 474	27, 592, 469	14, 987, 531	31, 838, 876	10, 741, 124
Texas	1, 161, 939	5, 653, 234, 000	103, 611, 700	57, 882, 939	45, 728, 761	44, 064, 971	59, 546, 729	44, 534, 710	58, 076, 990	51, 299, 626	52, 312, 074
Utah	159, 100	1, 253, 586, 000	16, 844, 700	8, 569, 424	8, 275, 276	7, 160, 910	9, 683, 790	6, 799, 008	10, 045, 692	7, 537, 186	9, 307, 204
Vermont	93, 631	299, 165, 000	7, 907, 500	4, 365, 881	3, 541, 619	3, 285, 403	4, 622, 097	3, 378, 472	4, 529, 028	3, 846, 099	4, 061, 401
Virginia	492, 649	2, 433, 320, 000	46, 794, 900	26, 877, 264	19, 917, 636	20, 730, 767	26, 064, 133	20, 964, 165	25, 829, 735	23, 601, 654	23, 193, 246
Washington	587, 353	8, 006, 150, 000	58, 361, 500	45, 475, 828	12, 884, 672	34, 588, 318	23, 772, 102	35, 119, 595	23, 040, 505	40, 070, 296	18, 290, 204
West Virginia	334, 558	3, 123, 873, 000	40, 936, 800	25, 468, 131	15, 467, 869	17, 874, 547	23, 062, 253	19, 358, 571	21, 578, 229	22, 924, 513	18, 012, 287
Wisconsin	836, 167	3, 059, 257, 000	75, 670, 900	43, 539, 752	32, 131, 148	33, 071, 905	42, 598, 995	33, 781, 197	41, 889, 703	39, 497, 830	7, 173, 070
Wyoming	51, 120	153, 835, 000	4, 471, 700	2, 142, 380	2, 329, 320	1, 714, 593	2, 757, 107	1, 683, 992	2, 787, 708	1, 873, 379	2, 598, 321
United States	32, 276, 376	184, 906, 652, 000	3, 072, 186, 300	1, 808, 935, 610	1, 263, 250, 690	1, 364, 295, 584	1, 707, 890, 716	1, 400, 900, 067	1, 671, 286, 233	1, 567, 850, 098	1, 474, 336, 101

Wallace Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of June 17, 1944:

WALLACE AGAIN

While magnificent performance is being rendered by our Army and Navy in France, Italy, and the Pacific, things are going haywire on the political and economic fronts at home.

There is a dangerous political situation developing in France due to the Allied disinclination to support De Gaulle. Whether he is persona non grata to Churchill or Roosevelt, or to both, is something we do not know. This may pass off, but should it delay or prevent French military or underground collaboration with the Allies, this rupture with De Gaulle may prove to be serious.

Now comes Vice President WALLACE with a pamphlet issued by the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations in which he says the United States, in its own interest, should promote the economic and political freedom of India, the Netherland Indies, and other colonial areas in the Pacific, and should help bring defeated Japan into the ranks of a free Asia after war. "It is to our interest to approve and cooperate with all trends which lead to our own standard of government of the people, by the people, and for the people," he says.

This is sophomoric logic. Are the 318,000,000 people of India capable of governing themselves? The two religions in India, Moslem and Hindu, are fanatical groups. Each would want to dominate the government. If India were independent which of them would? Our system of government is all right for us, but how do we know it would be to nations which have absolutely no concept of democracy, whose people are incapable of exercising any voice in their governments and who, unless held in check, might start another world conflagration at the drop of a hat.

Nations which through ignorance or lack of adaption to modernism are incapable of ruling themselves must be ruled by other nations which have great administrative capacity. This has been the role of Britain in India, Arabia, Burma, Malaya, Egypt, and much of Africa for upward of a century. Would Mr. WALLACE destroy this administrative power in a night? There is a certain virtue in imperialism. It keeps backward but potentially troublesome nations in check.

If we regain the Philippines we are to give them their freedom in 1946. This means that after the billions of dollars we have spent on them we are ready to wash our hands of them. Eventually those islands will be exploited by predatory nations and thus become a constant source of annoyace to the world.

What is particularly mischievous in the Wallace article on India is what it may do to stir up contention with Britain at a time when Britain and the United States are giving everything they have to win a war involving to a tremendous degree the future of both. WALLACE'S inclusion of the East Indies will stir up the animosity of the Dutch. Now he is over in China, whither he was sent with the blessing of President Roosevelt. For what purpose? The good Lord only knows.

To clap the climax Mr. Roosevelt has told National Democratic Chairman Hannegan that WALLACE is again his choice for Vice President, although the President was told by Hannegan that "nearly everybody is dead set against WALLACE on the ticket and that this is particularly true in the South and Middle West." To which the President replied: "I had a talk with HENRY about the situation before he left for China, and I personally want to see him on the ticket."

No matter how much WALLACE rocks the boat the President cannot now disavow his utterances. He is his choice again for Vice President and he goes to China on his recommendation. What a satisfaction it would be if the American people were to kick that whole kit and caboodle out of power. This is the people's year of opportunity.

Remove the Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I made a brief visit to my district and had an opportunity to get first-hand information as to the people's views on governmental affairs.

The people are most interested in winning the war and getting the boys back home as soon as possible. With the first news that the invasion was on came fervent prayers from all, and the people joined with the Members of Congress in calling for divine guidance and protection for our brave boys fighting everywhere, as we stood with bowed heads in silent prayer. I shall never forget my feelings and emotions on that occasion and more than ever before I realized what this war and all its horrors mean to those who are fighting the war and to their loved ones; what it means to our country and to the world today and for generations to come. We, as the elected representatives of the people, realized more than ever before what a free government should be and we thanked God that we still have a chance to continue as a free government, and the people are more determined than ever before to protect and to continue our form of government, of, by, and for the people.

I hope it will be comforting to the mothers, fathers, wives, children, and loved ones of those in our armed services that Congress has provided everything which the armed services have requested, both for the finest training possible, and for an abundance of the best and latest modern equipment of every kind for their protection and to enable them to end the war victoriously. I am happy that I have supported all legislation to provide this excellent training and equipment.

Every citizen realizes we are all in this war together and that each has his part to perform. Some must fight, some must supply the equipment, while others must produce food. We all must do our full part without fail. We must buy War bonds and back our boys to the full limit of our ability in everything that will help win the war.

At the same time, the people are demanding that their tax money and their War bond money be expended for winning the war and paying the legitimate expenses of government. They have had enough of "planned extravagance" by bureaucratic theorists. They want good common sense applied to the management of all Government departments and every effort made and every resource fully utilized in the war effort. They deeply resent any and all maneuvering for political advantages that would prolong the war. They realize that we have the best admirals and generals in the world. These officers have devoted their lives to the study and mastery of the art and science of war, and the people want these military and naval authorities to run the war and to determine the war strategy. They are the only ones in America qualified and trained to determine strategy and to execute the plans for conducting the war.

In addition to having the best military and naval leaders, we have the best Army, Navy, and Air Force in the world, fully trained and equipped with the best and most modern implements of war. These forces are doing a fine job, and under such able leadership, they will win the war, with the aid and cooperation of American industrial management and American labor, together with the American farmer and the American taxpayer and bond buyer, and we will win the war regardless of who is elected President in November. I think we will win the war more quickly if a Republican President is elected because he would leave the conducting of the war and the determination of war strategy in the hands of the military and naval experts who are now in charge, and he would not attempt to put Harry Hopkins and his like forward as military strategists. He would greatly aid the war effort by putting our Government in order, by putting competent persons in charge of the various Government activities and by stopping the boondoggling, the mismanagement and the waste and extravagance that have been ever present since the New Deal came into power. He would protect and defend our constitutional form of government and prevent the establishing of a totalitarian form of government.

Next to winning the war, the people want to win the peace and reestablish constitutional government by law. They want cooperation among the nations of the world that will prevent future wars. They are rightfully determined that they will not lose here at home what the boys are fighting over there to preserve. They are wondering what secret agreements

have been made and whether such understandings may now exist which would be a bar to world peace. They are quite worried over the reports of what seems to be very poor diplomacy in our foreign policy, and already come stories that our foreign policy has caused us to be hated by most of the governments of the world. The President has gone on the false theory that we could make lasting friends of nations by giving them money and by being overgenerous with our charity.

Real Democrats, as well as Republicans, want a return to constitutional government. They want the legislative branch to make the laws and the executive branch to administer them, and they want the courts to be free and unpampered. During the past 11½ years the New Deal administration has attempted to take over legislative functions, and pack the courts; has established a strong bureaucracy which now practically governs the people with rules, regulations, and directives, many of which are unreasonable and intolerable. It has practically destroyed local government. This bureaucracy was brought into being by Executive order, and its purpose seems to be to regiment everything and everybody, to definitely establish a government of planned economy about which the President boasted so much a few years back, an economy that was planned by the bureaucratic heads now in control. This bureaucracy can be ended only by the people who are determined to see that order and common sense replace the wild bungling, waste, and mismanagement of this administration. The people realize that unless our Nation stops the waste of the taxpayers' money, chaos and bankruptcy will result. We must remember that no bureaus in Wahhington were ever abolished by the voluntary action of the present administration, and if these many and useless bureaus are to be abolished, it must be done over the protests of the bureaucrats.

The people know that when the New Deal came into power our national debt was about $20,000,000,000. Mr. Roosevelt, as a candidate in 1932, expressed grave fears that we could not survive as a nation with such an enormous public debt. The first bill he advocated and asked Congress to pass was the so-called Economy Act, which was specifically titled "A bill to preserve the credit of the United States Government." This bill economized on the pensions and benefits paid to our war veterans. It reduced the payments made to most of the veterans and took all payments away from many of them. When this was accomplished, all pretense of economy was gone; and the New Deal entered upon the greatest spending spree ever known.

But the payments taken from many veterans were never reestablished. From that time on we have heard no fears expressed by the President or those high in his administration as to the solvency of the Government, although the national debt was more than doubled before the present war began, and now we are advised that we are faced with a probable national debt of over $350,000,000,000. It is estimated that all the property in America is valued at about $350,000,000,000. This, added to the debt of the local subdivisions of government, amounts to a greater value than everything in the country. Our forefathers spent hundreds of years of honest effort and, through their endurance and thrift, accumulated a strong and wealthy United States. In 11 short years the New Deal has squandered and wasted practically all those who had gone before were able to accumulate. The people remember that after the passage of the Economy Act the New Deal adopted a policy of spending, under the false theory that we could have prosperity by borrowing and spending. It was even boasted that the New Deal would tax and tax, and spend and spend, and elect and elect. The President said we should not be concerned about how large the public debt was because "we just owed it to ourselves." We notice that when we pay taxes we do not "pay them to ourselves," and the increased taxes being paid definitely show the fallacy of the President's theory about "just owing ourselves."

The fact is that we have in Washington the greatest, the most powerful, and the most expensive bureaucracy that has ever existed. This bureaucracy is steadily and surely taking from the people the freedoms and liberties granted them under our Constitution as a Republic, which freedoms our forefathers fought and died to establish and preserve.

There is one civilian employee in the War and Navy Departments for every six men in uniform, and this number does not include the thousands of Army and Navy men who are performing clerical work, or the thousands of WAVES, WAC's, SPARS, and so forth. There is a total of 3,556,909 civilian Federal workers, which is over six times as many as were on the pay roll when President Roosevelt took office. This civilian bureaucracy is costing the people over $8,000,000,000 a year. It is not confined to Washington but is in every section of our Nation, with branch offices everywhere. In many States there are several times as many Federal employees as there are State employees. In Indiana there are 33,400 Federal employees and only 9,419 State employees. As one example of New Deal extravagance and waste, I might mention that the O. P. A. employs 2,700 lawyers, with 500 of them in Washington, to write rules and regulations which are so technical and involved that no one can understand most of them; while Britain, with a rationing and price administration which has worked very well, has a regular staff of only 10 lawyers.

Of all the many and various freedoms declared for by the President, the Vice President, and the First Lady, there is no mention of freedom from bureaucracy or freedom of private enterprise and personal initiative.

Apparently the right hand of many bureaus does not know what the left hand is doing. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, in a magazine article of May 8, 1944, predicted that no end to rationing of any meats or canned goods could be expected before 1945. His statement was:

> Termination of rationing, whenever it is, will be attended by many difficulties. * * * If I were to make a guess my timetable would be something like this: Meat: some relief in 1945, with luck, and possibly end when the war in Europe is over. Processed foods: when the war in the Pacific ends.

While this article was being circulated, canned goods rationing was ended and most meats were made point-free, and, mark you, Mr. Bowles is supposed to be running the O. P. A. Now, to make the matter more confusing, Mr. Bowles has told Congress that he was quite confident that point-free meat will go back on the rationed list in 30 to 60 days, or perhaps early next year. Many people think rationing is being managed from a political standpoint rather than from the necessities of the situation, and from the actions of the O. P. A., the W. F. A., the W. P. B., and other regulatory agencies, these opinions seem to be wholly justified.

The people remember that in March 1942 Attorney General Biddle made a speech to a group of New Deal officeholders in which he urged them to "hold the political line," and stated that "the New Deal is a political party." Michael Streight, the toastmaster at this meeting, arrogantly boasted that "the New Deal is more dynamic than fascism and more revolutionary than communism."

The people of all parties recognize that the New Deal is not representative of the Democratic Party's philosophy of government. It is as foreign to the principles and policies of the Democratic Party as it is to those of the Republican Party. They realize that the New Deal is, as Attorney General Biddle said, "a political party," regardless of under what party label its members may hold office.

The New Deal has fully demonstrated its inability to properly run the Government. The President has placed impractical and inexperienced personnel in charge, and their actions and their rules and regulations have shown an utter disregard for the rights of our citizens and have worked useless and great hardships on our people.

The reports of the investigations of every congressional committee has shown an alarming state of affairs. The Byrd committee and the Truman committee have exposed the most wasteful and reckless spending of Government money in all history From the time the New Deal caused little pigs to be slaughtered and crops to be plowed under, up to the present moment, we have had nothing but mismanagement and waste. Even today our farmers cannot get the farm machinery needed to cultivate their land, while great quantities of this much-needed farm machinery has been and is being sent for foreign countries.

The American people have been looking in the mirror of the past 11 years. That mirror shows the true picture of the greatest bureaucracy ever known and the greatest waste and mismanagement in all history. It shows our people are governed largely by bureaucratic rules and regulations and by Presiden-

tial directives, not created by laws, but by Executive orders of the President. Between March 1933 and December 1942 there were 3,565 Executive orders issued, and alphabetical agencies have been created so fast it is difficult to keep count of them, although as a candidate in 1932 the President promised to reduce the number of boards, bureaus, and commissions. The people realize this overgrown bureaucracy is a rank departure from constitutional government and will permanently change our form of government unless it is ended real soon. We cannot expect the New Deal to do any differently in the future than it has done in the past. Therefore, the people are determined to elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress in November and save our form of constitutional government, ano when the boys come home in victory they will be happy that we have saved here what they fought for over there.

The people know that most of the so-called shortages are not real shortages at all but have been created by the unwise and unwarranted action of the W. P. B. The people will gladly do without anything and undergo any inconvenience if, by so doing, it will assist in winning the war. What the people complain about is the useless and unnecessary restrictions placed upon them by incompetent bureaucrats, who have as their goal the ruination of private business and the establishing of a totalitarian form of government. The people know that every un-American organization, every group opposed to the form of government established by our forefathers, have formally gone on record for a fourth term for the President. They know Earl Browder and Harry Bridges, whom the President released from prison 2 years ago, have carried the torch and blazed the way. They nave chartered the course which will likely be followed by the New Deal convention.

We have been taught that the proper way to cure an illness is to find the cause and then remove it. The people know it accomplishes nothing to condemn the heads of the various Government departments, boards, bureaus, and commissions for their unwise and unwarranted actions. It does no good to complain of the Hopkins, the Tugwells, the Biddles and their kind or the thousands of impractical crackpots, fellow travelers; or the inexperienced young so-called economists, because they are only the illness; they are simply doing what their Chief would have them do. The President appoints them to office, he fixes their policies, he approves what they do and he keeps them in office. He is the cause, and I firmly believe the voters will remove this cause in November.

The people know that today there is only one branch of government which is not under administration control and that is the Congress. This probably accounts for the New Deal anti-Congress tirades and for all the propaganda against the people's representatives. Congress is the only branch that can curb the dictums of the bureaucrats. The people realize that their representatives are fighting to prevent the bureaucrats from controlling the finances of the Nation and from ruling the people through rules, regulations, and directives, and to preserve constitutional government, with its checks and balances, which have made this country great.

The people know that, if a Republican majority in Congress is elected in November, our form of government is saved, and they will elect a Republican majority.

Oil Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, we have just finished the appropriations for the Army and the Navy. More than $80,000,000,000 have been made available for their use. There was no disposition to argue with them. They presented their estimates of what they would need and we gave it to them. No single thing that can be bought with this money is to be denied or withheld.

In this same session we refused to do anything about one of the most critical of the supplies. Oil is needed in greater and greater amounts. We could have insured the supply a few days ago when we voted on the Disney amendment.

The bill would have provided a 35-cent per barrel increase in the price of crude oil. It would have insured against shortage of supply for all the tanks, planes, ships, and the many other forms of oil-powered equipment which the $80,000,000,000 will buy.

The Office of Price Administration, in its persistent and distorted representations of the oil price question got out big posters and sent them to Members of Congress to show that the increase in crude-oil prices would cost Government $175,000,000 annually. Well, suppose it did? Are we stinting on anything else that is needed to win this war? Think of it as an insurance premium to guarantee that the $80,000,000,000 will not be wasted, for wasted it will be, and countless lives with it if we fail on oil supply.

The O. P. A. also used a poster to show that the consumer at home would be penalized $375,000,000 a year. It would increase his cost of living, said O. P. A.

When something has been taken from a man, it is not inflationary to give it back to him. I have heard of no concern outside the price-control circles on this point. The consumers would like to be able to use their cars. They have been driven into higher cost transportation by the stupid, blundering, and malicious policy on oil.

I am making these remarks in the hope that some of us may give some thought to this matter when we go home. Something is going to be needed. Nothing which will increase total supply is proposed by the people who have been given the authority on this question. There is a subsidy proposal and as to my own district it will be a kind of life preserver for the man with the little wells, but it will not increase the total supply. A subsidy is static, a price increase is dynamic.

An oil price increase has been sought, requested, and demanded for many months. There is nothing inflationary about it. It would be creative. Every new oil field found and every old one stimulated adds not alone to the current supply, which is our first concern now, but to the wealth of the Nation. An oil field goes on and on, for years, an addition to the Nation's supply, a means of employment, and a source of taxable wealth.

As I said, we did not solve the problem by refusing to pass the Disney amendment; we merely postponed its solution. There were 178 of us who tried to solve it. Some may have been influenced by the O. P. A.'s representations that nothing was needed to increase oil supply. The consumer knows there is not enough, the Navy knows it, for it has been warning its shore stations to conserve every drop and get along with as little as possible. The Petroleum Administration has recently told us how desperately short of heating oil the New England area was last winter. In places they were down to a single day's supply of kerosene and one tanker at sea had to be diverted to Boston to prevent suffering. The oil producers know that nothing can be done under the price now frozen at the level of 1941, for their costs have increased to the point where they have nothing left for expansion of operations.

A solution must be found. The price-control officials have said that their refusal to do anything is final. They are sustained and comforted in their attitude by the refusal of Congress to make them do their duty.

It is still a congressional problem. It will undoubtedly be put before you again a little later. I recommend that you think it over some more.

I'm a Little Mockingbird

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, like our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Mississippi, Representative RANKIN, many of us have heard the sweet voice of the mocking bird as he sings near the entrance to the Capitol during these dark days of war.

Following the remarks made by Congressman RANKIN the other day, an employee of the other body, Horace C. Carlisle, has been inspired to write a

beautiful little poem entitled "I'm a Little Mockingbird," which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD:

I'M A LITTLE MOCKINGBIRD

(Tune: Listen to the Mockingbird)

I'm noted not for beauty,
For beauty, for beauty—
I'm noted not for beauty—
But for songs of cheer that issue from my mouth.
I sing—to sing's my duty,
My duty, my duty—
I sing—to sing's my duty,
In the rhythmic realm of music in the South.

CHORUS

I'm a little mockingbird,
Yes, a little mockingbird,
Whose songs of inspiration catch the ear.
I'm a little mockingbird,
Yes, a little mockingbird,
Thrilling all the Sunny Southland with my cheer.

My heart sings in its sorrow.
Its sorrow, its sorrow—
My heart sings in its sorrow,
A sorrow that was never told in words.
The songs I sing, I borrow,
I borrow, I borrow—
The songs I sing, I borrow
From my Sunny Southland's other singing birds.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

A Time for Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been no time in the war now waging when we could neglect unity at home in favor of the privileges and customs of peacetime. The hour for unity and the hour for war struck as one note from the clock of history. But such is human nature that when the fortunes of war turned from those of loss and retreat to those of defense and attack many of us at home concluded that the emergency had passed and that we might well resume the situation of optimistic spectators waiting for the game to be over. This is a great error. The time for unity is now, and it will remain now until it is replaced by the time of victory—complete, final, world-wide victory.

Mr. Speaker, we find no lack of unity in our armed forces, nor in the armed forces of the Allied Nations as a whole. Divisions do not disband with every favorable turn of strategy. The Navy continues to plow the sea, and the air forces remain in forward flight. It is only at home outside of the defense industries, the transportation lines, and the works that produce for war, that we find the tendency to listen for the command: "As you were."

Mr. Speaker, it is not demanded, nor should it be demanded justly, that because a war is in progress we should abandon the ways of representative government. The machinery of ordinary administration of domestic affairs must go on; the courts must function, and the Congress must legislate for all the needs of the people. Party rivalry aimed at developing the best policies and the best candidates for public office must continue. But we must recognize that all these things are subordinate to the main enterprise that faces us now of winning the war. The householders must expect that, with war needs doubling and trebling the burden on the productive and conserving capacity of the Nation, that capacity must be enlarged at all costs, and we must reduce our freedom of action and scale of living at home that the product saved may enhance the war effort. No matter how we may seem beset by regulations, deprivations, and calls on our money and our energy, we must remember that the Nation as a whole and the principles for which it stands are even more beset and if the Nation falls, so must we all.

This is not a war for the rights of certain classes of individuals. It is a war to uphold the basic principles of national life as set out in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. It is the common heritage of all human right that is attacked and that must be defended and preserved. Individuals in a conquered country lose all their rights.

Our goal is not victory alone, but early victory. Saving blood, sweat, tears, and treasure. A material shortening of the war would mean more to all of us than all the reforms, political victories, changes of policy, and adjustments of the burdens of citizenship that all the factions, blocs, and partisans could catalog in an era of peace.

Let us not delude ourselves in the belief that our fighting forces are substituting for us. They have their job and are doing it. The man at the controls of a B–29 and the men firing the guns ask of us nothing more than that we back them up at home in the purchase of bonds, the payment of taxes, and in obedience of those regulations that are made to set free for war all the surplus energy and materials we can possibly spare. They simply ask us to do our job while they are doing their job.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to retain our functions as citizens by participating in political discussions, let us do so with an eye to proportion. We cannot expect all the sacrifices to be made by our armed forces, and unless we give them a better example we will find our tendency to separate at home will have a bad effect on those from whom we expect far greater unity, obedience, devotion, courage, and sacrifice on the battle front.

For over a century and a half philosophers and historians have spoken of our democracy as an experiment. Lord Bryce predicted we would be wrecked on the rocks of selfishness and class animosity. Even Lincoln over 80 years ago posed the question whether our Nation as first conceived "could long endure." Let us find the same solution in union that Lincoln found—the Union that gave strength—the Union that gave continued life to our country.

Mr. Speaker, Rome fell when selfishness and corruption displaced the unity that bound the empire together. We may well take a lesson from history for if we abandon unity now in pursuit of individual or class advantage we will have nothing left worth fighting for.

The nineteenth century opened by the triumph of democracy as a design for government after the great revolution. The twentieth century opened with the rumblings of a counter-revolution that professed to see a lack of efficiency in a democracy. Groups rose that sought to mobilize forces, not through common consent but by manipulating power so as to divide peoples in a nation into two classes, the governing and the governed. Arbitrary power achieved a certain material progress at the expense of common liberty.

This was followed by designs of nations for a similar use of power against smaller nations. Supermen dreamed of supernations and in the language of Mussolini democracy was sneered at as an "outmoded experiment." The counter-revolution was on from the beginning that struck down voluntary unity of effort and substituted for it the selfish plans of a few backed not by consent but by dishonesty and force. The only defense is a swing back to free and equal cooperation for the common good. This is our hope today—that unity may bind every class and every citizen in a common effort to avoid conquest and to live in the free air of peace.

A. F. of L. Endorses International Office for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the May 1944 issue of the American Federationist, the official organ of the American Federation of Labor, is devoted to a presentation of labor's place in international affairs. It is gratifying to find this great organization addressing itself not only to an assertion of its rights but to an assumption of its duties and responsibilities in the international field. This is not a new approach for labor; in fact, no group has contributed more richly to the promotion of international cooperation in the broad sense than have the organized workers, functioning through their respective free trade unions. It is probable that Samuel Gompers, more than any other one person in the world, was responsible for the establishment of the International Labor Office in Geneva. The I. L. O. today stands as an eloquent tribute to his great work.

Today, labor joins with a number of other groups in asking for the recognition of education in the new world machinery, when that is set up. Labor, recognizing the need for an International Office of Education, is today pressing

for the establishment of such an office. The issue of the American Federationist to which I have just referred, carries an article by James Marshall, one of the vice chairmen of the American Association for an International Office of Education. This article merits a large reading audience, for the principle it sets forth is a sound and truly social principle.

I therefore ask permission to have this article printed in the RECORD.

One of the vice chairmen of the American Association for an International Office of Education was Msgr. George Johnson. Monsignor Johnson has just passed away. He literally gave his life for the advancement of the fine ideals and principles for which he has stood through all his life. Many eloquent tributes have been paid him, resolutions of sympathy and of praise have been pouring in to his relatives and to the authorities of his church. Among the tributes paid to this great man was a resolution adopted by the Washington Central Labor Union, which simply tells the story of the man's greatness. He sought to help every child of every race and creed. He lived his faith in his every act.

The resolution expressing the tribute of the Washington Central Labor Union to this great cleric and great educator is as follows:

Whereas Msgr. George Johnson, a noted educator and cleric, passed away today while delivering a commencement address; and

Whereas Monsignor Johnson has rendered a great and rich service to the promotion of truly social concepts in and through education; and

Whereas Monsignor Johnson always concerned himself for the welfare of every child, regardless of race, rank, or creed, seeking ever to help all children: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Washington Central Labor Union mourns the loss of this great public servant; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the rector of Catholic University, to the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and to the sister of Monsignor Johnson.

And here is the text of James Marshall's article, referred to above:

LABOR'S INTEREST IN AN INTERNATIONAL OFFICE FOR EDUCATION

(By James Marshall)

In the proceedings of the sixty-third annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, held last October, there is a small but important recommendation of approval for a general plan for an international office for education. Thus an overwhelming section of American labor went on record, well in advance of other organizations and agencies, in recognition of the importance of education to post-war peace and stability.

This is no accident. Labor leadership has long seen the connection between oppression of labor and illiteracy. All of labor knows that the strengthening of the position of labor is closely linked with the development of educational opportunities. All of labor knows equally that world understanding and international relationships need, as a sound base, the widening of educational opportunity. It does not take elaborate charts to show the relationship. A quick glance over the map will show that coolie wages and substandard living go hand in hand with restriction of education to a favored few; hand in hand with a denial to large masses of people of the most elementary opportunities for educational advancement.

There is certainly a connection between low standards of education and substandard conditions of work. The illiterate, uneducated country using sweated labor is a continuing threat to the workers in lands with high educational and living standards. This is true not only when you look over the broad map of the world. It is true within any one country. The same rigorous law applies within the United States. The difficulties in organizing labor have been greatest in those areas of the country where illiteracy is highest, where educational opportunity is most restricted.

Such factors were unquestionably in the minds of the delegates to the 1943 convention of the American Federation of Labor. But labor leadership also recognized that plans for world peace and security cannot be left dependent upon the old devices of politics and government and international economic schemes. The rock-bottom basis for peace is, of course, a genuine understanding among peoples and nations. While no overnight miracles are to be expected, such genuine understanding can only come about by the intelligent, flexible, and wise use of the forces and instrumentalities of education.

There was a wise note of caution in labor's conclusion—a caution which it is essential we keep before us; namely, that education is not something to be imposed on a people from without; that it must be home grown, though it may be helped and encouraged and nursed along by the friendly influences of international cooperation.

The report of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor reads strikingly:

"Just as the international labor organization was made an agency of the League of Nations potent for lifting the status of labor throughout the world, the proposal is now maturing to include a department of education in addition to that of health under whatever agency may replace the League of Nations. We believe that labor should favor such a proposal.

"However, this agency should perform research and clearance functions and should not be used for any plan to impose cultures or ideologies upon nations or regimes. In such an agency labor should emphasize that education is more than formal schooling and that ways should be developed to assist adults in making the experiences of life educational of mind and spirit. Culture is not limited to study of the humanities, but is the experience of a people in their work, their group activities, including politics, their creative enterprises, their recreation and play.

"Labor could well insist in a world educational agency that the cultural autonomy of nations should be not only safeguarded and developed but enriched by opportunities to share the knowledge and experiences of other nations. Culture achieved through the educational experiences of life is a process of integration. As L. P. Jacks has so well stated:

" 'It is only as a laborer that man is capable of education or worthy of it. The men of science, the artists, the poets, the philosophers, the heroes, the saints, the captains of industry, and the captains of salvation—what are they in last analysis but highly educated laborers, found most frequently in communities where culture and laborer are working together in alliance, least frequently where they have drifted apart, as, alas, they are drifting in these days? The great task of our times, once more, is to reunite these separated elements.' "

These considerations were the very ones that led to the formation 2 months after the American Federation of Labor convention of the American Association for an International Office for Education. That association aims to bring the same message about education to the American layman.

As in the American Federation of Labor report, it was recognized that education is an essential prop to a peaceful world order. As in the American Federation of Labor report, it was recognized that this proposal must not be confused with the problems of victorious and vanquished countries. Indeed, the declaration of the American Association made it clear that the establishment of an International Education Office did not mean that "the nations of the world must step in and dominate or watch over local schools or national school systems. Aside from the fact that if we want a democratic world this would be an undemocratic way to go about it; people do not accept outsiders telling them what they must know, how they must think or what they must think is right and what wrong. We cannot tell the German schools, for example, what they must teach and hope to succeed. There is evidence that even totalitarian, authoritarian Germany has failed to control the minds of many of the younger Germans."

Emphasis is placed by the association on the point that: "There is a way, though, through education—through education which is not authoritarian, which does not attempt to make people docile subjects or keep them forever immature. We can, through education, create better attitudes in people and build up in them better thinking processes. We can through education show them reality and truth and dispel many fears which cause aggressive behavior. We can through education make clear the interdependence of men as neighbors, as nationals, and as citizens of the world."

This declaration and the interest of the American Federation of Labor and of other forces in the labor movement and among the general public have already had their results. Our Government has taken the first steps toward collaboration in the designation of a committee to meet with the Allied Ministers of Education in London. But these steps are preliminary and tentative. For the time being, they relate only to the immediate postwar reconstruction needs. The broader and more far-reaching purpose of a permanent International Office for Education is yet to be agreed upon.

But even at this stage there are several distinctive elements that must guide the efforts to set up a permanent International Education Office.

In the first place, the idea must be accepted, the concept that education is, and must be utilized as, an instrument for the promotion of understanding among nations without which there can never be an enduring peace. The political and economic peace machinery cannot possibly work for long if it depends solely on Government experts. It must be supported by a public, worldwide, which understands the peace machinery and, even more important, understands other peoples. In the second place, such an office must not be thrust off into the when-there's-nothing-better-to-think-about area of international interest. It must have adequate moral and financial support from the nations of the world every day in every year.

And, in the third place, it must not be another conference of Government officials or even educators alone. Education for world understanding must follow from the participation of the peoples of the world. This means that delegates to such an International Office for Education must include worthy representatives of broad sections of the people or at least be selected by them—just as representatives to the International Labor Office are not solely representative of or chosen by governments.

The action of the American Federation of Labor and the sponsorship of the American

Association for an International Office for Education by such outstanding figures as George Meany, secretary of the American Federation of Labor; Selma Borchardt, of the American Federation of Teachers; A. Philip Randolph, international president, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Clinton Golden, C. I. O. representative on the War Manpower Commission; Mark Starr, educational director, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; J. Raymond Walsh, director, Department of Education and Research, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Owen D. Young of the General Electric Co.; Henry I. Harriman of the New England Power Association and business representative on the I. L. O.; Beardsley Ruml, director, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, give testimony to the alertness of labor and industry to world needs.

As the country at large becomes aware of the needs to be met by an International Office for Education and as it expresses that support, official action of our Government will, no doubt, follow.

Thanks to LaFollette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to and to include in these remarks the following editorial, which appeared in the Evansville Press, of Evansville, Ind., on June 14, 1944, and approves the conduct of our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE]:

THANKS TO L'FOLLETTE

The resignation of Robert W. Lyons as Republican National Committee man is a personal victory for Congressman CHARLES LAFOLLETTE who risked his political neck to support a principle.

It is a triumph for decency in Indiana and fair warning to organization hacks, Republican or Democratic, not to consider as private property a trust assigned them by the voters.

Ku Kluxism was the issue in this controversy and apologists for Mr. Lyons referred to the ravishment of this State half a generation ago by this plague of intolerance and gangsterism as something which might be epitomized as "youthful indiscretion."

It was the same kind of "youthful indiscretion" which produced Hitler, led to the enslavement of nine-tenths of the population of Europe and has brought our young men to the Norman beaches in a death struggle to keep it from enveloping the world.

We can forgive folly which is sincerely repented, and even forget it if given a chance; but we cannot, in times like these, endorse it, even by inference.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE'S courageous action will have a definitely cleansing effect upon Indiana politics in general. Immediate popular approval of his stand is fair warning to those who would use public power for petty, personal purposes. The incident reverses an evil trend and establishes LAFOLLETTE as a leader in the new Republican Party, now just emerging.

It is said that old organization men whose policies he has crossed will attempt to get even by working for his defeat in the election next November. The sincere friends of decency and good government should remember this and, by their votes, demonstrate that they appreciate his kind of public service.

Hog Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

RE: THE PRICE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST HOGS MARKETED IN NORTHEASTERN INDIANA

Since the W. F. A. has established a ceiling price for hogs in northeastern Indiana at 10 cents per hundredweight lower than the ceiling for central Indiana, and

Since the hogs from these areas are principally consigned to the same eastern packers, and

Since the hogs produced in these areas are believed to be of similar quality; and

Since freight rates are practically the same from the two areas; and

Since W. F. A. ceilings are said to be established from the market histories of the respective areas which must then indicate a longtime discrimination against northeastern Indiana hogs;

We, the undersigned members of the De Kalb County, Ind., U. S. D. A. War Board, hereby resolve, That the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, and the director of Purdue University Agricultural Experiment Station be petitioned to: (1) Establish the causes of the discrimination in price against northeastern Indiana market hogs; and (2) State and Federal agencies take the necessary action to correct this discrimination; Be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be submitted to all Federal and State agencies concerned, as well as to other county U. S. D. A. War Boards in northeastern Indiana; to the press and read at public meetings.

ARTHUR H. LAUTZENHISER,
Chairman, De Kalb County A. A. A.
WILLIAM B. KLOCK,
Field Supervisor F. S. A.
LESTER E. BOGER,
Field Agent, Albion P. S. A.
ALBERT YODER,
District Farm Bureau Chairman.
C. E. BAKER,
County Agricultural Agent.

RE HOG MARKETING REGULATION EVASIONS

Whereas we, the undersigned members of the De Kalb County (Ind.) United States Department of Agriculture War Board, acting under instructions from our superior officers, urged farmers in 1943 to produce more pork as a patriotic duty and assured them that they would receive at least the floor price for their hogs as set by the W. F. A.; and

Whereas the farmers did respond to this plea for more pork by producing the country's largest hog crop for 1943–44; and

Whereas farmers marketing these hogs have had to oftentimes accept prices below the floor price established for this area and which was promised by the Government; and

Whereas farmers have had to submit to unusual, unorthodox, and unethical practices on the part of buyers in the bypassing of the floor price; and

Whereas pork products are retailed to consumers on the basis of O. P. A. ceiling prices which are independent of prices paid farmers; and

Whereas the packer is subsidized $1.30 per hundredweight on all hogs, regardless of the weight of the hogs, to enable the packer to make a profit on the hogs processed even if he has to pay the ceiling; so

We, the undersigned members of the De Kalb County (Ind.) United States Department of Agriculture War Board, petition the respective Federal authorities responsible for formulating and carrying out the food-for-freedom program to:

1. Keep faith with the hog producer by making the support price apply to all weights of market hogs and thereby eliminate floor dodging.

2. Provide that packers resorting to unusual practices, not common prior to the price support regulation so that the farmer is penalized by unusually heavy shrinkages in weight of hogs as a result of these practices, be made to disqualify themselves for subsidy payments in so doing.

3. Investigate the hog-marketing system in northeastern Indiana and withhold subsidy payments from packers who have in any way evaded or colluded with others to evade the purpose and intent of the W. F. A. in establishing a floor for hog prices; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this instrument be sent the War Food Administration, the Office of Price Administration, the United States Senator and Representative in Congress for this county, the National and State United States Department of Agriculture war boards, the county United States Department of Agriculture war boards of this market area, and to the press.

ARTHUR H. LAUTZENHISER,
Chairman, De Kalb County A. A. A.
WILLIAM B. KLOCK,
Field Supervisor, F. S. A.
LESTER E. BOGER,
Field Agent, Albion P. C. A.
ALBERT YODER,
District Farm Bureau Chairman.
C. E. BAKER,
County Agricultural Agent.

Slovaks Praise President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, no finer Americans reside in my district than those affiliated with the National Slovak Society of the United States of America. Thousands of their sons fight on every battle front of the world and on the seven seas. Thousands of its membership are employed in the great Pittsburgh steel industrial district—the district which makes steel for the ships, planes, tanks, and guns needed by our fighting men. Members of this organization are a loyal group led by Mr. V. S. Platek, president. They love peace and are willing to fight and die for it.

I am happy to include in my remarks the resolution of the National Slovak

Society, which was adopted on May 21, 1944, endorsing the great leadership of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

Whereas shortly after America's declaration of war we, in the name and on behalf of the membership of the National Slovak Society, gave allegiance and full faith to the President of the United States and pledged our wholehearted and unconditional support of the Chief Executive and the Congress of the Nation in their determination to protect the honor of America and its ideals of right and humanity, and dedicated our lives, our fortunes, our all, to that great and holy cause; and

Whereas today the field of white of our society's service flag is studded with almost 3,000 stars of blue, 29 of which have already changed to gold—to tell the world that 29 of our brethren have made the sacrifice in this the greatest of all wars, so that the most precious things of life, the God-given rights of man—freedom, justice, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's own conscience—may not perish from the earth; and

Whereas we know that the war must be fought to the bitter end—until the United States of America and her allies are victorious—if Americans are to live as freemen and not as slaves; and

Whereas we know that the President has not failed the Nation in the critical days gone by, will not fail us in the critical days which face the Nation—days that will end in an assured victory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved at the annual meeting of the Supreme Assembly of the National Slovak Society, now in session in the city of Pittsburgh, That an expression of renewed confidence and continued faith be trasmitted to His Excellency, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt; that we continue to have unbounded faith in his great understanding of the problems of the world; that we continue to have implicit faith in his efforts to solve those problems, which deep faith is merited by his masterful conduct of America's part in the global war during the many months since Pearl Harbor; that we pray to God on high to bless him with health and inspire him with wisdom to guide our Nation safely through the dangers of the global war the men and women of America are now fighting, shoulder to shoulder with the Allies; and, God willing, to lead our Nation to a just and lasting peace; be it further

Resolved, That the original of this resolution be subscribed by each member of the supreme assembly and be transmitted to His Excellency, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and that a copy be spread upon the records of the society.

Given at Pittsburgh, Pa., on this 21st day of May 1944.

(Signatures omitted.)

Admittance of European Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, there has come to me a clipping from a newspaper dated June 15 last under the caption "Westbrook Pegler remarks: Roosevelt's 'thousand refugees' mere sample." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOSEVELT'S "THOUSAND REFUGEES" MERE SAMPLE

(By Westbrook Pegler)

Always a champion of unpopular and losing causes, I find myself skeptical of President Roosevelt's notice to Congress that 1,000 European refugees will be brought to this country immediately and confined in a vacated Army camp and his assurance that, when the war is over, they will be repatriated.

This Nation has immigration laws adopted for the purpose of excluding undesirable persons. These laws have been administered insincerely in recent years and evaded often. As in the flagrant case of Mrs. Earl Browder, an active, alien Communist posing as a harmless and nonpolitical housewife.

The people of the United States are the sole authority on desirability, and yet, in justice to them, it must be admitted that the provisions which they have adopted for their own protection are extremely liberal and more so than those of the other countries in the family of more or less free nations on our side of the war.

Nevertheless, even this generosity has been flouted openly in recent years by the admission of individuals in the guise of visitors who were legally ineligible to settle here, when it was known that real conditions would make it impossible to deport them, regardless of their active conduct, or their attitude toward the American form of government.

Past performances in many fields instinctively suggest that the promise—that these refugees will be repatriated after the war and meanwhile restricted—will not be kept. Past performances suggest also that once a principle has been conceded by the importation of 1,000 European aliens with no pretense that they are eligible or suitable for permanent residence here, the number that will be brought in later will be limited by shipping facilities, individual pull exerted through personal friends and organizations within the United States, and public tolerance.

The latter will be a weak and leaky barrier against the immigration of Communists and others who won't like our way of living and doing and will do their damnedest to make us live and do their way; and against continental crooks, who would be no asset to any nation.

The public tolerance operates through Congress, and Congress is beset and bedeviled by propaganda and pressure which attack as a Fascist and a bigot any man who, in the interests of his own country and his own people, undertakes to restrict immigration to those who have something to offer. It is almost heresy to say that not all immigrants and refugees are ennobled by their sufferings abroad, but there is nevertheless much biographical data to prove that many who came here shortly before the First World War for asylum from European tyranny did not join the native American youth in destroying those tyrants, but instead joined alien groups and movements and tried to destroy the American system. The whole native public is not organized to counteract the pressure on public men exerted by the organized pressure groups which call the United States a melting pot but, in reality, have in mind something more like a central park of the entire world where anyone may enter as a matter of right.

The United States is, in reality, an exclusive organization. It has rules of eligibility and, like most of our unions, reserves the right to reject applicants who do not meet certain requirements. These restrictions are unjust to no foreigner, because no foreigner has any rights in the matter. If he is admitted to residence and later to citizenship, that is a privilege—not a right. The United States can decide to exclude all immigration, if it comes to that, and to restrict the right to vote and hold public office to natives and, I believe, should do so.

Obviously the first 1,000 are to be just a sample, because 1,000 refugees more or less in southern Italy would make no appreciable difference in the problem of feeding and governing the region. But to this country the difference could and probably will be great, with other thousands following on, with the conditions of their immurement gradually relaxed and with carefully selected distress cases flaunted in the public eye in an appeal for sympathy and unwary kindness, all for the purpose of revising the law retroactively to confer legitimate immigrant status on unselected thousands with complete disregard of the legal standards of desirability.

Of course, this is all based on an assumption that there will be not 1,000, but many thousands, and that, once they are here, that will be the last the country will hear of their return to Europe after the war.

Agricultural Extension Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks of Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, at a luncheon meeting yesterday at the Department of Agriculture for Extension Service workers who have been with the Service for a period of 10 years or more.

I desire particularly to call attention to one statement which I know will be of interest to many throughout the country. It is certainly of great interest to me. Mr. Byrnes said:

For example, there are now about 10,000 Army trucks ready for disposal. The procurement officer of the Treasury who handles the disposition of all surplus war materials of this kind, is cooperating with the W. F. A. in getting the bulk of these trucks into farm use. The plan is as follows:

1. State A. A. A. committees obtain information from Treasury procurement regional offices on the number and types of trucks that might reasonably be available to the State.

2. On this information, they notify county A. A. A. committees of the probable number and types of trucks that might be available for each county.

3. The county committees give farmers a letter certifying need for a truck to haul essential crops.

4. The farmers present these letters to truck dealers.

5. The dealers contact the regional procurement office, present the A. A. A. letters, and buy the trucks.

6. Dealers pay procurement ceiling price, and sell the trucks to farmers at O. P. A. ceiling prices for used trucks. If necessary the dealer reconditions the trucks. The maximum dealer margin over purchase price and repairs is approximately 17 percent. Prices and margins are controlled by Government regulations.

I am glad to have this information, because farmers are certainly in need of

automotive equipment, particularly trucks, and I think the information will be of much interest, and the entire speech is one of enlightenment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I think it a splendid thing for persons who have served 10 years or more in the Extension Service to organize a fraternity of this kind offering an opportunity to people with a common interest to meet and exchange ideas.

You would not remain for 10 years in the Extension Service unless you were really interested in the work. Only those who are interested in their work will ever make much of a contribution to its success. I am told that your Director was one of the founders of your fraternity and that its first chapter was organized at his home in Montana. I am not surprised because from beginning of the Extension Service to this date he has labored efficiently and zealously for every cause that promised to increase the efficiency of the Extension Service.

I was not the legislative father of the Extension Service. But as a friend of the legislation father, I was close to him at the time of its birth. I do not have to tell you that I refer to the late Congressman A. Frank Lever, of South Carolina. He represented the congressional district adjoining the one I represented. He was here for some years before I became a Member of the House. From him I heard of the dreams and hopes of those who for some years had been working to establish the Extension Service. I did what little a new Member of the House could do to assist Mr. Lever in his fight. That was in 1914. Through the years that have passed I have kept in touch with the Extension Service because I have been privileged to enjoy the friendship of a man who gave the best years of his life to the Extension Service, your former Director, Dr. Clyde W. Warburton.

All of us have cause to be proud of the work of the Extension Service during the war period. It seems to me that whenever a war program has been suggested, whether it was to recruit manpower for the farms, to sell bonds or fight inflation, everyone would immediately suggest that the Extension Service be entrusted with the major responsibility. How well the service has responded to every appeal is known to you and to the people. They have been able to exercise leadership only because they had won the confidence of the farmers of the Nation.

As they have time and again called upon farmers to increase quotas and to do many other things, it was inevitable that they should meet with some complaint from the farmers. To complain is the inalienable right of every American. Some of the politicians and writers who heard these complaints were not all acquainted with our farmers. Because of the complaints and particularly because the Agriculture Department was not run entirely in accordance with their views, they assured all of us that we were facing a great disaster; that the food shortage this spring and summer would be so terrible that the morale of the war workers would be destroyed, production curtailed, and the war lost.

These prophets of disaster are now without honor either in their own homes or any other home. Marvin Jones is calling upon man and beast to aid in the consumption of some surplus crops, and he will shy from a crate of eggs just like a mule will shy from a steam piano.

The American farmer rallied to the call of his country in its most critical hour; by his ingenuity and long hours of work has abundantly supplied the American war machine with food and fiber. Instead of famine at home we have enjoyed a feast. No Army or Navy in the history of war has been fed as well as our soldiers and sailors are being fed.

The Extension Service provided the leadership and the American farmers demonstrated they could do what was regarded as impossible.

Many forces combined to bring about the increased yields of 1942 and 1943, but when the story is written it must be said that there was no greater contribution than that of the 1,700,000 boys and girls, members of the 4-H Clubs. They had been trained for farm life and, like trained soldiers going into battle, they were an inspiration to the recruits and brought about our victories on the farms of the Nation.

Our bumper crops give cause for serious thought. If with reduced labor supply and a greatly reduced supply of farm machinery we could produce the bumper crops of 1942 and 1943, we should certainly be able to do it when the boys return to the farms and the supply of farm machinery is greatly increased. I know that you can think of many offsets. Many old men who are today hanging on to do their part in winning the war will retire; many women will return to the home from the field. But necessity has caused us to devise new methods, and with increased supplies of machinery and labor we can look with confidence for abundant crops.

We must continue to export our surplus wheat, cotton, and tobacco. For 2 years from the 1st day of January following the termination of war we will guarantee loans at 90 percent of parity. The full significance of this provision is not generally realized. It will give us time to plan in the light of conditions that exist after peace has been restored.

However, you who are agricultural thinkers will not wait until then to plan for the future. You will not be lulled to sleep by the security given by these loans. Borrowing money upon a crop is not the goal of a farmer. Crops are grown to be marketed for consumption—not to be stored. As stored crops accumulate, they hang like a sword over the market. Thinking farmers will realize that they have a vital interest in the removal of trade barriers which will enable them to sell abroad their surplus crops and enable the purchasers to pay for such crops.

As to our food crops, our domestic demands plus the requirements of the people of the liberated nations until they can get back to normal will consume all that we can grow. As our shipments abroad cease, whether we will have sufficient demands at home depends upon whether we have full employment at home.

Because this is true, the farmers of the Nation have a very vital interest in the reconversion program. We now have pending in the Congress three bills, one to provide for the speedy termination of war contracts; another for the disposition of surplus property; and a third for the payment of more liberal unemployment compensation benefits. The first is the most important because it will help to provide jobs. It does not cause the Government to give anything to contractors. It only provides that Government promptly pay what it owes and promptly remove its machinery and materials from a plant in order that the manufacturer may promptly return to civilian production and more quickly give jobs to workers.

If, in addition to this, there is a prompt revision at the end of the war of the system of war taxation so that men will be encouraged to invest money in industry, there is no reason why we should have a recurrence of the unemployment that we suffered in the days following the last war and again in 1932.

Of course there will be some unemployment but it should be of short duration. It will necessarily be aggravated in some industries and in some areas. If the Congress, by guaranteeing that State unemployment funds shall not be reduced below an amount equal to a year's contribution, can induce the States to increase the weekly benefits and pay such benefits for a longer period, it will help to sustain the demand for the products of the farm.

Because of the measure of success we have achieved in holding the line as to prices and wages, the farmer is in much better position to grapple with post-war problems than he was after the First World War.

From 1920 to 1921, in 1 year alone, the farmer's net income was cut in half, from six and eight-tenths billion dollars to three and six-tenths billion dollars. As the curve of farm income hit bottom, the curve of farm mortgages skyrocketed.

From 1920 to 1922, the outstanding farm mortgage debt increased from eight billion to over ten billion dollars. By 1924, it increased to $10,665,000,000, and the interest rate to the farmer on this huge debt averaged 6.3 percent.

It was not until 1933 that the curve of farm income began going up and the curve of farm-mortgage debt began falling below the 1920 level.

In 1943 the net income of farmers reached the all-time high of twelve and five-tenths billion. The farm-mortgage debt has dropped to five and six-tenths billion dollars and the interest rate has been cut to 5 percent.

We must preserve these gains and we must continue our present farm-productive output.

There seems to me to be one important missing link. Like no one else, the farmer has to face the hazard of crop failure as a result of weather. A sound system of crop insurance is necessary to assure the farmer a stable income. Legislation on this subject is now pending in Congress, and I believe its early enactment will enable the farmer to move into the post-war era with greater economic security than he has ever enjoyed before.

Steps are being taken by Government to put surplus machinery into the hands of the farmer. Some farmers have been led to believe that they will not be permitted to buy this machinery at a fair price. Under a program which has just been formulated they will pay what the Government receives plus a reasonable charge for handling.

For example, there are now about 10,000 Army trucks ready for disposal. The Procurement Officer of the Treasury, who handles the disposition of all surplus war materials of this kind, is cooperating with the W. F. A. in getting the bulk of these trucks into farm use. The plan is as follows:

1. State A. A. A. committees obtain information from Treasury Procurement regional offices on the number and types of trucks that might reasonably be available to the State.

2. On this information they notify county A. A. A. committees of the probable number and types of trucks that might be available for each county.

3. The county committees give farmers a letter certifying need for a truck to haul essential crops.

4. The farmers present these letters to truck dealers.

5. The dealers contact the regional Procurement office, present the A. A. A. letters, and buy the trucks.

6. Dealers pay Procurement ceiling price, and sell the trucks to farmers at O. P. A. ceiling prices for used trucks. If necessary the dealer reconditions the trucks. The maximum dealer margin over purchase price and repairs is approximately 17 percent.

Prices and margins are controlled by Government regulations.

This general plan went into effect only this month. The merits of the plan at this stage of development are that it assures prompt disposal, chiefly to farm use, at controlled prices.

A few reports of excessive margins have been received on truck sales before this plan was adopted. For example, in one case reported from Sumter County, S. C., exorbitant profits have been alleged. This is being investigated by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Instances of this kind may have arisen where dealers bought trucks directly from Army depots before the present plan was worked out. The Office of Materials and Facilities, the A. A. A., and Treasury Procurement are confident the new plan will work fairly and expeditiously.

Arrangements are being worked out with Treasury Procurement for the disposal of surplus agicultual machinery in Army depots, navy yards, etc. Procurement will notify the State A. A. A. (in the State where the equipment is located) of the types and amounts of machinery available. County committees will give farmers letters certifying need, and letters will go to dealers and then to the regional Procurement office. The procedure under consideration is virtually the same as in the case of surplus trucks.

The plan is to have dealers pay Procurement ceiling prices and resell at O. P. A. ceiling prices.

Much has been said about surplus jeeps. Only a few hundred have been disposed of by the Army. Several thousand nonstandard types, minus repair parts and in bad condition, apparently are not in active use by the Army. Some of these are being torn down for repair parts by the Army. Disposal of jeeps for farm use does not appear practicable for some time to come but when they do become available steps will be taken to release them to farmers as needs may justify.

W. F. A. has proposed that miscellaneous used items be sold through county farm auctions. Procurement is considering this as the most practicable method suggested to them, and the auction method will be used experimentally in the near future.

We can all be heartened by the assurance that plans are being perfected to lessen the difficulties incident to the transition from war to peace. But it would be tragic if we allowed our interest in conditions following the war to divert us from the task of winning the war. Today our fighting men are only upon the beachheads of Europe. They have not landed on the shores of Japan. The roads to Berlin and Tokyo are still long and bloody. This is no time to relax in our efforts. This is the time for us to put every ounce of our strength in the effort to increase production on farm and in factory, and thus hasten the day of victory, hasten the day when our fighting men can return to their homes.

Wake Up, America

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the forces of Americanism may lose the coming election, for want of getting out the truly representative American vote. This situation may be likened to the time-honored maxim which runs:

For want of a nail the shoe was lost; for want of a shoe the horse was lost; and for want of a horse the rider was lost.

Likewise, constitutional representative government may be lost to the American people if they do not awake.

Until recently, the communistic movement in America has been an undercover affair, carrying on its subversive activities largely in secret, and with little effect on our American form of government. This is so because their teachings are so repugnant to the free men and women of our country, that it has been found most difficult to convert people to the cause of the Communist doctrines.

Politically, the Communist Party has never been large in numbers, but in recent years they have adopted the technique of infiltration into other organizations, taking undue advantage of and using those organizations for their own nefarious ends. To illustrate, there are many members of the American Labor Party of New York who are not Communists, yet they have been so indifferent to what was happening right in their own organization that the radical Reds gained and are today in control of that organization.

Basically, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, popularly known as the C. I. O., is a labor union, having great influence in labor circles. The great majority of members of the C. I. O. are honest, law-abiding American citizens who believe implicitly in their country, and to whom the views and beliefs of the Communists are abhorrent. Cunningly, the Communists set about to gain a foothold in this labor organization, and they have succeeded in their infiltration to the point where many important offices are now filled with Communists, which insures their control of the organization known as the C. I. O.

Notwithstanding the great majority of membership of the C. I. O. would never admit they could be even influenced, yet so strong has become the pressure upon them that they find themselves almost powerless to oppose this control forced upon them by their leaders.

These cunning leaders have assumed such arrogance that their members are compelled by them to pay extra dues which are used to further the Communist cause politically. The amount of money thus filched from the honest, patriotic laborers is unknown, but admittedly it reaches many thousands of dollars.

I still have confidence the rank and file members of the C. I. O. will at the proper time throw off this yoke that has been forced upon them.

To identify this movement which is becoming daily more intensive and more securely entrenched in the political fabric of the New Deal, as well as holding a threat over the success of American principles in November, we know it as the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

Make no mistake, the P. A. C. has a purpose, a sinister one. What is that sinister purpose? To attain the greatest possible power and influence in and over the Government of the United States.

How do they propose to attain that power and influence? By combining their communistic philosophies with the New Deal, to bring about the election of Mr. Roosevelt for his fourth term as President of the United States and a subservient Congress. Successful in this, they will be forever entrenched in high places in our Government structure.

This "red" spectre of communism is stalking our country from east to west, from north to south, unrecognized. But the sinister purpose is there, thriving on our unsuspecting population, particularly in communities where there are large groups of factory and industrial workers.

How may this spectre be recognized? They are well and accurately described in a recent report issued by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, in which it is declared "the Communists will attempt by stealth and subterfuge to do through the Political Action Committee what they have failed to do when functioning as a political party under their own name, that is, to gain political leadership over millions of voters."

What are they doing to establish domination over our people? Cited is the UE Guide to Political Action, published by the Communist-dominated United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, a standard textbook for this insidious movement. I cite their methods to get out the vote in the forthcoming election campaign:

First. Workers are urged to secure the use of their union meeting halls for registration purposes, where they must register under the watchful eyes of their Communist chieftains. Woe betide the worker who fails to register, as these chieftains control his bread and butter.

Second. Special hours for registration purposes, and time off with pay, is the demand of these political chieftains.

Third. Checking of union membership lists against lists of registered voters. And God help the worker whose name is missing!

Fourth. Shop stewards instructed to check up on every employee to insure registration for voting. Imagine the lot of any individual who may fail to comply with this requirement.

Fifth. Visiting in the homes of unregistered voters.

Sixth. Unions furnishing automobiles to transport members to registration offices.

Seventh. Prizes for percentage of complete registration in shops and departments in industrial plants.

Eighth. Special registration stamps issued for checking with payment of dues.

Ninth. Registration en masse urged in shops, to insure 100 percent registration for voting in election.

Tenth. Compulsory registration in certain union organizations.

Eleventh. Instructions to precinct captains for canvass to insure registration of sympathizers with cause.

Twelfth. Women's auxiliary organizations for registration purposes.

Thirteenth. C. I. O. canteens opened all over the country for use of men and women in service.

We must not fail to recognize that the Political Action Committee is guided by some of the most cunning men in the country, in effective organization work. We might be better off next November, in our efforts to preserve our ideals of Americanism and the constitutional structure of our Government, if we take some lessons from this guidebook.

We cannot afford to overlook the success already attained by the C. I. O.-P. A. C., in defeating well qualified, experienced, able Members of Congress in primaries held during the past 2 months. This was due in part to the apathy and complacency of those people who did not vote.

Let this be a warning of things to come in November, if we continue that same apathy and complacency, and do not work, and work hard, day and night, to be at them at their own game.

It is high time those entitled to vote become alert, awake and ever mindful of the incontrovertible fact that the Political Action Committee never sleeps. We cannot sit idly by and watch this thing creep up on us. We must have action and more action. We must have the courage of our convictions and be willing to fight for those principles in which we believe.

Browder and Hillman are spending huge resources to register every last vote they can control, and their work will be unceasing to get out to vote every last man and woman, come the election.

You may say "It can't happen here." It can happen here. It has already happened in isolated cases in Alabama, in Texas, and in California.

We must go to the four corners of our country, urge and arouse our people to their duty to register, and vote on November 7.

Let us say to them: "Browder, Hillman, and the Communists are registered. Are you?"

Let us say to them: "Browder, Hillman, and the Communists will vote. Will you?"

The following figures, carefully authenticated, of the number of people who failed to vote all over the United States in 1940, are cause for alarm:

Alabama had 1,261,150 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Arizona had 113,307 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Arkansas had 898,243 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

California had 1,186,836 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Colorado had 139,406 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Connecticut had 230,156 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Delaware had 35,482 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Florida had 702,335 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Georgia had 1,456,430 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Idaho had 70,143 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Illinois had 901,919 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Indiana had 416,188 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Iowa had 393,496 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Kansas had 284,526 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Kentucky had 660,709 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Louisiana had 992,628 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Maine had 172,666 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Maryland had 493,406 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Massachusetts had 548,484 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Michigan had 1,045,797 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Minnesota had 479,359 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Mississippi had 1,019,255 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Missouri had 629,997 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Montana had 95,307 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Nebraska had 201,402 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Nevada had 17,153 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

New Hampshire had 60,440 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

New Jersey had 620,426 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

New Mexico had 92,213 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

New York had 2,025,967 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

North Carolina had 1,102,835 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

North Dakota had 77,315 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Ohio had 1,084,511 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Oklahoma had 536,226 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Oregon had 235,881 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Pennsylvania had 1,952,458 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Rhode Island had 105,227 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

South Carolina had 890,011 men and women of voting age who did note vote in 1940.

South Dakota had 69,978 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Tennessee had 1,180,568 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Texas had 2,669,206 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Utah had 50,343 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Vermont had 71,186 men and women of voting age who did note vote in 1940.

Virginia had 1,220,910 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Washington had 329,892 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

West Virginia had 178,031 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Wisconsin had 536,081 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

Wyoming had 37,791 men and women of voting age who did not vote in 1940.

The failure of our people to vote in the various States in the coming election may be a direct contribution to the downfall of our Government. Wake up, America.

Remarks on the Coming Campaign and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following series of remarks on the coming campaign and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. The series consists of remarks I have made concerning the alliance between four of the leading radical groups in America and the New Deal, the alliance having been planned by Sidney Hillman, who is now its leading spirit. I offer these remarks for the consideration of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, hoping also that the voters of the Nation will take due notice and be guided accordingly:

FOREWARNED IS FOREARMED

We have in this country today a well-organized, well-financed movement by the leftist wing of American labor to control the Congress. They propose to defeat any Senator or Representative they cannot control. A short time ago C. I. O. leaders announced they had set aside $750,000 to be used in the election of a friendly Congress. Later they announced that each member of the C. I. O. would be asked to contribute $1 toward the campaign fund which would give them something like $4,000,000 to work with. Already they have made their influence felt. In the Alabama primaries several weeks ago they defeated for renomination Congressman STARNES, who had been very active in the Dies committee work. Two weeks ago they defeated another Dies committee member, Congressman COSTELLO, of California. They boldly announce that they are going into every district the sitting member of which they do not control. With a campaign chest of $4,000,000, it would mean nearly $10,000 to spend in every district. That is quite a fund to be used against any sitting Member of Congress who will not take orders from the C. I. O. What do you propose to do about it? (Weekly News Letter, May 29, 1944.)

A HELPLESS DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Four of our extreme left-winger groups, the Communist Political Association, the American Labor Party, the Liberal Party (an offshoot of the American Labor Party), and the C. I. O. Committee for Political Action have all recently nominated and endorsed President Roosevelt for the fourth term. Where does this leave the regular Democratic Party? Does it not place them in the position of having to ratify a Presidential nomination already made for them by these four left-wing party groups? What else is there for them to do? Real Democrats don't like

the idea of these radical groups leading their parade, but there is nothing they can do about it. The play has been taken away from them. They cannot change the situation. The Democratic Party is helpless. From now on, if Roosevelt wins in November, the real Democrats—both North and South—must play second fiddle to these radical groups who have been embraced by the New Dealers. (Weekly News Letter, June 12, 1944.)

AN UNHOLY ALLIANCE

The New Deal, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee have teamed up against the American farmer. This unholy alliance was first shown on July 5, 1940, when the United States Department of Agriculture put on a radio skit to advertise oleo as a substitute for butter. The alliance was next demonstrated when Hoyt S. Haddock, of the C. I. O., testified before a congressional committee on June 21, 1943, that "oleo has a greater food value than butter. * * * The price of butter should be rolled back to 25 cents per pound * * *. The country would be better off if we had stopped producing butter altogether."

The attitude of the New Deal toward the farmer is summed up in the words of Jay Franklin, a semi-official mouthpiece of the New Deal, when he states in his book, For What We Are About to Receive: "The farmer has arrogated to himself all virtue and all knowledge. He has voted against progress and civilization, against the city, against science, against art. He has exhausted our soils, as he has exhausted our Treasury when given half a chance. Sooner or later we shall discover, as the Roman Church discovered, as England discovered, as Soviet Russia discovered, that the pagan, the landed proprietor, the Kulak, is simply so much mud on the paths of progress and must be swept aside if society is to advance. The American farmer as a political institution is a danger to our civilization."

Every man who milks a cow should keep an eye on the C. I. O. Political Action Committee headed by Sidney Hillman, of New York City. The New Deal may have started out to save the farmer; but following the leadership of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, it is now trying to destroy the farmer. (Weekly News Letter, June 12, 1944.)

WHAT LIES AHEAD?

American boys are fighting and dying all over this world so that American principles and ideals may be preserved for posterity. It is disturbing therefore to read in the daily papers a story from Detroit that says "The United Automobile Workers (C. I. O.) have asked General Motors Corporation to fire five war veterans who belonged to the union before entering service, but failed to maintain their membership after getting their old jobs back when discharged from the armed forces." If by any chance the boys on the beaches of France should read this story, what would they think? Would they not ask, "Are we to return to jobs that will be denied us unless we bow to the demands of radical labor leaders? Is this a sample of the liberties, the privileges, and the rights of American citizenship for which we fight?"

All fair-minded Americans believe that labor is entitled to its place in the sun; that it is entitled to decent hours, better working conditions, good wages, and collective bargaining rights. These are the things that the rank and file of labor believe in and have fought for. They should be preserved. But when C. I. O. labor leaders require a man to contribute to their political campaign fund in order to retain his job, even when the man is opposed to their political program, then public opinion turns against labor unions that have such leaders. "Labor racketeering" and "forced labor shake-downs" will eventually destroy the cause of labor. (Weekly News Letter, July 3, 1944.)

THE C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

Sidney Hillman, whose political ambitions are attracting wide attention throughout the Nation, capitalized on World War No. 1 and is now capitalizing on World War No. 2. Born in Russia, he arrived at Ellis Island August 10, 1907, at the age of 20. Seven years later, with no experience as a labor leader, no experience as a journeyman, he raided the membership of the existing garment makers' union and organized the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, which he dominates today. The First World War gave him his opportunity to put the young organization on its feet. The Government then, as in this war, insisted that manufacturers of clothing for the armed forces have satisfactory union contracts. Through the aid of the late Justice Brandeis, Felix Frankfurter, and Prof. W. Z. Ripley, Hillman had things his own way in the wartime clothing industry. Mr. Roosevelt, at the request of Frances Perkins, brought him into national labor prominence with the advent of the New Deal; but it was the coming of the Second World War that gave his union, together with that of the textile workers which he had taken under his wing, their present boom period of prosperity, which set in motion his political activities.

We look upon the two World Wars as terrible tragedies, but Hillman, looking back over his career, can say: "It is an ill wind that doesn't blow somebody some good." Were it not for the war, with the tremendous expansion of our industrial plants, and the general upheaval which a war creates, the A. F. of L. would soon clip his wings like nobody's business, just as it has done in the past. Hillman's ambitions are to elect a President and a Congress of his own choosing, not necessarily a Congress or a President "friendly" to labor, but rather a Congress and a President "friendly" to the Hillman philosophy. In order to accomplish this he has made an alliance with the Communists to form a united political front. Commenting upon this alliance, Mark Sullivan, Fulton Lewis, and other newspaper and radio commentators have pointed out that no one questions the right of anyone to engage in legitimate political activity, but the American people should be made acquainted with the purposes and aims of this radical labor leader.

As a youngster in Russia Hillman was schooled in revolutionary activities. In 1921–22 Hillman went back to Russia for a look-see at a time when pretty much of the world was frightened by the "great experiment." He found nothing frightening about it. Instead, he made arrangements then and there to do business with the Communist government and gave it his blessing. The question we ask today is "Should American labor follow the lead of Hillman in political matters?" (Weekly News Letter, July 10, 1944.)

Pending Insurance Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a recent Supreme Court decision has raised anew the issue as to whether or not the Federal Government shall control the insurance business or whether it shall remain within State control. Much misleading propaganda has befogged this issue. The following editorial from the November 5, 1943, edition of the Watchman-Advocate, of Clayton, Mo., is an accurate statement of the case as it affects the record of Congressman WALTER C. PLOESER:

THE INSURANCE ISSUE

Recently, the St. Louis evening newspapers have been manufacturing a great deal of news about the insurance bills before the Congress. Screaming, editorially, the reader would get the impression that someone was trying to steal something.

These insurance bills (introduced by Senator VAN NUYS and Representative WALTER) are obviously and candidly bills introduced at the request of the stock fire insurance companies to clarify the intent of the Congress. The bills declare that the supervision of the fire insurance business shall be left to the several States. The Congress can pass the bills or not as it chooses. It happens that the Federal court in Atlanta recently threw a New Deal indictment brought by the Justice Department out of court on a demurrer. This is not new, for the courts have held for more than 75 years that the regulation of insurance companies is not a Federal job. The St. Louis papers, New Dealish to the stooge degree, do not tell the people that the entire plot by the administration is to get into its control the many millions of dollars of insurance policyholders' reserves.

One St. Louis evening newspaper in an editorial tried to impugn Congressman WALTER PLOESER's announced support of the bills. This newspaper has attacked the Congressman unfairly before. It is not because they actually doubt his integrity. PLOESER's most bitter enemies very likely secretly respect the integrity of the Congressman. But the New Deal hates PLOESER as much as it hates any other man in the United States who opposes their views, and this newspaper must do the bidding of the master. In the case of the other evening newspaper, it is more a case of the distorted and muddled opinion of what constitutes liberalism. That newspaper, once great, is for free enterprise as it applies to itself but also for everything and everyone else being cartelized and regulated in the good old Fascist style.

We are sure that the Congress will pay little or no attention to these newspapers. The purpose of this editorial is to remind these critics that Congressman PLOESER commands the respect of the people partly because of his liberal and progressive insurance record.

Some States may have made a mess of the handling of the insurance business but, on the other hand, many of the States have done a splendid job. Missouri, under the infamous rule of the New Deal's Tom Pendergast and Insurance Commissioner Emmet O'Malley did a most deplorable job of handling the insurance business. Now, let us remember, who was it who first called to the attention of the public the dishonest conduct of the O'Malley insurance department? Who was it that first denounced the notorious "Missouri Rate Compromise?" Who was it that first defied the insurance department and sent someone hurrying to see where the rats may be hidden? If our memory and the record serves us correctly it was none other than insurance man WALTER PLOESER, in October 1936. For a further memory refresher the place was Columbia, Mo., and the occasion, the 1936 Insurance Agents Convention. Insurance man PLOESER did this in a speech before the Convention, which he made in opposition to a resolution of endorsement for the notorious New Dealer O'Malley. PLOESER braved the anger of most of the insurance fraternity in Missouri by so doing. Since then, he has merited un-

dying gratitude for his courage at a time when it was most unpopular to be courageous. If the word of insurance men is accurate, he has brought about other reforms in the insurance business. His record in the past is one of constant battle against monopoly He is one of the few men of the country who knows a monopoly when he sees one, and that includes the New Deal governmental type, too.

In 1942, Attorney General McKittrick threatened to come to St. Louis and speak against PLOESER on this insurance issued but after reflection remembered his only and disastrous encounter with PLOESER before the Small Business Committee of the House in the spring of 1942. One newspaper's trumped-up bluff with McKittrick never developed. We think we know why. Read the committee hearings on this same subject and you will learn that PLOESER made McKittrick look ridiculous. In 1943 the Federal Court of Atlanta confirmed PLOESER's opinions.

There are two sides to this issue, and manufactured news only draws attention to extreme political bias.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, at the meeting of the Republican State committeee at Philadelphia on May 20, 1944:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, the Republican Party has a right to be proud of its record.

Pennsylvania has seen 5 years of Republican rule turn a $71,000,000 deficit into a $100,000,000 surplus with lowered taxes, and at the same time an increase in appropriations for education and welfare activities of $40,000,000.

This action speaks louder than promises.

In the Nation three-quarters of a century of Republican Party administration strictly adhered to the policies of a strong Union of States with full assurance of the sovereignty of each State; of a stable and sound currency recognized over all the world; of low and equitable taxes; of protection of the public credit by lowering indebtedness and balancing budgets; of taking our place in the world to preserve peace and goodwill on earth; of maintaining trade restrictions necessary to preserve living standards in America by protecting wage earners, and of giving a square deal to every citizen through safeguarding his freedom of action.

These policies made us the most prosperous and the most respected Nation in the world.

What is the situation that confronts the United States after almost 12 years of New Deal rule?

We find ourselves entering the most difficult and dangerous period of American history.

The close of the war will find resources exhausted, trade vanished, industry paralyzed, and shipping disordered. Inflation will breed confusion and unrest. These threats to this Nation existed even before the dark clouds of war blackened the skies of the world.

There is no easy solution of the problem. It is far more difficult than those confronting us at the end of World War No. 1, or the Spanish-American War, or the War Between the States.

The Republican Party solved those problems. They were solved by hard work, sacrifices, tears, sweat, humility, and common sense. We can solve our problems of today by the same means if we have the courage to use them.

We must start with the fact that government cannot create wealth. All it can give is equal opportunities. The solution of our problems must be undertaken without class conflict, sectional hatred, or political demagogy.

The American economic-social plan has become the most colossal and the most complicated and interdependent system in the history of civilization. Fifty years ago we felt ourselves remote from the world. Our domestic problems were few, as our people had simple tastes. In that time more than 50 percent of our people literally supported themselves. They raised much of their own food. They had their own transportation, their own food, and their own water and fuel.

Now water is furnished by a corporation. Food is hauled and preserved for us. Transportation depends upon the oil supply. We buy power and light. We haul our children to school.

Capital has been combined into great corporations. Labor, lawyers, farmers, doctors, and ministers, groups and classes have their organizations. We are a bloc-conscious and group-ridden people.

Regardless of this, we must all recognize that the rights of the whole people are paramount to the rights of any section, class, or group.

We are all on the team. The various economic and social groups in America are players on that team. The refusal of any player or group to play will destroy the American team. Production will stop, people will go hungry, and in time they will perish.

During the peace period of 1927 to 1941 we had a total of 1,945 strikes, or an average of 138 per annum. For the war year of 1943 we had 3,737.

Some of these strikes directly affected the food and water supply. The rights of the public must be safeguarded and Government must have the courage to guard the rights and the lives and the well-being of the people.

We must approach this serious problem with the understanding that the soldier, the mechanic, the miner, the farmers, and the small businessman are all partners in this great enterprise. In the vast fields of social and economic conflict the Government must be the firm umpire and the impartial arbiter. The Government is not a good businessman and should stay out of business.

What are some of the things that have America by the throat while we are fighting a war for our very existence?

One out of every 41 Americans is now employed by the Federal Government. There are one-third as many on the civilian pay roll as in the armed services.

Federal employees greatly exceed the number named by both State and local governments. This swarming army of tax-eating locusts are snooping and prying into the private affairs of American citizens in ways never contemplated by the founders of the Republic. They are interfering with freedom of action.

It is all costly and non-American. Money is being spent in wild recklessness by Washington. When Federal employees in 1941 spent $157,000,000 for telephones, telegrams, printing, and travel costs it was time to call a halt. Those costs are far greater now.

The Federal Government will have no money when the war ends. But it will have the most enormous debt in history, a gigantic debt of almost $300,000,000,000.

At the low rate of 2½ percent, the yearly interest on the conservatively estimated national debt of three hundred billions following the war's end will be seven and one-half billions a year. This gigantic yearly charge for interest alone is twice the total largest peacetime Budget in the whole history of the United States prior to 1930 and six times the size of the whole national debt at the outbreak of World War No. 1.

Shortly after World War No. 1 the whole cost of Government per year was less than $3,000,000,000.

During the depression the national annual income fell to sixty billions. In hard times the burden of the debt charges alone would be crushing.

This war has shown all of us that Government is a hard task master, and a most inefficient one. The heartless corporation is a "sob sister" compared to Government with its iron-hard regulations. Bureaucrats become a law unto themselves. Daily they make new regulations which are not understood by lawyers, management, labor leaders, farmers, or even by Federal employees themselves.

Regardless of the fact that the Constitution has been ignored and frequently evaded, and that our domestic problems have been recklessly handled, the Republican Party cannot win by griping, complaining, and fault finding.

We must have a better program. We must convince the voters that we have the will and the ability to put that program into effect.

I firmly believe that we have better men and better policies and are in a better position to win the war and establish a permanent peace than our opponents.

In the very near future there will arise the question of "swapping horses in the middle of the stream." We will be told there should not be a change during the war. But the people will vote a change if we have a better horse to offer, a younger horse with a better understanding of the problems of our country, who will put country above self and will not compromise for personal popularity.

Great Britain changed horses in midstream and took Churchill for Chamberlain. She would have been beaten in this war if she had not changed. The new horse must be able to work with other horses. We must have teamwork rather than individual performance.

There are certain fundamental issues and vital problems that must be considered by the Republican Party and by the people of this country.

We must spend less money. The public pay roll must be decreased. Fixing that pay roll at the amount expended at the beginning of World War No. 1, which was twice the size it was during the administration of President Hoover, would save us $5,000,000,000 annually.

Agriculture is America's basic industry. It depends upon production, prices, and distribution. The farmer must be encouraged by a market for his products at a profit. He cannot depend upon subsidies and governmental grants. Profitable markets are his greatest concern.

Workers from the days of Lexington and Concord have always been stalwart in their Americanism. We want the man who works with his hands to have a profit from his labor, so he may educate his children, plan his own security, and build his own home, so he may be in fact independent. He has a right to organize, bargain, and strike, but

this cannot interfere with the rights of the public which are at all times paramount, and this rule applies with equal responsibility to capital.

The happiness of a country depends upon a sound financial system. Governmental budgets must be balanced. Debts must be reduced, and taxes made equitable. Our monetary system must be made so sound that the American dollar is worth 100 cents anywhere in the world.

The rights of the State have been recognized since the formation of this Government. Decentralization of government is necessary in a republic to preserve liberty. This means that each level of government—Federal, State, and local—has its functions to perform. One must not encroach upon the other. The legislative, the executive, and the judicial must be kept separate.

A government of laws, and not a government by men, is essential. The growth of bureaus has lessened the power and prerogatives of each branch except the executive.

We must have the courage to allocate to each level of government its functions and the tax sources necessary to carry those functions into effect. We must end this going to Washington and the State capitals with a tin cup and begging for help, unless we want finally to destroy local government.

The source of taxes—which is labor, agriculture, and industry—must not be destroyed. At all times they must have governmental protection.

Abraham Lincoln once said he did not know much about a protective tariff, but he did know that if we buy steel rails in a foreign country that country has the money and we have the steel rails, but if we make the steel rails in America we have both the steel rails and the money.

If we furnish money for other countries to start business, the same principle applies. When we loan to our own people we create business which means more employment at home and more taxes for the Government, thereby lessening taxes on business already in existence. If we loan to other countries they have the business and the results therefrom.

We must make clear beyond misunderstanding our position in our relationships with other nations. At the close of the war very great and very grave problems will face us. We will have the selfish and greedy nations. We will have the hungry and desolate peoples. Our own country will be tired of war.

We need a united country now, and we will need a united Nation then. We must have at the helm men of vision and understanding.

From the days of William McKinley, John Hay, and Theodore Roosevelt, the Republican Party has ably handled international affairs. The acquisition of the Philippines and Puerto Rico gave us great concern. The Democrats opposed, but the problems were courageously met and handled to the entire satisfaction of the American people by the Republican Party.

The Republican Party will be able to stop the greedy nations of the post-war years. We must feed the hungry, discourage the selfish, and lead our own people in the American way.

The nations now united for self-preservation must collaborate so that peace may be preserved. It may be necessary to use force to maintain the observance of peace and good will.

On our part this may mean a powerful navy, a large army, strategical air bases and airways, and a great merchant marine. In order to maintain peace we must have uninterrupted access to sources of water, coal, ore, oil, rubber, and lumber. All this must be done under the provisions of the Constitution, and at all times and at all costs we must never surrender any part of the sovereignty of the United States.

Summed up the following could be our program:

First. The use of all our energies to speedily win this war.

Second. Work for permanent peace in collaboration with other nations.

Third. The preservation of the sovereignty of the United States.

Fourth. A program for veteran rehabilitation, reemployment, and an opportunity to succeed as a recompense for sacrifices made in the service.

Fifth. A government of thrift and economy and the elimination of all unnecessary supergovernment. Bad management destroys the confidence in all government, even good government.

Sixth. A policy toward agriculture, labor, and management, that assures them equality of opportunity and freedom of action with a minimum of interference by government.

Seventh. Simplification and decentralization of government.

Eighth. An end to the economy of scarcity and a clear recognition that the economy of plenty is the only economy for America.

Ninth. The disposition, once the war is over, with all possible rapidity, of surplus lands, factories, and matériel acquired by the Government for the prosecution of the war and the full reestablishment of an economy of full private competition.

Tenth. A program of conservation of our natural resources to protect future generations, which is rendered enormously imperative as the result of the waste of war.

Eleventh. An adequate program of national defense to safeguard America and secure peace for the world.

And finally: For victory we must have unity. The most effective unity is voluntary. Regimentation and force are not effective in America, even among servicemen. The plan of willing discipline in the American armed forces has produced an unbeatable Army and Navy.

Every American is interested in seeing that rule by men is not substituted for rule by law. Individual interpretation of regulations will destroy much of the unity needed to win this war. Nor can unity come from a struggle over power or profit.

We must all understand that if we lose the war we lose everything. This applies to labor, capital, agriculture, and those in public places. Nobody is immune.

We will not get any place by one group smearing another, or by creating class hatred. Racketeering in politics, labor, or business is outrageous to free men.

In this country men cannot long remain free, united, and self-respecting when forced to be subservient to others. The way to victory is through unity. And unity is created by shoulder to shoulder effort in a common cause and a common understanding.

We must have a stable order of government. The old, sound ideas of thrift and self-responsibility are needed as greatly today as in the days of Benjamin Franklin.

The war clouds will pass away and then if those living on this continent with its tremendous natural resources will use the ability which God in his wisdom gave us, we can conquer new frontiers of health, happiness, and independence. We can give then of our blessings to the less fortunate of the world, and in that way assist in the coming of peace and good will toward men.

Above all, we must keep our hearts and minds attuned to the spiritual frontiers of America. There can never be any end to these spiritual frontiers so long as American men and women continue to have courage, determination, and purpose.

The Inter-American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Col. William C. Rigby at the luncheon meeting of the Chicago Bar Association on June 6, 1944:

The luncheon meeting of the Chicago Bar Association, held Tuesday, June 6, 1944, in the rooms of the Association, 29 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., was called to order at 1 o'clock, Forest D. Siefkin, chairman of the committee on international and comparative law, presiding.

Chairman SIEFKIN. Ladies and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you today Col. William C. Rigby, a member of the bar of this State and of a great many other States, who has been active in international and inter-American affairs for a great many years. He will talk to us on some aspects of the Inter-American Bar Association. Colonel Rigby. [Applause.]

Col. WILLIAM C. RIGBY. It is certainly a pleasure for me to come back home to Chicago, where I practiced—I can hardly realize it—for a quarter of a century, before the last World War. And when I went into the Army then, of course I had no idea of doing anything except doing my bit and coming back, but I got tangled up with some special things, so I stayed in the Army, and when I retired it seemed easier to practice in Washington and New York than to come back here, and that is my explanation for not coming back to the city I still look upon as my home.

The Inter-American Bar Association—I want to talk informally, if I may—really was organized in 1940. We took advantage of the presence in the city of Washington of lawyers from pretty much all over the continent at the Eighth American Scientific Congress. One section of that was what they called the Juridical Section. There had been in the air for some time before that the thought of the value of an organization of the lawyers of the continent. It took definite form first, really, in the American Bar Association as a result of the report of the Committee on International Bar Relations, created, I think, in 1932, fathered by Dean Wigmore, and in 1934 the committee made a report.[1]

It was quite a distinguished committee, and the committee report was that the lawyers were the only professional body of standing that had not, in some form or other, organized across the lines of the nations, internationally, and that because of the fact of the differences in the commercial laws of countries, and of the fact that the lawyers generally were the leaders of public opinion, it seemed especially fitting that the lawyers should in some form organize. They called attention to the organization of the International Law Association founded in 1873, and various others, and finally the International Union of Advocates organized in Belgium in 1928, and to the fact that it was organized on the basis of a representative association to represent not individuals—not to have individual membership, but to represent the different bar associations—and they

[1] 59 Am. Bar Rep. 620 et seq. [1934].

recommended that any new organization of the lawyers should be on that basis.

If I may read just a sentence, they recommended that "in the first place"—and I am quoting from page 622 of the American Bar Association Reports for 1934:

"In the first place, there need be no expectation of seeking to achieve practical results in any specific field of law. Time alone can lead to such possibilities. Propaganda should be no part of the aim.

"Next, there need be no express purpose of assimilating the laws of different nations. National independence and variance will always be inevitable, as well as healthy, in the vast field of law. And so far as assimilation may sometimes be desirable, it is usually better attended to by other existing bodies.

"Thirdly, there should be no desire to represent in any way the national governments. The legal profession, like the medical and the engineering professions, has a social existence and traditions independent of the forms of government. National politics should not enter into a fraternal affiliation of the bar.

"Fourth, and finally, there need be no purpose merely to promote professional clientage by exchanging references or otherwise. The public interests of the profession must be kept separate from the interest of personal profit."

Along about the same time, and beginning even earlier, back, I think, as early as 1928, under the leadership of Dr. Honorio Silgueira, of the Argentine, who was President of the Argentine Federation of the Bar for several terms in succession, a very distinguished lawyer, conferences had been held between first the lawyers of the Argentine and of Brazil; then that was extended. They included in annual meetings Chili and Peru, and began to develop the idea of an intercontinental association of the members of the bar. And so, with that foundation, from the two ends of the continent, we took advantage of the presence of lawyers, as I have said, from the different countries, at the Eighth American Scientific Congress in 1940, and under the stimulus of resolutions passed by the American Bar Association in 1937 directing its Section of the International and Comparative Law Committee to explore the field and prepare proposals, a draft constitution was prepared. The job of preparing the draft fell to the chairman of the Latin-American Committee of the Section, who happened to be myself at that time; and it was submitted to various committees, and finally was submitted at the meeting of the Eighth American Scientific Congress. It was approved and signed tentatively ad referendum by representatives of a number of bar associations present from pretty much all over the continent, including the representative of the American Bar Association, Mr. William R. Vallance, as Chairman of the Section at that time; and an organizing committee was chosen. The matter was presented then to the different bar associations.

The American Bar Association, at its following meeting that fall in Philadelphia, ratified the signature of its representative, Mr. Vallance; and with that lead-off, the national bar associations of, I think, 16 of the countries, had ratified it by the time that our first conference was held in March 1941, including Canada to the north, and down to Argentine and Chile to the south, practically all of the larger bar associations.

One or two odd things came up. In Guatemala the President has forbidden any bar association at all. And some peculiar things came up in some of the smaller countries. The Canadians came in all right, and we have had their representatives at each of our conferences. The Canadian Bar Association has been represented by a former president, Mr. McCarthy, whom many of you know; and Mr. St. Laurent, the minister of justice; Senator Maroud, of Quebec, and others; and we expect a good Canadian representation, I may say, at the forthcoming conference in Mexico. We have had very hearty support, on the whole, from Canada.

Our first conference was held in Habana, as I have said, in March 1941, and we had representatives at the time not only of those national bar associations, but also from a very good portion of the bar associations of States and cities of this country, and some from some of the others. The Chicago Bar Association, I am happy to say, joined very early; the Illinois State Bar Association also, and we now have the Illinois Women's Bar Association. The Bar Association of New York, the State Bar Association and the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and the New York County Lawyers' Association came in early, as did the Missouri and the Texas State Bar Associations, those of Pennsylvania and of the city of Philadelphia, and others. Later on we got the American Foreign Law Association and the American Society of International Law, the Federal Bar Association, and others, so that we have had, have now, a very strong representation, generally, of the bar associations of this country.

The purposes of the association and the method of its foundation followed the lead of the 1934 Committee of the American Bar Association. It is strictly an association of associations. It has no individual members. The members are of two classes: First, the national bar associations; and then, I might say, all others, which we describe as constituent geographical associations. They include State bar associations, city, county bar associations, other local associations, and then any associations of lawyers, even of wider scope, devoted to any specific branch of the law, such as the Federal Bar Association—the association of the lawyers in the Federal service of the United States—and, as I have said, the American Foreign Law Association, the American Society of International Law, and that sort of thing.

The governing body of the organization is its council. It is organized roughly along the same lines as the American Bar Association. It meets in conference from time to time, the general conference corresponding roughly to the assembly of the American Bar Association, and the council is composed, first, of one representative from each national bar association member. Each national bar association member is entitled, as a right, to one place on the council. There are, then, 15 other elective councillors elected at large by the members of the association. That, of course, is planned to give representation to what we call the constituent geographical associations, the local associations, and others.

Each national and each local association, each association member, has one vote in the conference. It may have whatever number of delegates it sees fit. It may appoint its delegates in any way that it determines for itself; but at the conference meeting the delegation must determine among itself how to cast its vote and who shall cast its vote for it and be recognized as its representative; and unless there be disagreement among the delegation itself, its vote is recorded in that way.

The purposes of the association generally are substantially the purposes of bar associations usually. They are stated in the constitution to be:

"To establish and maintain relations between associations and organizations of lawyers, national and local, in the various countries of the Americas;

"To provide a forum for exchanges of views;

"To advance the science of jurisprudence in all its phases, and particularly the study of comparative law;

"To promote uniformity of commercial legislation;

"To further the diffusion of knowledge of the laws of the various countries throughout the Americas;

"To uphold the honor of the profession of the law;

"And to encourage cordial intercourse among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere"; and finally,

"To meet in conference from time to time for discussion and for the purposes of the association."

At the first conference in Habana we were under the presidency of our first president, Dr. Manuel Fernández Supervielle, who was at that time also the president of the Bar Association of Cuba—the Habana Bar Association. We held a week's conference there, just short of a week 1 day. The proceedings of that meeting have been published in both Spanish and English. The plan is ultimately to publish them also in the other two languages, official languages, French and Portuguese, but those editions are not yet out. Some 22 resolutions were adopted at that conference, and I might just briefly, perhaps, indicate to you the type of thing that they cover, because it is those things in which we are interested.

The first one was a declaration of unreserved devotion to the democratic principles on which the American republics were founded, and the second that the president of this conference be directed officially to request in the name of the association all the governments of America to organize the National Commission of Aviation recommended by the Pan-American Conference of Aviation at Lima in 1937. Then there was a resolution that—

"Whereas the present legal provisions of the republics of the Americas for international judicial assistance, especially between the tribunals of the common law and those of the civil law systems, are uncertain, inadequate, inefficient, and expensive of operation;

* * * * *

"*Resolved*, That this association favors the execution by all the states of the Americas of treaties or their adherence to a convention providing a simple, expeditious, effective, and inexpensive system whereby the tribunals of each country, by invoking the assistance of the tribunals of others, can procure the service of documents and obtain evidence"—

and that sort of thing, to simplify that as between the courts of the different countries.

Then there was a resolution to express the hope that the law schools of the Americas prescribe as a condition of entry or requisite for a law degree or doctor of jurisprudence a high moral standard, and directing the executive committee to encourage discussion among the bar associations of the Americas on the subject of the formulation of a code of ethics, the results of which shall be submitted to the association at its next conference.

Then, a declaration that the conference recognizes the advisability and feasibility of incorporating in the civil law of the Latin-American countries the institution of the trust along the lines upon which it exists in Anglo-Saxon countries, and recommends the enactment of adequate laws so that in this important matter the two great systems in force on the American continent may be brought into harmony. I think you all know that in the civil law there is no provision for the creation of trusts, and that is one thing that our good friend, Dr. Ricardo Alfaro, former president of the Republic of Panama and a member of the Hague Tribunal, has been greatly interested in; and he succeeded in getting enacted in Panama a statute whereby you can now provide for a trust in that Republic, and banks can accept trusts, and trustees can be appointed. And that has been copied more or less in some of the other countries. It was enacted, I think in toto, in Puerto Rico, which, of course, is part of the United States, but has the civil law. It has been copied more or

less in Venezuela, and to some extent in Mexico; and that is an illustration of the kind of thing we are trying to promote. I might digress to say that it is an illustration of one of the basic values, as we see it, of the existence of the Inter-American Bar Association.

Mr. Otto Schoenrich, of New York, in one of the early addresses said that between the countries to the south of us and the United States the political forms of government rather tend to bind us together; that is, their constitutions are largely modeled on ours, however, ably or otherwise carried into effect. They believe in democracy, and their constitutions are like ours. On the other hand, the ordinary commercial law is such as to make it difficult to do business together, because theirs is the civil law and ours is the common law. They don't have a chattel mortgage, and it is very difficult to provide some way of selling goods on credit, because, basically, the pledge, as they understand it, means you have to put a pledged article into a man's hands, and he can hold it. There are quite a number of things along that line where practically the differences, partly in tradition, partly in method, between their systems and ours have just tended to keep us back in the development of commercial relations with them, and between their and our businessmen. For instance, the difference between the two systems in this particular thing of the organization of the trust; there is an illustration of that.

Then there was a resolution that a study be made of organizing some better method of international copyright system, following up and elaborating the present copyright convention, and to request the associations and organizations that are members of the Inter-American Bar Association to work with all the means at their disposal for the achievement of that purpose. And a resolution concerning immigration, naturalization, and citizenship laws looking toward—we can't unify them, but making them more harmonious than they are—and resolutions concerning legal documentation; and double taxation; and to establish a system of exchange of information on administrative procedures in the different countries; and we have had a very active study of administrative law—in those countries it is so much more developed than it is with us—and for the creation and organization of an academy of comparative law.

There are a number of other things. And then, a study of what could be done toward the organization of peace in the world in some way. Right at the beginning one of the things that was recognized was that after war conditions are over there will have to be some hope of something better than we have had, and that the lawyers of all the countries, because of their training, because of their position, as Dr. Supervielle said in one talk, in the way they stand between government and their clients—representing their clients and the people on the one hand, being in touch with Government officials on the other—are in a peculiarly good position to undertake to advise on that subject, as on other subjects.

That, of course, was before we were in the war. We planned the next conference at Buenos Aires in 1942, but because of transportation difficulties, that conference was postponed. Plans were going forward for that, but transportation difficulties and other situations made it impracticable to carry out our plans. We held, instead, simply a meeting of our council in Washington. Then we held our next conference, actual second conference, in Brazil, at Rio de Janeiro in 1943, and despite difficulties of transportation a very active conference resulted. The president at the time of this conference was Edmundo de Miranda Jordao, who was also the president of the Brazilian Bar Association, and that conference coincided with the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Brazilian Bar Association. We had a very good delegation there from Canada, and we had succeeded in getting a number down from the United States. We got travel priorities for but one man, our good friend, George Maurice Morris, former president of the American Bar Association. He was able to go down, with priorities, on the plane. I might say, incidentally, that our secretary-general, Mr. Vallance, succeeded in going down without any priorities of any kind, and so did Mitchell Carroll, of New York, the present chairman of the American Bar Association's Section of International and Comparative Law. One or two others just started out as adventurers on their own, and in one way or another quite a number of United States and Canadian delegates did get down there. There was a very active conference.

We discovered one thing, that our plan of placing proposed resolutions before the entire assembly didn't always work so well as it had at Habana. At Rio it resulted in a rather confused kind of meeting, but a very active one. Very greatly interested in it, everybody was, but it resulted in a hundred and twenty-two resolutions, instead of the comparatively few that the resolutions committee had recommended that they be boiled down to. So we are planning now, in our meeting in Mexico this August, to change that part of the plan just a little and have the resolutions committee report to the Council and let the Council do more active work in finally boiling them down, in open public meeting, of course, a step along the same lines as the American Bar Association made, and for much the same reasons.

The four official languages are the four languages that we have in the different countries here in this continent, and it worked very well at Habana and at Rio, and I understand that we can fairly expect it to work in the same way at Mexico City. We will have one of these translating-machine apparatuses that the International Business Machines Co. puts out, by which you have the translation of each talk as it is given, given over the different wires by translators standing by the speaker; and you put the receiver up to your ear, and turn the knob as you want to, and you hear it in French, or in Spanish, or in Portuguese, or in English, as you see fit.

We have 14 committees and sections now working along very much the same lines as were outlined in those first resolutions at Habana. I think the list of them is very much the same as it was at the 1943 conference. There is the commission on inter-American academy of international and comparative law; a committee on immigration, nationality, and immigration laws; a section on industrial property, patents, and trade-marks; a committee on the law of trusts and trustees; a committee on unification or coordination of legislation relative to the civil status of persons; a committee on taxation; one on administrative law and procedure; one on customs laws; one on customs law; one on commercial treaties; one on the protection of intellectual property; one on national centers of legal documentation and bibliographical indexes of law materials; a section on legal education; a committee on comparative constitutional law; a section on comparison of civil and commercial laws; a committee on communications, including air law, telecommunications, maritime and highway transportation; one on industrial, economic, and social legislation; one on penal law and procedure—by the way, our Canadian friend, Mr. McCarthy, is its chairman—one on territorial waters and ocean fisheries, and some of you may remember that Ed Allen, of Seattle, is very interested in fisheries, and there will be some of them that will talk fisheries all day long if you let them talk to you about the deep-sea fisheries and the difficulties between the jurisdictions, the claimed jurisdictions of the different countries—and a committee on on post-war problems, of which I think I have said our good friend George Maurice Morris is the Vice Chairman for the United States.

Of course, you are all of you aware that all kinds of propositions have been made in the discussion of post-war problems—it was at the last meeting of the American Society of International Law, I believe, when its president Mr. Coudert, said it had got to a point where a man who didn't have a solution of the post-war problem question ready to tell you about, and submit to you, was like a man that didn't have a dress suit. He just didn't exist, hardly; there are so many of them. But of course, it is a most vital, a most serious problem, and while we certainly don't want to be in the position of advocating any one plan or any other plan, I think that we can begin to see a kind of general agreement of thought that after this war there must be some method adopted, if it be possible, working toward the end of securing more permanent peace; and that probably there should be something a little in advance of the idea of an article of confederation, which was the basic idea of the League of Nations, largely. It must be something, perhaps, beyond a mere agreement among nations requiring the affirmative action of the legislative powers of each individual nation in order to carry into effect what the central authority may determine, something more along the lines of a constitution rather than of our old Articles of Confederation. There should be some provision for some kind of international judicial system; perhaps something for putting into effect some executive—and perhaps probably necessarily some power, police power, armed power, whatever you call it, to carry into effect the decisions—and some kind of rule-making, perhaps legislative, authority. I am only saying what I gather is rather generally in the minds of people talking about it now.

For the Mexico conference we desire to invite, of course, the cooperation of the delegates of the different associations, and their help, especially, along the line of the work of any committee or section in which they may be interested. When we say that our regulations provide that any papers anyone desires to submit should be submitted 30 days in advance of the opening date of the conference, which is on July 31, it is in order that there may be time to mimeograph them, and to translate them into the different languages of the conference. The physical arrangements are under the care of a local organizing committee in Mexico City. I have forgotten to say that our president this year, Dr. Carlos Sanchez Mejorada, is the president of the Barra Mexicana, the Mexican Bar Association, a competent lawyer who has proven himself an excellent executive, in making the arrangments. Some of you may know him. He is counsel, I believe, in Mexico for the American Mining and Smelting Co., and other large American interests.

We are to have the use for our meeting of the Palace of Fine Arts. The Government has been good enough to put that at our disposal for that purpose; and for our section and committee meetings, the Castillo de Chapultepec. We are well provided; and the Government has been good enough to let us have the assistance of a clerical staff, and that kind of thing. That is the only way in which we accept any aid from the Government, or any government, because one of the things we have been insisting on, is to keep the Association an association of independent lawyers not under the control of the Governments, or a Government organization in any way. Because of that we are going to have to ask delegates when they register to give us a registration fee of—don't let me scare

you now—25 Mexican pesos. I think that means $5.15 in American money; and of course, we all of us pay our own expenses. The hotels have placed, I think, 20 percent of their space available for use down there, and we make reservations through our office in Washington, and we have the schedule of the rates, the hotel rates. They are about the same as the better hotels in this country.

The arrangements for transportation—both the railroads and the airlines are trying to cooperate as much as they can and we know in these wartimes it is not so easy to be sure you get down there, but they tell us that once you get across the border, we can be taken care of. [Applause.]

Chairman SIEFKIN. Does anyone want to ask Colonel Rigby any questions? I don't think he said what the date was. It is July 31 for a week, isn't it?

Colonel RIGBY. Yes.[2] Registration is that day, and the large meeting is that evening. Then we break up into sections and committees for the next 4 days, and over the week end let the resolutions committee be struggling with what the sections and committees have brought in, and with what any other delegates may have offered; and let the other people see the sights around the neighboring communities. Monday we meet for the resolutions committee to report to the Council; and Tuesday we meet for the final meeting; and of course, they provide more or less entertainment, and that kind of thing that usually goes with it.

MEMBER. Are the resolutions submitted before?

Colonel RIGBY. No, not necessarily. Proposed resolutions are offered, or sent, directly to the section, or the committee, if it is proper for such a committee, or to the resolutions committee. The sections, with their committees, are to report by Friday evening, so the resolutions committee is to have over the week end and until Monday to digest them. They report on that day, Monday.

MEMBER. Are formal credentials necessary for the delegates?

Colonel RIGBY. Whatever the president of your own member association determines to give you. There is a credentials committee to whom the credentials are submitted, and that committee will present at the opening session the roll as made up from the credentials submitted. Others will have to go before the credentials committee as they may come in later on.

MEMBER. What other countries besides Guatemala refused to join the Inter-American Association?

Colonel RIGBY. Costa Rica joined, and their Lu's Anderson was one of our executive committee members. Then they passed an integrating bill act in the Parliament of Costa Rica which destroyed the existing bar association, and the new integrated association has not as yet joined us. El Salvador has not joined. Honduras joined, but is not very active.

MEMBER. There were two more.

Colonel RIGBY. Nicaragua, I think, is not in. They are the small countries. The large countries, I may say, are all in. Paraguay was the last one to come in, Paraguay and Uruguay, so we have a complete representation of the continent except those three or four small Central-American countries.

MEMBER. We have representation of the foreign colonies there like British Honduras, French Guiana, Dutch Guiana, and so forth?

Colonel RIGBY. No, the only British dominion that has joined is the Canadian Dominion. None of the others have.

[2] The conference runs from July 31 to August 8, 1944.

MEMBER. What are the dues; $100 a year?

Colonel RIGBY. It depends on the membership. National associations pay from $50 to $500. An association with 5,000 members or above, like the American Bar and Canadian Bar pay $500. Then it scales down to $50 for an association with less than 100 members, and there are a few of them. The dues for the local associations, geographical constituents, scale down from $100 to $25.

MEMBER. Are the local associations entitled to a vote?

Colonel RIGBY. On everything, yes, except that in the election of the councillors—they may take part in the election of only 15, because the balance of the councilors are appointed as of right by the different national bar associations. The American Bar Association has its own councilor. On other things, on the resolutions, there is no difference at all between different classes of the associations. There is this limitation, that no resolution can be passed except by a two-thirds vote, and that vote must include the affirmative vote of at least a majority of the national associations. The purpose of that, of course, is to prevent either end of the continent from over-riding the other on any question that might come up. If we disagree with our Latin-American countries, or vice versa, we want to avoid either party over slaughtering the other.

MEMBER. May I ask the Colonel a question and make a statement that may interest him. The question is: Should associations such as the Chicago Bar Association join the Inter-American Association as an independent group, as an independent national association?

Colonel RIGBY. It is very strongly our desire and our understanding of the value—of course, if we had only the national American Bar Association as the member from the United States, we would be completely overruled by the representatives of the 20 national bar associations to the south of us. It is only because of the membership of the various constituent associations that the United States and Canada are not completely overruled in everything. And, of course, frankly, our financial support necessarily comes from the various constituent geographical associations in the United States. We don't have very much financial support from these small national associations to the south of us.

MEMBER. That is an answer, Mr. Chairman, which of course I expected, but I wish Colonel Rigby to emphasize it and make it clear to those of us who are here. The statement which I wished to make is known to a few members of our International Law Comparative Law Committee at the Hague, and that is: At the last meeting of our committee in April there was a long discussion about the coming conference to be held at Mexico City, and the matter was discussed as to how many members of our committee and how many members of this association might join with us in visiting Mexico City at that time, primarily for that purpose, and as you, Colonel, have explained to us, the arrangements made there, we are now, I think, more particularly disturbed over the question of transportation. That matter was discussed quite fully, and I see a gentleman here who talked about it quite a good deal at that meeting, Mr. Solberg, and I simply voice what he said at that time, that we hope that this Chicago association will be able to make arrangements so that a very good delegation, not only of our committee, but of the association itself, may be in Mexico City next August 31, I believe you stated.

Colonel RIGBY. July 31 to August 8.

Chairman SIEFKIN. Thank you very much, Colonel Rigby. We enjoyed it very much. [Applause.]

APPENDIX

MEMBERSHIP IN THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Membership in the Inter-American Bar Association is open only to lawyers' organizations of the following types: National associations, State and local associations, and professional associations of lawyers devoted to particular branches of the law. Individual lawyers may participate in the activities of the association only as delegates of a member association. A member association may be represented at conferences by as many delegates as it may desire to designate, each delegation, however, being limited to 1 vote. Further information regarding membership of associations may be secured by writing the secretary-general of the Inter-American Bar Association at its headquarters office, 336 Southern Building, Washington 5, D. C.

The annual dues of member associations are fixed on a scale based upon the membership of the respective associations. The maximum of $500 per annum is payable by a national association having 5,000 or more actual dues-paying members. For national associations having less than 5,000 such members, the dues scale down to the minimum of $50 per annum, in proportion to their membership. For local associations, which include State, provincial, city, district, and special law associations, a maximum of $100 dues per annum is payable by those having 1,000 or more dues-paying members. The dues for such associations likewise scale down, depending on the membership. The maximum is $25 a year.

Member associations of the Inter-American Bar Association are as follows:

Argentina: Federacion Argentina de Colegios de Abogados.

Bolivia: Colegio de Abogados de La Paz.

Brazil: Instituto da Ordem dos Advogados Brazileiros, Instituto dos Advogados de Sao Paulo.

Canada: Canadian Bar Association.

Chile: Colegio de Abogados de Chile.

Colombia: Academia Colombiana de Jurisprudencia.

Costa Rica: Colegio de Abogados de Costa Rica.

Cuba: Colegio de Abogados de la Habana, Associacion Nacional de Registradores de la Propiedad de la Republica, Colegio Notarial de la Habana, Sociedad de Lagislacion Comparada.

Dominican Republic: Colegio de Abogados de la Republica Dominicana (ad referendum).

Ecuador: Academia de Abogados de Quito.

Haiti: Ordre des Avocats du Barreau de Port-au-Prince.

Honduras: Sociedad de Abogados, Tegucigalpa.

Mexico: Barra Mexicana.

Panama: Colegio de Abogados de Panama.

Paraguay: Colegio de Abogados del Paraguay.

Peru: Colegio de Abogados de Lima.

United States:

National Association: American Bar Association.

State and local associations: State Bar of Arizona; California State Bar; Los Angeles Bar Association; State Bar Association of Connecticut; Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia; Bar Association of the District of Columbia; Florida State Bar Association; Illinois State Bar Association; Chicago Bar Association; Women's Bar Association of Illinois; Indiana State Bar Association; State of Kansas Bar Association; Louisiana State Bar Association; Women's Bar Association of Baltimore, Md.; Michigan State Bar Association; Minnesota State Bar Association; Missouri Bar Association; Nebraska State

Bar Association; New York State Bar Association; the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; New York County Lawyers' Association; Pennsylvania Bar Association; Philadelphia Bar Association; Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico; Rhode Island Bar Association; State Bar of Texas; Bar Association of Dallas; Houston Bar Association; Virginia State Bar Association.

Special organizations: American Foreign Law Association, American Judicature Society, American Law Institute, American Society of International Law, Customs Bar Association, Federal Bar Association, Kappa Beta Pi Legal Sorority, National Association of Women Lawyers, National Lawyers Guild, Pan American Lawyers Association, Phi Delta Delta Legal Fraternity.

Uruguay: Colegio de Abogados del Uruguay.

Venezuela: Colegio de Abogados del Distrito Federal, Caracas.

PROGRAM OF THIRD CONFERENCE TO BE HELD IN MEXICO CITY JULY 31–AUGUST 8, 1944

July 31: Registration of delegates (registration fee 25 pesos Mexican, $5.15 American).

July 31, 8:00 p. m.: Opening session, Palacio de Bellas Artes; welcoming address by Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ezequiel Padilla; response, probably by Dr. Edmundo de Miranda Jordao; Presidential address by Sr. Lic. Carlos Sanchez Mejorada; address by mayor of the Federal District.

August 1–4: Committee meetings, 10 a. m., 2 p. m., Castillo de Chapultepec.

COMMITTEES

1. Committee on immigration, nationality and naturalization.
2. Section on intellectual and industrial property: Committee on intellectual property, committee on patents and trade marks.
3. Committee on taxation.
4. Committee on administrative law and procedure.
5. Committee on commercial treaties and customs law: Subcommittee on commercial treaties, subcommittee on customs law.
6. Committee on national centers of legal documentation and bibliographical indexes of law materials.
7. Section on legal education.
8. Committee on comparative constitutional law.
9. Section on comparison of civil and commercial law: Committee on law of trusts and trustees, committee on unification or coordination of legislation relative to civil status of persons.
10. Committee on communications.
11. Committee on industrial, economic and social legislation.
12. Committee on penal law and procedure.
13. Committee on territorial waters and ocean fisheries.
14. Committee on post-war problems.

August 5–6: Week-end trips to Cuernavaca, Taxco, Teotihuacan or Fortin.

August 7: Closing business session, 10 a. m.–2 p. m. Palacio de Bellas Artes.

August 8: Final plenary session, Palacio de Bellas Artes.

It is expected that there will be a reception for delegates by Sr. Lic. Ezequiel Padilla, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico.

It is also expected that there will be a reception by the Chief Justice of Mexico at which the Chief Justice, the ranking judicial guest, and one or two others will speak.

There will be a special session of the section on legal education at which Sr. Lic. Alfonso Noriega, dean of the National Law School of Mexico, the Minister of Education, Sr. Jaime Torres Bodet and Mr. James Oliver Murdock, professor of international law at George Washington University, Washington, D. C., will speak.

C. I. O. Political Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler from the Washington Daily News of June 20, 1944:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, June 20.—Long-distance telephone records subpenaed by the Dies committee have revealed a close relationship between the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. and the following:

The White House and Mrs. Roosevelt.

Vice President HENRY WALLACE.

The Department of Agriculture.

The Department of Justice, and various regional directors of the Farm Security Administration having power to exert strong political and economic pressure on farmers.

Numerous calls to regional F. S. A. offices were made in most cases by C. B. Baldwin, assistant director of the Political Action Committee, who resigned his job as chairman of the F. S. A. in Washington to become actual manager of the P. A. C.'s campaign to elect President Roosevelt for a fourth term and Mr. WALLACE for a second term and to defeat a select list of aspirants for the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Sidney Hillman, P. A. C. chairman, is president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, C. I. O., and recently has been denounced by David Dubinsky and other right-wing union radicals, as leader of the Communist Party in New York, now known as the American Labor Party.

Baldwin has held various key jobs in Washington ever since 1933, when he caught on as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture under Wallace. He became director of the Farm Security Administration in October 1940. The phone calls indicate a strong continuing interest and influence in the F. S. A., while he is on leave serving with the political leader of the New York Communist faction of the union movement.

The slips showed 28 calls from the New York headquarters of the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee direct to the White House, including one from Hillman to Mrs. Roosevelt, and another from Hillman to David Niles, formerly Nyhus, of Boston, one of the President's selfless assistants with a passion for anonymity and for left-wing politics. Hillman also called Vice President Wallace. Baldwin is recorded as having made three calls to Wallace's office.

The Hillman-Baldwin-Communist group of the C. I. O. has defeated for renomination both MARTIN DIES, of Texas, and JOE STARNES, of Alabama. STARNES is a member of the Dies committee.

Records show, according to the Dies committee, "hundreds" of calls from the P. A. C.'s New York headquarters to various Government officials, particularly in the Department of Justice, and in the Department of Agriculture, which controls the Farm Security Administration and the fortunes of many farmers through its local agents scattered everywhere.

Let's Get Tough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, ever since our Nation went to war, I have felt the citizens of the United States should have a national battle cry, which would unify all of the people solidly behind the supreme effort of quickly defeating the Axis Powers, and then help place our national economic and social house in order.

I shall not take time to enumerate the different famous battle calls which caused Americans to act as one to quickly accomplish a difficult national task in a time of a great national crisis. History books are replete with them.

Just recently I came across a sentiment which to my mind, and I am sure to the minds of millions of my fellow citizens once they hear it, could properly express what we Americans must do in order to get this war over quickly and restore and keep restored a constructive peace.

This sentiment came to me in the shape of a published song, whose title would make a wonderful battle cry for our armed forces and for every citizen of these United States who appreciates the blessings of his citizenship and wants them preserved.

The name of this song is "Let's Get Tough," and, to my great surprise, it was written by a young mother of two small children as a protest against the horrors of war and as a mother's appeal to get it over quickly. When the American mothers admonish us to "get tough" it is time to act.

I do not personally know the author or publisher. I do not have any direct or indirect interest in this song, whose title should be the battle cry of our forces abroad, and at home, and all of our American citizens—especially we Members of Congress.

The author's name is Mrs. Claude Hamilton, Jr., of 130 East End Avenue, New York City, N. Y. The publisher is the Shelby Music Publishing Co. of Detroit, Mich. I hope every American service band master and radio program director will make this song a part of their musical portfolio.

The words of this song are very inspiring—but the idea conveyed by the title "Let's Get Tough" is a good and timely one. We citizens of these United States, yes, especially we Members of the National Congress, have been too easy-going in connection with many national and international problems. We do not approach them from a "Let's Get Tough" attitude, which is absolutely necessary these days in dealing with a murderous foe abroad and their friends and agents here in this country where we have

nursed them along with every civic blessing.

So, I appeal to my colleagues to think it over. "For our boys are fighting and sacrificing, immortalizing history."

I hope my colleagues and their constituents will approach this job of finishing up this war and establishing a truly constructive peace from a "Let's Get Tough" viewpoint.

I am sure if every American says "Let's Get Tough," many of our vexatious, economic, social, and world-wide problems would be minimized or would vanish.

Hon. Thomas E. Scanlon, of Pennsylvania, Warns Congress To Keep Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, price control is mandatory if we are to hold the line against inflation. One of the leaders in Congress in the battle against inflationary threats and rising prices is my colleague from Pennsylvania the Honorable THOMAS E. SCANLON. As part of my remarks I am happy to include the column of Robert Taylor, Washington correspondent of the Pittsburgh Press, commending Congressman SCANLON for his valiant battle for price control. I include also the editorial which appeared in the Sunday, June 18, issue of the Pittsburgh Press entitled "Me, Too":

MUST KEEP PRICE CONTROL, SCANLON WARNS CONGRESS—PITTSBURGHER CITES GALLUP POLL RESULTS, SHOWS MAJORITY OF VOTERS FEAR INFLATION

(By Robert Taylor)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—Representative THOMAS E. SCANLON, Democrat, Pittsburgh, said today that any Congressman or any party that "votes against price control and for inflation" will be accountable to the voters who are almost solidly united for price control.

Mr. SCANLON is chairman of the unofficial congressional committee for the protection of the consumer, which is advocating reenactment of the emergency price control law, which expires June 30, with no amendments.

The committee is opposing a series of amendments inserted in the pending bill to extend price control, on the ground that they would break price control and hamper efforts of the Office of Price Administration to control prices and enforce ceilings.

"The American people are almost solidly united for price control, as the recent Gallup poll showed," he said. "And they are going to be a lot more important when the votes are counted next fall than the swarm of lobbyists who have been infesting the Halls of Congress during recent weeks seeking added profits for industries already better off than they ever were before."

TEXTILE MILLS PROFITING

Mr. SCANLON said textile mills, beneficiaries of the Bankhead amendment, are making almost 900 percent more profits than they made before the war, and that other plans for amending the O. P. A. bill would increase profits either by raising ceilings or weakening enforcement.

Price rises, he said, would increase living costs, leading to demands for wage increases and strikes which would upset war production. Wage increases would pyramid on price increases to boost the spiral of inflation.

LAST WAR'S INFLATION

"In the last war we paid a sorry price for inflation," he said. "Fixed incomes shrank to 40 cents on the dollar. War costs were increased by 70 percent. And the collapse which followed inflation was tragic beyond belief. Business profits were turned to losses. Business failures rose 40 percent above the pre-war period. Unemployment rose 500,500 and the pay of those who kept their jobs shrank."

The destructive effects of inflation, he added, are potentially greater now because our national income is more than three times what it was in 1918 and the total cost of the last war, including the inflationary part, would pay for only 4½ months of this war.

HOLD LIVING COSTS

Against this kind of pressure, O. P. A. has been able to hold living costs without gain for the past 12 months, he added.

"I, for one, will not, after such an outstanding success and in view of the power of inflationary pressure, vote to take any step that will turn the price line upward again," he said.

ME, TOO

From every corner of the congressional halls, pressure groups are seeking to gain exemption for their own products from the Government's wartime price-control program.

Unable to lick O. P. A. on valid gounds—because, despite all its faults, O. P. A. has prevented the disastrous price inflation of World War No. 1—the enemies of O. P. A. have joined with selfish interests in an effort to outflank the price-control front by chipping off the O. P. A.'s powers to hold costs to some reasonable level.

More than a hundred amendments of every variety have been submitted in the Senate and House to the pending bill to extend the life of O. P. A. Some of these proposals bear merit but most of them are bare-faced attempts to thwart effective price control.

Here, for example, is what some of the amendments—most of them, fortunately, rejected—would do:

Remove all price control from fresh fruits.

Exempt watermelons from price ceilings.

Take controls off raw furs.

Guarantee profit equal to that during the pre-war period on all products manufactured from agricultural commodities if a firm's business has suffered because of the war.

Take controls off rough rice.

Base crude-oil prices on parity.

Permit draftees to liquidate their personal property without regard to O. P. A. ceilings.

Abolish price ceilings on all used household goods and farm machinery.

Remove areas and portions of areas from rent control as soon as the districts are no longer defense rental areas.

Prohibit O. P. A. from issuing any order which will deny any merchant a fair, equitable profit.

Exempt from price control all food products except a list of 61 essential items included in the Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index.

Ease rental eviction restrictions and prevent O. P. A. interference between property owners and tenants as long as they act within State laws.

Prevent O. P. A. from bringing additional food items under price control.

And so on and on.

The men and women at the battle front well may wonder when we on the home front will bury our selfish interests for the common good.

United States Maritime Commission

REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on May 23 I addressed a letter to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, directing that committee's attention to what my preliminary investigations led me to believe are irregularities in the Procurement Division of the United States Maritime Commission. I urged the committee to undertake a thorough investigation of the situation.

Shortly thereafter, on May 29, I spoke in the House, inviting the attention of the Members to the unusual circumstances existing in the program to procure adequate, improved type life rafts for our merchant fleet.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] promptly made inquiry of the United States Maritime Commission regarding the facts and circumstances. Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, very promptly on June 1 returned special report number 80, upon the subject of the inquiry.

I have complimented Admiral Land upon the prompt and detailed response returned, and for his expressed willingness to cooperate fully in any further investigations which may be found to be warranted. I should like to take the opportunity to repeat those commendations to the members of the House.

At the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], I have studied this special report, and am submitting to him for the use of the committee an analysis. It is my belief, after careful study of this report, that it not only fails to dispose of the questions I have raised, but actually confirms the impression that serious irregularities do exist within the Maritime Procurement Division. Not only does this report show that procurement methods have been inefficient and wasteful; it clearly indicates delay and indecision over a prolonged period of almost 18 months, during which the seamen of the American merchant marine have been forced to rely upon old style rafts which have been considered entirely out-moded and inadequate since vastly improved type rafts have been available. Not only have these procurement officials apparently wasted valuable time and public funds, they ap-

parently have displayed a wanton disregard for the safety of these brave seamen who have faced all manner of danger to keep open the life-lines to our many battle fronts.

I submit here the report I have made to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries through its chairman, the gentleman from Virginia. I earnestly hope the membership of the House will carefully study my report, which is made a part of these remarks:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1944.

Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: On May 23 I directed your attention by letter to what I had been led to believe are questionable practices within the Procurement Office of the United States Maritime Commission. Subsequently, on Monday, May 29, I invited public attention to these apparent irregularities within the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration in a speech in the House of Representatives.

Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, is to be commended for the report he has returned in response to our inquiries into this subject of life raft procurement, and for his expressed willingness to go further into the matter as circumstances may warrant. Had the special report No. 80 by the United States Maritime Commission satisfactorily disposed of the questions raised in my original inquiry, I would have happily dismissed the matter without regard to the special interests of the Globe American Corporation, its thousand employees and their families, its 589 subcontractors and their several thousand employees, and the community of Kokomo, Ind., the home of this organization.

This special report, however, not only fails completely to dispose of the questions I raised, but appears, actually, to document the claim that a thorough-going investigation into this phase of Maritime Commission procurement policies and methods is fully warranted. I propose to show in the following analysis that the report, together with Admiral Land's letter of transmittal, reveals: (1) errors, misinterpretation, and omissions, and (2) clear evidence upon the procurement records of disregard of human life, waste, incompetence and delay.

Admiral Land states in his letter of transmittal (p. 945, par. 1) that specification for all life-saving equipment is solely the responsibility of the United States Coast Guard. The assumption is, therefore, that the U. S. M. C. purchases only with Coast Guard approval. Despite the recognized authority of C. G., however, M. C. entered the following contracts for life rafts, which were subsequently canceled because of failure of the product to meet C. G. requirements: Edwards Manufacturing Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, purchase order PD-MC44-24770, November 9, 1943 (p. 951); Colvin-Slocum Boats, Inc., New York, N. Y., purchase orders PD-MC44-27919, January 13, 1944 (p. 953), and MC44-3367, November 16, 1943, (p. 955); Stainless & Steel Products Co., St. Paul, Minn., purchase order PD-MC44-24438, November 24, 1943 (p. 953), presumably canceled. (See item B (5), p. 952.)

Note that all these orders were placed well after the improved Globe all-metal raft had been finally approved, and was in successful volume production. Note the inaccurate explanation given that Globe had no additional production capacity. Note, also, throughout this memorandum instances in which contracts have been awarded to producers with only tentative approval of raft design, and with no known production performance records. Note particularly the group orders placed May 9, 1944 (p. 956), under which 350 untested rafts were purchased from companies with no demonstrated ability to produce according to requirements.

This memorandum throughout reveals that Maritime Commission Procurement officials must have tried by every means over a period of several months to place contracts with almost anyone who offered a bid so as to avoid placing orders with the Globe American Corporation, the company which pioneered in all-metal life rafts. You will note that frequent explanation is made that Globe production capacity was fully employed in the performance of its original contract. That any such claim is absolutely false and unwarranted I am prepared to demonstrate from the records of the company's production, and from the reliable representations made by the company to the U. S. M. C. from time to time since it entered production. These records are available from the company's and, also, from the Commission's files.

Admiral Land, in his letter of transmittal, emphasizes the importance of spreading the production as widely as possible. With this commendable policy no one will take exception. The record will indicate that I have been one of the foremost advocates for spreading Federal procurement just as widely as possible, so as to enlist the capacities of the thousands of America's smaller industries, and to insure that they will not be destroyed in this war emergency.

Admiral Land is unquestionably right in stating it as fixed policy that we must spread the work to minimize possible interruptions by strikes, break-downs, etc. But when we consider this question of distributing contracts, we ought to consider all the important factors. Will you please ask the M. C. Procurement Division if its first concern in this instance has been in spreading the work, or in getting the best possible life-saving equipment aboard our merchant vessels in the shortest possible time? Is the prime responsibility to save the greatest possible number of industries in the order of their ability to bring pressure through their Washington lobbies, or is it to save the greatest possible number of lives of imperiled American seamen? Is the Maritime Procurement Office supposed to be a glorified wartime W. P. A., or is it supposed to buy the very most it can get for the American taxpayers' money with which it has been entrusted?

Finally, is the Maritime Commission Procurement Office supposed to fly in the face of the specific orders and recommendations of the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission and carry this spread-the-work policy to the point of placing contracts in areas of critical labor shortage which it has deliberately denied to competent producers in areas which have no critical labor problems? Does this spread-the-work policy go to the absurd extreme of shutting down a going producer, who has demonstrated his ability to deliver the goods, who has an established and experienced organization at work in a noncritical labor area, and who has a vast network of subcontractors in that same area, merely to toss new contracts into areas that have the most critical kind of a labor-shortage problem?

Let me refer you again to important facts in this program to procure improved type life rafts for our thousands of merchant vessels. Remember that Globe American Corporation designed, engineered, and developed an all-metal raft that was and is a vast contribution to safety at sea. Remember that actual models of this raft were tested and approved nearly 18 months ago. This special report says that the Maritime Commission very properly sought to establish other sources from which to procure all-steel rafts. With this effort to spread procurement, everyone, including the Globe company, fully agreed. From the very outset of this procurement program, in fact, the record will show that the Globe organization has willingly cooperated in making its design and engineering facilities and its production methods available to the Maritime Commission and to private companies desiring to enter the field of all-steel life-raft production.

Note particularly that the Maritime Commission at the outset of the all-metal raft procurement program allocated an important portion of this business to the Weber Showcase & Fixture Co., Los Angeles, Calif., and directed a large investment of public funds merely to duplicate production facilities already established through private capital and initiative by Globe.

I understand that some $300,000 of the people's money went into the Weber buildings and machinery, so that company could step into the procurement picture and throw my home-town company and my hundreds of neighbors out of business after they had pioneered the best life raft so far developed.

Note this striking contrast. Whereas this west coast concern has been aided and supported at great expense to the Government and the taxpayers, the Globe organization pioneered and developed the all-metal raft entirely at its own expense.

May I point out again, also, that this western producer copies the Globe designs and specifications exactly; and that its engineers visited the Globe plant to study and copy production methods worked out at no small private expense by the Globe organization. Globe has a real investment in all the engineering and development work necessary to make available this most advanced of all life rafts. That investment should quite properly be reflected in its prices. On the other hand, the Weber organization, thanks to Globe's pioneering work, has been able to avoid practically all engineering and development costs. Does it not stand to reason that a company operating under such a combination of fortuitous circumstances should be by far the lowest bidder on all-metal rafts in the entire field?

Note, then, the prices at which contracts have been let to this organization. See purchase order MC44-1430, August 13, 1943 (p. 950), base unit price $1,449 on 900 rafts. See MC44-19037 (p. 950), August 7, 1943, base unit price $1,549 on 133 rafts. See purchase order MC44-20553, September 2, 1943, base unit price $1,449 on 160 rafts. Now note the complete price, with full equipment, of $1,153 per unit paid to Globe on its basic contract, MC43-11758, April 15, 1943 (p. 950). Note that Globe has consistently underbid other potential raft builders, including Weber whenever it has been permitted to enter a bid. Note that on these three listed contracts alone, for a total number of rafts not quite sufficient to equip 1 vessel in 10 in our merchant fleet at its present strength, the Maritime Commission has paid or is paying to Weber well over a half million dollars more money than they could have secured the same identical Globe rafts for from the original designer and producer.

At this point I would like to call attention to two interesting items in the Commission's report. Note that the contracts for wooden rafts to be manufactured by the Peterson Manufacturing Co., Portland, Oreg., and steel rafts from the Weber Showcase and Fixture Co., San Francisco, Calif., dated August 7, 1943 (p. 950), are both at the identical price of $1,549 per unit. Inci-

dentally, I understand that the Globe bid on this requirement was $1,175 per complete unit, $326 below the award figures. The two successful bidders are at widely separated points. They submitted bids on entirely different types of rafts, and for different quantities. Yet, the two contracts were awarded at identical figures. Is this an instance of collusion between these bidders, or did Maritime Commission reconcile differences in the proposals of these to suppliers by direct negotiations?

Note, also, purchase order MC-3380, December 14, 1943 (p. 955), in report of which the name of the successful bidder and the reasons for the award are withheld. In view of the fact that this order was for equipment for ships in production near San Francisco, may we presume that the order went to the Weber Co., which was apparently the nearest approved and recognized bidder? If so, should we not properly inquire how this company was any better prepared to accept orders (at an excess cost, of course, of more than $300 per unit) than Globe, which then had a large potential reserve capacity to produce?

We come now to a phase of this procurement program in which the Commission implies that the Smaller War Plants Corporation has exercised a determining influence, namely, the spreading of raft procurement as widely as possible. As stated at the outset, everyone without known exception agrees upon the advisability of spreading this work just as widely as practicable. Among the first to recognize the desirability of such work-spreading, and to advance a practicable plan to accomplish this end, was the Globe American Corporation, the Commission's first producer of advanced type rafts. Very early in this procurement program, Globe suggested a subcontract arrangement with companies to be mutually agreed upon, at locations to be determined by the Maritime Commission; Globe to fabricate the all-metal raft components, and the selected subcontractors to assemble and deliver the completed rafts.

If there was a sincere desire to spread work to benefit smaller industries and to insure continuous and uninterrupted supply, here certainly was a logical solution. Any number of small assembly plants right at the points of raft delivery could have been set up successfully under this plan. And under such an arrangement real savings could have been effected, for Globe offered to supply completed rafts on the east and Gulf coasts at $1,100 per unit, and on the west coast at $1,200 per unit. As evidence note the following telegram:

MAY 24, 1943.

C. E. WASH, Jr.,
Director, Procurement Division,
United States Maritime Commission,
Washington, D. C.

We quote eleven hundred dollars f. o. b. east coast or Gulf plant and twelve hundred dollars f. o. b. west coast plant for additional quantities of improved type life raft which we designed, and agree to subcontract all quantities in excess of 600 per month with responsible subcontractors to be mutually agreed upon and located wherever you wish. These prices subject to revision under our renegotiation agreement and costing Government less than duplicating the $200,000 tooling and engineering costs with several prime contractors. Total quantity of rafts required do not justify duplication of engineering and tooling expense and wasting 6 months of labor and material in more than one plant. Situation similar to Welin davits which have been procured from one contractor exclusively for equally good and sufficient reasons. Please advise.

ALDEN CHESTER,
Globe American Corporation.

I repeat that if it was the honest purpose of the Commission to divide its procurement program as widely as possible, and to aid smaller industries wherever possible, it must have arbitrarily closed its eyes to the most intelligent and practicable proposal to accomplish this program, which was actually developed and advanced not once, but repeatedly, by the company which pioneered so remarkably in other phases of this entire life-saving program.

Note purchase order MC43-17906 to the Jaeger Furniture Co., Los Angeles, for 110 Taylor wooden rafts at $1,868.81 per unit. In this instance the Maritime Commission paid almost double the Globe price, or an excess on this small order of $99,969.10 Without further reference to the comparative merits of the wooden raft and the Globe improved all-metal raft, this seems to be a grossly unwarranted unit price. Grouping all contracts with producers other than Globe prior to the War Shipping Administration replacement order of May 9, 1944, it appears that the Maritime Commission has paid, or is paying, slightly over $1,000,000 more than the same number of rafts of equal, if not far superior, quality would have cost from Globe.

The Maritime Commission memorandum definitely leaves the impression that Globe production capacity has been fully employed by its original contract. Such is not, and has not been, the case at any time since Globe went into line production in the early fall of 1943. Globe officials have assured me that any time within the past 7 or 8 months that company could have stepped up its production from 500 to 600 rafts monthly to double that figure.

Incidentally, had Globe been awarded additional production, had it been permitted to set up assembly sub-contractors, or had it been given reasonable assurances of orderly extension of its contract, it is reasonable to presume that its contract prices to the Maritime Commission might have been reduced. The company's ability to produce ahead of schedule has been demonstrated repeatedly. I am advised that actual stock piles of rafts have accumulated in shipyards. I understand, in fact, that Globe rafts have been shipped abroad for disposition in England when stocks here became excessive, and that stocks have been moved from one yard to another to relieve congestion. I know for a fact that as of June 13, one eastern yard is begging Globe and the Maritime to stop raft shipments because it now has on hand 140 spare rafts for which it has no spare storage space. I understand, also, that Globe has readily met any extra demands made upon it in cases where other producers may have failed to meet delivery schedules. The records will show too that Globe has at numerous times brought these facts to the attention of the Commission and has requested permission to increase or extend production.

Not only has the Globe organization demonstrated its ability to produce in greater volume, as previously mentioned; it has, also, proposed a subcontract arrangement through which raft components fabricated by Globe could be assembled at any designated point at finished prices well below those from any other known source. If there has ever been any question as to Globe's ability to increase production within its own facilities, this subcontract arrangement would have assured adequate production for any present or contemplated program. Such an arrangement should, also, have satisfied the policy of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in that it would have logically drawn any practicable number of smaller companies into the life raft program. Such an arrangement should have been particularly desirable for the obvious reason that it would have saved large investments in duplication of fabricating facilities.

Forgetting for the moment the strong presumption of irregularities within the United States Maritime Commission procurement, one fact stands out in startling clarity. Whether Jesse French of Smaller War Plants Corporation or the United States Coast Guard interfered with and confused the United States Maritime Commission procurement program or not, someone is guilty of almost criminal procrastination in equipping our merchant vessels with proper life rafts.

Eighteen months ago, Globe offered the raft which is today recognized by everyone, I believe, outside the lumber and wood processing industries as the finest and safest life raft in existence. In the period since February 7, 1942, we have built and assembled for operation by the War Shipping Administration a merchant fleet of more than 3,200 vessels. To provide that merchant fleet with the best available life saving equipment, the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration should have procured, as of this date, at least 14,000 rafts of Globe design or its equivalent. By the Maritime Commission's own report, however, you will note that orders for all improved type rafts to date total only some 7,500. While I do not have definite figures, it is my impression that less than half of these new type rafts have been delivered to shipyards by all producers.

You will notice, also, in this same report, at page 956, that it was not until May 9, just a month ago, that the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration finally got around to entering the first purchase orders for new type rafts to replace the entirely unsafe and inadequate old rafts now in use in the merchant fleet. Note that the original intention was to purchase 7,500 rafts in this replacement program, but that for reasons unexplained, the total number contracted for is only 1,000. Investigation would almost certainly reveal that it would take more than the 7,500 rafts contemplated to replace every old raft now in service. Providing a reasonable reserve for loss and destruction in service, the replacement needs must certainly be in excess of 10,000. Every day the procurement officials delay this replacement program, they are needlessly and wantonly endangering the lives of thousands of American merchant seamen. Incompetence and indecision here are actually costing the lives of brave men; and are no more to be condoned than we would forgive the War and Navy Departments for failure to provide the fighting forces with anything less than the very best weapons and supplies we know how to produce.

Why have the responsible procurement officials waited more than 1 full year from the time improved rafts were offered to place these replacement orders? Why are the initial orders for what appears to be only one-tenth of the actual requirements? What does Mr. C. E. Walsh, Jr., Procurement Director, mean in his letter of May 1, 1944, to Mr. Jesse French III (p. 960) when he says, "The requisition we have covers only 1,000 rafts and it is our understanding that the remaining will not be requisitioned until a new design is perfected? Are we to understand from this statement that the new type rafts contracted for over the period from April 15, 1943, to date are inadequate or unsatisfactory? May we assume from this that the procurement officials contemplate radical changes in the present improved type raft, or that they anticipate the introduction of some entirely new and different raft? Are we to assume that manufacturers now in volume production will be required to tear up their production lines and undertake extensive retooling? If so, how much longer is it actually going to be before we can expect to swing into a really adequate raft production program?

As I stated at the outset, the special report which the Maritime Commission has submitted not only fails to dispose of the questions which I raised originally, but actually strengthens my presumption that there are serious irregularities and shortcomings within the Procurement Division of the Maritime

Commission. I am sure you will share my opinion that a most thoroughgoing investigation of the entire situation should be undertaken at the first practicable moment.

Sincerely yours,

FOREST A. HARNESS.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently I received two letters in connection with my work as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, which had under consideration the so-called G. I. bill of rights for returning war veterans. One of these letters is from Lisle H. Alexander, department adjutant of the American Legion, and the other from Francis M. Sullivan, executive director of the national legislative committee, and John Stelle, of the special committee on rehabilitation legislation for World War No. 2 veterans.

I include these letters herein:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF MICHIGAN,
Detroit, Mich., May 31, 1944.

Hon. JOHN B. BENNETT,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Time after time, when we have had occasion to write or telegraph you, it has been for the purpose of requesting your support upon legislation in which the American Legion is vitally interested.

During the recent months it has been a part of our program to make several contacts with you in connection with the American Legion G. I. bill of rights. You have been most courteous in acknowledging each contact made. This, we have appreciated. However, when the chips were down and you were asked to cast your vote on this important legislation you deemed it for the best interests of our country and citizens to favor the benefits provided in this bill.

We, as an organization, are very grateful for your action taken and feel that in this small way it is a privilege to express to you our thanks and appreciation for the part you played. We are equally confident that passage of this legislation and the resulting good will be a source of pride and satisfaction to you as well as to the American Legion.

It is my privilege to express these thoughts to you.

Yours very truly,

LISLE H. ALEXANDER,
Department Adjutant.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1944.

Hon. JOHN B. BENNETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The American Legion is most grateful to you for the earnest, intelligent consideration and effort you have given to S. 1767, which provides Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans.

It was gratifying to observe that the House of Representatives appreciated the work of your committee. This was reflected in the Members following the leadership of Chairman RANKIN and the committee members when the measure was up in the House for consideration.

Naturally, we of the American Legion are very proud of our part in this program. We feel when the measure becomes a law that the proper plans may be made for the day when the war will have been won and there will be "mass demobilization" of the present-day members of the armed forces.

We believe the privileges which will be afforded by the terms of S. 1767 to World War No. 2 veterans is a sound investment in the future of our Nation. The proposal represents an intelligent approach to the problem of readjustment in civilian life of the World War No. 2 veteran.

Again we express our appreciation for your splendid work in connection with S. 1767.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN STELLE,
Chairman, Special Committee on Rehabilitation Legislation World War No. 2 Veterans.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, National Legislative Committee.

International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. GEORGE
OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by H. S. Hallo, first secretary of the Netherlands Embassy, delivered before Kappa Beta Pi, Women's International League Honor Sorority.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The theme of this meeting is a very optimistic one because it presumes that international law in the past has been built on moral principles. It is true that in the modern human mind there is a strong feeling that international law can only be effective if it is based on generally accepted moral principles. The fact that this idea is more and more generally expressed in countries where a free exchange of opinion is possible holds a good promise for the future, but in the past the moral basis of international law, if present at all, has been a very weak one.

Let us have a look at the comparatively young history of international law. We may discern three periods in which the conception of international law was distinctly different. The first period extended roughly through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and was not based, as we might be inclined to think, on Grotius' De Jure Belli Ac Pacis—the law of war and peace. On the contrary, Grotius was far ahead of his time. His distinction between just and unjust wars certainly did not reflect the general conception of his contemporaries nor even of later generations.

In this first period people were much more frank about international law and openly conceded that it was purely based on power. There were no moral principles involved in the international law of those days which primarily consisted of certain rules observed by fully sovereign nations in dealing with each other. By far the greater part of these rules dealt with principles of protocol. Wars were considered to be legitimate means of obtaining what could not be acquired by diplomatic methods. War and the threat of war were the prolongation of diplomatic intercourse. However, even in that period there was a fairly general feeling that treaties and agreements had to be respected.

The second period, extending throughout the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, aimed at the codification of international law. All congresses and treaties beginning with the Congress of Vienna and ending with the Covenant of the League of Nations and the ensuing Treaty of Locarno and the Kellogg Pact, created the impression of a general acceptance of laws and rules built on high moral principles, on the basis of which sovereign states would deal with each other. It all sounded beautiful but it proved to be a hothouse plant which could not but succumb after having been exposed to the open air. In this period, international law was respected and its rules worked well only as long as there was a balance of power. Power and not moral principles formed its basis, notwithstanding the beautifully constructed moral facade.

The International Court was established in The Hague. It was meant to be the tribunal of mankind where the conscience of humanity would be able to express itself. However, as all states were sovereign and were free to decide for themselves whether they wished to submit their differences with other states to the court, mainly the small nations availed themselves of the services of the Court. It should not be forgotten that the Court was highly successful in dealing with the cases brought before it, but the great political issues of the 1920's and thirties were not brought before the Court. Power politics prevented it.

A new conception of international law is in the process of being born in our days. This conception indeed wants international law to be based on moral principles, which should bind great and small powers alike. The ruthlessness of this present war, which is a total war involving all human beings, and the development of air power have made the world so small that there is an ever-growing desire for the creation of a general system of security, which must be based on a general acceptance of certain basic principles of morality and on a general recognition of human rights. I feel very strongly that this can only be accomplished by education. Children all over the world should be taught much more cultural history and less, what I would call, battle history. The educational system in most countries glorifies the battles fought and won by our ancestors. I don't mean to say that we should not have admiration for the courage of our ancestors, when they were prepared to sacrifice their lives for freedom, but I feel that not too much emphasis should be laid upon the battles as such. Young children learn to play with tin soldiers, tanks, planes, guns, and battleships; this is bound to glorify war in their susceptible minds.

How little, on the other hand, do we learn of the cultural life and accomplishments of other peoples. What do we know of the men whose inventions made possible the technical progress in our way of living? What do we know of the intellectual and religious currents of other peoples and of the authors, painters, composers who give expression to them? The knowledge of cultural history tends to bring peoples together, because the spirit of man wants to grow unhampered by frontiers. I, therefore, feel that the exchange of cultural and spiritual values should be as free as possible because it cannot but strengthen the moral fundamentals of international law.

I may, however, add to this a word of warning; no people should force upon another people its ideals and ideas. In a free world every people must have its own way of life just as every individual is free to live the life he chooses. If I say that no way of life should be forced upon another people, I simply express my aversion to political propaganda aimed at the imposition of a certain outlook on life upon a country which does not fit its historical evolution. There are only two basic principles, which all states should accept. First, the fundamental rights of the human being, as expressed in the "four freedoms."

Second, the willingness to respect the rights of other states and to refrain from violating the rules set for the intercourse between states. This, of course, includes that no preparation for aggression can or should be tolerated.

I may end by expressing my conviction that no international organization for the prevention of war can be successful if the human mind has not been educated to reject war as a means for the settlement of international disputes.

The Bonds Between the United States and the United Kingdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. M. E. Bathurst, legal adviser to the British Embassy, before the Province Convention of Kappa Beta Pi, women's international legal honors sorority, on Saturday, June 17, 1944, at 8.30 p. m. at Washington Club, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It would be a great privilege at any time for a lawyer from my country to have the opportunity of addressing a legal association whose members include lawyers practicing both within and beyond the borders of the United States. I count it a special privilege to be asked to speak on the bonds between the United States and the United Kingdom, when a member of the English bar directs one of your association's provinces. I am always particularly glad to meet with lawyers of other countries, because I believe that it is only upon the foundation of an understanding between the ordinary citizens of nations that mutual respect and cooperation between governments can be founded. It is for this reason, as for many others, that we welcome in England today so many members of your gallant armed forces, who are for us both brothers in arms and ambassadors of goodwill.

When Edmund Burke said that "People will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors," he was stating the proposition that we can never hope to understand a situation unless we know something of the history by which it was created. And so one may pause to think how it has come about that our two Nations which parted company in 1776, today stand side by side, fighting, with their other allies, against the forces of tyranny and oppression. It might appear remarkable to a Colonial subject of 1776 that today the soldiers of our two countries are advancing together across the fields of Normandy, pursuant to a plan worked out with care and skill by the leaders of our armed forces. He might think it strange that, apart from military strategy, five other crucial wartime activities of our countries are jointly regulated by combined boards of our two Governments: munitions, production, raw materials, food, and shipping. He might be surprised to know that we in England have enacted that criminal offenses committed against the local law by American service personnel shall be tried by United States courts martial to the exclusion of the jurisdiction of the English courts. And that the British Government settles, as a mutual aid service, all civil claims made against members of the American armed forces in England in respect of accidents occurring in training or on maneuvers, through aircraft crashes, or otherwise in the course of duty.

This intermingling of our affairs is as natural as it is advantageous. It may be explained simply. Our two countries share common traditions and a common foundation of political faith. One who has practiced law in England and visits America cannot fail to be impressed at once by the similarity of the legal and political institutions of our two countries.

When the American people started on a century of westward expansion, they began a great story of adventure, perseverance, and daring. The Frontier, wrote Frederick Jackson Turner, was "a line, a region, a process * * * everywhere on the frontier civilization was being manufactured out of the raw material and personnel * * * each generation has in turn been able to challenge the social value of the common heritage and to modify its institutions to its shifting needs." It might have been thought that in a new country where forests had to be cleared before the bare means of existence could be wrested from a hitherto uncultivated soil, where each had to make good and make his place in the community by his own efforts, and where everything was in the future, the law of the old traditional community would be found inappropriate to the conditions and distasteful to the outlook of the new. But the English common law, with adaptations and modifications, was found adequate to this new task and became the center of your system as it remained the center of ours.

Everyone of your pioneers, however far he traveled, and in whatever regions he made his camp, held fast to certain concepts of right and justice, and so he made his camp, his village, his town, his territory, and ultimately his State, each squarely founded upon those concepts, which he had inherited and carried with him. In the early colonial history of Massachusetts there is recorded that an elected assembly broke out. It was not granted or decreed, it just appeared because it had to appear with that kind of people, with that kind of background. Wherever they went they began at once to imitate, as though in obedience to a natural law, the things they had left behind them on the western side of the Atlantic; the common law, Magna Carta, habeas corpus, the jury system, parliamentary tradition, and the spirit of representative institutions. All these things and much more belong to you by right of birth as fully as they do to us.

The law embodies the character and the outlook of the community. Law today is not thought of by the Englishman as something sent from Heaven or commanded by a sovereign, but as the result of the continued expression of the English people. Liberty consists not so much in the laws, but in the constant habits of the people. The frontier tradition of the United States was accordingly made up of that compromise between sturdy Anglo-Saxon individualism and the Norman tradition of orderliness which had found expression and fulfillment of the common law.

We see in your history and in ours repeated compromise between an excess of individualism and an excess of state control, a moderation which the common law embodied and to which the great documents of history—Magna Carta of Runnymede in 1215, our Petition of Right, the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights—gave expression. But more than all this and of equal significance, we have shared, as we share today, many international and domestic problems of a legal character. More significantly still our approach to the solution of those problems continues to be similar.

This is why each of our two countries finds interest in the progress of the law in the other. You will find striking differences, of course. The Constitution of the United States is remarkable for its brevity. Even if all its amendments are included, it contains only 7,000 words. The British Constitution is even shorter. Indeed European observers have been convinced that, being unwritten, it does not exist at all. It can be stated in six words: The King in Parliament is the supreme governing body. Any statute passed by both Houses of Parliament and ratified by the Royal Assent is absolutely binding on the courts.

You have abandoned, while we retain, the division of the legal profession into two branches—barristers and solicitors. In England no one may be a member of both branches at the same time. Barristers appear in the higher courts and receive their instructions (called briefs) from solicitors, to whom lay clients take their cases. A solicitor is largely limited to the office work involved in conveyancing and in the preparation of cases for trial, but he may appear before inferior courts. Barristers are more often specialists than are solicitors and much of their work takes the form of advice upon questions of law submitted by solicitors on behalf of clients.

But in spite of these distinctions between the legal and political institutions of our two countries, treatment of situations requiring legislative solution and the development of our case-law are very similar. If you look at our wartime statutes you will find that we both have similar problems and that the solutions in many cases are also similar. For example, we suffer from a vast amount of legislation made by the executive under powers delegated to it by the legislative powers, a phenomenon, I am told, not unknown to your legal system. This is a necessary evil of war and perhaps to a less degree of our complex peacetime economy. But the individual is protected against bureaucratic government by the power of Parliament to revoke these delegated powers and to annul regulations made by the executive, within 28 days of their promulgation. The executive has been given power to legislate as necessary or expedient for securing the public safety and the prosecution of the war, and all persons were required "to place themselves, their services and their property at the disposal of the king." The executive is accountable to parliament for the taking and the exercise of these powers, and answerable in the courts for acts beyond their scope. These wide powers have been used with restraint. For example, when we passed legislation penalizing the incitement of any strike among persons engaged in the performance of essential services, the regulation contained two provisos to make it clear that freedom of action and freedom of speech were curtailed only beyond the limit where their exercise constitutes an abuse, prejudicing the nation's war effort. The regula-

tion provided that no offense is committed by any person merely because he withholds his own skill and labor from a particular job, and a labor-union official is not liable in respect of anything which he says at a properly convened meeting of a union.

These are examples of the way in which individual liberty is sought to be preserved in our solution of many pressing wartime problems, just as you have done.

And so it is natural that by virtue of our common heritage and similar approach to problems, we find ourselves again side by side, united against tyranny. Many things which our two countries share, we share also with the other United Nations. This war can be summarized in a simple proposition of peculiar significance to lawyers; it is a war against a rule of force, which has been temporarily imposed upon the world by the Axis Powers, and a war for the reestablishment, more firmly than before, of a rule of law among nations.

The United Nations by virtue of their common traditions and as a result of their common resistance to the antithesis of law, have developed a sufficient body of common ideas about what constitutes justice and legality. It remains for these ideas to be given effective expression and for machinery to be set up to make them work. Few will question the necessity of embodying these ideas about international morality in some kind of international legal system. Few will question the necessity of an international law dealing not only with the mutual obligations of governments but also with their obligations to the people of the world as a whole. That is, an international law with an authority to enforce it and throughout the world a conscience and an attitude to sanction it. Ultimately the only guaranty of law is public opinion. If the public conscience is against some practice or principle no set of laws or policies, no police organization in the world can enforce it for very long. This is one reason why the Axis war against the public conscience could never succeed in the long run. But it does not mean that victory in this war will be automatic and that the post-war world will readjust itself without anybody's help. We need more than the demonstration that revolt against the public conscience will not succeed forever; we need a positive scheme to embody the public conscience in a legal code that will work and can be enforced.

This is a challenge to all lawyers who believe that the law embodies the ideas of justice and right held by those within the community. This is not beyond us.

So far as the future of your country and mine is concerned, I cannot do better than to quote what Mr. Churchill said more than a year ago in the Guildhall which, though scarred by bombs, still stands, in the very center of London:

"Upon the fraternal association and intimate alinement of policy of the United States and the British Commonwealth and Empire depends more than on any other factor the immediate future of the world.

"If they walk, or if need be march, together in harmony and in accordance with the moral and political conceptions to which the English-speaking peoples have given birth, and which are frequently referred to in the Atlantic Charter, all will be well."

With this association between our two countries as an example, we must seek closer ties between us and with the other United Nations. We should encourage media through which the lawyers of the United Nations may meet and exchange ideas. If this is a war to reestablish the rule of law among nations, it is the duty of the lawyers of the nations, with the sword of justice at their head, to form the vanguard in the forward march of civilization "to broader lands and better days."

Communism in the C. I. O.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, inspired by international Communists, revolutionary Socialists, Syndicalists, and an assorted variety of social reform crackpots, fellow travelers, brave-new-world, starry-eyed dreamers, dangerous un-American alien radicals, and other diverse subversive elements, the C. I. O. Political Action Committee has instituted a campaign in the coming elections to take over the control of the Government of the United States. This movement is part and parcel of a world-wide scheme to install international communism in every nation on earth of which the P. A. C. is the instrument here in America. For this purpose, the Communist Party has been ostensibly liquidated and its leadership, important executives, strategists, propagandists, and political quacks, pawns, and stooges have transferred their activities to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

The Communist technique predominates in all the activities of this group and aims to reduce all Members of Congress to the status of servile rubber stamps. No holds are barred. No rules are followed. No ethics or honor are respected. Misrepresentation, lies, slurs, smears, and shake-downs are the methods openly and notoriously pursued. Slush funds are collected from the hard earnings of poor workers who are taxed $1 apiece or more to finance the campaign of the opposition in most cases against their will and because they are subjected to various subtle forms of coersion and threats. Intellectual radicals, high-pressure men and professional agitators, experienced in Moscow front-line Communist Party organization activities are imported into our congressional districts, secretly and anonymously, to write speeches for the "Sacred Cow" candidates, prepare literature, pamphlets, posters, and letters and in general to direct the campaign of noisy, Union Square agitation and brazen misrepresentation of the records of incumbent congressmen. In fact, over 80 percent of the present membership of the House of Representatives is under attack by P. A. C.

This type of campaign has already begun in the third district. Since I believe that every voter and every true American citizen is entitled and ought to know the communistic and subversive character and background of this opposition, I am including as part of my remarks certain pertinent excerpts from the report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I urge everyone to read this important material and to take stern warning from it. Your Government is in danger. Americans! Awake!

The American form of government, the American economic system, the American way of life—free worship, free religious, social, and political institutions—are gravely threatened by these radical reptiles seeking to communize America. They are smart, experienced, plausible, and alert. They have unlimited financial resources which no candidate for Congress can possibly match. They will stoop to every trickery and chicanery to accomplish their diabolical aims.

Let all Americans, regardless of party, race, creed, or station in life, rise up against this alien menace and smash it once for all. Let us stand behind our gallant boys while they are away by defending and preserving the freedom and representative government for which they fight. I repeat, let us defeat and smash these un-American forces of evil and destruction. Let us keep our Congress and our country free.

In these efforts we will surely have the support and help of the honest, patriotic laboring men and women in and out of the rank and file of the C. I. O., whose loyalty and devotion to our country and its institutions can never be questioned and is second to none.

The excerpts referred to follow:

COMMUNISM IN THE C. I. O.

Two men, more than any others, were responsible for the split in the ranks of organized labor which led to the creation of the C. I. O. Those two men are John L. Lewis and Sidney Hillman.

In 1938 and 1939, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities did all that was humanly possible within the scope of its powers to warn John L. Lewis and other leaders of the C. I. O. that the Communists were moving in on their organization en masse. Their only response to the committee was silence or abusive language.

On February 29, 1944, John L. Lewis made a public statement concerning Communists in the C. I. O. (New York Times, February 29, 1944, p. 1). Belated as this statement may be, it confirms in toto what the Special Committee on Un-American Activities found 5 years ago and what it finds today. Lewis' statement, as quoted in the New York Times, reads as follows:

"When I was organizing the C. I. O., we picked up a lot of Communists in one unit after another as we grew—including Harry Bridges. But if I had not resigned the chairmanship and left the C. I. O. in 1940, I can tell you the Communists would have been weeded out of the C. I. O. long before now. Instead, as anyone might expect who has seen them throw their weight around inside labor organizations, the Communists dominate the C. I. O. today.

"Philip Murray is today the prisoner of the Communists in his own union. They control him and the C. I. O. through their seats on his executive committee. And there isn't a blessed thing he can do about it.

"Sidney Hillman is just as badly off. Both of them have got to play ball with the Communists now, or die.

"As heroic Russia battles against our German enemy in Europe, the Communists in our labor movement naturally hang on to the coattails of the Red Army and try to build an ideological bridge between our loyalty to Russia and their own pet schemes. This is a sheer abuse of our good will toward Russia. And, of course, the Communists in our labor unions are not even good Russians.

"What good citizen is not for a Russian victory over Germany in this war? Yet the Communists in the unions play hard on the trick idea that America cannot fight side by side with Russia and at the same time fight against American Communists and fellow

travelers here. That is an outrageous contention."

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities finds that Communist leadership is strongly entrenched in the following unions which are at present affiliated with the C. I. O.:

American Communications Association; International Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians; International Fur and Leather Workers Union; International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; International Union of Fishermen and Allied Workers of America; International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers; International Woodworkers of America; Marine Cooks and Stewards Association of the Pacific Coast; National Maritime Union of America; State, County, and Municipal Workers of America; Transport Workers Union of America; United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America; United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America; United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America; United Federal Workers of America; United Furniture Workers of America; United Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers of America; United Office and Professional Workers of America; United Packinghouse Workers of America; United Shoe Workers of America; and United Stone and Allied Products Workers of America.

The foregoing unions constitute a majority of all the unions affiliated with the C. I. O. It will be noted that these unions cover fields in which the most vital interests of the American Nation are involved—shipping, munitions, and communications, for example. It is a startling fact that these fields have their hundreds of thousands of employees organized under the leadership of Communists.

COMMUNISTS IN TRADE-UNIONS

It is not our purpose in this report to enter into any lengthy discussion of the underlying theories which guide the Communists in their efforts to gain control of unions. There is a voluminous literature on that subject which the Communists themselves have published, which we cannot deal with here.

Nevertheless, a few citations from this Communist literature will throw light upon their union activities as they are now conducted through the C. I. O. Politcal Action Committee and as they were conducted during the wave of political and sabotage strikes prior to the dissolution of the Stalin-Hitler pact.

The official program of the Communist International, which William Z. Foster, head of the American Commmunist Party, testified before the committee that he accepted, has the following to say about the place of trade-unions in Communist objectives:

"It is particularly important for the purpose of winning over the majority of the proletariat, to gain control of the trade-unions, which are genuine mass working-class organizations closely bound up with the everyday struggles of the working class. To work in reactionary trade-unions and skillfully to gain control of them, to win the confidence of the broad masses of the industrially organized workers, to change and 'remove from their posts' the reformist leaders, represent important tasks in the preparatory period."

In other words, it is the declared program of the Communist Party to do its utmost to gain control of the trade-unions in the period preparatory to its planned revolution.

To this end, the official program of the Communist International—to which Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, also avowed his loyalty under oath before the committee—also states:

"It is the bounden duty of every Communist to belong to a trade-union, even a most reactionary one, provided it is a mass organization. Only by constant and persistent work in the trade-unions and in the factories for the steadfast and energetic defense of the interests of the workers, together with ruthless struggle against the reformist bureacracy, will it be possible to win the leadership in the workers' struggle and to win the industrially organized workers over the side of the party."

An early declaration of the Communist Party in the United States laid down a principle which has from the beginning guided its policy in the trade unions. That declaration said:

"The labor unions must be revolutionized; they must be won for the class struggle against capitalism."

Concerning trade-unions, Stalin wrote, in one of his many books published by the Communist Party in the United States, that "they constitute a school of communism."

DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

Early in the present year, the national committee of the Communist Party announced that it had decided to dissolve the party, as such, and to transform it into an organization with some such name as the American Communist Political Association. Earl Browder immediately delivered a speech in which he elaborated this decision. This Communist maneuver, for that was all it amounted to, was a first-class news story.

The immediate significance of the party's dissolution is that during the 1944 elections Communists will throw their entire weight into the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. Their political leader will be, in effect, Sidney Hillman instead of Earl Browder. They will attempt, indeed are already attempting, to do by stealth and subterfuge through the C. I. O. Political Action Committee what they have failed to do when functioning as a political party under their own name.

Communists have long been entrenched in the leadership of most of the unions which are affiliated with the C. I. O. They now aspire to more complete political control over that fraction of organized labor (C. I. O.) which numbers several million voters.

Lenin explained these Communist tactical maneuvers fully in connection with the First World War. In his Letter to American Workmen, Lenin said that he entered into the fullest collaboration with a French imperialist, monarchist general when he felt that the cause of communism was helped thereby, although both he and the French general knew that they would try to hang each other when the collaboration had ceased.

Communists will denounce or embrace anything or anybody, depending solely on whether or not they hope for an advantage from their course of action. They have denounced and embraced America's participation in the present war. They have declared with all the passion of the crusading fanatic that "the Yanks were not coming," and then with equal passion that "the Yanks were not coming to late"—both within the space of days and hours. They have denounced John L. Lewis and embraced him and then denounced him again. To non-Communist innocents these reversals appear to be evidence of a ridiculous instability on the part of the Communists. They are, in fact, only examples of the Communists' tactical maneuvering.

That the proposed dissolution of the Communist Party is a purely tactical move and has nothing remotely to do with a renunciation of Marxism or communism or the party's inglorious past is made clear by the editors of the New Masses (Communist Party weekly). The editors of this Communist publication explode the naïveté of those writers who jumped to the conclusion that the Communist Party had renounced communism. Speaking of the speech by Earl Browder and the decision of the national committee of the Communist Party on the subject of the dissolution of the party, the editors of the New Masses declare that "they are an example of creative Marxism * * *" and further that "they are a brilliant example of Marxist thinking, rich and subtle * * *." Creative Marxism, as the Communist Party has always interpreted it from Lenin's time down to the present, means tactical maneuvering to gain temporary and partial advantages as well as fanatically keeping the ultimate goal of communism always in mind (if not in speech). This, then, is the self-proclaimed meaning of the decision of the national committee of the Communist Party to transform itself into an American Communist Political Association. Those who view it otherwise are being hoodwinked by their own (not the Communists') wishful thinking.

VOTING CHARTS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

One of the methods by which the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is at present carrying out its attack upon the Congress of the United States is the use of a chart which shows how the Members of the House of Representatives have voted on 20 measures.

There is, of course, absolutely nothing amiss, subversive, or otherwise improper about giving the widest publicity to the way in which a Member of the House of Representatives casts his vote. Any citizen or any group of citizens is at liberty to pass judgment upon a Member of Congress on the basis of his voting record. Indeed, it is eminently fitting that this should be done. Members of Congress except to be judged on their voting records.

But the important fact about the voting chart which is now in use by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is that it is absolutely identical with the voting chart now being used by the Communist Party for the same purpose. Both groups have selected the same 20 measures for passing judgment upon Members of Congress. In other words, the political views and philosophy of the Communist Party and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee coincide in every detail. The Communist Party's judgment for or against a member of Congress is based upon grounds which are absolutely identical with the grounds used by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee in deciding for or against a member.

It is also significant to note that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House of Representatives are blacklisted on the basis of this chart which is now being circulated by the Communist Party and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. More than 75 percent of the Members of the House fail to pass the test which is based upon their voting records on the arbitrarily chosen 20 measures.

It is not at all surprising that the voting charts of the Communist Party and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee should coincide completely. It is not, however, a case of mere coincidence. It could hardly be otherwise when there is such an extensive overlapping of personnel in the two organizations.

While Members of Congress do not object to the publicizing of their records such is not true of the leaders of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. They have used every influence within their powers to prevent the issuance of this report. Most of them do not wish their Communist records, together with the seditious nature of those records, exposed to the light of day by a committee of the Congress.

We have already referred to the fact that the 20 measures used in the voting charts of the Communist Party and of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee were arbitrarily chosen. In the period covered by these 20 measures, the House of Representatives voted on thousands of measures. Just why the 20 were selected out of these thousands

is far from clear. It is interesting to note further that these voting charts are being circulated in a pamphlet entitled "Keeping Score to Win the War." It would be difficult for any other than a devious mind, employing the most devious logic, to consider any one of the 20 measures as a "win the war" measure. Voting records on the declarations of war, on appropriations for Army and Navy, on lend-lease, and a hundred other measures which have to do with winning the war are not included in the charts of the Communist Party and of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. It is obvious, of course, just why the real "win the war" measures are omitted from these charts. If they were included, the record would show how unanimously and by what complete bipartisan unity the Congress of the United States has supported the war effort. But the Communists and the C. I. O. Political Action leaders do not wish that all-important fact to be brought to the attention of the American people. They wish, on the contrary, to disseminate the utterly false and slanderous notion that in the Congress of the United States there is an overwhelming majority, including many outright "Hitler agents," who do not want to win the war and who have, therefore, by their votes played the part of defeatists and obstructionists. The American people will not, of course, be deceived by this false and malicious propaganda of the Hillman-Communist conspiracy which is calculated to destroy the legislative branch of our Government.

In order that it may be made perfectly clear how far removed from either the question of winning the war or the question of labor most of the 20 measures of the charts actually are, we list them herewith:

1. The Hobbs antiracketeering bill.
2. The Connally-Smith antistrike bill.
3. Overriding President's veto of the Connally-Smith bill.
4. The Ramspeck Federal pay bill.
5. Lifting the $25,000 net ceiling placed on salaries by the President.
6. Federal income-tax bill.
7. No incentive payments to farmers.
8. Incentive payments for farmers.
9. No incentive payments to farmers.
10. No funds for crop insurance.
11. Support of rural-electrification program.
12. Liquidate Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
13. No funds for roll-back of prices.
14. Reduce funds for O. P. A. enforcement.
15. Putting big business in charge of O. P. A.
16. Abolish the domestic branch of O. W. I.
17. Create the Smith committee.
18. Continue the Dies committee.
19. Dismiss Watson, Dodd, and Lovett.
20. Anti-poll-tax bill.

In addition to the fact that most of the measures indicated by the foregoing list have little or nothing to do with labor or winning the war, there is also the fact that some of the headings in the list above are deliberately misleading. For example, measure No. 15 is described as "Putting Big Business in Charge of O. P. A."

The committee has documents in its possession which show that there has been an identity of wording in the attacks upon individual Members of Congress made by the Communist Party and by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. For example, the Voters Fact Book published by the Illinois State Committee of the Communist Party in the summer of 1943, says the following concerning an individual Member of the House of Representatives: "He has run up a record as an obstructionist, antiadministration, Red-baiting Congressman." One of the branches of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee uses the identical language concerning the same Member of the House in one of the circulars which it has just issued. Such identity of language could not be accidental.

NEIL BRANT

Neil Brant (also known as Brandt) is the international representative of the Washington office of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, one of the C. I. O. affiliates in which scores of well-known Communists such as William Sentner, James Matles, and Julius Emspak occupy important strategic positions.

Neil Brant writes frequently for his union's paper, the U. E. News. Few union papers are giving as much space to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee as the U. E. News, and few unions are working as energetically for the C. I. O. Political Action Committee as the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America. Neil Brant, as international representative of his union in Washington, is participating fully in this enthusiasm for the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

The Communist record of Neil Brant is an open book. It is, furthermore, indicative of the nature of the pretended patriotism of so many of the outstanding leaders of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

On February 14, 1941, Neil Brant was arrested and charged with "defiling the United States flag" in the State of New Jersey. His police description attached to the record of his arrest reads as follows:

"White, male, 37, 5 feet 6 inches, 145 pounds, gray eyes, dark brown, gray hair, slim build, sallow complexion, small mustache; occupation, labor organizer; birthplace, Russia."

This Russian-born traitor of 1941 and "patriot" of 1944 is a part of Sidney Hillman's political machine for 1944 elections. It will be noted, of course, that Brant's arrest for defiling the United States flag occurred during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact when the American Peace Mobilization was engaged in its Nation-wide seditious activities and when the Communist Party of the United States was lending every possible aid to Hitler by obstructing the Nation's military-preparedness program. Brant's attitude toward the United States flag during that period accurately reflected the Communist Party's views as they have been expressed throughout most of the party's 25-year history in this country. For example, when William Z. Foster, national chairman of the Communist Party, was a witness before a committee of Congress, he was asked the following question:

"Do you owe allegiance to the American flag? Does the Communist Party owe allegiance to the American flag?"

After some sparring, Foster replied:

"And all capitalists flags are flags of the capitalist class, and we owe no allegiance to them."

In the Daily Worker of July 14, 1936, page 5, there appears the following question: "Should Communists salute the American flag?" And the Daily Worker answered: "Our flag is the red flag of the international working class." Also: when one of the leading members of the Communist Party returned from the Soviet Union, he engaged in a demonstration during which he clashed with the local police, and this Communist's own account of his words was published in the Daily Worker, as follows:

"I told the police to hell with the United States of America flag. I said that the flag I claimed was the one with the hammer and sickle, the red flag, which we will have someday."

On December 15, 1940, the New Jersey State Industrial Council had before it a resolution which read as follows:

"The council condemns the dictatorships and totalitarianism of nazi-ism, communism, and fascism as inimical to the welfare of labor, and destructive of our form of government."

Brant led the fight to delete "communism" from the resolution.

Neil Brant is a member of the executive board of the National Federation of Constitutional Liberties, one of the most influential of the Communist Party's fronts of recent years, and also an organization which the Attorney General named as subversive.

In 1937, the International Labor Defense set up a trade union advisory committee of which Neil Brant was a member (Labor Defender, October 1937, p. 18). The International Labor Defense, as almost everyone knows by this time, is the legal arm of the Communist Party.

In 1941, the Communists established a school in New York City which was known as the School for Democracy (now merged with the Workers School into the Jefferson School of Social Science). Neil Brant was a lecturer at the School for Democracy.

There is no doubt whatever of Neil Brant's allegiance to communism nor of his using his strategic position in his union and in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee to advance the cause of communism.

JULIUS EMSPAK

One of the top men in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is Julius Emspak, secretary-treasurer of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America (C. I. O.), and in this capacity he was present at a political action conference held at the Hotel Warwick, in Philadelphia, on July 18, 1943. He is now also the editor of the U. E. News, official organ of the union.

Emspak's record as a Communist is established by his subservience to the line of the Communist Party on numerous issues, by his position of leadership in a Communist-controlled union, and by the Communist character of the U. E. News, official organ of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, under his editorship.

It has been estimated that three-fourths of the 570,000 workers in the U. E. R. M. W. A. are employed in defense industries, manufacturing such important war materials as aircraft and marine equipment, parts for tanks and guns, torpedoes, gun sights, range finders, sound detectors, altimeters, gyroscopes, radio equipment, gages, aerial cameras, motors, and cartridges. In 1943 the union claimed 970 collective agreements with such important defense manufacturing concerns as Westinghouse Electric with 75,000 employees, General Electric with 120,000 employees, General Motors with 30,000 employees, Radio Corporation of America with 12,000 employees, Fairchild Aerial Camera Co., Liquidometer Corporation, Colt Patent Fire Arms, Phelps Dodge Copper Products, Remington Rand, Babcock & Wilcox, Electric Dynamic, National Radio Tube, Union Switch & Signal, and U. S. Cartridge Co.

Communist control af the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America has been demonstrated by its activity and by the testimony of competent authority. At its September 1941 convention in Camden, N. J., the organization repudiated a resolution permitting local unions to exclude Communists, Nazis, and Fascists from office. When this resolution was presented to the general executive board by James B. Carey only two of its members supported him. Carey was charged with "Red-baiting" and was defeated for the presidency because he refused to back down on the issue. The convention adopted, by a vote of 789 to 377, a motion to bar only those who have been found guilty of "acts against the Nation or against the union." Carey's adherents characterized this proposal as a meaningless "straddle," since defendants would thus be judged by a stacked Red jury (New York Times, September 6, 1941, p. 16).

Prior to the break between Stalin and Hitler, the Communist leaders in the U. E. R. M. W. A. took the view that the British war effort should not be supported against Hitlerism. Anti-Communist forces in the convention sought to condemn the United Electrical

News as Communist, charging that the policy of the paper shifted with the Communist Party line. The policy of the paper was vigorously defended by Julius Emspak, its editor (New York Times, September 5, 1941, p. 23). Following this fight in which the lines between the Communists and the anti-Communists had been sharply drawn, Julius Emspak was elected as secretary-treasurer, and James J. Matles was chosen as national organizational director, both identified with the Communist wing of the union (New York Times, September 4, 1941, p. 1).

The United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, in which Emspak and Matles have been the real directing spirits, grew out of the Steel and Metal Workers Industrial Union, affiliate of the Trade Union Unity League, which has been characterized as under complete Communist control by Attorney General Francis Biddle in his decision on the case of Harry Bridges. Matles was secretary of the metal and machinery division of the Steel and Metal Workers Industrial Union (Labor Unity, December 1934, p. 16). He gave his open support to the Communist Party in 1933 (Daily Worker, November 6, 1933, p. 2). James Lustig, now organizer for district 4 of the U. E. R. M. W. A., was formerly an organizer for the Steel and Metal Workers Industrial Union. He also endorsed the Communist Party in 1933. Among the Communists now occupying leading positions of the U. E. R. M. W. A. are Ruth Young, Neil Brant, William Sentner, Louis Joel, James MacLeish, Fred Keller, Nellie Lederman, Victor Decavitch, Clifford Saunders, Henry Fiering, Arthur Goldstein, Joseph Kress, Dick Neibur, Joseph Garner, Frank Mance, Kermit Kirkendall, Eugene Rinehart, Ernest DeMaio, Abraham J. Isserman, Saul C. Waldbaum, Sam Cantor, Coleman Taylor, Fred Gardner, Fred Hough, Tom Malloy, Logan Burkhart, Theodore Wright, Nick Storko, Mike Petanovich, Robert Logsden, Charles Rivers, James Lerner, William Mauseth, Hilliard Smith, and Steve Adams.

Benjamin Stolberg in his Story of the C. I. O. wrote that—

"In the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers Union * * * where the Stalinists and their allies are in power, they term all opposition disruptive, undemocratic, 'Trotskyite,' silencing all criticism through frame-ups, steam-roller methods, character assassination, and plain hooliganism in meetings" (p. 149).

On the basis of evidence submitted to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, this committee found "Communist leadership entrenched in the * * * United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America" (Report, Jan. 3, 1940, p. 13).

With the full knowledge of the international officers of the U. E. R. M. W. A. and without public criticism by them, the following officers of the organization endorsed Israel Amter, Communist candidate for Governor of New York State: Anthony Composto, James Tren, Claire Zimmerman, Harold Simon, Alvin Van Arsdale, Victor Teich, Rudolf Grimm, and John Lemarese (Daily Worker, Oct. 27, 1942, p. 5).

With similar frankness, Local 448 of Union City, N. J., endorsed the Daily Worker and the Worker, official Communist organs, on November 8, 1943, as "the best labor papers in the country." The letter with clippings showing the publicity given the U. E. R. M. W. A. was published in the Worker of November 28, 1943, page 5. During 7 days of the U. E. R. M. W. A. convention, these two papers had given the union 367 inches of space according to a union tabulation. The Worker of September 20, 1942, page 4, devoted a full page to the convention of the U. E. R. M. W. A. and particularly to its resolution condemning red baiting as the chief instrument of Nazi oppression and of the pro-Fascist fifth column of America.

Locals of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America marched openly in the Communist May Day parades of 1938, 1939, 1940, and 1941, together with the Communist Party, the International Labor Defense, and other organizations in the Communist solar system. On April 17, 1943, page 5, the U. E. News, edited by Julius Emspak, called upon all members to attend the May 2 demonstration in Yankee Stadium, New York City, which took the place of the usual Communist May Day parade and demonstration.

The following news item appearing in the Daily Worker of February 5, 1937, page 4, is typical of U. E. R. M. W. A. personnel:

"James Lewis, 22, vice president of District 12 of the United Electrical and Radio Workers and a member of the Communist Party, died late Wednesday night following a pneumonia attack.

"Lewis, who was a member of the Young Communist League for 5 years before joining the Communist Party, was an outstanding leader in the Electrical Union."

Both Julius Emspak and the organization which he leads have followed with precision the circumlocutions of the Communist Party line. Prior to the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact, when the Communist Party was beating the drums for collective security against the Fascist aggressors, James B. Carey, president of the U. E. R. M. W. A., was a delegate to the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, a Communist front advocating collective security, and a member of the national labor committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy, formed at that Congress. We have in our files a typical leaflet of Local 1225, U. E. R. M. W. A., calling upon all workers in the industry to participate in the parade of the American League for Peace and Democracy, August 6, 1938, in New York City. Carey also supported organizations with the same aims, such as the Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts and the Committee for Peace Through World Cooperation. There is no doubt that he was expressing the will of the Communist leaders of his organization in so doing.

After Stalin signed his pact with Hitler, the Communist-led Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War, the Emergency Peace Mobilization, and later the American Peace Mobilization came forth to oppose the national defense program, lend-lease, conscription, and other "warmongering" efforts. Julius Emspak was a sponsor of the Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War (letterhead, August 10, 1940). He later became a member of the national council of the American Peace Mobilization.

The Communist steam roller in the U. E. R. M. W. A. had no trouble in getting the union to perform the same flip-flop. At its seventh convention held at the Hotel Hollenden in Cleveland in September 1940 the 700 delegates heard the war denounced as "imperialist" and as a struggle between two thieves. They were called upon to cooperate with the coming meeting of the Emergency Peace Mobilization in Chicago and with its proposed march on Washington against conscription. The officers' report, signed by Julius Emspak as secretary-treasurer, declared that the Second World War began as the result of "rivalries and national ambitions that had been ripening for more than a score of years in Europe." The convention sent word to the President that conscription "involves a very definite departure from the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence" (Daily Worker, September 4, 1940, p. 1; September 5, 1940, p. 1).

Emspak and his associates proceeded to put this program into concrete form in the U. E. R. M. W. A. A case in point is the April 1940 membership activities committee bulletin of Local 475 of Brooklyn which displayed on its cover the notorious "Yanks Are Not Coming" cartoon widely reprinted in the Communist press.

Simon Gerson, reporter for the Daily Worker, estimated that 100 locals of the U. E. R. M. W. A. were represented at the American Peoples Meeting on April 5–6, 1941, in New York City (Sunday Worker, April 13, 1941, p. 1, sec. 2). The American Peoples Meeting was the name chosen for its national convention by the seditious American Peace Mobilization.

While it is not the purpose or the province of our committee to enter into the question of wage demands, the question comes within the jurisdiction of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities when such demands are merely a cover for subversive designs calculated to interfere with national security and war production. It was avowedly this consideration which moved the President to send Federal troops to intervene in the strike of the Vultee Aircraft workers, a step denounced by the U. E. News of April 10, 1941, pages 23 and 24, edited by Julius Emspak. It was no accident therefore that the U. E. R. M. W. A. set in motion a general strike campaign throughout the industry in October 1940, a month after the meeting of the American Peace Mobilization.

Members of the American Peace Mobilization joined in supporting two strikes of the U. E. R. M. W. A. and aided in picketing the Pennsylvania Manufacturing Co. and the Emerson Radio Co. of Brooklyn, N. Y. (A. P. M. Volunteer, May 3, 1941, p. 4). Virgil Mason, U. E. R. M. W. A. leader at the Dohler Die Casting Co, was a member of the national council of the American Peace Mobilization. Albert Stonkus, business representative of Local 475, James Garry, organizer of Local 1227, and Edward Matthews, president of Local 1207, were members of the national labor committee of the American Peace Mobilization.

Immediately after Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, the line of Julius Emspak and the U. E. R. M. W. A. made a remarkable turn toward all-out support of the war effort. The officers' report signed by Julius Emspak to the seventh annual convention of the U. E. R. M. W. A. held in Camden, N. J., in September 1941, demanded that the union take "every step necessary to crush Hitlerism," and announced that all disagreements in the union on foreign policy had been removed since the Nazis invaded Russia (New York Times, September 2, 1941, p. 1).

At the ninth convention of the U. E. R. M. W. A., held in September 1943, at the Hotel New Yorker in New York City, a 30-page report was submitted by the national officers, including Julius Emspak, calling for the opening of a western front and insisted that "we are fighting to establish the kind of a world in which working men and women all over the world will be able to find just and peaceful solutions for the problems common to us all" (Daily Worker, September 14, 1943, p. 1).

Julius Emspak became an enthusiastic member of the President's Labor Victory Committee and is a frequent visitor at the White House.

Demonstrating conclusively that former wage demands were incident to the Communist Party line, Emspak and his fellow national officers of the U. E. R. M. W. A. now declare that their "members are willing to abstain from their just demand for a general cost-of-living wage rise at this time" (Washington Post, Feb. 25, 1943, p. 16).

As editor of the U. E. News, Emspak gives clear expression of his Communist sympathies. Almost every issue carries some laudatory article dealing with the Soviet Union. The paper has advocated the lifting of deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges (March 6, 1943, p. 7). It has defended Stanley Nowak, of Detroit, charged by the Depart-

ment of Justice with being a Communist and with falsification of his naturalization papers (Feb. 20, 1943, p. 12). The paper has defended the Oklahoma Communist cases (May 29, 1943, p. 8). A member of its staff is none other than James Lerner, formerly on the staff of Fight, official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism, and later the American League for Peace and Democracy.

It is significant to note Emspak's attitude toward the Congress of the United States, an attitude typical of the Communist Party and the Daily Worker. In his issue of the U. E. News of February 20, 1943, page 6, he denounced this body as "presently dominated by a bloc of Hooveritcs, poll-taxers, defeatists, and open defenders of treason and sedition."

Emspak is one of the outstanding leaders of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee; and the host of Communist functionaries in his union, the U. E. R. M. W. A., is energetically backing Sidney Hillman's movement to relegate the Congress of the United States to the role of a subservient tool of a minority Communist pressure group.

BEN GOLD

Ben Gold, president of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, which was cited as under Communist leadership by unanimous vote of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, is also a member of the executive board of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. He is prominent in the leadership of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. Gold is frankly and openly a prominent leader of the Communist Party who has been a frequent spokesman for the party in numerous campaigns and front organizations. His jail record is a significant one.

As far back as December 4, 1926, when Ben Gold headed the New York Furriers' Union Joint Council (A. F. of L.) a special committee headed by Matthew Woll and Edward F. McGrady, published a report in which it declared:

"It has been demonstrated beyond peradventure of a doubt that communistic and destructive leadership has gained ascendancy in the New York Furriers' Union Joint Council."

According to this investigating committee of the American Federation of Labor—"to secure communistic control of the International Fur Workers Union is not an end in itself, but merely a means to a greater end, which is the complete destruction of the American trade-union movement and the substitution of a revolutionary communistic reign of terrorism and corruption and dictatorship in its stead."

This A. F. of L. committee called upon the union itself to expel its Communist leadership, and, pending that expulsion, called upon the New York State Federation of Labor and the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York to cancel the affiliation of the furriers' union with those bodies.

Despite the foregoing findings and recommendations, the Communist Party's control of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union has continued down to the present time and was never more complete than it is today. The union is today affiliated with the C. I. O.

While all of the high-ranking officials of the union are well-known Communists, the outstanding one among them is, and has been for the past 17 years, Ben Gold.

Ben Gold's record of Communist activities—wholly apart from his leadership in the furriers union—is a very long one. It is, moreover, a public record, some of the outstanding items in which are as follows:

Ben Gold has been a member of the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States. This fact was included in the sworn testimony of Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, when he was a witness before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on September 5, 1939 (see the committee's hearings, p. 4281).

In 1931, Gold was one of the Communist Party's candidates for the New York State Assembly from the Bronx.

In 1933, he was the Communist Party's candidate for aldermanic president of New York.

In 1936, Gold was again one of the Communist Party's candidates for the New York State Assembly from the Bronx.

The foregoing items clearly establish the fact that Ben Gold is one of the high-ranking leaders of the Communist Party, but the wide range of his Communist activity is still more clearly revealed by his frequent leadership in the front organizations of the Communist Party. He has been prominent in the following party fronts: American League Against War and Fascism, American League for Peace and Democracy, American Peace Mobilization, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, American Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy, League of Struggle for Negro Rights, Consumers Union, International Labor Defense, International Workers Order, Jewish People's Committee, National Negro Congress, Workers Alliance, and the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance.

In 1942, he was elected as a member of the New York State Committee of the Communist Party.

In 1936 he publicly supported the candidacy of Israel Amter running for the position of president of the board of aldermen on the Communist ticket in New York City, and again in 1942 when Amter ran as Communist candidate for Governor, Gold was chairman of the labor committee supporting him.

Gold has been exceedingly active in defense of cases where his fellow Communists were involved, both nationally and internationally.

In 1938, he was a speaker in behalf of Ernst Thaelman, jailed German Communist leader. A year before he signed a cable in behalf of Luiz Carlos Prestes, Brazilian Communist leader and a former member of the executive committee of the Communist International. In 1943 he signed a declaration in honor of Georgi Dimitrov, former head of the Communist International.

Gold was a prime mover in several committees to free Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party. He was a sponsor of the Provisional Committee to Free Earl Browder in 1941, and in 1942 he supported the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder, the New York Trade Union Committee to Free Earl Browder, and the New York Community Divisions of the Committee to Free Earl Browder.

In 1942 he was a sponsor of the committee formed for the defense of Morris U. Schappes, an avowed Communist teacher, ousted from the City College of New York and serving in Sing Sing Prison for perjury.

In the same year and thereafter he supported the defense of Harry Bridges, now subject to deportation proceedings as a Communist.

Gold was himself convicted on a charge of assault and battery in Wilmington, Del., in 1933 in connection with a Communist-engineered hunger march on Washington. He was jailed in Canada in January 1930 as a leader of the Needle Trades Industrial Union, an affiliate of the Trade Union Unity League which was in turn affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions in Moscow. He was jailed again in Boston in February 1930 in connection with a Communist-led march of unemployed on the City Hall.

The Daily Worker of November 22, 1930, page 2, carried an account of the conviction of 11 members of the New York Furriers' Union, headed by Ben Gold, on charges of felonious assault during the 1926 furriers' strike. Gold and Shapiro were released but the following were convicted: Maurice Malkin, Franklin, Jack Schneider, Martin Rosenberg, Samuel Mencher, Oscar Miles (Mileaf), Otto Lenhardt, Joseph Katz, and George Weiss.

In 1940 Irving Potash, manager of the New York Joint Council of the Furriers' Union, was convicted on a charge of obstruction of justice, together with Joseph Winogradsky, assistant joint council manager, John Vafiades, manager of the Greek local, and Louis Hatchios, a member of the Greek local. The 5,000-page record of the trial was filled with evidence of violence in the industry charged to the defendants (Daily Worker, November 5, 1940, p. 3).

In 1938, Ben Gold received the congratulations of the Communist Party for his conduct of the International Fur Workers' strike, according to the Daily Worker of June 4, 1938, page 4.

In all of the May Day parades of the Communist Party in New York for many years past, the members of the furriers' union have constituted one of the largest contingents of the marchers. The union membership has likewise supplied large contingents for the gatherings and demonstrations of the numerous front organizations of the Communist Party, notably the American Peace Mobilization, which achieved its largest national publicity by its picketing of the White House just prior to Hitler's attack on Russia.

HELEN KAY

The State, County, and Municipal Workers of America is one of the most glaringly Communist outfits in the whole list of C. I. O. affiliates. The Communist record of Abram Flaxar, president of the union, is discussed in some detail in this report. At this point, we present the Communist record of another of the highest functionaries of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America.

This is the record of Helen Kay. It will be admitted on all sides that the editorship of the national publication of one of the C. I. O. unions is a key position. Helen Kay occupies this position in the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America. She is the editor of the unions national publication, News of State, County, and Municipal Workers.

Helen Kay (whose real name is Kolodny) has been a member of the Communist Party for at least 12 years. In the August 6, 1932, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 4), she contributed an article entitled "The Power of the Daily Worker." This contributed article was written from the standpoint of a party member who was boosting the party's official newspaper.

In 1933 Helen Kay was editor of the New Pioneer, the Communist Party's official publication for children. In addition to editing the magazine, she contributed numerous signed articles for its columns.

Helen Kay's writings for other Communist Party publications include contributions to Soviet Russia Today (June 1936) and New Theatre magazine (August 1936). The Workers' Library Publishers, official agency of the Communist Party, have also published her work.

Helen Kay's next Communist Party assignment was as executive secretary of the League of Women Shoppers. She was, in fact, the original executive secretary of that Communist front organization (see League of Women Shoppers' letterhead of October 7, 1935).

As editor of News of State, County, and Municipal Workers, it is one of Helen Kay's major duties to publicize the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. This duty she has performed in numerous issues of the union's

publication ever since the C. I. O. Political Action Committee was set up in July 1943. Miss Kay is simply one more in the long list of avowed Communists and notorious Communist sympathizers who form the backbone of Sidney Hillman's C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

FRANK R. M'GRATH

Frank R. McGrath is president of the United Shoe Workers of America, affiliate of the C. I. O. McGrath is a member of the C. I. O.'s executive board, highest governing body of the organization, which launched the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. He has, as a matter of course, represented his union in the annual conventions of the C. I. O. in recent years. At the present time, also as matter of course, he is putting the full force of his union into the work of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

The United Shoe Workers of America is under the domination of the Communists, and there is no doubt about McGrath's personal Communist affiliations.

In keeping with his Communist sympathies and affiliations, McGrath, on January 3, 1944, sent his cordial greetings to the Daily Worker, notoriously subversive Communist newspaper, on the occasion of its twentieth anniversary. In a letter of that date, addressed to Louis F. Budenz, editor of the Daily Worker, McGrath wrote as follows:

"I have been a reader of the Daily Worker for several years. I find your paper has been a consistent supporter of organized labor and has devoted itself to the worthy case of building cooperation and understanding among the people and governments of the United States, Great Britain, Soviet Union, China, and the other United Nations.

"I congratulate you on your twentieth anniversary and trust that you will continue your efforts on behalf of the laboring people. I am sure that you will continue to work with the American people who are supporting the efforts of our great President to mobilize our Nation for the early victory planned at the historic conference at Teheran."

It takes no reading between the lines to ascertain that the foregoing letter sent by McGrath to the Daily Worker is the work of a Communist. Not only its eulogy of the Communist newspaper, but its whole tenor reflects the current line of the Communist Party.

Most of McGrath's close associates in the leadership of the United Shoe Workers of America are notorious Communists. Among them are Isadore Rosenberg, Jack Zucker, Julius Crane, and Jack Spiegel.

McGrath was formerly a leader in the Shoe Workers Industrial Union Council. This labor organization was wholly Communist and was affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League, headed by William Z. Foster, national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States. The Trade Union Unity League was composed of some 20 Communist unions and was affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions of Moscow.

McGrath and Fred Biedenkapp, the latter a long-time Communist Party leader in this country, led a Communist committee of protest to Washington in 1933. (Daily Worker, October 30, 1933, p. 1.)

The United May Day Conference, entirely engineered by the Communist Party for its 1937 May Day demonstrations, numbered Frank R. McGrath as one of its members along with such outstanding Communist Party leaders as Ben Gold and Max Perlow.

McGrath was also affiliated with the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. Earl Browder testified concerning the Abraham Lincoln Brigade that some 60 percent of its personnel were members of the Communist Party. The Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade was a Communist front organization and was so found unanimously by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report to the House of Representatives in January 1940.

McGrath was a member of the Joint Committee on Trade Union Rights, which supported the Communist Party leaders of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union when they were serving prison terms a few years ago. (Daily Worker, November 11, 1940, pp. 1, 5.)

MORRIS MUSTER

Morris Muster, 42-year-old president of the United Furniture Workers of America (C. I. O.) claims 46,000 members in his organization. The Worker, official Communist organ, of April 18, 1943, page 5, devotes a full 2 columns to a laudatory account of his achievements.

Formerly president of the Eastern Seaboard Council of the Upholsterers Union (A. F. of L.), he led a left-wing split into the C. I. O. to form the United Furniture Workers of America in 1937. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its annual report of January 3, 1940, unanimously found, on the basis of evidence presented, that it was one of the unions in which Communist leadership was strongly entrenched.

At the third constitutional convention of the C. I. O., held in Atlantic City in November 1940, the delegation of the United Furniture Workers consisted of Morris Muster, Max Perlow (who endorsed the Communist candidate for the New York City Council in 1937), Alex Sirota (who endorsed the Communist candidacy of Israel Amter for Governor of New York State in 1942), Morris Pizer (who endorsed the Communist program and candidates in 1933), and Joseph D. Persily from the Indiana district of the union. Emil Costello, provisional secretary-treasurer of the union, was expelled from the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor as a Communist (hearings, vol. 1, pp. 264, 265). Joseph Magliacano, former business agent of Local 140, was a Communist candidate for Congress in the Thirteenth District in New York City in 1936.

The New York locals of the United Furniture Workers have consistently supported the May Day parades of the Communist Party from 1937 to recent date. In 1940, Max Perlow was the secretary-treasurer of the United May Day Committee.

According to William W. Hinckley, executive secretary of the American Youth Congress, another Communist-controlled organization, the United Furniture Workers supported that organization (hearings, vol. 11, p. 7040). The organization also supported the August 6, 1938, peace parade, organized by the American League for Peace and Democracy. Morris Muster not only endorsed the American League for Peace and Democracy but acted as a member of its national labor committee. The American League for Peace and Democracy, branded by the Attorney General as subversive, was the Communist Party's front which expressed the party's views on foreign policy until it was so completely discredited as a result of the Stalin-Hitler pact that it was disbanded.

During the Spanish Civil War, the Communist Party in the United States set up a number of front organizations through which it carried on a great deal of agitation. Morris Muster was affiliated with four of these Communist fronts, namely, the American Committee to Save Refugees (Daily Worker, March 23, 1942, p. 5), the United American Spanish Aid Committee, the American Relief Ship for Spain, and the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo.

Muster is a member of the executive board of the C. I. O. which launched the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and is a part of the large Communist bloc which is actively carrying on the campaign headed by Sidney Hillman for the purpose of subverting the Congress of the United States to Communist ends.

WILLIAM SENTNER

According to the U. E. News, official organ of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, one William Sentner was "the featured speaker" at a huge St. Louis banquet where he propounded the objectives of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

Who is this William Sentner, key figure in Sidney Hillman's political drive in the Midwest? We shall permit his record to speak for itself and in so doing to speak for the C. I. O. Political Action Committee also.

William Sentner, vice president of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, and president of the same union's District No. 8 in the St. Louis area, has a record as a member and official of the Communist Party since 1933. "When I joined," he declared in an interview published in Fortune magazine of November 1943, "I told everybody in town." He admitted that he still pays his party dues and solicits new party members, but devotes most of his time to union activities.

Sentner has held numerous posts in the Missouri-Arkansas District No. 21 of the Communist Party, among them being the following: Secretary of the East St. Louis section committee (1934); secretary, Communist Party of St. Louis (1935); district organizer, Communist Party of Arkansas (1935); organization secretary, St. Louis (1935); member of district committee (1938); delegate to Arkansas convention of the Communist Party (1938); and member of city committee of Communist Party of St. Louis (1939).

Records in the files of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities show that he participated in the following Communist Party meetings in St. Louis within a comparatively recent period:

January 24, 1942: Lenin memorial meeting, 1041 N. Grand Avenue.

February 22, 1942: Farwell party for John Rossen, city secretary, Communist Party, 1041 N. Grand Avenue.

August 10, 1942: Meeting in honor of Ella Reeve Bloor, Communist leader, Castle ballroom.

May 3, 1942: Meeting with Robert Minor, Communist leader, 1041 N. Grand Avenue.

May 16, 1943: Meeting to celebrate release of Earl Browder, 1041 N. Grand Avenue.

December 31, 1942: Communist New Year's Eve party, 1041 N. Grand Avenue.

February 21, 1943, chairman of trade-union sponsoring committee: William Z. Foster, production-for-victory rally, St. Louis Municipal Auditorium.

This 36-year-old-executive of a Communist-controlled union, operating in important Midwest war plants, has been neither an electrical, a radio, nor a machine worker. He studied architecture in Washington University in St. Louis and never completed his studies. As an artist he joined the John Reed Club, named after the founder of the American Communist Party, and became one of the club's national officers. He also spent some time at sea. In other words he owes his present powerful union post in a key war industry solely to the operation of the Communist Party patronage machine and not to any special qualifications in this field of industry.

Although classified as I-A by his local draft board, he has secured deferment at the request of his union. Moreover, he was selected as a member of the War Labor Board for region No. 7 (Missouri) on February 17, 1943, until his record caught up with him and he was forced to resign on February 10, 1944.

Sentner's earliest activities as a Communist include his acting as organizer of the Food Workers Industrial Union, affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League, a section of the Red International of Labor Unions with headquarters in Moscow. In this capacity he

led a strike of St. Louis nut workers who marched militantly on the city hall. The Daily Worker reported that "the strikers, one after another, told Mayor Dickinson of St. Louis that it was the Food Workers Industrial Union and the Communist Party who were responsible." (June 1, 1933, p. 3.)

Sentner was arrested during this period for violation of the National Recovery Act, in connection with a strike at the Lewin Metal Co., engaged in the manufacture of material designed for the War Department. The Daily Worker's account of what took place is illuminating:

"The strikers succeeded in keeping the locomotives out of the company's gates * * *. Switchmen * * * refused to switch the cars * * *. The party has boldly appeared from the beginning." (Daily Worker, Aug. 11, 1933, pp. 1 and 3.)

In accordance with the Communist Party's doctrine at the time, Sentner was concentrating on the vital parts of the American war machine. More recently, as organizer for the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, he organized the U. S. Cartridge Co. of St. Louis.

In 1938, Sentner, as district president of the U. E. R. M. W. A., was arrested on charges of criminal syndicalism in connection with the Maytag strike at Newton, Iowa, and found guilty after a jury trial. In 1939 he was sentenced to a maximum penalty of 10 years in jail and a $5,000 fine. His case was defended by the International Labor Defense, "legal arm of the Communist Party." (Equal Justice, July 1938, p. 3.) The law was later declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of Iowa, and Sentner was accordingly released.

Police records of St. Louis show that he was arrested on October 14, 1933, on charges of suspicion of inciting a riot and that he was fined $25 and costs.

Sentner's record shows that he has used his post as a trade-union official to promote the current line of the Communist Party. In 1937, he was a speaker at a Communist May Day meeting in St. Louis, as national organizer of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, and rallied strikers from the Emerson Electric Co. and the Century Co. to attend. (Daily Worker, May 4, 1937, p. 3.)

In 1938, he was a sponsor of the St. Louis branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy, the largest Communist front of that period.

In 1940, Sentner joined with other officers of District 8 of the U. E. R. M. W. A. to urge participation in the movement for the repeal of Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill. (Daily Worker, September 25, 1940, p. 1.)

In line with the Communist Party's most recent position, Sentner today pretends to be a patriot. His offer of cooperation with the war effort has elicited the commendation of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who no doubt was not aware that his correspondent was a man with a long Communist record. Sentner's union-management cooperation activities have brought forth praise from Stuart Symington, head of the Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co. of St. Louis (Fortune, November 1943). These gentlemen are certainly unaware that Sentner's patriotism is always conditioned by the line of the Communist Party.

Among the Communist organizations supported by Sentner have been the Scottsboro Defense Committee, the International Labor Defense, Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder, Harry Bridges defense, Commonwealth College, New Theatre League, and National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. On February 12, 1938, he was cited on the honor roll of the Midwest Daily Record, official Communist organ of Chicago.

SEYMOUR SIPORIN

Seymour Siporin is national legislative director of the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America, a C. I. O. affiliate which is headed by two other Communists, namely, Grant W. Oakes as president and Gerald Fielde as secretary.

Siporin heads the C. I. O. Political Action Committee of his union in Chicago. According to an article by Louis F. Budenz in The Worker (Communist Sunday newspaper) of February 27, 1944, Grant Oakes and Seymour Siporin are engaged in a campaign within their union to collect $20,000, half of which is to be turned over to the national organization of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. Offering further evidence of the close tie between the Communist Party and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, Budenz writes enthusiastically about the work of Grant Oakes and Seymour Siporin for Sidney Hillman's movement. Budenz also writes, in part, as follows:

"In the last week in January, Sidney Hillman of the national C. I. O. Political Action Committee, held a special meeting of his 14 regional directors in this city.

"The C. I. O. has been conspicuously fortunate in obtaining as regional director for this State a man who was familiar with the local Democratic Party organization and yet is also on close and comradely terms with the labor movement. That man is Raymond McKeough, former Congressman from the Chicago region, whose congressional record was particularly good in its progressivism and stand for victory. There has been a quick pick-up among the unions in this vicinity, therefore, to the measures that were urged by the Hillman Chicago conference.

"Take the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers Union, C. I. O.. It is up on its toes in pushing this political business in 1944."

Siporin has been arrested in Chicago frequently in connection with riots and demonstrations of the Communist Party.

In 1939, Siporin was chairman of the Communist Party's United May Day Committee in Chicago.

According to The Worker of January 9, 1944, page 6, Seymour Siporin endorsed the Communist Party's Daily Worker on the occasion of its twentieth anniversary.

It appears to be no accident that, as Siporin's case so well illustrates, the local activities and leadership of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee regularly fall into the hands of well-known Communists.

LOUISE THOMPSON

Louise Thompson and her husband, William L. Patterson, have both been openly avowed members of the Communist Party for many years, and both have held high positions in the party. A published list of the arrangements committee and sponsors of the Hyde Park Joint Political Action Conference, a subsidiary of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, includes the name of Louise Thompson.

In 1940, Louise Thompson was elected as one of the vice presidents of the International Workers Order, an auxiliary of the Communist Party, whose president and general secretary are Russian-born William Weiner (real name Welwel Warzower), who was convicted for passport fraud, and German-born Max Bedacht, who was at one time secretary of the Communist Party in the United States.

Louise Thompson has been a member of the editorial board of the New Pioneer, the official Communist Party publication for children.

She has also been a member of the women's commission of the Communist Party.

The official Communist Party magazine, Party Organizer, has published articles by Louise Thompson.

Another official Communist Party magazine, Working Woman, also listed Louise Thompson as a contributor; and she was one of the editors of the Communist-front magazine, Woman Today.

She was listed as one of the national sponsors of the League of Women Shoppers, an organization which this committee found to be a Communist-controlled front by indisputable documentary evidence obtained from the files of the Communist Party in Philadelphia.

Louise Thompson's leadership in political campaigns did not begin with her present membership on the aforementioned set-up of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. She was a member of the Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford, when those two candidates were running for President and Vice President respectively on the Communist Party ticket. She was also a member of the Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Congressman VITO MARCANTONIO.

Louise Thompson, a Negro herself, has been a speaker at the annual gatherings of the National Negro Congress, another notoriously Communist-controlled organization.

She was a member of the arrangements committee of the United States Congress Against War, a gathering which Earl Browder reported to Moscow as being openly led by the Communist Party and out of which came the American Leaguge for Peace and Democracy.

She was active as a member and official of the National Scottsboro Committee of Action. Parenthetically, it may be noted that for many years "action committee' has been a favorite designation of the Communist Party for its fronts.

Louise Thompson was also a member of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners, and its successor organization, the National Committee for People's Rights, both of which were named as subversive by the Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle, in his memoranda to the departmental heads of the Federal Government.

Finally, we note that she has been a member of the national committee of the International Labor Defense, of which her husband has been vice president. The International Labor Defense has been correctly described as the legal arm of the Communist Party.

Louise Thompson and William L. Patterson were married at the Chicago convention where the seditious American Peace Mobilization was launched in September 1940, and she became a member of the national council of the organization.

It is clear from the foregoing record that few Negro women have ever attained such prominence in the Communist movement in this country as Louise Thompson. She now takes her place in the councils of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, a move which represents no break in the continuity of her activities on behalf of communism over the past decade.

RUTH YOUNG

Rutn Young was one of the speakers at the C. I. O. Political Action Committee's New York conference of January 14-15, 1944. She is an official in the C. I. O.'s third largest affiliate, the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America.

This same Ruth Young, who is now so prominent and active in Hillman's political action committee, was for a long time equally prominent and active in the Young Communist League.

In February 1933 Ruth Young signed a public manifesto which read in part as follows:

"The growth of the party depends upon our own effort and will. We pledge to make the slogan 'Build the Party' the center of discussion and action among our members and among the broad masses of our sympathizers.

"Forward to build a strong and powerful Communist Party.

"Forward for a strong people's front to defeat fascism and war.

"Forward to the American October."

The reference to October in the foregoing manifesto is the bolshevik revolution of Russia. When Ruth Young was confronted at the 1941 convention of her union with the fact that she signed the foregoing Communist manifesto, she made no denial. On the contrary, her reply was that she was "not aware that it is illegal in the United States for anyone to hold any political or religious belief."

In the summer of 1938 Ruth Young was delegate to the Communist World Youth Congress (at Vassar College) from the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America.

It is now under the mask of patriotism and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee that such Communists as Ruth Young are working for what they have in the past described as "the American October." The 600,000 members of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America (employed in many of the most vital American defense industries) are submitting to an entrenched Communist leadership which includes such notorious Communists as Julius Emspak, James Lustig, James J. Matles, William Sentner, Neil Brant, and Ruth Young. This union is probably the most energetic of all the C. I. O. affiliates in supporting Sidney Hillman's C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

COMMUNIST-FRONT ORGANIZATIONS

The Communist-front organization is comparatively a new phenomenon in American life. Because of this and because of the deceptiveness and unprecedented character of the tactics employed, most Americans are slow to recognize these front organizations for what they are, instruments of the Communist Party. These Communist-front organizations are characterized by their common origin, the rigid conformity of these organizations to the Communist pattern, their interlocking personnel, and their methods generally used to deceive the American public. Being part of a conspiratorial movement, their very essence is deception.

During the first few years of the Communist International, immediately following the stimulus of the Russian Revolution, its international appeal was stridently revolutionary. As world-economic conditions improved following the First World War, the international revolutionary movement began to wane. The Hungarian and German Communist revolutions failed and the Communist International began to lose strength. Hence it was deemed necessary to moderate the earlier revolutionary appeal, to adopt middle-of-the-road slogans, and to build so-called united front organizations, as bridge and supporting organizations in the interest of the international Communist movement.

One of the leading organizers of these "innocent" organizations on an international scale was Willi Munzenberg, a prominent German Communist, whose organizing ability won him the sobriquet of the "Henry Ford of the Communist International." Munzenberg was engagingly frank in describing the real purpose of these organizations:

"1. To arouse the interest of those millions of apathetic and indifferent workeers * * * who simply have no ear for Communist propaganda. These people we wish to attract and arouse through new channels, by means of new ways.

"2. Our sympathetic organizations should constitute bridges for the nonparty workers * * * who have not yet mustered the courage to take the final step and join the Communist Party, but who are nevertheless in sympathy with the Communist movement and are prepared to follow us part of the way.

"3. By means of the mass organizations we wish to extend the Communist sphere of influence in itself.

"4. The organizational linking up of the elements in sympathy with the Soviet Union and with the Communists. * * *

"5. We must build up our own organizations in order to counteract the increasing efforts of the bourgeois and social-democratic parties in this respect, and

"6. Through these sympathetic and mass organizations we should train the cadres of militants and officials of the Communist Party possessing organizational experience." (Speech before the Sixth Congress of the Communist International in Moscow, July 20, 1923. International Press Correspondence, vol. 8, No. 42, Aug. 1, 1928, pp. 751, 752.)

In his Problems of Leninism, a standard textbook and guide for Communists throughout the world, Joseph Stalin emphasized the need of these front or mass organizations which he called "transmission belts":

"The proletariat needs these belts, these levers, and this guiding force [the Communist Party—Ed.], * * * Lastly we come to the Party of the Proletariat, the proletarian vanguard. Its strength lies in the fact that it attracts to its ranks the best elements of all the mass organizations of the proletariat, without exception, and to guide their activities toward a single end, that of the liberation of the proletariat."

Stalin quoted Lenin in support of his argument:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be effectively realized without "belts" to transmit power from the vanguard [the Communist Party—Ed.] to the mass of the advanced class, and from this to the mass of those who labor" (pp. 29, 30).

We cite the instructions of Otto Kuusinen, secretary of the Communist International, in his report at the Sixth Plenum (plenary session) of the executive committee of the Communist International:

"The first part of our task is to build up, not only Communist organizations, but other organizations as well, above all, mass organizations sympathizing with our aims, and able to aid us for special purposes. * * * We must create a whole solar system of organizations and small committees around the Communist Party, so to speak, smaller organizations working actually under the influence of our party." (Quotations taken from the Communist, May 1931, pp. 409-423.)

The rise of Adolph Hitler to power created a new threat to the Soviet Union and to the international Communist movement. Hence the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, in 1935, gave an added impetus to the creation of front organizations under Communist initiative and leadership, the chief purpose of which was to protect and serve the Communist Party and the Soviet Union. The ability of the Communists to ensnare large numbers of influential individuals, to serve as decoys in operating these fronts, reached its high point following the seventh congress in 1935.

The methods employed by the Communists in establishing and operating these front organizations, methods demonstrated by the various organizations herein cited, have been well summarized by a former high official of the Communist Party of the United States:

"A front organization is organized by the Communist Party in the following fashion: First, a number of sympathizers who are close to the party and whom the party knows can be depended upon to carry out party orders, are gotten together and formed into a nucleus which issues a call for the organization of a particular front organization which the party wants to establish. And generally after that is done a program is drawn up by the party, which this provisional committee adopts. Then, on the basis of this provisional program, all kinds of individuals are canvassed to become sponsors of the organization, which is to be launched in the very near future. A provisional secretary is appointed before the organization is launched and in every instance in our day the secretary who was appointed was a member of the Communist Party. * * * And as president of the organization we would put up some prominent public figure who was willing to accept the presidency of the organization, generally making sure that, if that public figure was one who would not go along with the Communists, he was of such a type that he would be too busy to pay attention to the affairs of the organization. * * *

"On the committee that would be drawn together, a sufficient number of Communists and Communist Party sympathizers, who would carry out party orders, was included, and out of this number a small executive committee was organized * * * which carried on the affairs of the organization, so-called, and this small executive committee, with the secretary, really ran the organization. And this small committee and the secretary are the instruments of the Communist Party, with the result that when manifestos or decisions on campaigns are made, those campaigns are ordered by the Communist Party" (hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. 7, pp. 4716, 4717, 4718).

In judging the individuals associated with Communist-front organizations, to determine the degree of their responsibility for its activities and their closeness to the Communist Party, one should be guided by consideration of the following categories of individuals included within them:

1. Members of the Communist Party who have openly avowed their affiliation.

2. Members of the Communist Party, not openly avowed, proven to be such on the basis of documentary or other proof.

3. Those accepting Communist Party discipline, either secret party members or outsiders who accept such discipline and instruction. This category may be recognized by the regularity with which it follows the line of the Communist Party, throughout all its variations, by the number of different front affiliations, by the posts they occupy in these front organizations, and by the fact that they retain their affiliation after the organization has been publicly exposed.

4. Those who have been attracted by the high-sounding aims of the front organization or organizations, by the prominence of its sponsors, or by a desire to be sociable. The judgment of such persons is certainly open to criticism just as much as if they aided in launching any other hoax.

For the guidance of the American people in detecting Communist-front organizations, we present the following criteria:

1. Does the organization have Communist Party members or those trusted by the Communist Party, in its posts of real power—on its executive board, as secretary, organizer, educational director, editor, office staff?

2. Are meetings of the organization addressed by Communists or their trusted agents? Does its publication include articles by such persons?

3. Does the organization follow the Communist Party line?

4. Does the organization cooperate with campaigns, activities, publications, of the Communist Party or other front organizations?

5. Is the address of the organization in the same building with other front organizations or within cooperating vicinity?

6. Does the organization cooperate with Communist-controlled unions?

7. Does the organization's official publication reflect the line of the Communist Party, publish articles by pro-Communists, advertise Communist activities, or those of other

front organizations or of Communist vacation resorts?

8. Are questions injected into meetings or in official publications, which have more to do with the current policy of the Communist Party, than with the professed purposes of the organization?

9. Are funds kicked back directly or indirectly to the Communist Party or to other front organizations?

10. Is printing done at a Communist printing house?

11. Does the organization use entertainers associated with pro-Communist organizations or entertainments?

12. Does the organization receive favorable publicity in the Communist press?

13. Is the organization uniformly loyal to the Soviet Union?

The line of the Communist Party on foreign policy is cited herewith. Its advocacy by an individual or organization, throughout all its variations, is a sound test of the loyalty and subservience of such an individual or organization to the Communist Party:

Prior to August 1935: No distinction was made between Fascist and democratic governments. They were all capitalistic and had to be destroyed by a revolution and replaced by a proletarian dictatorship.

August 1935 to September 1939: Adolf Hitler became a threat to the Soviet Union. Opposition to the Fascist governments. Support of collective security or a united front of the democracies and the Soviet Union against the Fascist nations.

September 1939 to June 21, 1941: The period of the Stalin-Hitler pact. Opposition to the present war as imperialist. Support of an isolationist position. Support of the peace policy of the Soviet Union. Demand that we pay attention to our own domestic problems first.

June 22, 1941, to 1944: Hitler attacked the Soviet Union. Support of the present war against fascism. Demand for a second front to aid the struggle of the Soviet Union.

In his decision on the deportation of Harry Bridges, the Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle, included the following excellent description of Communist front organizations:

"Testimony on 'front organizations' showed that they were represented to the public for some legitimate reform objective, but actually used by the Communist Party to carry on its activities pending the time when the Communists believe they can seize power through revolution."

OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS

1

This report deals with the leadership of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, which is the authorized agency through which the Congress of Industrial Organizations itself is participating in the election compaigns of 1944. Our investigations of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee began in July 1943, when it was first constituted by action of the C. I. O. executive board. Our findings, for the most part, are based upon the public records of the men who are active in the leadership of the Political Action Committee.

2

Sidney Hillman, national chairman of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, announced in the press and also stated in a letter to every Member of the House of Representatives that he would not comply with any subpenas of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, and that he would refuse "to submit the books or records of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee to Mr. MARTIN DIES for investigation."

3

We have not, in any sense of the word, conducted an investigation of organized labor as such. A reading of this report will show that the legitimate activities of organized labor are not a subject of discussion herein. Our investigations have been concerned solely with the Communist penetration of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. It should be noted that the American Federation of Labor has instructed all of its units to refrain from any cooperation with the Political Action Committee, and also that the A. F. of L. has publicly endorsed the principle of our investigation of Hillman's committee.

4

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities does not challenge for one moment the right of organized labor to engage in political campaigns within the limits of the statutes which govern such activity. The irresponsible and untruthful charge that we would deny to organized labor any of its lawful rights does not deter us from exposing the subversive activities of the Communists who have, in line with their current strategy, decided to work through the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

5

We assert at the outset, and have tried to make clear elsewhere in this report, that we do not impeach the Americanism of the overwhelming majority of the rank and file members of the unions which are affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Whether they belong to these unions by choice or coercion, there are millions of these rank-and-file C. I. O. members who are wholly guiltless of any sympathy with communism. The same cannot be said of thousands of the leaders, high and low, of the C. I. O. who are most energetically carrying on the activities of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

6

Communists, like all totalitarians, have always looked with contempt upon the legislative (or parliamentary, as they are accustomed to style it) branch of our Government. For many years the official program of the Communist Party of the United States contained the following statement:

"Communism repudiates parliamentarism as the form of the future; its aim is to destroy parliamentarism."

The same official party program went on to assert the following:

"Therefore the deep hatred against all parliaments in the revolutionary proletariat is perfectly justified."

It is true that Communists engage in political campaigns for the ostensible purpose of electing their members and friends to legislative bodies, but the official view of the Communist Party on this matter was set forth in the following language:

"The Communist Party enters such institutions not for the purpose of organization work, but in order to blow up the whole bourgeois machinery and the Parliament itself from within."

In a previous report, our committee made the following observation:

"The essence of totalitarianism is the destruction of the parliamentary or legislative branch of government. The counterpart of this destruction of the parliamentary institutions of democracy is the concentration of all power, irresponsible power, in the hands of the totalitarian dictator. In some countries, as in Hitler's Reich, the old forms of parliamentary government have been retained while the reality has been utterly effaced. The Reichstag has been degraded to an assembly of puppets who are called together at irregular intervals to scream "Ja" at the Fuehrer's bidding. No greater fallacy could obsess the mind of man than to assume that such a procedure with its outward show of absolute unity represents ultimate strength. In the totalitarian-ruled lands where democracy is dead, the undying issue confronting men is the restoration of freedom. In America, the issue confronting us is not the restoration but the preservation of the political institutions of freemen. This issue compels us to take cognizance of a widespread movement to discredit the legislative branch of our Government. The issue simply stated is whether the Congress of the United States shall be the reality or the relic of American democracy."

The foregoing observation, submitted by our committee to the House on June 25, 1942, is as relevant today as it was almost 2 years ago, and more so. It is, in fact, made vastly more relevant by the appearance on our political scene of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, whose major objective is to discredit the Congress of the United States.

We cite two typical cases of Communist contempt for the Congress of the United States. In the first case we have the notorious Harry Bridges, speaking as a leader of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee during a recent Nation-wide tour. "Why," said Bridges, "there are more Hitler agents to the square inch in Congress than there are to the square mile in Detroit." That is not a criticism of individual Members of Congress. It is, on the contrary, a contemptible slur upon the Congress of the United States as an institution. It is in a class with Walter Winchell's reference to this body as "the House of Reprehensibles."

In the second case, we have one Martin L. Fried speaking officially as the "political action representative" of Local 669 of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America. In a letter dated March 14, 1944, and addressed to a Member of the House of Representatives, Martin L. Fried wrote as follows:

"Hundreds and hundreds of men and women have come into our office here and have demanded that you be instructed to oppose the conference report and support the original Green-Lucas soldier vote bill, whether or not you favor it. We favor it—you vote for it!"

In this contemptible manner the C. I. O. Political Action Committee reveals itself in action, a manner not to be wondered at when the Communist ideology which underlies it is borne in mind. A letter written by Martin L. Fried to Soviet Russia Today establishes the fact that he is a Communist, as any reader of the letter may see at a glance. (Soviet Russia Today, July 1940, p. 34.)

7

We find that immediately prior to the setting up of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, the leaders of the Communist Party were agitating for the establishment of just such an agency as was created by the C. I. O. executive board in July 1943. (See sec. 2 of this report entitled "Patterned by the Communist Party.")

8

Sidney Hillman, chairman of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, has announced that the organization expects to raise and spend at least $2,000,000 during the election campaign of 1944. In some instances, units of the C. I. O. have made compulsory assessments against their members for the support of the Political Action Committee. Inasmuch as many members of the C. I. O. who do not share Hillman's political views are compelled by Government coercion to belong to its affiliated unions, such members are subjected to a form of tyrannical taxation without representation.

Another form of coercion is described in one of the official booklets of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee (U. E. Guide to Political Action published by the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America).

Under the heading "Voluntary 'compulsory' registration," this booklet says:

"Some unions have voted compulsory registration requirements. The membership of Local 6 of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, C. I. O., in San Francisco has adopted a rule requiring all probationary members, who are eligible, to register before they can receive their union books."

Inasmuch as union membership is, in many instances, the price of a livelihood, this type of coercion represents an intolerable invasion of the individual's political privacy and freedom. It smacks of the totalitarian state where the individual dare not exercise his prerogative to register or not to register lest he be deprived of his livelihood.

The Political Action Committee is simply the C. I. O. functioning as a political agency and using its coercive powers over its members to compel them to follow its political dictates. (See sec. 3 of this report entitled "The Set-up of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.")

9

The C. I. O. executive board which established the Political Action Committee is composed of 49 members, among whom there are at least 18 whose records indicate that they follow the "line" of the Communist Party with undeviating loyalty. These are the men who not so long ago supported the wave of sabotage strikes which gravely interfered with the production of defense materials. These same men now seek to discredit the Congress of the United States by malicious and slanderous charges of pro-Hitlerism when they themselves, prior to Hitler's invasion of Russia, were deliberately aiding Hitler and declaring, while they did so, that there was no difference between a Nazi victory and a British victory. (See sec. 4 of this report entitled "C. I. O. Executive Board.")

10

The Industrial Union Council is, perhaps, the most strategic unit in the work of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. This is also the unit of the C. I. O. which is most universally controlled by communists. We cite 33 instances in which industrial union councils were represented by Communists in the recent annual convention of the C. I. O. which was held in Philadelphia in November 1943. (See sec. 5 of this report entitled "The Industrial Union Council.")

11

A majority (21) of the international unions affiliated with the C. I. O. have an entrenched Communist leadership. This fully justifies the recent, even if belated, observation of John L. Lewis, in speaking of Philip Murray and Sidney Hillman, that "both of them have got to play ball with the Communists now or die." (See sec. 6 of this report entitled "Communism in the C. I. O.")

12

It is no accident that Communists have achieved such prominence in the C. I. O. It is the result of the most carefully planned program to capture unions for political purposes. The official program of the Communist Party, temporarily relegated to the background, said:

"It is particularly important for the purpose of winning over the majority of the proletariat, to gain control of the trade-unions."

(See sec. 7 of this report entitled "Communists in Trade Unions.")

13

The anncunced intention of the Communist Party to dissolve as a political party and to take some such name as the American Communist Political Association is not, in any sense of the word, a renunciation of communism. The Communists themselves have declared so emphatically. The immediate significance of the Party's dissolution is that during the 1944 elections Communists will throw their entire weight into the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. Their political leader will be, in effect, Sidney Hillman, instead of Earl Browder. They will attempt by stealth and subterfuge to do through the Political Action Committee what they have failed to do when functioning as a political party under their own name, i. e., to gain political leadership over millions of voters. (See sec. 8 of this report entitled "Dissolution of the Communist Party and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.")

14

A part of the Political Action Committee's program involves the sending of top C. I. O. leaders over the country on speaking tours. Banquets and mass meetings are being held in all of the large cities of the United States. One of the principal speakers who is making such a tour is Communist Harry Bridges. (See sec. 9 of this report entitled "C. I. O. Political Action Committee's Campaign has begun.")

15

Typical of the Communist predominance in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee was the roster of speakers at one of its meetings held in New York City, January 14–15, 1944. Among the speakers at this gathering of the Political Action Committee were Donald Henderson (see sec. 32), Reid Robinson (see sec. 48), Julius Emspak (see sec. 28), Grant Oakes (see sec. 43), Michael J. Quill (see sec. 46), Joseph Curran (see sec. 27), Lewis Merrill (see sec. 36), Ruth Young (see sec. 55), and Ferdinand C. Smith (see sec. 53). (See sec. 10 of this report entitled "New York Conference of January 14–15, 1944.")

16

According to a voting chart which shows how the Members of the House of Representatives voted on 20 measures the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body come under the attacks of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. However, the most significant thing about this chart which the Political Action Committee is disseminating throughout the country is that it is absolutely identical with one which the Communist Party is circulating in material which bears the party's own imprint. In other words, the political views and philosophy of the Communist Party and of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee coincide in every detail. The Communist Party's judgment for or against a Member of Congress is based upon grounds which are absolutely identical with those which the Political Action Committee uses for the same purpose. (See sec. 11 of this report entitled "Voting Charts of the Communist Party and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.")

17

One of the most seditious organizations which ever operated in the United States was the American Peace Mobilization, instrument of the Communist Party line prior to Hitler's attack on Russia. We cite the names and C. I. O. positions of 79 leaders of the American Peace Mobilization, most of whom are now active in the work of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. This single fact is sufficient to put the brand of communism on the Political Action Committee. (See sec. 12 of this report entitled "American Peace Mobilization and C. I. O. Political Action Committee.")

18

Whenever there is a Communist Party front organization, there will usually be found a large number of C. I. O. leaders in closest collaboration with the party. Each of the prominent Communist C. I. O. leaders is so useful to the Communist Party that his name appears not in one, but in many, of the Communist front organizations.

In subsequent sections of this report, we show how extensively the personnel of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee and various Communist front organizations overlaps. The American Peace Mobilization was the most notable example of this from the standpoint of conclusive proof of the Communist sympathies of various C. I. O. leaders, for the reason that the Peace Mobilization operated at a time when a wayfaring man though a fool could not fail to detect the party line.

We cite the names and union positions of 115 C. I. O. leaders who have been affiliated with the Communist front known as the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. (See sec. 13 of this report.)

We show how prominently C. I. O. leaders figured in the seditious American League for Peace and Democracy (originally known as the American League Against War and Fascism). We list herein the names and union positions of 45 C. I. O. leaders who were affiliated with that Communist front. Among them were 15 presidents of international unions of the C. I. O. (See section 14 of this report.)

When Earl Browder was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder. We cite the names and unions of 513 C. I. O. leaders who were affiliated with that committee. (See section 15 of this report.)

We have found at least 144 prominent C. I. O. leaders who have publicly declared their support of the Daily Worker, the Communist newspaper which over a period of 20 years has published a larger volume of subversive, seditious, and treasonable utterances than any other publication ever known in this country. (See section 16 of this report.)

Illustrative of the publicly declared Communist sympathies of some 28 C. I. O. leaders, we cite their support of the candidacy of Israel Amter when he ran for Governor of New York on the Communist Party ticket. (See sec. 17 of this report.)

Indicative of the hold which Communists on the west coast have over the machinery of the C. I. O., we cite the names and union affiliations of 18 west coast C. I. O. leaders who have constituted themselves a committee to support the Communist newspaper, the People's World. (See sec. 18 of this report.)

We cite the names and union connections of 21 C. I. O. leaders who have affiliated themselves with the Communist International Labor Defense in its activities on behalf of Mrs. Earl Browder, who is under an order for deportation to her native Russia. (See sec. 19 of this report.)

The Schappes Defense Committee, set up to defend a convicted Communist perjurer, is another illustration of the readiness of many C. I. O. leaders to associate themselves with Communist-front organizations. We list the names and unions of 16 very prominent C. I. O. leaders who are members of the Schappes Defense Committee. (See sec. 20 of this report.)

19

The independent judgment of numerous groups and individuals has arrived at the conclusion that Sidney Hillman has entered into a coalition with Communists for the purpose of building the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. This is not the first time in his career that Hillman has been found in league with the Communists, but it is by far the most sinister of all his Communist ccalitions. Because of his prominence in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, we have gone into more detail in discussing Sidney Hillman than we have in discussing most of the other leaders. (See sec. 21 of this report.)

The latter half of this report presents in alphabetical order the Communist records of 34 leaders in the work of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. We have gone to some lengths in offering a mass of detailed evidence in order that there may be no doubt in any quarter of the fact that these individuals are properly and fairly labeled "Communist." With a larger staff and with unlimited space in this report, we could have given such detailed records on hundreds rather than 34 of the leaders of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. We believe, however, that these 34 cases by themselves establish the fact that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee represents in its main outlines a subversive Communist campaign to subvert the Congress of the United States to its totalitarian program.

PATTERNED BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The origin of the idea of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is of real importance. That origin was definitely with the Communist Party and some of its leaders.

In June 1943, the Workers Library Publishers—official Communist Party publishing agency—brought out a pamphlet by Frank Ryhlick entitled "Congress and You." In the July 1943 issue of the Communist—official monthly organ of the Communist Party—Earl Browder and Eugene Dennis contributed articles entitled "Hold the Home Front" and "Victory and the 1944 Elections," respectively. These writings by Ryhlick, Browder, and Dennis cut the pattern for the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. They appeared some weeks before the formation of the Hillman organization. An examination of the views of Ryhlick, Browder, and Dennis shows how they anticipated in every respect the organization and activity of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. In his article, entitled "Hold the Home Front," Browder wrote as follows:

"We must unite the C. I. O. behind the leadership of Phil Murray and his clear and correct program for the labor movement, and we must work with every honest leading element who goes along with Murray in the fullest collaboration, giving them our confidence and support without any regard to possible past or present ideological differences. * * * We must build the unit of all anti-Axis elements for the war now, and for the 1944 elections, which are already a practical issue today in the course of the conduct of the war."

In his article, entitled "Victory and the 1944 Elections," Dennis wrote as follows:

"In analyzing the political situation and alinements within the country, special consideration should be given to the approaching 1944 elections. To begin with, we must understand that next year's national elections are not a post-war problem and not a problem to be resolved solely in 1944. * * * Recent experience has proved that one of the most important channels for developing labor's united action and influencing political developments is in the formation and activity of joint labor legislative committees."

Ryhlick wrote in his pamphlet, as follows:

"Political mobilization has become an all-embracing framework, within which lie the solutions to the many related problems confronting the people of America—problems including the opening of a second front, American-Soviet relations, economic planning, aid for the farmers, rationing and price control and taxes, wages and working conditions, abolition of racial discrimination, a victory Congress. The entire Nation could well take to heart the following words of George Addes, who with Richard Frankensteen, is helping President Thomas give real leadership to the United Auto Workers: 'It is obvious that whatever gains we will make we will have to achieve them through political action'."

Other Communist Party publications such as the New Masses and the Daily Worker bore down heavily upon the need for an organization like the C. I. O. Political Action Committee in the weeks which preceded the formation of Hillman's committee.

Whether or not Philip Murray and Sidney Hillman knowingly adopted a program of action for the 1944 elections which had been set forth by prominent Communist Party leaders and individuals, the record shows beyond the possibility of any dispute that well-known Communists immediately assumed important roles in the regional, State, and local activities of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. Murray and Hillman may allege that it was a mere coincidence that their organization so completely conformed to the one whose pattern had been drawn by the Communists. They cannot deny the presence of well-known Communists in the ranks of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee as it has been functioning from coast to coast during the past 7 or 8 months.

THE SET-UP OF THE C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

On July 7, 1943, the C. I. O. executive board, acting in the name of the entire Congress of Industrial Organizations, set up the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. The C. I. O., as a whole, obviously bears full responsibility for this committee which was created by its executive board.

Philip Murray, national president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, appointed the following members of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee: Sidney Hillman, chairman; R. J. Thomas, secretary; Sherman H. Dalrymple; Albert J. Fitzgerald; David J. McDonald.

Shortly after the setting up of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, Sidney Hillman announced that there would be 14 regional offices, as follows:

Region I, covering the New England States; with headquarters in Boston.

Region II, New York State; New York City headquarters.

Region III, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland; Newark headquarters.

Region IV, Pennsylvania; Pittsburgh headquarters.

Region V, Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky.

Region VI, Michigan; Detroit headquarters.

Region VII, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana; Chicago headquarters.

Region VIII, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Florida; Birmingham headquarters.

Region IX, Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska; Minneapolis headquarters.

Region X, Missouri, Kansas, and Arkansas.

Region XI, Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana; Dallas headquarters.

Region XII, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana.

Region XIII, California and Nevada.

Region XIV, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico; Denver headquarters.

To date, the following regional directors have been appointed:

Region I, Joseph Salerno; region III, Irving Abramson; region V, Jack Kroll; region VI, August Scholle; region VII, Raymond S. McKeough; region IX, John J. Jacobson; region XII, Roy Atkinson; region XIII, George B. Roberts.

The general plan of organization for the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is that every unit of the C. I. O.—international unions, industrial union councils, union locals, etc.—shall set up its own machinery for carrying out the committee's political objectives during the 1944 election campaign. In other words, all existing units of the C. I. O. are to be utilized to the full.

In addition to the utilization of existing C. I. O. units, the C. I. O. Political Action Committee has called for the creation of community councils which reach beyond the membership and immediate families of the C. I. O. The purpose of these community councils is to draw nonunionized professionals and other civic leaders into the work of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

According to Philip Murray, the voting strength of the C. I. O. unions and the immediate families of their members is something like 14,000,000. Sidney Hillman has talked in terms of organizing some 28,000,000 voters in the 1944 elections. These figures obviously represent a great deal of wishful thinking, and they are set down here merely as reflecting the proportions of Philip Murray's and Sydney Hillman's political ambitions.

On November 5, 1943, in PM, Hillman announced that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee expected to raise and spend the sum of $2,000,000 in the election campaigns of 1944. Philip Murray stated some weeks ago that the C. I. O. unions had already donated $700,000 of this enormous slush fund.

Many units of the C. I. O. have already imposed a compulsory assessment upon their members for the support of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. Inasmuch as Government coercion compels hundreds of thousands of workers to join the C. I. O., it is obvious that there are many of these workers who have no choice but to make their financial contributions to this Hillman-Communist conspiracy whether they approve of it or not. It is further clear that if this type of political coercion were applied by other than labor organizations, backed by the power of government, it would be widely held and courageously labelled an intolerable encroachment of some form of totalitarianism. As it stands, it is a piece of tyrannical taxation for those members of the C. I. O. who are compelled to contribute their assessments, at the risk of forfeiting their livelihoods, without sharing in any degree the political objectives of Sidney Hillman and his Communist associates.

C. I. O. EXECUTIVE BOARD

The C. I. O. executive board, the body which officially launched the C. I. O. Political Action Committee on July 7, 1943, is composed of the C. I. O.'s president, secretary-treasurer, 9 vice presidents, and 38 other leaders of its affiliated unions. Out of these 49 executive board members, the following who are now serving have notorious Communist records:

Lewis Alan Berne, Donald Henderson, Joseph P. Selly, Julius Emspak, Grant W. Oakes, Eleanor Nelson, Joseph F. Jurich, Ben Gold, Morris Muster, Harry R. Bridges, Ferdinand C. Smith, Lewis Merrill, Abram Flaxer, Michael J. Quill, Joseph Curran, Reid Robinson, E. F. Burke, and Frank R. McGrath.

The foregoing 18 individuals who are leaders in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee are not the only members of the C. I. O. executive board who have had affiliations with Communist-front organizations, but they are the ones whose records are such that they indicate complete subservience to the Communist Party line, regardless of the ways in which that line may change. The United States Civil Service Commission has provided one of the best definitions of a Communist as a person "who follows the Communist Party line through one or more changes." On the basis of that definition, all of the 18 listed above are Communists. Their records are discussed later in this report.

Eighteen Communists bulk extremely large in an executive board which numbers only

49 members. Admittedly they do not constitute a majority of the board, but, as long as the C. I. O. shelters so large a number of leaders who are subversive, the entire organization wears a dark blot upon its escutcheon. If any organization included or ever had included among its top leaders as large a percentage of provable Nazis and never did anything to remove them, that organization would be rightly suspect in the minds of patriotic Americans.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities is fully aware of the fact that large numbers of the rank and file members of organized labor have been sold on the idea that a Communist can be a good labor leader regardless of his communism. This, we believe, is a fallacy of the most sinister import. It is a fallacy invented by Communists for the sole purpose of worming their way into positions of leadership where, when the opportune moment arrives, they may be able to do the maximum harm to American institutions.

The strike at the aircraft plant of North American in California which occasioned the President's sending the United States Army to open the plant in defiance of the strikers is an excellent illustration of the damage that may be done when thousands of non-Communists submit to the leadership of a handful of Communists. Admittedly, that strike was organized and led by Communists. Admittedly, the overwhelming majority of the strikers had no sympathy whatever for communism, which is obviously true of the overwhelming majority of the membership of the entire C. I. O. Nevertheless, the strike occurred and the damage was done. It will be remembered that the North American strike took place some weeks before the entrance of Russia into the war. Today, the very Communist leaders who obstructed the production of military aircraft at North American are now clamoring for the enactment of a labor draft law which would subject every employee such as those at North American to the strictest military discipline.

The Communist-led strike at the North American Aviation Co. was not by any means the only such stoppage in vital war materials production. There was, to cite another example, the prolonged stoppage of production at the Allis-Chalmers plant—a political strike led by Communist Harold Christoffel, who is now active in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. There was also the most serious loss to the Nation's military security in the political strike at International Harvester where Communist Grant Oakes was in charge of the party's strategy to aid Hitler. In both the Allis-Chalmers and the International Harvester stoppages, there was no denying the Communist leadership but there was also no ground for believing that the overwhelming majority of the striking employees were even slightly Communist-inclined. As in the case of the majority of the strikers at North American Aviation Co., so in these other cases the majorities were submitting to Communist domination under the utterly false doctrine that even a Communist can do no wrong when he garbs himself for the role of a leader of organized labor. It is our considered judgment that, if Communists ever menace America, they will do so when working through such organizations as the National Maritime Union, the American Communications Association, the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

We incorporate at this point a summary of some of the Communist-led strikes which we included in our report to the House on January 2, 1943, and again point out that the very men who were responsible for these treasonable work stoppages now propose to say what the composition of the Congress of the United States shall be. The summary follows:

(a) Allis-Chalmers: One of the most damaging of the sabotage strikes was that at the Allis-Chalmers plant in Milwaukee which lasted for many weeks. The strike was conducted by the United Automobile Workers of America, whose leader at the plant was Harold Christoffel. The committee's investigation left no doubt about Christoffel's Communist affiliations. Among other Communist connections, he was one of the leaders of the American Peace Mobilization and of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

(b) Harvill: The committee made a thorough investigation of the strike leadership at the Harvill plant in Los Angeles, Calif. There the striking union was the National Association of Die Casters, and the leader of the strike was Kenneth Eggert. Although Eggert slipped into California under an alias for the purpose of tying up the Harvill plant, the committee promptly identified him and exposed him as Kenneth Eggert, former Communist Party secretary in Toledo, Ohio.

(c) Vultee: The committee exposed the Communist leadership of the disastrous work stoppage at the Vultee aircraft plant in Los Angeles, Calif. The union involved was the United Automobile Workers of America, and among the more important Communist leaders of the strike was Wyndham Mortimer.

(d) International Harvester: For weeks, the International Harvester plant at Chicago was tied up by the Farm Equipment Organizing Committee under the leadership of Grant Oakes whose Communist record included prominent activity in the American Peace Mobilization.

(e) Aluminum: In April 1941, the National Association of Die Casters tied up the plants of the Aluminum Co. of America in Cleveland, Ohio. The committee's investigations turned up the fact that Alex Balint, leader of the strike, was an alien, an ex-convict, and an old-time Communist Party member who had used the name "Al Barry."

(f) North American: The strike at the North American Aviation in Inglewood, Calif., led to an order by the President for the United States Army to take over the plant. In this instance, also, the committee established the fact that the strike leadership was Communist. The president of the local of the United Automobile Workers which conducted the strike was Elmer J. Freitag. Freitag vehemently denied all Communist connections until confronted with indisputable documentary evidence in the committee's possession.

(g) New York Transport: In March 1941 the Transport Workers' Union called a strike which seriously interrupted the facilities of the transportation system in New York City. The committee published a special report, known as appendix V, which established the far-reaching Communist control of the Transport Workers' Union under the leadership of Michael J. Quill.

(h) Lumber: The International Wood Workers of America called and continued a disastrous strike in the lumber industry in defiance of governmental agencies. The union's leader, O. M. Orton, was exposed by the committee as a Communist who occupied a place of foremost leadership in the American Peace Mobilization.

(i) Trona: The Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers' Union, headed by Reid Robinson, brought about a particularly serious work stoppage at Trona, Calif. The committee's investigation clearly established the fact of the Communist motives and leadership of the strike. Reid Robinson was vice president of the American Peace Mobilization.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee is the creature of the C. I. O. executive board and, by subsequent ratification, of the C. I. O. national convention. While Communists do not constitute a majority of the executive board, the latter must assume responsibility for launching a political movement which serves Communist ends and a political movement in which Communists from coast to coast have penetrated in order to further those Communist ends.

Military Victory Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the world, as many and as complex as they are, actually grow out of the one problem presented by man himself. When we are able to solve the problem of man by changing him from a selfish and greedy individual into one whose impelling motives are rooted in spiritual values, then all other problems will be solved.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include a very thoughtful article, written by the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, and published in the Commission, official publication of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

The article follows:

MILITARY VICTORY IS NOT ENOUGH

(By BROOKS HAYS)

With so much being said about a post-war world of peace and prosperity it is easy to be lulled into a feeling that all of our enemies, foreign and domestic, and with them all evil things, are to be put down and that a safe and stable world will be ours.

It should be apparent, however, that permanent peace among the nations and the establishment of unity at home involve such tremendous plans for the Christian community and such heroic qualities in their execution that the end of war will only call for new and greater exertions.

I agree that we are coming to one of the great turning points in history and that our victory, now assured over the neopaganism of Germany and Japan, will give us a grand, new opportunity to prove the soundness of the Christian way, and to teach it to the peoples of the world.

It is not my purpose in this brief statement to attempt a description of the Christian world state, although the fashioning of a world government with power to stop aggression is the supremely important work ahead for your political representatives. The churches have a tremendous stake in these plans. We who labor in the field of politics and so-called secular government must not fail those who in the name of Christian brotherhood have supplied the vision of a warless world.

To provide the mechanical arrangements for preventing wars is a challenge to the statesmen, but the final answer is in the realm of religion, not in politics.

It would help greatly, however, in the solution of the peace problem and of many domestic problems to think of religion and politics as related. It is time to abandon the idea that the separation of church and state

as institutions does not permit the occasional merging of political and religious influences. There is such a thing as Christian statesmanship.

The place of foreign missions is a vital one. I have in mind its relation to the work of building for peace and stability, rather than appraising its fundamental value, which must be measured in quite different terms. I have heard my colleague, Congressman WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, speak more than once of the value of Christian missions to the Allies' cause in China. He cites the Soong family and Chiang Kai-shek as outstanding products of our missionary enterprise, and states that, measured strictly in military terms, it would be impossible to evaluate their contribution to our defense.

There is another factor in international movements which may or may not serve the cause of peace and good will. What of commerce, which "outruns every wind, defies every tempest, invades every land"? Will this influence be favorable or otherwise? We should challenge the assumption that trade, being for profit and often aggressive, is necessarily a contrary force. I concede that it has sometimes been exploitive and to that extent it has diluted the Christian message; and further that it can hardly be dealt with except as we improve the structure of our own national life from which commercial, as well as diplomatic, and missionary activities stem.

The kind of impression we make on other people through these contacts may in the future be the best test of our Christian character. It seems that we have, not two problems, but a single problem, the same here as abroad. We cannot do better in world relations than we do at home in applying Christian principles.

There is so much to do, yet this problem is finally resolved into the simple matter of turning to God in repentance for our materialism and indifference, and determining to live according to rules which the first-century Christians had for their world. That world was much like ours. There was oppression and despair as well as slavery. Human freedom, including freedom of the spirit, as identified with Christianity, became the greatest hope of nations. Sensual pleasures and the quest for material gains had been the preoccupation of those to whom the Christian message was first carried, and there is today among great numbers even in America the same dissatisfaction that the disillusioned multitudes of Jesus' time experienced.

We, therefore, confront two requirements: (1) Establish on the political front a world government with power to enforce decisions judicially determined. It is desperately important that this much be done. (2) Follow with an expanded and dynamic foreign missions program.

This time our hearts must be in both enterprises. We must assume some responsibility for the kind of institutions under which the people are to live. As one of my minister friends says, "We may not be our brothers' keepers, but we are our brothers' brothers." If we do not make progress along this line, new forms of violence will break out in the future; new evils will give us fresh cause for war. We must have an adequate faith in the healing quality of Christianity if we put down the hatreds and bitterness engendered by this war.

As Christians we must avoid punitive measures, not opposing firmness in dealing with future threats of aggression and tyranny but voicing the hope for a peace based upon justice.

We must let our concern for stricken people find practical expression There should be a new interest in medical missions and in agricultural rehabilitation. The relief programs of the United Nations will likely carry splendid benefits in nutritional and hygienic instruction but it is not exclusively a Government program. We must make it apparent that Christianity is concerned with the whole of life.

In considering our relation to world tasks, attitudes are more important than theories. When victory comes our war weariness may cause us to lose some of our fervor for world reconstruction. The tendency will be to retreat from the foreign scene to our home affairs—to let old Europe alone now—to forget our responsibilities in the Orient.

I am properly sympathetic, I think, with the desire not to be meddlers. There are many internal problems which we must let other people settle for themselves, but we must resolve to keep our interest in the world—the new and smaller world in which our children will live.

That will not be easy for life at home will have its complications. Jobs may be scarce and there will be friction over who will have them. There will be economic rivalries and sectional jealousies; clashes between employers and employees will challenge our capacity for judicial calmness in the midst of controversy. New tensions between the races may appear. Only our Christian idealism will carry us through disturbances of this kind.

We may look to the Government for help for the solution of some economic problems, but we will find that political processes are not sufficient. We must learn to work with each other in a more effective and Christian way. Groups must think less of rights and more of duties. Reliance may be retained in "due process of law," but unless we invoke the higher law of charity and human service we will still be plagued by disunity and strife.

Some of our men will return to us with impaired health. A grateful Government will make every possible effort to restore them. Outside these activities there will be the need for active and generous assistance for those who have borne the battle. And there will be the wounds of the spirit to heal, the disharmonies which spring from the maladjustments of war.

Can mental and spiritual calm be recovered? I think so. And yet the objective is not to recover something. I am envisioning rather the attaining of something new—a better life for America than anything yet attained—the development of qualities in our national life that will bring enrichment of the soul where material things have brought frustration and misery.

America is strong. We must exert that strength in Christian leadership, not to dominate, for to seek conquest would mean renunciation of our finest and noblest traditions. Our future must not be the way of imperialism. In humility we must resolve to do our part in the world's work and to build at home through self-effacing service a Christian brotherhood worthy of those who have sacrificed so much toward that goal.

A Prosecutor's Viewpoint on Narcotic Addiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William T. McCarthy, assistant in charge of criminal division, office of the United States attorney, Boston, Mass.:

A PROSECUTOR'S VIEWPOINT ON NARCOTIC ADDICTION

(By William T. McCarthy, assistant in charge of criminal division, office of United States attorney, Boston, Mass.)

In the light of some articles that have appeared from time to time dealing with the treatment of the narcotic addict before the court and his relationship to the probation officer, this paper, written as the result of years of experience, is submitted in the hope that it will be helpful to those who are obliged to consider and dispose of cases involving violations of the Federal narcotic law.

A "drug addict" has been defined by the act of Congress of January 19, 1929, establishing Public Health Service hospitals, as follows: "Any person who habitually uses any habit-forming narcotic drug as defined in this act so as to endanger the public morals, health, safety, or welfare, or who is, or has been, so far addicted to the use of such habit-forming narcotic drugs as to have lost the power of self-control with reference to his addiction."

No part of this article should be considered as applying to so-called medical addicts; that is, persons suffering from real physical disability where incidental dependence is caused by continuous administration of opiates for legitimate medical purposes. Used in its particular place morphine is of inestimable value to medical progress; but sold by commercial traffickers to satisfy a narcotic appetite, it is the spawn of the devil.

The drugs which come within the purview of Federal narcotic law enforcement are opium or coca leaves or any compound, manufacture, salt derivative, or preparation thereof, and marihuana. A distinct demarcation exists between the opiate habit and the cocaine or marihuana habit in that continuous use of sufficient amounts of opiates works a physical change in the user so that he develops physiological dependence and becomes physically distressed if his supply is interrupted or severely diminished. Neither cocaine nor marihuana may substitute for opiates in relieving opiate-withdrawal symptoms; consequently, some writers endeavor to differentiate between cocaine and marihuana addicts and opiate users. As a matter of fact, when excluded from a source of supply, it is not uncommon for marihuana or cocaine users to turn to opiates; and opiate users, to marihuana and cocaine. While the abuse of cocaine by addicts has been almost completely suppressed, it is a matter of historical interest at least to note that this drug formerly was often used coincidentally with a heavy opiate habit.

In this country two factors are responsible for the very substantial progress which has been made in the reduction of narcotic addiction; first, international control of narcotics through enforcement of cooperative Federal and State enactments; and, second, the realization on the part of physicians that safeguards must be employed in the administration of opiates to minimize the risk of addiction. This has prevented new persons from acquiring this unfortunate habit and accounts primarily for the reduction in per capita rate of addiction. However, some credit is due responsible narcotic hospitals for their patience, perseverance, and cooperation in arresting this vicious habit and in some instances accomplishing cures; also, some addicts have conquered this habit the hard way and not relapsed after a voluntary or involuntary forced abstinence from drugs, while others are cured because of a sense of moral obligation to themselves, to the community, and to their God. But these cases form a very small part of the whole picture,

and past accomplishments must be considered when evaluating sociological viewpoints which may tend to weaken control of illicit drug traffic.

CAUSE OF DRUG ADDICTION

Before accepting the theory that the drug addict becomes such because he is a "sick man," let us analyze the phenomenon of drug addiction and illicit drug traffic. Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, writes, "Dr. W. L. Treadway of the United States Public Health Service is convinced that the first factor in drug addiction is ease of access to the drug" and "the most important predisposing cause is in inherent mental or nervous instability. Evidence is at hand, however, to show that addiction may be induced by the injudicious use of drugs in persons apparently free from any nervous or mental instability and, conversely, that due care in administrations may avert this result even in the unstable." A chimpanzee can be made an addict, and only a hardy psychiatrist, I believe, would argue that this addiction is caused by any fundamental personality deficiency in the animal.

That addiction follows accessibility to drugs is startlingly demonstrated by the fact that among 1,000 electrical engineers, 1,000 lawyers, 1,000 college professors, 1,000 medical doctors, or any other of the learned professions, we immediately and inevitably find an appreciable and significant addiction incident in the profession having free access to opiates. It would scarcely be urged by any reasonable person that medical doctors have in their ranks any greater proportion of mentally unstable persons than do the other learned professions. The obvious distinction between the medical profession and the others is that narcotic drugs are immediately and freely available at all times to the medical doctors; therefore, a larger percentage become addicted. If we should compare the incident of narcotic addiction among nurses, for example, with school teachers or some comparable group, we would find a much more substantial addiction percentage among nurses. Likewise, if we should compare the addiction ratio among physicians' wives with that of the wives of other professional men, we would find the addiction ratio higher with doctors' wives.

Again we have the obvious common factor that narcotic drugs are more or less freely available to persons in these categories, and it is well to remember the physiological facts of addiction. Generally speaking, closely repeated doses of opiates will develop in any person an addiction; that is, physical tolerance, habituation, and dependence. However, physical dependence can be corrected by a few days of forced abstinence from opiates, but elimination of the desire to reenjoy the effects of the drug is quite another matter. A corollary of the foregoing is the brutally plain fact that addicts make addicts. The addict is in effect a center of contagion or a focus of infection just as surely as if he carried communicable virus of his dreadful affliction. What Alexander Pope said about vice generally seems to apply with special force to the phenomenon of addiction:

"Vice is a monster of so frightful mien
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

THE NONCRIMINAL ADDICT

In addition to the noncriminal addicted medical man or woman, or their close associates who because of the propinquity to narcotics become addicted, the number of normal persons accidentally addicted make up a very small fraction of the addict population. With present medical knowledge and alternative drugs available in some cases, few persons are accidentally addicted through medication; and if so, they offer the best prospect of a prompt cure. Few of them appear before the courts. Of course, all addicted professional people are not necessarily noncriminal. One may find criminal types here, such as the abortionist, the "thieves' doctor," and the M. D. who is primarily a drug peddler and only incidentally and secondarily an addict. Then, too, there is the alcoholic who, given opiates to straighten him out when recovering from a spree, decides the cure is worth repeating.

THE CRIMINAL ADDICT

Both logical reasoning and demonstrable facts place the great group of narcotic addicts in the category of criminals first and addicts later. Because of its dark passageways and disregard for decency and moral order, the underworld has been for many years the principal recruiting ground for new addicts in contradistinction to the law-abiding order where drugs are available only to the few. The crook and the hoodlum, the prostitute and the shoplifter are most frequently and freely exposed; therefore, their ranks logically contain a large percentage of recruits to drug addiction.

Apologists for the drug addict frequently state that "big shot" criminals are not addicts. If the proponents of this theory mean there are more addicts in the little criminal group than there are in the major offender group, they are unanswerably right because there are more "little shots" than there are "big shots" in the criminal world. For example, the Uniform Crime Reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation show that for the 6-month period, January to June 1942, there were only 1,356 murders, 1,061 manslaughters, and 13,918 robberies; but there were 72,634 burglaries and 210,036 larcenies. Naturally, we can safely conclude more drug addicts are thieves and burglars than robbers or murderers. In his article, Lindesmith's Mythology, published in the November-December 1940 issue of the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Judge Twain Michelsen refutes the observation that "big shot" criminals are not addicts and recites several pages of names and records of "big shot" addicts.

The foregoing should serve to dispel the illusion that the addict undergoes a certain amount of secondary social regression and becomes a criminal because his illicit use of drugs necessitates approach to the underworld for his supply. With few exceptions the use of narcotics is not the efficient cause of the presence of the addict in the underworld; he is usually thoroughly conversant with a dubious environment long before he becomes addicted.

In attempting to dispel the conception that the opiate addict is a "dope fiend" who is stimulated to crimes of violence, too much emphasis is placed on the soothing effects of opiates. In the "Indispensable Use of Narcotics," published by the American Medical Association, Drs. E. C. Cutler and J. W. Holloway state: "It is unnecessary to emphasize the desirability of establishing such an attitude in the patient that he approaches the operative ordeal with a complete lack of apprehension. * * * Morphine lends itself to this purpose. * * * Morphine continues to be the most universally satisfactory type of preoperative medication." The drug that allows a patient to contemplate the surgeon's scalpel with equanimity also gives the irresponsible criminal a false sense of security and serves as an obvious explanation in many instances for the commission of very serious crimes.

The statement, "The long criminal records which drug addicts sometimes accumulate must be studied carefully," implies that these records arise from addiction. I agree that the records of these people should be carefully examined, but such records usually disclose a first arrest for something other than narcotics. While it is not conclusive, it gives rise to the presumption that the man was a criminal first and an addict afterward. Even where the first arrest is for narcotics, careful examination often discloses criminal or borderline activities before the narcotic agent happened to apprehend him. It is all too apparent that we have no simple medical problem with which to deal, no mere "sick" man to cure. As a matter of fact, narcotic law-enforcement officers point out that incarceration of criminal narcotic addicts frees the public from the depredations of a class of professional criminals.

I am aware there is a dangerous school of thought which regards the action of a bank robber as a tendency of protoplasm to strive to get into a more comfortable, pleasing, or suitable environment and believes that all our criminals should be dealt with by psychiatrists rather than judges, but I cannot subscribe to such a Godless doctrine. If a person joins a band of addicted confidence men and by reason of their representations, their example, or access to drugs which they supply, elects to assume the disability of drug addiction, thereby committing crimes against orderly government and establishing another link in a chain designed to pass this scourge on to others, why should he be absolved from the consequences of his acts by placing emphasis on his sickness rather than his criminality?

Dr. J. Bouquet, the French expert, in his remarks included in the papers of the twenty-fourth Meeting of Opium Advisory Committee at Geneva, Switzerland, referring to a north African situation, makes these trenchant comments:

"Nothing, I think, can be expected from methods which liken a toxicomaniac to a sick person and not to an offender. Such methods are only applicable to the class of drug sufferers who, as the result of necessary temporary medical treatment, have become accustomed to morphine or heroin. Only such toxicomaniacs are to be pitied. * * *

"But it must not be forgotten that this class constitutes a very small group of toxicomaniacs. The majority have no desire to become cured: it consists only of depraved people who are not only useless to the community but dangerous to the public welfare because they have only one desire, that is, to find a means to satisfy their vice, however, ignoble the means to be employed to that end may be.

"In my opinion, such people should be considered not as sick people worthy of pity but as delinquents who must be prevented from causing harm and who must be treated with the greatest severity."

In a report dated July 25, 1943, on the present drug addiction situation in Tunisia, Dr. J. Bouquet states, "It is argued that the majority of the drug addicts are vicious criminals and that they deserve to be imprisoned rather than placed in hospitals."

THE HANDLING OF THE PROBLEM

Statistics for the United States Public Health Service predicated on the population of the narcotic farms as a whole convince me that prognosis with reference to effecting cures for the criminal type addict is poor, as evidenced by the continued procession of ex-Lexington or ex-Fort Worth addicts who reenter our criminal courts. I believe the problem in this country is now primarily—I might say almost wholly—a law-enforcement matter, and resolves itself into one of control of narcotic addiction through control of illicit narcotic traffic. The medical aspects are merely incidental and supplementary. We must look to our police, our prosecutors, our courts, and our penitentiaries as the real line of defense against narcotic addiction because:

1. The best way to "cure" narcotic addicts is for the addiction never to have occurred.

2. The next most certain "cure" would be to make it impossible for the addict to obtain narcotics.

8. A corollary of successful medical and psychiatric treatment of the addict is that the "cured" patient, when placed on his own in society, finds drugs very difficult to obtain. Relapses are most frequent when drugs are most accessible.

THE PROSECUTOR AND THE COURT

An alert prosecutor interested in his work has at all times the opportunity to bring before a tribunal first-line criminals, such as the notorious gangsters commonly referred to as "Murder, Incorporated," as well as the street peddler, the store stick-up man, the burglar, the prescription forger, the medical man who prostitutes his profession to cater to the appetite of addicts, and the contemptible thief who would steal the pocketbook of a scrub woman in order to satisfy his appetite for drugs. Sometimes the frankness of a minor drug peddler discloses another whose operations frequently cover several continents. The purpose, aim, and object of duly constituted authority should be the control and flow of narcotic drugs so that they will be available for the deserving, sick patient under proper medical control and not for the trafficker and the ordinary addict.

That I have no time nor patience with the sociologist who preaches only the doctrine of hospitalization for the addicted drug peddler must be self-evident to anyone who reads this article. The circumstance of sending a defendant to the penitentiary for a long term instead of to the Public Health Service Hospital for a short term, does not indicate abandonment of all hope of curing his addiction.

THE FUNCTION OF UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Hospitals are desirable and necessary experimental stations, and public-health hospitals offer the best known techniques for the treatment of the narcotic habit. While they have not developed nor accepted claims of any quick or easy cure for drug addiction, they have protected victims, indigent or otherwise, from the uninformed, the quacks, and the charlatans. We should be ever watchful, however, lest the admission of a great many underworld characters to such narcotic hospitals destroys their real purpose and character and becomes a frustration to law enforcement. These institutions then become "country clubs" where big or little criminals can sojourn for a few months in idyllic surroundings with much better food than is available to the law-abiding citizen. We are simply "shadow boxing" with the narcotic problem if the drug peddlers are to be turned back every 6 months or so to resume activity, contaminate others, and to act as mechanical rabbits for the minions of the law to pursue.

ROLE OF THE PROBATION OFFICER

If the facts of a defendant's background are not already apparent, the presentence investigation of a probation officer with adequate knowledge of narcotic traffic will, of course, be of considerable assistance to the court. As to the addict on probation, it is not necessary to tell a probation officer who has had extended experience with narcotic addicts that, unless carefully selected, they represent a most difficult and perplexing problem. If the probationer has been a peddler, he not only has an urge to return to his addiction, but—as pointed out—he has been engaged in a crime which, in the addict or nonaddict, brings about a high degree of recidivism. In addition, he is likely to have behind him many years of other professional crimes. Schooled in dissimulation, he may outwardly appear to be making a successful probation, while actually he has reverted to the peddling of drugs, to other crimes, and to his addiction.

I do not mean to be understood as discouraging the idea of probation for these people, for occasionally the probation officer may receive an addict whose period of supervision will be entirely satisfactory. What I intend to convey is that subjects for probation should be carefully chosen.

CONCLUSION

Within the space allotted I have tried to give the reader a full and fair picture of the narcotic problem as it applies to the Federal law enforcement. I have been disturbed at the attitude of some writers who have not hesitated to attack the whole structure of the Harrison Narcotic Act and who have not been unwilling to advance their dangerous philosophies in this most important field of endeavor. We cannot permit false sentimentality and the "sick man" concept to break down our law-enforcement efforts. We cannot tolerate any experimentation or trifling with the administration of our narcotic laws, Federal or State. Such an unfortunate happening would do irreparable damage to our civilization. The Harrison Narcotic Act and the Narcotic Import and Export Act are very efficacious laws. They are a part of the golden treasury of laws that help to preserve our social order and we should resist with all the power at our command any attempt to interfere with their proper administration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs, reports by the Government of the United States of America for the years ended December 31, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, and 1941.

"Indispensable Use of Narcotics," reprinted from the Journal of the American Medical Association (March 14 to June 6, inclusive) 1931.

Morphine Addiction in Chimpanzees, by S. D. S. Spragg. Comparative Psychology Monographs, April 1940, published by the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

Uniform Crime Reports, 1942. Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, November-December 1940, published by the Northwestern University Press, Chicago, Ill.

The Prevalence and Trend of Drug Addiction in the United States and Factors Influencing It, by Lawrence Kolb and A. G. Du Mez. Reprint No. 924 from the United States Public Health Service Reports, May 23, 1924.

Pacific Coast International, March 1939 and October 1940. Published by the Pacific Coast International Association of Law Enforcement Officials at Portland, Oreg.

I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address of Mr. Edward J. Shaughnessy, special assistant to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, delivered at Boston, Mass., on Sunday, May 21, 1944, on the occasion of the celebration of I Am An American Day:

I am always happy to find a reason to come to my native State and revive the friendships of another day, but I am particularly happy to be here today—I Am An American Day—to participate in a fete honoring those among us who have achieved the full rights of citizenship by reaching their twenty-first birthday, and those who have voluntarily sought and have been granted American citizenship by process of naturalization.

I can think of no better way of beginning these brief remarks than by quoting from the President's message setting aside this day as I Am An American Day. I quote:

"Whereas our Nation has been enriched, both spiritually and materially, by the naturalization of many thousands of foreign-born men and women, and by the coming of age of great numbers of our youth, who have thereby achieved the full stature of citizenship; and

"Whereas these citizens have strengthened our country by their services at home and on the battlefield:

"Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, pursuant to the aforesaid public resolution, do hereby designate Sunday, May 21, 1944, as I Am An American Day, and do set that day aside as a public occasion for the honoring of American citizenship by giving special recognition to all of our citizens who have attained their majority or have been naturalized during the past year; and I call upon Federal, State, and local officials, and patriotic, civic, and educational organizations to plan and hold, on or about May 21, exercises designed to assist our citizens, both native-born and naturalized, to understand more fully the great privileges and responsibilities of citizenship in our democracy."

With these words, in part, the President of the United States proclaimed today as one to be set aside for an inventory of the rights, duties, and responsibilities which comprise citizenship of the United States. Perhaps never before in the history of this country has an evaluation of that status been of such paramount importance.

The historical background of this day is intensely interesting and shows gradual development in awareness of the value of citizenship. These ceremonies for new citizens, especially for those who are citizens through naturalization, are not new. Twenty-nine years ago, almost to the day, President Woodrow Wilson appeared at a great reception for several thousand naturalized citizens at Philadelphia. In that inspiring address he spoke of the gifts brought to this country by immigrants and of the ideals on which our Government is based. In speaking of the birth of America, he said:

"America was created to unite mankind by those passions which lift and not by the passions which separate and debase. * * * We came to America, either by ourselves or in the persons of our ancestors, to better the ideals of men, to make them see finer things than they had seen before, to get rid of the things that divide, and to make sure of the things that unite."

And in another part of that famous speech, President Wilson said:

"I was born in America. You dreamed dreams of what America was to be, and I hope you brought those dreams with you. No man that does not see visions will ever realize any high hope or undertake any high enterprise. Just because you brought dreams with you, America is more likely to realize dreams such as you brought. * * *

"A nation that is not constantly renewed out of new sources is apt to have the narrowness and prejudice of a family; whereas, America must have this consciousness, that on all sides it touches elbows and touches hearts with all the nations of mankind."

I take pride in recalling that my four grandparents came to America from Ireland about 100 years ago, bringing those dreams with them, and settled in eastern Massachusetts. They, and three succeeding generations have lived—and are living—to realize the fruits of those dreams.

No single individual and no one group can really claim credit for the origin of this occasion because it goes back to ancient days.

On May 3, 1940, the Congress of the United States passed a public resolution setting aside the third Sunday in May of each year as I Am an American Day, so that our people might join together to pay tribute to citizenship of this country.

On this occasion, the opportunity to speak for the American people in welcoming our country's new citizens into our ranks is an honor which I feel deeply. And in this event—one of the most typically American that it would be possible to imagine—I am not alone in the consciousness of honor. Pride in being able to greet the year's newcomers into our national electorate is shared by millions of other Americans. For this observance—which is unlike anything held in any other country on earth—is democratic in its very essence. On this day, among the millions who make up our Nation's citizenry, young or old, known or obscure, the honors are even.

During the past year the United States has enlarged its voting body by some 2,400,000 persons. It is for the purpose of giving formal recognition to their new status and of reminding them—and ourselves as well—of the precious rights and the solemn obligations which that status embodies, that we gather in response to a proclamation by our President designating this third Sunday in May as I Am An American Day.

The great majority of these 2,400,000 new voters are Americans by birth. The right to vote comes to them on attainment of the age of 21 years. Of these, there have been about 2,000,000 during the past year. They are Americans by birth, though I think I am quite safe in saying that among these young men and women there is not one who, if the choice were offered, would not choose to be an American, or who, indeed, would not defend that preference with life itself. At this moment, across the seas, many thousands of these young people are doing exactly that. On this I Am An American Day, we give them greeting, with a prayer that God will help us speed the day when they will be with us again to enjoy, in victory, those precious rights which they have preserved.

Along with these native-born Americans, we have also accepted into our citizenship during the past calendar year, 397,684 persons who were not born in this country and who had previously owed no formal allegiance to our Government. Having lived among us, having witnessed the working of our democracy, and having come to the decision that they would rather be a part of that democracy than of any other national entity on earth, these foreign-born residents in America have, of their own accord and with the consent of the United States Government, taken the action necessary to become citizens. They have met the prerequisites for naturalization; they have taken the oath of allegiance; and they now share equally the privileges and the obligations of all American citizens.

Thus these 397,684 new Americans are Americans solely by choice. Of their own volition they have sworn to renounce "absolutely and entirely" any allegiance to a foreign state and to "support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

Long before they took that oath, these residents of America knew that our country was a community of free citizens. If the world were to be swept into conflict over the issue of man's freedom, they knew which side this Nation would take. Had they so wished, there was opportunity then to change their decision. Until the oath is taken, an application for American citizenship can be abandoned at any time. But war did come, a war over the issue of man's freedom—or man's domination. And as the design of the aggressors took in the entire world as its field, it was inevitable that this Nation should be attacked and that it should join the fight for the preservation of freedom.

The decision of those who had expressed their wish to become American citizens remained unchanged. All those whom we welcome on this I Am an American Day took their oath of allegiance to America after this country had declared war against the Axis. And today they are carrying out in full the obligations which they assumed upon taking that oath. Both the production figures of our war industries where many of them are employed and the casualty lists now coming to us from the battlefields attest to the spirit in which they are meeting their obligation as citizens.

To these Americans by choice, therefore, we also extend greetings on this I Am an American Day. We believe they decided well because they have committed themselves to that cause which is the high hope of a decent world for themselves and the generations to come. In the contest on this issue, one does not wait until the battle is won. The decision is made, not on the basis of relative fighting strengths and logistics, but in the heart; it is dictated not by considerations of personal ambition, but by ideals and an innate sense of decency. Our new Americans, thus guided, could not have decided differently.

Included in the second group I have mentioned, we have accepted as new citizens within the past year, 56,396 men and women members of the armed forces who were noncitizens, more than 4,000 of these service people having been naturalized overseas. They have attained full status by virtue of their service, in accordance with provisions of the Second War Powers Act. None of us harbor doubt of the eligibility of these fighting men. They are now fulfilling the highest obligation of American citizenship. They are meeting that obligation as it needs to be met—with all they have. Some of them, before we shall have finished with this war, will have given their lives in the cause of the country which they had long wished to make their own. Along with their American-born comrades, they have carried on with valor through the hour of tragedy and darkness, at Pearl Harbor, Bataan, and Corregidor, and they are carrying on now with the same gallant spirit in the sure and steady march toward victory, in which we count among the milestones the Battle of Midway, of the Coral Sea, the daring capture and successful holding of Guadalcanal, our victories at Palau, Yap, Woleai, and the Ulithi Islands within 550 land miles of the Philippines, and the crushing defeat of our enemies in north Africa. Prominent among those to whom we dedicate this day, therefore, and deep in our own affections as fellow-citizens, are these newcomers in uniform. Wherever they may be, our message to them on the I Am An American Day includes the hope and prayer that they too will one day return to join us in the peaceful exercise of the freedom which they have preserved.

The three classifications of new American citizens—the native-born, the naturalized, and the foreign-born now serving in the armed forces—make up the huge total which is this year added to our national electorate. Over the past few years the numerical gains in the body of our citizenry have been greater than those of any similar period in our Nation's history. The number of native-born Americans reaching the age of 21 has shown a natural increase. But along with this trend, which was to be expected, were the less predictable but very significant increases through the naturalization courts. Ever since war clouds first overcast the European scene a few years ago, there has been an ever-increasing rate, with almost 400,000 persons coming into citizenship last year by way of the naturalization process. Thus despite the fact that new immigration has been practically closed off, and for more than 20 years has been held down to modest quotas, we are now witnessing a greater growth in our electorate than any previously known, even in times when the gates to America were open more widely.

In this way has our noncitizen population—people from many other lands—registered its preference. For these people the world crisis has sharpened the issue. Contemplating naturalization, some may have anticipated some personal advantage or greater security. But in the minds of nearly all, I think, there has been something far more. During the past few critical years, something bolder and finer has brought them to the ranks of the citizen. In taking the oath to defend the Constitution "against all enemies," the applicant for citizenship is not faced with a mere abstraction. He knows who the enemies of the moment are. He knows their evil design. For him, a part of the commitment to defend the Constitution is, at this time, the duty of doing all in his power to bring about the defeat of the forces of darkness loose in the world.

Preferences, long dormant, are sometimes brought to the point of decision in just such an hour of crisis. Naturalization is a long process. For many members of our alien population it has involved difficult hurdles, such as the educational qualifications. In time of peace there were reasons for the inertia which kept these people from making their applications. But men do not put off for tomorrow that which stirs their souls today. And to all persons who have in them a love of freedom and a respect for the dignity of human beings, these are soul-stirring times indeed. All that they hold most precious, even the freedom to worship their God, is at stake. Is it any wonder, then, that they should choose this time to make the decision which did not weigh so heavily upon them a few years ago?

To the leaders of the Axis nations this upward trend of naturalization in America is not good news. It is the manifestation of a new and greater national unity. Contrary to the hopes of Axis leaders and to the purpose of their active propaganda machines, the alien population of America was not influenced, cajoled, or misled into taking a stand that would have been harmful to our morale and disruptive to our war program. Appeals to race hatred and the spread of Nazi and Fascist myths, together with veiled or open threats of retribution—all the familiar Axis devices of terrorism and psychological warfare—were attempted at long distance through the propaganda networks, and all failed equally of their purpose. In America, it was discovered, these tactics did not work. Of the 5,000,000 persons who were aliens in this country in 1940, only an inconsequential fraction proved responsive to such propaganda. The others joined wholeheartedly in the American war effort, and hundreds of thousands of them applied for American citizenship. This was their answer to poisonous pens and voices.

To those in our country who still seek citizenship among us, the country does not offer personal safety as an inducement in this time of crisis. On the contrary, the inducement that is now offered in being an American is the opportunity to face and destroy the forces threatening the world, the opportunity to make sacrifices and undergo hardships, to live courageously, and to endure courageously in support of the determination of our people to remain forever free. That is what our new citizens of 1943 have learned. That is why they are proud to join us in saying, today, "I am an American." All the glory of America, that has been, that is today, and that will be, is theirs to share, in uprightness, in devotion, and in affection.

New Deal and Presidential Electors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I am inserting an interesting and scholarly treatise of our former colleague, John J. O'Connor, on the question, "Is the New Deal laying the groundwork to intimidate the Presidential electors, by using the Army, even?"

IS THE NEW DEAL LAYING THE GROUNDWORK TO INTIMIDATE THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS, BY USING THE ARMY, EVEN?

Some columnists and editors have recently adopted a line of comment on the outcome of the splits in the Southern States that is entirely misleading to the voters. For instance, Mr. Arthur Krock, brilliant columnist for the New York Times, in his article of June 12, following the line of some other writers, states, most astoundingly, in effect, that Mr. Roosevelt and his cohorts will find a way, willy nilly, to thwart any attempt of any electors to vote for a candidate other than Mr. Roosevelt, who will be nominated at the Democratic National Convention at Chicago.

In reviewing the recent revolts against the New Deal in the Democratic Party, in certain Southern States, such as Texas, Louisiana, South Carolina, Mississippi, and so forth, Mr. Krock follows the line of some other newspapermen, in throwing doubt upon the legality of electors voting "free" when they meet in the electoral college. He feels the courts can dispel and public opinion destroy any such bolt, or free voting.

Other writers substantially state the correct position: "It has been routine for electors to vote for candidates getting popular majority in their States, but constitution does not bind them to do so." (Scripps-Howard dispatch from Washington, May 27.)

The reasons for Mr. Krock's conclusion, even if they do not reflect his own wish, are most alarming, namely, he writes:

"The Federal judiciary was largely appointed by the President, and it can be relied on to find law which, as in this instance, would be based on tradition, almost unbroken custom, and public morality. (3) The President, leader of the people and of the armed forces in wartime, could easily enforce public opinion to the point of restraining electors from disregarding the will of the voters in their States."

That sure is something. One wonders if an anti-new dealer advocated such an abuse of our judicial process, and the suggested use of our armed forces, whether he might not be charged with treason or violation of one of the many laws, the courts might be relief on to find, such as against bearing arms or supporting insurrection against our Government.

To what pass have we come—when those presently in power in our Government, have the audacity to hold out such a threat against the free vote of our electors—on whose free exercise of their right to give their votes for a President and Vice President, as provided in the Constitution (art. II, sec. 1), there is no limitation on their free choice whatsoever. They are bound by absolutely nothing that can happen prior to the meeting of the electoral college on the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December (U. S. C. A., title 3, sec. 5a). They are State officers and not Federal officers, and each State has exclusive jurisdiction over their election and violations connected therewith (*Fitzgerald* v. *Green*, 134 U. S. 378, Va. 1890).

Any honest convictions that the elector is in any way bound, and has no free vote can only be attributed to the misconception that the voter casts his vote directly for the President. That was the fallacy, deliberately injected into the question arising over the soldier vote, and purposely, to confuse the issue. No voter has yet had, nor will he have, in 1944—short of the use of the armed forces—any opportunity to vote directly for Mr. Roosevelt, for President. Under our Constitution, he is still relegated to the representative Government, indirect method of voting for certain citizens of his State, who will, in their due turn, cast their votes for a President and a Vice President. True, new dealism and communism would have it otherwise, without even waiting on the orderly process of constitutional amendment.

For the first time in our political history has it been suggested that the electors should be constrained, or even influenced, by public opinion, or tradition, or unbroken custom the unbroken is, at least, historically incorrect), or "public morality"—whatever that is. Is it the New Deal prescription?

Any elector who would, for one moment, be influenced by such fabricated controls, or influence, and not give his vote as prescribed in our Constitution would prove himself unworthy to have been duly elected by the people to the high office of elector. He should have run as a "rubber-stamp Congressman."

The exact fact is, and the written law of the land is, that any objection to any vote cast by any elector is decided in each House of Congress, acting concurrently, without any aid or interference, suggested or permissible, by the Executive or the courts, or the armed forces. (U. S. Code Annotated, title 3, sec. 17.) Put that in the old pipe and light it.

What the purveyors of these threats, subtle or brazen, have in mind is the success which the new dealers have had in making guayule-stamp Congressmen out of Senators and Representatives, who were duly elected by their constituents to represent them—not to serve, completely, the Executive—but to cast their free votes.

There are some of us who do not treat as idle the suggestion that Mr. Roosevelt might send the armed forces to Capitol Hill, where the electoral votes are cast. A distinguished Representative in Congress, from California, some few years back, told the story of the experience an Army colonel, from that locality, had in connection with his desire for promotion. As the story went, when the colonel finally got an audience with the President, Mr. Roosevelt put to him this last question—"Colonel, if I should order you to take your regiment and march on Capitol Hill and order Congress to adjourn, would you do it?" The response of the startled colonel was "Well—No, Mr. President, I don't think I could carry out that order."

Whether our President was joking or not, the colonel did not get his promotion.

As corroboration, add the President's frequent annoyed expressions, then current, like "Congress should go home." "All they do here is put speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," etc.

The date of the incident was given as at about the time the President was having trouble with Congress over his Supreme Court packing bill and his dictatorial reorganization bill. Newspapers files will show it was also at just about that time, the spring of 1938, when the President delivered, at Warm Springs, at midnight his pronouncement to the whole world—a shirt-tail disclaimer—the press called it—that he had no desire to be a dictator. The psychiatrists have an explanation for such protests. Shakespeare also commented on them. (Hamlet, act 3, scene 2.)

Every member of the bar in the United States, sworn to uphold our Constitution and our laws, should publicly volunteer, and now, to represent any elector, if and whenever his right to cast a free vote in the electoral college shall be challenged, otherwise than in the manner provided by the law of the land.

If that other day, now threatened, shall ever come, call it E-day—the End.

Operations of the War Manpower Commission in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission:

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1944.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 22, and I appreciate your thoughtfulness in enclosing the clipping from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, and directing my attention to the remarks therein of Representative HOFFMAN, of Michigan, concerning the operations of the War Manpower Commission in his district.

The Congressman's comments are not very clear, but seem to bear upon two phases of the Commission's operations. He is in error in his understanding that Plainwell has been put in the same area with Battle Creek and Grand Rapids. On the contrary, Plainwell is included in the Kalamazoo labor-market area. This area classification around a central city encompasses such nearby towns or communities as would represent a locality wherein reside workers who might be considered part of the general working community, and from which principal employers secure the majority of their employees. Thus, each area is bounded by a radius of normal worker commutation.

Therefore, in classifying the labor-market area conditions around a central city, such as Kalamazoo, the Commission's certification as to existing conditions would naturally include the suburban or nearby communities, of which Plainwell and seven other small towns are a part.

The other reference presumably is to the Commission's employment stabilization program, which has for its principal purpose the prevention of unnecessary movement of workers in essential industry, with resultant loss of production. These local stabilization plans in no sense cause older men to be denied work. On the contrary, the plan merely stabilizes the labor market, while other procedures of the Commission are designed specifically to see that workers of all ages and classes, who are able and willing to participate in the war effort, shall find jobs where they may be used to best advantage.

The inclusion of Plainwell, or any other town, in a given labor-market area would have no adverse effect upon local people seeking employment, but the local office of the

employment service naturally would exert its best efforts to see that all local workers are first placed in war useful jobs.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. MCNUTT, *Chairman.*

Senate Joint Resolution 93

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 93 is a resolution which among other things authorizes the President "to advance the date of the independence of the Philippine Islands by proclaiming their independence as a separate and self-governing nation prior to July 4, 1946." When it was before the Committee on Insular Affairs I proposed to insert in section 3, after the word "authorized", the following language: "After constitutional processes and normal functions of government have been restored in the Philippine Islands." I desire to make clear the significance of this amendment and the reasons for it.

On November 10, 1943, the House passed House Joint Resolution 189, providing that "notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of article 7 of the amended Constitution of the Philippines, the present President and Vice President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines shall continue in their respective offices until the President of the United States shall proclaim that constitutional processes and normal functions of government shall have been restored in the Philippine Islands. Thereupon the tenure of office of the present President of the Commonwealth shall cease and the Vice President shall become President to serve until such time as his successor shall have been elected and qualified according to the constitution and the laws of the Philppines."

A good many of us opposed the passage of this resolution, largely because we feared that arbitrary setting aside by the United States of the Constitution of the Philippines might do a great deal more harm in the Philippines and all through Asia than continuing in their respective offices the present officials of the government in exile of the Commonwealth of the Philippines could do good.

To millions in Asia and in the United States, the Constitution of the Philippines is almost a sacred document, far more important than any individuals who hold office under it, just as we believe maintaining inviolate the Constitution of the United States, unless changed by orderly processes, is more important than any particular officials. It means perhaps even more in Asia than in the West, because this is the first time in history that a major power has voluntarily granted such a constitution to a colonial possession.

Therefore, I felt strongly that the very first step to take with regard to the Philippines is to restore the "constitutional processes and normal functions of government" which we suspended in House Joint Resolution 189, and only thereafter to advance the date of their independence as a separate and self-governing nation.

Without such a definite stipulation in Senate Joint Resolution 93, there is no assurance in law to the Filipinos that we might not proclaim their independence under a government which had been established, or at least continued in office, by the Congress of the United States rather than under the constitutional government chosen by the Filipinos themselves.

If, as I assume is the case, we do not expect the President of the United States to proclaim the independence of the Philippine Islands except under its constitutional government, then there could be no valid objection to making our intentions perfectly clear in the resolution itself—clear to the Filipinos, to other peoples in Asia, including the Japanese and their puppets, and clear to the American people.

This resolution was proposed primarily to express our recognition of the courageous demonstration the Filipinos have given of their capacity to govern themselves in a progressive and democratic manner and to give additional incentive to them as they resist Japan's invaders so valiantly, assuring them that their loyalty will be rewarded by granting them full independence just as soon as our joint efforts succeed in driving out the Japanese and restoring the constitutional processes we ourselves set aside. I am glad the Committee on Insular Affairs accepted the amendment and that the House has unanimously adopted the resolution as amended.

Columnist Calls Turn on Big Business Scheme To Control Sale of Surplus War Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 16, Mr. Drew Pearson in his column, Washington Merry-Go-Round, called the turn on scheme which has evidently been hatched in the minds of a few big businessmen for the purpose of seeing to it that big business has first call on the $25,000,000,000 in Government-owned war plants and the billions of dollars worth of other usable consumers goods surpluses which could mean life or death to the Nation's small businesses if not distributed in an orderly manner.

The House Small Business Committee of which I am privileged to be a member, has studied this surplus disposal problem for nearly a year now. The committee, after many hearings and much careful thought, sponsored a bill designed to protect legitimate and established wholesale and retail firms as well as manufacturers. Particular emphasis was placed on provisions which would protect small business firms and would then afford these small firms a fair and equal opportunity to participate in these surplus sales.

For reasons, not clear to me before reading Mr. Pearson's column, slow progress was made on the bill sponsored unanimously by the House Small Business Committee. If Mr. Pearson is correct and an attempt is being made to slide through the Congress in secret meetings a bill on this subject which is designed solely to be beneficial to big business only, I hope that any Members who might be unwittingly lending their aid to such a program will pause and take sober thought of the effect that their actions might have upon the small business firms of the Nation which are, as Mr. Baruch so correctly and, I hope, sincerely describes as "the backbone of this Nation."

A copy of Mr. Pearson's column, which usually appears in the Washington Post, but which did not appear in that paper last Saturday, when this subject was discussed is as follows:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND — BATTLE RAGES ON DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS WAR GOODS

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON, June 16.—While American doughboys are fighting the toughest battle in history, another decisive battle is going on in Washington without benefit of headlines. It is the battle for control of the tremendous surplus war property owned by the Government.

One group, headed by the Barney Baruch-Lehman Bros.-General Electric faction, has the skids all greased to pass, as quickly as possible, legislation putting surplus property mainly in the hands of the big firms which have profited most from the war.

The other group, headed by a coalition of Democratic and Republican Congressmen, is determined that the disposal of war goods shall not head the country into another economic tailspin.

At the end of World War No. 1 the United States Government sold about $7,000,000,000 worth of surplus goods with no orderly plan. Some of the goods were dumped on the market, with speculators making fortunes overnight. Some were sold in France without any stipulation that the French people were to benefit, so that French speculators bought them up and reaped juicy profits by shipping them back to the United States of America.

SEVENTY-FIVE BILLION DOLLARS INVOLVED

Part of the blame went to Bernard M. Baruch, criticized for turning the key on his War Industries Board immediately after the war and going home.

Now, instead of $7,000,000,000 there are about $75,000,000,000 worth of surplus war goods—including 1,500 new war plants built with $25,000,000,000 of Government funds. Months ago, Republican CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, and Democrat WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, started work on a bill to provide the equitable sale of post-war Government property. Hearings began in March.

Then, suddenly, John Hancock, of Lehman Bros., whom Baruch brought down from Wall Street to write his post-war reconversion report, swung into action. With him swung Will Clayton, largest cotton broker in the world, whom Baruch already has placed in the key job of disposing of United States war property. They asked Congressmen PATMAN

and HALLECK to hold up their bill. The latter two obliged.

Meanwhile, the Baruch-Hancock group prepared a new bill, called the Clayton bill, which has the effect of giving one man—in this case Cotton Broker Clayton—blanket authority to dispose of war property in any way he sees fit.

FAVORED BY BIG BUSINESS

Members of the House Small Business Committee are up in arms. So is the Senate Post-war Mobilization Committee. They claim that the Clayton bill is tailor-made for big business and speculators, and that, if it passes, the country can expect a new heyday of monopoly and another chaotic economic tailspin.

Meanwhile, greased-lightning hearings on the Clayton bill are being held before Senator GEORGE's Post-War Committee, with his friend, Scott Russell, head of Bibb Manufacturing Co., of Macon, Ga., one of the biggest textile operators in the South, serving gratis as committee adviser.

Here is how war goods are now being sold. The Army dumped 5 tons of screws on the market at Memphis, Tenn. No firm in that area was equipped to buy so many screws at once. * * * 25,000 small portable phonographs, originally purchased to trade to African natives, were offered for sale to a big New York department store. Phonographs are extremely hard to buy today, but one store was offered the whole lot. * * * Seven million pairs of jute socks, brand-new, have been declared surplus by the Army. * * * A Washington department store recently advertised all-wool tropical worsted suits for men, price $24.50. They had been bought from the Government for $17. Standard wholesale price is $27, the retail price about $35. Cheap sales of this kind naturally hurt other merchants.

Creation of Office of Senator-at-Large for Ex-Presidents of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to create the office of Senator-at-Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States which was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. Since that time more than a score of my colleagues have expressed enthusiastic approval of the proposal and not one has expressed dissent.

Among those endorsing the idea is the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], an avowed candidate for the Presidency. He said that careful study had convinced him it was "a most wholesome, timely, and constructive proposal, one that should have been advanced and approved years ago."

When I first broached the subject in my district last February, the Paterson Evening News, of Paterson, N. J., issue of February 16, said editorially:

CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD HAS A PRACTICAL IDEA TO UTILIZE THE ABILITIES OF OUR EX-PRESIDENTS

Congressman CANFIELD has advanced an idea that should be carried further than the mere discussion stage. Commenting on the overlapping authorities which control food administration in the country, Congressman CANFIELD told Passaic County farmers the other day that he deplored the fact that an able director of food distribution like Herbert Hoover has not been pressed into service.

Carrying the thought still further, the Congressman proposed consideration of legislation which would provide for membership-at-large in the United States Senate of former Presidents of the United States. They would be without vote, would not affect State representations, but would be available for discussion and for counsel.

And why not? Herbert Hoover is admittedly one of the country's great men. He was a great President. Because he stepped out of the Chief Executive's office, must he be relegated to oblivion, or at the most to the sidelines as an elder statesman? Why should not the country have the benefit of his wisdom, his experience, his advice?

Posing these questions, Congressman CANFIELD raises still another fine point. It is his feeling that President Roosevelt will not be a candidate for reelection. Must it be then that a man who has been three times President of his country must go on the shelf, lost to government? The Congressman's point is full of possibilities—Hoover and Roosevelt senators-at-large in the upper House! The idea is terrific!

Congressman CANFIELD should move to translate his idea into some kind of action. He will find a responsive reaction the country over, and whether or not the plan meets opposition, it will be at least generate a healthy discussion.

The Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News, dated February 18, editorially approved with the following:

A USE FOR EX-PRESIDENTS

It is not a new thought that Representative GORDON CANFIELD has suggested that a way be found to continue the services of any President of the United States after he retires from that high office, but it is well that he has brought it up again.

The suggestion is that legislation be enacted to make all retired Presidents Members at Large of the United States Senate. They would not have a vote and would not affect the right of each State to two voting Senators, but as honorary Senators would be available for discussion and counsel.

It would seem that this would be a dignified and proper way for the country to avail itself of the experience of such men as Herbert Hoover and of Franklin Delano Roosevelt after his retirement from the White House. Such men when they step out of office should not become mere private citizens. At no time would there be more than two, in all probability, and they should occupy such a position as elder statesmen.

It is too bad that Mr. Hoover's vast experience in public affairs, as an engineer, and as a distributor of food to distressed peoples is not today available to the people in some formal way. And if Mr. Roosevelt should be retired next January, what a pity it would be if as a private citizen he were given no formal part at all in public consideration and settlement of national and world problems.

The thought that seems to appeal to most of my colleagues is that the purpose I have in mind can be accomplished through the passage of a simple bill instead of resorting to the long, drawn-out processes of constitutional amendment which many have thought necessary. Furthermore, the bill would also apply to any ex-President retired before enactment.

C. Breck Parkman, of the Office of Legislative Counsel of the House, who assisted me in the draft of this proposal, drew attention to the fact the position of Senator at Large could be created by act of Congress in the same manner as legislation provided for the offices of Delegate from Alaska and Delegate from Hawaii in the House. Mr. Breckman formerly lived in Passaic, N. J., in my congressional district.

Tax Exemption of Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Ralph L. Van Name, secretary of the New York City Employees' Retirement System at the thirty-ninth annual conference of the Municipal Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada on the subject of exempting pensions from taxation:

Your speaker does hot offer his discussion today as that of an authority either on general taxation or on taxation and exemption of pensions in particular. He is administrator of a large staff pension fund, has become keenly aware of the hardships to present and potential pensioners of his own and of other staff pension funds, from existing war taxes, and presents this inquiry into the subject with certain recommendations as a contribution toward early remedying of evils that have developed principally since the present war began.

There was probably never a system of taxation in any country at any time which was conceded, by all who were taxed, to be equitable and just.

It is inevitable that when a scale of taxation has been raised as rapidly as in this country since we entered the war in 1941, inequalities, inconsistencies, injustices, and hardships appear.

It is not our purpose now primarily to criticise and to complain of the inequalities and hardships but to classify certain of them, to inquire whether there is a trend toward equitable taxation and exemption and to determine particularly if and how any existing provisions unjustly affecting income of pensioners (who are persons with deferred, reduced, and fixed incomes), should be modified.

Until recent years the absence of taxation on incomes below $3,500 and $2,500, the absence of taxation below the subsistence level within which seven-eighths of all pensions are paid, made exemption from taxation of pensions of very limited significance and appeal. With the coming of war taxation of incomes far below the subsistence level, taxation down to the tcp $100 on an annual income as low as $667 under the tax simplification law, the problem has become of acute importance to staff pensioners and prospective staff pensioners—persons with deferred, reduced, and fixed incomes.

Income taxation which formerly reached two to seven million of our people now reaches the pockets of 50,000,000 individual

taxpayers and threatens millions of potential staff pensioners. This expended income taxation is in addition to greatly increased and expanded spending and corporate taxation.

Income-tax rates which formerly began at 4 to 6 percent of amounts well above the subsistence level, now begin at 23 percent in the sixth $100 of gross annual income.

Special exemptions are granted—

For dependents, including wife: $500 each.

In lieu of other deductions for contributions, taxes, interest, and medical expenses: 10 percent of income but not more than $500.

(Greater percentages and amounts than 10 percent and $500 may be exempted on these items if they are listed in detail, for example, up to 15 percent on contributions and unlimited credit for personal interest payments which reduce available income.)

For soldier income: $1,500 exemption.

For veteran pension and bonus: Unlimited exemption.

For occupational disability pensions: Unlimited exemption.

For railroad pensions: Up to $1,440 per annum.

(Since no higher railroad pension is paid under the United States Railroad Retirement Act.)

For social-security pension (by construction): Up to $1,020.

(Since no higher social-security pension is paid.)

For employee-purchased annuities: Exemption of the returning purchase price.

For employer-paid pensions: No exemption to the pensioner. The Treasury and a special subcommittee of the Senate are trying to determine rules as to the amount of exemption of an employer's contribution for pension purposes on the way in, that is, whether there shall be more or less tax exemption to the contributor. There is no exemption to the recipient as a pensioner and his cost of living problem is unlikely to be lessened by any action resulting from this Treasury and special Senate consideration.

For pensions derived by long-lived from short-lived annuitants: No exemption.

Let us add one other exemption to this incomplete but illustrative list.

On estates up to $60,000: Full exemption from taxation under the inheritance-tax law.

However you may regard the amount, the $500 exemption for each dependent is the result of prodigious study, discussion, trial and error, bargaining and compromise, by competent committees of Congress itself.

Notice, now, the others. Fifteen hundred dollars' soldier pay exemption and total war veteran pension exemption without doubt reflect the desire of the average citizen that his war substitute shall be treated as generously as so great a factor of the population may be treated by the rest of us.

The top exemption on railroad pensions is incident to the size of the pension itself. Since the top pension is $1,440—$1,440 is the top exemption. The exemption was determined by Congress in the pension enactment—not in tax enactment where exact equities might be measured. The exemption was determined by Congress as exemptions of pension from State income tax have been determined in New York and other States. When the pension bill was enacted the pension law-making body decreed that the pension provided should be exempt from tax by the area within its legal control. The State could not legally and therefore did not enact Federal exemption.

The top exemption on social security pension is likewise incident to the size of the pension itself. Since the top pension is $1,020—$1,020 is the top exemption. The exemption was determined by legal construction—not in a tax enactment where exact equities might be measured.

The exemption by the Treasury of the repayment of the individual's annuity purchase money is perhaps on the principle that taxation on the way in and on the way out would be double taxation.

The absence of exemption of employer contributions paid to an annuitant when the employer is not a railroad nor an employer under social security is discrimination which continues to exist because other employer-paid pension, with the notable exception of Federal Government itself, has not been the subject of detailed national pension legislation, and so the occasion or opportunity did not arise to grant incidental exemption as was granted in the cases just cited.

The reason for the absence of Federal employer exemption is to be found doubtless in the fact that until recent years the top Federal employee pension was $1,200, not far from the bottom income-tax exemption. The need for Federal pension exemption arose only with increased Federal maxima and decreased income-tax exemptions, and is met by a bill now before both Houses of Congress to grant total income-tax pension exemptions to retired Federal employees. I do not predict or desire, but it would not surprise me if the bill is amended before passage to provide top exemption of $1,440 or $1,500.

The taxation of pension, then, has not resulted from deliberate planning by Congress in a tax bill seeking out pensions as a source of tax revenue. Rather married couple exemption of income, undeferred or deferred, changing or fixed, unreduced or reduced—domestic married couple exemption—has been reduced from $3,500 and $2,500 to $1,000; single exemption to $500 or $500 plus 10 percent and in the process has come from an income field which was entered by few pensioners to the field of average garden variety of pension, deferred, reduced, and fixed.

Exemption from income tax of pension and annuity has not been based on a standard of measurement but on the chance incident that when Congress was passing a pension measure it might just as well as not, and did, insert a pension income-tax exemption. There is no uniform standard for pension exemption. There has been none.

If we now reexamine our list of exemptions, we will discover that employee or staff pensions and annuities which are not exempt from income tax may be classified under two headings as:

(a) Pension paid directly or indirectly by employers who are not military or railroad employers or participants under social security, and pensions paid by employers who supplement the maximum $1,440 or $1,020 or other limits of such acts as the Social Security Act and the United States Railroad Employees' Retirement Act.

(b) Pensions and annuities which are non-employer gifts, however they appear. Included under B are the pensions and annuities derived by long-lived annuitants from the forfeitures of the annuities or pensions or equities of short-lived pensioners and annuitants, whether in employer or employee supported or jointly contributory cooperative systems.

Since there has been and is no uniform standard of pension exemption and since remaining taxed pensions are pension paid by a minority of employers to a potential minority of pensioners or are outright gifts usually by short-lived to long-lived annuitants, let us consider some of the favors which might determine a standard of exemption for pension and annuity.

Tax exemption of soldier income stops at $1,500. Soldier pension is naturally expected to be less than soldier income. Almost certainly, if the social-security pension maximum were brought up to the railroad $1,440 top, as is talked of, the social security pension tax exemption level would likewise rise to $1,440. The principle or practice seems to be developing that pension income up to $1,440 or $1,500, if Government sponsored, that is, reduced, deferred fixed income up to this amount, as distinguished from earned and current income of this amount, is income properly exempt from income tax. There is not one reason why $1,440 pension income, not Government sponsored and regardless of the employer, should not be equally exempt to $1,440. And it is interesting to record that while I was preparing this observation, H. R. 4883, introduced in the House of Representatives on May 25 by Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, came to hand proposing to amend the exclusions from gross income section of the Internal Revenue Code to add the following:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, there shall be excluded from gross income the first $1,440, in the aggregate for each year, of all retirement pension and annuity payments, including, but not limited to, payments under the old-age and survivors insurance law—Social Security Act—received during the taxable year by any retired employee."

Our association, I hope, will go further. But I trust our association, meanwhile, will earnestly and powerfully support the Keogh bill which is now in the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Notice, now, another principle of tax exemption which is well established in Federal Government practice, which, until thoughtfully examined, might be assumed to have no bearing on pension taxation.

Until the present war, passing estates were exempt from inheritance tax up to $40,000 with an additional $40,000 for life-insurance payments. Due to the pressure of war demands, the Federal Government has combined and reduced these exemptions on a passing estate to a single $60,000. Above the $60,000 exemption, the inheritance tax, paid once for all, begin at 3 percent and, unless the estate exceeds $100,000, it does not reach the 23 percent paid annually on part of the sixth $100 of annual income.

Consider now, the nature of an annuity agreement. One who has 10 years to live and requires $1,440 a year, who has a total of $14,400 might put that amount in a bank or in a hole in the chimney or under a board in the floor, draw $1,440 each year for 10 years, exhaust his principal and die having paid no income tax on his withdrawals since the amounts withdrawn presumably were taxed as they were previously accumulated. Or if he die and leave all or part of the $14,400, it would be free of Government tax.

But let two such people each with $14,400, who together will live 20 years, associate themselves in an annuity, pension, or retirement fund because one may live 3 years and the other 17. The one who lives 17 years will pay an income tax on $1,440 or thereabouts for 7 years or thereabouts from the time he has received back the last of his own money. What would each risk and one lose by entering the annuity or retirement group? Seven times $1,440, which one would not receive who dies after 3 years. What money would the long-lived survivor receive after the tenth year or thereabouts? Not his own. Whose then? He would receive the 7 times $1,440 or thereabouts derived from forfeitures of the short-lived annuitant. The long-lived survivor benefited from an estate. It would not be taxed in the hands of the first party. It would not be taxed as a legacy from the first party. But a socially bent government steps out of character to tax, at 23 percent, 7 annual installments of $1,440 because there was received through a pension fund an amount which would have been exempt up to $60,000 had it been paid directly from an individual estate.

That, as I have been saying around New York City for some time now, is not a social attitude; it is antisocial. That is not legislation favoring the little fellow; that is legislation which singles out the little fellow for special hardship, perhaps not intentionally but effectively. Such antisocial discriminatory 23 percent annual income taxation of

the deferred, reduced, fixed-pension income in contrast to individual estate exemption from tax up to $60,000 and tax at 3 percent to 22 percent once-for-all until $100,000 is passed, neutralizes and sabotages the annuity—civilization's most time-tested, amiable, and thrifty device to adequately provide against incalculable, more than average, individual old age.

At the risk of repetition, I ask you to note how much better exemption than $1,440 is exemption up to a $60,000 equity as granted to individual estates.

In a pension system, when the pensioner or annuitant outlives his average span of life and has drawn the moneys contributed by him and on his account, subsequent income for the individually surviving pensioner or annuitant in principle is drawn neither from employer nor from himself but is bequeathed, forfeited by, and received through the fund from the short-lived pensioner or annuitant and is financially possible only by reason of such a short life.

Consider the plight of the would-be pensioner who must meet present income-tax rates. He contemplated age 65 retirement at $1,440, based, let us say, on $230 for each 5 years of service and amounting to less than half pay. Statisticians tell him that he cannot subsist on that sum but he was willing to try. He now finds that before he may have $1,440 for his own purpose he must contribute $230 to the Federal Government in income tax since he is not a railroad pensioner or a social-security beneficiary. He finds he must continue in service to age 70 in order to increase his gross pension $230 and pay a 23 percent tax of $230 on a taxable income of approximately $1,000 after taking an exemption of $500 plus $167, that is, 10 percent of his $1,670. If he is in a flat half-pay system, as many employees are, he must face remaining in service to the compulsory retirement age and accumulating two tax amounts each year out of his current salary—one for immediate payment on his current salary, another for deferred payment on the pension, enjoyment of which must be deferred until he has his future pension tax money in hand, or as much of it as he may be able to scrape up before his compulsory retirement age.

Contrast now the Federal Government's contradictory methods in treatment of pensioners, for both cannot be correct. Retirement of railroad pensioners at age 65 at $1,440 is encouraged by tax exemption. Retirement of governmental nonrailroad, non-social-security pensioners, who are ready to retire at 65 on $1,440, is discouraged from age 65 to age 70 until they may build up enough increase over $1,440 to pay a tax not required of railroad or social security pensioners in their economic class.

The harm is not alone to the aged employee. New York City contributes annually $47,000,000 to take care of its employee superannuation and disability problem. Other cities and States contribute proportionate amounts; so does the Federal Government for its employees. It would be a lame excuse to say that Federal income tax by deferring retirement decreased local pension costs. When social security, railroads, the United States civil employees and many other retirement systems provide pension benefits for age 65, it is done in the knowledge that the average employee is becoming less efficient at that age and for the good of the service should be replaced by the young. The ability to so replace employees at age 65 is retained and promoted by the Federal Government for railroaders and social security pensioners; financial provision by the States and cities to so replace 65-year-olds of the State and city employees is defeated by the Federal Government income tax which applies to pensioned State and city employees. The Federal Government, taxing some 65 year old pensioners and exempting others receiving like pensions, must be wrong on one count. When the Federal Government siphons into the Federal Treasury 23 percent more or less of the State and city taxpayers' money contributed to meet adequately superannuation and disability problems, the Federal Government is executing an antisocial, antigovernmental policy which is contradictory to its more correct railroad and social security pension tax stand.

Public officials are beginning to realize that this is not a problem that has been with them always; rather, it is one that has developed

(1) Because of the beginning of income taxation away below subsistence levels instead of above them.

(2) Because in this reduction of income tax exemption limits, no distinction has been made between income that has increased and may increase, on the one hand, and, on the other, deferred, reduced, fixed income, such as pensions and income of millions of white-collar workers as well, as pointed out by Senator THOMAS of Utah in the May American Magazine in his article on 20,000,000 Forgotten Americans.

Mayor LaGuardia of New York City, seeking such exemption as Congressman KEOGH's bill proposes, and writing to every Senator, to all of the mayors in the United States Conference of Mayors, of which he is head, and to many other governmental officials, says:

"Congress should bear in mind that the purpose of paying an employee income is to keep him in service while the purpose of offering him a pension is to enable him to leave and discontinue service. Taxing an employee is proper business for the Federal Government, since it increases the necessity for his earning an income. The prospect of 23 percent taxation, on the contrary, compels a potential aged pensioner on half pay or thereabouts to remain in service for want of the necessary sustenance if he were to retire. As a result the opportunities for civil-service employment of our returning veterans are seriously diminished and the governmental pension contributions are diverted from the purpose for which they are made."

I've discussed the subject with other public officials who have too wide a field of interest to study this subject to a conclusion on their own account but who are willing, if a plan is laid before them by such an association as ours, to consider the proposals on their merits. They may pay little heed to requests for special-favor exemptions, but if they may be shown broad principles under which present and future exemptions may be justly unified, they will, I believe, be interested.

We have exemption of return of one's own contributions. We have a haphazard exemption of some other pension amounts. I have brought to your attention today a seeming analogy between the ultimate pensions of the surviving aged which are unjustly taxed and individual inheritances which are tax exempt to $60,000. There is still another approach. Corporate excess-profits tax rates are laid most heavily on corporations whose incomes have risen most and most lightly on those whose incomes have risen little. Applying this principle to individuals, Senator THOMAS of Utah suggests additional exemption for those individuals whose incomes have not risen perceptibly since Pearl Harbor. Canada and Great Britain have something like this in their provision for partial post-war refund of excess taxes. In Canada, since the aged individual may not live to personally realize this post-war refund, he is permitted to apply for a lower, current rate in lieu of the later, too late reduction.

Following the principles established by our country in other tax fields than that of individual income taxation and individual pension exemption, particularly in the inheritance and excess-profits field, and the example of Canada as well, we must differentiate between the productive and often rising income of the strong and the deferred, reduced, fixed, unproductive income of the aged and disabled.

I submit these specific proposals for corrective legislation:

(a) Exclusion from gross income up to $1,440 of all retirement pension and annuity payments as proposed in the Keogh bill, H. R. 4883, now in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

This proposal was originally offered as an amendment to tax simplification bill. It received the support of the mayors of many of your cities at the request of Mayor LaGuardia, as head of the United States Conference of Mayors. The proposal was kept out of the bill for no lack of merit but because of the previous iron-clad agreement of the Senate and House to strictly limit its provisions to those simplifying the tax clarification form.

Congressman KEOGH has resubmitted the proposal as a separate bill, where you may and should support it on its merits, because it will immediately provide for other pensioners relief identical with that now justly provided by Congress for the millions of present and potential social-security and railroad pensioners.

(b) Exclusion from gross income of additional annuity income, if any, until one's own money (taxed before annuity purchase) has been returned.

(c) Reduction of the income-tax rate payable by pensioners whose income before exemption has been reduced.

(d) Valuation of the entire pension and annuity remaining in the year in which a living pensioner, beginning from his retirement age, has arrived at his expectation of life or average span or, if you please, valuation, when there has been returned to him the initial reserve whether contributed by or for him. The deduction from that value of $60,000 precisely as before taxation of an individual estate, remembering that the pensioner may not so receive more than he was committed at the outset, to bequeath to another through the fund had he been the short-lived annuitant.

Taxation once for all of the remaining value, if any, at current inheritance-tax rates. These once-for-all rates are on a rising scale from 3 to 22 percent, still below the income-tax 23-percent rate when the estate is as much as $100,000. As an alternative to individual payment, the law might authorize payment of this final tax by the retirement fund with authority to the fund to slightly reduce for the remainder of life the resulting tax-free pension.

We must contend for equality of treatment of individual and collective inheritance. Unless inheritance through the retirement fund can be brought up to the $60,000 individual standard of exemption, the standard for retirement fund and individual inheritance must be equalized between the present $60,000 individual estate exemption and the low or zero exemption of a like equity.

Under the above plan, a pensioner would pay an income tax at a lower rate because of a reduction from his former active income and would begin to pay only when he has received his own money back over and above $1,440 per annum. If regarded as preferable, the tax could be equalized from the outset by reducing the pensioner's taxable income at the beginning of his retirement in the proportion which the member's contribution, with or without interest, bears to the total value of his retirement contract. In either case, when the value of his pension, by whoever contributed, has been repaid, such tax would cease and would be succeeded, if at all, by a not too burdensome single payment to be taken up by his fund, if desired, and, in that case, resulting in a

wholly tax-free pension for the remainder of his life.

I submit these suggestions to you for study, for such modification as may seem advisable to you and, as so modified, for recommendation to Congress. We will, in my opinion, have missed an opportunity if we do not seek and obtain congressional action in 1944.

Above all, I trust this association will not demand total pension exemption. There is too much of pension income which, on sound principle, is entitled to payment of materially less tax than now, to weaken our case and the prestige of this association by a demand for something to which we are not soundly entitled.

How Many More Steps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address entitled "How Many More Steps?" delivered by me before the Executives Club of Chicago on Friday, June 2, 1944:

When first I was invited to address this organization I felt highly honored. The second time you had me here to speak to you, I really felt flattered, but now that I have been invited for the third time to appear before the same group, I am really beginning to wonder whether I am great or you are just dumb. [Laughter.] Anyway, I am overwhelmed—by your capacity for punishment. [Laughter.]

There will not be much that I shall say here today that will be new to you. You have heard me, for the past dozen years, preach a certain philosophy of government and a certain kind of economic life that we have been accustomed to. I am sure, however, that you will hear me retract not one single word that I have ever uttered since the middle of 1933.

It is really a relief, gentlemen, to escape the torturing torment of turbulent Washington for even a little while, to come out to this great center of the United States, to address the members of the Executives' Club. I want you to think with me for a little while this afternoon about national socialism. And that term, national socialism, I think, will cover the different kinds of government which were established throughout the leading nations of the world, in the wake of the last war.

It is not at all accidental, gentlemen, that communism rose its head in Russia; that fascism was established in Italy; that Nazi-ism became entrenched in Germany, or that New Dealism has gained a vast foothold in the United States. National socialism covers all these different forms of new government, both abroad and at home. And I want us to think of certain definite, specific steps which these different nations have taken, following in the wake of the last war.

THE FIRST STEP

The first step, of course, in order to establish national socialism is to make the masses of the people in any country feel their complete hopelessness and their utter inability to meet and solve their own problems. This psychological state of mind is naturally easy to develop in a time of economic stress or of national disaster. In times of depression or of war, and in the aftermath of war, which often is as dangerous and disastrous as war itself, we find a fertile soil in which to sow the seeds of national socialism.

I am not talking abstractly or theoretically this afternoon, but as a fellow American, more particularly as a Missourian, who has to be shown, and I have been shown, because it has been my privilege, even if I am an Ozark hillbilly, to have traveled and lived in these different countries and to have seen, first hand, democracy die, freedom fly out the window, dictatorship and totalitarian forms of government established. I say the first step that must be taken is to make the masses feel their helplessness in times of depression or in times of war, when the people are weary and war-worn and tired, and when they prefer to have some strong, benign, all-wise leader to rule them than to take the trouble to rule themselves. That is the first step that any nation or people take in setting up national socialism.

The second step that is taken is to get the government as far removed from the control of the people as is possible. Individual responsibility, State rights, and local self-government must be done away with. No longer will the Government of the United States be at Peoria or Kenosha or Kalamazoo. Governmental powers will be centralized in bureaucrats in far-off Washington.

The New Dealers have told us that concentration of wealth in the hands of the few is destructive of the economic liberties of the people, and to that thesis I subscribe with all my heart. The concentration of wealth in the hands of the few is a bad and dangerous thing. But, my friends, concentration of political power in the hands of a few is a fatal thing to liberalism and democracy. [Applause.]

I have no fear, no more than your great fellow Illinoisan, Abraham Lincoln, had any fears, as long as Government remains in the hands of the people. But when the people fall into the hands of the Government, under its control and domination from a distant place, when we have government by remote control, then you no longer have a government of, by, and for the people. You have a government by a single, mighty leader or a small group of men, who use their power and influence to control and exploit the masses of the citizens of any State.

THE THIRD STEP

There is a third step that is taken. It was taken in Russia, in Germany, and in Italy, and there is a deadly parallel here in the United States. What is that third step? When you have the people convinced that they are helpless and incapable of solving their own problems, when you remove the control of the government from localities to a centralized point, the next thing to do is to abolish constitutional guaranties. How is that to be done? By ridicule, by abuse, by saying that these constitutional guaranties are old fashioned, they are outmoded, that they belong to the horse-and-buggy age.

Not only constitutional guaranties, but where the Government goes in and seizes private property without due process of law and where they can even send the United States Army into a plant in Chicago, throw the president and the chairman of the board of a great organization out forcibly. It happened in a factory yesterday, and it may happen in your home tomorrow if it is allowed to go on unchecked. But, thank God, the one barrier that stands between the American people and tyranny today, namely, the Congress, was quick to grasp the significance of that move. Both the House and Senate appointed investigating committees without delay. And the administration was so frightened that they didn't even want to wait for a court decision, though most of the courts today are under the domination of the Executive.

The citizens of the United States deplore the Gestapo methods used by Attorney General Biddle in the Montgomery Ward case. They feel that his action was illegal and destroys the very thing for which Americans are fighting and dying. My people do not approve the action of Mr. Roosevelt and I only hope that we have as many good soldiers to defend our home front as we have fighting for our cause abroad. We have been grossly outraged and our only hope for relief is a change in administration. We need not only a new President, but also a Congress—strong, independent, and fearless—who will do their best to save this Republic.

The President's seizure of the Montgomery Ward plant by force without authority granted by Congress and in clear violation of the Constitution which he is sworn to uphold and defend has justly aroused the indignation of a free people and struck a vital blow at representative government.

Abolish constitutional guaranties? The Constitution is old-fashioned. So is the Magna Charta. So are the Ten Commandments. But the Decalog of Moses are as true and needed as much today as they were the moment he uttered them on Mount Sinai. There are some eternal verities, some truths that are unchangeable with time. Two plus two equals four today, just as much as they did in the time of Archimides. You do not have to burn down your house to get rid of the mice in the pantry. You do not have to kill your dog to get rid of his fleas. I think fleas are good for any dog. They keep his mind off being a dog all the time. [Laughter.]

You have got to have progress. The Constitution can be changed. The fathers who wrote that immortal document, the greatest ever struck off by the mind of man, realized it would have to be changed to meet changing conditions. But they provided a constitutional way whereby it can be changed. Not by usurpation. Only one power can change the Constitution, and that is, the power that made it, namely, the people themselves.

Did any one of us, a few years ago, ever dream he would live to see the day when the Executive of our land would urge Congress to enact laws regardless of any doubts as to their constitutionality? Yet that is what F. D. R. asked the Ways and Means Committee of the House to do when the Guffey bill was enacted. Not only do away with constitutional guaranties, but scrap the Constitution itself.

Two weeks ago I spoke to the Women's Council of the Navy League of the United States in Cleveland; a great gathering of patriotic women. But some of the steel unions were having a convention at the same time. And I was shocked and even alarmed as I rode down the elevator when I overheard certain caustic and nasty remarks about the Constitution of the United States; we were going to do this, and we were going to do that, in spite of the Constitution. You cannot eat the Constitution, they say. And these political philosophers are guided in all their thinking by their stomachs. Their thoughts never rise above their belt lines. They never exercise even their cerebellums or cerebrums; grounded in Marxian materialism.

Yes; make the people feel hopeless and helpless. Raise up a benign and all-wise leader who will solve their problems. Make them dependent upon Washington. Destroy State rights and individual responsibility. Let Uncle Sam do it. We have a Santa Claus in the White House. Do away with constitutional guaranties. If you want to take over a business, take it. Take it under the cry of emergency. Oh, emergency! How many crimes have been committed in thy name during the past dozen years? The New Deal feeds and fattens on emergency. It grows rich and powerful on the pressure

of war. Under the cry of that emergency, and under pressure of that war, we are having foisted upon this country national socialism, under the guise of liberalism and democracy. I have no quarrel with the American people. If they want national socialism, let them vote for it. But I do object to a small group of smearers and wasters in Washington, who were never elected by anybody, who, by surreptition and indirection, who boring from within, with their alien creeds and their false philosophies, are shackling upon you and me and our fellow countrymen a type of government totally foreign and different from any which we have ever known.

A VICIOUS STEP

These leaders of the New Dealers, of fascism and communism and nazi-ism, they do not stop there. They have to take another step. What is that? It is to undermine the faith and confidence of the American people in the lawyers and in the courts of this land, because often the lawyers are the defenders of the peoples' rights. We must make the masses feel that lawyers are crooked and that courts are dishonest. We will assail the highest tribunal of the land by calling them the nine old men. The only objection to them was their age of 70 years. And how many men, in high Government position, since that attempt—that ignoble, ruthless attempt to pack the Supreme Court—past 70 years of age have been appointed?

Undermine the courts. And they have pretty well done it.

Thomas Jefferson realized that unless we had a frequent rotation of the Presidency it would soon degenerate into an inheritance. Thomas Jefferson, realizing the enormous appointive powers of the President, knew that if any one individual stayed in the Presidency too long, with his appointive power, he would control not only the executive arms and branches of the Government, but that he would dominate and control the judiciary. And it is significant that of the nine members of our highest Court, seven of them have been appointed by the present incumbent of the White House, who in addition, has appointed almost 70 percent of the total judiciary of our country; filled with men who see eye to eye with him; who will uphold the constitutionality of any bill which his stooges can enact, under the whip lash of patronage or of public funds. Yes; the court, due to the long tenure of one individual, is pretty largely today under the thumb of the Executive. I have said in Congress and out of Congress, look at the Supreme Court of the United States today and you will know why Jesus wept. [Laughter.]

Why, they not only have disdain for precedent; they not only have a disregard for tradition; they not only scorn the lessons of experience; they not only overrule decisions made by the greatest legal minds and the ablest students of jurisprudence in the history of our Republic—but they often contradict themselves; reversing their decisions of yesterday in their decisions of today, with lines so sharply divided, that one of the ablest members of that Court, Mr. Justice Roberts, in stinging language, recently pointed out to them that unless they can get some unity, some consistency, some logic in the writing of their decisions, soon the American people would lose confidence and respect for that highest tribunal.

Yes, they do not have courts in Soviet Russia. Oh, they have; they have many trials over there. They shot a lot of their best people. Hitler has no courts in Germany. A Nazi court is stacked and packed. There is a joker in every deck and the cards are played according to the way the Fuehrer wants them played. And we have some members of our highest tribunal, who are supposed to be apart, separate, and independent, sneaking in the side door and the back door of the White House, instead of belonging to a great body of judicial minds, who sit and exercise an independence that guarantees the American people full justice in any controversy or crime.

ANOTHER DANGEROUS STEP

They do not stop there. There is another step the Communists take, and that is to undermine the legislative branch or Congress. It is to smear Congress. Didn't I see Mussolini, with a handful of Black Shirts, march on Rome, dissolve the Italian Parliament and call them every dirty name in the catalog? Didn't I see, as a student in Germany, following the last war, Mr. Hitler fooling many intelligent Germans; and, knowing the German people as I do, I marvel that so many intelligent Germans were dragged into such a net, until this National Socialism was so fastened upon them that they could never extricate themselves. And not only did Mussolini dissolve Parliament, Stalin also did away with the Chamber of Deputies. Hitler had a Reichstag, a shell of a parliament, but he robbed it of all its power, and whenever a vote was called for, there was only one answer: "Ja, Ja, Ja." He didn't stop there. Hitler even burned down the Reichstag. And what a beautiful building it was, there at Brandenburg Tor! He burned it down. And I know of vermin and rats in this country, digging and boring within, a group of character assassins, scandalmongers lower than the reptile that hisses in the grass, who would like not only to destroy the influence of the legislative arm of our Government, but who would like to burn down the Senate and the House of Representatives; render Congress completely impotent.

The executive branch of our Government, not content with dominating our courts, demands to control Congress. And when members of his own party kept him from packing the Court, the President set out, with public funds and with this great club of patronage that he holds over the heads of recalcitrant members of his own party, to dominate and control the Congress of the United States.

NATIONAL SOCIALISM

And books have been written by men under aliases. Imported foreigners, the refugees and royalists from over there, trying to damn and blighten the American Congress. Why? Because when the legislative arm of a government is destroyed, then we have one-man rule. It happened in Russia. It happened in Italy. It happened in Germany. It has been happening here for 12 years. Step by step, not accidental, but carefully planned, adroitly maneuvered and skillfully carried out. Take all the things that have happened. They are like the pieces of a jig-saw puzzle. Put them together and it makes a perfect picture. What is it? National socialism. They want only Members of Congress who can and will carry out the will of the Executive. If Mr. Roosevelt would take a pill, they would move first. [Laughter.]

Can anyone doubt it? I say to you that when a small coterie of labor racketeers, when men like Bridges and Browder and Dubinsky and Pressman and Hillman can collect, they say, $700,000—other sources of authority tell us $2,000,000—not only for the Presidential campaign, but to get the scalps of the Members of Congress who believe in constitutional republican government, when those men can go out and shake down the poor laboring people of this country, forcing them to pay tribute in order to exercise their constitutional right to work, and then go out and defeat men like JOE STARNES and JOHN COSTELLO, and force MARTIN DIES out of the ranks, it is high time that the American businessmen get their eyes open, take their shirts off, and fight like hell to save this Republic. [Applause.]

We have been asleep at the switch and we are getting run over. I am not so optimistic as a lot of my fellow Republicans. They told you my politics. What I am trying to talk of are American principles. I am trying to talk facts. I am not so optimistic about the outcome of this present election. Businessmen say, "What can we do about it?" Well, Sidney Hillman is doing something about it. And I am afraid that with all the funds they have, they will purge certain others who are marked for slaughter—and I rank about No. 1, I think. God, how I welcome their opposition. I will meet them on any battleground at any time. I am not going to stand in the back row, silent, and let the thing be set up here which our men and women are fighting all over this world to destroy. And if you do, you won't have anything to live for or fight with when this deluge is over.

ECONOMIC STEP

All right. They are going to undermine Congress as well as the courts. Let us see what the other steps are. Economically, the people must be ground down by high and excessive taxes, in order to reduce us all to a common level. But, ye gods, what a low level. The Government then has control of capital and the credit of the country, due to these high taxes that are collected in one form or another, under one pretext or another. And, by the way, the other day, I took the returns of my own personal income tax, small as they are, for this and last year and the year before and I compared those returns with those of 1929, 1930, and 1931. My taxes are more than 20 times as much today, and yet I make no more money. For 10 years following the last war, every year we reduced taxes and cut down the national debt, in 10 years, from $26,000,000,000 to $16,000,000,000, and in the following 10 years after that, beginning in 1932, up to the time of Pearl Harbor, mind you, not counting any appropriation for war expenditures, we enormously increased taxes every year, and the public debt was raised from $20,000,000,000 to $66,000,000,000.

That brings us to another step that the New Deal takes, or any other government takes that wants to establish national socialism. Grind down the people by high taxes. Lift the one-third up by pulling the other two-thirds down. Then you think you are getting somewhere. But we must create a gigantic public debt from which no individual citizen will ever be able to escape its burden. Brother, we have created one. The national debt, at the end of this month, will be nearly $200,000,000,000. By the end of June next year, approximately $250,000,000,000. And by the end of the war it will be, perhaps, $300,000,000,000. A debt that is in excess of the national wealth of this country, all the bank deposits, insurance policies, farms, homes, factories, and businesses. Will we ever be able to pay the interest on such a debt? The interest alone will run from six to nine billion dollars annually.

Before the war, even the New Dealers never spent more than $9,000,000,000 a year, and they ran from three to five billion dollars a year, each year, in the red. Continuous deficit spending, and in spite of those huge expenditures before the war, not for preparedness but in boondoggling, building monkey houses and dog pounds and counting rats, we still had eight and one-half million unemployed men in this country on December 7, 1941. And yet they say they are indispensable. Ye gods, they cannot run this country in time of peace, let alone war.

UNDERMINING FAITH IN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Yes; we will have high taxes and we will have enormous deficits. A back-breaking national debt will make the Government receiver of the Nation. The state will own all. Another step we must take is to undermine and destroy the faith of the people in private business and individual enterprise. It started out under the old N. R. A. You had to spend half of your time in filling out forms, answering questionnaires, carrying

out orders of the distant tax-eating bureaucrats in Washington. You did it in peacetime, and you are doing it in wartime. And if they are continued in power, you ain't seen nothin' yet. [Laughter.]

No, you haven't. Wait until the war is over. It will be continued. This thing is a leech. It is being fastened upon us, and so firmly that I seriously question, unless we have an immediate change and unless we get rid of this poisonous propaganda that has been instilled into the minds of the American people, we will never be able to throw it off. The life of the Republic is at stake. I am not going to sit idly by. You are soldiers as much as any man on the front line. They are fighting to destroy this thing abroad while it is being cleverly and insidiously established here at home.

Private business and industry in this country have saved our face because, with all of our mistakes and waste and extravagance, the output of industry, the production of America have won this war. Victory is now in sight. And yet it is American business and industry which these long-haired men and short-haired women, wild-eyed theorists, in Washington would have destroyed during this past decade.

THE BUREAUCRACY STEP

Well, of course, there is another step that is taken, and that is to set up a giant centralized Federal bureaucracy composed of men who were never elected by anybody to any office and whom you cannot get rid of. They are responsible only to the Executive who employs them. And they issue daily decrees that run into hundreds and thousands. You cannot keep up with them. Before you can read one of their orders you perhaps receive a new one telling you that the first was canceled. Tax-eating bureaucrats. You can get rid of Members of Congress. You can cut our throats every other year. We are representatives of the people and can be hired and fired. You cannot get rid of bureaucrats whether you like them or don't like them. The only way you can get rid of them is to get rid of the man who appoints them. [Applause.] That is what we have in this country.

CONTROL OF EDUCATION

I do not want to trespass upon your time. You are busy men. There are two other steps that they take after all these. One is to control the education of the youth of the country. Oh, it was the youth of Italy that followed Mussolini with idolizing enthusiasm. It was the youth of Germany, the young boys and girls, who hiked and marched and who almost worshipped with adoration, the fuehrer. And don't think Adolph Hitler rode to power by being a tyrant. No; he was the savior of the people. He was idolized. He was indispensable. He was bringing in a new order. Just like some other men I know, in high places, were worshipped and idolized. He was going to be the savior. And they followed him with fanatical zeal and religious devotion. That is the reason Germany has not collapsed before now. He was their savior. The intention perhaps good? Well, we won't argue about that. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

There are bills pending before the American Congress today whereby the Federal Government would make grants. And, oh, the grants and doles and pensions and gratuities and all the rest that is poured out of the National Treasury to perpetuate those who are now entrenched in power. That is why it is done. It is to control the votes. And we have the most astute politician in the world. I will put him up against Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, and all of them combined. He is smooth. You squeeze him here and he is over there. He is as slippery as an eel. He can blow hot and cold and say yes and no in the same breath, and make them all like it. But I think the people are fed up on charm. They want less charm and more character today; less showmanship and more statesmanship. They want less chicanery and more candor. They want less panegyric and more prayer, but prayer that is natural, real, honest, humble, and sincere.

Bills are pending in Congress whereby the Federal Government will make grants to cities and localities. Beware of Greeks bearing gifts. Uncle Sam or any Federal Government never gave to its people anything that it did not take from them. And always Government exacts in return control over the lives and destinies of its citizens. It was so with the farmers. They were paid not to grow stuff, but the farmer had to take orders from Washington. They told the farmer what to sow, when and how much.[1] Social Security? Protection? Why, even the mendicants are offered the abundant life and security from the cradle to the grave. But before security is given them, they have to submit to rules and regulations made in Washington.[2]

The Federal Government goes out into the States—comes into Illinois and Missouri and reaches out and digs down deep into your pockets and takes so many millions of dollars back to Washington. Then they say in Washington, to you people in Illinois and Missouri, "Now, we will let you have a few millions of your own money back providing you will follow the rules and regulations that we lay down. We are going to control you."

And the education of youth? Teach them humble submission and to bow in that spirit of idolatry and of zealous worship for the great leader.

THE PROPAGANDA STEP

And then the last step that they take, which backs and fortifies, promulgates and promotes and strengthens all these foregoing steps, is a ceaseless, incessant propaganda, over radio, on the screen, in the press, to exalt and glorify all those faithful who will bow the knee to the leader, and who will besmirch and smear, damn and condemn anyone who dares raise his voice in protest.

So there we are. Thomas Paine once said, "These are times to try men's souls." Isn't that so? We have heard a lot about the "four freedoms"; freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from fear, and freedom from want. When, in the name of God, did any American never enjoy those freedoms? We perhaps had hard times. We have had many depressions in the history of our country. But we always pulled out without scrapping the Constitution or without piling up a back-breaking debt which will lead to bankruptcy, and bankruptcy will lead to revolution. And we have reached the point where in this country we have to have reformation or revolution. And if that be treason, make the most of it. [Applause.]

THE REAL MEANING OF FREEDOM

We are at the crossroads now; not tomorrow. We are there now. Time is short. And it is later than most of us think. Why, a man in jail can enjoy the "four freedoms." He is free to speak, he is free to worship, he is free from want. He has shelter and clothing and food. They have him locked up. He is free from fear; more so than these rascals who are out of jail. [Laughter.] Oh, the "four freedoms," if that is all we are fighting for, God help us.

No; they have overlooked the greatest freedom of all, namely, the freedom to be free; free from the fear of government. That is what we want. Freedom from Executive decrees and Presidential fiats and bureaucratic rules and regulations that threaten us with severe penalties, amounting to huge fines and long imprisonment.

The American people want to be free to exercise their own God-given talents, to earn, labor, and save, own property and enjoy its fruits; the results of their own labor.

Ah, freedom? We are fighting for the freedom where the free men and women in this country can walk the earth, each his own king, the equal lord of every other man; to go his own way; work out his own will; weave into the warp and woof of the magic days, the dreams that haunt, the duties that inspire and urge him on. That is the freedom we have known in America. That is the freedom that has produced the automobile and the telephone and the skyscraper and the airplane and the radio and the thousand and one comforts that we enjoy and that has produced a higher standard of living for our people than for any other on the face of God's earth.

Oh, it is great to be an American; to live under our constitutional form of government; a republican government; where government is the servant and not the master of men.

It is great to live in a country where a poor backwoodsman, born in a log cabin, with the ground for a floor, who never saw the inside of a college but who, because of the talents with which the Almighty had blessed him, because of his rugged honesty, because of his great love for humanity, because of his unimpeachable integrity and his sterling patriotism, because of his hatred of evil and love of the true, the beautiful, and the good, could rise from abject poverty to the highest office in the gift of a great and a free people. And only in the United States could Abraham Lincoln ever have lived. [Applause.]

Isn't it great to live in a country where a poor newsboy, selling papers on the trains out of Detroit, who worked hard and saved his pennies, nickels, and dimes, who lived in a country that did not believe in rewarding idleness and punishing industry—isn't it wonderful to live in a country where an humble newsboy, who toiled and slaved and who was not held down by bureaucratic control, who had no ceiling over his head but who could rise to any height which his God-given talents, his industry, and his personal worth as a man could lead him? So that he could reproduce the human voice and light up the world? And only America could ever produce a Thomas Edison. [Applause.]

Isn't it great to live in a country—not a national socialistic state, because individual freedom and national socialism cannot exist side by side—isn't it wonderful to live in a country where a poor mechanic, who got dirt under his fingernails and grease in his hair, who worked in a woodshed and saved the results of his toil while others spent their substance in wild and riotous living, in the hope that the Government would take care of them, whether they took care of themselves or not; isn't it wonderful to live in a country where that individual could work during the day and toil during half the night and save his money, and go to a friend who had the confidence and respect in him to venture a little private capital—without a dollar subsidy from the Government—but who was left free to breathe the air and exercise his mind and to put forth his energies to lift us out of the mud and muck and mire and place us upon wheels and, through the method of rapid transportation, obliterate the barriers that once segregated us into different communities? Only America could ever have produced a Henry Ford. [Applause.]

Ah, gentlemen, it is always good to talk to the members of this club. You are always attentive and appreciative, whether you agree or not. I do hope and pray, and I certainly would not have taken the time to run away from busy Washington, because I am on the Military Affairs Committee, and Mr. RAYBURN has placed me on the Committee on Post-

[1] Thomas Jefferson said, "If we were told from Washington when to sow and when to reap the people would go hungry."

[2] Benjamin Franklin once said, "He who surrenders his liberty for temporary security deserves neither and will soon lose both."

War Military Policy—I would not have come out here unless I thought that some of the things I say here are the stark naked truth, that they are timely, that they are vital, and in the hope that you will heed some of the thoughts thrown out—and that you will do something about it. It is not going to do a bit of good to be moved here and then go out and forget everything.

We are in the midst of a war. We are on every continent and sea, and we are here at home. I am under an oath, a sacred oath, as you have been, Carl Chindblom, time and again, to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution against all its enemies both foreign and domestic. And my brother, who has been with the 8th Air Force in England over a year, and my four nephews, who are in the armed services, and your sons, brothers, and nephews are taking care of the foreign foe. I have no fear about them, any more than when I volunteered with two of my brothers, in the last war. But I am thinking of domestic enemies. Who in the name of God is going to fight the battle here on the home front, preserve our Constitution and save our Republic and our American way of life, when so many youthful Americans are on distant lands and on remote seas, fighting and dying and giving their very last ounce of full devotion to their country?

In the name of God, gentlemen, let us remember the immortal words of Lincoln when he said, "This fair republic is the last best hope of earth and America is God's last chance to make a world." [Applause.]

A Moral Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 20, 1944:

A MORAL RESPONSIBILITY

President Roosevelt's announcement that 1,000 European refugees will be granted temporary shelter in this country will be welcomed by all who have given any thought to the plight of those great numbers of people who have been uprooted by the war and put to flight by the Nazis. Life has dealt harshly with these men, women, and children, and they need the support of every nation that can serve as a haven for them. Heretofore the United States has limited its assistance to diplomatic efforts to establish homes for them in other lands; now, on the strength of the President's decision, we shall share directly in the task of caring for them. An unused military camp in upstate New York will be opened for the purpose. There, subject to essential security restrictions, the thousand will live for the duration, our regular immigration procedure being suspended to permit their entry, with the understanding that they will be returned to their native countries when peace is restored. In view of the dimensions of the problem, the number seems surprisingly small and perhaps we shall find it desirable, later on, to open our doors to many more—a gesture contemplated by a congressional proposal to set up several "free ports" to accommodate additional thousands. In any event, no one with the least humanitarian impulse will question the fitness of Mr. Roosevelt's action; it is simply a step in recognition of the moral responsibility which every nation in a position to help bears toward the oppressed and stricken of the world.

South Dakota Man Leads B–29 Raid on Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, while the news of the great B–29 bombing raid on the Japanese mainland thrilled all America, South Dakotans received a special lift from this epochal military venture due to the fact that a South Dakota man, Gen. LaVern G. (Blondey) Saunders, was the commanding flight officer of the raid. South Dakotans have long appreciated the fighting qualities of General Saunders and it is gratifying now to find his name linked with that of Jimmy Doolittle as the two Americans to lead the two air raids which have produced the most headlines of this war.

Under leave granted me by the House, Mr. Speaker, I am including with these remarks at this point a news story by Capt. Lowell M. Limpus, appearing in the Washington Times-Herald for June 18, 1944. I believe people in the Congress and the country will be interested in learning more about the man from South Dakota who commanded the B–29 raid on Japan and thereby attained a turning point in the history of this war since Secretary of War Stimson assures us that this is the beginning of a series of raids which we all hope will sufficiently soften up Japan to pave the way for early victory:

BLONDEY SAUNDERS, COMMANDER OF B–29 RAID, FIRST TOOK TO AIR AGAINST JAPS AT PEARL HARBOR—FLYER OFTEN CITED FOR WAR HEROISM—CHAFED AT DESK JOB IN WASHINGTON

(By Capt. Lowell M. Limpus)

"Mister, I've only got one request to make of this man's Army. I wanna go back with Colonel Saunders—and go wherever he goes. He'll probably take me to Japan."

The speaker was a tough little sergeant from Brooklyn who had been wounded while serving with Saunders off Guadalcanal; the place, the Air Force rest area at Miami Beach; the time, a few months ago.

SERGEANT GETS WISH

And the sergeant got his wish. Two days ago General Saunders took him to Japan aboard one of the new B–29 Superfortresses. The incident is typical of the whole thrilling expedition, because that's the way the battle-tested commander of the raid always seems to affect the men under him.

They know "Blondey" Saunders is a hero—a hero in the real sense of that oft-used word—although he'd scalp any man who called him that. They know it by virtue of the ribbons on his breast, because they know how he won the rare decorations for which they stand. And, more than that, they know he's a square-shooting leader who has repeatedly risked his own life for the men he leads.

Hap Arnold knew what he was doing when he picked the stocky, slow-speaking Saunders, with the thinning raven locks, to lead the first big, all-revealing blow at Japan, and to utilize the new weapons for the first time on a large scale. He, too, knew "Blondey's" record and the kind of job he would do.

WORLD GETS ANSWER

And today the world knows the kind of job he did do.

But it doesn't begin to realize the effort that went into getting ready for it, as "Blondey" helped his chief, the equally soft-spoken "K. B." Wolfe to polish off the expedition. They made a great combination; "Blondey," the battle-tried tactician, and "K. B.," the master technician, straight from the Wright Field laboratories.

Neither of those men was apt to strike until he was ready—and "Blondey" knew they were ready before they left the United States. He told a veteran comrade so, during his last trip to Washington.

"Our team is all uniformed and they've learned their signals," he said, quietly. "They'll hit the line hard, when the whistle blows."

WAS ALL-AMERICAN TACKLE

There spoke the old football coach, and "Blondey" was that, too. He helped coach West Point teams that were almost as great as the one on which he played, back in the late twenties, when he won his rating as an All-American tackle.

And that was the beginning of "Blondey's" career. He was given that nickname by his roommate, "Light Horse Harry" Wilson, the great running back, who operated behind the line that "Blondey" helped hold and won All-American honors, too. Now "Light Horse Harry" is a flying colonel and "Blondey" is a brigadier general. But Harry first called him "Blondey" because his hair was so black. There was more of it then.

The pair graduated in 1928, and Blondey transferred from the Infantry to the Air Corps 17 months later. He soon became a bomber expert and December 7, 1941, found him a major at Hickam Field, near Pearl Harbor. That day he first tasted combat—and for many hours, Major Saunders was 50 percent of the air power that Uncle Sam had in the air. He went looking for the Jap fleet alone that afternoon but he didn't find it, which was probably fortunate for him, as well as his country.

MEDAL 6 MONTHS LATER

He started winning medals 6 months later—and he won some good ones. Today he wears the D. S. M., the D. F. C., and the Silver Star, as well as the hard-to-get Navy Cross (which is rather rare for an Army flier), not to mention the Purple Heart "for wounds received in the Solomons area."

There's a separate story behind each of them—and a thrilling one, too, but it would take a book to tell them all. And they have to be dug out of dry official records, because Blondey won't talk about them—even to old friends.

Most of them concern the tense days in the Southwest Pacific, when we were fighting for our lives, and Colonel Saunders (as the sergeant still calls him) led a considerable portion of the bombers upon which so much depended. The D. S. M. citation tells how he carried a double load as base commander, while he planned and led the raids that inflicted such "great damage," knocked out 60 Jap planes, damaged 33 others, sent an aircraft carrier limping off in a sinking condition (they think she went down), and plastered 20 different other vessels.

STRENGTH SAVED COMRADES

There was the time the bomber he was riding was knocked out by fighters and the colonel snatched the controls from the dying pilot—the co-pilot was already hit—and

nursed the big cripple down, amid a hail of lead, to land off a Jap-held beach. He used his great strength then, to drag the wounded members of his crew ashore, passed out weapons and dug in to fight to the end.

And he was still leading them when the unexpected rescue came. "Brilliant leadership * * * courageous devotion to duty * * * grave danger"; that's the way they summarized that performance when they gave him the Navy Cross.

Space is lacking to describe the others, but the citations read like adventure stories—"landing on Guadalcanal * * * in the face of enemy attack * * * bombing from the air and heavy shelling from warships at sea." Inspecting the ruined runway amid flying lead—clearing away the debris (that's how he won the D. F. C.), "courageously pressed his attack * * * in spite of anti-aircraft and fighter fire (that's Lunga Point in the Solomons and the Silver Star)—and so it goes.

THEN SENT TO DESK JOB

No wonder the wounded sergeant wanted to go back instead of taking the rest to which he was entitled. (How he got back is another story, not yet to be told.)

After all that, they sent him back to a desk job in Washington, to be a deputy chief of the air staff, and pass on his knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I also include with these remarks a news story from the Aberdeen American News of Aberdeen, S. Dak., which tells something of the early record of "Blondey" Saunders. Born on a South Dakota farm, near Stratford, S. Dak., this man has the background of a typical American boy and his success story in his chosen field of specialization follows the pattern which America has made the envy of the civilized world and which can function only in a free republic such as we have in the United States.

MRS. SAUNDERS KNEW BLONDEY'D BE THERE

Informed that her husband, Brig. Gen. LaVerne G. (Blondey) Saunders was the ranking officer on the B-29 bombing of the Japanese homeland, Mrs. Saunders said here today:

"He would be * * * I knew when I read about the raid that if Blondey was anywhere around he'd be in on it."

The epoch-making assault was wholly in character for the black-haired, beetle-browed general who is known as a "flyer's flyer."

In the early stages of the aerial campaign for the Solomon Islands, Saunders, then a colonel, flew on several missions with his "boys." One time, his B-17 was set upon by Japanese Zeros, the pilot killed and the copilot mortally wounded. Saunders took over the controls, landed the flaming craft on the water and helped other crew members to safety on a nearby island, from where they were rescued. Saunders suffered a gash on the forehead and still carries a scar.

The broad-shouldered general, former football star at the University of South Dakota and at West Point, where he had later served as line coach, spent a year in the Solomons building up the aerial might which later was to help roll the Japanese back toward their homeland. Out of dense jungle on an undisclosed island, Saunders and his men hacked an airbase to accommodate the B-17's which helped smother the Japs on Guadalcanal and others of the Solomons.

Saunders must have felt a deep sense of satisfaction as he flew on the mission to attack Japan. He was at Pearl Harbor when the Japanese struck December 7, 1941, destroying much of the Pacific fleet. One of the few American flyers to get into the air at Pearl Harbor, Saunders succeeded in taking off in a B-17.

The general, a former Stratford, S. Dak., farm boy, holds a long list of decorations. One of them is the Navy Cross, seldom awarded men outside the naval service.

Saunders' wife and two sons reside in Aberdeen.

Washington, Iowa, in the Nation's War Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three newspaper articles with regard to Washington, Iowa:

NEW YORK WRITER SEES WASHINGTON AS TYPICAL MIDWEST TOWN DOING ITS FULL PART IN ALL WAR EFFORTS

(EDITOR'S NOTE—Recently Jack Steele, a writer for the New York Herald Tribune, visited Washington and wrote two articles for his paper, stating his view that this town really knows there is a war going on and is fighting to preserve the home front. The first of the stories is reprinted herewith, and the other will be published tomorrow.)

WASHINGTON, IOWA, May 27.—This is the side of the war you don't read much about—the home front that the men are fighting to come home to.

This is Washington, Iowa, population 5,227 in 1940, seat of Washington County, shopping center for 15,000 corn and hog farmers in southeastern Iowa, prototype of thousands of towns, some a little larger, some a little smaller, which millions of American youths in camp and overseas are thinking and dreaming about.

Washington, Iowa—a grassy square in the center of town shaded by maple trees and scattered with iron benches for loafing and talking. Around the square a quadrangle of two-story red and yellow brick store buildings, McDaniel drug store, Chocolate Shop, North Side Cafe, the Washington State Bank, Klein's (men's wear), J. C. Penney's (dry goods). Beyond a crisscross of wide, tree-lined streets flanked by neat, white frame houses.

NO BIG WAR PLANTS

No humming war plants, no signs of the hustle and bustle of war now so familiar in New York, Chicago, and Washington, no men in uniform on the streets (except for an occasional soldier or sailor home for a brief furlough), no crowded bars or cocktail lounges, no trouble getting a room at the Washington Hotel, a steak dinner advertised for 65 cents.

You stand beside the fountain in the square and survey Washington on a bright May morning with the air tingling with cleanness after an all-night rain, and you wonder.

Is there really a war going on? Has Washington, Iowa, heard about it?

FEW DRAFT-AGE MEN

Then you begin to notice the people walking by. All the men are middle-aged or older, or high-school boys or younger. You stay two days in Washington without seeing more than a dozen men you would be willing to bet are of draft age.

McDaniel's Drug Store window gives the answer you already know. It is jammed with pictures of young men in uniform, so many that they overlap and hide many of the faces.

Here is a corner of America stripped of its young manpower. All that are left are a handful of IV-F's (Iowans are a healthy breed) and a few deferred to work essential farms (they don't come to town very much, at least during spring planting).

KNOW WAR'S ON

Still pondering, you start out to see more of the town. The first stop is James Shoe Shop to have some Iowa mud removed from your shoes. A young women comes out as you enter. The cobbler tells you (you didn't ask) that her husband died a few weeks ago in a bomber.

Does Washington, Iowa, know there is a war going on?

Your next call is on Ralph E. Shannon, editor of the Washington Journal and president of the Iowa Daily Press Association. A picture of a handsome boy, wearing wings and captain's bars, hangs on the wall behind his desk.

You don't mention it at first, but gossip about the Iowa floods, politics, and the newspaper business. Then Mr. Shannon sees your eyes drift toward the picture.

"We lost one of our boys you know." A soft voice with just a tinge of pride mellowing the infinite sorrow.

AFTER 25 MISSIONS

Capt. Robert H. Shannon was one of the first American flyers to complete 25 missions over Europe. He was on his way home, piloting a plane taking Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews, American commander in the European area, to Iceland for an inspection tour. A crash against a hillside in the fog. Then a telegram: "The Secretary of War desires that I assure you of his deep sympathy." * * *

Does Washington, Iowa, know there is a war going on? You might not think so at first glance, but I stayed 2 days, and I think it does.

Literally everyone in Washington, Iowa, knew Shanny Shannon. His death brought the war closer to them than full-page lists of casualties, the sight of thousands of men in uniform every day on the streets and scores of minor war irritations bring the war home to most city dwellers. One casualty in Washington is a loss to the whole town.

FARMERS DO PART

Yes, Washington, Iowa, knows about the war and is doing the only things it knows how to support it. Farmers are working from dawn to dark and later. Women and youngsters of ten are driving tractors. War bond drives are going over the top. There is the blood bank and the Red Cross.

But most of all, Washington, Iowa, is trying to stay just as it was before the fighting men went away, to keep intact the kind of life that it knows from the letters they write home is the big thing they are fighting for. No one in Washington quite says that or is doing it wholly consciously, but you sense it everywhere.

Washington is "sweating out the war," praying that the men in uniform will finish it off soon and come back to find the same homes they left. Shanny Shannon was a flyer, and he would understand that.

INTERVIEWS EICHER

Another of Washington's men, Capt. Roger Eicher, came home from the Anzio beachhead the other day on a furlough after, as he expressed it, "2 years and 5 days on the other side."

He lounged in the living room of his family's home today, with a pair of his father's old overalls pulled over his uniform, and told what it is like to come back.

"I found just about everything in Washington just as when I left," he said, "except that none of the fellows I grew up with are around. Some of the people have a few

more gray hairs, but they seem just the same as I remembered them.

"It's not quite what I expected, though. We heard a lot about the home front, about rationing and things like that; and I guess I thought things would be changed more than they are.

SAYS PEOPLE "GRAND"

"Everybody kids a lot on the other side about the 'IV-F boys.' They mean all those under 45 who are not in it. When I first hit the States again, I found myself wondering every time I saw somebody in civilian clothes why he was not in uniform.

"I think I've seen most everyone in Washington since I got back, and they've been pretty grand. I only met one of the fellows I knew in school. That was down in one of the stores Saturday night. I found out he's fighting a little war of his own on a big farm, working day and night.

"Some of the ideas I had over in Africa and Italy have changed since I came home, and I imagine the others will have about the same experience when they get back."

FINDS FARMERS IN COUNTY IRKED BY MANIPULATIONS OF HOG PRICES; SAYS THEY'LL VOTE AGAINST NEW DEAL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Here is the second of two articles on Washington, Iowa, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, written by Jack Steele, who spent a few days here to find out for eastern readers how a typical Midwest community is carrying on its share of the war—as described in the first article reprinted in the Journal yesterday—and the attitude of the farmers to political and economic problems.)

WASHINGTON, IOWA.—Here is what might be called the case history of a "bungle."

Republican politicians in Iowa and other Corn Belt States are supremely confident that farmers will vote overwhelmingly against the present national administration in November, regardless of the Republicans' nominee or what he says.

A few days passed in talking things over with the farmers of the corn-and-hog country surrounding this Iowa town indicate that such confidence is well founded. Good words for Washington, D. C., and the New Deal are as scarce as proverbial hen's teeth around Washington, Iowa.

Washington County farmers are more prosperous today than ever before, but they are also hopping mad about the administration's varied and detailed activities in attempting to regulate and manage the Nation's wartime agriculture. Politicians refer to a good share of these farm regulations as "bungling." Some of the things farmers call them can't be published in a family newspaper.

DRIVE TO PRODUCE MORE

Washington County is among the 10 leading hog-producing counties of Iowa, so this case history of what its farmers consider a typical "bungle" naturally concerns hogs.

For more than 2 years the Federal Government has been using every means at its command, financial as well as patriotic, to urge farmers to raise more pigs. As a result, Washington County, like most of the Corn Belt, became knee deep in fat porkers.

The administration also imposed certain wartime regulations on the livestock and meat industry, regulations through which it sought to replace the so-called natural laws that normally govern priced production. It set ceiling prices on hogs to protect consumers and floor or support prices, since it had promised farmers a high return to encourage more production.

Last fall the huge hog crop the administration had asked for began to come to market. The support price ($13.75 a hundred pounds at Chicago) soon became the top price for hogs, and the higher ceiling price lost all meaning.

PRICE REMAINS SAME

This support price remains the same throughout the year. Normally hog prices fluctuate over a range of about $2.50, dropping during the peak winter marketing and rising at other seasons. This encouraged farmers to spread their marketing over a longer period.

As a result of elimination of this normal price spread and the huge hog crop, stockyards have been glutted with hogs since fall. In the first 4 months of this year, packing houses slaughtered near 29,000,000 head, twice the average of the previous 5 years and 10,000,000 more than last year, and still could not handle all that farmers were ready to sell.

Steps were taken to keep farmers from sending more hogs to market than could be handled. Embargoes were placed upon shipments. Stockyards refused to accept them. Packers set up quotas on how many hogs they would accept.

MUST REGISTER HOGS

A small stockyard in Washington forces farmers to register when they want to sell hogs and then wait until notified to deliver them. It now has more than 25,000 hogs on its books, hogs which are ready for market but can't be sold. A farmer with hogs ready for market today can't get rid of them for 4 to 6 weeks.

And here comes the rub, or, as the farmer says, the "bungle."

The War Food Administration made the support price applicable only to hogs weighing between 180 and 270 pounds. The top limit was set to discourage feeding of scarce corn to hogs after they become too heavy to convert the grain into meat most efficiently.

But the glut of the hog market and the restrictions on sales now are forcing farmers to hold many of their hogs on the farm and continue feeding them corn until they weigh more than 270 pounds. The price packers pay for these overweight hogs now averages nearly $2 a hundred pounds less than the support price, so the farmer loses about $5 a hog.

HEAVIER PIGS SOLD FIRST

He may succeed in shipping his hogs to Chicago or some other central market before they reach the 270-pound limit. But the packers, who know a good thing when they see it, buy the heavier and cheaper hogs first.

The support-weight hogs are held over for several days before they are bought. They shrink several pounds a day in the stockyards. The farmer must pay for their feed and care. He still loses several dollars an animal.

The Washington county farmer is not going to strike. He will still have a good income. But the indications are he will do two things—vote against the administration in November and raise less hogs next year.

Washington, D. C., may have ready explanations for the muddled hog situation, but to Washington, Iowa, it is still a "bungle"—one of the scores that farmers have piled up against the administration in 2½ years of wartime regulation of agriculture.

LITTLE WASHINGTONS

(An editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Star)

In Washington, D. C., everybody knows there is a tremendous global conflict going on. But what about the little Washingtons, distributed all over the 48 States? Do their people understand? Jack Steele, of the New York Herald Tribune, "sampled" Washington in Iowa to get the answer to that question.

And the answer is better than some persons would expect. The Iowa Washington represents what the men at the front are fighting to come home to. Mr. Steele tells how it looks: "A grassy square, shaded by maple trees and scattered with iron benches for loafing and talking. Around the square a quadrangle of two-story red- and yellow-brick store buildings. Beyond, a crisscross of wide, tree-lined streets flanked by neat, white frame houses. No humming war plants, no sign of the hustle and bustle of war."

Instead of excitement, there is the purposeful quiet of waiting—and working. All the men in Washington, Iowa, are "middle-aged or older or high-school boys or younger." McDaniel's drug-store window is "jammed" with photographs of soldiers, sailors, and marines, so many that they overlap. Mr. Steele declares: "Here is a corner of America stripped of its young manpower." The folk who remain are laboring from dawn to dusk. "Youngsters of 10 are driving tractors."

Meanwhile, the prayer in the hearts of the residents of Iowa's Washington is that "the men in uniform will finish it off soon and come back to find the same homes they left." Mr. Steele discovered no anxiety for change among the citizens with whom he talked. "Most of all," he reports, "Washington, Iowa, is trying to stay just as it was before the fighting men went away, to keep intact the kind of life that it knows from letters they write home is the big thing they are fighting for. No one quite says that or is doing it wholly consciously, but you sense it everywhere.

Capt. Robert H. Shannon, who crashed with Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews and Bishop Adna Wright Leonard in Iceland, May 3, 1943, was the son of Ralph E. Shannon, editor of the Washington (Iowa) Journal. He is remembered as one of the first American flyers to complete 25 missions over Europe. When he died the entire community mourned—and was proud.

The Postal Guide indicates that there are 41 little Washingtons from Maine to California and from Michigan to Louisiana. Iowa's Washington is central to them all, and probably symptomatic of them, likewise.

America on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful address delivered by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] before the American Trucking Association, in convention at San Francisco, Calif., on June 7, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Americans are perhaps the most transportation-conscious people in the world. There are many reasons, of course, both environmental and historic, to explain this. The expansion, development, and growth of this Nation is, without a doubt, the great miracle of the nineteenth century. Behind this miracle is another miracle—the miracle of American transportation.

Our struggle to settle and develop this continent has been in many ways a struggle with time. The theory that space and time are relative is a conception which we Americans

appreciated, and translated into action, a long time ago. Our history shows that we have had intuitive understanding of this theory, an understanding we did not express in words but in swift achievement—visionary, urgent, and creative.

The stagecoach, the pony express, the covered wagon, the first woodburners, the horsecars, the express trains, the automobile and bus, the air transports—in our history these are more than simple evolutionary steps in the development of transportation. They pass too swiftly, overlap in a process too urgent and meaningful. They are the telescoped symbols of a dynamic urge that allowed us in the course of a short century and a half to achieve the growth, the vision, and the power to shift the center of the world.

Historically, the part that we of the new world are playing in this war and the part we are clearly destined to play in the future of the nations of the world, when peace comes, overshadows, I feel, almost everything else. Behind this momentous evolution in world affairs we find once against the miracle of American transportation. We have outmatched our enemies and startled the world with our industrial capacity and our technological genius. But we were able to make both felt, able to make both decisive, because, in keeping with our tradition, we revealed our native vision, energy, and will to bridge the ocean with our ships and conquer space with our planes.

If getting there is the problem, it can be said truthfully that that problem we Americans can always lick.

The first big step in the history of American transportation was the cutting of roads through the early wilderness; roads over which commerce moved by on horseback, by wagon, and by coach to fuse a series of backwoods outposts into an economic whole. Then came the canals, the canals that outflanked the Alleghenies and brought the irresistible westward tide into the fertile plains of the Mississippi. The Pennsylvania, the Chesapeake and Ohio, the Ohio and Erie, the Wabash and Erie Canals, connected the Atlantic coast with the waters of the Ohio, the Wabash, the Illinois, and the Mississippi Rivers, as well as with the Great Lakes, which became in their turn the probing fingers of our national destiny.

Railroads were the next big step, finally spanning the continent. When the last spike was driven on the first transcontinental railroad, a tie was forged between the rocky coast of the Atlantic and the sunny shores of the Pacific, which was the first firm assurance of the permanent continental breadth of this Nation. There still remained many important gaps in our national unity, from a transportation standpoint; gaps which expansion of rail transportation did not fill, and which continued to exist until the advent of the automobile, and the growth of truck and bus transportation, provided the incentive for a new and greater expansion of our highway network. Finally came the most revolutionary vehicle of all—the airplane—using the great sea of the air as man has used the seas of the earth, and carving air highways where the construction of surface roads would be difficult, if not impossible.

All of these—the waterways, the railroads, the truck and bus, the transport plane—form our present transportation system. Each has played a vital part, each has a still more vital part to play. Our waterways already are taking on new importance as a means of cheap and strategic long-distance transportation. Our railroads face a new era of expanded usefulness in the post-war world. New horizons for highway transportation—the truck and the bus—already are in sight, to be reached and passed in the years immediately after the war. And the possibilities of air transportation have scarcely been touched.

Transportation, binding different areas together, making the resources of the one available to the industries of another, bringing the products of industry to every city, town, and hamlet, and to every farmhouse, has made commerce a dynamic force for integration of our national consciousness. Transportation weaves the close ties that are the foundation of cultural and national unification. Transportation has given us—one of the most diversified and scattered peoples on the face of the earth—both a continental economy and a continental unity.

Let us look at the question from another angle. It is estimated that we spend about $20,000,000,000 annually on transportation. Transportation accounts, it is said, for about one-fifth of our national investments. In peacetime the Federal Government expends about a billion dollars a year for transportation. Clearly, there is every reason why we should be the world's most transportation-conscious people.

There is another, and an even more important fact, about our transportation system. As a whole it is what in many ways can justly be called a people's system. I do not mean to say that those who have managed our transportation systems have always been responsive to all the needs and wishes of the people, or to the fullest needs of commerce and industry in general. What I do mean is this, that where such responsiveness was lacking, deserved economic punishment, inevitable under free competition, sooner or later followed. I mean also that the people, for the greater part, had choices; had choices and had recourse to remedies.

If the waterways failed us, we had the railroads. If one railroad failed us, we often had another. Should the railroads have failed us altogether in any instance, we had busses and trucks. I cannot say that we have been pampered. But so far we have almost always had the means to make our wishes felt. Business on the whole has enjoyed relative freedom to get the services it needed and desired, if not from one source, then from another. We have been relatively free to move the centers of our economic activity, and there was always a medium of transportation to serve us.

Let us bear this fact in mind. It is the most important fact of all as we face our future. The future holds great promise for us. I know that I have many sound reasons for saying that in particular it holds great promise for the Western States. It holds the promise for us here in the West, and for this great Nation as a whole, of further development, further expansion, and perhaps startling new growth.

Now, growth means movement. Not merely movement of goods. Not merely movement of people from city to city. It means movement to new sites, to new opportunities, to new lands, to new future cities. Today, and let us not forget this, we are still free to move. We can move and we can be certain that our purchasing power—so long as we have free competition—will bring to our door the necessary services. That's real democracy. We know that if one form of transportation is not available to us, another will be. If the old established companies in any line of transportation should fail or refuse to provide us with adequate service, we can easily organize new companies. The field is free. Our movements will not be impeded.

Of course we want coordination of transportation, if the coordination we desire is feasible and economically realizable. We want the greatest possible coordination and economy. We are a business people. Coordination and economy are essential to our existence, our prosperity. But I think that we—the American people—want this coordination simply as coordination, not as arbitrary unity of control. We want it in a way which will allow us to deal with each transportation unit individually. We want it in a way which will keep our whole transportation framework flexible. When we say we want coordination, we mean coordination, and not monopoly.

It is against this background that I want to discuss the proposition being urged upon the people and the Government of this Nation today. It is the proposition that we should "integrate" our different transportation facilities into a single and centralized national transportation system. This proposition places before us a grave danger. The danger is all the more grave because it is part and parcel of the trends to centralization that threaten us from all sides. "Integrate" is but another word for "centralize."

The formula offered for the centralization of our transportation system calls for "integration with competition." Competitive integration is a phrase that could have been taken right out of the book of an internationalist cartelist. It is a phrase full of a contemporary flavor. Don't expect me to explain how a system can be integrated and competitive at the same time, how the four branches of transportation—water, highway, rail, and air—can be resolved into a single integrated service and yet have each compete with the others as to service, schedules, and rates.

Let us not be misled by the nonsensical terminology, however, into understanding the danger we face from this plan, the new panacea. In recent years we have seen the spectacle of more than one Nation being shackled with empty phrases. Words like "integration" have a special appeal to certain minds; particularly those minds that would father things so big that they become dangerous, and which, being dangerous, carry within themselves the seeds of a plausible justification for their being taken over by the Government.

State socialism is both an ideal and a fool's reward. There are two roads to it, as our contemporary history proves. There is the road of the moon-eyed idealist and his fellow travelers, and there is the road of the short-sighted fool.

Let us examine the pattern of this proposed integration.

Obviously the integration which is advocated is not and cannot be an arrangement between equal partners. Throw all branches of transportation into a single unit, and one of those branches is bound to take control. Investment, entrenchment, power and magnitude, would automatically become dominating factors. Competition would be almost wholly eliminated, and all of the transportation services but one would be made subservient to the interests of the one.

Let us ask ourselves this question: Can we believe that one branch of transportation service, relieved of competition in its own sphere, and placed in a position of such dominance, would use its tremendous influence impartially to allow the other branches of transportation their fullest development.

I want to pay tribute here to the service the railroads of this country have rendered to the Nation during the great war emergency. I also want to recognize the pledge made by the railroads, in their wartime advertising and publicity, that they mean to offer the people of this country a greatly improved and more progressive service after the war. I am not lacking in genuine appreciation of either the magnitude and merit of the job the railroads have done or of their good faith in making pledges for post-war improvement. I have for the railroads of this country the utmost good will. However, the bearing of good will does not require that we shut our eyes to the clear prewar record of the American railroads. I am glad that the railroads themselves recognize the need for improving on that record. When we raise the question whether any one of our

transportation services, given practically unlimited power, can be trusted with the responsibility of an integrated transportation system, the record of what has happened in the past must be considered.

During my service in the Senate I have learned a few practical things in regard to management both in Government and business. For one thing, I know it is best to avoid a Government set-up or a business set-up, so arranged, that the agencies in charge, if they are to perform their expected duties, must act contrary to human nature.

It would be contrary to human nature for the executives of the dominant transportation agency, under the proposed integration, not to make the other transportation agencies subservient to their own. We cannot risk this experiment. I say we cannot risk it, for once we will have achieved this integration, and built up the physical and managerial structure of our transportation system around this integration, then to combat the inevitable evils that would result we would have only one final recourse—nationalization. We certainly don't want that.

I want to make it clear that I do not object to the plan merely because it is inspired by one agency or another. I have attempted to examine the plan first of all on its merits. It is a bad plan because it would place our whole transportation system at the mercy of some one dominant transportation agency, without offering us any evidence that such agency would use its power at all times in a manner satisfactory to our interests.

I wish to make this point without prejudice to any transportation agency. I cannot commend them for their lack of foresight in pressing a scheme, which, if it succeeded, would bring our transportation system to the final step before nationalization. However, impulse is human, perhaps all to human. They have their interests to serve. Other interests also must be served, the national interest foremost of all. To balance all interests, achieve a matching of powers on a fair and equitable basis, is the secret of democracy, the key to freedom. The effort to do so is a struggle, eternal and relentless.

Admittedly, our transportation system today is in may ways disjointed, inefficient, and even wasteful. It has many shortcomings. But the remedy is not to be found in the proposed plan for integration. We are not dealing here with a problem requiring mathematical perfection, to be solved in a social and economic vacuum. We are dealing here with a complex service, which must be treated in two distinct lights—service and always better service on the one hand, and on the other, responsiveness, the greatest possible responsiveness to the needs and desires of the people, business and industry. We cannot propose to solve one at the cost of the other.

I readily agree with a statement made by my colleague in the Senate, Senator TRUMAN, who said:

"I have little patience with those who concoct fancy and plausible schemes out of thin air, ignoring the lessons and experiences of the past, and who, because they are convinced that existing methods and systems are imperfect, conclude that any change, not matter how ill-founded or ill-conceived, would be an improvement."

This plan to integrate our transportation system belongs in the category of those schemes properly condemned by Senator TRUMAN. It offers the strong attraction, to some, of being foreign to our system and to our traditions. The word "integration" is a glamour word. But the glamour is superficial and misleading.

What do we want of our transportation agencies? Above all, we want responsiveness. We want maximum, intelligent, and progressive responsiveness to democratic economic demand. Ours is not a planned economy. Our economy is unmatched, unrivalled, because it is responsive to the talent, the genius, the will, the dreams, the hopes, the ambition—yes; even the avarice—of every free citizen. Our transportation system must be equally responsive and resilient. We want the transportation system to take us and our goods where we want to go and where we want our goods to be taken. We don't want our transportation system to become a series of petrified and vested ruts, denying our will and our hopes and stunting our national growth. We don't want a centralized and planned system. We want a free system, responsive to economic demand. Such a system can be maintained only under conditions of free competition. Such a system—the system demanded by our vital interests—is the antithesis of the integrated system proposed.

We are facing new horizons. A new industrial revolution is taking place before our eyes. Already the magnitude of this revolution has dwarfed the old industrial revolution of the steam engine and the simple mass-production machines. Industrial chemistry is changing the whole base of our raw materials sources or our processes and technique.

Areas that are wildernesses today, waterways that are merely bare expanses may tomorrow become the seats of mighty new industries, the sites of new cities, and the lanes of fabulous new traffic.

The sunshine of our Nation's tomorrow will find our every town, our every city, a sea coast community—its land the fruitful earth, its sea the regions of the air.

By our country's genius, Tennyson's vision has been visualized:

"For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the vision of the world and all the wonder that would be,
Saw the heavens filled with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens filled with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue:
Far along the world-wide whisper of the scuthwind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging through the thunderstorm:
Till the war drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle flags were furl'd
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world."

In that federation, visualized by the poet, the United States of America may make itself strong and free to dominantly lead, so that slaughter and hate and the foolish enterprise of war shall not be recurring; so that the markets of the world may have opportunity to purchase and produce. Freedom of movement is the vital of our democracy. Constrict that by making it ever possible for one agency of transportation to dominate all others, and we will have put home a solar plexus to the American way of life.

No; we are not going through a period of industrial integration. To the contrary, we are facing a period of tremendous evolutionary change. Only by understanding this evolution, by anticipating its trends, by keeping abreast of the developments it foreshadows, can we hope to maintain our great place, politically and industrially, among the nations of the world.

In the great changes we face, the West, with its tremendous and barely touched resources, facing the Pacific, is going to play a great role. The West is the key to this Nation's prosperity and its future development. The needs of the West demand that our transportation system be kept resilient and competitive. We don't want integration. There is nothing to integrate. Why, we've just started to move.

Snake River Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam, as we affectionately call our Federal Government, has vast undeveloped resources, largely in Government ownership, locked up in the mountain fastnesses of western Montana, central Idaho, eastern Oregon, and Washington. Reaching into this immense undeveloped area from the Pacific Ocean we have the mighty Columbia and its main tributary, the Snake River, navigable in high water to the city of Lewiston, Idaho, located at the confluence of the Clearwater and the Snake Rivers. It is now proposed to open these vast resources by the construction of the necessary dams to provide year-round navigation.

There is inserted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues the presentation recently made in support of this plan to the Senate committee having this legislation under consideration:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1944.

RIVERS AND HARBORS OMNIBUS BILL

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., pursuant to adjournment on Wednesday, May 17, 1944, in room 224, Senate Office Building, Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Present: Senators OVERTON (chairman of the subcommittee), ROBERTSON, and CORDON.

Present also: Senators MILLIKIN and O'MAHONEY.

Senator OVERTON (chairman of the subcommittee). The subcommittee will be in order. We have with us this morning Representative COMPTON I. WHITE of Idaho.

SNAKE RIVER, OREG., WASH., AND IDAHO—
resumed

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Representative WHITE. My name is COMPTON I. WHITE. I represent the First District of Idaho.

The proposed dams on the Snake River will be in the State of Washington, but their construction will bring navigation to Idaho.

Senator OVERTON. Do you wish to address the committee on the Snake River project?

Representative WHITE. On the Snake River project, and particularly on the navigation dams between the confluence of the Snake River with the Columbia River and the confluence of the Snake River with the Clearwater River, at the Idaho boundary line, at Lewiston.

I might preface my remarks by stating that some of the places out there bear the names of the explorers Lewis and Clark. Away back in 1805 when Lewis and Clark were sent west by the National Government to explore the Northwest, particularly the Columbia River, they crossed the State of Idaho on what is now known as the Lolo Trail. There is a great deal of history attached to this route. They reached the Snake River at Lewiston, Idaho, and from there by navigation and by portage they went to the mouth of the Columbia. I think

the record discloses that in making their exploration trip back they named the main branches of the Great Columbia River for themselves—Clark Fork, from its confluence with the Columbia River up to its headwaters, and the south branch they named the Lewis River, which is now known as the Snake. Due to the fact of the governmental policy of accepting the names given by the local settlers, the river is now called the Snake.

If you will recall, Lewis and Clark were there in 1805, and gold was found in 1849, and it was in the early sixties that gold was found in Idaho. The south branch of the Snake River was so crooked that the people called it the Snake River, so that the name given to it by the explorers lost its identity. The only place that carries the name of Lewis at this time is the town of Lewiston; and just across the River in the State of Washington there is the beautiful town of Clarkston. So we have the twin cities at the confluence of the Columbia and the Clearwater Rivers; and that section is destined to be one of the great industrial centers of the West.

That is borne out by the investigation of the Army engineers who have made extensive investigations of the resources tributary to this area; and we have in central Idaho the greatest undeveloped resources in the United States, I might say. I say that advisedly.

In the files of the Department of the Interior, in the records of the United States Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, the Forest Service, and the Department of Agriculture are records of vast resources that are now inaccessible, that are locked up, due to the lack of transportation to markets.

What I have been doing in my 10 years here in representing that district of Idaho has been to try to induce the Government to adopt a constructive policy in an effort to open up these resources. Now we are in this war, and the Nation is in debt, and we will have to continue the expansion of our industry. So it seems to me that the utilization of these resources will be one of the best means that we can find to expand our industries and help solve our Government financial problems.

We can visualize the future and see that our Nation is going to be more dominant in the Orient, more influential in trade with the South Sea Islands and in opening Alaska, and here we have a great industrial section of the United States in the making, along the Snake and Columbia Rivers.

Coming to the matter immediately before the committee, the Columbia River, we find the Missouri combined with the Mississippi our greatest rivers—the Columbia being the second greatest river in the United States—drains and will give access to the greatest undeveloped section of the United States.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I interrupt you?

Representative WHITE. I shall be happy to have you do so. I would like to make this a conference rather than a speech.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I want to do a little boasting for Wyoming. I do not believe that the attention of the committee has been called to the fact that the three greatest river systems in the United States all receive waters which originate in the State of Wyoming. Within an area of a comparatively few square miles south of Yellowstone National Park there are found the source waters of the Columbia, the Colorado, and the Missouri.

Representative WHITE. In the light of the issues that have been raised here I would like to remind the Senator from Wyoming that in disposing of the waters of his State that flow south into the Colorado River a very fine and comprehensive plan has been worked out in entering into a compact with what is known as the upper-basin States and the lower-basin States for the disposition of that water. I knew this in handling the matter of legislation and rewriting the Boulder Dam bill and going into some detail dealing with the disposition and allocation of the waters of the Colorado River it developed that a very fine plan had been worked out, with the sanction or approval of Congress. In other words, these States got the authorization from Congress to enter into a compact, and a compact was entered into, and was brought back to the Congress for approval. There was no use to spend $140,000,000 to build Boulder Dam and provide for storage in Lake Mead if the people of the upper States could have diverted all the water of the Colorado River. So in this compact it was arranged that half the water of the Colorado River would be permitted to flow down and fill this reservoir. And there was a compensation for that, if you please. The bill carried a provision that $500,000 a year of the income from the sale of power and water would be put into a separate fund in the Treasury to finance the development of reclamation districts in the upper-basin States.

The lower-basin States, for the loss of taxes they would otherwise have received from the large development of Boulder Dam by private interest—I think the transmission lines alone cost $17,000,000, that carry the energy generated at Boulder Dam over the hills to the market place in southern California—get $150,000 a year in lieu of taxes.

I just point that out as a precedent in settling the allocation of the waters between the several States.

I would like to read into the record an amendment to this river and harbor bill that I supported in the House and which I want to suggest to the members of this subcommittee [reading]:

"In connection with dams and works herein or hereafter authorized, any use for the maintenance of a navigable channel of the waters of any stream or tributary thereof shall be subordinate to and shall not interfere with any use of such waters for domestic, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes heretofore or hereafter established under State law."

I think that is a constructive amendment. I think it would protect the whole situation. It is exactly in line with the provisions of the Idaho State Constitution which gives first preference to water for domestic use, then for irrigation, mining, and things of that kind, and lastly for power. I think that that provision of our State constitution can well be adhered to in the policies that are set up in dealing with the distribution of the waters of these rivers.

To my mind, some of the arguments that have been made seem to be rather childish with reverence to navigation. It seems to me that a little boy going out after a rain to play in the yard, and with a hoe draining little pools and puddles, would know that when you retard the flow of water and raise its outlet you can deepen the channel without drawing on more water. It seems to me that a single navigation dam that would retard the flow of water would automatically deepen the channel without making any drafts on irrigation up the stream. That is the position we take here.

Now, I want to call attention to the essence of the issues in this particular case with reference to these navigation dams proposed to be developed on the Snake River.

In the first place, referring to a relief map prepared by the Geological Commission of the State of Idaho, I will state to the committee that I tried to obtain a similar map of Oregon so that I might show you both sides of the Snake River, but, unfortunately, there is no relief map of that kind yet made by that State.

The Snake River rises in Wyoming, away over at the Yellowstone Park, and flows across the State of Idaho through a fertile plain. I believe they call the soil volcanic ash. There we have one of the most productive sections of the United States.

North of this lava plain or volcanic-ash country the State of Idaho is exceedingly rough; it is one of the roughest sections of the whole United States. It lies just west of the Continental Divide. I have been in that part of the State. Due to the ruggedness of the country it has been inaccessible to the construction of railroads.

The fact is, in traveling from north to south in Idaho we have to go by rail over 300 miles east to Butte, Mont., and go south to Idaho Falls or Pocatello to get access to southern Idaho, or go around by Pendleton, away over in Oregon. The country is so rugged in that area of Idaho that there is no chance of building a railroad through that section of the country.

We have at this very time, 330 miles from where the United States Highway 10 crosses northern Idaho down to where U S 30 crosses southern Idaho, a section where there is absolutely no highway across there except forest trails.

I just cite that so that you may know something of the ruggedness of that country.

There is a heavy snowfall in this area every year. I do not have the records here, but I know that the snowfall and the rainfall are very heavy. That supplies two great rivers, the Clearwater on the north and the Salmon on the south. There is no way in the world that any of that water in the State of Idaho, or anywhere else before its confluence with the Snake River, can be used in any way for irrigation. It can be used for power, but not for irrigation. The Army engineers tell us that there is enough water in the Clearwater River alone to supply the water to make the necessary depth for navigation in the Snake River at the confluence with the Columbia River.

I want to offer for the record a telegram dated March 17, 1944, from Col. Ralph Tudor, district engineer. [Reading:]

MARCH 17, 1944.

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Committee on Irrigation and
Reclamation, Washington, D. C.:

Reference is made to your request for further data on stream flow on lower Snake River. Records at Weiser for the period 1930–40, inclusive, show low flow to be approximately 6,600 cubic feet per second; 90 percent of time flow exceeds 8,500 cubic feet per second; and 75 percent of time it exceeds 10,000 cubic feet per second. At Riparia low flow is 11,000 cubic feet per second; 90 percent of time flow exceeds 15,200 cubic feet per second, and 75 percent of time it exceeds 18,300 cubic feet per second. Flow required to provide slack-water navigation when all dams are built will be less than 1,000 cubic feet per second. Either the Clearwater or Salmon Rivers provide at all times flow in excess of this minimum amount.

TUDOR,
District Engineer.

If we took every drop of the Snake River water where it leaves Idaho and enters into the Snake River Canyon between Idaho and the State of Oregon, if we did not make any allowance for a return flow from these irrigation districts, we would still have all the water we need for navigation below Lewiston to say nothing of the rivers that come in from an equally rugged section over in the State of Oregon.

The four rivers emptying into the Snake on the regon side and two big rivers, Salmon and Clearwater on the Idaho side will more than supply enough water to deepen the channel by the construction of the necessary dams on the Snake River.

Between Lewiston and the confluence of the Snake River with the Columbia River you

now have navigation as far as Lewiston; and this navigation, gentlemen, is not just an experiment. I have here actual photographs of the river transportation now in effect during the high-water period on the Snake River as far up as Lewiston. I have a picture here showing the loading of wheat. They have built elevators and have facilities for loading their wheat into boats right at Lewiston, Idaho.

I have brought with me some copies of the hearings before the House committee for you members of the committee.

Senator ROBERTSON. You might hand me a copy for Senator O'MAHONEY, if you please. He wishes me to express to you his regret that he had to leave to attend an important meeting of another committee of which he is a member.

Representative WHITE. If you will turn to the frontispiece opposite page 1 of the hearings you will find a picture of a steam barge of the Union Pacific Railroad that plies the Snake River up to Lewiston, passing, in this picture, under the Interstate Bridge between the towns of Lewiston and Clarkston at the confluence of the Snake and Clearwater Rivers.

There is a great amount of wheat that is moved downstream, and there has been regular service during the high-water period. In the low-water period they cannot navigate.

If you will turn to page 5 you will find a picture of the confluence of Clearwater and Snake Rivers at the town of Lewiston, and that picture shows the Interstate Bridge between the towns of Lewison and Clarkston.

When the Lewis and Clark Road is completed it will be one of the main arterial highways between Portland, Oreg, and Chicago, Ill.

Now turn to page 7, if you please. There you will find a picture of an elevator constructed with a loading chute to deliver grain to the barges. In the high-water period they haul petroleum up from tidewater at Portland, particularly to Umatilla. In high water they haul it as far as Lewiston and take a cargo of grain back.

On page 11 you will find a picture of a barge on the river at Lewiston, being shoved by a tug upstream. It is in the grain and petroleum traffic.

On page 17 you will find a picture of the famous Lewiston hill highway, one of the famous roads and one of the heaviest-traveled roads in the West. It is the main highway between US 95, between the North and South. It taps Spokane, Boise, Salt Lake, and Lewiston, and, when it reaches the top of the high plateau it traverses the famous Palouse country where they raise so much wheat, where the seat of our university is located, and the seat of the Washington State College. They are only 8 miles apart and about 30 miles from Lewiston. The road passes over the brow of the hill and descends 2,000 feet. The town of Lewiston is only 700 feet above sea level. It has a very mild climate and enjoys a very fine location downgrade from all the upper country where there are so many undeveloped resources to which I have referred.

The next illustration is at page 22. That is another view of a barge hauling freight into and out of the Lewiston country.

The next is at page 31, which is a magnificent picture of the city of Portland. It is too bad that we had to reduce the size of the picture. Portland is on the Columbia River at the confluence of the Columbia and the Willamette Rivers, one of our large industrial centers of the Northwest and destined to be a great commercial and industrial city. It is the port which we are trying to reach by the improvement of the Snake River for all-year-round navigation.

The back maps are maps showing the location of the power projects along the river, Grand Coulee and Bonneville. The projects at John Day and Umatilla are also indicated. That is an older map.

I think I have demonstrated to the committee that there is sufficient water tributary to the Snake River above Lewiston to supply any navigation needs without in any way interfering with the reclamation on the river upstream; and I might say to you that the canyon on the Snake River is one of the deepest canyons on the continent. It is deeper than the Grand Canyon of the Colorado. That is an established fact.

I would like to say a word now to the members of the committee about the resources that will be tapped by the development of the Snake River for year-round navigation.

As I stated previously, the records over in the Department of the Interior prepared by the United States Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, have disclosed that we have in central Idaho, eastern Oregon, and western Montana, tributary to this country, one of the greatest undeveloped mineral sections of the United States, if it is not the greatest.

Just to illustrate: This little town of Stibnite [indicating on map] is in a mining district where they are hauling ore out from the mines 80 miles over three mountain ranges to reach the railhead at Cascade. Before the war started there was a little operation there, only one small mill. After the Bureau of Mines went in there and made explorations, other mineral deposits were opened up. Stibnite is the name of an ore that contains antimony and zinc; with this they have opened large deposits of tungsten. They are now taking out $1,000,000,000 a month, out of that section, hauling it by truck 80 miles. That is exclusive of the lead and silver mines, the cobalt mines, and gold mines in other sections of central Idaho. That country is one of the greatest undeveloped mining sections of the United States.

There is another thing that I would like to point out to you gentlemen. We are now preparing to open up the Columbia Basin, involving 1,200,000 acres of proven rich agricultural land. We have built the Grand Coulee Dam and the water is now available to irrigate all this section [indicating on map]. That country has got to be built up. There will be cities and towns and farms and all the things that go to build up that country. We have a cement plant now in production, and one of the greatest white pine mills in the world at Lewiston. This operation is utilizing the vast timber stands in central Idaho. When these dams are in, the navigation division of the river will be complete.

Senator OVERTON. When you say "these dams" what do you mean?

Representative WHITE. I am talking about the five proposed Snake River dams on the Snake River. Some objection has been raised to their being included in this bill, on the proposition that they will make a demand on water upstream that is needed for irrigation. The point that I want to bring out is the fact that that objection is unfounded.

Senator OVERTON. I just wanted to make it clear for the record.

Representative WHITE. Just think what a simple matter it would be to build up this great Columbia Basin area with materials available, and mostly in Government ownership, in central Idaho by floating them down the Snake River to Pasco and different landings along the Columbia River, moving them to the points where they are to be used. We now have navigation below there. This is not an experiment.

I would like to bring to the attention of the committee the fact that this is the second greatest river in the United States. It drains one of the greatest sections of Government-owned resources in the United States. Great stands of white-pine timber owned by the Federal Government are located in this area. Every foot of white-pine timber and the bulk of the timber owned in the Northwest is tributory and dependent, if you please, in large measure on the improvement of this river for navigation. This, gentlemen, will complement and carry out the original plan of building the Panama Canal. The Panama Canal was constructed to give access to the western part of this country; and the minute that the Panama Canal was constructed, big lumber companies from the Eastern States came into the West and put up big mills; I might say, immediately after the Panama Canal construction was started. They are now moving timber that is accessible from these Pacific ports around through the canal to the eastern markets.

This improvement of the Columbia and Snake Rivers will simply complement and carry forward the plan that was started when we built the Panama Canal. It will give navigation access to the bulk of the timber owned by the Federal Government. I would like to get that fact before the committee.

I recall at one time, in making a trip over my district, that a prospector came to me and said he was from Sweden, that he had been working in the iron mines of Sweden and had also been with the survey parties of United States Steel Corporation in Minnesota and in Michigan, and that he found better iron in Idaho than they had in Minnesota and Michigan. There is iron in central Idaho. Geologists were sent out to investigate. I have on my desk an application from a cement plant. They say they have found better iron there than they are obtaining in Utah and that as soon as it is opened up they will contract to the extent of 1,500 tons a year. This is to be used in the manufacturing of cement. In addition, there will be great demands for this iron ore from various sources for use in the manufacturing of iron and steel products of all kinds.

We cannot open this country up if we do not make a start; and this improvement of the Columbia River and the Snake River to Lewiston is the main start.

I hope that this bill will be reported out by the Senate with the amendment I have submitted as it was by the House and that these dams will be authorized. It is not an appropriation. It is a fine start to build the empire of the Northwest, to give access to a great industrial section in the northwest part of our country which is tributary to the Columbia River and by navigation to every section of the United States.

I thank you for your kind attention.

Senator ROBERTSON. This project recognizes the prior rights of domestic use and irrigation throughout the Snake River?

Representative WHITE. Yes. There is no interference in any way, in the authorization of these dams, with the use of water upstream, because there is an abundance of water. I have tried to impress the committee that if we take every drop necessary for irrigation upstream there would still be enough coming in from rivers below Weiser, Idaho.

One of the big problems, after you irrigate land, is to get the water off the land which requires a big investment in drainage. If you pass along over these irrigation districts you will see large canals with high mounds of dirt piled along, and generally those are drainage canals where they have had to go to big expense to get the water back off the land. The water has to be delivered back somewhere; it has got to be gotten off the land. If they did not take the water away again, once it was put there by the streams flowing through all these big canals surging

down on the land, you would have a lot of lakes. So that the item of irrigation water return flow is a big item, and calls for an investment to get water back off the land by the construction of drainage canals once it is put on there. If you did not get it off the land would sour and you would make no crops. So that return flow means a lot in irrigation, and the return flow on the Snake River means a tremendous amount of water. Every drop that you put out, except that which disappears by evaporation, comes back, and there is plenty of water in the Snake River down where it makes the boundary line, between Oregon and Idaho and that is as far as the irrigation section extends. From there on it flows into the deepest canyon on the continent; and there is no possibility of using any water for irrigation until you get far below these dams. There you can use the water and divert it out on the land again with an abundance of water for all irrigable land below the dams downstream.

So I cannot see that there is any interference at all with irrigation; and I speak advisedly. I am speaking to you now as the chairman of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Senator ROBERTSON. I think you are right, Congressman. I just wanted to make it clear for the record that if at any time, for reasons that we cannot see now, there should be a shortage of water in the Snake River, the domestic and irrigation uses would have a prior right.

Representative WHITE. If the amendment that I propose is adopted, I think it will improve the situation. It failed to carry in the House, but I am again offering it to the Senate. Let us follow the provisions of our State constitution and give preference to domestic use first, irrigation next, industry and navigation next, and power last.

I am going to take the time of the committee, if you will bear with me, to read a resolution and my answer thereto, for the record. There is a good deal of agitation, and the people do not understand the situation.

I am in receipt of this resolution from one of the irrigation districts, located in the district which I have the honor to represent, where the farming section is mostly irrigated lands. I am here to look out for them and protect their interest as a Member of Congress with the responsibility of representing my district and also as chairman of the irrigation district for reclamation. With me reclamation comes first.

This resolution reads as follows [reading]:

"RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY PIONEER IRRIGATION DISTRICT MAY 2, 1944

"Whereas this district consists of approximately 35,000 acres of agricultural lands, 25,000 of which, as well as many other thousands of acres of land in Idaho which are now being irrigated, are badly in need of supplemental water; and

"Whereas there are approximately 6,000,000 acre-feet of water annually wasted down Snake River and out of Idaho which will eventually be used to reclaim and bring under cultivation many thousands of acres of new land, as well as provide additional supplemental water for the lands already in cultivation; and

"Whereas H. R. 3961 (which is an omnibus river and harbor bill) authorizes the construction of dams numbered 1, 4, 7, and 10 and open-channel improvement for purposes of navigation and irrigation on Snake River, and Umatilla Dam on Columbia River for navigation, power development, and irrigation purposes, in each case in accordance with House Document No. 705, Seventy-fifth Congress, with such modification as the Secretary of War may find advisable after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and such other other agencies as may be concerned; and

"Whereas many legal and engineering authorities on water law have studied the contents and purposes of H. R. 3931, and have expressed the opinion that the bill as now proposed will give a prior right to the downstream interests for navigation and power to the waters of Snake River and its tributaries and shut off the possibility of utilizing the waters of Snake River and its tributaries for the development of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas said bill also contains a clause giving the Secretary of War such broad authority as might seriously affect the interests of southern Idaho, the wording of such clause being, 'with such modification as the Secretary of War may find advisable': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, by Pioneer irrigation district that we do urge that said H. R. 3931 be so amended as to provide that the use of water for domestic, irrigation, mining, and industrial purposes shall not be adversely affected thereby, and that said bill be further amended so as to adequately protect and guarantee forever the right to the necessary use of the streams flowing through Idaho, and especially Snake River and its tributaries, for the above purposes within the State of Idaho; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge that the clause authorizing the Secretary of War 'to make modifications as he may deem advisable' be so amended as not to jeopardize the right to the use of the waters in Idaho above referred to; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Secretary of War, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, the Idaho congressional delegation and the Governor of the state of Idaho."

I answered that as follows [reading]:

MAY 15, 1944.

Mr. J. O. BAUM,
President, Pioneer Irrigation District,
Caldwell, Idaho.

DEAR MR. BAUM: The support and assistance of the members of the Pioneer irrigation district of the efforts of the Members of the Idaho congressional delegation to have inserted in the rivers and harbors bill an amendment to safeguard and protect the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries for irrigation as expressed in the resolution that accompanied your letter of May 8 is greatly appreciated, and will be of great assistance in presenting the matter to the Members of the Senate when the bill comes up for consideration. The amendment to the bill that we have prepared, and will submit to the Senate committee in charge of this legislation, is exactly in line with the provisions of the Idaho State Constitution—establishing priorities for the beneficial use of waters in the State of Idaho. The amendment to be offered follows:

"In connection with dams or works herein or hereafter authorized, any use for the maintenance of a navigable channel of the waters of any stream or tributary thereof shall be subordinate to and shall not interfere with any use of such waters for domestic, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes heretofore or hereafter established under State law."

In safeguarding the waters of Idaho streams for irrigation and development of new irrigation districts, we must not neglect the development of our State's vast resources of raw materials dependent on improving our main river—the Snake—below Lewiston to provide cheap transportation by navigation to tidewater which can be done without taking a drop of water out of the Snake River that can be used above Lewiston for irrigation. It is unthinkable that the waters of the Salmon and the Clearwater Rivers in Idaho, and the Malheur, the Imnaha, the John Day, and the Grande Ronde Rivers on the Oregon side draining a precipitous mountain section in Oregon and Idaho on either side of the Snake River should be permitted forever to run away unused to the sea; and Idaho resources should remain inaccessible and unused, and Idaho industries remain undeveloped by our failure to improve this river for navigation in order to gratify the selfish few who would profit to Idaho's everlasting disadvantage.

Central Idaho, with its Snake, Salmon, and Clearwater River Basins with all its vast resources of mineral, timber, and water power is the making of a second Pittsburgh industrial district.

We must not let those interested in competing transportation systems mislead us on the false proposition that deepening the Snake River from Lewiston to the Columbia by the construction of dams to retard river's flow and provide river navigation would interfere with irrigation upstream in Idaho

This fact is clearly presented in the enclosed copy of telegram from the district Army engineer, Ralph A. Tudor:

"PORTLAND, OREG.

"Representative COMPTON I. WHITE, M. C.,
"House of Representatives, Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, Washington, D. C.:

"Reference is made to your request for further data on stream flow on lower Snake River. Records at Weiser for the period of 1930 to 1940, inclusive, show low flow to be approximately 6,600 cubic feet per second; 90 percent of time flow exceeds 8,500 cubic feet per second; and 75 percent of time it exceeds 10,000 cubic feet per second. At Riparia low flow is 11,000 cubic feet per second; 90 percent of time flow exceeds 15,200 cubic feet per second; and 75 percent of time it exceeds 18,300 cubic feet per second. Flow required to provide slack-water navigation when all dams are built will be less than 1,000 cubic feet per second. Either the Clearwater or Salmon Rivers provide at all times flow in excess of this minimum amount."

We must not forget that the Army engineers have constructed and are successfully operating the great hydroelectric and navigation project at Bonneville. What they have done at Bonneville can be done in constructing and operating the navigation dams on the Snake River below Lewiston without in any way interfering with the use of Snake River waters upstream for irrigation.

Let me assure you, as your Representative, that I propose to support legislation that will fully protect the use of the waters of Idaho streams for irrigation and reclamation.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE, M. C.

I would like to say to the committee, further, that the Army engineers have a long, successful record for improving the Mississippi River. One of the first things that was done by the Government to improve navigation on the Mississippi, as I recall when a boy, was that because of the shifting currents changing the channels they had to have a special pilot between New Orleans and the Gulf, and the Army engineers built the Eads Jetty, a long revetment that narrowed the channel and made navigation up to New Orleans easy. From then on when all these problems arose over the country the Army engineers have been the forefront of the Government in handling the problems.

When the Bonneville Dam was to be built it was entrusted to the Army engineers. One of the first things they had to do was to provide for navigation. They built a lock there; and I never heard a word raised against it when they were talking about building a lock in there. I never heard it said when it had to be so deep and the depth of water was specified that it was going to be a draft on the waters upstream and that it could not be built because it might interfere with irrigation. I never heard a word about that.

There was a great barrier on the Columbia River—The Dalles, a place where the Indians went to catch salmon that leaped over the

falls. They are catching them there yet, by treaty right. The Government had to build a canal to get navigation around The Dalles. I never heard that that canal was a draft on the water up the stream and that we might not be able to irrigate some day because they had to have a canal to bring traffic around The Dalles.

I do not see why, with all the water we have in the Columbia River coming in from the States of Oregon and Idaho, we should stop progress and stop the development of the United States and leave these vast resources of timber owned by Uncle Sam, if you please, while we are appropriating thousands of dollars every year to support and administer—that we must leave all these resources locked up; that we must leave this material in the hills that will make railroad ties for the rest of the world; leave the lodgepole pine standing on every hillside for miles and miles. We could treat those poles and make railroad ties, pulp, plastic, and so forth.

Some day the Northwest is going to be one of the greatest industrial sections in the United States.

I thank the committee.

Senator MILLIKIN. I was very much interested in your statement about the priority that irrigation and domestic consumptive use should have, and I am in hearty approval of it. I think I should bring to your attention the fact that the record shows that the Army has testified that if we construct these initial dams, while they are in existence it will require 15,000 second-feet of water during the navigation season, and not until the full project is completed will it be reduced down to 1,000 second-feet.

Representative WHITE. You refer to these dams. I still insist, if there is going to be a shortage of water to carry the navigation or a shortage of water to irrigate—and they are both problematical—irrigation should take preference.

These folks are taking a long-range look when they are raising the issue here, because they are talking about some future plan to use water. As a matter of fact, the Bureau of Reclamation has a very comprehensive program for the utilization of the water, to irrigate new lands, not of the Snake River but the tributaries. We have three great rivers coming into the Snake River in the vicinity of the city of Boise. We have the Boise River, the Payette River, and the Weiser. The waters of each one of those rivers are being utilized. The fact is that the principal source of supply for irrigation in the Boise Valley is out of the Boise River. We have Arrow Rock Dam, and we are now building the Anderson Ranch Dam.

Now permit me to digress just a moment with reference to the latter dam. That is a project that has been proposed for a long time for supplemental water. We have changed our system of cropping in the irrigation districts of Idaho. When we first built these projects it was in order to have water in the early growing season. We never thought much about water in the later seasons. But when the sugar factories came in and we got into the growing of sugar beets, and the creameries came in and we produced milk and butter, we found that late irrigation was almost as essential and important as early irrigation to raise the ordinary crops, because the alfalfa in the summer is taken off and the land has to be used in the fall for pasture, and it has to have water on it or pasture will dry up. The sugar beet just has to have water at the time that sugar forms. If it does not get water at the right time, you will have a short sugar crop. So there has been a great deal of agitation for supplemental water; and they mean just what they are talking about—they mean more water at a later period of the year. These districts use up their storage along about the middle of August to September and October, and frost does not come until pretty late out there, and they are short of water. We had two or three sites to provide storage of supplemental water. There is one place called Garden Valley on the Payette River. We had a place on the Boise River called Twin Springs. We overcame a lot of difficulty and got the President to O. K. the budget and got a million dollars to start at Twin Springs, and the Bureau even took off $100,000 of our appropriation for some laboratory tests. I never could understand how they spent that amount of money just for laboratory tests, but they did it; so our appropriation was reduced that much.

But the Army engineers came in under a new arrangement. It was not done by law but by some kind of a voluntary cooperative arrangement between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation engineers, and they looked the whole situation over and said, "Gentlemen, we have found a better site." Instead of Twin Springs that had been surveyed and even laboratory-tested by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army engineers came in and showed them a better way. They went to another site and bought another place, which is called Anderson Ranch. We have that project about half done.

The credit for finding more capacity and a better place goes to the Army engineers, even when we are dealing with the Bureau of Reclamation. So the Army engineers have not been, in Idaho, as I see it, an obstruction to our progress. They have helped us.

Senator MILLIKIN. I think that in fairness I should bring to your attention the fact that they have said that during the navigation season they would take 15,000 second-feet and it has been indicated that that would seriously injure irrigation.

Representative WHITE. Now, would it? Would it take water from present projects or water from potential projects? That is the first thing we should settle. We will soon be getting supplemental water from Anderson Ranch. The main contention is that by building these Snake River dams we will make a draft or establish a priority on water that might be used for future development.

We do have a tremendous irrigation project at Mountain Home. The Bureau of Reclamation have made very comprehensive surveys. I never heard very much about bringing the water out of the Snake River. Their plan is to redistribute the water from these three tributary rivers. In the first place, they will divert as much water from the Weiser River as they can spare. They will use that water and release water from the Payette River and divert that water to the Boise River Basin. That plan is already being undertaken at the Cascade project now, to put the Payette water through the divide and get a 250-foot fall going over to Boise, and then they will release the Boise water and bring some water from the head of the Salmon River and Red Fish Lake through the divide to irrigate this tremendously big plain between Boise and Mountain Home. But that does not say anything about lifting water and pumping it up out of the Snake River.

One of the Senators from my State spoke of diverting all the water of the Snake River for irrigation now running down to the sea without being put to use. Every time I cross the Snake River and see all the water that is running away to the sea, I think that our Senator has a long way to go yet before he stops this water from running away to the sea and putting it on the land. It is a grand proposition; but there will always be enough return flow and enough water out of these tributaries, and there will be enough water to give Idaho products transportation out to the seacoast and out to the world you know most of this material owned by Uncle Sam.

Senator MILLIKIN. I offer for the record, Mr. Chairman, a letter dated April 8, 1944, from General Robins to Senator THOMAS, which confirms the facts which I have just stated to Congressman WHITE.

Senator OVERTON. That will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, April 8, 1944.

Hon. JOHN THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letter dated March 24, 1944, concerning the item contained in H. R. 3961 now under consideration by the Senate providing for authorization of construction of four dams and open channel improvement in the Snake River in accordance with the plans submitted in House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session. You point out that the district engineer at Portland, Oreg., recently informed Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE, Representative in Congress, that a flow of only 1,000 cubic feet per second will be required to provide slack-water navigation after all the dams are built, and you ask that you be advised as to the number of cubic feet of water per second that will be required for navigation purposes between Lewiston and the mouth of the Snake River after dams Nos. 1, 4, 7, and 10 only have been constructed, together with the open channel improvements as proposed in the bill.

Under the coordinated plan presented in House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, for improvement of the stretch of the Snake River between the mouth and Lewiston to provide a controlling depth of 6 feet by means of a series of four locks and dams supplemented by open channel work, indications are from studies made at that time (p. 38, par. 86) that a flow of 15,000 cubic feet per second would generally be required during the navigation season. During extreme low flow (10,600 cubic feet per second) a depth of 5 feet would be available. As pointed out in the district engineer's telegram to Congressman WHITE, the flow of the Snake River at Riparia, Wash. (approximately midway between the mouth and Lewiston) exceeds 15,200 cubic feet per second about 90 percent of the time. The proposed 4 locks and dams contemplated in House Document 704 would be so located as to improve the river sections that cannot be adequately improved by open-river methods, and they are but the first step toward the ultimate development of slack-water navigation throughout this reach of the Snake River, as presented in that document, which would require, either by a system of high dams or 10 low dams, a flow of less than 1,000 cubic feet per second for operation of the navigation project.

It is noted in your letter that the view is expressed that eventually all of the water of the Snake River and its tributaries will need to be diverted in southern Idaho to provide for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes. In this connection I feel confident that as the plan proposed for ultimate improvement of this river contemplates the slack-water system of navigation, which when completed will require a minimum of stream flow, the progressive development of this basin in the combined interests of navigation, irrigation, and related purposes can proceed under a well-planned and coordinated program without conflict and to the mutual benefit of all interests.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Major General,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

"MEMORANDA BY E. W. RISING

"It is very clearly shown in the above letter that there will be a conflict between navigation and the use of water for consumptive purposes in Snake River Basin above Lewiston, Idaho, for 10 percent of the time.

"During the low-water periods of August and September there will only be sufficient water to maintain a channel 5 feet in depth without drawing directly on upper-basin storage.

"An amendment to H. R. 3961, now under consideration by the Commerce Committee of the Senate, providing that consumptive uses of water for domestic, irrigation, power, and industrial purposes, shall not be affected adversely by demands of navigation is necessary, if additional diversions of water are to be made from the Snake River or its tributaries during the short-water months, for purposes of providing a supplemental water supply for lands now under irrigation or for lands under a new project."

Congressman WHITE. I asked the engineers if they could verify what the Tudor district engineer said in his telegram about the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers being enough. I would like to have that appear in the record at this point.

General ROBINS. I think the figures given to Congressman WHITE at Portland, Oreg., were put into the record.

Senator OVERTON. Would there be a lack of water for irrigation purposes?

General ROBINS. No, sir.

Senator MILLIKIN. Those figures indicate the difficulties which have just been referred to, General?

General ROBINS. No, sir.

Senator OVERTON. In other words, there is sufficient water, if these five dams are built on the Snake River, to take care of irrigation and navigation?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir.

Senator OVERTON. I think the mayor of Walla Walla confirms your statement, too, Mr. WHITE.

Representative WHITE. This information is from the district engineer at Portland, who has actual charge of the district, and he is the highest authority that we could get in that connection. It is such a big subject and so tremendously important to the whole Nation that I could not content myself without getting that information.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask General Robins, now, whether the comments that have just been made would influence or modify the conclusions of that letter, which I now hand to General Robins?

Representative WHITE. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bashore is here, and he and I have worked pretty close together. He is the Commissioner of Reclamation. I wonder if he would care to comment on what I said, and bear out my statement.

Senator OVERTON. Very well. We will be glad to have Mr. Bashore make a statement.

STATEMENT OF HARRY W. BASHORE, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Recalled

Mr. BASHORE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I believe that Congressman WHITE has stated the case for navigation and irrigation very well. It all resolves down to this issue, it seems to me, that we believe that irrigation should take precedence, should be respected, in the planning of these river channels and improvements, and if that protection is afforded, apparently everybody will be happy.

The plan proposed by the Engineer Corps is, in my opinion, defective only in that it does not include enough dams to provide slack-water navigation in the Snake. We all realize the tremendous importance of navigation in that Northwest region. Congressman WHITE has very eloquently and completely expressed the importance. It is certainly one system that it is very important to the country to have, and it is not difficult to maintain.

I do not believe that I can add anything in the way of clarification to Congressman WHITE's very complete statement.

Senator OVERTON. Do you agree with Congressman WHITE's statement, reinforced by the reports of the engineer and the statement of General Robins, and, according to my recollection this morning, the statement of the mayor of Walla Walla, that there will be sufficient water for both irrigation and navigation with these five dams constructed on the Snake River?

Mr. BASHORE. I believe that I could not go quite that far, Mr. Chairman. If the Congress stops with the five dams and does nothing further, there may come a time, there very probably will come a time, in the history of this country, when there will be a shortage of water for both uses; but if Congress goes ahead with the full plan which the Engineer Corps has in mind, then you will have slack-water navigation which will require only an inconsequential amount of water.

Senator OVERTON. But as the situation exists today, there is sufficient water for both purposes?

Mr. BASHORE. As it exists today, irrigation as presently developed has not had to make any releases for navigation.

Senator OVERTON. So there is sufficient water for both purposes?

Mr. BASHORE. As it exists today.

Senator OVERTON. When you consider the irrigation as it exists today, and the navigation contemplated by the construction of the five dams?

Mr. BASHORE. At least, sir, I can say this much, that the irrigation interests have not been handicapped in the construction of a navigation channel on the Snake and Columbia by being called upon to release water for the purpose of navigation.

Senator OVERTON. All right, sir.

Representative WHITE. Thank you.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman, may I now ask General Robins whether the contribution of the Clearwater River is reflected in the conclusions of this letter?

Major General ROBINS. Yes, sir; that letter tells about the stream flow in the river below.

Senator MILLIKIN. After making the contribution of the Clearwater?

Major General ROBINS. The flow that exists, below.

Senator OVERTON. I do not know that I can understand it—in fact, I have never seen the letter. Can you explain if there is any discrepancy between the letter and your present statement, and, if so, what it is.

Senator MILLIKIN. It is a short letter, suppose you read it.

Major General ROBINS. There are no discrepancies, Senator.

Senator OVERTON. Do you agree with that, now Senator MILLIKIN, that there is no discrepancy between the letter and General Robins' present statement?

Senator MILLIKIN. Yes. The general has cleared up in my mind the question that I wanted settled, whether the Clearwater was adding a contribution that took away the significance of this letter, or whether this letter reflects the contribution of the Clearwater; and the general has said that it reflects the contribution of the Clearwater.

Senator OVERTON. I see. All right.

Senator MILLIKIN. The net effect would be that it requires 15,000 second-feet of water during the navigation season, under the four-dam project, and it would only require 1,000, under the complete project.

Representative WHITE. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest a simple amendment, providing no call would ever be made upon irrigation storage upstream to release water for navigation downstream of these dams? Would such an amendment as that correct the situation?

Senator OVERTON. That would be a matter to be gone into.

Senator ROBERTSON. Would you also include the Missouri River project in that, Congressman, so you would get another supporter?

Representative WHITE. We have more water coming into the Snake than can possibly be used for irrigation anywhere else. We are in the clear on this question of taking water away from reclamation, because we have got water that cannot possibly be used for that, on both sides of the river.

Senator OVERTON. I asked Colonel Feringa to give me the cost of all of the dams in the ultimate plan on Snake River, and he has that information available.

STATEMENT OF COL. PETER A. FERINGA, RESIDENT MEMBER OF THE BOARD FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS

Colonel FERINGA. The total first cost of the 10 dams in the Snake is estimated at $58,625,000. That does not include power installation. The cost of the four dams, which are included in that total cost which I have just given, is $30,200,000. The whole project, including the four dams now in the bill, not including the electric-generating machinery, is $58,625,000. Those figures are from old records not in the printed record, because we only talked about the first step in the project document.

Senator CORDON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Colonel——

Senator OVERTON. One moment. Do the four dams include the power installations?

Colonel FERINGA. No, sir; those do not. I can give you the cost of installing power at three of those dams, which are the only ones we feel now should have power installed.

Senator OVERTON. Very well; suppose you do that.

Colonel FERINGA. The power installation at three of the dams, for which we have the figures, amounts to $19,000,000.

Senator CORDON. Is that three of the four dams?

Colonel FERINGA. Three of the four dams.

Senator MILLIKIN. That is for three of the four dams?

Colonel FERINGA. Three of the four dams.

Senator MILLIKEN. The final project contemplates 10 dams, does it not?

Colonel FERINGA. That is right

Prevention of Accidents in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of accident prevention in the United States delivered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] at the Film Safety Award Committee luncheon held in Washington, D. C., on June 8, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The eyes of every American are today on our armed forces in their crusade for liberation of Nazi-enslaved countries. Every eye is turned to the headlines for every fragment of invasion news. Every ear is alert

to the radio. The heart of every person is with our fighting forces. The prayers of every man, woman, and child on the home front are with the sons and daughters of Uncle Sam as they wage a war we hoped would never come.

Our war aims are clear cut. Every weapon known to military science is being used to hasten victory. Fighting fire with fire, we hope to end for all times mass murders, mass brutalities and tyranny. Everyone looks forward to the day of a liberated world. Our Commander in Chief has told us that the price we must pay will be heavy. He has candidly told the American people that the way will be long and hard.

But there is more to be done on the home front than to merely wait and hope. Production of the implements of war and supplies for our fighting forces must be stepped up. Every citizen can be proud of the way we are backing the attack. We have much to be thankful for but we must do more than give thanks.

In no other country on the face of the globe can a meeting such as this be held. It is living evidence that men and women with vision are concerned with wartime accidents. Yet, our record since Pearl Harbor is not a source of pride. We naturally expect battle losses and battle casualties. But we should not expect that the tools and supplies of war should be held up because of accidents due to carelessness.

But they are being held up due to just that. In 1943 for example, 480,000,000 man-days were lost to production throughout the United States because of accidents. We might have been much nearer Berlin and Tokyo and much nearer victory had these man-days not been lost.

In waging a war to liberate the world and make it free, we should also keep in mind that one vital part of freedom is safety.

Our Constitution pledges to every man "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Yet lives, many thousands of lives, are being snuffed out daily due to careless accidents. This tragic situation is a stain on our home front. It does not make for happiness.

What is the record? The War Production Board says that production must, from now on, be stepped up. It also says that the manpower situation is crucial. Yet, accidents last year represented a loss to the war effort of nearly 50,000 workers killed and 5,000,000 injured. The number of people injured approximates half the number of our armed forces at home and abroad. Surely, we cannot believe that our people are callous to the extent that they are not interested in this tragic problem.

Accidents have always been with us. Yet, the steady increase in the number is a sad thing to contemplate. Sometime ago the National Safety Council said that if the headlines screamed "the Nation's war-production machine to shut down 1 full week," it would shock the country. There has been no such headlines but there is a basis for the statement.

The growing shortage of productive manpower should be emphasized. In pre-war years it was generally considered that the only worker accidents which affected production were those that occurred on the job. Now, it is realized that production suffers almost as much from an off-the-job accident as from work accident—and that the two groups of workers' accidents form a large proportion of the national total of all accidents.

The occasion on which we are gathered here is to pay tribute and present a plaque to a motion-picture company—Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer—and Pete Smith for a very worthwhile contribution to the effort to halt accidents. This contribution took the form of a picture titled "The Seventh Column." The idea was inspired by the campaign to smash the seventh column—carelessness that causes accidents.

It reminds me that last November a colleague of mine in the Senate, JIM MEAD, of New York, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very inspiring speech on the subject of accidents by Maj. Gen. T. A. Terry. In speaking of the smash-the-seventh-column campaign, Senator MEAD said:

"This campaign is in every respect unique. It is the outgrowth of a desire of an insurance company to render wartime service. Bennett Moore, vice president and director of public relations of the Liberty Mutual Insurance, of Boston, conceived the idea of terming accidents the 'Seventh Column.' The smash-the-seventh column slogan won Nation-wide attention, so much so that it has been supported by the War Departmen and has become a rallying cry for the safety movement. It is perhaps one of the best known of all wartime slogans—a slogan of public service."

I heartily concur with the statement made by Senator MEAD.

At a time when production is vital to winning the war, we naturally think first of accidents in war plants. They should be our first concern. Let's suppose we were notifying our fighting men abroad of the death and injuries of relatives in the same way that people at home are notified of war casualties. If we were doing this I shudder to think of the effect it would have on service morale.

As I have said before, in building toward a free world we must also build toward a safe nation. One serious phase of the problem is, of course, traffic accidents. It would naturally be assumed that with a decrease in the number of motor vehicles, with a decline in the use of cars, with a shortage of gasoline and tires, that motor accidents would drop off sharply. Yet, such is not the case. For the first few months of 1944, traffic accidents are running fully 15 percent above what they were during the same period a year ago. Certainly, we must think of this situation in planning for the post-war period. Speed limits will be raised. Many millions of men who are driving tanks and planes at full speed in the fury of battle will again take the wheel of cars on the highway. Automobiles that are being worn out will be replaced by new vehicles. We will have plenty of gasoline and plenty of tires.

This would be good news if it were not for the fact that with these things will come a swelling tide of accidents. Unless we move, and move quickly, to arouse public appreciation of the danger, we will have conditions at home that may in every respect be worse that the conditions abroad. That is a bold statement; yet, it is one which we should contemplate.

There is today before the Congress legislation designed to bring about a rebuilding of our important national highways. I have every confidence that when this legislation finally takes shape it will meet the obligation of the Federal Government to assist the States in making roads better and safer.

Early this year the President sent to the Congress a message relating to highways. In that message our Chief Executive said:

"On April 14, 1931, I appointed a committee, known as the National Interregional Highway Committee, to investigate the need for a limited system of national highways to improve the facilities now available for interregional transportation, and to advise the Federal Works Administrator as to the desirable character of such improvement and the possibility of utilizing some of the manpower and industrial capacity expected to be available at the end of the war.

"The committee, with the aid of a staff provided by the Public Roads Administration, made careful and extended studies of this subject, and has submitted its final report which I transmit herewith and commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress. The report recommends the designation and improvement to high standards of a national system of rural and urban highways totaling approximately 34,000 miles and interconnecting the principal geographical regions of the country.

"The recommended system follows in general the routes of Federal highways, and when fully improved will meet to optimum degree the needs of interregional and intercity highway transportation. Its development will also establish a transcontinental network of the modern roads essential to the future economic welfare and defense of the Nation."

I mention highways, because I firmly believe that the only way that we can combat the most tragic phase of our accident situation is to have roads that will make accidents virtually impossible under reasonable driving conditions. Unfortunately, our people are not alert to the importance of modernized roads. I know of no finer service that this group and groups like it can render in planning for the years ahead, than to bring safer roads.

I have talked about accidents because efforts to halt accidents is the theme of this important luncheon. It is a subject that is rather new for me, yet one I have long been concerned with. And I can assure you that as majority leader of the United States Senate, every bit of legislation that has its purposes to give the country better roads, safer traffic conditions, safer working conditions, and a better life, will have my wholehearted support.

There has been presented at this luncheon, the plaque to M. G. M. as I have mentioned. The motion-picture industry has rendered noble wartime service on many fronts. It has helped to arouse a high degree of patriotism. It has provided entertainment for our men and women in camps and on the fighting fronts. It has sent its stars into the battle zones to lift morale. In brief, the motion picture industry has met the wartime challenge. I have confidence that in many happy peace days certain to come, that industry will continue to be alert to peacetime service. Certainly, there is no better way that it could be rendered than to help make America safe.

Problems of the Post-war World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on June 9, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who is chairman of the Special Committee on the Decentralization of Industry, spoke to a joint session of the California Legislature on problems of the post-war world. I ask unanimous consent that his address may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The day is drawing close when we in this country must take on the most formidable, the most complex, and the most fateful task in our whole history. The task I mean is the task of reconversion; the job—the greatest we will have ever tackled—of rebuilding the peace.

Despite its many facets, each formidable in itself, the task of reconversion is in reality a

single task. Its many parts are inextricably involved, the whole one and indivisible. The problems of maintaining employment can hardly be separated from the problem of foreign trade, nor can either or both be separated from our fundamental laws and traditions. The future of our system of free enterprise cannot be separated from the problem of international trade policy. The question of our prosperity and employment overlaps the question of a sound international monetary policy. The total national problem, on the other hand, is in reality a problem of regions, of States, of towns, farms, and villages. Should we fail to understand this, we would run the danger of involving ourselves in serious difficulties, perhaps very grave difficulties, from the start.

My duties in the Senate, in particular, my position as chairman of the Committee To Investigate the Effect of Centralization of Heavy Industry, have provided me with many opportunities to study the problem in detail. There are the international problems, trade and monetary, that were unsolved when the war broke—that were, in many ways, contributing causes to the conditions that brought the war about. There are the national problems that were still unsolved when the war involved us. There are all of these problems still unsolved and further aggravated by the war. There are the new problems created by the war. There are the still unrealized problems, which we must anticipate, that will arise as we tackle the job of rehabilitation. The trouble with running away from problems is that it is worse than futile. The problems not only catch up with you; they multiply and grow while they pursue you. They gang up on you, too.

We are approaching a critical point, not only in our own, but in the world's history. There can be no further running away.

Early in July 1943, in view of the many problems, both war and post-war, that were crowding upon us, I wrote letters to 55 Senators, suggesting that a Senate bloc be formed to foster new and expanded facilities for the production of iron and steel in areas outside the acknowledged steel centers. That's the way the centralization committee began. You have no idea how complex the matter has become since. I know whereof I speak when I say that you cannot separate our post-war problems in watertight compartments. Later in October 1943, some 30 Senators and from 50 to 75 Members of the House met in caucus to discuss a program of general industrial decentralization. At this meeting, steering committees of 7 Members from each House were set up. On December 21, the resolution was approved by the Senate, setting up the special Senate committee to investigate industrial centralization.

Shortly, as our work expanded, and we began to perceive more clearly the great complexities in the picture, we set up a special subcommittee to establish and maintain cooperation with State planning boards and other such State and local agencies, both official and unofficial.

I have sketched this brief history for you so that you will understand that my colleagues and I in the Senate have been prying into the problems of reconversion both deeply and broadly. We know the facts. We are familiar with the needs and the difficulties. We have pondered long over remedies. I can assure you that we mean to act, too; that we are very active already.

Speaking from my knowledge of the problems that lie ahead of us, it is my conviction that, far more than the war, the task of reconversion is going to put our democracy, our understanding of it and our faith in it, to the supreme test.

Dangerous pitfalls mark our path. One of these pitfalls against which we must guard is the pitfall of carrying over the war-mood into the problem of peace.

At the beginning of this war we had the impressive experience of discovering that a peace psychology, no matter how adequate to the tasks of peace, fell short, at times almost disastrously short, of the tasks demanded by and imposed by the business of war. Let us not forget this experience in reverse.

War, even among democratic peoples, is a totalitarian interlude. It is a necessity of limited duration, a hateful but necessary job that demands and justifies the suspension of individual planning, of many individual liberties, and raises maximum individual sacrifice rather than individual liberty and well being, to the heights of the greatest social ideal. War has the effect of creating the psychological mood essential for its success—the mood that has for its motive the suspension of all but the military considerations.

This necessary mood, this heroic but collectivist mood, is not the normal mood of this Nation. It is not the mood in which this Nation has achieved its strength, its greatness, and its wealth. We cannot regard it as more than a necessary interlude.

Yet, as you well know, there are those among us who are so enamored of this mood that they would attempt, and definitely mean to attempt, to carry it into the period of peace. Such a peace would be a military peace, a peace of barracks and totalitarian discipline. It would be a peace that would forever destroy the foundations of our democracy, of our constitutional government, of our vital liberties.

We must guard against this mood, which will tempt us strongly because the problems of reconversion, of reconstruction, will be so complex and so trying, and we must be on guard against the men who advocate that we turn to the building of the peace in this mood. These men would cost us the peace.

Because the problem is so complex, the temptation is very strong to pass the whole thing along to the Federal Government. It is a little late to speak merely of the temptation. This trend has already gained a dangerous head start. Should all our States, and all our cities, and all our towns lump their problems together and drop the whole thing in the lap of the Federal Government—incidentally in the very willing and receptive laps of our bureaucrats—the result will be a total problem of such magnitude and complexity that any attempt to cope with it must result in an administrative colossus which we will be unable to control by law. Moreover, the process of government will be made so complex that it will become impossible for the average citizen intelligently to participate in it. The process of government will be removed from the people and the process of administration from all possibility of regulation and control by law.

The trend to centralization, economic and industrial as well as political, constitutes today the greatest menace to democracy. The parallel trend to centralize the reconversion problem, if it is not checked, will provide the favorable conditions for the total and fatal subversion of our democratic form of government. I feel it is my solemn duty to warn you that should the reconversion problem be left overwhelmingly to the Federal Government, the result will be a Federal apparatus that will prove fatal to the position of the State governments and the whole question of States' rights.

This is one reason why I deplore a certain indulgence by many well-meaning Americans—an indulgence that has become too fashionable. I mean those Americans who come to Washington with their prayer rugs and prepared exhortations, as if Washington were not simply the seat of a democratic government but the sacred temple of an ancient oracle. They come to Washington, or turn toward it, and then with breast beatings and loud incantations, plead that the oracle offer some indication about the future of this, and the future of that, problem. Already, you see, even amidst the great democratic process of a national election, the people, in their increasing anxiety, look less to themselves and more and more to the exalted and unapproachable political Mount Olympus on the Potomac.

I deplore this trend because it is unworthy of a democratic people and because it is altogether too symptomatic of the threatening decadence of democracy in our midst. I deplore it again because it is so fatuous. Let me give you an inside tip. There is no oracle there.

True, gentlemen, the Federal Government's hand in the problem of reconversion, as a result of the sheer mechanics of centralization for one reason, as a result of bureaucratic willfulness for another—the Federal Government's hand is already heavy, very heavy, and endowed with revolutionary power. We would be blind to shut our eyes to this fact. The businessman and the farmer would be blind, indeed, if they, concerned about the future, did not show a proper appreciation of this power.

But there's every reason why this power should not be increased.

Let us stop our process of self-mystification. Let us turn to the task we face with a degree of common sense. Our task is to take an economy that has been radically expanded and altered by the uneconomic demands of an emergency situation and put it back on the tracks of sound economic law and the practices consistent with our system of free enterprise.

First of all, emergency measures will be required to carry us through the transitional period. Factories cannot stop producing tanks one day and start producing automobiles or toasters the next. It is as clear as day, facing these emergency measures, that the State governments have easier access to information as to what will be required. Have easier access to information; and can do the job with a simpler apparatus; can do it without necessitating a duplication of the state apparatus in Washington, which will have to be done if the whole problem is to be handled from Washington. Beyond the question of efficiency, there is the basic democratic question—the right of the States, of the people in each State, to determine for themselves what they wish to do, and how.

Much of the problem that each State will face is the result of a national policy dictated by national necessity. A degree of national responsibility cannot be evaded. This national responsibility speaks for a national policy that would equalize the economic burden of the emergency period. Coordination, where coordination is required, and equalization, as the conditions dictate, should be the maximum of Federal participation. I am not arguing against men, against individuals in Washington or elsewhere. I am arguing for efficiency, for simplicity, for democratic procedure.

Obviously, gentlemen, this battle cannot be fought effectively from Washington. My colleagues in the Senate and I have never hesitated to do all in our power to check the tread to centralization and to government by willful men instead of government by law. But ultimately the issue must be decided by the State governments. The problems cannot be evaded. Either you will solve them, thus avoiding the necessity for excessive centralization of power in a body that is furthest removed from the life of the people and from popular control, or the Federal Government will have to solve them. We can put the issue before you. We can call your attention to the dangers. We cannot do more than that. The problems must be solved. The debate is bound to become

a little academic if the problems remain unsolved while the State governments sleep.

I speak again from experience when I say that we in the Senate are not suffering from a shortage of plans. My point is not that we cannot do the planning. Alas, one well-meaning fool can devise more plans for the cure of all human ills and the solution of all our pressing problems than all the wise men since the beginning of time could successfully carry out, even if they were granted an eternity of time.

There are a lot of workable plans if you are willing to allow our Government the exalted role of shepherd and the American people the simple and cure-all status of a flock of sheep.

Again, let us take a common-sense view of one large aspect of the reconversion problem, an aspect that has tremendous long-range implications.

Three-fifths of the area of this country lying west of the Mississippi accounts for only one-fifth of the national population. This area accounts for at least half of the minerals mined in this country. It has by far the largest reserves of untapped mineral resources. It has enormous reserves of the strategic minerals of which we found ourselves short at the beginning of the war, and which are so vital to all the new processes. It possesses three-quarters of the potential water power of this country. Its timber and sea resources are fantastically large. Yet this area, this empire with its enormous wealth and potentialities, larger than India, as large as Europe excluding Russia, accounts for only one-fifth of our population, only one-fifth.

Everything argues for the intelligent development of this area, including reasons of national security. Our security in the Pacific demands a larger population in the Western States, demands more industry, more agriculture. The story of Soviet Russia's resistance might have been far different if Russia had made our mistake, had left Siberia undeveloped, had made Siberia economically and militarily dependent upon western and European Russia.

In addition to the question of our national security, the question of a better balanced and less centralized economy also demands the development of the West. A larger urban population in the West would open new prospects to the agricultural States of the Middle West, would prove a boon to eastern industries, too.

Finally no other single prospect has so much to offer for the solution to the total post-war economic problem.

The West offers new prospects and new opportunities to millions of people who have reached the zenith of their hopes and possibilities in the overcrowded and overdeveloped East. A pronounced westward movement of population would set the industries of the East humming by creating a maximum demand for durable goods, producers' goods, and consumers' goods. The over-all picture, excluding the West, would lead us to the conclusion that we have already overexpanded. But, on the other hand, think of what would happen should 10,000,000 new settlers be attracted to the West. Think of the demand for housing, power, transportation, household goods, electrical appliances. On the basis of studies and surveys made by the centralization committee, I venture to say that an intelligent policy of developing the West would open to this whole country a new era of prosperity and would go far to add much needed stability to our national economy.

Such a policy toward the West—a policy dictated by our national security and our national economy—would immediately create new opportunities for transforming savings and deposits into active and profit-making investments. It would open to millions of workers in the East, and to their families, new opportunities for a healthier life. The density of population in the Western States is roughly about 12 to the square mile. Compare this with 675 to the square mile in Rhode Island, which practically equals the density of the population of Java, the world's most densely populated country. Compare our 12 to the square mile with New Jersey's 553 and Connecticut's 550. New York State has a density of population of 281 against China's 104 to the square mile.

I am emphasizing the common-sense approach. Are we lacking in opportunity? We have a whole new empire to build. We can at once increase our wealth, provide prosperity, stimulate industry, create employment, and at the same time relieve some of the dreadful congestion of the East.

But, gentlemen, don't be optimistic. As soon as we pose this problem as a national problem and attempt to handle it from Washington, you have the opposition of the East. The East has never understood the West. You know that. It is not a theme that I have to develop at great length. All the energy of the East will be devoted to depriving you of the war industries you have acquired. I cite this to point out once again that centralization does not make for simplicity but confusion and contradiction. Centralization does not make for efficiency but only for selfish bungling. Lump all of our problemes into one and the very balance of power resulting from the now unbalanced distribution of population and wealth tends in the direction of accentuating all of the evils of excessive concentration of population and industry on the one hand and those of the arrested development of our vital and rich areas on the other. Centralize this problem and you place it within the hands of our vested interests.

The development of the West is a real opportunity. It is an opportunity that touches the imagination. New industries, new businesses, new enterprises, new opportunities for professional people, would provide a salutory blood-bank for our system of free enterprise. It would strengthen its popular base. It would be refreshed and invigorated with new blood and a new optimism. But to realize this opportunity the States themselves will have to go into action. The Western States must individually and collectively take over the task of preparing the ground, preparing the plan, and mobilizing for the job.

I have pointed cut that the State governments are the logical and the proper agencies to handle the emergency problems of reconversion. I want to point out as well that the long-range problems can be handled best and most directly by the State governments. The opportunities offered by the development of the West is one instance. There are opportunities in the South, too. The South is industrially underdeveloped for its population. The Southern States have a density of population of some 50 to the square mile, which is above the national average of 44 to the square mile. The Southern States do not need more people. They need more industries.

The Southern States need and are entitled to a fairer share of the national income. The Western and the Southern States are allies; we have a common cause, a national cause, the cause of a healthier and more equitable economy, the cause of the Nation's prosperity versus the cause of vested selfish interest. We are allies, but here again, to be intelligent and effective allies, the Southern States must develop their problem and present it in terms of their resources, their potentialities, while we must present our problem in terms of our own resources and potentialities. We can serve each other, serve a great common cause; but we can serve each other effectively and intelligently only if we avoid lumping our problems in a national stew, but, instead, work to help each other with each other's clear, specific, individual problems.

What I mean to say holds good for the whole Nation. You cannot lump together the problems of California, of Nevada, of Alabama, of New York, and Kentucky, and arrive at anything like a common problem. If you cannot have a common problem you cannot have a common solution. Where a common solution is impossible, the centralization of the whole complex of problems is unreasonable and impractical.

California and Nevada are neighbors. But you in California have already a sufficient density of population to make possible the development of mass-production industries. We in Nevada cannot approach our problems on that base. We have no such population. Your further development will help us. Nevertheless our problems are individual. We can work together, we must work together, but we cannot make our problem one. We may have common objectives but we have not got common instruments and common problems.

Now, gentlemen, nobody in the world is more competent than you to deal with the problems of the State of California. Nobody in the world is closer to the people of this great State or more familiar with their needs and their desires.

I do not hesitate to say the same for the government of every State of this Union. If these State governments have hesitated to take aggressive action it is because they have been so intimidated by the political processes of the past decade that they do not know where they stand.

I know the many objections. Yes; there is the problem of revenue. I say to you, stake your claim, get to work on the problem, make your intentions clear, and then fight for the means. Start the work, have something to show to back your argument, and you will find, I assure you, that you have more friends in Washington than you know.

I would like to strengthen my argument why the reconversion job should be taken over largely by the States, with the assistance of the local governments, by pointing out a few practical details.

In the work of the centralization committee, we discovered that we needed accurate information on the population shifts that have occurred since the war. You have no idea what a complicated and round-about job it is to get such information in Washington. The best that you can get is only an appropximation. You cannot very well estimate the needs and problems of regions and States if your estimates of the population, one way or the other, are off by a million or two, or perhaps even more.

It would be much simpler for the States—if they shared in the responsibility—to take the time off to get these very important figures and get them right. I'm stressing this simple problem because, while it may appear very simple in itself, it is an important ingredient in the whole solution. There are hundreds of such simple problems, each raising the same point in question.

To study the problem we must have accurate information on industries and resources and transportation and population, not merely in each State, but almost in each county, city, and town. And when we do get this information, through the maze of researchers and agencies, it is dead information. It lacks the vitality and the impulse of life, of interest. The vital force is lacking. We have the information, but not the living interest, the vitality, the vision that must be brought into the picture if our plans for the reconversion is to be responsive to living men and moving and progressive interests.

There are other and very important problems behind the reconversion problem that cannot be lumped together. There is the question of what is to be done about the practice of bleeding States of their resources without permitting the people of these States

the opportunity to add to their natural wealth by processing or manufacturing. This is one of the core problems as regards the future of many States in the West and the South.

It would take me days to exhaust the list of problems that have come up in the work of the centralization committee—problems that can be handled better, more directly, and with less trouble and cost by the State governments.

Gentlemen, let us call a halt to the rhetorical invocations to Washington to reveal its hand. This very pleasant but almost useless pastime has been carried so far that a man can almost make his political reputation by simply standing up and addressing a few commonplace questions to the Federal Government. This is nothing but a form of procrastination. I say to you, Take over, before you are taken over.

If the Washington branch of the new international bureaucracy is to handle the whole problem for the Nation, then, I assure you, it will wait, and very smartly so, until the confusion is so great, and the situation so critical, that there will be little opposition to whatever it chooses to do. They can wait. The question is, Can we?

I speak to you as one who is up to his ears in the problem. Vanity might tempt me to say to you, Leave it to me and my colleagues. You have nothing to worry about. All you have to do is work, sacrifice, fight, pay taxes. We'll take care of the rest. Truth, however, leads me to advise you to take over. Take over without delay.

Every town and every city should have its own plan. All of these plans should be coordinated, integrated as much as possible, by the State governments. Each State should have its own plan and should look to its own apparatus for the execution of the plan. Where economic interests overlap, regional committees should be set up by the States. Study your problems, decide what you want, organize yourself for the task, complete your regional organizations as quickly as possible, and be prepared to make your wishes recognized.

Some very important questions may remain unanswered for a time to come. Let us not be deterred or confused by questions which are made to appear important, even crucial, and which really are not. I mean such questions as the renegotiation of contracts.

There is not a single question before the people today in itself of sufficient importance to justify any delay by the governments of the States and the governments of the cities in setting themselves to the task of preparing the necessary plans and effecting the necessary organization so that the peace we shall build will be a peace, economically and politically, achieved with the full participation of the people.

Throughout the world democratic government has been weakened by an historic process which the democratic peoples have often, only too often failed to grasp. As the problems of government under the impact of social, industrial, and technological developments became more complex, instead of decentralizing so that the people could through direct participation keep abreast of the developments, the method that was adopted was one of centralization. This method more and more has tended to remove the problems of government from the people, and the people from all the essential conditions necessary to allow them the opportunity of intelligent choice. On the one hand, the people have been left with little more than their anxieties, adrift in a world of contradictory and uncertain trends and tides. Demagoguery became the main political instrument, exploiting the anxieties and the antagonisms that spring from uncertainty and confusion. On the other hand, the processes of the highly centralized governments have became more and more the property of an esoteric cult of power-lovers, parading under a mantle of altruism. This chasm between the people and the Government grows wider each day as the people find the processes of government more and more beyond their reach and beyond their grasp and as the demagoguery of the entrenched bureaucracy becomes more and more skillful and ruthless. This chasm must be bridged if democracy is to survive.

Only through the instrumentality of the State governments, through the assumption by the States of the responsibility for the tasks awaiting us can their chasm be bridged. Only so can we bring the people back into the councils of government, and bring the processes of government back within reach of the people.

If the post-war America we are to build is to be a democratic America, a people's America, we must at once rescue government from what it is rapidly becoming—a dark and mysterious magic that must be worked by saints, supermen, and indispensables. We must tear this mystery asunder. We must bring the people into the government and bring government to the people.

This can be done only through decentralization. This fateful historic task rests today with the State governments more than with any other body. The task of reconversion is your responsibility and your opportunity. The future of democracy is in your hands.

Prevention of Accidents in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD on the subject of the Prevention of Accidents in the United States, delivered by Col. John H. Stilwell, president of the National Safety Council, at the Films Safety Award Committee luncheon, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., June 8, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I regard this award luncheon as another milestone in our continuing effort to halt the swelling tide of careless accidents. Thus it goes without saying that I am honored to have a part in this unique ceremony. So much has been said on the subject of accidents that we are reaching the point of repetition. Yet with all that has been said and all that has been done, accident prevention continues to be our greatest home-front challenge.

We are faced today with a sad paradox. On far-flung battle fronts our men and women are giving their lives so that America can live in our traditional way. But here on the home front, at a time when the manpower situation is desperate, we are literally wasting precious life and valuable property due to carelessness.

I have often asked myself whether our people are really concerned with accidents; whether they accept them as the price we must pay for industrialization and faster transportation. Yet I cannot believe that this is true. Rather I like to think that perhaps we have not found the right way to bring about that public consciousness; that public opinion so necessary to the solution of a common problem.

It is for this reason that I say that this is a very significant occasion. I say it because here are gathered leaders in the motion picture world and leaders in the safety field. They have much in common. They are both concerned with public service. And visual education can help us do the job of accident prevention.

Our motion pictures have become more than mere entertainment. They play a vital role in arousing public interest and forming public opinion. The men and women in the industry are doing a remarkably fine job in helping to keep up morale. As a result, the industry is serving in this perilous wartime with great distinction.

And I have every confidence that when victory comes the motion-picture industry will turn from wartime service to new heights of peacetime service on the home front. When that glad day comes I am sure that our far-sighted leaders in the industry will lend their efforts to making peacetime America a safer America.

Anticipating that day, the National Safety Council and cooperating groups stand ready to give full cooperation in making the great mass of people aware that accidents can be prevented. Mr. Harris has told you that the National Safety Council is taking over the functions of the Film Safety Awards Committee. We accept this honor with full realization of the challenge it presents and the fine work that has already been done. I spoke earlier of the important role that movies can have in making our people alert to the accident problem. We have here today living proof of that statement.

About 2 years ago a great insurance company, in seeking ways to do a real wartime job, ways to back our armed forces and to serve our people, conceived the idea that accidents are truly the "seventh column." As a result, the effort to "Smash the seventh column—carelessness that causes accidents" has become symbolic of the whole safety movement. This slogan and its accompanying activities have literally breathed life into safety activities. The man who conceived this idea is one of our distinguished guests here today. I would like at this point to ask Bennett Moore, vice president of the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., to stand up.

It is customary for a speaker on the subject of safety to endeavor to startle an audience with statistics. I shall forego this custom. I do this because the movies, through the medium of a splendid picture, have shown us a better way to arouse attention than to count the dead and the injured. In other words, to point the way to accident prevention by stimulating public appreciation of how accidents can be prevented.

The Film Safety Awards Committee, working hand in hand with the movie industry, has been largely responsible for this development. Thus, the National Safety Council is in reality taking over an established and functioning activity. Originally the Motion Picture Traffic Safety Committee, the Awards Committee is largely another product of Liberty Mutual. The late David S. Beyer, director of the Traffic and Safety Bureau of Liberty Mutual, was extremely active in setting up this subject.

And the purpose of this luncheon today is to present the David S. Beyer award on behalf of the Film Safety Awards Committee to a movie company for an outstanding contribution to safety. Let me tell you the story briefly.

When the "Smash the Seventh Column" campaign was launched, it caught the public fancy as a wartime slogan. In fact, it attracted so much attention that a major

producing company, seeing another opportunity for public service, titled a short subject dealing with accidents "The Seventh Column." This short is head and shoulders above any previous visual treatment of the safety problem. As a result, the Film Safety Awards Committee, a few months ago, selected "The Seventh Column" as the outstanding safety picture of 1943. This gathering today is for the purpose of making the award. In addition to the main award for treatment of general safety, the committee voted honorable mention for sequences in feature films focusing attention on occupational safety. These pictures were M-G-M's "Swing Shift Maisie" and Columbia's "Good Luck, Mr. Yates."

Representing the industry here today is Charles Francis Coe, vice president, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, an associate of Will Hays, who has played a prominent role in increasing the scope of public service on the part of the movie industry. Mr. Coe will tell us something of how the industry desires to help.

But before we hear from Mr. Coe, I would like in behalf of the Film Safety Awards Committee and the National Safety Council, which will carry on the committee's work, to present to him this plaque. It is donated by Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. in memory of the late David S. Beyer. In presenting the Beyer award to Mr. Coe I ask him to deliver it to Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer and that master of short subjects, Pete Smith, with a message.

The message is that all concerned with accidents appreciate the contribution that has been made to a worthy cause. And with it goes the hope that the motion-picture industry will strengthen its ties with those of us in the safety field and go forward with us in making America a safe place as well as a happy place.

The O. P. A. Conference Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the O. P. A. and the discussions about the act convince me of two things. One is that the O. P. A.'ers can have done many things that appeared at variance with the printed word, but also with the spirit of the Price Control Act. The second conviction is that many injustices could be avoided if and when the O. P. A.'ers wished to avoid them.

The O. P. A. Act, Public Law 421, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 26, second session, provides the following:

Make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determined to be necessary to obtain the necessary maximum production thereof.

If the O. P. A. can subsidize a vegetable canner so that he obtains a fair price for his product, and after the W. F. A. has increased the producer price of corn from $9 to $17 per ton and up to $27 or $28 per ton in New England, I would like to know why in the name of common sense the O. P. A. and W. F. A. allow the packers to pay as little as two-thirds of parity for light hogs and still pay the packer a subsidy on the meat produced the same as is paid on the support-priced hogs?

The O. P. A. and W. F. A. have sufficient authority of law to give all producers a parity price if they wished to do so. In other words, the reason that a little-underweight hogs have been purchased by the packers at less than parity and some of the lighter ones purchased at as low as 50 percent of parity, and the reason that the O. P. A. pays a subsidy to these packers on the basis of support prices is right on the doorstep of the O. P. A. and W. F. A. Until they correct this unfair situation, they are deserving of the criticism they have received and will continue to receive.

Discriminations in Railroad Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able argument made by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] on the subject of discriminations in railroad freight rates before the Interstate Commerce Commission in Washington, D. C., on June 14, 1944. The argument was made in connection with the so-called Southern Governors Freight Rate case.

There being no objection, the argument was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Class rate investigation, 1939, No. 28300; consolidated freight classification, No. 28310]

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF SENATOR TOM STEWART, OF TENNESSEE

My contribution to the argument in this proceeding is to be limited principally to a discussion of the significance and effect of the amendment of 1940 to section 3 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act by which the words "region, district, territory" were added to that paragraph. This is, as you will readily perceive, the subject listed as No. 7 of part I of the topics suggested by the Commission. My familiarity with the background and purpose of that amendment leads me to undertake to point out and emphasize to the Commission the real and unmistakable meaning of that amendatory legislation.

First, may I say that Congress intended by the addition of the quoted phrase to section 3 (1) of the act to effect a real and substantial change in the basic law against discriminations. Congress was familiar with the outcome of a previous attempt to bring about a change in the national freight-rate structure when the United States Supreme Court, in its decision in the case of *Ann Arbor R. Co.* v. *United States* (281 U. S. 658), held that no change had actually been made by the Hoch-Smith resolution in the basic law. In framing the legislation I am now discussing Congress did not rest its case on the passage of a resolution directing the Commisison to investigate the rate structure, as was done when the Hoch-Smith resolution was passed, but went further and added some important language to section 3 (1) of the act so as to make the inhibitions of that paragraph apply directly to discriminations in rates as between regions, districts, and territories.

Not only was the Congress familiar with the results of its effort by the simple expedient of a resolution to affect the contour of a rate structure, but it was the beneficiary of much other information gathered over a long experience in the regulation of commerce. I was conscious of the fact that the underlying purpose of the original act to regulate commerce was to eradicate and control discrimination or, as the Supreme Court expressed it in *Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co.* v. *Mottley* (219 U. S. 467), "to cut up by the roots every form of discrimination, favoritism and inequality." The operation of the railroads without national regulation had demonstrated that discriminations, rebates, preferences, prejudices, and abuses of all kinds had become prevalent throughout the country and after careful and thorough investigation and consideration by Congress the original act was passed. Naturally, the main effort in this initial legislation was directed at the particular abuses which had developed. Discriminations of various kinds were the principal ones.

Since that time Congress has conducted many other inquiries and it has had the benefit of annual reports from the Commission detailing its experiences in the administration of the basic regulatory law.

After the turn of the century another particular form of discrimination made itself manifest, centering largely in the great intermountain territory, but outcropping also in other regions. I have reference, as you have perhaps already perceived, to the long- and short-haul discriminations. Congress took note of this situation and finally made the fourth section of the act more rigid. I cite this historic incident here to indicate the continuing purpose of Congress to adhere to its original determination to control discriminations in the freight-rate structure of the country and in the common carriers' performance of their public function of transportation. So far as I have been able to judge, Congress has not relaxed the law against discriminations in any instance, but has always sought to make more effective its control of this form of abuse.

Freight classification, a particular phase of rate making that may be made a vehicle of discrimination by and of itself, is a subject that has received special mention by the Commission in its annual reports to Congress since 1887. Congress has been told many times of the importance and desirability of uniformity of classification. Some of your early reports contain some very logical and convincing argument to that end. Congress also knows that the Director General of Railroads in the First World War, through the assistance of the Commission, brought about a substantial measure of classification uniformity in certain particulars, such as the description of the articles and minimum carload weights.

Your reports to Congress also show that following the First World War, that is, during the decade of the twenties, the Commission instituted several regional or territorial investigations of freight rates. I believe you have officially designated these as Eastern Class Rate Investigation, Southern Class Rate Investigation, Consolidated Southwestern Cases, and Western Trunk-Line Class Rates. I understand, although I do not know the details of these investigations, that they did not abolish differences or distinctions between regional or territorial rate structures yet they may have, and probably did, ameliorate these differences to some extent. I understand also that you accomplished by these decisions a high degree of uniformity

of rates within the respective regions or territories. This was done under the law before the amendment to which I am addressing myself was passed by Congress. If you were a layman on the outside, or if you were a Member of Congress charged with the responsibility for legislation in this field, I believe you might reasonably form the conclusion that I did when I looked into the record; namely, that the law was effective when applied to regions or territories but that something was lacking when the law against discriminations was given a wider sweep and applied to the Nation as a whole where one regional rate structure could have been compared to another.

In looking over the digests of cases over the years, I think one might reasonably form that conclusion. For instance, I notice that a great many of the earlier cases held that undue prejudice or preference could not be said to exist as between shippers or communities unless the same carrier served them or participated in their traffic. In some cases, where joint rates were involved (and I assume that joint rates would be prominently involved in interterritorial or interregional traffic) it was held that a mere showing of participation in a rate by a carrier is not sufficient to establish undue prejudice if defendants do not control the rate or cannot affect it by the carrier involved canceling its participation. *Elliott Jones & Co. v. Atlanta & W. P. R. R. Co.* (144 I. C. C. 374), is a case in point, but there are others. This view of the law as it originally stood would, I am sure, make it difficult to get at and control discriminations between territories and regions.

There is another sidelight on this question of dealing with territorial or regional discriminations under the old law. The only reference in the original section 3 (1) to a geographic unit was by the use of the word "locality". Undoubtedly of course that word was to be given its plural as well as its singular meaning, but (and I think this is important in evaluating the effect of the amendment of 1940) localities in a plural sense did not possess the significance that the word "district", "territory" or "region" possess. The latter comprehends, not merely numerous localities, but localities so integrated that they constitute a definite geographic, economic, and social entity and, particularly when applied to territories in a transportation sense, definite groups of railroads with, as now seems to be true, distinctive rate structures and methods of spreading out or distributing the general burden of rates. Instead, therefore of having an inhibition in the law against (insofar as geographic units are concerned) discrimination between localities we have a definite and positive prohibition against discrimination between districts, territories, and regions. I think here, too, is an answer to the defense which I notice from your digests has frequently been made in these discrimination cases, that section 3 (1) does not condemn differences in rates where the transportation burden is distributed differently. Now, I think, the law comprehends the method of distributing this burden and requires an examination of it because that may be responsible for a forbidden discrimination, particularly if there is not an ample justification from a transportation standpoint (not a mere historical standpoint) for the differences in this distribution of the transportation burden.

I have said that in my judgment Congress intended by the amendment under consideration to effect a substantial change in the basic law on discriminations. I think I have a commission precedent, based upon another change in this section, for such a view. I have reference to the *Albany Port District case* (219 I. C. C. 151). This proceeding was started by a complaint of the Albany Port District Commission, an agency of the State of New York, alleging that Albany and Rensselaer, N. Y., were being charged unreasonable rates on export, import, coastwise, and intercoastal traffic, and that they were being unduly prejudiced by lower rates on similar traffic to and from other north Atlantic ports. Complainant contended, in developing its case under its allegation of prejudices, that the existing rate adjustment operated as an artificial barrier which had to a great extent prevented Albany from participating in port traffic. Defendants answered by saying, among other things, that they did not and could not legally prejudice Albany because no one carrier or group of carriers could remedy the situation under an alternative order issued under section 3 of the act. The defendants relied in part also on the decision of the Supreme Court in *Texas & Pacific Ry. Co. v. United States* (289 U. S. 627), decided in 1933, which held that the word "locality" appearing in the original section 3 (1) did not comprehend a port. Congress, however, has amended this paragraph by adding the words "Ports and port districts." As to the degree the carriers' control of rates at the complaining and allegedly preferred points the Commission remarked upon the fact that some large carriers, in substance and effect, were responsible for maintaining a general rate structure applicable at all the ports involved. It concluded that if a carrier could escape the legal consequences of such discrimination—I am stating the effect rather than the exact words of the Commission's holding—in the circumstances presented the Commission would be without power to remove prejudice existing in any extensive rate adjustment. After reviewing the legislative history of the amendment of section 3, which added "ports and port districts" to it, the Commission said that it thought the amendment was intended to cover just such situations. I understand the Commission's order in that proceeding was put into effect and I take it that no one felt justified in challenging the Commission's construction and application of this amended law.

So it established effective authority to remove discriminations in freight rates throughout a port district despite a plurality of carriers serving the various shipping points. I am convinced the case cited above establishes a clear precedent, equally applicable to regions, districts, and territories, now that they have been added to the antidiscrimination provisions of section 3 (1) of the act. Manifestly, the amendment in question is as comprehensive and appropriate for controlling discriminations between regions and territories as the earlier one was for controlling discriminations between ports and port districts.

If, in the face of the long history of an expanding antidiscrimination policy in Congress, there can still be any doubt of what the National Legislature intended this amendment to do, I believe I can dispel that doubt by a review of the discussions and legislative incidents that led up to its enactment.

Where doubt of the meaning of any law, or any provision of it, may cloud the minds of those entrusted with its administration it is and always has been sound practice to look to the intent of the law-making agency and to examine all evidence that might establish or clarify this intent.

You will be impressed, I believe, as I have been in reviewing chronologically the history of the 1940 amendment, not merely with the unanimity of purpose of the proponents of this provision, but with the growing agreement among the Members of both Houses of Congress as to the effectuality of the wording employed.

In the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress there were introduced in both Houses several resolutions seeking to broaden the Interstate Commerce Act by extending its antidiscrimination provisions interregionally and calling for an investigation by the Commission of reputed rate discriminations. Senate Joint Resolution 99, offered in the Senate by Senator HILL, and House Joint Resolution 223, offered in the House by Representative RAMSPECK, are typical of these proposals. The former was incorporated without substantial change in the provisions of S. 2009, reported by the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee and accepted by the Senate, and the Ramspeck companion resolution served a similar purpose in House committee discussions, and became a part of the House substitute measure.

On the score of the extension of the Commission's authority to remove discrimination, the report on S. 2009 (presented to the Senate by Chairman WHEELER on May 16, 1939) made this significant comment: "There has been no substantial change therein, except that the words 'region, district, and territory,' appearing in lines 20 and 23 on page 26 have been inserted. This insertion is taken from a resolution by Senator HILL, directing the Commission to investigate interterritorial freight rates." Evidently, the committee considered the addition of the words, "region, district, and territory," a substantial change.

The aims and efforts of the members of the committee with respect to the provisions in question came in for full and, I think, very illuminating discussion on the floor of the Senate during the 4 days of debate that led up to the passage of the bill.

I should like to quote briefly from those discussions to recreate the atmosphere that pervaded the Senate and bespoke the Senators' state of mind and disclosed their intent. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 22, 1939, beginning with the fourth paragraph of Chairman WHEELER's remarks on page 5888 and continuing for some three pages. He began by reviewing the popular demand from the South and West for the removal of freight-rate barriers and the efforts of members of his committee to comply with it in the provisions of the bill. He first mentioned the injunction to the Commission to investigate these reputed discriminations and remove them.

This brought forth questioning from Senator CONNALLY, who expressed a doubt that the Commission was granted sufficient authority to remove any interterritorial discrimination they might find. In response, Chairman WHEELER read the undue preference and prejudice section of the bill, which is now a part of the Interstate Commerce Act and to which I am addressing my remarks. And he offered this comment:

"Then we have added the words 'region, district, territory,' which are to be found at the bottom of page 23 and at the top of page 27."

Mr. CONNALLY replied: "That is at least some progress."

Mr. WHEELER then continued: "The previous provision with regard to 'discrimination' simply referred to discrimination as to 'locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point,' without specifying the region, district, or territory. So we felt that by broadening the language we would at least take away that excuse, and we would provide expressly that the Commission should not discriminate in its rate structures. The Commission is directed to proceed immediately. Perhaps it will not mean anything to the Commission but, as I said a moment ago, if what Congress says does not mean anything to the Commission when we pass legislation, then so far as I am concerned I am willing to have Congress pass more stringent laws. At the present time however, I feel that as far as we could go would be to direct the Commission to investigate, and then to put into effect any orders necessary, and then to broaden the other section with reference to unjust discrimination."

Further explaining the action of drafters of the bill, Senator HILL, who headed the subcommittee on discrimination, added, after reiterating WHEELER's construction of the provisions in question, "In that connection let me say that my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is very much interested in the subject and who sat with our subcommittee for several days helping us to work the matter out, himself introduced a resolution, which, as I recall, is more or less substantially the provision which is written in the bill. I am sure the resolution was not any stronger in any way than is the language now written in the bill."

Then the inquiry was taken over by Senator Lee, of Oklahoma, who, after reading testimony on specific rates from the subcommittee record, commented: "There is the difference thrown out in strong relief of 98 cents for 100 pounds hauled 300 miles just over the Missouri River, as against $1.53 in western Oklahoma and Texas. And that is the point I am sure the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Alabama had in mind in the proposed amendment. I wish to say to the Senator, who has worked so hard on this matter, that our only interest is to be sure that that condition will be changed.

"As the Senator from Texas has well pointed out, that situation has existed for years. Of course, the Interstate Commerce Commission knows that already. If we trust only to their generosity or to their feeling of justice, I fear that it will not be changed. But we hope that the bill will contain such mandatory language as to bring about a change.

"Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I have generally found that when the Senate and the House pass a measure, even though we do not direct the Commission positively to reduce the rate, yet the Commission recognizes that we are the policy-making body and they generally try to rectify these matters. As I understand, the Commission has a case pending before it at the present time, and is going into some of the very matters to which the Senator from Texas, the Senator fram Alabama, and the Senator from Oklahoma have called attention, and I am of the opinion that some of these matters may be straightened out."

Through the comment of Senators Wheeler and Hill it becomes quite clear why the provisions were embodied in the simple amendatory language that has since been added to the act and equally as clear what the proponents of the amendment were aiming at. The debate continued in the same tenor, several other Senators joining in and a little later on they went into the meaning of the word "unlawful" as employed in the provision. In response to a suggestion that other wording be employed, Senator Wheeler made this significant comment: "The experts from the Commission tell me that the word 'unlawful' is the broadest term that could possibly be used. If a rate is unreasonable or discriminatory, it is held by the Commission to be unlawful; so that 'unlawful' is the broadest term that could be used with respect to it."

I mention this for more than the word in question, the clear implication of the Senator's discussion is that members of the Commission, or the staff, themselves suggested the wording of the amendment, as I have always understood they did. It is an inevitable assumption that the Commission experts chose the best language their training and experience could command to carry out the aims and intentions of the Members of Congress. I might mention that in this debate Senators WHITE of Maine and REED of Kansas added their seasoned opinion in support of Senator WHEELER's interpretation of the meaning of "unlawful."

The "undue preference and prejudice" section was separately considered and specifically adopted by the Senate without dissent on May 23.

The limits placed on my time permit me to detail only a fragment of the Senate debate on the amendment, but I should like to comment in conclusion that the whole tenor of it was in support of an effort to remove interterritorial rate discriminations and nowhere, insofar as my examination of the RECORD discloses, did any Member suggest that the proposed amendment was aimed at anything else.

The bill embodying it passed the Senate on May 25, 1939, and went over to the House.

After due consideration by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Chairman LEA on July 18 of that year reported to the House the bill with an amendment that constituted virtually a new bill. However, on the undue preference and prejudice feature, the House report discloses there had been no substantive change.

The House debate on the antidiscrimination provisions of the bill, while briefer, clearly indicates on the part of Members a viewpoint, aims, and intentions synonymous with those of the Senate. I cite this comment by Chairman LEA in introducing the question: "Now, I want to refer for a moment to the Ramspeck resolution. That is embodied in this bill. It directs the Interstate Commerce Commission to make an investigation of certain freight differentials, and then to make the orders that are necessary to remove the unlawfulness of rates found to be unlawful. It further provides, in the provisions prohibiting discriminations, the protection of territories and districts. In my judgment that resolution is directed at what is one of the most important situations in rate structure. It points to a place in our rate structure where the greatest opportunity to help our transportation system on an economic basis lies. The correction of that condition would serve the interests of shippers and carriers alike."

On the next day Representative PEARSON of Tennessee spoke more at length in the same vein, and I may add that in the House, as in the Senate, there was no suggestion on the part of any Member that the provisions had any less purpose than the removal of interterritorial rate discriminations.

The House then adopted the amended bill and the measure was committed to a conference committee which struggled for more than a year to report a bill on which both houses could agree. This was accomplished only after the bill had been committed twice to the committee and a great many disagreements composed, but through it all, insofar as the committee report (No. 2016, 76th Cong., 3d sess.) discloses, there was no change made in the antidiscrimination provisions in the legislation.

Campaign Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly the attempt to amend House Resolution 551, adopted by the House, by the Committee on Rules was aimed at the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. Very properly, however, it has been amended to make the inquiry applicable to all persons and entities.

I suggest the congressional special committee examine into the expenditures for the election of President, Vice President, Members of the House of Representatives and Senate not only by labor organizations but by powerful manufacturing and financial groups. If the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L. are to be challenged in their collections and expenditures of funds during the campaign, then, certainly, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and other similar groups should be put to the same inquiry. Also, powerful families and dynasties which have been throughout our history instrumental in making or breaking political personages should likewise be screened. There are the Pews of Pennsylvania, the du Ponts of Delaware, the Morgans and Rockefellers of New York, the Guggenheims of Colorado.

In this inquiry, it is hoped that the members of the special committee will be very careful in their demarcations as to what is or is not political activity. The bill provides for examination into the violations of the so-called Hatch Act. I voted against the Hatch Act. To my mind, it is a political abortion. It cannot be enforced. It provides that 3,000,000 workers cannot engage in political activity, whatever that may mean.

Inquiries at the Department of Justice indicate that it is just as difficult to enforce the Hatch Act as it was difficult to enforce the Prohibition Act. Apparently, grand juries refuse to bring in true bills and petit juries refuse to convict and judges are most loath to impose severe sentences. The comparatively few convictions obtained resulted in most mild sentences. In most cases sentence was suspended. In one case a fine of 1 cent was imposed. In another case the punishment was 1 hour in the custody of the marshal.

Why should not Federal employees advocate the election of any candidate? A Federal worker has the right to have his say like any other citizen. Why should he not be permitted to address a gathering, be the gathering of 3 or 3,000, and tell what he thinks of the campaign issues, of the conflicting contentions of the candidates? To deny him this privilege is to deny him the protection of the Bill of Rights, specifically, freedom of speech and freedom of press. If the Federal employee goes beyond the realm of propriety or does the bidding or chores of any political leader or ward heeler, his administrative or departmental head or bureau chief can discipline or punish him by adoption of appropriate regulations. There are plenty of statutes in existence that could clothe the passing of such regulations. Such administrative remedy is far better than a horrendous yet unenforceable "political noble experiment" like the Hatch Act.

Men who are in Government service at $1 a year are subject to the Hatch Act. That is absurd.

Periodically, we are asked to extend the exemptions of the bill. We are asked to extend the exemption to members of the Selective Service Board, to teachers, and so forth. I am for continuing the exemptions until the bill is so cut to pieces as to be useless.

The War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, the War Manpower Commission, the War Labor Board

not only use dollar-a-year men but even have volunteers who serve without compensation, and also so-called day-to-day services of men who have been called in as experts in their own particular field. If the Hatch Act were enforced against these particular men, there would be nothing left of these particular bureaus and boards. Such employees who are experts would have to resign. There is the case of an expert who acts as a War Labor Board member and receives the regular per diem compensation of $25 per service. The Hatch Act provision would apply all day—that is, this expert could not act as a board member during the regular working hours and make political speeches that night. On other days this gentleman or other officials similarly situated could go campaigning to their hearts' content so far as the Hatch Act is concerned.

These anomalies highlight the absurdities of the act.

Nor are we sincere in our attempts to enforce the Hatch Act. We only appropriated $50,000 a year for that purpose. We only render lip service to it.

A shipyard worker, formerly a member of a political organization, perhaps a precinct committeeman for either the Democratic or Republican Party, takes a job as a worker in the Federal navy yard. He has to stop his political activities, although he may have been a precinct captain for 10 or 20 years. That proscription is absurd.

The Hatch Act excludes 3,000,000 American citizens from taking their appropriate share in properly molding or influencing an important decision in the coming election.

Furthermore, we had a fine example recently of a definition of "political action." Certain Army authorities banned the reading by soldiers of several important books. One of them was Charles Beard's book on the Constitution. Another was the Yankee From Olympus. The first was published seriatum in Life, and the other appeared in the Reader's Digest. They are both splendid books. The Yankee From Olympus is the biography of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. Yet these harmless but educational and enlightening books were barred as involving politics. To indicate to what appalling lengths we go when we attempt to define what is meant by "politics" under the Hatch Act, a few examples will suffice. A Federal employee might be a student of Henry George and a firm believer in the single tax system. He may want to conduct classes in his department, or he might want to speak before a group on the lecture platform. Under the Hatch Act, I believe he would be barred. Another Federal worker might wish to abolish the electoral college. It might be an issue in the coming election. He would be barred from voicing his opinion because that might be indulging in politics. Federal workers must put blinders on their eyes, plugs in their ears, and gags on their mouths. They must be, in short, robots. They must see nothing, hear nothing, say nothing. They must, finally, dwindle into mere ciphers.

There has been the tendency to single out the C. I. O. Political Action Committee for special treatment. Yet this C. I. O. committee was completely exonerated in a report made by the Department of Justice. Its activities have been primarily concerned with awakening a political consciousness among C. I. O. members. It has inculcated its members with the need for political education. It has campaigned for the soldiers' vote, for post-war work, for the setting up of full employment conferences. It has urged their members to register and vote in the election. The objects of the committee are:

First. To mobilize the electorate for full and enlightened participation in the 1944 elections, National, State and local.

Second. To unite workers, farmers, and all progressives for political action.

Third. To assure the renomination and reelection of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President of the United States by welding the unity of the people around his candidacy.

Fourth. To elect a Congress committed to full support of President Roosevelt and of the program and policies which he espouses.

Fifth. To secure the election of progressive candidates to other offices.

Sixth. To make political contributions in connection with the 1944 elections.

Seventh. To assist in financing the C. I. O. Political Action Committee in the conduct of its activities.

While the investigating committee is at it it might well train its guns on other labor groups. How about William L. Hutcheson, head of the carpenters' union, who will undoubtedly back the Republican nominee—perhaps with money of his own or of the union. Hutcheson has backing for the nomination of the Vice President on the Republican ticket. If the C. I. O. is to be singled out for special consideration because it is backing Roosevelt, perhaps Hutcheson should be singled out as well. Then there is the United Mine Workers with John L. Lewis. How much will he and his backers spend to beat Roosevelt?

Efforts to Aid Refugees Completely Stymied in Spain by Our Ambassador Hayes—Celler Demands Recall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the War Refugee Board was established by Presidential directive in January. Under the able direction of John W. Pehle, many refugees have already been saved.

Because of the work of the War Refugee Board successful cooperation has been gained in a number of our American embassies and legations, notably in Bern, Lisbon, Stockholm, Ankara, as well as in capitals of Latin-American countries. But like a lonely island in a great sea, Madrid is the exception. Absolutely no cooperation has been accorded Mr. Pehle and the War Refugee Board by our Ambassador to Spain, Carlton Hayes. This is most reprehensible and passing strange.

The President has set up a free port or a haven at Fort Ontario, N. Y., for these unfortunates. Following the President's example, England has granted several thousand certificates of entrance to Palestine to these refugees who are to be taken out of southern Italy, having come there through the underground. The military will thus be relieved of the necessity for supporting and feeding them. Again, following the President's example, England has likewise established a free port for refugees. Spain, too, might follow in establishing such havens if Ambassador Hayes would so much as approach the Spanish Government to place the suggestion before it.

Because of the cruel recalcitrance of Mr. Hayes, money for the relief and escape of refugees was sent to Portugal and several hundred were saved. Mr. Hayes resented this; his pride had been injured because his inaction had been circumvented. Mr. Hayes complained. It is noteworthy that had Mr. Hayes been willing to cooperate thousands could have been saved through Spain instead of hundreds through Portugal. Our Minister in Lisbon, Mr. Norweb, has been most humane and actively sympathetic in his attitude and stands ready to do more if aid were forthcoming from Carlton Hayes.

What are the motives and reasons behind Ambassador Hayes' attitude? The burden is upon him.

It is common knowledge that Ambassador Hayes has not even tried to obtain the cooperation of the Spanish Government in carrying out the policy of the President as announced in the directive setting up the War Refugee Board. It is hard to believe that the Spanish Government, if approached on humanitarian grounds, would not be willing to help in this great cause.

Ambassador Hayes has the hardihood to balk not only the War Refugee Board and the Treasury Department, but the State Department as well. The Treasury Department, with the approval of the State Department, has issued a license to an American relief organization in Spain to carry on relief and evacuation work therein. Ambassador Hayes has actually refused to transmit to the American relief organization this license approved by such high authority. It is exactly on par with a like license issued to relief organizations in Switzerland. In the case of Switzerland, the issuance of such a license, together with the cooperation of the Legation at Bern, has resulted in greatly furthering the relief and evacuation program.

It is the studied policy of the War Refugee Board in seeking cooperation of various countries to relieve the governments of all burdens, since the Board guarantees maintenance and rapid evacuation of all refugees. The cost has been borne by private agencies and at no expense to the American Government. Nonetheless, there has been consistent

refusal on the part of Hayes to present to the Spanish Government for its consideration any plan to facilitate the evacuation of refugees into and through Spain, despite the fact there would be no responsibility of maintenance attached to the Spanish Government. In other words, the Ambassador has been reluctant, for reasons best known to himself, to ask the Spanish Government to take any action. It would cost Spain nothing and yet gain for her world good will.

It is difficult to understand the position taken by Ambassador Hayes. Can he arrogate unto himself the authority to defeat the President's declared policy? Does he not appreciate that his adamant and cold-blooded attitude has tied the hands of the War Refugee Board? Has Ambassador Hayes grown so inhuman as to fail to realize that human lives are at stake?

The War Refugee Board is concrete proof that where there is a will to achieve coupled with humanitarian purposes, and where the organization is not bogged down with red tape and diplomatic niceties, work can be accomplished which the weak and hesitant failed to do. For example, take the case of Turkey. Before the establishment of the War Refugee Board we had in Turkey an ambassador who was ready and willing to render all possible aid, but who lacked the official backing of Washington. But with the promulgation of the War Refugee Board, Ambassador Steinhardt has been the means of initiating, together with Ira Hirschmann, official representative of the War Refugee Board in Turkey, a program that has already saved many lives. And there were those who said previously it could not be done. How much more shabby and ill-considered then is the attitude of Ambassador Hayes?

It would indeed be tragic if the efforts of the War Refugee Board were thwarted by Hayes' persistent refusal to permit a full-time representative of the War Refugee Board to be stationed in Spain, for so he has done, despite the fact that other countries have raised no such objection.

Will Ambassador Hayes be permitted to make policy in contradiction to the stated policy of our President?

The time has come to put the screws upon the Francophile. Hayes should be recalled.

Not a One-Way Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a Congressman's job is not a one-way job.

There was a time, before the coming of the New Deal, when necessary legislation could be considered and passed in a few months and a Congressman was then free to go home, visit with his constituents, learn their views, attend to his own business, come back to Washington, inspired by the contact with the home folks, to do his best.

But with the coming of the New Deal, there has been an endless succession of apparent and real crises and emergencies calling, in the opinion of the New Dealers, for the enactment of one law after the other; first, one creating a new agency or assigning new duties to an old one, and after that, other new laws to correct the faults of the first.

A new agency or board is created to take care of some fancied or real grievance and then almost before the ink is dry other acts of Congress are required to plug the loopholes, increase the power, extend the activities, make new appropriations for, the newly found so-called remedy. The result has been that, urged by the executive department, Congress has continued bit by bit to ignore its good sense, surrender its independence, and yield to ever-increasing bureaucratic demands.

So now Congressmen find that, in the opinion of many people, they are expected to stay in Washington 365 days of the year. It follows that a Congressman gets out of touch with his people. His time is too much occupied with legislation. He not only becomes affected but afflicted with Washington thinking, and Washington is self-centered; forgetful of the rest of the country; intent too often upon its own little petty affairs and, as a sideline, endeavoring to solve the troubles of all the world, while, at the same time, determined to prescribe rules and regulations, not only for the farmers but for business of all kinds.

Since the New Deal caught the fancy of the people, their troubles have multiplied and most Congressmen find themselves almost overwhelmed by either suggestions as to remedies, demands that an end be put to injustices or insistent requests for legislation benefiting special groups.

In my humble judgment about the best service a Congressman can render is to visit the home folks frequently and discuss frankly the problems which confront us here at home, as well as those growing out of our foreign policy—this because the home people as a rule have their feet on the ground. They have not lost their sense of proportion. They are ever conscious of the realities of life. They know where bread, milk, and meat come from—not out of cellophane or cans. They know that hard work is the only answer to many of our problems. They think things through clearly and, 9 times out of 10, they have the correct solution. Therefore a Congressman should get home and learn what his boss wants, needs, must have, if we are to continue as a republic.

While home the efficient Congressman, of course, leaves in his office, especially in wartime, a competent secretary who can act as an intermediary between the home folks and department heads, relaying requests for information, the answers to pertinent inquiries.

One of the most important parts of the secretary's and Congressman's duty—and by me the one first given attention—is that of giving the parent, the wife, the relatives, and friends of those who have been taken into the service obtainable information as to those who have gone and which otherwise is not so speedily available.

Those who would remake America have had considerable to say about the duty of Congressmen remaining here in Washington. Naturally, they would like to see Congress stay here, get out of touch with the people, so that they themselves might suggest and elect representatives who were less responsive to the people's desires.

But that little scheme will not work, at least not so far as I am concerned. I intend to get around the district, where my bosses, the voters and those who do not vote, can tell me what they want, why they want it, and the reason for their opinions that their requests, either for relief from oppressive directives or laws, or for remedial legislation or actions, should be made possible of fulfillment.

It is my hope that during the coming recess I can get into every town and city in the district to listen to the advice of those I represent so that, when Congress meets again, my services may be of more value to the district, to the Nation.

Our Post-War American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of our post-war American merchant marine, I include therein a letter written by Robert H. Patchin, vice president of the Grace Line, Inc., a large part of which was published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 11, 1944. The entire article deserves very serious consideration and is sound.

JUNE 6, 1944.

WILBUR FORREST, Esq.,
New York Herald Tribune,
New York City.

DEAR MR. FORREST: I believe you and the Navy League have done a great job in eliciting from so many Senators pledges of support for an adequate post-war Navy and by "adequate" I mean a fleet much larger than the pre-war force. In my opinion, however, these replies were defective in one important particular—they made no mention of the need for a larger, active merchant marine. As you know, and as General Marshall and Admiral King have admitted in their reports, our impact in the war was delayed for lack of merchant ships and this went for the air attack as well as the overseas transport and maintenance of troops.

Although the most brilliant exponent of the indispensability of merchant shipping in war was an American officer, Captain Alfred T. Mahan, our Navy has always been weak in this respect because of our vacillating maritime policy. Thus, it was necessary to buy foreign ships to transport even our small

forces to Cuba and the Philippines in the Spanish-American War. When Theodore Roosevelt finally got together 16 battleships in a battle fleet and sent it to the Pacific and around the world to show the Japanese that we were not weak in the Pacific, it was coaled throughout the voyage by foreign ships, British and Scandinavian chiefly.

Before World War No. 1 we had so few ships that our commerce was paralyzed by the war and we had to build a $3,000,000,000 merchant fleet, most of which was not completed until after the Armistice. However, the fact that the United States did get under way a vast ship construction program assured reserves of men and materials for the Allies and contributed mightily to winning the war.

Between World War No. 1 and No. 2 substantial gains were made in the establishment of competent, regular, and frequent American flag steamship services from the three coasts of the United States to the chief markets of the world. American shipping companies gained a position of increased importance on these routes with the result that our commerce was better off when war began in 1939 than it had been in 1914. But, as more than two-thirds of our commerce was being carried by foreign ships, we were crippled in providing carriage of our essential imports and of exports to the rest of the world which turned to us when European sources of supply were closed off.

Fortunately, the Maritime Commission had begun in 1937 a program of fast new cargo-ship construction but few units had been completed by September 1939 and our own preparedness program suffered for lack of ships. Then, after we had repealed our neutrality legislation and the Nazi submarines began to take an increasing toll of our ships, even before we got into the war, it became apparent how weak this country was. Our preparedness program was held up for lack of ships and after Pearl Harbor our impact on the war was delayed for the same reason. There is good reason to believe that both the Germans and the Japanese relied on our maritime weakness in timing their attacks. They realized that the United States would eventually come into the war but they felt they could win before we could build enough ships to make our military effort count. One need only to read General Marshall's report to see how our effort would have been much more prompt had more ships been available.

It quickly became apparent that the United States was the only place where merchant ships could be built faster than the Germans could sink United Nations vessels then afloat. Britain had neither sufficient shipbuilding ways, material nor manpower to do the job. Existing American shipbuilding facilities were inadequate but the industrial power, materials and manpower were available. Old shipyards were enlarged and new yards were built and a reservoir of skill, equipment and manpower was channeled into the total shipbuilding plan with results that have amazed the world. Merchant ships are now being launched at the rate of five a day with a steadily increasing proportion of the fast, economic C and Victory types and a decrease in the Liberties. This could have been done nowhere else.

By the middle of next year the United States will have built 45,000,000 tons of shipping consisting of 4,500 new merchant ships and tankers. This total of 45,000,000 deadweight tons will be equal to more than two-thirds of the total tonnage of the world existing in 1938. Of course, the United States has no idea of "hogging" world shipping but the need of avoiding past perils is obvious.

In 1938 the United States had about 11,000,000 tons of merchant shipping, more than half of which was in coastal and intercoastal trades. The merchant marine consisted chiefly of old freight vessels, although a substantial number of modern fast combination passenger and cargo vessels had been built. Possibly 40 percent of the latter type have been lost and as the present shipbuilding program does not include the passenger types, that deficiency remains to be remedied, as does the lack of smaller freight vessels of 4,000 to 7,000 tons. However, the war-built fleet is efficient. The fast freight vessels of the C and Victory types are equal to or better than any of that class hitherto built anywhere in the world. The same is true of the new tankers. The Liberty ship is equal to a good pre-war 11-knot freighter, useful for bulk cargoes but not for liner service such as the commerce of the United States chiefly requires.

Along with the disarmament and little-Navy sentiment that menace the future of American naval strength, there is some evidence of a little-merchant-marine philosophy. This takes the form of doubts as to the ability of American shipping to compete without vast subsidies. Another negative argument being advanced is that shipping is the lifeblood of Britain, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries. The same thing might be said of Germany, Italy, and Japan, but those who would return the American merchant marine to its inadequate pre-war status do not venture at present to include these nations in their arguments. There have even been suggestions that if the American merchant marine should largely increase its pre-war minor (less than 30 percent) share of the carriage of our own foreign commerce, other maritime nations would be deprived of shipping earnings to an extent which would greatly impair their ability to buy American merchandise.

This argument has been proved misleading. Net earnings from the carriage of freight is such a small percentage of the value of the goods that the shift from foreign to American vessels would affect our export trade to only a negligible degree.

Another factor in the situation is often overlooked, namely, the possibility, if not probability, of a general world-wide increase in trade, possibly permitting the United States to gain without impairing the shipping earnings of others. Then there is the opportunity, pointed out by Admiral Land, that the United States should take up a part of the position formerly held by Axis maritime powers who used their merchant fleets for political and military purposes.

Suggestions that the United States settle back to a merchant fleet of pre-war size (11,000,000 deadweight tons), consisting of new instead of old, fast instead of slow, vessels, must necessarily be based on lack of faith in greater world trade or the proportionate share of the United States therein.

But even if the world trade should not increase, experience has twice demonstrated that the United States needs a substantially larger merchant fleet for the service and encouragement of its commerce in peace and as a stand-by for the Navy and Army in war.

The idea that this auxiliary shipping service over and above a small merchant fleet can be assured to the Navy by maintaining a laid-up fleet of five or ten million tons does not meet the situation. You can have a laid-up fleet but you cannot have a laid-up personnel. An effective Navy calls for a good deal more than battleships, carriers, destroyers, submarines, etc. It would be more practicable to lay up some of the warships and rely on a larger active merchant marine for a reserve of officers and seamen enrolled in the Naval Reserve.

Our maritime development during this war is notable, not only for the ships turned out but for the personnel trained. Merchant marine academies have been established which have schooled a fine class of young Americans to be merchant-marine officers and by the end of the war the merchant-marine personnel will have reached a total of 200,000 officers and men, as compared with between 30,000 and 40,000 before the war. Employment conditions being as they are, it will not be so difficult hereafter as it formerly was to get first-class young Americans to go to sea.

The idea that an American merchant marine can be maintained only by a vast outlay in subsidies is not valid. It is true that it costs more to build and operate American than foreign ships. The subsidies authorized by the Merchant Marine Act are designed to equalize this disparity in costs. Ordinarily, the size of the merchant fleet would be limited by the amount of money that Congress would be willing to spend to build ships at the American cost and sell them at foreign prices, thus placing the purchasers on an equal footing with their competitors. However, due to the war, our Government has built this great fleet. The money has been spent. The ships exist. The only way for the Government and taxpayers to get something back is to sell the ships for private operation as contemplated by the Merchant Marine Act and give the shipowners the opportunity to earn the money to pay for them. Thus, the question of construction subsidy for the freight fleet has largely been solved.

It is probable that it will still be necessary on highly competitive lines to pay operating subsidies to overcome the higher American cost of operation. This, however, in the case of the new fast and economic ships should not be very large. It has been estimated (see article Shipping and the National Defense in Grace Log for February-March) that $40,000,000 a year in operating subsidies would maintain a substantially larger merchant marine. Had we expended this amount for 10 years before World War No. 2, we would have more quickly prepared for war and our weight in the war would have been heavier and earlier and far less costly in money and life.

To sum up, this war has shown that the center of gravity of world maritime strength has shifted to the United States. This country has assumed greater responsibilities of a political, military, and economic character. It is pledged to the maintenance of a stable peace by force if necessary. We have already built a Navy thrice the pre-war combat strength. Our allies are quite willing that we should maintain a big Navy, but some of them dislike the idea of bringing our merchant shipping into balance with the naval combat strength for purposes of defense or to increase it to the point where it will more effectively encourage our commerce in peace and protect it when deserted by foreign shipping as it always has been in war.

I hope the Navy League will think it worth while to accent the merchant shipping side of the naval problem.

Sincerely yours.

R. H. PATCHIN,
Vice President, Grace Line.

O. P. A. Conference Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the conference substitute, section 105, modifies the amendment which I offered and

which was adopted by the House without opposition.

The substitute merely omits the provision for optional public hearings.

The substitute gives our citizens substantial protection to which they are entitled, and thereby eliminates "star chamber" proceedings.

With the protection of counsel and a record made by a reporter, persons subpenaed need no longer fear the inquisitorial power of O. P. A. investigators.

C. I. O. Political Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the entrance of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee into the political life of our country confronts us with a threat for which we are utterly unprepared. Not only are the Republican and Democratic Parties threatened with possible disintegration from within by this organization, but there is involved a real menace to our democratic way of life.

In June 1943, the Communist Party, U. S. A., held a special meeting of its leading functionaries at which its proposed dissolution as a political party was announced. Gene Dennis, reporting jointly with Earl Browder, stated that "special consideration should be given to the approaching 1944 elections."

Speaking before the Communist constitutional convention on May 20, 1944, Earl Browder, former general secretary of the "dissolved" Communist Party, United States of America, and now president of the newly formed Communist Political Association (C. P. A.), gave further expression to the intentions of this subversive group, as follows:

This election must not be left in the hands of the old party machines of professional politicians. * * * We must cross party lines. * * * The people * * * must build their own organizations for political action, beginning in the neighborhoods, and wards, extending to districts, towns, and cities, to the States and the Nation as a whole. * * * We will participate in political life as independents through the established party organizations of our progressive associates. * * * We remain an organization of Communists. (Daily Worker, May 22, 1944, p. 3, supp.)

In conformance with the general pattern set forth by Mr. Browder, the Communists have chosen as their special instrument in the 1944 campaign the newly formed C. I. O. Political Action Committee, which has already set up 14 regional offices covering the entire United States, operating chiefly within the Democratic Party and in certain localities like Oregon and Maine within the Republican Party. Communist support of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is unmistakably demonstrated by the following typical citations from the Daily Worker, official Communist organ:

A key factor in determining the result of the national elections will be the extent of the political organization of labor, and the C. I. O. committee is the instrument for doing the job effectively (March 11, 1944, p. 6).

Referring to the circular of William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, directing A. F. of L. unions to desist from any cooperation with the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, the Daily Worker declares:

The Green letter, attacking the C. I. O. and its Political Action Committee, is timed with the Dies committee's drive and general reactionary gang-up against this most effective political movement among the workers for continuance of the Roosevelt policies (March 4, 1944, p. 6).

Let me cite also a circular letter, undated, sent out to delinquent subscribers by Rebecca Grecht, business manager of the Daily Worker:

Every worker, every trade-union member, must take action during the coming months, to broaden the influence of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. * * * To know what to do and how to do it—you need the Daily Worker. * * * Renew your subscription today.

Despite the fact that I have taken issue with organized labor from time to time on specific issues, I do not for a moment challenge its right in a proper and lawful manner to engage in political activity to further the interests of the organized labor movement of the United States. But I emphatically deny that this movement is essentially promoted in the interests of American labor or the American people as a whole. Let me cite the statements of recognized and loyal American labor leaders in proof of this fact. On March 14, 1944, Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, issued instructions to all affiliated national and international unions in the name of his executive council, calling upon them "to cease and desist from collaborating with the C. I. O. on political policies." On April 4, 1944, the American Federation of Labor Weekly News Service, issued by authority of Mr. Green, referred to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee as infested "with Communist leaders of every tinge of red."

On February 29, 1944, John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, former president of the C. I. O., declared:

The Communists dominate the C. I. O. today. Philip Murray is today the prisoner of the Communists in his own union. They control him and the C. I. O. through their seats on his executive committee. And there isn't a blessed thing he can do about it.

Sidney Hillman is just as badly off. Both of them have got to play ball with the Communists now or die.

This is the set-up which has given birth to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and seeks to control the political destiny of the Nation.

After making an exhaustive study of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities declared in its report of March 29, 1944:

The record shows beyond the possibility of any dispute that well-known Communists immediately assumed important roles in the regional, State, and local activities of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. Murray and Hillman may allege that it was a mere coincidence that their organization so completely conformed to the one whose pattern had been drawn by the Communists. They cannot deny the presence of well-known Communists in the ranks of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee as it has been functioning from coast to coast during the past 7 or 8 months (p. 9).

The most important local unit within the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is the American Labor Party in New York. The history of the latter organization reflects the pattern of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee in its development. From the outset, the American Labor Party officials, led by Sidney Hillman, were loud in their protestations against charges of Communist influence or domination. Just as in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee the front line men were almost invariably non-Communist. But when it came to everyday spade work in the neighborhoods, wards, and house-to-house campaigns, it was the Communists who took over. In this connection I will cite the testimony of individuals who were high in the official circles of the American Labor Party. The following statement was issued over the names of Dean Alfange, the 1942 American Labor Party candidate for Governor of New York; Joseph V. O'Leary, former State controller, elected with Labor Party support; Alexander Kahn; Dr. George S. Counts, the retiring State chairman; Alex Rose, the retiring secretary; and Andrew R. Armstrong, the retiring treasurer:

The primary returns leave no doubt that Mr. Earl Browder has captured the American Labor Party. The presence of Mr. Sidney Hillman within this Browder-Marcantonio coalition is of but minor significance. The overwhelmingly Communist-dominated new State committee undoubtedly will also attempt to nominate non-Communists on its executive committee to present an innocent façade before the public to expand thereby its insidious influence. (New York Times, March 30, 1944, pp. 1, 15.)

In a public statement officially and publicly withdrawing from the American Labor Party, David Dubinsky, one of its leading founders and president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, gives a remarkable insight into the methods employed by the Communists which they are now applying on a national scale through the C. I. O. Political Action Committee:

Starting out with an advantage of 25,000 colonized Communist votes, on which they could always count in our previous primaries, and the additional Communists who enrolled last year in the A. L. P. * * * it required but a minor voting contribution from the Hillman end of the partnership to assure victory for Browder and his Communist Party * * *.

I regard the former American Labor Party as a Communist labor party, and am therefore withdrawing, publicly, and officially, from that party. Mr. Hillman can act as a front for the Communists; I never did and never will. (New York Times, March 31, 1944, pp. 1, 15.)

Subsequently the International Ladies Garment Workers Union withdrew its financial support from the American Labor Party. The resigning members of

the American Labor Party thereupon formed a new party, the Liberty Party, which in its constitution provided for the exclusion of Communists from membership. They may well have established a precedent which other political parties will have to adopt.

Already the C. I. O. Political Action Committee has succeeded in electing as a delegate to the national convention of the Democratic Party, Mervyn Rathborne, of California, whose record of Communist activities and connections is described at length in the March 29, 1944, report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (p. 158ff). Political observers have called attention to the possibility of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee assuming what amounts to practical control of the Democratic Party.

Permit me to pose for the consideration of Congress certain problems which are presented by these developments.

We are witnessing the birth of a new totalitarian political machine in the United States which seeks to control the vote from the pay roll to the ballot box. Here is the picture. Government agencies through official pressure and the institution of the check-off system are forcing workers to join these C. I. O. unions. These unions are notorious for their high-handedness and lack of internal democracy. Members are compelled to contribute to the enormous treasury now being amassed by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, under pain of the loss of a livelihood if they refuse. The members of these unions are being deluged with propaganda giving a warped viewpoint on candidates and campaign issues. The Communists, who have taken over economic control of the workers in key war industries through the C. I. O. unions, are now engaged in shackling them politically.

An amazing incident of the situation is the open and insolent disregard of the law by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee in its activities.

The amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act, contained in the so-called Connally-Smith bill, plainly prohibits a labor union from making a contribution in connection with any election for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress, or for a political committee to accept such contributions.

For months this C. I. O. Political Action Committee has been flooding the country with speeches, pamphlets, interviews, and publications urging the election or defeat of candidates for Congress, the Presidency, and the Vice Presidency, and boasting of the huge sums of money contributed by various C. I. O. labor unions to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee in connection with such activities. No plainer case for prosecution under the law by the Department of Justice could be conceived.

I have repeatedly called the attention of the Attorney General to these activities and urged the prosecution of the guilty parties.

Copies of my correspondence with the Attorney General on the subject, which are attached hereto, should form a significant chapter in the efforts of a Communist-dominated labor union to take over the American Government.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I desire to direct your personal attention to a flagrant violation of the criminal provisions of section 9 of the War Labor Disputes Act, commonly known as the Connally-Smith Act. Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., in an article in the February 1944, issue of the American Magazine, outlines the objectives of the so-called "C. I. O. Political Action Committee." The article is entitled "Labor's Political Aims," which aims are clearly indicated in the article as designed to influence, if not control, the national elections in 1944.

Philip Murray, President of the C. I. O. and author of the article, on page 28, makes this statement: "The various C. I. O. unions have made an initial contribution of $700,000."

Section 9 of the Connally-Smith Act makes it unlawful for "any labor organization to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, or a Senator or Representative in, or a delegate or resident commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for." And provides that an officer of any labor organization who consents to any contribution by the organization shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year or both.

Mr. Murray is President of the C. I. O. The article is a defiant confession of the violation of the statute.

A number of other officers of the union are named in the article as parties actually engaged in carrying on the unlawful enterprise.

I respectfully request that you present the whole matter to a Federal grand jury forthwith, with a view to the indictment and prosecution of those engaged in this conspiracy to control the national elections of 1944.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. SMITH.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1944.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This acknowledges your letter of January 10, calling my attention to possible violations of the Smith-Connally Act.

I have instructed Assistant Attorney General Tom Clark to inquire into the matter immediately, and to take such action as may be appropriate under the facts as developed.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I thank you for your letter of January 13 advising me that you have instructed Assistant Attorney General Tom Clark to inquire into and to take such action as may be appropriate with reference to the subject matter of my letter of January 10.

As other evidences of this and similar violations of the criminal provisions of the Connally-Smith Act are brought to my attention, I will take the liberty of sending them on to you.

Yours very sincerely,

HOWARD W. SMITH.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1944.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: On January 10, 1944, you wrote me complaining that a flagrant violation of the criminal provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act, was revealed by an article by Philip Murray of the C. I. O., published in the February issue of the American Magazine. This article described the newly organized Political Action Committee of the C. I. O., and stated that various C. I. O. unions had made an initial contribution of $700,000 to the work of the Committee.

I at once ordered a thorough-going investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and instructed the Bureau to look not only for possible violations of the criminal provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, but also for violations of the provisions of the Federal statute (the Hatch Act) which limits the amount which may be contributed in connection with an election for a Federal office.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation advises me that the officials of the Political Action Committee and of the C. I. O. made their records available to the agents of the Bureau, who, in compliance with my order, have examined the books, records, and correspondence in the files of the Political Action Committee at its offices in New York and in its regional offices, and in the National Headquarters of the C. I. O., and have interviewed officials of the Committee.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act, concerning which your question arises, makes it unlawful for "any labor organization to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidetnial and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution" so prohibited. The act contains definitions of the terms "political committee" and "labor organization," and for the purposes of this letter we may proceed on the premise that the Political Action Committee is a political committee as so defined and that the international unions which have contributed to it are labor organizations as so defined.

It appears from the investigation so made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee was formally created at the national convention of the C. I. O. held at Philadelphia on November 4, 1943, which adopted a resolution outlining a program for the activities of the committee. The international unions thereupon appropriated funds to defray the expenses of this program. The principal objects of the program, as stated in the resolution, were to stimulate the political consciousness of the individual members of the unions, to make them understand the value of the vote and the importance of exercising it, to interest them in participating actively in the political and community affairs of the localities in which they live, and to instruct them on general issues, such as (1) "the support of our military effort"; (2) "the maintenance of our economic, social, and legislative standards, as a guaranty of wholesome living standards for our people, and the protection of the highest possible morale among our millions of war workers"; (3) "the mobilization of all of our resources for the vigorous prosecution of the war"; and (4) "a sound and progressive post-war program to ease the difficult transition to a peacetime economy, give full employment to our people, provide an adequate system of social security in time of unemployment, sickness, and old age, and lay the basis for a more secure and abundant life."

The language of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act above quoted makes it applicable only to elections at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for; another section of the act provides that it is limited to general or special elections and is not applicable to primary elections or conventions of political parties. Contributions in connection with State elections in State campaigns are not covered by the act.

The investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the activities of the committee has not disclosed any violation of the above provisions of the act. The Bureau reports, in fact, that the only contribution discovered by it made by the committee for the election of a candidate was a contribution of about $15,000 to the campaign for a candidate for the governership in New Jersey; but this would not be prohibited by the Federal law.

Furthermore the Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that the files of the committee contain instructions to its agents to conform to the provisions of the Federal statute. A letter from the chairman of the committee to all the regional directors contains the following statement on this point:

"I want at this time, however, to call to your attention the necessity of scrutinizing all of the expenditures of your office to make certain that they are made in strict conformity with all of the provisions of law, and particularly with the requirements of the Smith-Connally Act."

The investigation shows that the committee has received a total of $569,608.06, $400,000 of which was in lump sums of $100,000 each, appropriated by three of the international unions and the C. I. O., and the balance of which came principally from other national unions. These sums were sent for the support of the program of the committee above referred to. As of January 31, 1944, the committee had made total expenditures amounting to about $39,000. The greater part of these expenditures, other than the approximately $15,000 contributed for the State campaign in New Jersey above referred to, are stated to have been for salaries, for current office expenses, travel, etc., which expenditures are, of course, not prohibited by Federal law.

Activities of the committee to date in furtherance of its general program above referred to in the nature of general organization of the national and regional offices, the launching of a get-out-the-vote campaign, consisting in the effort to have the unions get their members to register and qualify as voters in their respective communities, a campaign in favor of the soldiers' vote bill, a full employment conference, and the preparation of a post-war program, are not, likewise, prohibited by any Federal law.

Based on the foregoing investigation, it appears that to date there has been discovered no violation by the political action committee of the criminal provision of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, as amended, or of the Federal statute limiting the amount which may be contributed in connection with an election. Certain expressions in the article in the American magazine to which your letter referred might be subject to the construction that in the future, action might be taken by the committee which would not conform to the provisions of the Federal statute; but no such illegal action has been discovered. If future acts by the committee of a nature prohibited by the act should occur, I can assure you that appropriate action will be taken by this Department.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
The Attorney General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am in receipt of your letter of April 6 in further response to my letter of January 10 calling your attention to activities of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee which appeared to be in violation of the criminal provisions of the Connally-Smith Act in that the C. I. O. unions were making, and the political action committee receiving, contributions "in connection with" the Federal election.

I am amazed to learn from your letter that the investigations for 3 months of the alleged crime was confined to the records and statements of those charged with the commission of the crime, which records and statements have been accepted by your office without question. The investigation seems to have been confined to asking the accused if he was guilty, and accepting with enthusiasm his statement that he was innocent.

Your letter concedes that the C. I. O. is a labor organization and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee a political committee, but asserts that no crime has been committed because the money has not been expended in violation of the law.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee is by its name as well as its activities a political committee. The law, in plain and simple words, makes it a crime for a political committee to receive contributions from a labor union or for a labor union to make such contribution. It is only necessary that the contribution be made "in connection with an election," and not necessarily in the interest of any particular candidate or party.

The crime consists in a political committee receiving a contribution from a labor organization in connection with any Federal election. When the union contributes, and the political committee receives, the crime is complete, irrespective of how the money is eventually used. Your own letter discloses that labor unions have made, and the Political Action Committee has received, contributions. I am sure that no one is so naive as to believe that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is collecting these huge sums of money on a national scale for the purpose of giving Sunday school picnics.

The Department of Justice is charged with the duty to present to a grand jury any case where there appears to be a strong probability that a crime has been committed. My files, which have been available at all times, will disclose ample evidence that cries out for a grand jury investigation.

The only result that I can see of the Department's investigation is that the accused was given 3 months in which to persuade the Department of Justice that it was not guilty. In 3 minutes, I could have given your investigators enough evidence from the files in my office to justify presentation of the case to a grand jury, but no investigator from your Department ever communicated with me or evinced the slightest interest in any evidence which I could supply. For instance, if you are in doubt as to whether the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is seeking to influence the 1944 elections, I quote from a C. I. O. publication in which Sidney Hillman, chairman, is quoted: "We must build up a drive for Congress, we could do the job in 1944 to elect the proper representatives in Congress and by 1948, we can retire every reactionary in Congress." Another publication of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, obviously paid out of the funds which you state have been collected, is as follows: "But if we fail to elect a progressive government in 1944, all we fought for, sacrificed for, built up painfully brick by brick, will be swept away as if by tornado." I have much other data of a similar character which is available to you.

I fear that in the multitude of your duties, this very vital matter has not had your close scrutiny. I, therefore, respectfully request that you reopen the investigation under your personal supervision, and that the new investigation be not confined to the absurd limit of merely consulting the person charged with the commission of the crime.

Yours very sincerely,

HOWARD W. SMITH.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1944.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: In your letter of January 10, requesting an investigation of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, you referred only to Mr. Murray's article in the February 1944 issue of the American Magazine as the basis of your complaint, and in your later letter of January 14 you stated "As other evidences of this and similar violations of the criminal provisions of the Connally-Smith Act are brought to my attention I will take the liberty of sending them on to you."

As I received no further word from you in accordance with your letter, I assumed that you did not have other evidence in your possession.

I shall be glad to have the material which, in your letter of April 7, you report is in your files, and I have directed Mr. G. Maynard Smith, of my staff, to obtain it for me.

With personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1944.

Honorable FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 10 relative to your investigation of the activities of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. The letter was delivered by your Mr. G. Maynard Smith with whom I discussed the matter in some detail.

I have turned over to Mr. Smith all of my files relating to the subject for his inspection.

Yours very sincerely,

HOWARD W. SMITH.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: You will, of course, recall previous correspondence I have had with you concerning the violations of the Corrupt Practices Act by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and you will doubtless recall that after your letter to me of April 6, in which you stated that you had discovered no violation of the law by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, I wrote you under date of April 7. In reply to that letter, you wrote me under date of April 10 stating that you had directed Mr. G. Maynard Smith, of your staff, to obtain from me the evidence in my files. Your Mr. Smith called on me on April 11, and I turned the files over to him with the understanding that they would be examined, and further investigation conducted.

A period of 2 months has now elapsed during which I have received no further communication from you nor any indication that

it is the purpose of the Department of Justice to prosecute violators of the Corrupt Practices Act.

As there are rumors that other well-financed minority groups may adopt a similar subterfuge to violate the Corrupt Practices Act on the strength of your previous opinion, it seems to me imperative that an early and decisive opinion in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee case should be had. Otherwise, any group such, for example, as corporations, could adopt a similar subterfuge by setting up a political action committee to which they could contribute large sums of money that would ultimately be used to influence the coming elections. Such a situation would seem to me to be the equivalent of a repeal of the Corrupt Practices Act.

May I earnestly request an immediate answer.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. SMITH.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1944.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I have your letter of June 12, with respect to violations of the Corrupt Practices Act by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

The files that you turned over to Mr. G. Maynard Smith, to which you refer, were examined but did not give us any additional information.

For some time Mr. Tom Clark, head of the Criminal Division of the Department, has been engaged in a further investigation not only of this committee but of other organizations engaged in political activities. If any violations of the Federal statutes are shown, prosecutions will follow.

With personal regards, believe me,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

An Amazing Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Sun of June 20, 1944:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

AN AMAZING DOCUMENT

I hold in my hand a mimeographed letter dated May 26, 1944, and issued by United States Department of Agriculture, Buerau of Agricultural Economics, 222 Mercantile Building, Berkeley 1, Calif. Attached to the letter is a questionnaire: The object of asking American citizens intimate questions is clarified in this paragraph of the letter:

"These facts * * * show the effect on the devolpment of the American community when the land is generally farmed in large tracts. Perhaps major cause of differences between these two communities is that where the land is farmed in large blocks, four-fifths of the families receive their support from wage labor and have little security and no permanent roots in the community. The gulf between them and large land owners is great, and they do not participate in social events together. Where the working farmer is the rule, there is a closer tie between him and his helpers, and the proportions of farmers, laborers, and merchants are more nearly equal."

Now as to the questions: The questionnaire not only wants to know about church and/or Sunday school membership of all the members of the family but also about frequency of attendance and earlier affiliation. Hitler, of course, had a grandmother clause, so that earlier affiliation was dependent upon the right number of generations in the changed religion. Martin Luther, John Knox, and Calvin, to say nothing of Cardinal Newman, would have been in a lot of trouble over that. But this question is pursued further as follows:

"2. Did any member of your family change denominations upon coming to this town, or since you have been here? 3. If so, what was former affiliation (indicate in last column of question 1)? 4. Do you attend church more or less frequently now than before the change?" Perhaps the Department of Agriculture would like to count the gold stars that the children bring home from Sunday School, or the apples they give the teachers.

Now they want information about—

"6. What informal activities did members of your family participate in? Type of activity: (a) school functions; (b) card parties; (c) picnics; (d) dances; (e) movies; (f) community affairs.

"7. Do you have a small group of close friends? Number in group?

"8. Where do they live?

"9. What do they do?

"10. Do they all belong to one church or club? What one?

"11. List families with whom you visited regularly in 1943 and 1940 (if different) and whom you consider your more intimate friends."

That No. 11 will surely make trouble. Imagine what would have happened to Romeo and Juliet if any such questionnaire had had to be made out in their day. The stabbings would have taken place in the first act or earlier. And look what they want to know about your intimate friends:

"Name, occupation or tenure, related, ethnic group, number visits in their home, your home, residence, year."

Please tell me what an "ethnic group" is. Stalin is a Georgian—a mixed Indo-Aryan-Taurian people with undoubted Mongolian, to say nothing of Tartar, and possibly even Scythian stocks. Suppose Mr. Roosevelt when he visited Teheran had to answer this questionnaire and say that he visited an Indo-Aryan-Taurian-Tartar-Scythian called a Caucasian for a better word.

Frankly, nobody on God's green soil has any business asking an American citizen whom he visits, why, and what ethnic group the visitee belongs to, and as long as our people submit to this busybody snooping and spying and butting into their lives, there will be folks to do it. I pledge myself now to sock the first one who comes my way in the eye and I call upon red-blooded, hairy-chested, strong-armed Americans to take the same kind of pledge. Marion Clawson, who signs this letter, says:

"This method of interviewing, the type of questions asked, and the methods of combining and analyzing the results, have all been used for many years by both public and private agencies in sociological studies in many parts of the country. The best place to obtain information regarding farm and community life is from the people who participate in it; the best way to obtain such information is to ask the people themselves about it."

You see, they blame it on you.

The American Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in my district I am fortunate in having a very dear friend and an outstanding editor, the Honorable E. D. Lambright, editor of the Tampa Morning Tribune, Tampa, Fla. Recently he wrote, and there was published in the Tampa Morning Tribune, the American Pledge, which, in my opinion, deserves a permanent place among the great documents of history, and I am, therefore, taking the privilege of asking that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may be available for my colleagues and many others to read. The pledge referred to is as follows:

THE AMERICAN PLEDGE

At Concord Bridge—
American men,
Firing the first shots
For a free nation.
At Gettysburg—
American men,
Fighting each other—
Dividing their country
Yet making it stronger.
At San Juan Hill—
American men,
Battling on foreign soil
To save a people,
Create a new republic.
At Belleau Wood—
American men,
Dying far from home,
Yet winning a war
They thought would end wars.
In Normandy—
American men,
Again fighting, falling,
For the same cause.
This time their blood
Shall not be shamed in peace.
This time their victory
Shall stand.
This time their sons
Shall live!
In America—
American men,
Heirs of today's heroes,
Holding high their heritage,
Will keep the peace, compel
All other peoples to keep it—
So that not again
Will men be slain—
Our men—or any men—
To sate a tyrant's greed.
So help us God!

William Shenkel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED ROWE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, in the cruel days of this war, little does one suspect how soon the fatalities and bad news will

reach into his own close circle of friends. A very good friend of mine, formerly associated with the Cleveland News and the Cleveland Press, then coming to the largest city I represent to be associated with the Times-Press, later being promoted to associate editor of Newsweek and lately known as editor of the page Washington Trends in the Washington bureau of Newsweek, recently departed from this country on a special assignment for that publication.

He completed one mission over Italy, after which he was taken to a very secret rendezvous to perform a special mission for Newsweek. Today I have been informed that William Shenkel, editor of Washington Trends, is reported missing over Japan, taking part in the recent raid by the new Superfortresses and was along especially to report that raid to the American people.

It seems but a short time ago that I had occasion to meet him on a day of great joy to him when he brought his baby boy to my office in my home town that I might see this baby. I will not soon forget the winsome smile on those features that day, as his jovial expression was a little more pronounced than usual. Now that baby boy in his adolescence may be fatherless because his father placed duty to his public in reporting the initial raid of the B–29's over Japan over and above his love of home and family. It is with deep regret, I am sure, that the American people acknowledge the loss of the alertness and ability of this fine outstanding newspaperman, and it is with grief that his friends accept the news of his being missing.

Crop Insurance or Wheat and Cotton Insurance?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4911 is on the Calendar to be considered tomorrow, June 22. We have had wheat insurance for several years and later added cotton insurance. This insurance program has cost the Government millions of dollars.

A year ago legislation was enacted to discontinue the insurance program as of July 1, 1944. One of the reasons of the losses has been that only two crops, wheat and cotton, were insured and the overhead was too great. A broader base with a wider coverage would have reduced the overhead. Flax, which was a $146,000,000 crop in 1943, has been added to the wheat and cotton in the proposed legislation incorporated in H. R. 49, though corn with a value of over $3,400,000,000 is not included in the proposed insurance in 1945. Tame hay with a 1943 value of over one billion three hundred and eighty-eight million is not included though it exceeds in value either the cotton or wheat production for the year.

Certain individuals have criticized Members of Congress for being opposed to crop insurance when in fact they only opposed wheat and cotton insurance.

There are two apparent crop insurance angles to consider at this time: First, a long time program which should include all crops and not be confined to a small part of the Nation's crops, and, second, since we are engaged in war it would appear more desirable to provide insurance for war crops like peanuts and soybeans, and other oil-seed crops than to set up an insurance program that is largely devoted to crops of which we have an abundance, like cotton and wheat. There is no need to select cotton and wheat and give them any special support by providing for insurance for them when they are not the food production problems of the day. Cotton and wheat are already provided 90-percent parity loan protection by other legislation.

Wheat production for 1944 is estimated at over a billion bushels. If this estimate is realized, at threshing time, it will be the first time since 1915 that we have had a billion-bushel wheat crop. Millions of bushels of wheat are being fed to livestock, while the W. F. A. is having difficulty in finding sufficient corn for industrial purposes as well as for animal feeds. Cotton is in such an abundance that millions of pounds are being subsidized in order to get rid of it, after millions of dollars have been paid for raising it or not raising it, and other millions because it did not bring enough in the market place. Some $6,000,000 is expected to be paid as a subsidy to producers of insulation material in 1944.

We are in a war; we should insure war crops if we need a further increase in the production of these war crops. We should not legislate for a few at the expense of the many, and if we insure any crops, other than war crops, the insurance should cover a broad base, and the insurance should pay its own way. This crop-insurance legislation is of great national importance. Both major political parties have recognized its significance. Most farm organizations have expressed their attitude.

We cannot and should not continue to legislate for two or three crops that represent a small part of American agriculture. We have had altogether too much legislation of this kind during the past 10 years, and we at least should be willing to resist the pressures during wartime.

The following letter from Mr. C. E. Burkhead, of the B. A. E., indicates the production and value of the most important farm crops of 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1944.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY, M. C.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: In answer to your request made by telephone today, we are showing below production, and value of production for a number of crops produced in 1943. We have assembled this information in the manner requested by you—by showing the individual crop having the greatest farm value first and other individual crops in descending order.

In case we have omitted a crop (or crops) that you might desire, we are also enclosing a copy of Farm Production, Farm Disposition, and Value of Principal Crops, 1942–43, issued in May of this year and in which you will find additional crops and more complete information for the crops we are showing below.

Production and farm value of crops, United States, 1943

Crop	Unit of production (thousands)	Production	Value of production
			Thous. of dol.
Corn	Bushels	3,076,159	3,439,268
Tame hay	Million tons	87,264	1,388,232
Cotton and cottonseed			1,374,037
Cotton	500-pound bales	11,427	1,129,985
Cottonseed	Tons	4,688	244,052
All wheat	Bushels	836,298	1,127,448
Oats	Bushels	1,143,867	823,630
Irish potatoes	Bushels	464,656	609,310
Soybeans	Bushels	195,762	359,020
Barley	Bushels	322,187	322,469
Peanuts, all purposes	Pounds	3,615,840	256,356
Sweetpotatoes	Bushels	72,572	148,216
Flaxseed	Bushels	52,008	146,783
Rice	Bushels	70,025	127,369
Beans, dry, edible (cleaned)	100-pound bags	20,066	121,208
Sorghums for grain	Bushels	103,168	119,026
Peas, dry field (cleaned)	100-pound bags	9,997	49,129
Rye	Bushels	30,781	30,215
Sugarcane for sugar	Short ton	6,056	28,496
Alfalfa seed	Bushels	1,115	22,540
Red clover seed	Bushels	1,143	20,617
Cowpeas	Bushels	4,841	16,185
Lespedeza seed	Pounds	159,920	16,031
Buckwheat	Bushels	8,830	10,730
Popcorn	Pounds	150,724	7,420
Alsike clover	Bushels	239	3,862
Timothy seed	Bushels	1,500	3,623
Sweetclover seed	Bushels	458	2,630

It is a pleasure for us to serve you and if we can be of further help please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Very truly yours,

C. E. BURKHEAD,
In Charge, Grain Section, Division of Agricultural Statistics.

The Dismissal of Minister From Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown dealing with the dismissal of Hjalmar Procope, Minister from Finland to the United States, published in the Washington Star, of June 20, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The reason behind the dismissal of Hjalmar Procope and his three counselors from the United States is that the State Department became convinced the Finnish Legation's telegrams to the Helsinki government

describing in too rosy colors the friendly feelings of the American people toward Finland have contributed to Finland's determination not to accept Moscow's peace terms.

Mr. Procope has been the most popular diplomat in Washington ever since he arrived here. His popularity was due not only to his charming personality, but to the fact that he represented a nation which was truly democratic.

Moreover, at a time when all the debtor nations were describing this country as "Uncle Shylock" because the American Government insisted on their paying the $20,000,000,000 they owed us since the last war, Finland went on paying her debts. Finland's debt, measured in dollars and cents, was relatively negligible. But there were other European nations which also could have made "token payments" and did not.

When Finland became Germany's war associate in fighting Russia, the White House and the State Department changed its attitude toward the Finnish Legation. Underneath the warm feelings for "little Finland" did not change. But officially, for reasons of high politics, a marked coolness toward the Finnish envoys developed in high quarters. Moscow has been insisting that we follow London's example and either declare war or break off diplomatic relations with Helsinki. The administration, realizing that such a move would not be popular in this country, informed our Russian associates that we might induce Finland to accept Moscow's peace terms and, consequently, it would be better if we maintained diplomatic relations.

The State Department has frequently asked Mr. Procope to urge his government to accept Russia's proposals. There is no question that he forwarded these messages to Helsinki. But at the same time Mr. Procope and his aides, who remained popular in Washington, informed their chiefs that the view of the State Department was not shared by the rank and file of the American people.

In support of this contention, Mr. Procope cabled to Helsinki speeches made on the floor of the House and Senate, articles written in American newspapers, and the gist of the conversations with responsible Americans. Sometimes the latter was highly colored and exaggerated.

In his frequent meetings with responsible Americans at luncheons and dinner parties, Mr. Procope and his principal aides who are being sent back to Finland emphasized what it will mean to Europe if the United States helps Russia to establish an oriental civilization over that continent. He spoke openly about the millions of Poles, Balts, and even Finns who were sent to concentration camps in Siberia by the conquering Russians.

The Minister is credited with having enriched the international diplomatic dictionary with a new expression. "Plebisciting," according to Mr. Procope, stood for the word theft when it was a question of a large nation taking over a smaller neighbor. It was based on the fact that Moscow claimed title to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania because of a plebiscite held under the threat of the Russian divisions which had entered these three republics to protect them. The word made the rounds of Washington. The expression was amusing although not particularly complimentary to our eastern war associate.

President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull, together with their advisers, are fully aware that the Finnish Minister was not a Nazi sympathizer. It is said that no such trace could be found either in his utterances or his dispatches. But he had become what the State Department describes as a nuisance. He was too popular, too active in spite of the restrictions imposed on him and his staff many months ago.

Desperate China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial labeled "Desperate China," in the Washington Post of June 21, 1944, commenting on the loss of Changsha and the consequent threat to the entire Hankow-Canton railway line, begins as follows:

General Chennault has done more with less than any other commander in this war. He is also a man of uncommon common sense. For these reasons anything he says about the war in China is of impressive authoritativeness. If the Japanese are successful in clearing the entire Canton-Hankow railroad and building defensive positions on it, he says, the Asiatic war could be prolonged for years.

Once more I want to stress that the American people are concerned about the seriousness of the military situation in China, and as the picture unfolds are becoming daily more aware that if the Japanese succeed in establishing a north-south railway line across China and cleaning up the air bases between that line and the coast, the Allied cause will have suffered a major setback. The fathers and mothers of America, whose sons will be sacrified in larger numbers if the war in the Far East is thus prolonged, will soon want to know why those who have it in their powers to allocate supplies, especially transport planes, are not leaving General Chennault with enough air transports so that he can get full use out of his air force unit and attain his objectives, one of which is to render the Chinese armies the necessary assistance to check the Japanese advance. The Japanese threat in the Far East at this particular moment is along the interior Chinese railway lines. Let us, first of all, concentrate where the menace is the greatest and give General Chennault and his Chinese and American airmen the support which they require and which they so richly deserve. Men who are familiar with the situation in the India-China area express the opinion that there are enough transport planes in that entire theater of operations to provide General Chennault with the aviation supplies which he requires, provided too many planes are not diverted for other purposes; but should any more planes be required it would seem a comparatively simple matter to allocate a fleet of Douglas Skymasters—C–54–A models—which, as I have pointed out on previous occasions, are so well suited for the over-the-hump service.

The Washington Post editorial of June 21, 1944, read as follows:

DESPERATE CHINA

General Chennault has done more with less than any other commander in this war. He is also a man of uncommon common sense. For these reasons anything he says about the war in China is of impressive authoritativeness. Evidently he is profoundly concerned with the present Japanese offensive along the Hankow-Canton railroad. If the Japanese are successful in clearing the entire Canton-Hankow railroad and building defensive positions on it, he says, the Asiatic war could be prolonged for years. That is something to ponder over, even as we jubilate over the B–29 attack on Japan. After all, even after we reduce Japan, we shall have to clear the Japanese out of China.

The Japanese drive in China is proceeding from two main directions. In the north the Japanese advance has at last overrun Changsha where thrice in the past the Chinese threw back the invaders. The Chinese once again put up a heroic resistance with the help of the Fourteenth Air Force, whose fighters and bombers have been active over a wide area of the Hunan front. But the enemy is powerful and, except in the air, enjoys great superiority in equipment and fire power. Furthermore, the withdrawal of a large number of seasoned troops from Manchuria after the announcement of the Russo-Japanese pact of March 31 enabled the Japanese to throw into this fourth battle of Changsha more troops than they employed in their previous assaults.

At the same time the Japanese have started a drive north from Canton with the ultimate hope of making junction with their forces now in the vicinity of Changsha. This southern spearhead has got as far as Fengtsun on the railroad 30 miles north of Canton. In itself this latter drive constitutes no real menace to the Chinese since at Fengtsun the Japanese are still 325 miles from Changsha. But in conjunction with the southward drive it means an accentuation of the danger facing our Chinese allies.

The fact must not be forgotten that once in possession of the entire stretch of the Hankow-Canton railroad, the Japanese would have an interior line of communication all the way from Manchuria to South China. Furthermore, the loss of that line by China would cut China in two. And, lastly, Japanese control of the Hankow-Canton line would deprive China and our Fourteenth Air Force of vital airfields from which Japan's supply line along the Formosa Strait has been hard hit. All in all there was never a greater need of reinforcing China's fighting capacity than there is today.

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have just celebrated Flag Day. A very appropriate address concerning Flag Day, made by Fraser S. Gardner, national employment officer for the Disabled American Veterans, before about 1,200 students of the Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., Wednesday forenoon, June 14, 1944, Flag Day, has come to my attention.

Because of the very pertinent statements in this address, I here extend it as part of my remarks, as follows:

Fellow citizens, I am honored by being the representative of the Disabled American Vet-

erans on this program honoring our country's flag. Those men who so gallantly have borne mute evidence of their heroic sacrifice in following the flag in the service of our beloved country, again with love and reverence, salute the emblem of our freedom and our strength—our Nation's flag.

It was during the dark days that followed the Declaration of Independence that efforts to create some semblance of unity and resistance formed the background for the dramatic incident which occurred in the modest shop of a Philadelphia needle woman named Mrs. Betsy Ross. To her shop, in the summer of 1776, came a distinguished group of patriots, headed by General Washington. They had with them a rough sketch for a flag, a symbolic banner behind which they hoped to unite the efforts of the Thirteen Colonies. Thus it was that this needlewoman set herself to the immortal task of making our first Star-Spangled Banner, and, while this particular flag was never formally recognized by Congress, it was used on many occasions before the efforts of Betsy Ross finally culminated in official recognition by the Continental Congress, which, on June 14, 1777, the first birthday of Old Glory, adopted a resolution: "That the flag of the 13 United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

When the Star-Spangled Banner was first flown at the head of the Continental Army, its general, George Washington, described its symbolism as follows: "We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

Following the cessation of hostilities, and the organization of the United States, under its new national constitution, the flag continued to be modified by the addition of a star and a stripe for each State coming into the Union. After the admission of Kentucky and Vermont, a resolution was adopted in January 1794 making the flag one of 15 stars and 15 stripes.

Realizing that the flag would soon become unwieldy with the addition of a stripe for each State, Capt. Samuel C. Reid, United States Navy, presented to Congress the suggestion that the stripes again be 13 in number, representing the 13 colonies which struggled to found the Nation, and that a star be added to the blue field for each additional State coming into the Union. This suggestion became the text of a resolution by Congress, effective July 4, 1818.

Many years later President Wilson said: "This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought, and purpose, as a Nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute those choices, whether in peace or in war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us, speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us, and of the records they wrote upon it."

And, now, ladies and gentlemen, our annual commemoration of Flag Day, first celebrated as such on June 14, 1916, was inaugurated by a proclamation by our then President, Woodrow Wilson, reading as follows:

"My fellow countrymen: Many circumstances have recently conspired to turn our thoughts to a critical examination of the conditions of our national life, of the influences which have seemed to threaten to divide us in interest and sympathy, of forces within and forces without that seemed likely to draw us away from the happy traditions of united purpose and action of which we have been so proud. It has, therefore, seemed to me fitting that I should call your attention to the approach of the anniversary of the day upon which the flag of the United States was adopted by the Congress as the emblem of the Union, and to suggest to you that it should this year and in the years to come be given special significance as a day of renewal and reminder, a day upon which we should direct our minds with a special desire of renewal to thoughts of the ideals and principles of which we have sought to make our great Government the embodiment.

"I therefore suggest and request that throughout the Nation and, if possible, in every community the 14th day of June be observed as Flag Day, with special patriotic exercises, at which means shall be taken to give significant expression to our thoughtful love of America, or comprehension of the great mission of liberty and justice to which we have devoted ourselves as a people, our pride in the history and our enthusiasm for the political program of the Nation, our determination to make it greater and purer with each generation, and our resolution to demonstrate to all the world its vital union and sentiment and purpose, accepting only those as true compatriots who feel as we do the compulsion of this supreme allegiance. Let us on that day rededicate ourselves to the Nation 'one and inseparable,' from which every thought that is not worthy of our fathers' first vows of independence, liberty, and right shall be excluded and in which we shall stand with united hearts, for an America which no man can corrupt, no influence draw away from its ideals, no force divide against itself—a nation signally distinguished among all the nations of mankind for its clear, individual conception alike of its duties and its privileges, its obligations and its rights."

That proclamation was signed by President Woodrow Wilson on May 13, 1916.

Every year since then our country's President has issued a similar proclamation calling upon Americans to commemorate June 14 as Flag Day.

What significance does Flag Day have for us this year, 27 years after the original Flag Day in 1916? Our flag is now again a battle flag, the symbol of our unity in the fight of our country and its allies, to resist, and finally to crush, the wanton aggression of a few nations that have violated all international law and agreements in order to try to take, treacherously and ruthlessly, what they wanted from others.

If their efforts to enforce their will upon others should unfortunately succeed—but it won't—then our own safety and freedoms would become forfeitable at any time.

It is unthinkable to permit the rule of force to be substituted for justice, to permit might to supplant right, to permit rigid regimentation to replace collective cooperation, to permit complete censorship, to squeeze out freedom of the press, to permit dictatorship to drive out democracy. These drastic methods of government, with the complete loss of our prized freedoms, and of our individual opportunities to work for the well-being and happiness of ourselves and our children, would immediately follow the domination of dictatorships.

Our beautiful red, white, and blue flag is now the bright symbol of the determination of all good Americans to protect America, to crush its enemies, to perpetuate Americanism and all that Americanism includes, and to assist other peoples to attain the "four freedoms"—freedom from fear, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom from want.

Flag Day, my fellow Americans, is significant to all of us as an opportunity to renew our faith in our own representative form of government, and to renew our mutual determination to protect and to perpetuate our American freedoms.

As so well stated in the lovely poem by Wells E. Bemont:

"Unfurl the flag, display with ours,
To represent the many powers,
Whose aim through earth's eternal hours
Is full and lasting freedom.

"Revere the flag with emblem bright,
The crimson bars on field of white,
And may it ever stand for right,
Beloved flag of freedom."

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent Polish congress at Buffalo gave ample proof of the unity and solidarity of Polish-Americans on the great question of Polish autonomy.

Never perhaps in the history of the Poles in this country has there been such a representative, such a solemn, and such a determined and inspired concourse of Americans of Polish blood. An intense fervor of American patriotism pervaded the gathering which left no doubt in the minds of observers that here was a group that could be depended on to the last man and woman to remain true and loyal to our own country, to be ever ready and willing to sacrifice everything for the sake of American security and American liberty.

In a word, the congress was fairly permeated with the recognition that Polish-Americans owed much to this Nation and that they were prepared, if called upon, to pay that debt. Indeed their brave sons in the armed forces have demonstrated beyond any doubt that there is no braver, nobler, stronger, or more courageous American than the Polish-American.

But the Congress was also possessed by another powerful feeling and that was the feeling that America owes something to the Polish-American in the grave crisis that presently embraces the motherland—fairness and justice in appraising her claims for the recapture of her birthright of freedom and independence, and forthrightness and candor in acting through diplomatic channels and any other method that may be available to the end that the pledges to small nations seeking and fighting for the recovery of their freedom and independence shall be kept.

This Congress must make its position clear on this vital issue. We have announced our belief in and faith in the principle of self-determination, we have encouraged our own people and other peoples to fight for it and we must do everything in our power to make sure that this battle for the right shall not be

fought in vain, either in the present or future.

I have very many Polish-Americans in my district and I know and appreciate the greatness and sterling qualities of this group. They are, above all, God-fearing and law-abiding. They are industrious, thrifty, frugal, and honest. There are few sluggards among them. They respect the rights of others, they bring up their children as fine Christians and fine Americans and they seek no special favors. They are gifted and talented in the arts and in the crafts. They combine what is rare in any people, the artistic and the practical. They love their church, their families, and the institutions of America with the fiery passion born of centuries of struggle against tyranny. They love liberty because they know what it is to fight and die to achieve or protect it.

But the Polish-Americans are a determined people and they possess a strong sense of justice and a passionate love of the land and traditions of their forebears which has contributed so much to the Polish character and to America.

These people were terribly aroused by the Nazi aggression, and this feeling turned to bitter hate with the spectacle of ruthless destruction of the cities and countryside of Poland, the decimation of their monuments of culture, the cruel slaughter of their kinsmen. In these circumstances there was probably additional reason why gallant and courageous Polish boys by the hundreds of thousands flocked to the colors and can be found today in every battlefield, in the air, on and under the sea, where our American forces are fighting the enemy. Far in excess of their proportion to our total population, these Polish-American boys have been cited for valor and gallantry in action and have paid the supreme sacrifice. Surely there is no stronger, tougher, braver, more courageous fighter in all the world than our own Polish-American boy. He has won his spurs in action. He has discharged with interest his obligation of patriotism and loyalty to the country for what it has given him and his family.

But these good Polish folks also love their native land, the birthplace of their fathers and mothers. They want to see it free again. Nazi domination is detestable and base. But Russian domination is no less hateful. Communism with its traditional enmity toward religion, the home, the family, the marriage institution, freedom of thought and action, is most obnoxious of all. The Pole by nature is an individualist—a lover of creative art, free enterprise, and initiative.

Thus, is it surprising that our Polish-Americans are so disturbed and upset over the events transpiring in Europe? They observe the steady pressure of Russia on the gateway to their country—the occupation of substantial parts of it, the threats toward the remainder. They see Russian puppet governments springing up all over Europe; yes, and in the Orient, inexorably spreading Communist principles and Communist techniques to well-nigh all of the world. They note the effort to infiltrate Poland with Communist ideas—the Polish Red youth movement, the battalions of women, the propaganda of press and radio designed to woo the people of Poland and prepare them for the advent of communism.

All these things have deeply moved and gravely concerned our Polish-American friends, as indeed they must be a source of grimmest anxiety to all Americans who love human liberty and desire a peace based on justice and the right of every people to determine their form of government without outside interference, military or ideological domination.

Let us be on guard and on watch, and let us be realistic. This is not the time to be lulled into an easy-going optimism that these grave developments will take care of themselves. This is a time for Americans to recognize the limitations of their own power, but to use the power America now wields in our own interest and in the interest of the ideals for which we fight. To be just, fair, honest, and honorable with all nations, certainly should be our aim and hope. To protest injustice and work against aggression and conquest certainly is our purpose and determination.

To Poland and every other small nation threatened with extinction or ideological penetration we must hold out the willing hand of assistance and cooperation. And this Congress cannot move too quickly in these perilous days to declare and effectuate a staunch policy of Americanism at home and abroad that will command respect and enable us to preserve democratic government.

The Missouri River Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon recess, and I hope that when the Members of the States along the Missouri go home that they will look into the Missouri River problem and come back with a greater understanding of the problems which confront all of us in that area. The times call for serious thinking, and when we consider the Missouri and its tributaries we are considering one of the greatest resources that this country has. Let us talk with our neighbors and try to come back with the soundest possible idea for the future development of the Missouri, so that it will be to the benefit of all the States through which it flows.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including an editorial concerning the Missouri taken from the Montana Standard for June 12, 1944:

SOMETHING MORE THAN VITUPERATION REQUIRED

It is a pity that there should be acrimonious contention and vituperative debate over this water problem that confronts the people of the great Missouri Valley. The problem never will be solved by villification or by attributing base and selfish motives to those with whom we do not agree. And the problem must be solved without further delay.

Many in Montana have been scanning eagerly and anxiously every word, every opinion, every suggestion that has come from our neighbors below in the hope that something will be found upon which we can agree and make a start for the solution of a tremendously vital problem.

There should be regret that some in places of community leadership believe they can bring a solution of the great problem of water by calling names. It is rather shocking that a newspaper in so fine and upstanding a metropolitan community as Kansas City should condemn the people of the Upper Valley because they insist upon their rights to the use of the waters of the Missouri.

These people always have believed it fundamental that water goes with the land. Otherwise this vast and incalculably rich area never would have been settled. With the use of water its immense resources, first of gold and silver, helped to rehabilitate this Nation financially and economically at the close of the Civil War. In a single gulch of Montana more than $75,000,000 in gold dust and nuggets was sent out to the prostrate East in the years immediately following the close of that war. Not a hundredth part of that vast treasure could have been reclaimed from the earth had no water been available. And that was only just a beginning when there were only a handful of settlers in the territory.

It is fully as regrettable that here at the top of the valley, where we are striving to protect our very existence by advancing our claims to the water, some should answer in kind and make petty threats of economic blacklisting against our neighbors below.

In our great problem, so vital to us and equally as vital to the people below who suffer from the rampages of the river, let us follow the magnificent example set for us by a great newspaper of the lower valley, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. That newspaper agrees that it is a monumental problem, that no solution can be reached unless all the divergent interests are represented and served in the ultimate decision.

We of the greatest valley in the world are one people engaged in an extraordinary variety of pursuits. We have regard for each other. Those below have no desire to wreck our fine and expanding industries. We have no desire to deny them protection from floods or to deprive them of the beneficial use of the river's waters.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has demonstrated its high consideration for us here at the river's beginnings. Recently it published in full detail a far too lengthy dissertation from Butte on the needs and the problems of the people of Montana who are dependent upon the waters of the Missouri, although it is likely that its editors entertained some serious exceptions. That was a demonstration of good will and good faith. It was evidence of complete fairness.

We must come to an early agreement as to the control and division of this vast resource. Our hope here in Montana is that it can be done on a mutual basis, that we can reach our own agreement among the States involved, and that when such an agreement is reached, it shall be carried out by some properly created agency which must be guided and limited by the terms of the agreement. Thus the interests of all will be served and injury and loss and suffering will be stopped.

Such an agreement is in prospect. We are close to it today and we shall be closer to it tomorrow, if we can restrain our extremists. The Army engineers' plan and the Reclamation Bureau plan for the disposition of these

waters together furnish us all the information that is needed.

The time for mutual recognition and common action is at hand.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Subcommittee on Public Health, Hospitals, and Charities of the Committee on the District of Columbia on juvenile delinquency:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1944.

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Hospitals, and Charities of the Committee on the District of Columbia respectfully submits the following report on juvenile delinquency in the Nation's Capital.

A survey of this subject was initiated January 27, 1944, by your subcommittee, as the result of the receipt of complaints from individuals and associations, and publication of reports regarding increasing delinquency among Washington's youth.

The chairman of your subcommittee conducted lengthy hearings and made personal inspection tours of places of supervised youth activities and received the testimony and recommendations of many of the outstanding officials of the municipal government, including the juvenile court, the police, the public schools, and the Recreation and Welfare Departments, as well as leaders in church, private social agencies, Boy and Girl Scouts, the boys' club movement, and numerous interested parents.

We conclude that while Washington's suddenly swollen population has resulted in the creation of an alarming situation, that there has been an increase in delinquency and delinquency tendencies shocking enough to call for more concerted remedial and preventive efforts than have heretofore been organized by the community.

This statement is not to be taken as one denouncing modern youth for, given its proper chance and the right kind of guidance, it will stand the test, but rather is one emphasizing that the adults in charge have been remiss in providing the counsel, the sign posts, the facilities that present conditions—wartime conditions—demand.

This committee recognizes that morals, character building, and parental responsibilities cannot be created by legislative act any more than there can be by that process the inculcation in the child's mind of a proper sense of values. These come from home and church training, from proper associations, and from good organization of public and private programs and facilities, and the committee is of the opinion that the present problem, accentuated by the wartime spirit of restlessness, can be met adequately only by the effective cooperation of all related elements of the community, civic, educational, religious, receational, and social work, public and private. There are many ways in which this can be done, and we find that here and there new programs and studies have been started in the National Capital that speak well for the motives of its adult and responsible citizenry.

Your committee in its report will attempt to cover some of the causes and preventive measures, and include recommendations it believes will have a helpful effect if adopted.

EXTENT OF PROBLEM

First of all, the committee was concerned with the question of whether there had been abnormal increase in juvenile delinquency in Washington within a recent period. We found there had been an increase that was in some measure beyond that which could reasonably be attributed to an increasing population. For instance, data submitted by Maj. Edward J. Kelly, Superintendent of Police, revealed the following as the arrests of minors for offenses of all classes, including traffic violations:

Fiscal year	Male	Female	Total
1940	4,787	582	5,319
1941	6,586	549	7,135
1942	6,685	710	7,395
1943	6,439	1,006	7,445
July to October 1944	2,603	316	2,919

Arrests of juveniles for felony charges

Fiscal year	Male	Female	Total
1940	721	22	743
1941	1,666	21	1,687
1942	1,506	20	1,526
1943	1,340	110	1,450
July to October 1944	556	12	568

It might be noted that if the 4 months' period above reported were the average for the whole fiscal year, the grand total number of juvenile arrests for felonies in 1944 would be 1,704, well above any of the previous 4 years.

Children, 17 years old and under, arrested for drunkenness in public places:

Fiscal year	Male	Female	Total
1939	14	4	18
1940	9	4	13
1941	12	9	21
1942	35	5	40
1943	72	5	77

Such figures as these are supported by published reports of representatives of the Department of Justice showing, for the Nation as a whole, a shocking increase in arrests of juveniles for crimes, all of which indicates we are in need of increased activities on the preventive and correctional side of the score.

HOUSING CONDITIONS

There are many causes of juvenile delinquency, and in this regard, we do not attempt to draw any line between hereditary and environmental factors, for we have reason to believe that both are of the greatest importance in considering the problem. A child born and reared in the slums might rise to great heights of achievement, if he had the proper stimulus, though the chances seem to be against it; just as a child reared amid all educational and social advantages, might—and sometimes does—go wrong. One witness before our committee made the very convincing statement:

"It is hard to be an angel in the slums."

It may be added that these studies, confirming earlier ones reported on by this committee, convinced us that insanitary and inadequate housing conditions continue unabated in the District of Columbia, and that in sections where these conditions predominate, there is a higher rate of delinquency than in others. Conspectus, overcrowding, insanitation, conditions that depress the opportunity for the development of good sound social values, serve as a breeding ground for delinquency, as well as disease.

Since this subject is under a comprehensive study by another committee of Congress, which is expected to soon make positive, detailed recommendations, we leave the question there except as to a reminder that slum-clearance action is vital.

MENTAL DISORDERS

It appears to this committee that one of the most crying needs of the District is a more progressive and better financed system of meeting the problems of juveniles who are mentally substandard. The established District institutions supposedly meeting this problem are inadequate and understaffed. This situation is recognized by some District officials, but action comes so belatedly that the problem always is ahead of performance, and the war priorities situation has intruded to further delay corrective construction programs. Perhaps Congress, too, has a responsibility in this, for there is nothing new in this situation. District officials may not have shouted loudly enough, but Congress perhaps should have heard the call earlier.

Leaving blame and generalities aside, it is painfully apparent that the District now lacks, and for a considerable time has lacked, adequate facilities for housing an appreciable portion of mentally deficient persons who should have institutional care. The District Training School for Feeble Minded at Laurel, Md., is not only inadequate as to housing and other facilities but it is lacking in sufficient personnel to control the situation, judging from the unquestioned reports of the number of "escapes" and the lack of control of inmates who cannot be left to their own resources.

Welfare Director Ray L. Huff frankly reports that the Laurel institution is filled to capacity, that there is a certified list of 350 who should be placed there but for whom there is no room and to whom no District care can now be given; that there is probably a much larger list needing care but not yet certified; that, largely due to improper facilities and inadequate numbers of supervisory personnel, some 300 former inmates of this institution are now at large.

We regard these circumstances as a sad commentary on the District situation. We submit that this problem has been accentuated by the critical materials situation and the wartime labor shortage, but we find that it was existent, apparently in large measure, before the United States entered the war.

On the same subject, though differently related, it should be stated that testimony before the committee highlighted the lack of scientific planning as to case finding and treatment of incipient cases of mental disturbance among school children in the District. The newly but tentatively established guidance clinic of the juvenile court, which was described at the time of its inception last October by Judge Fay L. Bentley, as a major step in coping with the problems of child delinquency, is threatened with short life, for no provision was made in the 1945 District Budget for its continuance. We recommend funds should be provided for its continuation. Likewise, the Commissioners have refused approval of funds sought by the Health Department for the proposed establishment of a psychiatric clinic under that Department to deal with the problems of substandard mental cases on a city-wide basis. Support for our views that such funds should be provided is found in our record of hearings in testimony by Ray L. Everett, of the Social Hygiene Society, by Welfare Director Ray

Huff, and Robert L. Haycock, the superintendent of schools. The latter, speaking of the need to expand the "adjustment classes" in the public-school system, emphasized this necessity for those people who are a "little off center" or a "little out of step" with their classmates.

VOLUNTEER PREVENTIVE MEASURES

It was indicated in testimony before this committee that many segments of Washington's civic life have been aware of the problems of juvenile unrest, and many constructive steps already have been taken. This applies to voluntary groups even more so than to public agencies. The principal lack to date has been an effective coordination of public and private efforts though there has been progress along this line in the past year.

For instance, the Council of Social Agencies has been making studies, the board of education has established a city-wide representative committee, and certain church groups have been outstandingly active in regard to the problem. Supplementing this, church, public, and private social welfare groups have been promoting remedial programs, many of which seem to strike at the roots of the condition. If there has been a lack of proper and effective city-wide organization, there has not been a lack of appreciation on the part of enlightened leaders of the gravity of the problem they faced, nor their dedication to serve in its solution.

Parent-teacher groups, social workers, religious leaders, boys' clubs, Boy and Girl Scouts, social hygiene experts, police officials, juvenile court officials, among others, have pondered the problem. Organization of special delinquency committees in each school has been suggested, community groups have been proposed and in some cases established to deal with the situation, parents and teachers have consulted, schoolhouse canteens have been set up to conduct supervised dance and play activities; proposals have been offered to extend hours of service by public libraries as a means of affording worth while free entertainment.

DIFFICULTIES FACED

While the above-stated programs are directed to the right purpose, they are confronted with obvious difficulties. War demands have taken many trained workers from the juvenile court, from the District Recreation Department, from all and sundry staffs where trained personnel are needed. Probably there is justifiable need for deferments in numerous cases but the priority of demands of the war are so compelling we can but suggest that temporarily there must be improvization, substitution, and replacement organized as best it may be. As an expression of profound faith, we voice our belief that American zeal and ingenuity will fill the gaps and effectively function.

SOURCES OF CONSTRUCTIVE AID

It is the belief of this committee that organization and operation of neighborhood councils, with the cooperation of parent-teacher groups, as suggested by school authorities, will prove helpful when inspired by broad principles and kept clear of personal issues.

Numerous church and socially minded groups already have promoted interesting and wholesome recreational or character-building programs that are providing splendid activities for leisure time. School Superintendent Haycock suggests leadership, so far as possible, by teachers and other school employees in guidance of the leisure-time activities of school children, expansion of recreation-supervision programs of the school system, assignment of more teachers as youth counselors, extension of adjustment classes for maladjusted pupils, and extension of public library facilities as a means of affording interesting and worth-while leisure time for youth pursuits.

We are convinced that one of the main factors contributing to juvenile delinquency is the lack of religious education and inspiration both for the child and the parents. Testimony presented to this committee indicated a much too small percentage of our boys and girls were regular attendants of Sunday schools. One of the reasons for this probably rests in the indifference of parents with respect to religious activities.

Within the past 2 years the board of education has more deeply realized the seriousness of the juvenile-delinquency problem. Surveys were conducted which disclosed that about 25 percent of the boys and girls found in some measure of trouble came from homes in which both the father and mother have positions. This war-aggravated situation is one of the most difficult with which to deal, for most of such parental employment has a patriotic motive transcending the pay, yet in many cases it leaves the child or children without proper parental guidance, for which there can be no comparable substitute.

As a result of this survey, efforts are being made to provide guidance for leisure-time activities of school-age children through extension of supervised recreation; however, as yet this has fallen short of the goal. One of the attractive features inaugurated in junior high schools has been the school "canteens" which includes free movies, dances, and refreshments. Under proper supervision these social functions could go far in providing a healthful usage of youthful energy, while providing wholesome fun. While there were questions as to whether there should be any charge for such events, staged in a public school buiding, the answer of witnesses was that these were extra-curricular affairs and that the children, or their parents, were quite willing to pay for what they wanted, especially for dance music and other entertainment.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Economic security is receiving the serious consideration of the Federal and District authorities, and it is something which requires the efforts of the entire community to accomplish. For years local and Federal authorities have been working with the problem of housing, and slowly but surely low-cost housing has been made available to people in the lower income groups. The Hébert bill, streamlining the District government and giving more authority to the Board of Commissioners, is expected to bring about quicker action on numerous municipal matters which now are delayed until Congress passes individually on them. This legislation should improve the functioning of the District government.

Juvenile delinquency is not something which occurs overnight. It starts in the home and is progressive. After the child starts to school the teacher is the one who first notices its antisocial behavior, and it is her duty not only to try to correct it—in classes of not more than 25 to 30—and to see what she can do in connection with the home, but to bring to the attention of the school doctor anything that she feels should be remedied.

Along with the schools come the clubs. You have the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Police Boys Club, and so forth; and whenever the teacher finds that the student is not interested in club work, she should do something to encourage interest. There, again, the teacher needs to work closely with the parents.

Your regulatory agencies do not take charge until after a child becomes a delinquent, and from then on it is the duty of the regulatory agency to cooperate with the teacher and with the family.

In regard to economic conditions, if a child is in a neighborhood where they normally have good regulations, good police protection, and a high standard of family life, these will all have a tendency to keep the child in line. However, if the economic condition of the family is near or below the subsistence level, the problem is greatly aggravated.

CAUSES OF DELINQUENCY

The following were found by your committee as being among the factors contributing to juvenile delinquency:

1. In many homes both the mother and father have jobs. Consequently, their children lack proper parental supervision and training.

2. Broken homes, with father in war service, or mother in full-time employment, brothers or sisters away from home—any of which circumstances may cause attitudes of unrest or uncertainty in the impressionable child.

3. Children employed under unwholesome conditions that limit educational progress or expose them to immoral habits.

4. Migration of family groups into Washington, particularly those from the South, where children have been uprooted from familiar and perhaps more comfortable surroundings to be lodged in congested inadequate housing.

5. Attendance at dance halls, beer parlors, and other places of commercial amusement where constructive supervision is lacking.

6. The war-aroused general spirit of excitement, anxiety, tension, and adventure—which is felt by all, but probably to a more compelling degree by the youth than by adults—and which is reflected in disregard of discipline, especially by those who have not had the advantage of considered care.

7. The ease with which today's youth earns "big money" with the pupil sometimes making a higher wage than his teacher and, in too many instances, without having adequate training in how to spend or save his earnings. While the easy-money problem is definitely war related, the committee regard it as highly important, and one that will not necessarily pass with the ending of the war.

8. The easy-going performance of the District Alcoholic Beverage Control Board which, in the face of increasing problems of enforcement, has invoked fewer suspensions and revocations of permits than in former years, without any justifiable showing that, despite wartime increases in population and growing shortages of potable supplies, there is a reduced desire for drink or created greater respect for regulations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Your committee then come to these recommendations:

1. That District recreation facilities, seriously curtailed by war activities, should be expanded and that all possible steps should be taken to make fuller use of existing facilities. Included in the latter reference is nighttime use of public-school buildings where there is a showing of a substantial number of interested persons and where necessary supervision can be provided.

2. That funds be provided for continuation of the psychiatric clinic at the juvenile court.

3. That funds be provided for creation of a Department of Mental Hygiene.

4. That action be taken by school authorities, and other city officials, if necessary, to bring about full cooperation by owners of all movie houses and other places of amusement to bar children of school age from such places during school hours, unless accompanied by parents or guardians.

5. That municipal officials and others use all legitimate means to secure adequate and

proper facilities for the District's Industrial Home Schools and the Training School for Feeble Minded as soon as the war priorities situation will permit.

6. That programs of enlistment and training of substitute recreation leaders, in public and private organizations, be initiated to fill the places of men and women who have embarked on war services.

7. That there be created by formal appointments by the Commissioners a District Juvenile Commission to serve as a clearinghouse for pertinent data on problems of children and as a fact-finding and advisory body to suggest constructive programs to the District Commissioners and to Congress, and to public and private agencies dealing with the problems.

This commission should include representatives of established organizations now at work on the problems, such as the public schools system, the Board of Public Welfare, the Health Department, the Council of Social Agencies, the Washington Federation of Churches, the Federation of Citizens' Associations, the Federation of Civic Associations, the juvenile court, the District Recreation Department, the Social Hygiene Society, the Boy and Girl Scouts, the boys' clubs, and the parent-teacher associations.

We feel the District government should provide any reasonable and necessary expenses to cover payment of clerical help to enable the Commission to conduct its correspondence, compile factual data, and outline its recommendations.

Since this would not be an operating agency, but an advisory group, it does not appear there would be needed any considerable appropriation and probably the needs of secretarial help could be provided by loans of secretarial or clerical help on a part-time basis from one or more of the District agencies, but if formal authorization and appropriations were found necessary, we ask the Commissioners to prepare and forward them. We hold that the prospective result of coordinated advice and efforts would far outweigh the contemplated minor cost of perhaps $5,000 to $10,000 a year.

The Board of Education already has made a start in this direction with the creation of an advisory committee on juvenile problems, which includes representatives of various public and private agencies. Our proposal is not intended to disparage the work of that advisory committee but rather to make it possible for a more formally recognized and permanent agency, to be named by the District Commissioners, to operate on an even more effective basis. Perhaps the city heads will find it desirable to merge the existing committee into the commission hereinbefore proposed.

8. That the requests of the Commissioners for funds for employment of additional playground leaders be approved.

9. That the requests of the Commissioners for employment of seven additional inspectors for the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board be approved, with the hope that this increase in the Board's own staff will enable it to obtain a more intimate knowledge of what is happening in some of its licensed places.

10. That the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board consult its record on the question of whether or not it has been too lenient with licensees who have been careless as to their regard for the letter and the spirit of the law—a liberal law which should be strictly enforced as the best means of preventing a return of prohibition with all its evils.

11. That all members of the District Board of Public Welfare make frequent inspections of District welfare institutions operating under their direction, particularly those dealing with juveniles, to assure a personal knowledge of conditions over which they exercise control.

Something About Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Winchell has had many things to say about many people. The people should have an opportunity of reading something about him written by a fellow New Yorker, who should know whereof he writes. The release is as follows:

WINCHELL GETS A TASTE OF HIS OWN MEDICINE

NEW YORK.—Walter Winchell, who publicly admits to being the country's outstanding reporter of gossip and scandal, becomes the victim of his own device—gets a taste of his own medicine—in a 52-page booklet just published in which he is handed his own species of "scallions" and is accused of being a "dupe of Axis agents," a promoter of "Hitler's divide-and-conquer strategy," and a leading figure in an asserted home-front plot to impose totalitarian government on the United States.

It is also charged in the booklet that Winchell is the "mouthpiece" for an "un-American gestapo," and the "press-agent stooge" of a smear bund.

The booklet, which prys into Winchell's private affairs, probes his public pronouncements, reviews his "checkered" career and declares that he is powerful and dangerous and a menace to America, is authored by Joseph P. Kamp, New York publicist, who has been excoriated by Winchell principally as a collaborator of Congressman MARTIN DIES.

Entitled, in sly and bitter humor, "With Lotions of Love * * *" the booklet is published by the Constitutional Educational League, Inc., of which Mr. Kamp is a vice chairman. The League was organized by war veterans in 1919 under the sponsorship of President William Howard Taft and Gen. Leonard Wood and is known nationally for its militant opposition to un-American activities and for its exposés of Communists, Fascists, and Nazis.

"With Lotions of Love * * *" picks up the Winchell saga where other biographers have left off. It gives time, place, and unrestricted detail of asserted incidents in the career of "America's No. 1 newsboy." "It is certain to raise Winchell's blood pressure as well as the reader's eyebrows," the author said in a statement.

The booklet declares that "Winchell, as a Naval officer, is a joke," and then proceeds to tell in detail how little he knows about the Navy and recites the unbelievable story of his "active" service record. It points out that, contrary to Winchell's public statements, he had requested "deferred status" because "he believes he can best serve interests of Navy by remaining in an inactive status."

Winchell's slurs against the Army are also highlighted together with the charge that his "propaganda" has been branded as "detrimental to the war effort" by Military Intelligence.

Winchell's one-man campaign against Congress is given particular attention with special emphasis on his controversy with Congressman DIES, and his passages-at-arms with Representatives RANKIN and HOFFMAN.

While admitting that Winchell is "probably not a Communist," the author asserts that he is "much worse than a Communist" and in support of his accusation enumerates some of the columnist's acts and items which are asserted to have helped the Communist cause.

In releasing the booklet Mr. Kamp declared: "For 20 years Winchell has perpetrated a ludicrous and mischievous hoax. Numerous articles and several books have been written about him and his mean and malicious scandalmongering. While all of these previous writings have been factual in content, most of them have presented Winchell as nothing more sinister than an illiterate boor . . . a dull fellow, with a penchant for smart-alecky wisecracking, who generally amused his 130,000,000 American betters by a frank confession of peeping under drawn blinds and sniffing at social garbage cans.

"My purpose is to allow the American people to see for the first time this jester to the court of bad taste stripped of his cap and bells so that they may judge for themselves whether his wartime antics are those of a clown or a conspirator."

In a preface to his booklet, Mr. Kamp identifies Winchell as an important and vociferous agent of a home front underground movement seeking to impose a totalitarian form of government on the people of the United States.

This movement, according to the booklet, is headed by a powerful group of internationalists whose politico-sociological scheming involves high personages in official Washington. This movement, the booklet discloses, is aided and abetted by a smear bund which maintains an un-American Gestapo to snoop on the American people and to spy on representative patriotic organizations.

The Dies committee is cataloged as a Fascist outfit, the booklet charges, and Little Business Men of America, the Racquet Club, the Republican Club, the Prayer League of America, the United States Police Reserve Association, the Society of the Cincinnati, and the International Catholic Truth Society, among others, are named as subversive organizations in the secret files.

"Investigation further discloses," the author declares, "that a listing of borderline subversive groups includes the American Bar Association, the Republican National Committee, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Knights of Columbus, the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars."

The heavily documented material in "With Lotions of Love * * *" is taken mainly from two chapters of Mr. Kamp's forthcoming book Un-American Gestapo.

Refugee Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement prepared by me for presentation before the House Committee on Immigration, June 21, 1944. The meeting was canceled because of the heavy legislative program. It follows:

I appear to record my unqualified support of the measures under consideration before

this distinguished committee today. So far as the various bills are concerned, it does not matter to me which one, or which combination of any of them, you may decide to support so long as the historic American principle of asylum is enunciated and speedily adopted by the committee. There is not, and should not be, any partisan, or even nationalistic, considerations attached to these measures. They seek to permit a great humane salvation of thousands of our fellow-beings who have felt the cruel lash of unspeakable tyranny and persecution—men, women, and children sorely afflicted and grievously mistreated solely because of their race, their religion, their political views, or simply because they were caught in the tragic network of global war.

It so happens that predominantly our Jewish brethren have been the chief and most conspicuous sufferers from the oppression and bestiality of ruthless zealots. But other races and other faiths have also been visited with a form of intoleration and brutality which has few parallels in the annals of history. To make matters worse, these Jewish people because of the faithlessness of a selfish international diplomacy which engineered the defeat of the abrogation of the white paper have been denied harbor and refuge in their own lawfully constituted national homeland of Palestine. Barred even from their own ancient native land, driven from pillar to post, these pitiful victims are forced to wander as exiles over the face of the earth, turned away from every haven of safety, starving, and destitute and homeless.

Other races and faiths, including the Italians, the Polish, the French, and others, have suffered a similar fate—their homes destroyed, their fortunes stolen, their earthly possessions pilfered, their innocent children slaughtered before their very eyes. All these unfortunates look to America—to us, with hopeful hearts to save them from a destiny more cruel than death—enslavement and torture.

We cannot fail them. Not only as Americans whose country has traditionally held out the hand of refuge and comfort to the afflicted and the persecuted, but as human beings whose hearts must be deeply moved by this sight of suffering and barbarous punishment, we must perform our sacred duty to mankind. We must not turn these people away from the last door upon which they can knock for shelter and a chance to live. We must let them in; we must bind their wounds; we must give them shelter in our midst—all of them who suffer indescribable anguish and tearfully pray for deliverance from tyranny and injustice.

This does not mean that we will have to discard our present immigration laws, nor that we will unwisely multiply the social and unemployment problems of the post-war period. We can stipulate, as these measures do, that when the war is over and conquered territories have again been liberated, these people will be returned to their own countries.

Members of the committee—tomorrow may be too late. Every day sees thousands of these victims slain, tortured, driven to madness or a slow death by starvation. In the name of humanity and mercy, in the name of Him who died for the salvation of mankind, let us take these sufferers to our own secure homeland. I urge you with all my heart, I plead with you with all my earnestness and strength—report these measures at once and demonstrate to the whole world, particularly to the crazed tyrants who have perpetrated these outrages, that the soul of America is as kindly and human as its sword is invincible and mighty.

I have every confidence that to a man you will harken to the pleas of humanity.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for the opportunity to be heard.

Pledge to the War Wounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malvina Lindsay, from the Washington Post of January 15, 1944:

THE GENTLER SEX

(By Malvina Lindsay)

PLEDGE TO THE WAR WOUNDED

(For a woman at home)

I will begin now faithfully and prayerfully training myself for the test of battle I am soon to meet—that of welcoming back the war wounded and making them feel that it is home as usual.

If I see a maimed serviceman on the streets, I will firmly stifle any urge to stare curiously, or to turn away with the slightest gesture of shrinking, or to let even a shadow of commiseration cross my face. I will summon all the sensitivity of mind and aristocracy of soul I possess, and give him the usual, matter-of-fact glance I would give any stranger.

I will never, under any circumstances, be so boorish and unfeeling as to ask any serviceman about his wounds or to seek to draw him out on his battle experiences.

I will never, in a public place, comment to a companion, even in a whisper, about a serviceman whose battle injuries are apparent. I will realize that even though he may not see or hear me, his acute sensitivity will make him unhappily aware that he is a subject of attention.

I will never let the term, "Poor fellow" pass my lips—or abide for a moment in my thoughts—in connection with a battle-scarred serviceman.

If anyone I know or love lies wounded in a far-away hospital, I will not write him dishearteningly or too curiously and anxiously, but will rather try to make him feel that I am not unduly worried or alarmed and am not attaching too much importance to the physical afflictions he has suffered. I will try to communicate to him my calm, cheerful, and hopeful acceptance of whatever has befallen him.

If any member of my family returns partly whole from this war, I will make it my major undertaking to see that he is treated as far as possible as a completely whole and normal person.

For the sake of all those men in my orbit of life who may return home sick or wounded in body or mind, I will cultivate in myself the habit of cheerfulness. I will cherish about me joy, laughter, and gayety, both now and later, knowing that these things often have more curative value than medicine.

I will determinedly root out of my own nature any neurotic, shrinking attitude toward those who bear the permanent marks of battle. I will train myself to regard these scars with reverence as testimonials of human courage and character.

I will constantly remind myself of the mental achievements of great men and women who have been physically handicapped. I will remember St. Paul the Apostle, the lame Queen of Sheba, the blind Homer and the blind Milton, the deaf Beethoven, the crippled Alexander Pope, the invalid Stevenson—and I will also remember that one of the foremost figures right now in world leadership, who is also the President of the United States, attained his distinctions under physical handicaps as severe as most wounded veterans will return with.

I will try to meet this test of battle behind the lines with as much courage and steadfastness as the brave men who incurred these wounds displayed at the battle front to guarantee to me the way of life I now enjoy.

Termination of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH MRUK
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, "the day is rapidly approaching when primary responsibility for settlement of terminated war contracts must rest squarely upon war contractors and subcontractors themselves, rather than upon any agency of the Federal Government." I am quoting Mr. Paul Engstrum, a nationally known consultant, industrial engineer, and authority on contract termination and on Government and war contractors' procedures. He is the director of the contract termination division of a well-known firm of Federal consultants in Washington, D. C.

Mr. Engstrum has told me, so rapidly has the War Department moved to reinforce its organization for handling settlements of canceled contracts and in setting up policies and procedures for termination boards to follow, that in the near future it may become practically current in disposing of such cases. In the meantime it is urging contractors themselves to get their organizations in readiness for the day when the present trickle of contract cancelations mounts into a tidal wave.

Up to the present, termination settlements have been relatively small in relation to total war production. W. P. B. Chairman Donald Nelson, giving what he termed a "realistic view" of the war-contract situation, said recently that the Government's outstanding obligation for goods still to be delivered totaled about $75,000,000,000, or "considerably more" than the 1943 production.

A second big fact—

Said Mr. Nelson—

is that out of $210,000,000,000 in prime contracts placed by Government since June 1940, the face value of contracts terminated up to April of this year totaled only $22,000,000,000.

Most of these canceled contracts were swiftly replaced by contracts for different models of the same product.

Thus, while a few terminations have been coming through almost daily, the great flood of them will pour out over the country on "X-day," the day Germany falls.

Steps have been taken to make holders of America's more than 2,000,000 prime

and sub contracts for war goods "termination-minded." These include the following:

First. The setting up of "termination units" within individual companies holding war prime and sub contracts. This plan has the backing of both the War Department and the United States Chamber of Commerce. It is designated to help companies prepare the way for sudden cancelations which might come in a large quantity at any time. Once these units are properly organized, they are expected to help both their own organizations and the Government termination agencies dispose of cancelation problems.

Second. The War Department is having certain personnel trained in termination procedure by the United States Office of Education.

Third. Streamlining of Army policies to make termination as speedy and as final as possible. One of the latest of these policies is the constant revision of General Procurement Regulation No. 15 to bring them up to date with changes in termination legislation and surplus property acts. For example, the Army has just announced that it has revised the procedure governing the review of contract-termination settlements for smaller contractors. Whereas, formerly each proposed settlement agreement involving the payment of more than $5,000—excluding payment for completed items or work at the contract price—had to be examined by a War Department advisory panel before final settlement could be concluded, the revised regulation raises to $25,000 the minimum value of a contract which must be reviewed by a settlement board before final termination payments can be made.

The Army has announced that termination claims of $171,000,000 have been settled. The surplus property resulting from these terminations has been sold or disposed of in new war contracts, and $133,000,000,000 actually have been paid out by the War Department in final settlements. These payments cleared off $2,000,000,000 in face amount of canceled contracts on which claims have been made. Over two and one-half billion dollars of additional contracts were settled without any claims at all.

However, it is estimated that war contractors still are entitled to claim more than one-half billion dollars in settlement of fixed-price contracts which already have been terminated. Up to the 1st of May, only a little more than $130,000,000 of these unsettled claims actually had been filed. The Army feels that it is vital that this job be speeded up by industry in general. To get paid, the contractors' claims must be properly submitted in detail.

To obtain a settlement from the Government on a terminated contract, a contractor must present all facts on which a negotiated settlement can be based. The primary facts are: First, a complete inventory of all property for which reimbursement is expected, and second, a complete statement of costs allocable to the terminated contract. Hence, the Contractors Termination Organization must be manned by responsible officers of their own company, who should in turn be advised by termination consultants, in order to be able to prepare these facts accurately and speedily.

In many quarters in official Washington, stress is being placed on this aspect of the demobilization job: When termination comes, industry must be prepared. War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes disclosed recently that instructions will go out to all war contractors within the next 30 days, notifying them of the percentage cutbacks which will be applied to them at the end of the European war.

Mr. Byrnes emphasized to a special Senate committee that delay in the settlement of terminated contracts will greatly aggravate transition to peacetime employment and if delay is to occur "Then we might as well immediately provide for a huge public works program."

Outlining comprehensive steps which have been taken by Army procurement officials to curtail military production immediately upon the collapse of Germany, the War Mobilization Director said that the Army already has prepared a revision of its current supply program to be put into effect on the day Hitler surrenders. These revised procurement schedules have been made available to W. P. B. The Army shortly will make these tables available to its field offices, and contractors will thus be able to get an inkling of proposed reductions in their orders in time to cushion the effect of termination on their organization.

Official statements from Washington war agencies continue to emphasize the need for termination preparedness at the company level. This is necessary if executives are to avoid expensive and unnecessary delays in winding up their business with the Government. Primarily, the job is viewed from official sources as one of education, to make industry aware of what must be done. The problem is complicated by the fact that the whole procurement process filters through prime contractors, through thousands of subcontractors, and in turn to the suppliers of the subcontractors.

An authoritative spokesman for the Army made the following statement in connection with adjustments of production cut-back and the termination of war contracts:

> The effective utilization of manpower, facilities, and materials in the production of supplies and equipment of the Army of the United States requires constant planning. Changes in production programs are necessary as the war progresses from one stage to another. It is vitally important that we make these changes if lives are not to be unduly sacrificed and the taxpayers' money is not to be spent for munitions which have become obsolete or semiobsolete because of changes in enemy tactics, terrain, or climatic conditions. Such changes can have serious consequences upon living conditions and employment in particular areas. It is, therefore, essential that all reductions in programs and cancelations of contracts be given careful consideration.

The implications of the contract termination job for American industry are staggering when viewed in the aggregate. War expenditures are running at a daily rate of more than $300,000,000. Schedules call for nearly $69,000,000,000 in arms production for 1944. This represents an average monthly rate of 20 percent over last year.

A sudden cancelation of even a portion of these huge war contracts will come as a rude shock to the companies holding them. Yet such a prospect is exactly what industry faces on X-day, when the European military campaign is finished and the Allied war machine can turn its attention to the Pacific. A reduction in over-all military equipment needs of from 35 to 50 percent is forecast for the period immediately after the fall of Germany, and this country's war plants will bear the brunt of this reduction.

On the assumption that, on the average, industry is 2 months ahead of deliveries in its expenditures for production, the amount of claims which would be filed if all contracts were terminated would be one-sixth of $69,000,000,000, or about $11,300,000,000. If industry, on the average, is 3 months ahead of deliveries, the amount of claims would be one-fourth of $69,000,000,000, or roughly, $17,000,000,000.

Despite the magnitude of this termination problem, the miiltary services are doing everything possible to protect the contractor. More information on cutbacks will shortly be available. Encouragement is given the establishment of company termination units and the training of men to staff them. With continued cooperation the jol of transition to a civilian economy need not be insurmountable.

Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in this solemn hour when our Government has apparently in effect broken diplomatic relations with little Finland I wish to extend my sympathy to the Finnish people of this Nation.

Finland has for many years demonstrated a fine moral honesty that might well be emulated by other nations. Without fail she has met her obligations on her national debt to this country. In many other respects this brave nation has given us proof of the high character of her people, their love of freedom and democracy and their willingness to die to preserve her birthright of free men and women.

It is urged by our Government that Finland fights against one of our allies. It might well be mentioned that that ally fights against only one of our major enemies and still retains friendly relations with the nation that attacked us. But in any event, I deplore the fact that Finland, or any other nation, should have

punitive action taken against it by this Government simply because she fights to protect herself against aggression and seeks to preserve her boundaries and her territory from unwarranted invasion. If the principle of self-determination is to have any substantial meaning, if the words of the Atlantic Charter are sincerely put, if our pronouncements of freedom, liberty, and democracy are to be something more than hollow echoes, our Nation cannot logically take sides for any reason, or on any pretext, against a brave people struggling for their existence, their lives, and their independence.

It is bad enough that Finland should be invaded and conquered; but it is worse that she should be made the victim against her will and by the force of arms of a deliberate communistic infiltration. I sincerely trust that the long-time policy of this American Government will not subscribe to this most unfortunate result. I hope that our State Department will reconsider this grave question and give Finland as a free and independent nation the recognition she deserves. This course will be pleasing and gratifying to all true lovers of freedom but most of all to the very many American citizens of Finnish descent in our midst whose loyalty to America and whose contributions to American life are certainly not exceeded by any other group in the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by John O'Donnell from the Washington Times-Herald:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

As might well be expected, the Soviet Embassy here and the thick red line of F. D. R.'s fourth-term backers, led by Comrade Browder and Mr. Sidney Hillman of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, are delighted over the State Department's ouster of Finland's minister to the United States, Hjalmar Procope, and three of his aides, along with their immediate families.

With considerable smug satisfaction, some of the worthy gentry in the State Department are now announcing that the removal of the popular Finnish minister from this Capital "has closed up the last Axis listening post in Washington."

But so far as we have been able to discover, Moscow has no intention of shutting down Japan's listening post in Moscow.

For some strange reason, the State Department at first was very coy or jittery (or perhaps it was just honest ignorance) when it came to discussing the make-up of the Japanese staff in Moscow which is naturally interested in digging up all the military information possible about the effectiveness of the American-made 10,000 airplanes, 5,600 tanks, etc., etc., that we have poured into Russia.

But finally after a 24-hour interval the Department came through with a list of the Japs on the watch in Moscow, as of last month.

Our enemies, the Japs, have a very effective and large staff of expects in their diplomatic business of keeping on good terms with the Russians and quite properly digging up our military secrets.

Shrewd Naotake Sato is Tokyo's Ambassador in Moscow. His opposite number, the Soviet Ambassador to Tokyo, is Jacques Alexandrovich Malik.

The top men in Japan's set-up in Moscow form a spy bureau which is impressive to our military and naval men who have met them in peacetime.

The Jap Army experts in Moscow are directed by Col. C. Yabe and Maj. K. Nokhara—or were in May when last word was received here from the enemy listening post.

Naval Attaché Capt. S. Yamaguchi and his aides, including Capt. M. Fumoto, are very busy picking up what they can learn about our Navy secrets and plans and shooting the information under diplomatic secrecy back to the Jap Imperial Staff in Tokyo.

The list of Japs in Moscow is well salted down with experts in aviation and espionage. The latest list showed the presence in Russia of these top-flight Jap agents, career men in the legalized art of spying when carried out under diplomatic immunity:

Minister-Counselor G. Morinima, Counselor Kameyama, Secretaries Takeuchi, Kawasaki, Yukhani, Akivama, Takakhasi, and the big-shot undercover experts, designated as attachés, Umenuro, Komuro, and Kawamata.

So far as Washington has been able to discover, Pal Joey Stalin is very sot in his ways when it comes to moving him with the plea that American admirals and generals would feel a lot better and safer if Stalin's Jap guests in Moscow were given a diplomatic heave-ho and gently ushered away from their listening posts where they are industriously laboring to gather and ship back to Japan the hottest United States military secrets.

We've politely intimated to Pal Joey that the presence of Japanese army and military experts in a spot where they can get ripe and valuable information on our American equipment shipped to Russia may mean the death of American fighting men in Burma, or in the Southwest Pacific under General MacArthur, or in the broad Pacific command of Admiral Nimitz.

Pal Joey has just puffed on his pipe and smiled. He put on the pressure for us to boot out the Finns. We did. We renewed our request that he play ball and oust from Moscow our enemies, the Japs.

Pal Joey has given us the diplomatic grin, the Russian shrug, and sits tight.

When general resentment flared up in Congress against the manner in which the State Department had handled "L'Affaire Procope" there was a buzz of inspired whispers from our worthy diplomats.

The gist of this behind the hand whispering was that Procope was too friendly with Senators and Congressmen who simply don't like the Roosevelt administration.

Coming down to specific cases, one of these inspired whispers from on high was that Procope had tipped off certain Senators (Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire among them) that this Government was turning over to Stalin our cruiser *Milwaukee*.

Well, we took the trouble to run this whisper down. The one gentleman who should know, because he proclaimed it on the floor of the Senate, is positive (and this is the highest authority) that he didn't get the news from Procope, never spoke to Procope about it, but did get it on separate occasions from two high ranking officers in the United States Navy.

"In the long run," observed one of our distinguished Senators yesterday, "in the long run, I repeat, the people of Finland are going to receive more respect and admiration from the people of the United States than a lot of these fourth-term strategists up on Pennsylvania Avenue."

Well, we remember that back in the days when we were writing sports, the Finns were mighty good long distance runners. We recalled the piece we once wrote about Paavo Nurmi. But that was a long time ago. And the smooth perfection of the legs of those brother Finns—Willie and Hans Kolehmainen. And that was a long, long time ago. But in the "long run," as the Senator observed, we're betting on the Finns.

We whole-heartedly agree with those brave words of President Roosevelt when he rebuked the pinkish American Youth Conference on the White House lawn, back in '40 when they hailed the red aggression of Finland.

Said F. D. R. of Finland that afternoon.

"Here is a small republic in northern Europe. A republic which, without any question whatever, wishes solely to maintain its own territorial and governmental integrity.

"Nobody with any pretense of common sense believes that Finland had any ulterior designs on the Soviet Union.

"American sympathy is 90 percent with the Finns in their effort to stave off invasion of their own soil. That American sympathy by now is axiomatic.

"The Soviet Union, as a matter of practical fact, as everybody knows, who has the courage to face the fact, the practical fact known to you and known to all the world, is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world.

"It has invaded a neighbor so infinitesimally small that it could do no conceivable, possible harm to the Soviet Union. A small Nation that seeks only to live at peace as a democracy, and a liberal, forward-looking democracy at that."

Father's Day, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Cleveland:

There is a peculiar poignancy to this particular June day for all of us. Our hearts are torn with the ever-present thought of what the invasion is bringing to our fighting forces. Death and suffering will be the fate of many. Courage and fortitude are and will be the need of all.

We have come together here in this church to find the courage we, too, need in this hour, as well as to remind ourselves and each other of some of the deep realities that underlie all our living. One of these realities is the valiant way in which the fathers of the world are carrying their hearts' sadness. So much is said of the sorrow of the mothers of the world, so little has been said of fathers. Let us stop a moment on this Sunday morning and consider those things that we know are in their hearts. One can readily imagine the deep sense of personal failure and disillusion in the hearts of our American fathers who fought in the First World War and whose sons are fighting today.

There are 244 Members of Congress who have sons and daughters in the armed services, and in our private and informal meetings many of them express the sorrow that they guard in public. They watch the war and try to know the war. Many have had an understanding of war drawn from their experience 26 years ago, but their understanding of war never gave them an understanding of this kind of war, which is a war of steel against flesh.

In some ways war is harder on fathers than it is on mothers. A father places all his dreams in the life of his son. It is for a better life for his son that a father labors, and a son is, for many fathers, all the immortality they expect to have. So it is hard on those

fathers who fought in the "war to end war" to have to see their sons go off to fight again.

SUGGESTION TO FATHERS

My suggestion to fathers who have a feeling of compulsion to do something more than the ordinary in helping with the war effort is to take on some of the boys of the neighborhood, get up baseball games for them, and set up a workshop for them where they can be busy making things.

Some mothers don't see the man's point of view. There is no one who can take the place of a father who has gone to war, but at least the young sons of soldier fathers are better off when they have the benefit of a man's counsel.

As for our boys in the service, we should in every way give them strength, courage, and fortitude. Our churches must be vital centers, not of tradition, but of truth. This is what the boys expect of them. And so many soldiers have told me that the form of religion doesn't really matter to them any more; what really matters to them is what the form symbolizes. They have come to recognize that truth exists in many garments, that it may be found in the heart of a Chinese, a Hindu, or an African, as well as in their own kind of people.

We must not fail the boys when they come home. Our soldiers and our young people will have little patience if we do not carry through to the end. Our responsibility is to encourage our boys, to meet their needs, and, when they come home, to make them feel that tomorrow's world will be their world.

Address of Hon. James C. Auchincloss, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address delivered by my distinguished colleague, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey, on June 20, at the annual luncheon of the Better Business Bureau of Washington.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS is chairman of the Better Business Bureau of New York City and for many years has been a national leader in this most constructive form of public service.

With his varied experience as a successful businessman, his practical knowledge of business needs, his faith in fair and honest principles and practices as the absolutely essential basis of any permanent business prosperity, the views of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS command respect and intelligent consideration within and out of Congress.

It goes without saying that Mr. AUCHINCLOSS brings to his work as a Member of Congress the same tireless industry, faithfulness to duty, and understanding of economic and social problems which have characterized his life-long efforts to establish better business methods throughout the country.

Mr. Baltz, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor to be asked to speak on this occasion which is a milestone in the life of the Better Business Bureau of Washington. I realize that there are many people far better equipped to address you than I am, but I suppose I was asked because I have been connected with Better Business Bureau work for a great many years and it was felt that I should be asked to address you out of courtesy. As a speaker, I do not rate very high but I always try to bear in mind the advice given me by a friend of mine not long ago when I first ran for public office. He said "Stand up so you can be seen; speak out so you can be heard; and sit down so you can be appreciated." I will certainly endeavor to live up to that advice so I may achieve whatever appreciation may accrue.

Better Business Bureaus are not easy to bring into being; they do not just happen. It requires a great deal of hard work to organize a Better Business Bureau and they cannot be successful unless there is a sincere desire for them on the part of the businessmen of the community they serve. Furthermore, a Better Business Bureau executive who is worth his salt, is very hard to find. He must have a temperament which is fair and he must be endowed with a crusading spirit for what is right and sound. His honesty must be beyond question and his respect for the opinions of others must be real. You are indeed fortunate here in Washington, in having such a director in Mr. Claude Woodward and the outstanding service rendered by the Washington Bureau is eloquent testimony of his ability. I rather suspect, however, that the sterling qualities which make him a first-class Better Business Bureau director have been supported and encouraged by his association with Mrs. Sally Muchmore, the assistant director. I can testify that she is well known to the Better Business Bureau of New York City, as one who has brought a great deal of good common sense and practical knowledge of business to the Better Business Bureau work. It is largely due to these two people that the Washington Bureau has achieved such a high standing among the Better Business Bureaus in the country and I might call your attention to the fact that this is no small praise, as there are 60 odd bureaus in the United States that are all doing excellent work.

The thing that attracted my attention most to Better Business Bureau work, many years ago, was the fact that it was a movement started by businessmen who were determined to clean house and set up high standards for the conduct of their business in order to gain consumer confidence. Unlike many similar movements, this one grew and prospered because it was conceived in sincerity and born with a singleness of purpose which has stayed with it throughout the succeeding years.

Businessmen, by supporting and strengthening the Better Business Bureau in their community, are thus recognizing their own responsibility toward the purchasing public. This by itself is very laudable and entirely praiseworthy and it is strong proof of the integrity of the American businessman. I am one of those who believe that American business is conducted on honest principles or it could not have reached the high standard of efficiency it now enjoys. We could never have become the "arsenal of democracy" if the American businessman were a cheat and a fraud. He is a high type of patriotic citizen and intends to remain one. In connection with this, I was very much interested in the testimony of Mr. C. E. Wilson, former president of General Motors Corporation, before the special committee of the House of Representatives on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning, when he said, "The average contractor and businessman is honest and I would make my rules and regulations on that basis. Not too much on the basis of trying to catch the crooks. Now many of you men down here are lawyers and you get in on the seamy side of things. I think you sometimes make a mistake. There are so many darn honest people in our country." That is a significant statement, coming from the president of a corporation which is perhaps the largest employer of labor in the country and the same spirit is behind the Better Business Bureau movement—honest men in business getting together to protect the public from fraud formed the Better Business Bureau at the start and have been forming and supporting Better Business Bureaus ever since.

Of course it is sound business for a merchant or banker to gain the confidence of the public and undoubtedly this principle plays a part in motivating the supporters of the Better Business Bureau, but public confidence is bred by honest dealing and don't let anyone tell you anything different. That is true in the business life and just as true in the political life of a people and I will venture this statement—the business of politics holds no monopoly on honesty.

A Better Business Bureau should never concern itself with politics; that is outside its function. This may seem a strange statement to some of you, especially when the aid of Better Business Bureaus is solicited in the support of what appears to be constructive legislation. But my experience in bureau affairs has impressed on me the fact that Better Business Bureaus being formed for the benefit of business do not achieve this purpose if they get off that track and meddle around in political matters. Politics is always controversial and such controversy is not the function of the Better Business Bureau.

During this war, Better Business Bureaus have been asked by Government on more than one accasion to aid in the enforcement of Government regulations. I have been consistently opposed to Better Business Bureaus engaging in any such activity, claiming that they were never intended to be an enforcement agency for anyone. It is their function to receive complaints against unfair trade practices, to watch for unsound advertising and when improper practices are discovered, to first call them to the attention of the offender and then if he does not mend his ways, report the offense for prompt action to the constituted authority, who is the enforcing agent and not the Better Business Bureau. I can remember back in the days around 1920, when "bucket shops" were flourishing in New York City and our New York Better Business Bureau was called upon on many occasions by victims who had been robbed of their funds. Our staff would gather the evidence of the fraud and present it to the office of the district attorney and if that office refused or delayed action for one reason or another, the Better Business Bureau would demand its attention under threat of publicizing the facts. As one of the great men in the bureau activities in New York put it, "When the district attorney did nothing, the Better Business Bureau acted as a very efficient burr under the horse's tail." I can well remember on one occasion that this burr was so efficient that an attorney general of the State of New York was forced to return from a vacation in California and attend to his business or take the consequences.

Government authorities of late days have come more and more in contact with the Better-Business Bureau and its work, and it is with distinct pleasure and a thrill of pride that those of us who are so interested in this work learn of the respect and the constructive impression that the principles and ideals of the Better-Business Bureau make on Government officials. Indeed I may say that it comes as a bit of a shock to some of the people in our Government today, who are perhaps imbued with the idea of making over our economic system and in using businessmen as a whipping boy, to learn that businessmen know the difference between right and wrong and through their Better-Business Bureaus maintain high standards of business honesty. Businessmen may well be proud of

this part they are playing in the Nation's economy in establishing and insisting upon truth in advertising and high principles in business.

Business, however, has a great responsibility and must not permit this pride to dull its vision. When this war is over, businessmen throughout the country will be called upon to assume a more commanding and perhaps a more aggressive attitude, and I am speaking particularly to the merchants and bankers. I am serving my first term in the Congress, my first experience in public life, but it is perfectly obvious to me that Government does not understand business and business does not understand Government. There may be good and sufficient reasons for this, but I hope and pray that businessmen of the country will assert themselves more definitely in the political life of the country by becoming acquainted with the principles of Government and by sharing the responsibilities of establishing a sound economy, which today they are too apt to feel should be borne entirely by Government. The days to come will present great and complex problems, and I believe there will be a surge of buying and development in this country during the postwar period which will dwarf anything that we have ever known before. Businessmen will have to adapt themselves to these new conditions, and they should be thinking about these things in an articulate manner right now. Try and learn what Members of Congress are thinking about; I can assure you that Congressmen would be interested in knowing what you are thinking about.

Our immediate job, of course, is to win this war and win it quickly. But if we are to preserve what we are fighting for—the preservation of our ideals, our business institutions, and our economic life—our business leaders and not Government must set the pace under the new conditions, with progressive and sound ideas.

I am fully aware of the fact that the business of the country is considering what the post-war era will bring but even greater efforts are needed and I urge that businessmen discuss their ideas and their thoughts with their Representatives in Congress, both in the House and the Senate, so that a lively discussion may be stimulated out of which real comprehensive plans may be made. Government and business must get together.

The Better Business Bureau in this postwar era will have a tremendous opportunity to do a constructive piece of work. Through its experience in the past in guiding businessmen in their dealings with the public, it will be able to help businessmen in their approach to the solution of the great problems which lie ahead. There is one thing that is certain if our country's industry is to progress—the public more than ever must have faith in businessmen. They must have faith in their character and in the merchandise they offer for sale. We must all have faith in each other, faith in our country, and faith in our God so that in the day of victory, we may be a united people and go forward to even greater heights and loftier business standards than ever before.

Solution of Jewish Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein certain correspondence, evidencing my interest in and devotion to the cause of the afflicted Jew throughout the world and zealous efforts to promote racial and religious tolerance here in America.

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL,
Washington, May 5, 1944.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: The American Zionist Emergency Council is preparing a volume which is designed to demonstrate the interest of the Members of the Congress of the United States in the permanent solution of Jewish problems in the world through the development of a Jewish National Homeland in Palestine.

On March 17, in a letter to me, you made the following statement:

"The present plight of our Jewish brethren in the occupied countries of Europe where they have undergone such pitiable and indefensible persecution by Hitler and his minions of hate is a great question of human brotherhood. Millions of innocent Jews, many of them aged and infirm, others helpless women and children, are wandering over the face of the European continent tonight, driven from pillar to post, from one country to another—homeless, shelterless, friendless, and without food and nourishment to keep body and soul together.

"We must move promptly to succor and relieve these poor unfortunates. The continued effectuation of the nefarious White Paper will result in the slaughter of additional millions of Jews, not only in Europe, but probably also in Palestine itself where racial hatreds are being fanned to white heat. Now is the time, not only for Jews, but for all true Americans, to rally to the cause of a great ancient people who are now being persecuted and threatened with extinction throughout many parts of the civilized world."

We would be grateful for your permission to publish this statement in our projected anthology. If you wish to change or elaborate upon it in any way, we shall be delighted to have you do so.

We contemplate the publication of this volume in the very near future, and we will doubly appreciate your prompt reply to this request.

With many thanks for your sympathetic understanding and support, permit me to remain,

Very sincerely yours,
RABBI LEON I. FEUER,
Director, Washington Bureau.

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., March 24, 1944.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: I am pleased to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th, which was sent to Rabbi Feuer on the occasion of the meeting held last Tuesday at Madison Square Garden, New York.

Your fine letter contains a complete statement of our purpose and the necessity for keeping Palestine open for Jewish settlement, so as to provide a haven and a home for the millions of suffering Jews of Europe.

On behalf of the American Zionist Emergency Council, I want to thank you for your kind message.

Very respectfully yours,
HARRY L. SHAPIRO,
Director.

AMERICAN JEWISH CONFERENCE,
New York, N. Y., March 17, 1944.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PHILBIN: I want to thank you for your letter of March 16, in which you so wholeheartedly give your support to the Wright-Compton resolution. It is extremely gratifying to have your sympathetic statement.

Very sincerely yours,
I. L. KENEN,
Public Relations Director.

AMERICAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE,
Washington D. C., April 17, 1944.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Old House Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: It gives me great pleasure to welcome you as a member of the American Palestine Committee. I feel confident that through this committee tangible and constructive steps can be taken to alleviate the suffering of the Jewish people and to assist them in rebuilding their national home in Palestine.

We appreciate your cooperation and sponsorship.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT F. WAGNER.

NEW YORK CITY, Friday, February 11.—News that a congressional steering committee has been set up to aid in the passage of national legislation to outlaw anti-Semitism was announced today by Leonard E. Golditch, secretary of the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism.

The announcement was made following a meeting of the sponsors of the national committee at the Waldorf Astoria in New York City.

Among those serving on the congressional steering committee, according to Mr. Golditch, are Congressmen PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, Massachusetts; P. W. GRIFFITHS, Republican, Ohio; ADOLPH J. SABATH, Democrat, Illinois; GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, Democrat, Michigan; ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, New York; LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI, Democrat, New York; GEORGE H. BENDER, Republican, Ohio; VITO MARCANTONIO, American Labor Party, New York; SAMUEL A. WEISS, Democrat, Pennsylvania; CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, Democrat, New York; JAMES H. FAY, Democrat, New York; ROBERT GRANT FURLONG, Democrat, Pennsylvania; THOMAS E. SCANLON, Democrat, Pennsylvania; and SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, Democrat, New York.

The meeting agreed to set up regional offices throughout the Nation as a means of strengthening the campaign to outlaw anti-Semitism nationally and in each of the 48 States.

At the same time it was announced by Mr. Golditch that an educational committee has been set up and is now preparing a series of booklets and other printed material on anti-Semitism and the danger it holds to each American family and to the democracy of our country.

In a resolution adopted unanimously at the meeting it was pointed out that in Hitler's address of January 30, marking the eleventh anniversary of the National Socialist regime, he threatened that regardless of the outcome of the war, the cause of the Nazis and Fascists could still triumph through the use and the spread of anti-Semitism. The resolution then goes on to state:

"No words could be plainer, no threat more brazen and more pregnant with danger for the peace and security of every nation and of every people. That his agents and his followers in this country will greatly increase their anti-Jewish activities goes without saying.

"To take quick, powerful, and effective action against anti-Semitism becomes a matter of simple self-preservation for the United States, and for all the United Nations.

"With this in mind, we, members of the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism being a cross-section of American life, and nonsectarian in our membership, assembled on the 7th day of February, 1944,

at the Waldorf-Astoria in the City of New York, hereby resolve to make every possible effort to have introduced and passed in the Congress of the United States and in the legislatures of the 48 States bills outlawing anti-Semitism and making it a criminal offense.

"The movement to outlaw anti-Semitism is growing among all the United Nations. Jan Masaryk stated that the prospectives of Teheran bring up the necessity for outlawing anti-Semitism in all European countries. The work of our committee will immeasurably contribute to this worthy and necessary goal."

NEW YORK.

PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Clinton, Mass.:

Will you join with other prominent Americans in appeal to Premier Joseph Stalin and Soviet Government to exert all efforts to force cessation of extermination of thousands of Jews in Hungary and Bulgaria to reaffirm Soviet intention to punish as war criminals all those who carry out Nazi program of annihilation and to offer Hungarian prisoners of war held by Russians in exchange for Jews in Hungary with guaranties that these will not be used in combat units by either side. Exchange can be made auspices International Red Cross or neutral country. Unless immediate action undertaken along these lines annihilation of some hundreds of thousands of innocent people is certain by official German decree. Your support in this appeal will be of great importance. Please phone or wire collect.

GABRIEL WECHSLER,
National Secretary, Emergency Committee to Save Jewish People of Europe.

MAY 16, 1944.

GABRIEL WECHSLER,
National Secretary,
Emergency Committee,
New York, N. Y.:

Will be glad to join with you in every practicable effort to liberate and rescue unfortunate Jews in Europe now threatened with annihilation. We must do everything in our power to assist these most unhappy victims of persecution.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Congress and Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in reading this morning's Washington Post I was impressed by Marquis Childs' article on Congress and Price Control. His sense of fairness in paying just and deserved tribute to certain Members of the House—in both parties—has so impressed me that I am, under unanimous consent, inserting his article for the benefit of the Members.

To Mr. Childs, I wish to extend my congratulations for a fine piece of newspaper work.

WASHINGTON CALLING—CONGRESS AND PRICE CONTROL
(By Marquis Childs)

Fourteen men meeting behind closed doors these past few days have been deciding what you and I will pay for shoes and butter and clothing—everything we eat and wear—in coming months.

They are the Members of House and Senate who in conference have been trying to iron out the differences in the price-control bill as passed by the two bodies. What they finally send down to the White House may have the look of a victory for the consumer.

It will probably be a bill which the President will sign. As of the present writing, both the Bankhead amendment raising the price of cotton goods and the Dirksen amendment to tie O. P. A. administration up in the courts are out.

But it's much too early to do any crowing. In fact, it looks as though by virtue of certain niggling little changes, enforcement of price control will become increasingly difficult. While they would scarcely justify a veto, they will nevertheless open up cracks in the already shaky price-control dam.

Unhappily, too, many of the conferees talked one way in public on the floor and another way in conference. They pressed for the niggling amendments even though they must have known that it would make enforcement of price ceilings doubly difficult.

Granted the pressure was great. Being a Congressman in these times is no easy job. Pressure groups work incessantly to pry this or that special favor out of the people's Representatives.

Remember, too, a Representative's job is the kind that ends every 2 years. That may be one reason some of the price-control conferees have caved in. They're tired and they know they've got to get home and start mending their political fences.

The wonder is that there are so many conscientious men, the men who do the hard slugging work—and it is hard work and often tiresome and unrewarding. The workers must make up for the drones and showoffs who fail to carry their share of the burden.

Men like JOE MARTIN, the minority leader; WADSWORTH, of New York; WOLCOTT, of Michigan; CASE, of South Dakota; and, yes, thorny JOHN TABER, of New York, who sent shivers of apprehension down the spines of so many bureaucrats, typify the Republicans who carry the load. On the Democratic side I would name Speaker SAM RAYBURN, JOHN MCCORMACK, the majority leader; RAMSPECK and VINSON, of Georgia; COCHRAN, of Missouri; and WOODRUM of Virginia.

One encouraging sign is the number of younger men—and women—coming up who have little of the traditionally bitter partisanship of the older generation. Such men as WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, on the Republican side, and MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, on the Democratic side, are typical of 50 to 60 juniors who, if they had any authority, would go a long way toward reasonable agreement on the big issues of our day.

They're scattering now to the four corners of America. Most of them will go to the conventions and in between times they'll revisit Main Street to try to find out where they stand.

Under this urgency all legislation, and especially the Price Control Act, has suffered. In a way it's too bad that the issue was not clear cut. If the conference had left in one of the big obstacles, such as the Bankhead amendment, a veto would have followed and the blame could have been properly allocated.

As it is, with the seemingly minor restraints on enforcement, the O. P. A. is likely to be fighting a rear-guard action. If, for example, a modified rent-control agreement allows landlords to seek redress when increases in cost have been "substantial," then most of the owners of the Nation's 14,000,000 rented dwellings will descend on the O. P. A.

Chester Bowles, it seems to me, has done a good job up to the present. He has gone a long way to be reasonable and to get along with Congress. Too far, some of his critics have said.

But I imagine he must have deep concern for the future. He can see the waters of inflation mounting behind the dam and he knows how much more difficult his job has been made.

Experts Serve Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the June 15, 1944, edition of the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass. This excellent editorial was written by Mr. Fred Bowler of that paper:

EXPERTS SERVE GOVERNMENT

Those who have taken to task the administration of President Roosevelt for various reasons in past years were given somewhat of a shock recently when the Pabst Brewing Co. announced the winners in its $50,000 contest for plans for post-war employment.

The company offered a first prize of $25,000, a second prize of $10,000, and 15 additional awards of $1,000 each. Manuscripts were submitted to an impartial board of judges who had no way of knowing the identities of the authors.

And what happened?

The two major prizes, and nine out of the $1,000 awards were won by employees of the United States Government, many of them holding responsible positions.

Winner of the grand prize, $25,000, was Herbert Stein, 28, a native of Detroit and a graduate of Williams College in Massachusetts, who is Chief of the Economic Analysis Section of the War Production Board.

Winner of the second prize, $10,000, was Leon H. Keyserling, native of Charleston, S. C., and a graduate of Columbia and Harvard, who is 36 years old and is general counsel for the National Housing Agency.

Here are some of the $1,000 winners:

Grover W. Ensley, a native of Washington, who is a fiscal analyst for the United States State Department.

Mordecai Ezekiel, a native of Richmond, Va., who is economic adviser to Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard.

Joseph M. Gillman, a native of the Ukraine, Russia, who is assistant chief of the Munitions Branch of the Bureau of Planning and Statistics.

Leo Grebler, a native of Berlin, Germany, who is director of the Division of Operating Statistics of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Everett E. Hagen, a native of Minnesota, who is an economist with the Division of Research and Statistics, Federal Reserve System.

Albert Gailord Hart, a native of Iowa, who is a consultant for the Division of Tar Research of the United States Treasury Department.

Rolf Nugent, a native of Pennsylvania, who is overseas on special work for the United States Government.

John H. G. Pierson, native of New York, who is chief of the Post-War Labor Problems Division, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

Maj. Lyle M. Spencer, native of Wisconsin, who is now with the United States Army in Italy.

By winning 11 out of 17 prizes offered in this contest sponsored by a private business concern, the Government employees have proven what President Roosevelt's supporters have known all along—although his opponents have refused to concede it—that he has brought able men into his Government, the best brains in the country.

Oh, yes, one of the judges in this contest was Beardsley Ruml, treasurer of R. H. Macy Co., and chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The others were President Clarence Dykstra of the University of Wisconsin; Prof. Wesley C. Mitchell, of Columbia University, and A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

They scrutinized thousands of plans entered in the contest and the results indicate that the United States Government already has available men who can plan for post-war problems effectively.

Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in Collier's Weekly, issue of June 24, 1944:

DIES DEPARTS

Representative MARTIN DIES, Democrat, of Texas, has announced that he will not try for reelection, after 14 years in Congress, many of them spent as chairman of the Dies committee on subversive activities. Maybe he really wants to go back to private life, maybe he's afraid he couldn't win. We don't know and don't much care.

We are convinced, though, that DIES' committee performed services which added up heavily on the black side of the ledger, in spite of all the times DIES hit some innocent person or group.

This country has freedom of speech and press, at least up to this writing. It also has a goodish number of disloyal or misguided persons who are forever trying to bludgeon or bemuse Americans into changing over to communism, fascism, nazi-ism, funny-moneyism, and some other ism. Most of these persons make a virtue of trickery, deceit, and hitting below the belt. Because of the Bill of Rights, they have every leeway short of treason itself. This is all very well and makes life in the United States that much more interesting than in the strait-jacketed countries.

We wouldn't change this state of affairs if we could. But the bulk of us need a watchdog of the type the Dies committee has been—a group of official vigilantes—to keep exposing the tactics, pretensions, and plots of the would-be destroyers of democracy, and thereby to keep them cut down to their correct size.

For these reasons we think DIES deserves the thanks of the American people as he leaves the congressional stage; and we're in favor of Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS' (Republican, New Jersey) proposal that Congress establish a permanent Dies-type committee.

Detailed Information on Legislation for Veterans and Their Dependents, World Wars Nos. 1 and 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, so much new veterans' legislation has been passed by this Congress that a brief statement of benefits and general outline of procedure for securing assistance is necessary at this time. Many requests for this information are being made to your Congressman and this brief outline is made available to service men and women, veterans and their dependents in answer to these inquiries. It is impossible at this time to analyze all the various phases of our veterans' legislation. In fact much planning and details of operation are still to be outlined by the Veterans' Administration under Senate bill 1767, recently passed by Congress. I shall keep you informed of changes and administrative interpretation of this new legislation. A request to my office, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C., will bring you an immediate reply on questions concerning your individual status as to these special benefits provided in this new legislation.

The following information was prepared by a member of the House World War Veterans' Legislation Committee with the advice and assistance of the Veterans' Administration:

OUTLINE OF BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN, VETERANS, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS UNDER EXISTING LAW—COMPENSATION AND PENSION FOR DISABILITY OR DEATH

Service-connected disability: Under the veterans regulations promulgated under the act of March 20, 1933, as amended, honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 are entitled to compensation or pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by such service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10 percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month. While the World War No. 2 veterans were entitled to these rates following the act of December 19, 1941, they were placed on complete parity under the veterans regulations by the act of July 13, 1943, Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, with reference to the requirements governing proof of service connection of disability. The latter act also liberalized the regulation concerning the presumption of soundness upon entry into service. Under Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates based upon service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including special awards and allowances fixed by law, were increased by 15 percent.

In lieu of such pension or compensation, reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, meeting the requirements of the Army regulations pertaining to retirement of officers of the Regular Establishment, are retired by the War Department, certified to the Veterans' Administration, and their retired pay, equal to 75 percent of their base pay, is paid by the Veterans' Administration out of the pension appropriation.

Non-service-connected disability: Under Public Law No. 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the rate of pension for permanent and total non-service-connected disability, applicable to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion, the Philippine Insurrection, and World War No. 1, was increased from $40 to $50 per month, with an increase to $60 per month where such veterans have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or reach the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. This act also provides that the above pension for non-service-connected disability shall apply to veterans of both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

Service-connected death: The rates of compensation or pension for widows, children, and dependent parents of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans based upon death in service, or service-connected death, are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100)	50
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

The above rates are contained in Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943, and constitute a material liberalization of the prior rates.

Non-service-connected death: The widow, child, or children, of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 are entitled to the following rates of compensation if the veteran at the time of death from non-service-connected cause had a disability incurred in or aggravated by such war service.

Widow but no child	$35
Widow and 1 child (with $5 for each additional child)	45
No widow but 1 child	18
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	27
No widow but 3 children (equally divided)	35
With $4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).	

Payments are limited to an aggregate of $64 in any one case.

Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, act of May 27, 1944, increased the rates to the above amounts and also included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans, the law previously having applied only to World War No. 1 veterans.

Claims and effective date of awards: Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred to a Veterans' Administration facility, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for adjudication, the applicant should file claim on proper form which will be supplied upon inquiry addressed to any Veterans' Administration facility or regional office, or to the local representative of the American Red Cross or of a veterans' service organization.

Under interagency agreement a person who is to be discharged from military or naval service is in need of further hospital care, prior arrangements are made by the commanding officer to afford him opportunity to file all necessary claims, supply necessary clinical and service data and to send the vet-

eran to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. (Cf. A. R. 615-360, change No. 4, April 16, 1943.) If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

Upon death in service, the service department notifies the Veterans' Administration, and claim forms are sent immediately to all known dependents.

Groups potentially eligible for pensions: All members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the Public Health Service or of the Coast and Geodetic Survey when ordered to active service with the Army or Navy or as to United States Public Health Service while serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, and as to Coast and Geodetic Survey when assigned during present war to duty on business of War or Navy Departments in areas outside continental United States or in Alaska or coastal areas of the United States as determined by the War and Navy Departments to be of immediate military hazard, are potentially eligible for pensions.

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was not in the active service; and, while the several Women's Reserve Corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard originally were in the active service, they were by statute precluded from pension eligibility; in lieu thereof, being subject to laws pertaining to employees' compensation. Legislation was subsequently enacted making the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard components eligible potentially for pension benefits—Public Law 110, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 1, 1943; Public Law 183, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved November 8, 1943; and Public Law 214, approved December 23, 1943.

Awards to date: Pension payments to veterans of World War No. 2 and their dependents total $37,760,572.78 through March 1944. In addition, retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration to Reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, totaled $1,020,137.33 from July 1, 1942, through March 31, 1944.

Disbursements for the relief of World War No. 1 veterans and their dependents from 1918 through March 1944 for disability and death compensation or pension, service connected and nonservice connected, totaled $5,007,029,954.54. In addition, disbursements for World War No. 1 emergency officers' retirement pay through March 31, 1944, totaled $84,889,697.63. Our older veterans are not being forgotten just because there is a new and larger crop, as these figures prove.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE, PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES, AND DOMICILIARY CARE

Eligibility is extended to any veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 honorably discharged, having a service-connected disability requiring such care, treatment, or appliance, or one who was discharged for disability and not dishonorably; also one not dishonorably discharged, who is unable to defray his expenses, has tuberculosis or a neuropsychiatric ailment or disability which requires hospital care.

Dependent upon availability of facilities, eligibility includes any veteran of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, and who is in need of such care and is unable to defray the expenses therefor—regardless of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service.

The service groups included are all components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, the respective Women's Reserves thereof, and United States Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey under the conditions stated for pension purposes.

The Veterans' Administration maintains 94 facilities and has contract facilities with a total of 92,019 beds, distributed as follows (as of March 23, 1944):

Tuberculosis	6,212
Neuropsychiatric	29,417
General medical and surgical	25,658
Domiciliary	16,117
Contract—other governmental	4,227
State and private	388
Total	92,019

Diagnostic centers, with expert specialists available, are maintained at Hines, Chicago, Ill.; San Francisco, Calif.; and Mount Alto, Washington, D. C. Cancer clinics: Bronx, N. Y.; Hines, Chicago, Ill.; Mount Alto, Washington, D. C.; Atlanta, Ga.; Portland, Oreg.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

The present building program will raise this total to more than 100,000 beds. The Veterans' Administration anticipates an eventual need of 300,000 beds to enable veterans of World War No. 2 and of prior wars to receive hospital and domiciliary care to the same extent as is now provided. However, this estimated maximum should not be needed until long after the war or require the eventual additional construction of more than 100,000 beds, since there will be, under present plans, 100,000 beds in Veterans' Administration facilities, and it is anticipated that it should be possible to obtain the same number from the Army and Navy shortly after the termination of the war.

Claims: Any person who is to be discharged from active service and who is in need of and entitled to hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration, is transferred directly to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. Claim for all benefits, and necessary clinical and service data accompany him, or are filed by the manager if the veteran is insane or incompetent.

All others should file claim for treatment or hospitalization directly with the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office—one, or more, in each State in the Union except Delaware. The regional office in Colorado is located in Denver.

Sixty-four thousand nine hundred and eighty-two veterans of World War No. 2 have been hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration through April 30, 1944. On April 30, 1944, there were 44,967 World War No. 1 veterans and 12,866 World War No. 2 veterans receiving hospitalization, and 8,477 World War No. 1 veterans and 196 World War No. 2 veterans receiving domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration.

While domiciliary care cannot be said to be a part of the rehabilitation process, it is a valuable benefit for those who have reached a permanent state of disability and have no other means of support.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved by the President March 24, 1943, provides—

First, that any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war.

Second, and who was honorably discharged;

Third, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay;

Fourth, who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement.

Immediately following the passage of that legislation there was created in the Veterans' Administration a vocational rehabilitation service composed of three divisions, namely, the Vocational Advisement Division, the Training Into Employment Division, and the Research Division. The planning and control functions created by the administration of this act are exercised in the central office of the Veterans' Administration. All operations, including determinations of need for training, vocational advisement, induction into training, supervision, as well as the selection of training facilities, are functions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Division in that facility of the Veterans' Administration having jurisdiction of the territory in which the veteran resides. There are 53 such facilities. These facilities are, generally speaking, bound by State boundary lines. In a few States there is more than one facility. Colorado has one facility at Fort Lyon.

The course of training prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit the veteran for employment may not exceed 4 years and may not extend beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by virtue of a handicap due to service-connected disability. In performing the functions imposed upon the Administration by Public Law 16, it will be the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to utilize educational institutions and establishments of recognized standing in the training of these disabled veterans into employment and to train each person as near his home as may be possible. In securing employment, a problem which obviously will be very great after the end of the war and perhaps acute after demobilization has been accomplished, every available Federal and State facility will be utilized. Employment of veterans has been accomplished to a considerable extent through the United States Employment Service. It will be the purpose to correlate these activities to the end that those vocationally trained will be graduated into employment opportunities.

While the disabled veteran is in training his pension, unless it equals or exceeds such amounts, will be increased to $30 per month, if single; $90 per month, if married, with $5 additional for each child, and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required.

Claims: Those persons discharged from the service directly to the Veterans' Administration facilities for hospitalization will have their claims filed and processed; and the question of need for and entitlement to vocational rehabilitation may be given consideration as soon as the individual's physical and mental condition make training feasible. Any other person honorably discharged from the service may make claims for vocational rehabilitation in the claim for pension which may be filed at the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office.

INSURANCE

National service life insurance: National service life insurance was provided under the act of October 8, 1940, Public Law No. 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, and liberalizing amendments thereto were enacted during the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses. A number of other liberalizing proposals are pending in the present Congress and the Veterans' Administration has submitted certain proposed changes found to be justified by studies conducted. Application may be made for not less than $1,000 nor more than $10,000 without physical examination prior to the expiration of 120 days from entrance into active service. Thereafter, any such person in the active military or naval service may apply if the application be accompanied by acceptable evidence of good health.

Applications: Application forms are supplied the service departments, and may be obtained from the commanding officer or designated insurance officer. The applicant may elect to pay premiums in cash, or by allotment of pay. Policies are not issued during the war, but insurance certificate is mailed to the address designated by applicant.

The insurance is against death only, but includes waiver of premiums during total disability existing for more than 6 months, and commencing prior to insured's sixtieth birthday. The policy is a 5-year level premium term policy with rate based upon the American experience table of mortality and 3 percent interest—the Government assuming the extra hazard of the military and naval service and the administrative expense. The insurance is payable only to a widow (widower), child (including a stepchild or illegitimate child, if designated as beneficiary by the insured), parent (including person in loco parentis), brother and sister of the insured; and is payable only in monthly installments. The insured may change the beneficiary designation at any time.

After the policy has been in effect for at least 1 year, while in force it may be converted to an ordinary life, 20-payment life or 30-payment life policy upon application to the Veterans' Administration without medical examination.

In cases where the person in service died or became totally disabled, or was captured or isolated by the enemy prior to April 20, 1942, and had less than $5,000 insurance in effect, the law provides that gratuitous insurance to an aggregate of $5,000 shall be deemed in effect. Claims for such gratuitous insurance should be filed as soon as possible, because of limitations. In most of these death cases only a widow, child, or dependent parent can claim such insurance.

As of March 30, 1944, over 14,303,291 applications had been received, representing a total amount of nearly $105,596,766,000 of insurance. The average policy was approximately $7,382.69; the average coverage per life approximately $8,926.74.

The insurance is payable in the event of the death of the insured while the policy is in force to a beneficiary or beneficiaries, which may be designated by the insured, only within the relationship of widow or widower, child, parent, brother, or sister. The proceeds of the policy are payable as an annuity in 240 equal monthly installments of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance to any beneficiary who is under 30 years of age at the time of the death of the insured; otherwise, in continuous monthly installments throughout the lifetime of the beneficiary, with a guaranty of the payment of 120 monthly installments to the surviving relatives of the insured who are within the permitted class of beneficiaries. The amount of the monthly installment under the latter mode of payment is dependent upon the age of the beneficiary at date of death of insured. For example, if the beneficiary is then 40 years old, monthly installment is $4.50 for each $1,000 of insurance; if 50, $5.39; if 60, $6.81; if 70, $8.51.

The beneficiary would receive under a policy of $5,000 or $10,000, for example, monthly payments, beginning at the stated ages, in the following amounts: $27.55–$55.10, $22.50–$45, $26.95–$53.90, $34.05–$68.10, and $42.55–$85.10.

Claims: All claims for insurance benefits should be addressed to the Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C., but necessary forms may be secured from the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

United States Government life (converted) insurance: This insurance can be applied for only by those who served in World War No. 1. No one may have more than $10,000 national service life insurance and Government (converted) insurance combined.

Insurance premiums are guaranteed by Government under Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended: Any person in the active service having a commercial life policy or policies meeting the requirements of said law, article IV, may, upon application to the Veterans' Administration on form supplied the Army and Navy, secure guaranty of premiums, on amount of insurance not in excess of $10,000, while he is in the service during the present war. The insurance premiums so guaranteed by the Government constitute a lien against the policy and must be paid by the company out of any settlement thereof. In the event of the insured's discharge from service, he has a period of 2 years within which to pay the premiums with interest so guaranteed or otherwise such indebtedness constitutes a loan on the policy with interest and if the amount of such indebtedness exceeds the cash surrender value, the policy is automatically canceled and the Government pays the insurer the difference between such cash surrender value and the indebtedness. Forms for making application for such insurance protection are supplied to the War and Navy Departments and may be secured in person or from his commanding officer or other designated official.

As of March 31, 1944, 72,204 applications with insurance totaling $178,189,853.21 have been approved and premiums guaranteed.

INSURANCE UNDER OTHER LAWS

Old-age and survivors insurance is administered by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; unemployment benefits by Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; retirement by Railroad Retirement Board and Civil Service Commission. Credit for active military or naval service is allowed for civil-service retirement and railroad retirement purposes.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mustering-out pay is provided by the act of February 3, 1944, Public Law 225, Seventy-eighth Congress, and is administered by the War and Navy Departments. The amounts are from $100 to $300.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES

Administered by the War and Navy Departments for dependents of those in the service. Your Congressman can supply many details about this subject and help get delayed allotments straightened out for dependents of servicemen.

DOMICILIARY CARE

United States Soldiers' Home, under jurisdiction of the War Department; Naval Home, under jurisdiction of the Navy Department. This is in addition to that provided by the Veterans' Administration.

GUARDIANSHIP

Supervision is maintained, in cooperation with the State courts, over payments of any benefits made on account of insane or minor beneficiaries to insure proper application of such benefits.

RETIREMENT PAY

Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard: For officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Establishment, and reserve components of Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

TAXES

Bureau of Internal Revenue: All veteran benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration are exempt from all taxation. Special consideration is shown in the income-tax laws for those in the service.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE

Up to the amount of $100 may be paid for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension or compensation, as to any veteran discharged from the armed forces for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

A United States flag to drape the casket, subsequently to be turned over to the next of kin, may be furnished as to any veteran, discharged honorably after active service during any war or after serving at least one enlistment or by reason of disability incurred in line of duty. Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, as to his minor children or adult unmarried daughters. The expenses incident to transporting the body of one who has died while in active service, or of a veteran who has died in a Veterans' Administration facility, to the place of burial, are, within limitations, borne by the Government. Headstone or marker—stone or marble—will be furnished for the unmarked grave of any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who died while in the active service.

Various benefits, rights, and privileges are also provided as to certain veterans, their dependents, and their organizations under State laws, as per the résumé thereof, as published by the House Committee on Pensions, entitled "State Veterans' Laws."

CIVIL, SPANISH, AND OTHER WARS

Pensions on the basis of age, degree of inability to earn a living, and/or length of service for (1) Civil War veterans, in the amount of $75 per month, or $100 if in need of a regular attendant, (2) Indian War veterans, in amounts ranging from $20 to $60 per month, or $100, if in need of an attendant, and (3) veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion, in amounts ranging from $12 to $75 per month, plus varying amounts if in need of a regular attendant, with total not to exceed $100 but only $20 while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by the United States or a political subdivision thereof if the veteran has no dependents, provided that as to those in a soldiers' home continually since on or before July 15, 1943, the pension not to exceed $50 shall be continued.

Pensions at lower rates than above are available to veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion, based upon service of 70 days or more but less than 90 days.

Pension under the Economy Act of March 20, 1933, and the veterans' regulations promulgated thereunder, as amended, of $50 per month for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, or World War No. 1, with 90 days or more of honorable service, or, if less than 90 days, if discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, who suffer with permanent total disability, regardless of service connection, if not due to misconduct. Only $5 per month is paid to single men, without dependents, while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by a Government agency.

EDUCATION

Congress provided in 1944 that any veteran who served on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and whose education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service, or who desires a refresher or retraining course, and who served 90 days or more, is entitled to education at public expense. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition and books and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if single and $75 if married, not to exceed 4 years. Any person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service is assumed to have had his education interrupted. Veterans must meet the

regular entrance and scholarship requirements.

FARM, HOME, AND SMALL BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

The Federal Government, through the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, will guarantee up to 50 percent and as high as $2,000 of any approved loan secured by a veteran from a private or Government source for purchase or operation of a farm, home, or small business. Loans will be interest-free the first year and interest will not exceed 4 percent per annum. Applications for this benefit must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs within 2 years after discharge by those who served in the armed forces on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to termination of this war.

JOBS

Congress provided, in 1944, in addition to the foregoing education, farm, home, and small business opportunities, that every veteran of World War No. 2 shall be helped to find a job. The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board cooperate to fill this responsibility. Veterans are to be registered and every effort made to assist them to find jobs. This provision includes veterans of all wars. Information on how to get the benefits of this provision can be obtained by the veteran from his own local United States Employment Office in his home town or county.

Return to the job after discharge is under jurisdiction of Selective Service; placing in other jobs is under War Manpower Commission; veterans' preference is administered by United States Civil Service Commission and various departments and agencies; job training, rehabilitation (nonservice disability) is administered by Federal Security Agency.

Certain preferences as to Federal civil service, as to physical and age prerequisites, examinations, ratings, appointments, retentions, and reinstatement of Federal employment are extended to qualified service-connected disabled veterans, the wives of unemployable service-connected or 50-year-aged pensioned veterans, the widows of veterans, and other war veterans and regulars, supplemented by extensive United States Employment Service, and Veterans Employment Service, in every State, for war veterans. Any World War No. 2 veteran who applies therefor, within 40 days after discharge, is entitled to reinstatement to the Federal position held at time of entering service, or to one of equal grade and pay, or to his previous private employment, where at all practicable for employer, enforceable by order of court, if necessary.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Congress provided, in 1944, that for the first 2 years after a veteran's discharge he will be entitled to unemployment compensation for 52 weeks if he cannot find a job or the Employment Service cannot find one for him. This allowance is $20 per week, less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of $3. Provisions for unemployment compensation, farm, home, and business ownership and education are part of the so-called G. I. bill of rights, one of many veterans' bills prepared in 1943–44 by the World War Veterans' Committee.

Labor Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following speech delivered by me at 11:30 a. m., June 18, 1944, on radio station WBZA, Hotel Bradford, Boston, Mass., entitled "Labor Speaks":

Labor is speaking this very minute not only through the millions of its members in the armed forces at every battle station around the world but through the millions who are producing the weapons needed for victory.

In this earth-shaking struggle between the people and the forces of reaction the cause of humanity is winning through.

Four long and bitter years have passed since the evacuation of Dunkerque—4 years during which freemen struggled desperately and at times hopelessly for mere survival. Four years during which the light of civilization flickered low before the storms of tyranny. In spite of the Luftwaffe and the panzer divisions, the concentration camps with their tortures and mass murders, in spite of Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, Himmler, Tojo, and those who collaborated with this terror, the spirit of man held fast. Now, at last, the day of vindication approaches.

But the spirit of man could not have survived the brutal assault of fascism without power to answer power. The margin of survival was narrow. I doubt if many people in our country even now realize how close we came to disaster. Be that as it may, the crisis is past. Great efforts lie before us, but we know that we have the spiritual faith and the material resources needed for the victory.

At Dunkerque we had too little and too late. How that grim and pitiful scene has changed. Today we have unchallenged sea and air power. The United States, Britain, and Russia have the best-equipped armies in the world. We waited long but we waited until we were ready and now we move forward to bring the world criminals to justice. What accomplished this miracle? I say, without hesitation, that this great part of the coming victory belongs to the will and the skill of American labor. From a Nation that was pathetically unprepared, we have built the greatest Navy and the most effective Air Force in the world. And to our allies we have given large quantities of the tools of war. No less an authority than Premier Stalin of Russia, has acknowledged his debt to American production. Out of our fields and factories, across long stretches of submarine-infested waters to ice-bound Murmansk and the burning Persian Gulf we sent the materials which stayed the Russian retreat and enabled the Red armies to break the back of Nazi aggression. Even as I speak, we know that American arms are being sent to the underground in France and to Marshal Tito's forces in Yugoslavia. And in due time, this lifeblood of supplies will give vigor to our Chinese allies.

This is labor's contribution to victory. But labor knows that the problems of the peace to follow may be no less acute than the immediate demands of war. The Congress of Industrial Organizations is preparing to meet this challenge with fair, intelligent, and straightforward action. The city of Washington is crowded with lobbies, pressure groups seeking sordid, selfish gains. In this disturbing picture of greed, it is refreshing to be able to single out the C. I. O. For this organization is basing its program, not on the special needs of labor alone, but on the broad and firm foundation of the national welfare.

This is Americanism in the best sense of the word. It allows for legitimate self-interest, but it is also concerned with community responsibility, for the true welfare of the individual depends upon the health and happiness of his neighbors. Only in this cooperative spirit can we meet and master the problems which face the Nation, not only during the trials of war, but in the social and economic readjustments which must follow.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations is interested in promoting the welfare of all people who work for a living. It seeks a fair share for labor from the harvest of production. It seeks economic insurance for those workers whose security is imperiled by age, disability, or enforced lay-offs. Of more immediate importance, it is improving the conditions under which labor works. The safety and sanctity of his home, the education of his children, the health and happiness of the worker himself, all these values it promotes, all for the unity and continued progress of American democracy.

But as our soldiers and sailors fight and die that we may live, there are special lobbies in Washington who seek to destroy on the home front what our men are winning on the battle fronts.

The current debate on price control is but a mere sample. Amendment after amendment is being added to the act. If retained, these crippling amendments would open up the flood-gates to inflation. The wages of American labor could not possibly keep pace with the rising cost of living. This is an issue of grave concern to every American worker. I am happy to say that the Congress of Industrial Organizations is fighting this home-front sabotage with all the sincerity and energy it commands. But to win this fight for stability, the C. I. O. must have the active support of every wage earner in the country. The time has come for political action. Let the Congress of the United States know your mandate. Fight with the democratic weapons of your voice, your pen, and your ballot * * * to make certain that the security of your purchasing power is not undermined. Millions of our men, far off on foreign battlefronts, are too busy for this. They must depend on you to safeguard the economic welfare of their families home. Fight for a Price Control Act which will protect you from the threat of rising prices. Do it now * * * before it is too late. And remember that this is a present and continuing fight. You have a part to play in this fight against inflation. Whenever you buy, make certain that you never pay more than ceiling prices for any commodity. This is it. This is your battle on the home front.

The C. I. O. has organized for political action. In a democracy, political action means that every citizen must make it his business to know what is being done in Washington. Political action means that you cannot expect others to do this for you. Effective democracy means that you must make your economic rights known, while the legislation is being formulated.

Labor has made the greatest gains in history during this administration. In the future, these gains must be secured and extended. From some quarters we hear the cry that increased power demands increased responsibility. That is profoundly true. I have every confidence, however, that labor is aware of its responsibility to the Nation. At the same time I wonder if other groups with greater power and greater wealth are as acutely aware of their responsibilities to the American workingman and workingwoman.

Even now, these special interests seek to turn the American soldier against the American worker. This must not happen. The individual American soldier and the individual American worker are winning this war because they form an unbeatable team. They must stand together as citizens to build a constructive peace.

As of this fateful moment, fascism is the common enemy. Fascism took the great powers released by science and sought, by these means, to enslave all for the benefit of a few. The aroused conscience of mankind will defeat fascism on the battlefield. But will it defeat the more subtle forces of exploitation that bore from within? This is the

challenge to constant vigilance for all who labor. Let us not be afraid of words. The world is going through a period of social and economic revolution. This is the inevitable ferment at work in every nation of this world. We have found the answer to the problem of production. How we must achieve a more equitable distribution. In our time and our country, modified by our American outlook, we must find this answer. It will not come from those who would turn back the clock to a period in our history that has gone forever. It will come from the true voice of democracy, from the millions who labor.

In his message to Congress this year, the President said: "This Republic had its beginning and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights, among them the rights of free speech, free press, free worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

"As our Nation has grown in size and stature, however, as our industrial economy expanded, these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness.

"We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. Necessitous men are not free men. People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made."

American labor is winning the fight to give our men the tools to win. In the readjustments of peace, let American labor go forward with courage and dignity to establish a standard of living higher than we have ever known. By alert citizenship and group action, labor can do more than any other group to establish a commonwealth of free men, busy men, secure men that will be the fulfillment of the American ideal.

As we witness the courage and the sacrifice of our men at the front we must—all of us—feel a solemn obligation to carry on, here at home, for them. With this shining example before us, let us resolve to work together as comrades in American citizenship, to eliminate poverty and ignorance, that all may share in the fruits of work, well done.

Excerpts From Speeches Delivered During the Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include various excerpts from the speeches I have made on important legislative subjects during the past 18 months of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The people of my district are entitled to know how their Representative stood on the important issues we have considered.

PRICE CONTROL OR INFLATION

May 7, 1943

Price control of living costs has been adopted by every member of the United Nations as a vital part of the war effort. * * * In practically every instance their controls are more rigid and severe because their scarcities are greater. * * * We now have price control. * * * We must make it work by retaining all its good points and eliminating its evils. * * * Due to the uncontrolled prices in World War No. 1 we laid the basis for the crash of 1921 and the postponed depression of 1929. * * * Do we want to see this condition again? Yet this is what we face unless we win the battle against inflation.

THE TRUTH ABOUT PRICE CONTROL

May 23, 1944

The people of America are entitled to know the truth about a function of Government which affects the standard of living of 132,000,000 people. In order to check the rising spiral in the cost of living and prevent the disastrous repetition that occurred during and after World War No. 1, Congress on January 30, 1942, passed the Emergency Price Control Act. * * * War is economic waste. It always causes scarcity. Scarcity usually means high prices and high prices mean inflation. After inflation comes deflation—the collapse of business we call depression. It was to prevent this vicious cycle that Congress passed the Price Control Act in 1942. * * * I do not claim the O. P. A. has been perfect. They have made mistakes and will make more, but the benefits far outweigh the evils. * * * In World War No. 1, sugar rose from 5 cents to 27 cents per pound; butter went from 30 cents to 78 cents per pound. * * * In terms of averages, retail food prices advanced over 126 percent. * * * World War No. 2 has been going for 53 months and we have had price control for only 24 months of that time. Yet the rise in the cost of living has been only 25 percent according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics—less than half the rise that took place in World War No. 1. * * * We believe the millions of American people on fixed income should be protected against the war profiteers. We believe that this war that our sons and daughters are winning with their maimed and broken bodies, should not create another batch of blood millionaires. We believe the dependent families of these boys and girls are entitled to protection against war profiteers, so their meager allowances will cover the cost of the necessities of life. The O. P. A. is our principal defense against inflation.

SOLICITUDE FOR THE VETERAN OF ALL WARS IS OUR PATRIOTIC DUTY

May 16, 1944

Since my first day in Congress, I have supported all the legislation brought before the house for consideration which had as its purpose the veterans' welfare. I yield to no man a higher regard or greater admiration for those men and women who have left their civilian paths and entered the armed forces of our country. The resources of America which they are preserving, in many instances with their maimed and broken bodies, should be mobilized in such a manner that their rehabilitation and readjustment into civilian life can be assured. * * * The able-bodied must be provided jobs. The sick and disabled must be provided with adequate hospitalization. Where vocational or academic education is desired, it must be made available. Where homes or farms are needs, provisions for long-term, low-interest-rate loans must be made. * * * Many of these men and women will not return. * * * To their dependents we owe not only a financial obligation, we must try to discharge, but a debt of gratitude which a thankful people can never repay.

SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS DESERVE ADEQUATE ALLOWANCE

October 18, 1943

Testimony given by recognized statistical departments such as the Cost of Living Division, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the entire scale of dependency benefits should be revised upward to furnish the families of the members of our armed forces a decent maintenance allowance. There will, of course, be the cry from some of the Members of economy, but I take the position today as in the past—human rights are more sacred than property rights. To those who raise the cry of "It will cost too much," I give this answer: No nation can afford the ungrateful parsimonious policy of forcing an indecent and insufficient standard of living on the dependents of its fighting heroes.

ELEVEN MILLION VOTERS—SHALL WE ALLOW THOSE WHO FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY TO VOTE FOR DEMOCRACY?

December 18, 1943

Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my commendation and some words of appreciation to many others from home and abroad, for the great fight that the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WOALEY, is making on behalf of the servicemen's right to vote. Many of us who believe in extending the rights and privileges of suffrage to our men and women in uniform are deeply grateful for his leadership. Many of the States' requirements are so severe that for all practical purposes absentee voting is impossible. These factors and many others which space does not permit me to inscribe will prevent the members of our Armed Forces from voting if the matter is left to the separate action of the 48 States. As I see it, several imperatives exist:

(a) A uniform Federal ballot approved by Federal law.

(b) Full cooperation of our Federal military facilities and personnel in the (1) transportation and distribution of ballots, (2) operation of the polls, and (3) collection and returning of the cast ballots to their respective States.

Here the Federal cooperation ceases and the States distribute to their respective election boards the sealed ballots. Thus you have joint action of the Federal and State authorities. The spirit of democratic suffrage has been maintained. State rights would be protected and at the same time we as a grateful Nation could set an example of democracy in action, an example of democracy, zealous of the rights of 11,000,000 service men and women to cast their votes even in times of war.

DISCHARGE COMPENSATION FOR WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS ($100 PER MONTH FOR 12 MONTHS)

December 13, 1943

Mr. Speaker, I have given a great deal of thought to the moral responsibility of the Representatives in Congress toward the veterans of this global war which we are now engaged in. I feel that we have a duty and a responsibility to introduce and pass before the end of this war proper legislation to provide adequate protection and to a certain extent at least compensate the members of our armed forces during the period immediately following demobilization day.

My bill, H. R. 3735, was introduced on November 24, 1943. * * * The bill provides for a flat sum of $100 per month extended compensation after discharge. * * * The important thing is that this principle of extended or discharge compensation be enacted into law before the end of this war. The adoption of this principle will be a great force in improving the morale of our troops and removing the fear and uneasiness from their minds, when they think of the uncertainty of their financial and economic status during the post-war demobilization period.

REAL FREE ENTERPRISE—FREEDOM OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

April 7, 1944

I happen to be a sincere believer in real free enterprise—the kind of free enterprise which has been the backbone of our Nation until recently. Our democracy was founded on the rights of an individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In order to insure

those inherent rights we guaranteed to our people either specifically or by implication, three great principles without which our Nation cannot endure: religious freedom, political freedom, and economic freedom. * * * I believe sincerely in these three principles. I believe that we are swiftly losing the third freedom—the right to economic freedom, which embraces the principle of free enterprise.

Is free enterprise as now practiced really free? * * * Are we to be told again that free enterprise, as it now functions, will lead the people into full employment? * * * The free enterprise of big business was in control, without Government interference, preceding the crash of 1929 to 1932. Have the champions of free enterprise changed their methods of operation or solved the cause of periodic depressions? Unfortunately for the American people, the answer to the last question is an emphatic "No." * * *

We must insist on full operation of our plant facilities, in order that full employment may bring the blessings of full production to our people. We must decentralize the monopolistic corporate economic empires within our business system. * * * We must restore the economic opportunity that is inherent in real free enterprise and give the independent businessman a chance to operate successfully again in our society. * * *

May God give us the clarity of vision to demand the restoration of real free enterprise of our fathers, and protect us from the fraudulent brand of free enterprise as advocated by the great corporate monopolies of big business.

IN THE MIDST OF WAR—PREPARE FOR A JUST AND LASTING PEACE

June 6, 1944

The United Nations must take the initiative in forming an international organization to function as a parliamentary, judicial, and executive body on global questions. * * * It is my opinion that a world nuclear organization should be formed before victory, if possible, and that the present unity which exists primarily because of military pressure, should be utilized before the reason for it is weakened by victory. * * * The peoples of the world are entitled to ask their leaders to embody in their plans for an international organization three great principles in order that we may have global peace. The principles I suggest are: International security, international justice, and international welfare of peoples. If these principles are embodied in the formulation of an international order, we can have a permanent and lasting peace. If they are ignored, in part or together, world peace will be impossible.

We fight for the freedom and dignity of the individual soul, without which spiritual strength and growth is denied and without which true worship of God is impossible. We fight for the recognition of the brotherhood of all men everywhere, even those who are now our enemies and unless the brotherhood of man is established universally, we can only pay lip tribute to the fatherhood of God. We fight for a better world than we've had before—a world "wherein dwelleth righteousness"; where an environment can be established in a physical and material way that will encourage spiritual growth among the children of men. These are the things we fight for, whether consciously or unknowingly.

In my opinion only a goal which includes these great spiritual aims justifies the travail which humanity is presently enduring. It is only through securing such a world for the men and women in our armed forces to come back to, that we can justify the sacrifices of those who fail to return.

UNITY FOR VICTORY

April 2, 1943

A democracy is comprised of many different groups of people with apparently separate interests. * * * No important group or interest in America can be isolated or segregated from another group entirely. There is always present an overlapping, mingling, or duplication of common interests which prevent segregation. * * * The members of the capital management groups, those who are in the labor group, and last, but not least, the members of our armed forces, must not be divided by any injudicious act of ours. We as advisors and protectors of the welfare of the Nation must not unwittingly aid the clever divide-and-conquer plans of our enemies. * * * The welfare of our Nation as a democratic society depends on our intelligent opposition to the Axis effort to segregate these groups into antagonistic, destructive units.

LABOR SHOULD NOT BE PUNISHED

June 2, 1943

Obviously the war can be won only through the harmonious efforts of every section of American society. We cannot at this time afford to drive a divisive wedge into our united efforts. * * * Let us consider the 8,000,000-plus of our young men and women who are members of the armed forces. They come from every level of American life—the rich, the poor, the capitalist, and the laborer—all making their sacrifices to preserve America as it was when they entered the service. And now let us consider the American people that constitute one of the most important parts of our civilian life as it pertains to war production; I speak of the 12,000,000 members of organized labor. What is their record? I say that their record is finest of any labor group in the world. They have given of their membership into the armed forces over 2,000,000 members. But most important of all, through their efforts we have achieved the greatest production of matériel of war the world has ever known. Our free labor has outproduced the slave labor of the Axis. Let us act wisely therefore and not allow our justified feeling of resentment against a few wildcat strikes to rush us into a legislative act which will punish and penalize over 12,000,000 loyal members of organized labor.

CIVIL LIBERTIES OF OUR CITIZENS

May 18 and February 10, 1943

In this time of war hysteria it is the solemn duty of every representative of the people to defend the civil liberties of our citizens. It is a time when the three branches of government should be maintained inviolate. We have given up many of our civil privileges as a necessity to the war effort, but we should be on guard for the first attack on the Bill of Rights, even if that attack is instituted and authorized by a congressional resolution. * * * In conclusion, may I say that we who love the democratic way of life and would die to preserve the civil liberties of the individual, upon which this Nation was founded, should be more alert now than ever before to guard against those forces within our midst who, under the guise of Americanism, are following the Axis propaganda line of divide and conquer.

RACISM—THE FOE OF DEMOCRACY

October 19 and November 16, 1943

Mr. Speaker, the theory of totalitarian philosophy is not bounded or limited by geographical boundaries. * * * Wherever twisted minds are found, there also is found the ground wherein the seeds of totalitarian philosophy will grow. * * * We frequently find men and women practicing, in many cases without knowing it, one of the most vicious tenets of totalitarianism. The practice I speak of is that of racial discrimination and its accompanying trait, minority group persecution. * * * It is my opinion, gentlemen, that democracy is justified in passing laws which will stamp out in every way possible this abominable doctrine of racism. We are a Nation composed of many races. Our existence as a Nation depends upon the unifying force of racial equality and opportunity before the law. Our national life depends upon the willingness of all those races to fight and, if necessary, die for its preservation. Any attempt to incite racial hatred or strife is a dagger in the heart of democracy and a threat against your liberties and mine.

The Grandest Job of Our Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement address delivered by Mr. David E. Lilienthal, chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, at the College of the City of New York, on June 17 last. The subject of the address was The Grandest Job of Our Century. It is an able and challenging presentation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a strange and fearful hour in history—this spring of 1944. In the very week in which you are graduated death and destruction have reached a pitch of fury such as men have never before witnessed; the whole earth is convulsed in turmoil and unbelievable suffering. And yet it is a time not of despair but of great expectations. In the face of unparalleled destruction and grief, in spite of agonies of anxiety and sorrow and hardship, the prevailing spirit among Americans and the peoples of many other parts of the world is not despair but hopefulness. Our thoughts are upon tomorrow in the very darkest hour of this night.

This is not merely a pathetic attempt to escape from the grim realities. Indeed the reality—and many people sense it—is this: ahead can lie the most fruitful era of creation the world has yet known. Beyond the war there opens before us an historic opportunity—it is but an "opportunity," not an inevitable wave of the future—an opportunity without parallel for the building of new life and a new and firmer foundation beneath our feet.

By an age of building I do not mean only the putting together again of what war has torn apart, not just rebuilding what the guns and bombs have destroyed. We are rather standing at the gateway of an age of expansion, of the flowering of creative forces of the modern imagination and the new skills and knowledge of modern man.

This giant task of creation may be the most bold and stirring adventure of the human spirit since the circumnavigation of the globe. It can release a flood of pent-up genius in the works of building, in the skills of management, in the fine arts, and in the development of the free spirit beyond our imagining.

History is filled with monumental paradox. But this is the greatest paradox of all—that the splendor of a creative age should follow

close upon a nightmare of destruction. It is a pardox that can give added meaning to the war, fresh meaning to the death in the lonely skies and distant seas of those young men who might otherwise be here with you tonight. The prospect that prodigious creation may follow gigantic destruction, that the satisfaction that men feel in building will displace the futility of tearing down—is one to give us heart, to add fire to our will to fight, quicken our resolve to win, so that we can then devote ourselves completely to this, the grand job of our century.

When I speak of an era of creation and building I speak not of an ideal world lying somewhere in the remote future, peopled by a different kind of human beings than we actually are, and living under a social system devised in the imagination. Nor am I speaking in the language of prophecy or prediction. I am describing an imminent opportunity, something that can be done, beginning on that tomorrow when the war has been won, in the America of here and now. The great job can be done with tools of knowledge and organization already in our hands.

The understanding and the skill that you have received as students in this college, and that thousands of other young men and women like you have acquired on other campuses, become part of that reservoir of knowledge that gives us, now, in our time, the power to act, to create, to mold the very face of things.

The skills of organization and technology do exist. But it is not foregone, not automatic nor inevitable that they will be used for an age of creation. We must have the will to embark on the adventure, the resolution to begin, to begin from where we are, not waiting until the day of some ideal society for the bold setting-out. We as a people need the will and the faith—but more, a sense that this is the historic hour, that this is the time to turn the first shovel.

What stands in the way of this golden prospect? Not lack of knowledge. We know how. We know how to organize to do almost anything. Take a trip through one of the new war plants covering 50 acres, built in a few months; through laboratories and new Army hospitals. Observe how quickly we can train tens of thousands of men to be technicians of every kind. Lack of knowledge does not stand in the way, nor lack of physical resources if scientifically developed. Do we lack initiative and daring and high spirits? Are we held back by the bonds of tradition or caste? Of course not. Does conflict between groups within America prevent our entering an era of great building? Definitely not; we can indeed boast that nowhere on earth in any period of human history has there been a vast nation less cursed with deep class divisions. The knowledge of technology and of organization, the resources and the imaginative spirit are all here.

But there is a danger. It is not an inconsiderable one. The danger is that we may permit ourselves to be diverted from the creative opportunities by disputes over economic and political theories and dogmas. The danger is that we will allow our energies and our driving vitality to be consumed in violent controversy over meaningless slogans and catch-phrases, by name calling over vague abstractions—undefined phrases such as "free enterprise," "collectivism," "reactionary," or "radical."

My fear is that preoccupation with words may divert us from the flesh-and-blood realities, from the real things that we could agree should be done and could be done to strengthen the basis of democratic life for all of us in America.

When I speak of the opportunity to build America I am not talking about such slogans or abstractions, but of real things that we can see and understand. I speak of the very foundation stones of life itself, upon which all else rests. The current preoccupation with labels, with words that flow so smoothly out of American dogmatists as they inundate us here at home, and do not even spare our nonplussed allies abroad—words about words, and words upon words—these will only add to our confusion and our divisions. The words will inevitably mean different things in the mind of each man who uses them and listens to them. Men will always dispute over economic and political abstractions.

But real things cut through the fog of dogma.

A program for America's building that deals with those real things can be understood and can be acted upon.

An American development program for your generation, for the period from now until 1975, a program for America's building, can be stated in terms of real things—land, factories, streams, electricity, forests, jobs, minerals.

THE LAND

America's soil needs badly to be strengthened, the topsoil preserved, the fertility restored, in an intensive 20- to 30-year enterprise. A new beginning has been made in the past decade—but only a beginning.

This vast undertaking will vitalize the private business of farming and add to the attractiveness of farming as a family way of life. It will mean new opportunities and new jobs in factories making soil chemicals, agricultural machinery, electric pumps, tractors, materials for millions of farm buildings and barns and rural schools.

THE RIVERS AND STREAMS

America's vast rivers need grievously to be put under control and made to work for, not against, the people.

Our methods of managing almost all of our rivers, after all these years of trying, is still in the ox-team period, compared with American progress in nearly every other technical field.

To develop our rivers by modern methods is by no means beyond our capacities, but it will be the largest engineering project of all time. It will save thousands of communities and farms and private businesses from periodic invasion by floodwaters. Enterprise will be nourished along the new water highways. The modernized rivers will provide an inexhaustible source of electrical energy out of waters now wasted and destructive. Irrigation with stored waters will cause to flourish millions of acres that now are fertile but dead. Lakes will be formed that will create spots of beauty for outdoor recreation.

The development of America's rivers on a huge scale will raise up a profession of monumental builders such as the world has never seen.

Out of such a huge development of America's incomparable rivers would come countless new private undertakings—the building of barges and towboats, the erection of electric furnaces and hundred other kinds of old and new enterprise to use the added power, the building of hotels and hostels along the new man-made lakes, the expansion of existing business no longer threatened by flood destruction, the building of new highways and railroads to keep up with the resulting expansion.

THE FORESTS AND MINERALS

America's forests need to be restored and refreshed, after the drain of a century, by the most extensive reforestation undertaking in human history, and by the spread of scientific forestry methods, in an intensive educational effort the country over. Our present forest supplies need to be converted to countless new products made possible by the discoveries of science.

America's minerals need to become the basis of the greatest exploratory and research program ever undertaken, on a quarter-century schedule, to promote the most intensive and prudent and wealth-creating utilization of these fundamental resources.

These programs for forests and minerals would mean increased need for technicians and administrators of many kinds that would strain the universities and private laboratories and training centers; it would mean hundreds and thousands of new industrial processes, new and exciting jobs and opportunities in existing and new private industries and in public service.

These are real things to be developed and built upon—the land, the waters, the minerals, the forests. Here in sight of the towers of the greatest city in America it is so easy for us to forget that the foundation of these skyscrapers is not the rock of Manhattan but the soil of America, her forests and streams and minerals. But it is quite as easy to forget this fundamental fact in Omaha in sight of the Great Plains, or in Chattanooga, or Denver. There is something about being in a city, any city, that makes one feel self-sufficient, cut off from the real underpinning of our life.

I trust I have made it clear to you that the American development I am describing is not what is usually labelled a "public works" program. Public works would be involved, of course, for bridges and highways and new postoffices and schools and sewer systems would be necessary if America took the step toward expansion that such a program would entail. But that would be incidental.

Nor is this a proposal to provide unemployment relief, a "shot in the arm" of public employment to tide over a period when private employment or investment is tending to stagnate. If we fail to strengthen and develop the foundations of all private undertakings by some such program as this, we will certainly need more and more frequent doses of all kinds of economic benzedrine. The program I speak of relates not to such devices, whatever their merits, but to the very source of productiveness itself.

Here is another illustration of the way the dogmatist delights in abstract phrases that only confuse—neatly segregating public works from private enterprise as if they were not both parts of the same living tissue of community existence, interacting and wholly interdependent. The building of a new automobile factory, privately owned, develops a need for new highways, publicly built. New highways—public works so-called—create the opportunity and the need for new automobile factories, oil refineries, tire factories, filling stations, and so on. The arbitrary labels that identify highways as public works and automobile making as private enterprise are convenient; but they are no more than that. The labels have nothing to do with the fundamental unity of physical development of things.

A dogmatist, a worshiper of words, may be defined as a man who has his feet firmly planted in midair. But factories and new jobs and new products, more fertile soil, and improved nutrition—the things people want, the things such a building program for your generation will produce—these realities rest not in midair on words and dogmas, but upon the realities of the earth, upon the resources of Nature, upon the technical and organizing skills of men and women.

The expansion in our standard of living in America that can take place between 1945 and 1975 can be accomplished with no fundamental change in our institutions of government or of property. To do this particular job the Constitution of the United States needs no amendment, nor does the scope of functions of Government require basic revision.

Nor is dictation and coercion of the citizen by private organizations or by government the price of such a mammoth building enter-

prise. On the contrary, a further development of characteristic American methods of voluntary cooperation would be essential. There is a very simple reason for this: Unless there is public understanding and public confidence in what is being done, there would not be public participation—voluntary and understanding participation by the businessman, the labor leader and worker in the factories, the farmer on the land, the teacher and preacher and librarian and physician and local official. The undertaking is too broad, its threads too closely interwoven to be possible of accomplishment except by voluntary methods. And, unless the method of the program's fulfillment be one that encourages participation—in short, voluntary methods—then freedom and opportunity for individual development would have lost rather than gained ground; and the physical achievements would be of dubious value.

The part of the United States where I live and work—the Valley of the Tennessee River—offers some evidence of what a comprehensive program of economic development can produce, in benefits to the people. In that valley the people and their institutions—among them the resource development corporation known as T. V. A.—have in a decade completely changed the face of the region. The standard of living has materially increased for nearly all of 5,000,000 citizens. The productiveness of the area has grown manyfold; faster than has that of the country as a whole in that decade. Opportunities for interesting work for the young men and women have increased. There are many new factories and jobs and professional work that did not exist before. Standards of health and education have gone upward. There is a resurgence of confidence, a chesty feeling, a dynamic burgeoning of human energy, a dreaming of future plans and further development that has been described by observers, among them Thomas Mann, as a manifestation of the American pioneer spirit at its best.

The Tennessee River has been put to work by engineering structures, made to serve as a reliable river channel, as a source of electric power that has multiplied the region's energy resources by 10 times in a decade. The soil, so lacking in fertility only a decade ago, is fast being restored by farmers and their associations; that soil and farm electricity have become the basis of attractive and prosperous living. Out of the modern tools they now have in their hands the people are fashioning a new valley.

Millions of visitors from every region of America have come to the Tennessee Valley to see for themselves these dramatic changes and to observe the T. V. A.'s methods. Not only from other American valleys, but from all over the world have come observers in a steady stream—men from China and Brazil, from India and Italy, Egypt, Bolivia, Ontario, New Zealand. These visitors, their imaginations stirred and spirits hopeful, sense that what has taken place in that once remote American valley could be made to happen, too, in their valleys, in almost any of a thousand valleys the world over.

What does all this mean to you?

What can you do about it?

You have received years of training. You are looking forward, after the war at least, to putting your training to useful creative work. What can you do to bring about this picture of an America of expanding opportunity?

Today the fighting and winning of the war is everyone's first concern. But there is something you can do, and do now, that will be useful in this grand job of the century.

Know this country's resources; know your region's resources, the real things upon which your life is built. Keep in mind how America is really put together, what really makes it tick.

Get the interesting habit of looking at a river, for example, as a force in the life of your region rather than a piece of scenery or a place merely to go boating; the relation of that river to factories and farms. Begin to look at the land not as dirt or farms, not as merely what separates one railroad station from another, but as a vital force that determines the livelihood of your city and your own future. Think of your country not only in terms of statistics and economic principles and political policies, but as farmers, woodsmen, chemists, steel workers, lumber and lumber mills, mines and miners. Think about steel-rolling mills and wheat and cattle, and the men and the communities that produce them, the relation of those men and their children to your chosen field of work and your region, their place in this period of development I have described. Think of floods not merely as something reported each spring on the fourth page of the New York Times. Think of people drowned, communities disrupted, railroads stopped. Think of floods as waste, waste that dams could save. Think of what such saving of lives and property means to the people of New York City and Cleveland and Springfield, Ill., and a thousand other centers of commerce.

The kind of American development I have been talking about will depend upon all of us thinking and uttering almost lovingly words that speak of pine and cedar, of streams and rivers, of aircraft factories and steel billets, of red clay and black loam, and fields of wheat, wave after wave, of barges and of electric lines, of coal and copper ore, of construction workers and miners and farmers and doctors and lawyers and teachers—of things and of people.

You are beginning your active careers at a time of great sorrow and destruction, and also a period of great opportunity. The kind of opportunity for choice of life work and of service that will present itself to each one of you, will depend to a large degree not upon what happens right here in the United States—upon whether in the coming years we are a static nation, resting on our laurels, holding fearfully to what we have; or a land that forever renews its youth by magnificent dreams, noble plans, and great deeds.

The South Must Choose Its Own Way

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in Southern States steps are being taken by political leaders which indicate a coolness in the South toward some of the trends lately evident in our national administration. There are those who question or condemn these activities. I neither question nor condemn them. The South has a perfect right to seek good government and to explore the methods by which it may be obtained.

If Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and South Carolina, and the States which may join them, are able to convince this Nation that the South is not necessarily a voiceless, helpless appendage of the Democratic Party, I shall personally be very proud of them. And there may be no better way of so convincing the Nation than the course presently advocated in these States for independent and, if necessary, drastic action in the coming election.

Yes; I am a Democrat. But first, I am an American and a southerner. And we in the South like to think that as Americans we, too, are entitled to our way of life, to our traditions; even entitled to old-fashioned democracy since we happen to prefer that kind to state socialism.

There are some in our party, and they are high in its councils, who want to rewrite our way of life in the South. There are others who see in the South only a block of votes which at 4-year intervals can be counted almost solidly Democratic, and which can be comfortably forgotten between these intervals.

Neither group understands the South or seeks very diligently to understand it. The South does not ask to be segregated, nor does it want to sit in the front row of the new world order. The South wants to develop its resources, to take advantage of long semidormant assets. The South wants equitable freight rates. It wants agricultural prices which will begin to counterbalance the long, long years of tariff discriminations against southern products. The South wants to develop its waterways, its shipping, and its ports, some of which are even now being frozen out in anticipation of the reduced shipping of the post-war period. The South asks no greater recognition than that to which any large area of this Nation is entitled, but that much it does ask, and it is my hope that it will learn to demand its just recognition.

The South is American to the core. No intellectually honest person questions that fact. It carved its homes from the great New World wilderness, fought for this Nation's freedom, developed a culture and a way of life, then waged and lost a tragic war for the things in which it believed. But the South does not live in a departed age. It does not look back to the romance and glory of other days. It looks ahead. It builds on the future, the future of the South and of the United States. Love of country and love for the things for which it stands are bred into our people. We have no "isms" down there but Americanism.

So, my friends, let me assure you that statesmanship in the South is not dead. The movement for political and economic recognition which you have noted is not a work of irresponsibility. If there is concern about the stirrings of political independence in the South, let it be charged to a quest for assurance that we in the South may continue to enjoy democratic processes as we know them.

Illinois Farming in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD a statement prepared by me on the subject Illinois Farming in Wartime.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Illinois farmers, like those in the rest of the country, met unprecedented wartime demands with record-breaking production. The huge output of the Nation's farms made the millions of men and women in our armed forces the best fed and clothed in the world, enabled the United States to send huge food shipments to its allies, and at the same time gave the civilian population during 1941, 1942, and 1943 the best diet level they ever had enjoyed in any 3-year period.

To date during the war period prices of most farm products have been favorable, and farm income is the highest on record. Farm purchasing power also gained, as national price-control efforts held the line on most things farmers buy. In contrast to the rise in mortgage debt that marked farm prosperity in the First World War, farmers in the Second World War used part of their improved incomes to reduce their long-term debt substantially.

Farmers achieved their tremendous war production with far less permanent damage to the soil than that which marked the smaller wartime effort of 1917 and 1918. The agricultural effort of the Second World War was more closely geared to the total national economy than in the earlier struggle. Production goals for various products were established in the light of available manpower, materials, machinery, and land as well as military and civilian requirements. Agriculture's claims to essentials of production were presented in the national councils. The War Food Administration gave general direction and assistance to wartime production, processing, and distribution of essential farm products. National farm programs which had helped farmers pull out of the slump of the early thirties proved flexible enough to aid in stimulating wartime production and distribution. Through existing representative committees farmers themselves had a large voice in the creation and administration of wartime farm policies.

Illinois is an important agricultural State. On its 213,439 farms totaling 31,032,572 acres, it has 968,103 rural people or 12.3 percent of the State's population. Illinois ranks fourth among all the States in value of total agricultural output, which was $1,146,000,000 in 1943. It ranked first in production of soybeans, second in corn and hogs, fourth in chickens and sixth in eggs.

In 1943 agricultural production in the United States was 28 percent above the prewar average for 1935–39 and 45 percent above the average of the 2 years of America's participation in the First World War, 1917–18. In terms of percentage, this is how Illinois farmers' 1943 production of important products compared with the 1935–39 average:

Hogs	130
Cattle and calves	123
Corn	122
Soybeans	227
Milk	108
Eggs	142
Chickens	129
Oats	95
Butterfat	109
Wheat	56
Sheep and lambs	104
Hay	94

Requirements for armed forces, lend-lease and other exports have taken an increasing proportion of United States food production: 6 percent in 1941, 15 percent in 1942, 21 percent in 1943 and an estimated 25 percent in 1944.

In addition to meeting record war needs, American farmers have produced enough to feed civilians during this war better than in any other period in our history. Per capita civilian consumption of principal foods indicated for 1944 compares with pre-war and last year as follows:

Commodity or group	Pounds in 1944	Percent of 1935–39 average	Percent of 1943
Meats	145	115	106
Eggs	44	118	103
Fluid milk and cream	396	116	98
Fats and oils	46	96	100
Fresh citrus fruits	65	133	109
Fresh vegetables	242	103	104
Sugar	81	84	104
Wheat (flour)	158	102	100

Cash receipts from the sale of farm products in 1943 reached the all-time record of $19,252,173,000 in the United States and $1,146,626,000 in Illinois. These amounts for the United States were 140 percent above the 1935–39 pre-war average, 303 percent above the 1932 low and 58 percent above the 1917–18 average in the First World War. For Illinois, the farm income figure in 1943 was 139 percent above 1935–39, and 348 percent above 1932.

Farm prices in the United States and in Illinois have been generally favorable. At the same time the line has been held reasonably well on the prices of things farmers buy. The result has been a high percent of parity for most commodities, which in general are being produced in far greater volume than during the pre-war years.

Prices received by farmers for specified commodities, United States and Illinois, 1943, and 1943 as a percentage of 1932, 1917–18 average and 1935–39 average, and average parity price, 1943

Commodities	United States average					Illinois average			
	1943	Percent of 1935–39 average	Percent of 1932	Percent of 1917–18	Percent of parity	1943	Percent of 1935–39 average	Percent of 1932	Percent of 1917–18
All agricultural products	(1910–14=100) 192	179	282	101		(1910–14=100) 185	167	319	96
	Dollars					Dollars			
Hogs (hundredweight)	13.70	165	410	91	116	14.00	164	394	91
Cattle (hundredweight)	11.80	185	278	128	138	13.10	173	262	120
Corn (bushels)	1.12	171	351	75	98	1.06	169	393	78
Soybeans (bushels)	1.81	209	335	57	108	1.81	222	385	.....
Milk (hundredweight)	3.12	172	244	116	120	2.95	176	219	.....
Eggs (dozens)	.370	178	261	109	110	.348	185	278	104
Chickens (pounds)	.244	162	207	131	131	.244	164	218	125
Wheat (bushels)	1.33	163	348	65	88	1.49	177	355	72

During the First World War and immediately afterward, farm mortgage debt mounted to an all-time record, resulting in foreclosures and other distress afterward. During the present war, on the other hand, farm mortgage debt has steadily declined. In 1943 the total for the United States was reduced to $6,100,000,000, $4,700,000,000 less than the 1923 peak and $64,000,000 below the 1917–18 average. In Illinois farm mortgage debt in 1943 was $373,981,000, which was $336,890,000 less than the 1924 high point and $14,036,000 less than 1917–18.

Similarly, farm foreclosures and other forced sales for the United States in 1943 were 77 percent below the average of the 1920's and 92 percent below the record number in 1932. In Illinois farm foreclosures and forced sales during 1943 were 87 percent below the 1925–29 average and an estimated 95 percent less than in the State's worst year, 1932.

While long-term farm debt has been reduced, short-term loans for war production have been expanded both to individual farmers and to farmer cooperatives.

Production credit associations supervised by the Farm Credit Administration last year made 230,735 loans to farmers totaling $501,211,688 in the United States and 10,886 loans amounting to $26,600,755 in Illinois.

F. C. A. loans to farmer cooperatives last year totaled $404,998,320 for the United States.

In addition, funds of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation in the F. C. A. system were used to make 108,620 loans to farmers amounting to $64,597,006 for the United States and 1,132 loans totaling $618,810 to the farmers of Illinois.

Prepayments in advance of maturity on long-term farm mortgage indebtedness in 1943 amounted to $242,448,000 for the United States.

Aided by the Soil Conservation Service, complete farm plans to make the best possible use of every acre had been worked out by the end of 1943 for more than 315,000 farmers covering 105,000,000 acres in the country as a whole and for approximately 7,000 farms covering 1,143,000 acres in Illinois. On most of this land intensive soil and water conservation practices are carried out through soil-conservation districts.

Appropriate conservation practices increase crop yields by 20 percent or more on the average. According to recent reports from 412 typical Illinois farmers, soil conservation farming has resulted in an average increase of 29 percent in average annual yield per acre of all major crops, 33.4 percent for corn, 36 percent for barley, 18.4 percent for oats, 21 percent for wheat, 96.9 percent for soybeans, and 31.3 percent increase in animal unit months per acre of pasture.

Preliminary figures show that the 1943 agricultural conservation program conducted by the elected farmer committeemen of A. A. A. included 403,000,000 acres, or 88 percent of the Nation's cropland and for Illinois 21,281,000 acres or 85 percent of the State's cropland. This program resulted in the following important conservation practices for 1943:

Agricultural conservation program practices	United States	Illinois
Application of materials: [1]		
20 percent superphosphate or equivalent.	1,854,877 tons on 1,259,627 farms	81,308 tons on 26,656 farms.
Limestone or equivalent	18,783,858 tons on 968,637 farms	3,126,359 tons on 79,283 farms.
Reseeding or partial seeding depleted pastures.	14,732,368 pounds on 1,410,840 acres of 93,809 farms.	675,155 pounds on 66,604 acres of 4,148 farms.
Plowing-under green manure crops:		
Legumes and nonlegumes	22,558,993 acres on 1,669,51 farms	1,070,460 acres on 53,394 farms.
Annual lespedeza	930,267 acres on 101,221 farms	31,954 acres on 2,477 farms.
Total	23,946,962 acres on 1,815,397 farms	1,102,414 acres on 55,871 farms.
Harvesting hayseed and legume seed	3,105,300 acres on 308,098 farms	345,382 acres on 22,382 farms.

[1] There may be some duplication in the numbers of farms, since a material may be applied in more than 1 form and if so is counted as a separate practice.

Electric power on farms played a significant part in our record war production. From the time the Rural Electrification Administration was created in 1935 until the end of 1943, more than $480,000,000 in loans were made to provide electric power to American farmers, and $22,000,000 for the State of Illinois. Most of these loans were made to farmer cooperatives.

R. E. A. loans have been used to construct about 400,000 miles of distribution lines serving 1,104,183 rural consumers in the country as a whole and 20,000 miles of distribution lines serving 50,000 consumers in Illinois.

At the end of 1943 borrowers were more than $15,000,000 ahead of schedule in paying their loans for the United States and $1,252,000 for Illinois.

During the period 1935 through 1943 the proportion of farms having electric service jumped from 10.4 percent to 40.4 percent for the United States and from 12.3 percent to 52.9 percent for Illinois.

Many small farmers who in the past had scarcely been able to subsist are now contributing substantially to war production with the aid of the Farm Security Administration.

Rehabilitation loans totaling $809,882,606 have been made by F. S. A. to aid small farmers in the United States, and loans totalling $16,439,701 have been made in Illinois. Altogether, rehabilitation loans have been made to 961,129 farmers in the United States and to 15,995 Illinois farmers who were unable to receive adequate credit from other sources.

Farmers in the United States have repaid 86.7 percent and Illinois farmers 81.3 percent of the principal due on these loans.

In addition, 33,559 farmers in the United States and 636 farmers in Illinois have been enabled to purchase farms through F. S. A. farm-ownership loans. Farmers in the United States are 48 percent, and Illinois farmers 42 percent, ahead of schedule in their payments of these loans.

In connection with their loans, F. S. A. borrowers have helped in working out complete farm and home plans which have both increased their income and boosted war-food production.

The following table shows how farmers on F. S. A.'s rehabilitation program have contributed to the increased output of vital war-food products:

Production

Product	U. S. Farm Security Administration rehabilitation loan borrowers	
	Amount produced 1943	Percent increase over 1942
Soybeans.....bushels..	5,049,187	37
Dry beans and black-eyed peas.....pounds..	84,184,996	15
Irish potatoes.....bushels..	20,996,840	65

Product	Illinois Farm Security Administration rehabilitation loan borrowers	
	Amount produced 1943	Percent increase over 1942
Soybeans.....bushels..	1,525,098	67
Dry beans and black-eyed peas.....pounds..	129,865	[1] 652
Irish potatoes.....bushels..	17,237	16

[1] This large increase is due to the fact that some Farm Security Administration borrowers in Illinois planted these crops for the first time in 1943.

Sales

Product	U. S. Farm Security Administration rehabilitation loan borrowers	
	Amount sold 1943	Percent increase over 1942
Hogs.....pounds..	532,361,529	56
Cattle and calves.....do....	432,390,682	43
Sheep.....do....	62,777,820	30
Milk.....gallons..	571,116,008	13
Chickens.....pounds..	66,069,728	47
Eggs.....dozens..	126,353,312	32

Product	Illinois Farm Security Administration rehabilitation loan borrowers	
	Amount sold 1943	Percent increase over 1942
Hogs.....pounds..	26,228,950	28
Cattle and calves.....do....	8,598,749	61
Sheep.....do....	517,628	28
Milk.....gallons..	16,598,158	16
Chickens.....pounds..	1,543,525	16
Eggs.....dozens..	3,272,282	14

NOTE.—Pounds are live weight.

Crop loans in the early part of the past decade were made principally for the purpose of supplying farmers with ready cash for products not immediately needed in marketing channels. The ever-normal granary thus accumulated was available to meet rapidly expanding needs at the start of the war. Reserves of feed grains were of particular importance in making possible the rapid increase in meat and milk production. After the war began, the loan policy was continued as a method of price support and an aid to orderly marketing.

As farm workers flocked into the armed services and jobs in war industries, manpower became one of the most pressing problems of farm production. Supplementing a series of steps in national policy, culminating in existing selective service exemptions for many essential farmers and farm workers, agencies of the Department of Agriculture, including the Federal-State extension service, administered or helped administer programs for recruiting, transporting, and placing farm labor. During 1943, 4,299,563 placements of farm labor were made through Federal-State agencies throughout the country, involving about 2,100,000 individual workers; 73,998 such placements were made in Illinois. About 14,000 of the workers placed throughout the country were transported interstate by the War Food Administration Office of Labor, and 66,000 were farm workers brought by W. F. A. from other countries. Five hundred and ninety-two of the foreign workers were on Illinois farms in 1943. About 100,000 farm workers were being brought by W. F. A. from other countries in 1944. Illinois was allotted 950, all of whom were on farms in the State by early summer.

Crop loan and purchase machinery will be available for use after the war. Congress has placed a floor under farm prices, at 90 percent of parity for 2 years from the January 1 after hostilities cease.

When war broke out in Europe, a program of Government purchase of farm products was well established as a marketing aid and means of surplus disposal. The machinery was adapted to carry out a program of consolidated wartime purchase of farm products for military and lend-lease requirements as well as small remaining domestic requirements, such as the school-lunch program. Some of the national purchase figures for farm products important in Illinois follow:

Commodity	1941	
	Amount	Value
Pork.....pounds..	662,416,132	$257,686,043
Cornstarch.....do....	194,500,660	5,794,060
Cheese.....do....	169,102,503	38,720,507
Butter.....do....	1,918,801	698,976
Dried eggs.....do....	56,725,675	64,738,229
Evaporated milk...cases..	17,592,280	60,012,874
Canned vegetables...do....	10,486,937	19,941,827

Commodity	1942	
	Amount	Value
Pork.....pounds..	1,637,325,506	$439,521,280
Cornstarch.....do....	261,191,256	7,367,520
Cheese.....do....	268,342,723	62,524,815
Butter.....do....	33,249,940	12,965,640
Dried eggs.....do....	202,367,152	209,384,137
Evaporated milk...cases..	25,489,174	83,098,597
Canned vegetables...do....	5,421,632	12,629,314

Commodity	1943	
	Amount	Value
Pork.....pounds..	1,[illegible],655	$543,076,910
Cornstarch.....do....	102,740,464	3,215,669
Cheese.....do....	210,716,206	57,501,535
Butter.....do....	119,675,144	58,089,496
Dried eggs.....do....	240,770,964	291,185,256
Evaporated milk...cases..	7,181,458	29,208,729
Canned vegetables...do....	15,368,418	23,597,074

Years of research by Department scientists lay behind much of the expanded war production. Ten years ago, for example, hybrid corn was very little known or used. In 1943 it had practically taken over the Corn Belt; in Illinois, for instance, it occupied 93 percent of the corn acreage. The use of hybrid corn increased our production by some 600,000,000 bushels in a single year over the production that would have been possible with open-pollinated varieties.

When the war came the Agricultural Research Administration concentrated on immediate wartime problems. Thanks to the work of its scientists, penicillin can be produced in large enough quantities to meet all the needs of our soldiers, and the extraordinary new insecticide DDT is being used by our armed forces all over the world to combat deadly insect pests.

The Northern Regional Research Laboratory at Peoria, one of the Research Administration's many scientific centers, has made notable contributions to the war. The work on penicillin production was done at this laboratory. It developed the butylene glycol process for making butadiene, used to produce synthetic rubber. Its methods for analyzing the oil content of soybeans have saved the Government and taxpayers large sums of money in the Government-supported soybean program. This laboratory also coordinated the program for producing alcohol from wheat, to save badly needed corn. It developed methods, now in commercial production, for making glucose sirup and high-quality protein from wheat. Among other developments were a cork substitute made from peanut shells and a material made of corncobs and peanut shells for the blast-cleaning of aircraft engines.

C. I. O. Political Action Committee

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is evidence in the files of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities which clearly shows that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is, in fact, the political arm of the New Deal administration and that the activities of the organization are directed from the White House by the New Deal political strategists, David K. Niles and Jonathan Daniels. But what is more important, Mr. Speaker, there is evidence to show that the Farm Security Administration, an agency of the Federal Government, is being used as a political weapon by the New Deal and the P. A. C. to defeat certain Members of this body and the Senate.

The House committee evidence includes, among other things, records from the telephone company, showing long-distance telephone calls between prominent C. I. O. political action leaders to the White House and to Government agents in States where political upsets recently took place.

The assistant director of the political action committee, C. B. Baldwin, a few months ago resigned as head of the Farm Security Administration to direct the C. I. O.'s campaign for the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt and for the defeat of Members of Congress to whom they were opposed. Mr. Baldwin, who headed the Farm Security for a long while is now using that organization for political purposes. The evidence shows that Mr. Baldwin has been in direct communication with the officials of the F. S. A. throughout the country and at the height of certain primary campaigns where distinguished Members of this body were defeated, Mr. Baldwin was in daily telephonic communication with the regional directors of the Farm Security Administration.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee, in its campaign for vengeance against those Members of Congress who refused to be led by them is working in collusion with many high officials of this Government, and there is ample evidence to prove it. Most of us have become hardened to New Deal scandals. But I, for one, confess myself shocked and astounded at this latest manifestation of contempt for the laws intended to keep political campaigns clean. Here is a Communist-dominated group, wielding a $4,000,000 slush fund aimed at the political death of every Congressman who will not take its orders, stretching its tentacles into the White House itself, constantly in communication with the President's closest intimates, undoubtedly with his full knowledge and approval. It would not have been credible under former administrations, either Democratic or Republican, but it agrees with the pattern adopted by this regime, which has for its purpose the destruction of constitutional government.

Speaking as one member of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, I purpose to see that the Congress and the people have the full facts based upon this amazing evidence which has just been obtained by our committee investigators.

Address by Marshall Field Before the Capital Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate into the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered last evening before the Capital Press Club by the Honorable Marshall Field 3d, of the city of Chicago.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEGRO PRESS AND THE ISSUES OF DEMOCRACY

I am glad to be here tonight, glad that Mr. Smith asked me to be your speaker. As the publisher of two papers which seek to tell the whole truth to all the people, I would be remiss indeed if I did not take the opportunity to come here and meet the correspondents who tell the Washington side of the Negro story to the Negro press and public.

It is undeniably true that a great deal of news of interest to the whole country, as well as to Negroes, originates here in Washington. I want to congratulate the Negro correspondents who cover that news on the Capital Press Club.

The past year has seen three outstanding events of interest to all Americans, which originated with the Negro press and its correspondents. During this year a Negro correspondent representing the Negro Publishers' Association and the Atlanta Daily World was accredited to the White House. Likewise during the past year, the President of the United States for the first time sat down with an organized body of Negro publishers who presented a series of war aims as they saw them. Also during this past year, news accounts of Negro ground troops in combat prepared by one-the-scene Negro correspondents appeared for the first time. More than a dozen Negro correspondents are now with Negro troops overseas. As more and more Negro troops are committed to combat, as they must be, we shall see more and more of this story told to the American public. These stories should not be told to the Negro public alone. Stories of the Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, and the Ninety-third Division, and the Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron, and the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group, which distinguished itself within the last fortnight, show that courage and sacrifice are equally the property of all Americans. It is right and proper that the story of these Negro combat units and of all other Negro units should be told to the Negro public by Negro correspondents through Negro newspapers. But that is not enough. These stories are and should be of interest to all Americans regardless of race or origin. It is highly important that these stories should be told to all Americans through all news channels.

Suppose we begin by drawing up a balance sheet of Negro contributions to this war. In the defense period and the early phases of the war, our domestic problem was mainly one of mobilizing our productive capacity and our manpower to meet the enemy challenge. During this period one-tenth of our manpower reserve was shamefully neglected. Thanks to long-standing discriminations in education and employment opportunities, this segment was less highly trained and experienced than America's workers in general. Many important steps were taken through the National Youth Administration and other training and recruitment agencies to make up this training deficiency. But it was not enough, and employers generally were reluctant to hire up to the limit of the skills, experience, and grade of the Negro manpower available. But as the manpower situation became tighter, employers gradually overcame their reluctance and in 1942 and 1943 the employment of Negroes increased 15 times as fast as white employment. By July in 1943, 1,300,000 Negro workers were employed in war industries, a number which represented about 7 percent of all war workers. The number has increased somewhat since then. Chairman Ross of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice told the Labor Committee of the House the other day that demobilization would involve the conversion of 1,500,000 Negro workers from production for war to production for peace.

In certain industries the employment of Negroes has been exceptionally large. In shipbuilding, the number of Negro workers in March of this year exceeded the total of all shipbuilding workers in 1940. But in other industries which have also experienced large scale and rapid expansion the employment of Negroes has been very small. And generally speaking, the employment of Negroes in skilled and semiskilled positions, and in supervisory positions has lagged behind the skills and experience of the workers available. The same thing is true of the employment of Negro women.

In speaking of our organization for war, let us not omit the contribution of Negro farmers. Although the Negro population is no longer predominantly rural a very large number of Negroes are still living on farms.

Six hundred and seventy-two thousand farmers, 98 percent of all Negro farmers, live in the Southern States. They make up a fourth of the farm operators in the South and more than half the farm laborers in that area. While one can only estimate their contributions, it is plain that their labor and to some extent their products are an important part of the South's food production for war. In 1943, in addition to nearly all the country's peanut and long-staple cotton needs, the South produced one-third of the Nation's beef requirements, one-fifth of the milk, one-fourth of the eggs, one-third of the chickens, and one-fifth of the hogs. It strikes me that this is a Negro contribution to the war which has been largely ignored by the Negro as well as the white press.

And now how about the armed forces? In this war we have repeated the pattern of race relations which prevailed in previous wars. It has never been properly explained to the public that Negroes have participated in every major war this country has fought. In the Revolution, which gave this country its freedom; in the War of 1812, when we defended that freedom and our rights on the high seas; in the Civil War when we extended

the right of freedom more widely and preserved the Union; in the Spanish-American War and in both World Wars, Negroes were present and fought valiantly. In the earlier wars Negroes fought side by side with whites. But in all these wars at first we were reluctant to let Negroes fight. While our manpower needs became more and more acute, we debated the qualities of Negroes as fighters. Finally we trained Negroes to fight and waited to see how they performed. They performed well and our writers and leaders sighed with relief and said, "Thank God that's settled." But in suceeding wars that debate began again.

This war has been no exception. The Selective Service Act forbade discrimination in the draft. Nevertheless, Negroes were at first inducted more slowly than whites. Today Negroes make up 10.4 percent of all selective service registrants of military age, while Negroes are 9 percent of all men in the Army. Although the Army has stated that it expects to remedy this deficiency before the year is up, it has not been achieved yet. Present plans call for an Army composed of 6,245,720 whites and 709,280 Negroes. As of February 29 this year the War Department announced there were 664,066 Negroes in the Army. At about the same date there were approximately 100,000 Negroes in the Navy, 10,000 in the Marines, and 4,000 in the Coast Guard. Nearly 5,000 of the Negroes in the Army were commissioned officers.

Fifty percent of our Negro troops are serving overseas, according to a letter from the Secretary of War to Representative LUDLOW. And of the Negro soldiers overseas, 35 percent are in combat and combat support units. As all of us here know, very small numbers of these troops have as yet seen combat. While this is also true of white soldiers overseas I think we all subscribe to the statement of war aims made by the Negro publishers to the President. Among other things they said:

"This is our country, to share with all other Americans. We have purchased our stake in this, our native land, with our blood and toil during more than 300 years. We have a right and duty to share its blessings, its sacrifices, and its sufferings."

Those sacrifices include the ones made in Normandy since June 6, in the South Pacific where the Ninety-third Division has been fighting the Japanese for the past 2 months, and elsewhere in the world since Pearl Harbor. Let us all remember that only a small portion of a modern Army gets into hand to hand combat with the enemy. At a beachhead such as Anzio, Negro supply troops unloaded ships under fire and were as much in the front line as though they had been exchanging hand grenades with the Nazis. I think it should be a matter for solemn pride that early reports from the beachheads show that Negro soldiers, sailors, and Coast Guard men participated in most phases of the Allied landing in northern France. Early Signal Corps radiophotographs showed Negro soldiers mopping up Nazi snipers in a French town. Others showed Negro medical corpsmen evacuating wounded men in France and bringing them ashore in England. Another showed a Negro gun crew in action on an invasion craft.

Behind the invasion team are the men who prepared the blow we struck on June 6. We know Negroes helped make the goods and build the boats that carried our forces of liberation. Who readied the planes that flew 27,000 sorties in 3 days? Who guarded the fields they took off from? Who loaded the 4,000 ships the British Prime Minister spoke of? Negroes want to know, and I believe the whole American public wants to know.

In drawing up this balance sheet let us not forget that every officers' candidate school has had at least one mixed class in which Negroes were completely integrated. Let us also remember the technical training which is being received by Negro soldiers. It is going to be up to us civilians when our soldiers have destroyed the Nazis and the Japanese militarists to see that those skills are not wasted. And last, but in no sense least, let us remember that the Army has been able to take some tens of thousands of young Negro men, whom our civilian social system had failed to equip with the fundamental skills of literacy, and in the short space of 8 weeks has been able to give them these skills. I suppose it will come as a shock to our domestic adherents of race supremacy to hear that Negro boys have performed fully as well as white boys in these literacy classes.

To me this balance of Negro contributions in industry and the armed forces adds up something like this. Negroes have made substantial contributions in both phases of the war program. They could have made even more substantial and more spectacular contributions had it not been for the exclusion of Negroes from many aspects of American life in the years before the war. And in the military side of the war, Negroes are ready for more substantial and more spectacular contributions than they have been permitted to make.

I want to touch on a very sore point in connection with Negroes in uniform. The discriminations and indignities to which Negro soldiers and sailors have been subjected not only rankle deeply in the hearts of all Negro Americans but are a source of shame and concern to many white Americans. I do not know, frankly, whether we should castigate the Army more or civilian Americans more. Negro soldiers have found they could get only limited transportation from camp to town; when they got there could find only limited recreation, housing, and entertainment facilities. If they got into difficulties—as who might not under those circumstances—Negro soldiers have too often found that wearing a uniform was no protection against police brutality. These things cannot be corrected by civilian or military authorities alone. Joint action is required, but it will not come until these facts are made known to white Americans as well as Negro Americans, and a plan of action is presented to them.

Americans generally don't know these things. Why not? The American people's knowledge about our organization for war and the contributions all Americans are making toward it comes from news sources—the press, radio, and news reels and from films, books, and magazines. The Negro as a soldier and a war worker seldom appears in these channels. Many white Americans have no idea even of the number of Negroes in the armed forces, let alone what their role has been. The bulk of news stories in the daily press about Negroes is not connected with the war. Even now Negro crime stories are more frequent than Negro soldier stories. There are exceptions to this newspaper treatment. I wonder how many of you noticed the episode from "Terry and the Pirates," in which Terry was flying from China to India. On the way he passed by the point at which Negro combat engineers are building the Ledo road and fighting off Japanese patrols. Milton Caniff's drawing showed the Negro engineers. There was no comment, and no tag line, but it was plain to everyone that these were Negro troops. This is the sort of thing that is needed to break down the Negro stereotype.

A number of nationally circulated magazines have carried stories about Negroes recently, some with pictures. But none has attempted an over-all assessment of Negro contributions to the war; and few have dealt with Negroes as war workers.

After the Ninety-ninth Fighter Group brought down 12 Focke-Wulfs in 1 day the news reels carried the story. Up to this time there had been no combat or serious soldier shots in the news reels since the beginning of the war.

On the radio, with the exception of a few special feature programs and the current "New World A'Comin'," most Negro programs have been religious or musical features with little or no news comment.

This being the case, there is little wonder that the National Opinion Research Center at Denver recently found in a Nation-wide poll that most white people held the view that Negroes were not contributing much to the war effort. So much lack of information leads beyond ignorance to hostility. From "do not contribute" it is only a step to "cannot contribute" and from there it is only a step to "should not contribute." It is not guess work that these opinions are held by many white people. The same poll showed it.

Where the Negro media are concerned it is a different story. Through the Washington correspondents, Government war news which originates in Washington has been very throughly covered. But, while Washington is an important source of news, it is not the only one. Many production and employment stories are local. They have not always been covered.

Through individual and pool correspondents, the activities of Negroes in the armed forces have had, on the whole, a thorough coverage. There are still many types of stories which have not been handled. Who is covering the Negro side of the invasion? So far, we have only scattered stories and pictures in the Negro as well as in the white press.

There is now a newsreel devoted to Negro subjects and there are a good many well-established Negro magazines. Radio programs directed primarily to Negro audiences have mainly a religious and musical content. The shortage of Negro news on the radio is not made up in Negro news programs.

In other words, Negro news is segregated just as much as any other aspect of Negro life. The news channels which reach white Americans contain practically no reference to Negro contributions to the war. No matter how good a job the Negro media do they cannot fill this gap unaided, since Negroes read both white and Negro papers, but white Americans read only white papers.

The segregation of Negro news lends weight to Gunnar Myrdal's judgment that "To get publicity is of the highest strategic importance to the Negro people." We all know that the race problem is a problem of the mind. Publicity and information alone will not lead us to a solution of the American dilemma, but they are the necessary first steps to a solution.

The days are past when we think the mind with preferences and prejudices is unassailable. We have spent too much time in approaching the minds of white and Negro Americans with appeals to tolerance and good will. These approaches are needed, but they are not enough. Prejudice feeds on misinformation. The protective veil of ignorance is abetted by the segregation of Negro news. Let us make a fresh approach to the problem by putting an end to segregation in the news columns of our daily press. The first point of attack should be Negro contributions to the war.

Perhaps some special channels will have to be devised. The recently formed American Council on Race Relations may be able to handle part of this problem. But only an informed and aroused public opinion which sees the danger to our democracy in the waste of manpower and the bitterness which accompanies discrimination can be-

gin to approach a solution. In this the Negro press and correspondents play a part but not the whole part. What is the proper role of the Negro press in the solution of the American dilemma?

Let us look at the Negro press itself. Perhaps we can find an answer there. To my mind the greatest of all Negro editors was Frederick Douglass. This man, who was born a slave and was taught to read and write secretly by the wife of one of his owners, was one of the leaders in arousing public sentiment against American slavery, not only in this country but in the British Isles. At the same time he was a Negro leader of great judgment and clarity of thought who understood fully the need for a national solution of the race problem of his time. Against a good deal of opposition he spoke out strongly for an avoidance of sectionalism on the slavery issue. When Garrison wanted to take a stand against dealing with slave holders—a solution which would have amounted to promoting northern secession—Douglass spoke out against him. Without ever ceasing to protest by word and deed, Douglass counseled against the John Brown uprising. And Douglass never lost sight of the final objective—full participation by men of all races in local and national life. He was the first editor to suggest the use of Negro troops in combat during the Civil War, and he urged it not only to whites but to Negroes. He wrote: "Men of color, to arms! * * * Slowly and reluctantly that appeal is begining to be heeded. Stop not now to complain that it was not heeded sooner. That it should not, may or may not have been best. This is not the time to discuss that question. Leave it to the future. When the war is over, the country saved, peace established, and the black man's rights secured, as they will be, history with an impartial hand will dispose of that and sundry questions."

And again he says: "There are weak and cowardly men in all nations. We have them amongst us. They tell you this is the 'white man's war'; that you will be no better off after than before this war'; that the getting of you into the Army is to sacrifice you on the first opportunity.' Believe them not; cowards themselves, they do not wish to have their cowardice shamed by your brave example. Leave them to their timidity or to whatever motive may hold them back. * * *

"The case is before you. This is our golden opportunity. Let us accept it and forever wipe out the dark reproaches unsparingly hurled against us by our enemies. Let us win for ourselves the gratitude of our country and the blessing of our posterity through all time."

The time and circumstances of Douglass' appeal do not limit its significance to slavery days or to men of any particular race. In Douglass' time this country was engaged in a war over a national versus a sectional solution of a vital social problem. One part of that vital problem involved the freedom of an important part of America's people.

Today we are engaged in a war in which the freedom of all men is at stake—men of all races and all nations. Negroes have a natural and legitimate interest in the fate of oppressed peoples everywhere—the people of occupied Europe and Asia are under the yoke of the Nazi and Japanese militarists with their theories of racial and national supremacy.

In this situation it seems to me the Negro press and writers might examine more closely the principles which guided Frederick Douglass. The Negro press has rightly been concerned with the Negro's stake in democracy at home and in Negroes' right to participate fully in the struggle to preserve it. But Negroes share with all Americans a stake in the problem of world-wide democratic order. Douglass urged the Negroes of his time to participate fully in the struggle for democracy, to join in all the humanitarian movements of their time, to work for a broad national solution of the race problem, and to work with men of both races who loved liberty.

If the Negro press is to lead opinion, its columns should not stop short at urging Negro participation in America's war job; or in discussing the fate of the peoples of the Caribbean, of India, and the colonial problems of Africa and the East Indies. Wherever the struggle for freedom goes on—the struggle for political and economic rights and opportunities, whether at home or abroad, black or white, on the farm or in the factory—that struggle should have news value for the readers of the Negro press.

In short, the Negro press has all the rights of a minority protest press. But it has the responsibilities that go with those rights. In the narrowest sense those responsibilities require that the Negro press should follow the ordinary canons of good journalism—to tell the whole story accurately. In the widest sense those responsibilities require that the Negro press should inform its reading public about the issues of democracy abroad as well as at home. The masses of people everywhere are engaged in a struggle to broaden the base of economic opportunity and political rights and to secure the fundamental freedoms of free speech and worship. This is the true meaning of democracy. The fight to win it abroad cannot be separated from the fight to win it at home. Let the white press tell its readers more about the fight at home; let the Negro press tell its readers more about the fight to win it abroad.

These are interests we have in common. Protest is not the exclusive property of the minority press. In an earlier day when the founders of this country were fighting for the freedoms they later wrote into the Constitution, Tom Paine helped to crystallize some of the democratic issues of his day. Tom Paine and Frederick Douglass had this in common: They fought with words as weapons for the democratic liberties the American creed declares are the right of all men everywhere.

Benefits for Veterans of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to tell the House of the laws passed in the Seventy-eighth Congress and benefits derived therefrom, and also to review the benefits presently offered the veterans and dependents of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2 and their cost.

The Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, approved February 3, 1944, Public Law No. 225, Seventy-eighth Congress, provides, under certain conditions and limitations, mustering-out payment of $300 for persons who, having performed active service for 60 days or more, have served outside the continental limits of the United States or Alaska; $200 for persons who, having performed active service for 60 days or more, have served no part thereof outside the continental limits of the United States or Alaska; and $100 for persons who have performed active service for less than 60 days.

The act of March 1, 1944, Public Law No. 242, Seventy-eighth Congress, increased the service pension rate for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, based upon total disability or age 65, from $60 to $75 per month; liberalized the delimiting marriage date governing eligibility of widows of deceased veterans of that group for service-pension purposes by changing the delimiting marriage date from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938; and provided for increased pension to widows of this group by granting $40 per month to a widow when the age of 65 years is attained or $50 per month if the widow or former widow was the wife of the veteran during the period of his service in the war.

The act of March 3, 1944, Public Law No. 245, Seventy-eighth Congress, amended the service pension laws pertaining to veterans and widows of deceased veterans of the Indian wars. It increased the rate for total disability or age 65 years to $60 per month and authorized the rate of $100 per month where the veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance of another person. The act also liberalized the delimiting marriage date of March 3, 1917, by including additional widows married after that date if 60 years of age and if married to the veteran 10 or more years prior to his death, with the requirement of continuous cohabitation with the veteran from date of marriage to date of death, and increased service pension from $30 to $40 per month is provided for the widow upon attainment of age 70 years and $50 per month is provided for the widow who was the wife of the veteran during the period of his service in an Indian war.

The act of May 11, 1944, Public Law No. 300, Seventy-eighth Congress, provided for volunteers, National Guard men, and selectees pension benefits based upon disability resulting from injury or disease incurred in line of duty while reporting under orders of the local draft board and prior to acceptance or rejection from service. This act provides benefits similar to those which were provided for World War No. 1 cases.

The act of May 24, 1944, authorized the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide seeing-eye dogs trained for the aid of blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to provide such veterans with mechanical and electronic equipment for aiding them to overcome their handicap of blindness.

The act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, increased by 15 percent the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension

payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities; increased the rates for widows and children under Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, which provides compensation to the widow and children where any World War No. 1 veteran dies of non-service-connected cause, but at time of death had a service-connected disability; and included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the said Public Law No. 484, as amended.

The act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, increased the pension payable for non-service-connected disability of permanent and total degree applicable to veterans of World War No. 1 and the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, from $40 to $50 per month, and increased the rate to $60 per month where such veterans shall have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or reached the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. The act also made the benefits above described available to World War No. 2 veterans.

The act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 314, Seventy-eighth Congress, provides for the payment of pension or compensation to certain persons receiving retired pay by permitting waiver of so much of the retired pay and allowances as is equal in amount to the pension or compensation to which the retired person is otherwise entitled. Inasmuch as pension and compensation are exempt from income tax and retired pay other than that for disability incurred in line of duty is not so exempt, the effect of this act is to permit exemption of so much of the retired pay as is waived in order to receive pension or compensation.

The act of June 22, 1944, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly referred to as the G. I. bill of rights, provides Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans. This act I will explain more in detail. Generally speaking, it contains a number of administrative provisions to facilitate the administration of veterans' affairs and to protect the rights of veterans to benefits provided for them. The major benefits afforded by the act are—

(1) Educational aid by way of payment of the cost of education and maintenance allowance of $50 per month for a veteran without dependents and $75 per month if the veteran has a dependent or dependents.

(2) Loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property, and which provides for the guaranty by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of not to exceed 50 percent of a loan or loans for such purposes, with the provision that the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed $2,000.

(3) Aid in the employment of veterans by the creation of a veterans' placement service board, with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as chairman, to carry out the intent and purpose of the Congress that there shall be an effective job-counseling and employment-placement service for veterans. The board is to determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service. The operating entity will be the United States Employment Service.

(4) Readjustment allowances for former members of the armed forces who are unemployed under which unemployment allowances of $20 per week are allowed for a maximum period of 52 weeks.

BENEFITS PRESENTLY AFFORDED VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS OF DECEASED VETERANS OF WORLD WARS NOS. 1 AND 2

The following statement briefly sets forth the benefits provided for World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans and their dependents, as to types and amounts, eligibility requirements and procedure to be followed in securing them. The statement reveals the benefits made available by the Seventy-eighth Congress.

There is attached a table showing the disbursements made for the relief of World War No. 2 veterans and their dependents from December 1941 through March 31, 1944; World War No. 2 veterans hospitalized or domiciled, showing admissions to hospitals for domiciliary care from December 1941 through April 30, 1944, and those remaining at the end of April 1944; and a table showing the disbursements for relief of World War No. 1 veterans and their dependents from 1918 to March 31, 1944, and through March 1944. There is also attached summary of activities of the Veterans' Administration, November 30, 1941, February 29, 1944, March 31, 1944, and April 30, 1944.

The so-called G. I. bill of rights, S. 1767—Seventy-eighth Congress, an act "To provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans," has become law by approval of the measure by the President, June 22, 1944. Because of the special interest in that legislation a brief statement explaining its provisions is included under a separate heading.

COMPENSATION AND PENSION FOR DISABILITY OR DEATH

Service-connected disability. Under the Veterans Regulations promulgated by the President under the act of March 20, 1933, as amended, honorable discharged veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 are entitled to compensation or pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by such service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10 percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month. While the World War No. 2 veterans were entitled to these rates following the act of December 19, 1941, they were placed on complete parity under the Veterans Regulations by the act of July 13, 1943, Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, with reference to the requirements governing proof of service connection of disability. The latter act also liberalized the regulation concerning the presumption of soundness upon entry into service. Under Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates based upon service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including special awards and allowances fixed by law, were increased by 15 percent.

In lieu of such pension or compensation, Reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, meeting the requirements of the Army Regulations pertaining to retirement of officers of the Regular Establishment, are retired by the War Department, certified to the Veterans' Administration, and their retired pay equal to 75 percent of their base pay is paid by the Veterans' Administration out of the pension appropriation.

Non-service-connected disability: Under Public Law Numbered 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the rate of pension for permanent and total non-service-connected disability, applicable to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion, the Philippine Insurrection, and World War No. 1, was increased from $40 to $50 per month with an increase to $60 per month where such veterans have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or reach the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. This act also provides that the above pension for non-service-connected disability shall apply to veterans of both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

Service-connected death: The rates of compensation or pension for widows, children, and dependent parents of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans based upon death in service, or service-connected death, are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100)	33
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

The above rates are contained in Public Law No. 144, Seventy eighth Congress, July 13, 1943, and constitute a material liberalization of the prior rates.

Non-service-connected death: The widow, child, or children of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 are entitled to the following rates of compensation if the veteran at the

time of death from a non-service-connected cause had a disability incurred in or aggravated by such war service.

Widow but no child	$35
Widow with 1 child (with $5 for each additional child)	45
No widow but 1 child	18
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	27
No widow but 3 children (equally divided)	36

With $4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

Payments are limited to an aggregate of $64 in any one case.

Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, act of May 27, 1944, increased the rates to the above amounts and also included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans, the law previously having applied only to World War No. 1 veterans.

Claims and effective date of awards: Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred to a Veterans' Administration facility, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for adjudication, the applicant should file claim on proper form which will be supplied upon inquiry addressed to any Veterans' Administration facility or regional office, or to the local representative of the American Red Cross or of a veterans' service organization.

Under interagency agreement, when a person who is to be discharged from military or naval service is in need of further hospital care, prior arrangements are made by the commanding officer to afford him opportunity to file all necessary claims, supply necessary clinical and service data, and to send the veteran to the Veterans' Administration facility designed to receive him. (Cf. AR 615-360, change No. 4, April 16, 1943.) If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

Upon death in service, the service department notifies the Veterans' Administration, and claims forms are sent immediately to all known dependents.

Groups potentially eligible for pensions: All members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the Public Health Service or of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, when ordered to active service with the Army or Navy or as to United States Public Health Service while serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, and as to Coast and Geodetic Survey when assigned during present war to duty on business of War or Navy Departments in areas outside continental United States or in Alaska or coastal areas of the United States as determined by the War and Navy Departments to be of immediate military hazard, are potentially eligible for pensions.

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was not in the active service; and, while the several Women's Reserve Corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard originally were in the active service, they were by statute precluded from pension eligibility; in lieu thereof, being subject to laws pertaining to employees' compensation. Legislation was subsequently enacted making the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard components eligible potentially for pension benefits (Public Law 110, 78th Cong., approved July 1, 1943; Public Law 183, 78th Cong., approved November 8, 1943; and Public Law 214, approved December 23, 1943).

Awards to date: As indicated on the attached table No. 1, pension payments to veterans of World War No. 2 and their dependents total $37,760,572.78 through March 1944. In addition, retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration to Reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, totaled $1,020,137.33 from July 1, 1942, through March 31, 1944.

Disbursements for the relief of World War No. 1 veterans and their dependents from 1918 through March 1944 for disability and death compensation or pension, service-connected and non-service-connected, totaled $5,007,029,954.54. In addition, disbursements for World War No. 1 emergency officers' retirement pay through March 31, 1944, totaled $84,889,697.63.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE, PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES, AND DOMICILIARY CARE

Eligibility is extended to any veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 honorably discharged, having a service-connected disability requiring such care, treatment, or appliance, or one who was discharged for disability and not dishonorably; also one not dishonorably discharged who is unable to defray his expenses, has tuberculosis or a neuropsychiatric ailment or disability which requires hospital care.

Dependent upon availability of facilities, eligibility includes any veteran of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, and who is in need of such care and is unable to defray the expenses therefor—regardless of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service.

The service groups included are all components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, the respective Women's Reserve thereof, and United States Public Health Service and Coast and Geodetic Survey under the conditions stated for pension purposes.

The Veterans' Administration maintains 94 facilities, and has contract facilities with a total of 92,019 beds distributed as follows (as of March 23, 1944):

Tuberculosis	6,212
Neuropsychiatric	39,417
General medical and surgical	25,658
Domiciliary	16,117
Contract—other governmental	4,227
State and private	338
Total	92,019

Diagnostic centers, with expert specialists available, are maintained at Hines, Chicago, Ill.; San Francisco, Calif.; and Mount Alto, Washington, D. C. Cancer clinics: Bronx, N. Y.; Hines, Chicago, Ill.; Mount Alto, Washington, D. C.; Atlanta, Ga.; Portland, Oreg.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

The present building program will raise this total to more than 100,000 beds. The Veterans' Administration anticipates an eventual need of 300,000 beds to enable veterans of World War No. 2 and of prior wars to receive hospital and domiciliary care to the same extent as is now provided. However, this estimated maximum should not be needed until long after the war or require the eventual additional construction of more than 100,000 beds, since there will be, under present plans, 100,000 beds in Veterans' Administration facilities, and it is anticipated that it should be possible to obtain the same number from the Army and Navy shortly after the termination of the war.

Claims: Any person who is to be discharged from active service and who is in need of and entitled to hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration is transferred directly to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. Claim for all benefits and necessary clinical and service data accompany him, or are filed by the manager if the veteran is insane or incompetent.

All others should file claim for treatment or hospitalization directly with the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office—one, or more, in each State in the Union except Delaware.

As shown by table No. 1, 64,982 veterans of World War No. 2 have been hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration through April 30, 1944. On April 30, 1944, there were 44,967 World War No. 1 veterans and 12,866 World War No. 2 veterans receiving hospitalization, and 8,477 World War No. 1 veterans and 196 World War No. 2 veterans receiving domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration. (Table No. 2.)

While domiciliary care cannot be said to be a part of the rehabilitation process, it is a valuable benefit for those who have reached a permanent state of disability and have no other means of support.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved by the President March 24, 1943, provides (1) that any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war; (2) and who was honorably discharged; (3) and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay; (4) who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement.

Immediately following the passage of that legislation, there was created in the Veterans' Administration a vocational rehabilitation service composed of three

divisions, namely, the Vocational Advisement Division, the Training Into Employment Division, and the Research Division. The planning and control functions created by the administration of this act are exercised in the central office of the Veterans' Administration. All operations, including determinations of need for training, vocational advisement, induction into training, supervision, as well as the selection of training facilities, are functions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Division in that facility of the Veterans' Administration having jurisdiction of the territory in which the veteran resides. There are 53 such facilities. These facilities are, generally speaking, bound by State boundary lines. In a few States there is more than one facility. The course of training prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit the veteran for employment may not exceed 4 years and may not extend beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

"The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by virtue of a handicap due to service-incurred disability." In performing the functions imposed upon the Administration by Public Law 16, it will be the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to utilize educational institutions and establishments of recognized standing in the training of these disabled veterans into employment and to train each person as near his home as may be possible. In securing employment, a problem which obviously will be very great after the end of the war and perhaps acute after demobilization has been accomplished, every available Federal and State facility will be utilized. Employment of veterans has been accomplished to a considerable extent through the United States Employment Service. It will be the purpose to correlate these activities to the end that those vocationally trained will be graduated into employment opportunities.

While the disabled veteran is in training his pension, unless it equals or exceeds such amounts, will be increased to $80 per month, if single; $90 per month, if married, with $5 additional for each child, and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required.

Claims: Those persons discharged from the service directly to the Veterans' Administration facilities for hospitalization will have their claims filed and processed; and the question of need for and entitlement to vocational rehabilitation may be given consideration as soon as the individual's physical and mental condition make training feasible. Any other person honorably discharged from the service may make claims for vocational rehabilitation in the claim for pension which may be filed at the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office.

INSURANCE

National service life insurance: National service life insurance was provided under the act of October 8, 1940, Public Law No. 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, and liberalizing amendments thereto were enacted during the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses. A number of other liberalizing proposals are pending in the present Congress, and the Veterans' Administration has submitted certain proposed changes found to be justified by studies conducted. Application may be made for not less than $1,000 nor more than $10,000, without physical examination prior to the expiration of 120 days from entrance into active service. Thereafter any such person in the active military or naval service may apply if the application be accompanied by acceptable evidence of good health.

Applications: Application forms are supplied the service departments, and may be obtained from the commanding officer or designated insurance officer. The applicant may elect to pay premiums in cash or by allotment of pay. Policies are not issued during the war, but insurance certificate is mailed to the address designated by applicant.

The insurance is against death only, but includes waiver of premiums during total disability existing for more than 6 months, and commencing prior to insured's sixtieth birthday. The policy is a 5-year level premium term policy with rate based upon the American experience table of mortality and 3 percent interest—the Government assuming the extra hazard of the military and naval service and the administrative expense. The insurance is payable only to a widow (widower), child (including a stepchild or illegitimate child, if designated as beneficiary by the insured), parent (including person in loco parentis), brother, and sister of the insured, and is payable only in monthly installments. The insured may change the beneficiary designation at any time.

After the policy has been in effect for at least 1 year, while in force it may be converted to an ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policy upon application to the Veterans' Administration without medical examination.

In cases where the person in service died or became totally disabled, or was captured or isolated by the enemy prior to April 20, 1942, and had less than $5,000 insurance in effect, the law provides that gratuitous insurance to an aggregate of $5,000 shall be deemed in effect. Claims for such gratuitous insurance should be filed as soon as possible, because of limitations. In most of these death cases only a widow, child, or dependent parent can claim such insurance.

As of March 30, 1944, over 14,303,291 applications had been received, representing a total amount of nearly $105,596,766,000 of insurance. The average policy was approximately $7,382.69; the average coverage per life approximately $8,926.74.

The insurance is payable in the event of the death of the insured while the policy is in force to a beneficiary or beneficiaries, which may be designated by the insured, only within the relationship of widow or widower, child, parent, brother, or sister. The proceeds of the policy are payable as an annuity in 240 equal monthly installments of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance to any beneficiary who is under 30 years of age at the time of the death of the insured; otherwise, in continuous monthly installments throughout the lifetime of the beneficiary, with a guaranty of the payment of 120 monthly installments to the surviving relatives of the insured who are within the permitted class of beneficiaries. The amount of the monthly installment under the latter mode of payment is dependent upon the age of the beneficiary at date of death of insured. For example, if the beneficiary is then 40 years old, monthly installment is $4.50 for each $1,000 of insurance; if 50, $5.39; if 60, $6.81; if 70, $8.51.

The beneficiary would receive under a policy of $5,000 or $10,000, for example, monthly payments, beginning at the stated ages, in the following amounts: $27.55—$55.10, $22.50—$45, $26.95—$53.90, $34.05—$68.10, and $42.55—$85.10.

Claims: All claims for insurance benefits should be addressed to the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., but necessary forms may be secured from the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

United States Government life, converted, insurance: This insurance can be applied for only by those who served in World War No. 1. No one may have more than $10,000 national service life insurance and Government, converted, insurance combined.

Insurance premiums are guaranteed by Government under Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended: Any person in the active service having a commercial life policy or policies meeting the requirements of said law, article IV, may, upon application to the Veterans' Administration on form supplied the Army and Navy, secure guaranty of premiums, on amount of insurance not in excess of $10,000, while he is in the service during the present war. The insurance premiums so guaranteed by the Government constitute a lien against the policy and must be paid by the company out of any settlement thereof. In the event of the insured's discharge from service, he has a period of 2 years within which to pay the premiums with interest so guaranteed, or otherwise such indebtedness constitutes a loan on the policy, with interest, and if the amount of such indebtedness exceeds the cash surrender value, the policy is automatically canceled and the Government pays the insurer the difference between such cash surrender value and the indebtedness. Forms for making application for such insurance protection are supplied to the War and Navy Departments, and may be secured in person or from his commanding officer or other designated official.

As of March 31, 1944, 72,204 applications with insurance totaling $178,189,853.21 have been approved and premiums guaranteed.

GUARDIANSHIP

Supervision is maintained, in cooperation with the State courts, over payments of any benefits made on account of insane or minor beneficiaries to insure proper application of such benefits.

G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which I had the pleasure of seeing the President sign this morning, became law at that moment.

Some of the measures heretofore explained constituted a part of the program of post-war adjustments necessary to bridge the gap between discharge or release from active service and reestablishment in civilian pursuits. Other necessary steps in post-war adjustment requiring legislation were to provide for those persons whose education or training was interrupted by entrance into active service, employment assistance and Federal aid in the nature of unemployment allowances. Numerous bills were introduced and received the consideration of the Congress looking toward the necessary provisions for the post-war or post-discharge period. The better features of all of these bills have been embodied in the G. I. bill of rights. Without attempting to set out a comprehensive itemization of the many rights and benefits afforded by this act it may be of interest to note the more important benefits afforded by the six separate titles of the act.

Generally speaking, to be eligible for the benefits provided, the person must have served in the armed forces for a period of at least 90 days unless sooner discharged for a disability incurred in service in line of duty, and such service must have been during the period beginning September 16, 1940, and ending with the termination of the war. While benefits are provided immediately for those who have been discharged or released from the service under prescribed conditions, the general scheme of the legislation contemplates the affording of readjustment benefits, particularly during the more difficult post-war period. General provision is therefore afforded that the benefits may be claimed and secured within 2 years after discharge or release from the active service or the end of the war, whichever be the later, with an over-all limitation which will permit the serving of one enlistment after the end of the war, and yet permit the person so serving to receive the maximum benefit extended within the prescribed period subsequent to his later discharge.

Subject to the above, the following direct and indirect benefits for veterans of World War No. 2 and certain benefits of similar nature to veterans of prior wars are afforded:

TITLE I. HOSPITALIZATION, CLAIMS, AND PROCEDURES

1. Adequate organization of the Veterans' Administration to administer all veterans' benefits except employment.

2. Adequate hospital facilities for the care and treatment of veterans for non-service disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

3. The right to have explained to him before discharge or release from active service all rights and benefits to which he may be entitled as a veteran, and an opportunity, if he so desires, to file a claim therefor.

4. The right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

5. Adequate safeguards as against forced statements against interest.

6. Adequate contact facilities in Army and Navy discharge centers, including those furnished by the services, by the American Red Cross, by national veterans' organizations, and by the Veterans' Administration.

7. Prompt transfer of the essential records of service departments to the Veterans' Administration and prompt adjudication of claims for benefits.

8. The right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service, (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (b) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (c) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

TITLE II. EDUCATION OF VETERANS

1. One year, or the equivalent thereof in continuous part-time study, of education or training (a) at any school or institution of his own choice; (b) in any subject or subjects desired for which he is fitted.

2. Not to exceed 3 additional years of education and training dependent upon (a) length of service; (b) satisfactory progress in studies or training; (c) the condition that the person was not over 25 years of age at the time of entrance into service, or if over such age, that his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of entrance into service.

3. Payment of all tuition and other fees, cost of books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses not to exceed a maximum of $500 per school year.

4. Subsistence allowance while pursuing education or training in the amount of $50 per month if without dependents, or $75 per month with a dependent or dependents.

5. Part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance, but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

6. The right to have released to him books and equipment furnished if he satisfactorily complete his course of education or training.

The right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities is extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

TITLE III. LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

1. Loans for the purposes stated or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000; (a) loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions; (b) the proceeds of the proposed loan must be used for one or more of the purposes specified and the circumstances must meet the specifications prescribed; (c) interest rate must not exceed 4 percent per annum; (d) the loan must be practicable and suitable to the veteran's circumstances; (e) the loan must be repaid within 20 years; (f) the Government must have the right of subrogation to the extent of any guaranty paid; (g) the liability under the guaranty must decrease or increase with the decrease or increase of the amount of unpaid obligation; (h) the agreement must permit the Government to protect itself in case of default through the right to bid on foreclosure proceedings or to refinance.

2. In the event a principal loan is made or guaranteed or insured by a Federal agency, a loan for all or part of the balance of the purchase price or cost may be guaranteed (a) if it does not exceed $2,000; (b) if it does not exceed 20 percent of the cost or purchase price; (c) if the interest rate does not exceed by more than 1 percent the interest rate on the principal loan; (d) if the conditions otherwise meet those prescribed under (1) above.

3. Any veteran eligible under title III shall also be eligible for the benefits of the Bankhead-Jones Farm-Tenant Act, as amended, to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant. Eligibility must be determined (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; (b) by the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE IV. EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

1. The right to registration for employment with, and for placement in employment by, the Veterans' Employment Service through (a) the United States Employment Service, (b) any State employment agency cooperating with the United States Employment Service.

NOTE (a). This right applies to any veteran of any war discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

NOTE (b). While the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is made responsible for veterans' employment, this is not a function of the Veterans' Administration, but is retained in the United States Employment Service.

TITLE V. READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

1. Unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed, subject to the following conditions:

First. The week of unemployment must have begun (a) after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the effective date of the act; (b) not later than 2 years after discharge or release

from active service or the termination of the war, whichever be the later date.

Second. The person is not receiving subsistence allowance for education or training under title II of the act, or increased pension for vocational training under Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Third. To be eligible, the person must (a) reside in the United States; (b) be completely unemployed—or if partially employed, at wages less than $23 per week; (c) be registered with, and reporting to, a public employment office; (d) be able to work and available for suitable work.

Fourth. Any person will be disqualified from receiving an allowance if (a) he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause, or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; (b) he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work or to accept suitable work offered; (c) he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; (d) he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage; (e) added penalties apply to successive disqualifying offenses.

Fifth. Within the 52 weeks' limit the total eligibility is determined by allowing 8 weeks of allowances for each of the first 3 months of service, and 4 weeks of allowances for each month or major fraction thereof of service thereafter.

Sixth. The allowance of $20 per week will be reduced by any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation—other than pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration—received by the veteran for the same period of time.

2. Any person self-employed for profit in an independent establishment, trade, business, profession, or other vocation is eligible for readjustment allowances (a) if net earnings are less than $100 for the previous calendar month; (b) the amount of allowance to be the difference between the net earnings and $100 per month; (c) the conditions as to eligibility otherwise as provided in title V, except the qualifications and disqualifications.

3. Severe penalties are provided for fraud and misrepresentation in connection with claims for readjustment allowances.

4. Readjustment allowance claims are to be serviced by State agencies or as to railway employees, by the Railroad Retirement Board.

5. Right of appeal from any such agency to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is preserved.

TITLE VI. GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND PENAL PROVISIONS

1. By definition, "veterans" include those who reside within the continental United States, the several States, Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

2. A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable is made a prerequisite to entitlement to benefits under Public Law No. 2, as amended, as well as this act. This will apply to (a) pensions, (b) compensation, (c) hospitalization, (d) domiciliary care, (e) vocational training, (f) benefits provided by this act.

Declaration of intent is made that benefits received under this act shall be deducted from any benefit afforded by subsequent legislation, if any, in the nature of adjusted pay or adjusted compensation for service.

VETERANS' BENEFITS UNDER OTHER LAWS

Mustering-out pay: Mustering-out pay is provided by the act of February 3, 1944, Public Law 225, Seventy-eighth Congress, and is administered by the War and Navy Departments. The amounts are from $100 to $300.

Allotments and allowances: Administered by the War and Navy Departments.

Domiciliary care: United States Soldiers' Home, under jurisdiction of the War Department; Naval Home, under jurisdiction of the Navy Department. This is in addition to that provided by the Veterans' Administration.

Employment: Return to the job after discharge, under jurisdiction of Selective Service; placing in other jobs, War Manpower Commission; veterans' preference, administered by United States Civil Service Commission and various departments and agencies; job training, rehabilitation (nonservice disability), administered by Federal Security Agency.

The Veterans' Administration cooperates fully in all these functions.

Insurance: Old-age and survivors, administered by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; unemployment benefits, Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; retirement, Railroad Retirement Board and Civil Service Commission.

Retirement pay: Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. For officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Establishment, and Reserve components of Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

Taxes: Bureau of Internal Revenue. All veteran benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration are exempt from all taxation.

It is my belief that certain laws that have been passed for the benefit of the veterans will have to be amended and improved. I earnestly hope that our legislation will prove to be of great benefit to them. They deserve our unswerving loyalty and help.

I am listing acts which assist service men and women and World War veterans:

Public Law No. 10, March 17, 1943: Amends Veterans' Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits in certain World War No. 2 cases.

Public Law No. 13, March 23, 1943: Amends section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 16, March 24, 1943: Amends title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the veterans' regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 17, March 24, 1943: To amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 23, April 8, 1943: Relates to the selective-service deferment on occupational grounds of persons employed by the Federal Government.

Public Law No. 36, April 12, 1943: Amends section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended by section 10 of Public Law No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 20, 1941.

Public Law No. 38, April 16, 1943: Provides for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

Public Law No. 49: May 7, 1943: Provides for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 73, June 15, 1943: Abolishes certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 74, June 15, 1943: Provides for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 87, June 23, 1943: Provides reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 89, June 25, 1943: Relates to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 90, June 26, 1943: Making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 99, June 29, 1943: Amends an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war."

Public Law No. 101, June 29, 1943: Equalizes certain disability benefits for Army officers.

Public Law No. 113, July 6, 1943: Amends the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return in civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 115, July 7, 1943: Provides for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government.

Public Law No. 126, July 9, 1943: Amends the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year.

Public Law No. 144, July 13, 1943: Provides more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

*Public Law No. 165, October 21, 1943: Amends section 11, Naval Aviation Cadet Act, 1942, uniform allowance for ensigns and second lieutenants.

Public Law No. 169, October 25, 1943: Amends section 12—Naval Aviation Cadet Act, 1942—designation of beneficiary.

Public Law No. 170, October 25, 1943: Transportation in Government-owned motor vehicles—employees of Veterans' Administration at field stations—absence of adequate transportation.

*Public Law No. 171, October 25, 1943: Amends Naval Reserve Act, 1938, allowance for uniforms.

Public Law No. 174, October 26, 1943: Amendment to Allotment and Allowance Act of 1942.

*Acts not in book.

Public Law No. 183, November 8, 1943: Amends act providing for Women's Reserve of Navy and Marine Corps so as to grant same benefits as are granted male members and amends act providing female physicians so as to restrict members of Naval Reserve to shore duty in continental United States.

Public Law No. 184, November 11, 1943: Public Health Service Act of 1943. Grants same benefits as granted to members of armed forces under certain conditions.

Public Law No. 187, November 22, 1943: Provides for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

Public Law No. 197, December 5, 1943: Amends the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. (Induction of fathers.)

Public Law No. 213, December 23, 1943: Limits private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

Public Law No. 202, December 17, 1943: Increases amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States.

Public Law No. 214, December 23, 1943: Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act, 1941—SPARS—amendments to.

Public Law No. 221, January 20, 1944: Amends Nationality Act of 1940.

Public Law No. 225, February 3, 1944: Mustering-out Payment Act of 1944.

Public Law No. 242, March 1, 1944: Amends Spanish War laws to increase pension for veterans and widows at age 65. Extends marriage date to January 1, 1933.

Public Law No. 245, March 3, 1944: Increases pensions to Indian War veterans and their dependents.

Public Law No. 248, March 4, 1944: Amends Public, 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, so as to provide for full participation of institutions of the United States in training of nurses program.

Public Law No. 268, March 29, 1944: Amends section 4, Public, 612, Seventy-sixth Congress, re appointment of officers.

Public Law No. 269, March 29, 1944: Amends provision of act authorizing 6 months' death gratuity.

Public Law No. 275, March 31, 1944: Amends act of March 3, 1895, re surety bonds.

Public Law No. 279, April 1, 1944: Deficiency appropriation, 1944.

Public Law No. 280, April 1, 1944: Authorizes pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children.

Public Law No. 285, April 4, 1944: Clarifies the application of section 1 (b) of Public, 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

Public Law No. 300, May 11, 1944: Amends part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a).

Public Law No. 308, May 23, 1944: Regulates furnishing of artificial limbs to retired officers and enlisted men and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment.

Public Law No. 309, May 24, 1944: Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans.

Public Law No. 312, May 27, 1944: Increases rates of compensation and pensons to veterans for service-connected disability, and to widows and children under Public, 484, Seventy-third Congress.

Public Law No. 313, May 27, 1944: Increases the rates of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specified cases.

Public Law No. 314, May 27, 1944: Provides for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay.

The following charts will be of interest to the House. They are a summary of the activities of the Veterans' Administration and the disbursements.

Veterans' Administration — Disbursements made for relief of World War No. 2 veterans and dependents, Dec. 1941 to Mar. 31, 1944

	Disbursements	
	Total to Mar. 31, 1944	During March 1944
Pensions:		
Veterans:		
Service-connected	$22,863,228.56	$6,069,057.25
Retired Reserve officers and enlisted men [1]	1,020,137.33	161,783.89
Dependents	14,897,344.22	1,733,650.27
Total	38,780,710.11	7,964,491.41
National service life insurance:		
Cash payments made for death benefits disbursed from national service life insurance	26,484,748.11	3,588,642.42
Approximate cost of hospitalization and domiciliary care: World War No. 2 veterans	11,746,846.26	1,304,641.23

WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS HOSPITALIZED OR DOMICILED

Admissions to hospitals or domiciliary care, Dec. 1941 through Apr. 30, 1944:	
Type of patient, hospital:	
Tuberculosis	7,732
Neuropsychiatric	20,052
General	37,474
Total	[2] 65,258
Domiciliary care admissions October 1943 to Apr. 30, 1944	412
Remaining under hospitalization or domiciliary care at end of April 1944:	
Hospitalization:	
Tuberculosis	2,427
Neuropsychiatric	6,743
General	3,696
Total	12,866
Domiciliary care end of April 1944	199

DISBURSEMENTS FOR RELIEF OF WORLD WAR NO. 1 VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS, 1918 TO MAR. 31, 1944

	Tota. to Mar. 31, 1944	During March 1944
Direct benefits:		
Compensation or pension:		
Death—		
Service-connected	$868,442,746.15	$4,518,327.80
Non-service-connected	58,245,290.81	913,408.33
Disability:		
Service-connected	3,674,274,252.66	13,563,302.02
Emergency officers' retirement pay	84,889,697.63	343,919.57
Disability allowance or nonservice pensions	406,067,665.52	3,133,479.33
Adjusted-service certificates	3,796,908,046.74	220,697.45
Adjusted-service and dependent pay	55,557,990.92	[3] 92.46
Loans to veterans for transportation	76,103.36	
Insurance:		
Term	2,199,941,125.84	193,022.25
Government life (converted)	621,156,134.07	3,872,284.06
Allotments and allowances	582,931,923.50	[3] 354.50
Vocational Rehabilitation	644,866,393.98	
Total expenditures for direct benefits	12,993,357,370.58	27,557,904.05
Indirect benefits [4]	2,066,151,540.65	6,491,347.31
Grand total	15,059,508,911.23	34,049,311.36

[1] Retired Reserve officers included with Regular Establishment living veterans prior to fiscal year 1943.
[2] Hospital admissions include 276 admissions for domiciliary care.
[3] Credit.
[4] (Operating cost of central office, regional offices, and hospitals, burials, transportation of beneficiaries, hospital construction, etc.).

Veterans' Administration—Summary of activities, Nov. 30, 1941, Feb. 29, 1944, Mar. 31, 1944, and Apr. 30, 1944

ACTIVE PENSION AND COMPENSATION CASES, ALL WARS AND REGULAR ESTABLISHMENT

	Nov. 30, 1941		Feb. 29, 1944		Mar. 31, 1944		Apr. 30, 1944	
	Living veterans	Deceased veterans	Living veterans	Deceased veterans	Living veterans	Deceased veterans	Living veterans	Deceased veterans
War of 1812 (special act)		1		1		1		1
Mexican War:								
Public acts		93		64		64		62
Special acts		9		6		6		6
Total, Mexican War		102		70		70		68
Indian wars:								
Public acts	1,840	3,717	1,310	3,139	1,294	3,114	1,273	2,986
Special acts	37	57	24	47	22	47	22	47
Total, Indian wars	1,877	3,774	1,334	3,186	1,316	3,161	1,295	3,033
Civil War:								
Public acts	1,236	37,453	440	26,428	428	26,032	408	25,653
Special acts	15	3,667	5	2,699	5	2,662	4	2,619
Total, Civil War	1,251	41,120	445	29,127	433	28,694	412	28,271

Veterans' Administration—Summary of activities, Nov. 30, 1941, Feb. 29, 1944, Mar. 31, 1944, and Apr. 30, 1944—Continued

ACTIVE PENSION AND COMPENSATION CASES, ALL WARS AND REGULAR ESTABLISHMENT—continued

	Nov. 30, 1941		Feb. 29, 1944		Mar. 31, 1944		Apr. 30, 1944	
	Living veterans	Deceased veterans	Living veterans	Deceased veterans	Living veterans	Deceased veterans	Living veterans	Deceased veterans
Spanish-American War:								
Service-connected	1,476	1,301	1,239	1,217	1,233	1,216	1,228	1,217
Non-service-connected	149,378	60,151	134,040	63,946	133,364	64,021	132,999	64,217
Special acts	73	139	64	118	64	118	64	117
Total, Spanish-American War	150,927	61,591	135,343	65,281	134,661	65,355	134,291	65,551
World War No. 1:								
Service-connected	349,455	96,022	338,868	88,332	338,413	88,016	338,054	87,863
Non-service-connected	76,636	23,616	84,720	27,267	84,264	26,975	84,378	26,849
Special acts	2		2		2		2	
Total, World War No. 1	426,093	119,638	423,590	115,599	422,679	114,991	422,434	114,712
Regular Establishment:								
Public acts	38,140	11,003	42,637	13,527	42,669	13,523	42,641	13,499
Special acts	652	344	624	280	623	278	622	277
Total, Regular Establishment	38,792	11,347	43,261	13,807	43,292	13,801	43,263	13,776
World War No. 2			80,231	19,504	118,839	21,551	154,056	23,517
Total, pensions and compensation	618,940	237,573	684,204	246,575	721,220	247,624	755,751	248,929

NOTE.—Figures reported under "Living and Deceased Veterans of All Wars prior to Spanish-American War" represent number of regular monthly payments.

EMERGENCY OFFICERS' RETIREMENT, WORLD WAR NO. 1

	Nov. 30, 1941	Feb. 29, 1944	Mar. 31, 1944	Apr. 30, 1944
Emergency officers entitled to retirement pay	2,951	3,042	3,043	3,043
Receiving retirement pay	2,637	2,557	2,548	2,543
Retirement pay suspended:				
Under sec. 212, Public Law 212, 72d Cong	36	41	39	39
Active duty	3	31	31	32
Incompetent, estate over $1,500	8	7	7	7
Terminated by death	267	405	418	422

RETIRED RESERVE OFFICERS

	Nov. 30, 1941	Feb. 29, 1944	Mar. 31, 1944	Apr. 30, 1944
Reserve officers entitled to retirement pay		725	826	920
Receiving retirement pay	5	709	810	903
Retirement pay suspended:				
Under sec. 212 Public Law 212, 72d Cong		6	5	6
Active duty		2	2	2
Incompetent		1	1	1
Request of War Department		1	2	2
Veterans renouncement of retirement pay		1	1	1
Terminated by death		5	5	8

INITIAL BURIAL AWARDS DURING MONTH

	November 1941	February 1944	March 1944	April 1944
World War No. 1	2,433	2,682	3,125	3,308
World War No. 2		225	266	208
Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion	479	555	578	475
Civil War	30	17	19	18
Indian wars	17	20	16	12
Regular Establishment	32	32	34	31
Other wars	13	1	5	1
Total	3,004	3,532	4,043	4,053

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

	Aug. 31, 1943	Feb. 29, 1944	Mar. 31, 1944	Apr. 30, 1944
Cases in file	1,742	9,265	12,562	15,836
Applications approved pending induction	192	628	769	1,050
Applications approved declined induction	46	343	441	607
In training	48	1,195	1,684	1,993

GUARDIANSHIP

(Incompetent veterans, other dependents and minors)

	Nov. 30, 1941	Feb. 29, 1944	Mar. 31, 1944	Apr. 30, 1944
Fiduciaries:				
Guardians	57,502	53,744	53,845	53,944
Legal custodians	10,144	10,226	10,302	10,401
Institutional awards only	593	811	825	843
Total	68,239	64,781	64,972	65,188
Wards:				
Under guardians	66,416	60,745	60,826	60,852
Institutional awards only	593	811	825	843
Under legal custodians	15,695	15,997	16,102	16,222
Total	82,704	77,553	77,753	77,917

Veterans' Administration—Summary of activities, Nov. 30, 1941, Feb. 29, 1944, Mar. 31, 1944, and Apr. 30, 1944—Continued

OUT-PATIENT MEDICAL ACTIVITIES

	November 1941	February 1944	March 1944	April 1944
Number of individuals receiving out-patient treatments during month	25,195	19,984	21,917	21,773
Number of individuals examined during month for	27,288	32,515	35,057	33,912
Pensions and compensation	5,315	11,515	13,311	13,071
Insurance	657	299	264	238
Determination of need of hospital or domiciliary care	11,916	12,748	13,520	12,815
Out-patient treatment (veterans)	6,608	4,899	4,830	4,590
Vocational rehabilitation		30	43	69
Out-patient (others)	844	1,504	1,424	1,847
Civil Service Commission	1,042	745	1,011	661
Employees Compensation Commission	92	262	107	109
Allied pensions	27	28	25	28
Work Projects Administration	45			
Railroad Retirement	207	180	237	195
Army	506	239	245	260
Navy	8	63	64	53
Other Government departments or agencies	13	3	6	7
Civilian Conservation Corps	8			

PERSONNEL ON ROLL

(Excluding purchase and hire and $1 per annum employees)

	Nov. 30, 1941	Feb. 29 1944	Mar. 31, 1944	Apr. 30, 1944
Central office:				
Washington, D. C.	6,123	5,940	5,995	5,917
New York branch		3,819	4,035	4,217
Field offices	38,663	37,347	37,834	38,093
Total, salaries and expenses appropriation	44,796	47,136	47,864	48,224
Central office, hospital and domiciliary appropriation	34	80	92	167

INSURANCE, DEATH AND DISABILITY

(Cases on which claims have been adjudicated)

	Nov. 30, 1941				Feb. 29, 1944				Mar. 31, 1944				Apr. 30, 1944			
	War risk term and automatic		U. S. Government life		War risk term and automatic		U. S. Government life		War risk term and automatic		U. S. Government life		War risk term and automatic		U. S. Government life	
	Death	Disability	Death	Disability	Death	Disability	Death	Disability	Death	Disability	Death	Disability	Death	Disability	Death	Disability
Total adjudicated	224,017	35,726	65,173	16,024	224,261	35,697	76,796	16,689	224,265	35,696	77,299	16,670	224,272	35,694	77,724	16,682
Allowed	180,207	15,933	49,031	13,197	180,496	15,954	60,619	13,838	180,501	15,955	61,122	13,819	180,508	15,953	61,547	13,831
Active	7,588	10,324	8,321	10,743	3,585	9,811	11,496	10,798	3,332	9,789	11,619	10,777	3,225	9,771	11,723	10,777
Terminated	11,435	4,457	10	2,165	11,575	4,889	27	2,666	11,582	4,910	27	2,666	11,587	4,921	27	2,677
Payment of cases completed	161,184	1,152	40,700	289	165,336	1,254	49,096	374	165,587	1,256	49,476	376	165,696	1,261	49,797	377
Lump sum	52,334	1,152	36,047	289	52,791	1,254	43,459	374	52,803	1,256	43,799	376	52,811	1,261	44,089	377
Installments expired	108,769		4,651		112,463		5,635		112,702		5,675		112,803		5,706	
Funds escheating to Government	81		2		82		2		82		2		82		2	
Disallowed	43,810	19,793	16,142	2,827	43,765	19,743	16,177	2,851	43,764	19,741	16,177	2,851	43,764	19,741	16,177	2,851

U. S. GOVERNMENT LIFE-INSURANCE POLICY

	Nov. 30, 1941		Apr. 30, 1944	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Applications received	1,185,879		1,209,988	
Applications approved to date	1,117,626	$4,640,615,906	1,135,961	$4,767,945,183
Insurance in force:				
Ordinary life	140,674	698,999,162	140,774	703,819,536
20-payment life	221,725	779,089,664	213,500	761,485,789
30-payment life	28,581	146,200,671	28,415	146,768,026
20-year endowment	69,795	187,873,604	57,163	153,517,531
30-year endowment	28,636	121,317,085	28,060	119,417,679
Endowment at age 62	29,598	139,866,024	29,089	137,223,154
5-year convertible term:				
Duration less than 5 years	3	23,000		
Duration more than 5 years (whole life 745)	22,064	128,314,533	21,146	122,691,144
Renewed, second period	3,888	27,012,710	24	115,020
Renewed, third period	16,529	108,386,162	5,337	34,727,852
Renewed, fourth period			11,793	77,005,059
5-year level premium term:				
Duration less than 5 years	19,284	125,659,609	22,026	162,818,773
Renewed, second period	5,079	26,883,122	5,861	32,315,879
Renewed, third period			1,385	7,428,068
Extended insurance	15,636	45,270,342	12,306	34,352,397
Paid-up life	2,655	4,379,118	2,767	4,900,389
Paid-up endowment	858	901,683	733	818,253
Total	605,005	2,540,185,489	580,379	2,500,004,491

Veterans' Administration—Summary of activities, Nov. 30, 1941, Feb. 29, 1944, Mar. 31, 1944, and Apr. 30, 1944—Continued

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

(Cases on which claims have been allowed)

	Nov. 30, 1941		Feb. 29, 1944		Mar. 31, 1944		Apr. 30, 1944	
	Number	Amount of insurance	Number	Amount of insurance	Number	Amount of insurance	Number	Amount of insurance
Allowed	401	$1,963,420	38,650	$289,965,400	43,077	$328,648,500	51,234	$400,163,700
Active	401	1,963,420	38,497	289,129,500	42,914	327,709,100	51,055	399,137,300
Life annuity	337	1,646,420	31,606	234,066,000	35,058	263,859,100	41,460	319,554,600
240 installments	58	282,000	5,847	46,009,300	6,595	52,866,500	8,013	65,558,400
Life annuity and 240 installments	6	35,000	1,044	9,054,200	1,261	10,983,500	1,582	14,024,300
Payments terminated			141	749,900	148	829,400	164	916,400
Awarded claims canceled			12	86,000	15	110,000	15	110,000

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE-INSURANCE POLICIES

	Nov. 30, 1941		Feb. 29, 1944		Mar. 31, 1944		Apr. 30, 1944	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Applications received	719,428		14,250,927		14,586,572		14,889,583	
Applications approved to date	682,195	$2,381,451,000	[1] 13,991,986	[1] $102,750,808,500	[2] 14,323,618	[2] $105,738,765,000	[3] 14,620,771	[3] $108,429,550,500
Applications disapproved to date	11,741	46,743,821	[4] 75,181	[4] 332,050,888	[5] 77,010	[5] 340,820,388	[6] 78,610	[6] 348,928,888
Insurance in force:[7]								
5-year level premium term	656,020	2,276,249,472	13,623,742	100,213,582,804	13,932,564	103,029,901,208		
Ordinary life			2,650	17,312,500	2,705	17,559,000		
20-payment life			14,023	80,516,500	14,503	83,029,500		
30-payment life			2,357	16,083,000	2,426	16,523,000		
Total	656,020	2,276,249,472	13,642,772	100,327,494,804	13,952,198	103,147,012,708		

[1] Includes radio applications: 4,898, $27,309,500.
[2] Includes radio applications: 8,382, $38,393,500.
[3] Includes radio applications: 12,419, $49,519,000.
[4] Includes radio applications: 160, $288,000.
[5] Includes radio applications: 8, $10,000.
[6] Includes radio applications: 12, $41,000.
[7] Tabulation for current month not available.

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT OF 1940

	Nov. 30, 1941		Feb. 29, 1944		Mar. 31, 1944		Apr. 30, 1944	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Applications received	17,540		85,463		87,573		89,975	
Applications approved	13,026	$34,347,787.02	70,700	$174,037,142.73	72,204	$178,189,853.21	73,984	$183,252,563.03
Applications rejected	3,291	7,159,577.55	12,150	27,561,472.31	12,319	28,016,557.77	12,519	28,499,205.18

BENEFICIARIES RECEIVING HOSPITAL TREATMENT OR DOMICILIARY CARE, CLASSIFIED BY WARS

	Nov 30, 1941					Feb. 29, 1944					Mar. 31, 1944					Apr. 30, 1944				
	Hospital treatment				Domiciliary care	Hospital treatment				Domiciliary care	Hospital treatment				Domiciliary care	Hospital treatment				Domiciliary care
	Tuberculosis	Neuropsychiatric	General medical and surgical	Total		Tuberculosis	Neuropsychiatric	General medical and surgical	Total		Tuberculosis	Neuropsychiatric	General medical and surgical	Total		Tuberculosis	Neuropsychiatric	General medical and surgical	Total	
World War No. 1	4,449	30,918	17,320	52,687	14,619	4,722	29,657	12,622	46,001	9,146	3,681	29,658	12,256	45,595	8,888	3,659	29,309	11,999	44,967	8,477
World War No. 2						2,329	5,756	3,537	11,622	184	2,430	6,257	3,642	12,335	198	2,427	6,743	3,696	12,866	193
Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion	103	1,359	1,511	2,973	783	97	1,419	1,444	2,960	650	86	1,418	1,434	2,948	640	92	1,400	1,326	2,818	577
Civil War		8	11	19			5	5	10			5	4	9			5	4	9	1
Regular Establishment	492	2,204	354	3,050	375	306	2,435	304	2,844	231	299	2,146	292	2,737	232	307	2,163	301	2,771	227
Retired officers and enlisted men	13	106	69	188	8	10	117	88	215	9	9	116	106	231	8	9	113	104	226	11
Other wars	14	36	43	93	24	3	43	17	63	15	3	34	23	60	14	5	42	31	78	14
Non-Veterans' Administration			224	224				214	214				216	216				301	301	
Total	5,071	34,631	19,532	59,234	15,809	6,466	39,232	18,231	63,929	10,235	6,524	39,634	17,973	64,131	9,980	6,499	39,775	17,762	64,036	9,503

NOTE.—Figures for observation for compensation, pensions or insurance, and temporary hospitalization included in "General medical and surgical."

Veterans' Administration—Summary of activities, Nov. 30, 1941, Feb. 29, 1944, Mar. 31, 1944, and Apr. 30, 1944—Continued

BENEFICIARIES RECEIVING HOSPITAL TREATMENT OR DOMICILIARY CARE AUTHORIZED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Branch of service, facility or hospital	Nov. 30, 1941				Feb. 29, 1944				Mar. 31, 1944				Apr. 30, 1944			
	Service-connected	Non-service-connected	Non-Veterans' Administration	Total	Service-connected	Non-service-connected	Non-Veterans' Administration	Total	Service-connected	Non-service-connected	Non-Veterans' Administration	Total	Service connected	Non-service-connected	Non-Veterans' Administration	Total
Veterans' Administration	12,468	42,912	215	55,595	16,573	44,047	207	60,827	16,964	43,768	211	60,943	17,195	43,244	296	60,735
Federal Security Agency:																
Marine	32	784	2	818	35	696	2	733	22	666	----	688	35	708	----	743
St. Elizabeths Hospital	50	31	----	81	51	25	----	76	51	26	----	77	50	26	----	76
Army	150	641	1	792	100	263	----	363	115	343	----	458	87	337	----	424
Navy	46	861	1	908	44	782	----	826	69	779	----	848	59	843	----	902
Civil and State	204	731	5	1,040	352	747	5	1,104	365	747	5	1,117	371	780	5	1,156
Total, hospital treatment	13,050	45,960	224	59,234	17,155	46,560	214	63,929	17,586	46,329	216	64,131	17,797	45,938	301	64,036
Domiciliary care: Veterans' Administration	961	14,848	----	15,809	759	9,476	----	10,235	736	9,244	----	9,980	712	8,791	----	9,503
Grand total, hospital and domiciliary	14,011	60,808	224	75,043	17,914	56,036	214	74,164	18,322	55,573	216	74,111	18,509	54,729	301	73,539

NOTE.—Figures for observation for compensation, pensions, or insurance and temporary hospitalization included in non-service-connected.

AUTHORIZED BEDS IN ALL VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

	Nov. 30, 1941							Apr. 30, 1944						
	Hospital					Domiciliary	Grand total	Hospital					Domiciliary	Grand total
	Tuberculosis	Psychotic	Other neuropsychiatric	General	Total			Tuberculosi	Psychotic	Other neuropsychiatric	General	Total		
In operation	5,193	33,364	2,538	20,750	61,845	18,725	80,570	7,372	38,668	2,884	22,542	71,466	16,139	87,605
Work in progress	----	463	----	799	1,262	71	1,333	770	6,544	----	----	7,314	—1,155	6,159
Total	5,193	33,827	2,538	21,549	63,107	18,796	81,903	8,142	45,212	2,884	22,542	78,780	14,984	93,764

Budget and Statistics, Veterans' Administration.

Latin America Resentful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief article entitled "Latin America Resentful," written by Bainbridge Colby, former Secretary of State, and eminent constitutional lawyer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN AMERICA RESENTFUL—"GOOD NEIGHBOR" POLICY ASSAILED

(By Bainbridge Colby, former Secretary of State and eminent constitutional lawyer)

The distinguished Brazilian educator, Prof. Hernane Tavares, asserted the other day that the relations between the United States and Latin America have been steadily deteriorating, and the fact has been carefully kept out of the press of the United States. The statement was made at a meeting of the International Educational Assembly at Hood College, in Frederick, Md. Dr. Tavares is a professor "on leave" of the University of São Paulo, who has been acting as a special adviser to the Coordinator of International Affairs in Washington.

The deterioration which he notes is due, in his opinion, to political and economic causes, as well as the offensive personal conduct of many representatives of this country, now engaged in "improving" South American life, pursuant to our much-touted good-neighbor policy.

Our "good neighbors," alas, show little disposition to thank us. On the contrary, they seem resentful of our interferences in their economic and industrial life, and have a definite fear of our meddling in their politics.

As to what he had in mind in his reference to "personal conduct," our Brazilian visitor leaves us in no doubt. He says the United States Government agencies have been "pouring officials by the thousands into Latin American countries with the most disastrous effect"; their conduct, he says, has been "unorthodox"; they "spend too much money" and many "become rowdy and drunk in the best casinos."

These officials, he adds, were "not carefully selected" and "know nothing of the background of Brazil and how to act in the presence of Brazilians."

There has been no attempt by the administration to reply to these startling charges.

When similar assertions were made in our periodical press and in the Senate a few months ago, by Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, as the result of his investigations involving 20,000 miles of travel in the countries of Central and South America and a visit to each of the 20 Latin American republics, a disposition was encountered to pass over the facts with weak disclaimers and no attempt at refutation.

Perhaps Mr. Tavares had this in mind when he was interrupted by the chairman to remind him the newspapermen were present and asked if he wanted his remarks to appear on the record. To which Dr. Tavares replied, "I am so disturbed with conditions as I saw them in Brazil, that bringing the facts into the open may help."

As Senator BUTLER said, concerning this apparent desire to conceal what we have done in South America:

"The entire record of the undertakings and promises in Latin America needs to be brought from under the cloak of secrecy, and publicly ventilated and debated."

It seems that there is no substantial dispute that we are spending $6,000,000,000 in connection with our good neighbor policy. This is six times the national budgets of the 20 Central and South American countries.

This spending has been entrusted to a dozen or more New Deal agencies, operating more than 12,000 projects of 1,000 different types.

Myriads of functionaries have been put on the public pay roll, as for instance an estimated 675 who are attached to the Embassy of the United States in the city of Mexico alone.

Some of the projects are incredibly ridiculous, as for instance, stocking rivers and lakes with game fish; guide books on the South American Indian, their folk lore and recreations; surveys of Latin American music, etc.

Senator BUTLER says he is appalled and astonished at what he learned of our so-called good-neighbor policy.

He says it has become a hemispheric handout, which is neither good nor neighborly, and asks us to remember that the people of South America are a proud people—proud of what they have achieved in the past, and what they are seeking to accomplish in the present.

"They naturally," says the Senator, "desire to be the architects of their own future.

"We treat them, however, as if they were mendicants; attempt to seduce them with boondoggles; and make it plain that, whether they like it or not, we aim to do them over in our own image."

Post-War Highway Legislation

REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. ROBINSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the House have made inquiries in recent days regarding the status of post-war highway legislation.

The executive committee of the American Association of State Highway Officials, meeting this week in Chicago, has addressed a similar inquiry to me through Mr. Samuel C. Hadden, the president of the association.

Mr. Hadden points out that time is running against the State highway departments, the blueprinting of post-war road construction projects cannot go forward, and State-wide improvement programs cannot be formulated until the Congress determines what the Federal-aid policy shall be in that period. It will take about a year to perform the necessary engineering and legal work after Congress has acted. Just as important, advance notice should be given to the 45 State legislatures convening January 1, 1945, of the intent of Congress in relation to future appropriations which must be matched by the States.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Roads Committee, of which I am chairman, are fully aware of the urgency of this legislation. I wish to assure the interested Members of this body, and the State highway officials as well, that we realize the need for prompt action. We have no desire that the Congress shall make this provision either "too little or too late" on so important a phase of post-war planning.

The Roads Committee has reported out a bill, which is pending before the House. The bill, H. R. 4915, was approved unanimously by members of the Roads Committee, following public hearings extending over more than 6 weeks, in which more than 100 qualified witnesses appeared from nearly all the States in the Union.

Let me add, for the information of those who are interested in the background of this legislation, that the question of post-war highway Federal aid has been under consideration for more than a year and a quarter. It was first raised in January 1943 by the American Association of State Highway Officials in a splendid presentation before the Roads Committee. The subject has received long and careful consideration.

In view of the urgency of the legislation, and considering the long delays which necessarily have been involved in the drafting of a suitable bill, it had been my hope that H. R. 4915, carrying unanimous committee approval, would reach the floor of the House for consideration prior to our recess.

Unfortunately, it appears, this was not possible, due to the crowded calendar. I have been in consultation with the leaders of the House, and have agreed with them that under the present circumstances it will be necessary to postpone consideration of the bill.

I have their definite assurance, however, that the bill can be taken up quickly after this body has reassembled following the recess. The delay in its consideration should not, therefore, be more than a matter of a few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding these remarks, I wish to read the telegram which I have received from Mr. Hadden, so that his inquiry, as well as the assurances I have just given, may be made a part of the record:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 20, 1944.*

Hon. J. W. ROBINSON,
New House Office Building:

The executive committee, American Association of State Highway Officials, has asked me to inquire regarding progress being made this week on H. R. 4915 for post-war highway legislation. As you know, it is necessary for Congress to establish post-war Federal-aid highway policy before States, counties, and cities can proceed toward solution of complex legal, financial, and engineering problems which must be met in advance to assure sound post-war road program. All States are deeply concerned and time is running against us. Prompt action by Congress is urgent so that this vital phase of post-war planning will not be too little and too late.

SAMUEL C. HADDEN,
President, American Association of State Highway Officials.

The Domestic Political Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio broadcast by Frank Kingdon over Station WMCA on June 20, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Apart from the progress of the invasion of France and the Japanese islands of the Pacific, Washington tonight is its normal political self, with general political interest running unusually high because of the near approach of the Republican National Convention. The Congress is working under high pressure to get caught up on its work so that it may adjourn for a month to allow its Members to attend the national conventions of the two parties and meanwhile to patch up their political fences in their home districts. Bills are being put together and rephrased hastily, and then passed with a minimum of debate. Matters which cannot be quickly whipped into shape are being postponed. The main intention is to get to the recess. This is understandable enough, but it hardly encourages hope that adequate measures will be enacted to meet the developing situations resulting from the progress of the war. Bernard Baruch, for example, last week urged the country to "Hurry, hurry, hurry" in its preparations for a reconversion program, that is, a plan to get us back to peacetime production as quickly as possible after the war. The Senate's special Post-War Economic Policy and Planning Committee put out last week its proposals for such a program. But the next step will have to wait while the solons take time out to get their party machines going. We shall be lucky if this does not cost us dear. One encouraging action, however, was taken today when the Senate overrode a southern bloc and voted $500,000 to finance operation of the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee for the fiscal year beginning July 1. This Committee is charged with correcting one of the most basic undemocratic practices that still remain to stain our national life, and its continuance means that we are giving more than lip service to the great idea for which we are fighting. Political interest here has centered mainly in the fact that Governor Dewey is now to all intents and purposes an avowed candidate for the Presidential nomination. His lieutenants have opened headquarters in Chicago, and have frankly said that he will accept the nomination which they prophesy will come to him on the first ballot. The general opinion in well-informed circles here is that their hopes are well founded, and that only a major blunder on the part of his campaign managers can prevent his nomination before the first roll call is completed. Some of the older members of the party are not enthusiastic about it, but the great momentum that was given his drive in the days when he was the stop-Willkie candidate seems to have carried him so far that his opponents in the party are helpless.

This estimate is further borne out by a survey completed tonight by the International News Service. It is based on the opinions of scores of Republican leaders across the Nation, delegates to the Republican Convention, and Members of Congress. It results in the prediction that Dewey will come to the first roll-call with 698 votes, Bricker with 156, Stassen with 36, and the rest scattered with 135 uncommitted. This tabulation gives Dewey 168 votes more than the 530 necessary for nomination, so that, even though there will be the usual preconvention shifts and fluctuations, he has a wide margin of safety. His public avowal of his candidacy is further emphasized by the apparently authorized report in congressional circles that he has approved a Republican foreign policy plank which pledges American collaboration in efforts to keep the post-war peace. The plank has been drafted by a committee headed by Senator VANDENBERG, and practically reproduces the declaration made at the Mackinac Conference. It pledges American support of a post-war world organization, but contains a strong declaration that there shall be no international police force, and that no nation shall be required to give up its sovereignty; Dewey has gone over it and approved it. I do not have the text, but the substance does not differ greatly from that of the President's proposal. This may mean that foreign policy will largely be eliminated from the campaign this fall. This is what Secretary Hull wants. He has injected himself into the preparations for the Democratic National Convention which will meet next month by insisting that all discussion of post-war security shall be on a strictly non-partisan basis. He has already discussed this approach with Governor Kerr of Oklahoma, who will deliver the keynote address. He is strong for the idea that the Democratic platform shall lay down its policy in such a way as to prevent a partisan division which might jeopardize an international organization for peace. We can sympathize with his desre and yet realize the danger of this approach. All the soft words in the world cannot erase the truth

that the leaders of the Republican Party approach the question of world organization with much less enthusiasm than the President and Secretary Hull. Senator TAFT has declared his willingness to accept a weakened version of the League of Nations. Senator VANDENBERG clings with all the tenacity of Henry Cabot Lodge and William Borah to the blessed word, sovereignty. Governor Dewey has so little enthusiasm for an international association that he has been able to restrain himself altogether from discussing it. One does not have to be partisan to detect the difference between the reluctant approach of such men and the passion of Secretary Hull and the President for the idea.

This is not an idle or factitious distinction to draw. It is fundamental. In 1920, Warren Harding said all the right words. He stood on a plank not much different from that of the present Republican proposal, but, in his heart he did not want an association of nations, and, in the showdown, we did not get one. It is high politics to take our acceptance of an international organization out of the bitterness of the campaign, but it will prove to be tragic shortsightedness if this results in defeating the idea itself. There is a difference between the two parties in their approach to our foreign policy, and we shall not serve the Nation well by obscuring this distinction by pussyfooting on the issue, or by an artificial truce that weakens the national will to enter an international agreement. There always remains the question of where Colonel McCormick and the Chicago Tribune will stand. If the Republican plank can be so interpreted that they can accept it, then we need no further proof that it is a fake gesture toward international collaboration. This is an acid test. If Colonel McCormick supports Dewey, it can mean only one thing, that, in spite of his phrases and the good intentions of Mr. Hull, we are confronted with a choice between a candidate who is honestly for an association of nations and one who is not. I am sure that when I put it as strongly as this, I am not being more emphatic than Colonel McCormick himself would be. This is not an issue to be evaded or slurred over. The lives of the sons of the men now fighting are at stake. If we do not now with full hearts and determined wills establish a firm organization for international peace, we may count ourselves as failures in the most crucial test of our generation, and we may truthfully label ourselves as the authors of the next world war. I am for a nonpolitical solution of this question if we can find one, but I am not for a phony clouding of our choice in a decision that holds the fate of the future of the world in it. The stakes are too large. How large they are is emphasized by the news that Vice President WALLACE has arrived in Chunking. He comes to the capital of our great Oriental ally as the official of highest rank from an allied country who has traveled there. He is on the other side of the world, but he is not very far from us. He is merely symbolizing a world outlook that is as comprehensive as the mechanical ties that bind us intimately now and for ever with Asia. There is something peculiarly right about the fact that his plane was loaded with agricultural seeds—43 varieties of grass seed and 19 kinds of animal forage seeds. That kind of freight is rightly American, and fits with excellent fitness into the character and philosophy of WALLACE himself. In the midst of a war for mankind's survival, when planes are flying over oceans and continents carrying death-dealing bombs and incendiaries, an American has come to China in a plane carrying seeds of life. Here is the ambassador of the new world. This is the preoccupation of free men—the inescapable urge that even war cannot suffocate. This is the answer to the riddle of our own achievements. We have invented machines beyond anything our fathers dreamed, but what is the meaning of them? The answer is the man at the controls. Put a Nazi there and he delights in the power of the machine to destroy; he sows death. Put a free man there and he delights in the power of the machine to spread life; he sows the seeds of new and richer crops. A man has come to China bearing seeds. That is America's message to the world. It is a message from that America which can save the world.

Address by Walter White on His Recent Trip Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address recently delivered by Walter White, in which he made an interesting report on his recent trip to Great Britain, north Africa, Italy, and the middle eastern war fronts.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not understand who it was that had made the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it was a radio speech.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the Senator from Kansas to say it was a report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it was a speech which was made by Walter White.

Mr. CAPPER. It was an address delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System by Walter White, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He has recently returned from a trip to Great Britain, north Africa, and the war fronts. In his address he told the story of his trip. It was very interesting.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did he travel in a Government plane?

Mr. CAPPER. No; I believe not. I do not know how he traveled. He was abroad for several weeks.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that he must have traveled in a Government plane.

Mr. CAPPER. The address makes very interesting reading.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no disposition to object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator. I merely wished to find out how the author of the address had managed to secure transportation to the various war fronts.

Mr. CAPPER. I believe that his address contains information which will be very helpful to Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no doubt that the address is illuminating, but I was curious to know how its author had procured transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been my good fortune during the past 3½ months to travel more than 20,000 miles and to talk with many officers, soldiers, and civilians of our own and other countries in Great Britain, north Africa, Italy, and the Middle East. I have seen the European theater of operations as it prepares for invasion of the Continent. My capacity to observe and absorb has been taxed almost beyond belief by the immensity of production of American factories of war materials, their transportation through submarine-infested waters, and their efficient distribution in preparation for D-day. As Americans one cannot help but be proud of the job done which belies much of the carping criticism here at home.

It has been permitted me also to see the north African theater of operations over which the war has passed. I have seen the desperate fighting in the hills around Cassino, in Italy, where our troops have been momentarily checked by the enemy. And I have seen a little of the fabulous Middle East, where the fighting is not with planes and guns, but intrigue over the prizes of oil and human destinies.

Many disturbing rumors had come from these war theaters and from the Pacific, which I hope later to visit, of friction between white and Negro American soldiers. Both as a war correspondent and as secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, I was charged with the responsibility of investigating these rumors and recommending corrective action where the rumors were found to be true. Here is what I found:

The majority of American soldiers abroad have been decent Americans interested in but one objective—winning the war as speedily as possible and returning home. A surprisingly large percentage of them—both officers and enlisted personnel—are concerned over the bad name being given to the United States by the friction some of their number have caused. A gratifyingly large percentage manifest deep concern about the world problem of race and the necessity of working out a solution to it. Many of these are from the South. But, unfortunately, a highly aggressive and vocal minority has sought to transplant patterns of racial behavior like that of the most backward States of the South to the countries where they have been sent as soldiers to fight a war against Nazi racial theories.

Some of them have sought to poison the minds of British, Italian, north African, and other peoples against Negro Americans. They have told such stories as these, that Negroes are inferior, illiterate, diseased, and savage. Some of them have even used physical violence to prevent the association of Negro soldiers with British, Italian, and other people. They have objected to the use of places of public accommodation such as pubs and restaurants by Negro soldiers.

Such behavior has puzzled and antagonized many of the people of these countries. They have found it difficult to understand why some American soldiers should be so violent in their hatred of other American soldiers, especially when all of them are fighting in a common cause. They have resented the action of visitors presuming to dictate to them who they should or should not invite into their homes or associate with. Many of our allies are puzzled too by the American pattern of segregation. Repeatedly I was asked why the United States, fighting a war for freedom, should send abroad two armies—one white and one Negro.

It is particularly unfortunate for America that brawls and other disturbances created by Americans of this type should overshadow the decent behavior and attitude of the far larger percentage of Americans who did not create scenes. As one American officer

phrased it, "Two men having a friendly drink together is not news; while one man objecting to another having a drink in the same pub is news." Col. Carlos P. Romulo, one of the great heroes of the battle for the Philippines, recently wrote of similar repercussions in the Pacific: "When race riots broke out in Detroit and Harlem, Tokyo for days thereafter gave the Orient a lurid picture of racial war being waged in the United States. Such rioting plays beautifully into the hands of Jap propagandists because they use it to prove what they hav been telling the orientals—that the white people have nothing but hatred for the yellow and brown."

It is difficult to appraise how far-reaching is the combined effect of the episodes overseas of racial friction and what is going on here at home. The news we have received abroad during the past 4 months has been almost universally depressing. It has been of certain Members of Congress pouring forth hate-filled tirades against the Commander in Chief of our Nation and against racial and religious minorities, as vicious and intemperate in content and tone as any sent out by Goebbels from Berlin. It has been of politics being played on the soldiers' vote bill, and of blatant boasts of filibusters against the anti-poll tax bill. It has been of amazing statements by Governors, Congressmen, and professional hate-mongers against the United States Supreme Court because it outlawed disfranchisement by means of a so-called "white" Democratic primary. It has been of predictions of post-war strife against recial and religious minorities in the United States.

Many American soldiers with whom I talked—both white and Negro—are gravely concerned both by the conduct of some of their fellow soldiers abroad and by the news from back home. Many of them are becoming aware of the need for more information. But when they try to get objective information, they are not permitted to do so. Recently a Congressman who is chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, threatened a fight against the War Department if it distributes a factual, non-propaganda pamphlet on "The Races of Mankind" written by two of America's most distinguished anthropologists, Professors Ruth Benedict and Gent Weltfish. The War Department revoked its plan to distribute the pamphlet.

Fortunately, there are brighter aspects of the picture. In the European theater of operations Gens. Dwight Eisenhower and John C. H. Lee, supreme Allied commander and deputy theater commander, respectively, have issued unequivocal directives and have taken other steps to eliminate the causes of this kind of trouble. They have acted on specific recommendations made to them after exhaustive investigation, and are considering further steps to be taken. Among the latter is the remedying of the condition when I was in England where the overwhelming majority of the Negro troops there were assigned to service units. The importance of this may be seen by contrasting the situation in England with that in an active theater of operations like Italy. Among the units now fighting in Italy is the Negro Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron which has made an enviable record in dive bombing enemy targets. Three other Negro squadrons recently arrived on the Italian front are beginning to demonstrate their effectiveness. One of the most courageous feats now being performed on any battle front is the running of supplies into the Anzio beachhead by quartermaster and trucking units, about 70 percent of them being Negroes, according to Ernie Pyle. The record being made by these Negro soldiers has earned for them respect as fighters. It is also interesting to note that as men approach actual battle and face the dangers of combat, they tend to discard many of the prejudices and pre-conceived notions they formerly held.

It is startling to find upon returning from war zones that there are still many Americans who believe that the war in Europe is virtually over, and that victory is certain. I found no such illusions overseas. We face a resourceful and fanatical enemy, both in Europe and in the Pacific. The division in our ranks and the fomenting of racial or other antagonisms are postponing the day of victory. They are creating doubt among our allies as to our sincerity when we assert that we are fighting a war for freedom for all peoples. Whoever causes the war to last 1 single day longer than necessary is as much a traitor to our country as one who sinks a troop ship or reveals military secrets to the enemy. If for no other reason than to win the war as soon as is humanly possible and to save the lives of American men—perhaps among them the life of your son—it is imperative that any person, whatever his race, who causes trouble should be stopped. That will be done only if the people of America and their Government stop evading or temporizing with this fundamental question whose solution is imperative if we are ever to have a world of peace.

Insurance or Doles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and persuasive editorial entitled "Insurance or Doles," which appeared in the Washington Post today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSURANCE OR DOLES

Senator GEORGE'S post-war committee has gone on record in opposition to administration proposals aimed at establishing uniform standards of unemployment compensation during the post-war adjustment period by means of Federal supplements to inadequate State benefit payments. The committee recommends instead a limited extension of coverage to new-exempt workers, including Government employees. It merely urges the States to liberalize the provisions of their unemployment insurance systems, and, as an incentive to that end, suggests that the solvency of State unemployment funds should be guaranteed through Federal loans.

In our opinion such half-hearted measures would have negligible effect. Those States with reserves so limited as to be speedily exhausted by serious local unemployment are not likely to be lured into liberalizing their systems by offers of aid when calamity threatens. Moreover, the existence of separate State unemployment insurance systems creates special financial problems that would not exist if the insurance coverage were Nation-wide and insurance reserves were pooled. Even the administration proposal advanced by O. W. M. Director Byrnes is a temporary makeshift. It is, however, a compromise program which would achieve some of the advantages of federalization without encountering as strong political opposition as the opposition aroused by demands for outright federalization.

The George post-war committee report on employment contains cogent arguments in support of the very proposals it has just rejected. For instance, the report emphasizes the magnitude of the post-war employment problem. It stresses the labor dislocations resulting from the war and the difficult adjustments that will be required to provide jobs for demobilized servicemen and dismissed war workers. The committee emphatically recognizes that the solution of these problems constitutes a national, not a local or State, responsibility. It says that the severity of the transition period and the ability of industy following that period to absorb 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 more workers than it has ever absorbed before will depend very largely on governmental policy and this committee is primarily concerned with shaping that policy. In short, the inescapable implication is that the post-war unemployment problem is a responsibility of the whole Nation acting through the Federal Government.

The labor market is a national market. Hence even if State insurance systems were in all respects satisfactory as to amount and duration of benefits, migratory workers would often be deprived of benefits. As matters now stand, workers may lose out not only by moving from State to State but by shifting fom covered or insured to uncovered employment. They forfeit benefits also when they move from States where standards are comparatively high to those where the insurance benefits are meager. The result is that desired mobility of the labor market is not achieved. Our economy, as Mr. Willkie says, is interdependent. Consequently it becomes an indefensible anomaly to set up independent insurance systems that are conspicuous for their lack of uniformity of benefits. In our opinion, therefore, reliance upon State systems of unemployment insurance to tide demobilized workers over the difficult postwar transition period is doomed to failure.

Director Byrnes has expressed opposition to revival of W. P. A. or payment of dismissal wages to be charged against contracts. Yet doles in some form, paid for by the Federal Government, are the alternatives which we shall almost certainly be forced to embrace in the absence of a uniform, adequate system of unemployment insurance benefits financed in part by the Federal Government.

Relation of Taxes to Post-War Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, which appeared in the Des Moines Sunday Register of June 11, 1944:

RELATION OF TAXES TO POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT

We think this subject is tremendously important. We also have a feeling that it is desirable to clear up two or three fuzzy things about American thinking, or lack of thinking, before getting directly into it.

First, the nature of America's experience in developing the resources of the continent gave the businessman and the business mind for a long while unchallenged leadership. One effect was to make the enterprisers of the country (the job providers) so sure that

what was good for them was good for everybody that they just took it for granted and figured that everybody else should do likewise. They saw no need of explaining why, and lost the knack of it.

And the country sort of grew up, and the economy got more complex, and when the interests of other big groups began to be pressed quite legitimately, and when it became evident that what most enterprisers thought would be swell for them immediately might not always be to the long-run good of the whole people, a large part of a bewildered public got the notion that anything that the business crowd contended for was properly suspect and probably wrong.

This was an absurd swing of the pendulum.

A second fuzzy idea that needs disposing of is the one about the uselessness of economists in solving broad economic problems. Unfortunately, businessmen did most to discredit trained economic thinking. You, Mr. Reader, know how the slurs ran: "Economists are all impractical theorists" and "No two economists agree on anything, so the thing to do is to ignore them, or at most to treat them as pestiferous flies."

The fact is that reputable economists do agree on some mighty fundamental things, and can give the sensible reasons for them, and their knowledge needs very much to be spread and used. In the matter of tax policy, specifically.

The third thing that is important for everybody to get unequivocally into his head is the fact that, while a century hence America may decide to turn socialist or something like that, we are certainly going to stick to our system of capitalist democracy for a good long time. We aren't going to accept a situation in which the Government is the only or even the principal employer. We are certainly going to depend primarily on private enterprise, more or less regulated in certain fields but not superseded, to do the great bulk of our job providing.

And, since everyone with his wits about him now recognizes that our major problem after the war is going to be the providing of enough steady and adequately paid jobs to prevent our fighters from "selling apples on the streets" and to absorb our war workers, we've simply got to face up to the question of how to accomplish this.

Of course, we recognize that reasonably full employment in peacetime occupations will be essential not only for humane reasons but also to avert an economic and consequently a social tailspin. Only through millions and millions of new civilian jobs provided by corporate and individual enterprisers can we hope to push out the purchasing power necessary to avoid another great depression.

Here is where tax policy comes in. Here is where broad economic thinking, including that of the overwhelming majority of economists, both conservative and liberal, comes in. Here is where we have to recognize that, as long as we stick to our type of society, resting upon a somewhat regulated but not superseded private enterprise, some of the basic points made on behalf of private enterprise are indubitably sound.

Obviously, if as a Nation we expect and demand that enterprisers provide enough peacetime jobs to keep our economy going, we've got to make it possible for them to do it. The conditions that are determined by national legislative policy must be, if not perfect, at least workably sound.

Now, to create enough jobs through private enterprise there must be either large expansion of present businesses or the starting of many new businesses. As a practical matter, there must be both. And, while other factors, such as uncertainty about the degree of regulation, have their importance, tax policy comes closer to being the key to everything than does anything else.

For what, at bottom, America demands, is that enterprisers be enterprising. We want people who have savings, big or little, to invest those savings in businesses where the savings go to work providing jobs which provide salaries and wages, which provide distributed purchasing power, which provides demand for more goods, which provides opportunity for more investment, and so on.

National tax policy which discourages investment in the expanding of present businesses or the creation of new is just plain silly. Taxes that make the risking of savings in business enterprise not worth while are suicidal.

At present there is no such thing as a national tax policy. All we have is a lot of taxes. The net effect is to discourage exactly what in the immediate post-war period we have the most urgent need to encourage. In other words, if we aren't to make a mess of our post-war job hopes, we simply must have a national tax plan. (Don't jump, Brother Enterpriser; for a basic "plan" of taxation is precisely your need.)

The first principle of tax policy and preparation for post-war job-making, must be to encourage business investment. The first application of that principle must be to end the most powerful deterrent of risking savings in business, which is double taxation of business earnings.

Bear in mind that risk means risk. There must be incentive to make people take it. Unless there is a pretty fair opportunity for an investor to make something substantial, he won't put his savings where, unless the business succeeds handsomely, they evaporate.

If, for illustration, a corporate business in which you, Mr. Reader, invest your savings pays half its gross earnings in taxes, and if then you individually pay a big chunk of the dividends you get, as personal income tax, you are being subjected to such heavy double taxation on the earnings from your risk-taking investment that you are likely to see no point in putting your savings to that use.

Not being a dunce, you will reflect that, if you are to get no more from a risk-taking investment that pans out beautifully, but in which you might have lost your shirt, than you would get if you had put your money in Government bonds or a savings bank account where the risk was zero, why should you be interested in putting your money where it would help make the jobs would give workers purchasing power that would serve the Nation's interest for the long and hard pull?

If savings have a duty to move into job-creating enterprise, the Nation has a duty to make it possible for savings thus to flow.

This is not any case of babying Wall Street, or the rich corporations, or even business in general. It is a case of using ordinary horse sense toward the accomplishment of our major post-war economic objective.

We shan't get anywhere by applying the whip to the flanks of the job-making nag, and yelling "giddy-ap!" while at the same time pulling back on the bit and in effect yelling "whoa!"

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, various communities in the congressional district I have the honor to represent are taking a very active part in promoting the post-war construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. All political parties in the State of Wisconsin for many years have written planks supporting this project in their party platform.

I can conceive of no good reason why this project should not now receive immediate authorization so that work can be commenced as soon as the necessities of war permit the allocation of material and men. This subject has been discussed for over 25 years. The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors has conducted extensive hearings and has reported legislation authorizing this important work.

The Common Council of the City of Sheboygan, Wis., on April 17, 1944, unanimously adopted a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to immediately pass authorizing legislation. I am pleased to incorporate this legislation as part of these remarks:

Whereas the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway will have tremendous effect upon the progress of almost all communities surrounding the Great Lakes; and

Whereas much of this landlocked area is actually decreasing in population which is partially resulting from the disadvantage of high costs of shipping to the different coastal cities; and

Whereas the authorization of the St. Lawrence seaway by the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States will be as a starting gun for vast activity, especially in all the Great Lakes ports, which ports will prepare for that day when ocean navigation will spread to all parts of each of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas, this great project should be authorized in readiness for the war's end as insurance against a post-war slump and unemployment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Sheboygan, That the common council respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to immediately take steps to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway as an early post-war project; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Member thereof.

Campaign Correspondence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR
THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACY
THROUGH EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1944.

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. MORRISON: I wish to express to you the appreciation of the teaching profession as represented by the National Education Association and our Commission for the splen-

did work you have done in the advancement of legislation for Federal aid for schools in the House of Representatives. We particularly appreciate your filing of Discharge Motion No. 12 for which teachers all over the country are working.

We are also indebted to you for the cooperation you have given to our representatives who have been working at the Capitol.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD DUSHANE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I am writing you this letter to ask you for your vote and your support in my reelection to Congress September 12, 1944.

As a Member of Congress I have tried to serve each and every citizen of the Sixth District. No job was too small nor none too large for me to tackle. No letter or telegram was ever received that was not promptly and efficiently answered. No request was too large or too small for me to try to fulfill.

I have supported President Roosevelt and the armed forces on every war measure that was brought before Congress for the successful prosecution of this war.

Much of the soldiers' legislation was introduced by me while at the same time I vigorously supported all soldiers' legislation.

At all times I have voted the way I thought the vast majority of my district wanted me to so vote. Frankly I am proud of my record and believe that my worst critic will have to admit that I have done a good job.

It may be that I will not have the opportunity to see you personally and talk with you before the election, so that is why I am writing you this personal letter asking for your vote and support in order that we will win another great victory on September 12, 1944.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JIMMY MORRISON, M. C.

P. S. If I can be of any service to you as your Congressman please write me either at Hammond, La., or at Washington, D. C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FELLOW OFFICIAL: I am taking the liberty of addressing you in this manner because both of us have one thing in common and that is that we hold public office and were elected by the people.

As you know, I am running for reelection to Congress. I have tried to do everything within my power to aid my district and feel that you will agree that I have done a conscientious job. Even my worst critic admits that I have done a good job as Congressman. I will certainly appreciate it if you could see fit to support my candidacy. I sincerely hope that I will be able to contact you personally, but prior to that opportunity I decided to write you this letter asking for your support.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON, M. C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: As you no doubt know I am a candidate for reelection. Naturally I am proud of the record I have made in Congress and believe that I can do an even better job in the next 2 years. Anyway that will be my aim.

From my inception in Louisiana politics down to the present time, I have been most keenly aware of the negligent manner in which the school bus drivers of Louisiana have been treated. I have always been fully cognizant that the school bus drivers have been underpaid, never given certain rights which their position entitled them to, and overlooked by all politicians of every political creed.

You, who are responsible for the safety of our children in going to and coming from school, in whom we place such a confidence and trust with reference to the physical well-being of our loved little ones, are entitled to those means with which to earn a decent livelihood for yourself and your family.

In Washington I have fought long and hard against the O. P. A. for more liberal gas allowances for the Louisiana school-bus drivers, for priorities, additional tires, parts, etc. I have always insisted that you use your busses in whatever manner you see fit when not carrying school children. The betterment of the position of the bus drivers of Louisiana is so important in my viewpoint that I have included the same as an important part of all my future plans.

I pledge unhesitatingly to do everything within my power, to continue to help you to remedy the evils that beset you at this time, and to improve your working and living conditions. Your support and that of your friends will help me to help you.

Cordially yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON, M. C.

P. S. If I can be of any service or assistance in my capacity as your Congressman to you at any time, please do not hesitate to call upon me either in Hammond, La., or Washington, D. C.

Statement by James A. Farley, Chairman of Democratic State Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. BURCHILL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include therein a statement by the Honorable James A. Farley, former chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, upon his resignation from that post in which he had served since 1928.

The statement follows:

In 1928 I was elected secretary of the Democratic State committee. In 1930 I was elected chairman, and I have served continuously in that office.

During all the years I have served as chairman I have tried, insofar as possible, to give all the time and attention necessary to perform my duties in a satisfactory manner and to aid in every way I could in the election of Democratic nominees. In State and National campaigns during all those years I devoted all my time from early morning until late at night on behalf of the party's nominees. That is the duty of any chairman.

We will soon be involved in another national campaign and one of great importance. My business duties and obligations are such that I could not possibly give the time necessary, and which I believe is necessary to properly conduct that work, and for that reason I am resigning as chairman of the Democratic State committee.

I do this reluctantly and with a feeling of deep regret because it means the severance of a close, personal relationship with the county chairmen, the vice chairmen, the State committee members, and the party workers—a relationship which has been an exceptionally happy one for 16 years. I doubt if any man in my position has ever enjoyed the friendship of the leaders and the party workers as I have during these 16 years, and it is not easy for me to break away, but I have no choice in the matter.

The Democratic State committee should be in a position to select my successor so that he may be able to perfect the plans which of necessity must be put into operation on behalf of Democratic nominees in the November election. The party and the nominees are entitled to the whole-hearted and complete support from him, and he should have ample time to work out the organization according to his own viewpoint.

I am going away on a business trip which will take me away from New York for several weeks and I have instructed Albert L. Ward, secretary of the State committee, to call a meeting at the National Democratic Club in New York City, on July 11, for the selection of my successor.

During the 35 years I have been active as a Democratic worker, a county chairman, and an officer of the State committee, it has been my privilege to support Democratic nominees who have been elected and have given splendid service. My association with all of them was enjoyable and in the days which are ahead I should look back to those years with pleasant memories.

Whatever success I may have had in the performance of my duties as chairman of the State committee has been due entirely to the assistance I have had from the leaders and the precinct workers—men and women—down through the years. A splendid relationship has always existed among us and they have made it possible for me to carry on. I shall always be grateful for their loyalty, their cooperation, and their friendship.

The Congressional Pages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, a week ago the Congressional Pages School graduated 10 young men from the high school. These young men have served the Members of this Congress faithfully and well throughout the past year, and have proven a great aid in lightening the many burdens of the membership of the House. These fine young men with their pleasant dispositions, sincerity, and industriousness, and their constant willingness to assist in every way possible, have materially eased our tasks and have made our work here the more enjoyable because of their splendid cooperation. To them as they depart from high school, we bid them Godspeed on their journey through life and pray for them every success.

Just as these younger citizens have learned to serve here in the halls of Congress, we find four of them entering the direct service of the country with our armed forces. Two have already joined the services: Gerrie P. Putnam, from El Paso, Tex., who is now a Navy Air Corps student at Duke University; and Randlett T. Lawrence, from Monthalia, Tex., who has joined the marines. Two others will soon enter upon their military careers: Donald R. Kaufman, from Dallas,

Tex., who will become a member of the Army; and Dorsey Joe Bartlett, from Clarksburg, W. Va., who will become a member of the marines in the immediate future.

Indicative of the viewpoint of these graduates toward the problems of life which now confront them, I am pleased to submit a brief discourse by Dorsey Joe Bartlett, who for the past 3 years has had direct supervision of the pages assigned to the Republican side of the House. The discourse is as follows:

THEY WILL CARRY THE TORCH FORWARD

You hear a great deal of talk today about the future of America. People concerned, some actually worried, about the coming generation. This isn't the first time, and I am sure that it won't be the last, that many minds have dwelt with this question. The concern will be an asset to our youth; the worry, I am certain, will prove needless. I base this conviction on a very interesting and representative group about whom I would like to tell you—the congressional pages in the United States House of Representatives. I have been very close to these 48 boys, even closer to the 14 under my direct supervision in the last 3 years, before and since Pearl Harbor.

From a Georgia cotton plantation, from a Midwest oil town, from a West Virginia mountain home (like myself), and from the great metropolis, these boys come forth to serve Congress. Eleven- to sixteen-year-old lads leaving the watchful eyes and loving care of their mothers to independently face life and its problems in the "hub" of the world. No mother there to see that they arise in time for 7 o'clock classes, or spend their time and money wisely, or wash behind their ears, or behave themselves properly. Yes; they have the greatest opportunity—but for failure as well as for success. Their answer to the challenge of temptation is best shown in their past records. Many successful businessmen, ministers, Members of Congress, war heroes, fine loyal American citizens, first faced life when a young lad as a Congressional page. This example is by no means an exception for the American youth. Anything adverse is the exception. Too often do we base our judgment of all on one of these rare exceptions, which usually can be traced to a fault other than that of the child's. Our youth has what it takes.

In my mind there is no doubt as to the future of the Nation. The citizens of tomorrow will carry the torch forward with the light of free institutions and traditions shining over a peaceful and prosperous America.

DORSEY JOE BARTLETT.

Veterans' Legislation, Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a résumé of the legislation reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and enacted into law during the Seventy-eighth Congress, including the so-called G. I. bill, which was signed by the President today, and became Public Law No. 346; and also including my widows and orphans bill, which passed the House unanimously and is now pending in the Finance Committee of the Senate.

PUBLIC LAWS, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, EMANATING FROM THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

H. R. 1749: Became Public Law No. 10 on March 17, 1943. (To amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to veterans of World War No. 2.)

H. R. 2023: Became Public Law No. 13 on March 23, 1943. (To amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States.)

S. 786. Became Public Law No. 16 on March 24, 1943. (To amend title I of Public Law No. 2, 73rd Cong., Mar. 20, 1933, and the veterans regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans of World War No. 2.)

H. R. 2703. Became Public Law No. 144 on July 13, 1943. (To provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.)

S. 964. Because Public Law No. 170 on October 25, 1943. (To provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation.)

H. R. 800. Became Public Law No. 187 on November 22, 1943. (To provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States.)

S. 693. Became Public Law No. 300 on May —, 1944. (Granting service connection for disabilities incurred prior to induction or enrollment for veterans of World War II.)

H R 3176. Became Public Law No. 308 on May 23, 1944. (Providing artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment.)

H. R. 4519: Became Public Law No. 309 on May 24, 1944. (To authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans.)

H. R. 3356: Became Public Law No. 312 on May 27, 1944. (To increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension of veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, 73d Cong., as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act.)

H. R. 3377: Became Public Law No. 313 on May 27, 1944. (To increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specified cases.)

S. 1767: To provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans. Became Public Law No. 346 on June 22, 1944.

H. R. 1744: Granting compensation to the widows and children of deceased veterans of World War No. 1 without the requirement that the veteran at the time of his death must have had a disability shown to have been incurred in or aggravated by such service. This bill passed the House on May 19, 1944, without a dissenting vote, and was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, where it is now pending.

Labor Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Fitchburg Sentinel and letters to the editor of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram:

[From the Fitchburg (Mass.) Sentinel of July 17, 1943]

PHILBIN ANSWERS NO-STRIKE BILL CHARGE BY C. I. O.—SAYS ABSENCE IN HOUSE ON DAY OF VOTE CAUSED BY DEATH IN FAMILY

In reply to a charge made at meeting of C. I. O. unions in this city that he had supported the Smith-Connally antistrike bill and had been absent from the House of Representatives when the final vote on the measure was taken Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN today sent a letter to Thomas Binall, temporary chairman of the tri-city council denying that he had supported the measure and explaining that his absence from the House when the vote on the bill came up was due to a death in his family.

The letter to Mr. Binall in part is as follows: "Since I do not believe you would intentionally misrepresent my position, but since your press account is in fact, a flagrant misrepresentation of my position, I wish to advise you that I repeatedly voted against the Smith-Connally antistrike bill.

"I voted against the rule permitting its consideration by the House. I voted against the bill itself, and I voted against the conference report.

"At the time the bill passed over the Presidential veto, I was unavoidably absent from my duties because of a death in family. Had I been present I would have voted to sustain the Presidential veto.

"I cannot believe, therefore, that any responsible labor leader would have knowingly participated in such a palpable misrepresentation of my position. In fairness, I ask you promptly to retract and correct the misstatements you have conveyed to your membership and to the public, and also give me the source of your false information so that I may take proper steps to protect myself against further publication of these misstatements."

The action to which Mr. PHILBIN takes exception was taken in this city Wednesday night at a meeting of C. I. O. unions from Leominster, Gardner, and Fitchburg held for the purpose of organizing a tri-city C. I. O. council.

After the Smith-Connally measure had been characterized as a "blow to national unity and to the unquestioned loyalty and patriotism of American labor" the council went on record as in support of President Roosevelt and then voted to write Senator LODGE and Representative PHILBIN in regard to their support of the bill and to cite PHILBIN's absence from the House when the vote was taken.

To the EDITOR, WORCESTER TELEGRAM, Worcester, Mass.:

As an active member of C. I. O. who is enthusiastically supporting PHILIP J. PHILBIN for Congress, I read with interest and no little amusement the letter of Mr. Thomas H. Binnall, chairman of the Tri-City C. I. O. Council, Gardner, which contained a number of sweeping generalities concerning Congressman PHILBIN's record of votes on various measures passed upon by the Seventy-eighth session of Congress. Mr. Binnall's charges that PHILBIN is anti-labor is refuted by the record. Mr. Binnall infers that the Clinton representative "voted badly or was absent on 10 crucial bills before Congress," while giving the impression that these same measures were bills having direct bearing upon organized labor, as such, and were of little or no interest to the rest of the country.

Unfortunately, Mr. Binnall was not specific, because the record is otherwise, as to just what bills Mr. PHILBIN voted against when they came to a vote in the House. For that reason, we must turn to the Massachusetts C. I. O. News, May 5, 1944, for the bills Mr. Binnall had in mind. This paper contains a listing of 22 measures to come before Congress and the voting record of each Congressman is marked "good" or "bad" depending on how the C. I. O. felt about each particular piece of legislation. Incidentally, it is not amiss to point out that a listing of these same 22 measures is absolutely identical with a chart issued by the Communist Party and tallying in exact detail to the last vote on the so-called goodness or badness of each Congressman's voting record. By this standard, about 95 percent of Congress should be smeared and purged for having black records on these same measures, according to the C. I. O. Only two out of 18 Massachusetts Senators and Congressmen could pass this test; and only 5 out of 280 members of the General Court.

Mr. Binnall says Congressman PHILBIN voted against organized labor by not "keeping down exorbitant corporation salaries." After much search of the Massachusetts C. I. O. News, we come to this measure: "Lifting the $25,000 salary limit." Congress here killed part of the President's plan to make the rich share the sacrifices of war." Mr. PHILBIN is listed here as voting against labor along with every other Member of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress. Moreover, this "salary limitation bill" was lifted bodily out of the Communist Party platform of 1940 and strikes a body blow at free enterprise. Actually under present taxes the rich and everyone else including the poor is paying tremendous portions of their incomes for the war. Taxes have automatically put a limit on salaries and income.

Mr. Binnall says Congressman PHILBIN voted against labor by not "lowering the ceiling prices on foods and necessities." This refers to the much-discussed subsidy issue, which sought to establish that the Government of the United States is under an obligation to pay part, or indeed all, of the grocery, meat, and food bills of all its people at a time when wages and the national income are higher than ever before in the history of the Nation. The subsidies issue was defeated by a large vote and as a consequence some 300 Members of Congress should be retired to private life, according to Mr. Binnall. PHILBIN voted for temporary subsidies on necessities to relieve low-income groups, but opposed general "handouts" which were estimated by some to cost $25,000,000,000 a year, would cripple the Treasury, and jeopardize all pension systems for veterans and civil employees. As usual, the poor would pay this cost. A broken national fiscal system would be the result.

Mr. Binnall says Congressman PHILBIN voted against labor by not voting for "financial assistance to poor farmers." This is a pretty tough one to find in the Massachusetts C. I. O. News' master chart, but it could be that Mr. Binnall has this confused with the following listing in the C. I. O. News: "Senator BYRD's F. S. A. bill—an amendment designed to strip the Farm Security Administration of its power to make loans to small farmers." Unfortunately, this measure did not come before the House for a vote, but was acted upon in the Senate. Until such time as Mr. Binnall is more specific, we must conclude that he was furnished with the wrong set of figures or the wrong script. PHILBIN has been a consistent friend of the farmer. Of course, he is opposed to the collective farming and crackpot resettlement advocated by the Communists.

Mr. Binnall says Congressman PHILBIN voted against labor by "crippling the O. P. A. with big business domination." The C. I. O. News has this to say about this measure: "Big business in O. P. A. A House vote to enable big business to plant its own agents in policy-making positions in O. P. A." This particular measure was an amendment to the 1944 appropriations bill for the O. P. A. to provide for the employment of personnel with at least 5 years business experience in that field or activity which they would supervise as Government employees in the Office of Price Administration. The amendment also served to eliminate a number of impractical theorists and dreamers, who did much to hamper an efficient O. P. A., in the early days of rationing and price control. The measure passed by the House by a large vote and it is very difficult to figure out how labor was dealt such a death-blow as Binnall describes by the passage of this amendment by the House, in fact the bill was manifestly in the interest of rich and poor alike.

No one in Congress more vigorously fought for strict, just, price control and elimination of the black market than Congressman PHILBIN, who even went so "all out" for labor as to favor abrogation of the Little Steel formula, if necessary, to bring prices and wages into balance and prevent unconscionable mulcting of poor low-paid consumers by inflated price scales ordered by the starry-eyed dreamers in O. P. A. PHILBIN supported all appropriation requests to finance rigorous enforcement of price ceilings, with court appeals for all aggrieved citizens.

Mr. Binnall says that Congressman PHILBIN voted against labor by voting for the "abolition of the domestic Office of War Information." The domestic activities of O. W. I. have not been abolished. They have been curtailed because Congress cut the O. W. I. appropriations for domestic operations, and increased appropriations for overseas propaganda work. In addition, it would certainly make interesting reading to have Mr. Binnall tell us how the laboring men and women of the Third Congressional District suffered when Congress passed this measure by a decisive vote. It must also be borne in mind that there is strong radical activity in O. W. I. at home and abroad, unwise, harmful propaganda, censorship and other irregularities. Does Mr. Binnall remember the phrase "the moronic little king." That was hatched in O. W. I., and much more, too. The work of screwballs in O. W. I., being paid by United States taxpayers and laborers.

Mr. Binnall says that Congressman PHILBIN voted against labor by "loosening control of rent." This is a very broad statement entirely unsupported in fact and it was most difficult to find out just what measure Mr. Binnall had in mind since Congress at no time voted to discontinue or relax rent control. The C. I. O. News enlightens us, however, and we find: "Creation of Smith committee. The House gave HOWARD SMITH of Virginia a committee which tried to destroy rent control." This was a vote for the creation of a committee to investigate all phases of rent control and other abuses of administrative power and to report to Congress thereon with whatever recommendations were felt necessary. PHILBIN has been a staunch advocate of rent control during the war crisis but he does not want private ownership confiscated by bureaucratic decrees denying appeals to the Federal courts. He does not want the homes of the poor people taxed away from them. Incidentally, the Smith committee was approved by the House by a preponderant vote. Mr. Binnall says Congressman PHILBIN voted against labor by voting to continue the Dies Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. Mr. Binnall's concern is apparent, since the Dies committee has been very appropriately investigating the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. However, he should not mask an investigation of the activities of this particular group as being detrimental to organized labor as a whole. Honest organized labor has never suffered from the hands of the Dies committee. Many "parlor pinks," Communists, radicals, and so forth have suffered through exposure of their nefarious work, among them notably a major portion of big executives in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, of whom we will hear more of as this campaign progresses.

Mr. Binnall should be more frank concerning his discussion of Congressman PHILBIN's labor record. The American Federation of Labor has endorsed PHILBIN's record and has requested all its members to support him at the polls. So have the railroad brotherhoods, the postal employees, and thousands like me in the C. I. O. The C. I. O. is not opposing PHILBIN because of an alleged anti-labor record which exists only in fancy of propagandists. It is opposing him because he is not a 100 percent rubber stamp, because he cannot be controlled or delivered, because he is fighting the Communists and the crackpots.

Labor has little to fear with PHIL PHILBIN in Congress. The outstanding measure, solely touching upon organized labor as such, to come before the Seventy-eighth Congress for vote was the so-called Smith-Connally bill designed to liquidate labor unions. This was the acid test of loyalty to labor. PHILBIN voted against this measure in committee, he voted against the rule permitting consideration of the bill on the floor of the House, he voted against the hostile Harness amendment, and he voted against the bill itself when it came up for final passage. When the President vetoed the bill, Congressman PHILBIN was called away from Washington by two tragic deaths in his family, but on the basis of his previous votes on this measure, it is easily apparent that he would have voted to uphold the veto. At that time, Mr. Binnall joined with the tri-city C. I. O. in misrepresenting PHILBIN's vote and actually publicized a letter in the press condeming him for voting wrong on the Smith-Connally bill, though he voted for labor.

We will have more smears and lies before this campaign ends because the radical boys of the C. I. O. palace guard know that PHILBIN is one of the strongest enemies they have in Congress and they will try to liquidate him at all costs. Slurs, smears, and shake-downs of poor workers are the technique. But the people have the power to smash these subversive influences in the voting booth and will do it. And the rank and file of C. I. O. which will not follow radical leaders will help them do it. I predict an overwhelming majority of C. I. O. will support PHILBIN. Over 95 percent of my own C. I. O. local endorse him.

The intelligent electorate of the third district will not be confused by the smokescreen, and distortions circulated by the C. I. O., because Congressman PHILBIN has demonstrated real leadership, honest, conscientious service and independent courageous thinking and acting in the Congress of the United States. C. I. O. radicals are not going to turn this country Communist or run the Government, nor will they turn us loyal Americans in C. I. O. into Communists. And stooges and rubber stamps are not going to be elected to Congress. The people will retain their own free Government and their own good, honest, conscientious Representatives in Washington. We need more Congressmen like PHILBIN and we will have them. That goes for labor and every other group in the third district.

Colleagues of C. I. O.—don't be used as tools. Vote American. Vote for the boys who fight, their early return, for your homes, your families, and your American institutions. Vote for PHIL PHILBIN for Congress.

Very truly yours,

JOHN O'ROURKE,
Vice President, Local 2828, United Steel Workers of America, C. I. O.

Southern "Revolt" Against the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles G. Ross, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

SOUTHERN "REVOLT" AGAINST NEW DEAL AND ITS VARIOUS AND UNUSUAL POSSIBILITIES—IF ELECTORS FROM DISAFFECTED STATES SHOULD VOTE AGAINST PARTY NOMINEE RESULTING DEADLOCK MIGHT ELECT PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT FROM DIFFERENT PARTIES

(By Charles G. Ross, contributing editor of the Post-Dispatch)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—The shabby political shenanigans now being practiced by anti-Roosevelt Democrats in some of the Southern States could result, conceivably, in the election next January—January, not November—of a Republican President and a Democratic Vice President. Or there could be a deadlock over the Presidency that would make the Vice President the acting head of the Nation.

These interesting possibilities grow out of the scheme in the South—Texas, South Carolina, Mississippi, and perhaps other States—to name Democratic electors who will vote in the electoral college for some other person than the party nominee unless the national Democratic platform meets certain specified conditions. These are: Support of the poll tax and the South's traditional views on the race question and, according to the demands of Texas and Mississippi, a restoration of the rule requiring a two-thirds vote for the Democratic Presidential nomination.

The scheme may or may not come to fruition. The Texas situation has been further complicated by a State Supreme Court decision, handed down last Wednesday, granting pro-Roosevelt Democrats the right to file suit to require that the names of Roosevelt electors be placed on the July 22 primary ballot. But if the scheme does work, the choice of a President, as has happened on two occasions in our history, might be thrown into the House of Representatives through the failure of any Presidential candidate to receive an electoral-college majority.

VICE PRESIDENT WOULD ACT

The election of a Republican as President might well follow, for it appears likely that unless the Democratic nominee wins in a sweep the House will go Republican. There could, however, be a deadlock in the House beyond the date, January 20, of the beginning of the new Presidential term, and in this event the Vice President-elect would act as President until a President had qualified.

Why the likelihood of a Democratic Vice President, to serve, possibly, with a Republican President, if the action of the rebellious southerners prevents a decision in the electoral college? Because the Constitution provides that the choice of a Vice President in that case shall rest with the Senate, and the Senate (with at present 58 Democrats, 37 Republicans, and 1 Progressive) probably will stay Democratic no matter how the November elections may go in other respects.

Back in 1924 our antiquated electoral college system came in for the same sort of scrutiny it is receiving today. There were three candidates for the Presidency—Calvin Coolidge, John W. Davis, and the late Robert M. La Follette. As the event showed, Coolidge was never in danger, but early in the campaign there was widespread fear on the part of the Republicans that La Follette would get enough votes to keep Coolidge from a majority—266 votes—in the electoral college and so throw the election into the House.

VOTING BY STATES

The line-up in the House at that time was such that a deadlock for an indefinite period might have resulted. In the Senate, it appeared highly possible that through a combination of Democratic and insurgent Republican (La Follette) votes, the Vice Presidency would be won by the Democratic nominee, Charles W. Bryan, brother of William J.

This—in the Republican view—horrendous chance that Charlie Bryan would become acting President of the United States was exploited to the limit in G. O. P. propaganda and undoubtedly had something to do with the poor showing of both Davis and La Follette at the polls.

The Constitution provides (twelfth amendment) that when a Presidential election goes into the House, the voting there shall be not by individuals but by States. Each State has one vote, so that Nevada, for example, with only 1 Representative, has exactly the same power in the balloting as New York, with 45 Representatives.

The House must choose among the three Presidential candidates with the highest votes in the electoral college and a majority of all the States—or 25—is necessary for a choice. How a State would vote would depend on which party controlled its delegation. If a State was represented in the House by, say, 11 Republicans and 10 Democrats and all voted on party lines, the vote of that State would go to the Republican nominee.

How this arrangement would work out in practice was the subject of endless speculation in 1924. The regular Republicans controlled 22 delegations, the Democrats 20, and La Follette 1, while in 5 there was a tie between the Democrats and the Republicans. As long as the tie lasted these delegations would have been out of the voting. Neither party could count immediately on the 25 votes necessary to a choice. The chances for trading were obvious. Deaths or resignations in the tied delegations might have tipped the scales. Conceivably, the result could have been determined by a single special election to fill a House vacancy.

WITH OUTGOING HOUSE

The decision at that time would have rested with the outgoing House, and this was one of the considerations that led to the adoption of the Norris constitutional amendment, the twentieth, which abolished the short, or "lame duck," session of Congress and provided for sessions beginning each year on January 3, and for the start of the Presidential term on January 20. Until the adoption of this amendment, the Chief Magistrate of the country could have been chosen by a House which had just been repudiated at the polls.

If this condition still obtained, the election would go into a House—the present House—in which the Democrats control 22 delegations (this gives them New York, which is divided 22 and 22 between the two parties, with the American Labor representative holding the balance of power); the Republicans control 23 (though Wisconsin could be made a tie if its two Progressives voted with the Democrats); and in three States—Idaho, Washington, and West Virginia—the 2 parties cancel each other out. With this division, there would have to be a break somewhere before any candidate could get the required 25 votes.

It is anybody's guess how the next House—the one actually to make the decision in the event of electoral college impotence—will be divided. Seemingly the Republicans will gain the edge in any election close enough to permit the rebellious southern bloc to throw the Presidential contest into the House; but it should be noted that the Republicans can make very material gains in numbers in the House without greatly altering its voting complexion on a State-by-State basis.

Take Pennsylvania, for example, with 20 Republicans and 13 Democrats. The Republicans could wipe out the Democratic representation, gaining 13 seats, and yet have no more voice in the selection of a President by the House than they would have today. Or Illinois, where the Republicans could add 7 seats to the 18 they now hold and still have but one vote on the Presidency.

BALANCE OF POWER

It follows that a Republican victory which would give them control of the House would not necessarily enable them to elect a President. The balance of power might rest with the Democratic Representatives from the insurgent Southern States. Would they vote with their party colleagues, or throw the election to the Republican nominee, or continue to hold up the choice by following the example of their States' electors and voting for a third person—say Senator BYRD? A stalemate might well ensue in the House for a considerable period, with all that this would mean in the way of undercover political trading—to say nothing of the indescribable confusion into which the country would be thrown by the uncertainty.

The voting in the Senate, if the electoral college should fail to choose a Vice President, would be on the two highest candidates for that office; hence there would be a deadlock only in the event of a tie. A majority of the whole Senate, or 49, would be required for a choice. The voting would be as it is normally—by individuals. As already said, the complexion of the Senate is such that the Democratic candidate probably be chosen.

It would be an ironic outcome of the southern rebellion if it should tie up the House and thereby elevate to the headship of the Nation, for an indefinite time, a man whom the rebels condemn equally with the President—HENRY WALLACE.

The House has twice elected a President. In 1801, Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr

were tied in electoral votes. The House balloted without adjournment from February 11 to 17 and on the thirty-sixth ballot chose Jefferson. Under the constitutional provision which the twelfth amendment superseded, Burr, being the second highest on the list, became Vice President.

The second election by the House was in 1825, when Andrew Jackson and John Quincy Adams were the leading contenders. Jackson had received 99 electoral votes and Adams 84. Henry Clay threw his support to Adams, who was elected and made Clay his Secretary of State.

LEGISLATURE CONTROLS

If the southern anti-Roosevelt Democrats persist in their plans they will undoubtedly bring on renewed demands for abolition of the electoral-college system in favor of a less complicated and more democratic way of choosing our Presidents and Vice Presidents.

The present system stems from the constitutional provision that in each State electors shall be chosen "in such manner as the legislature may direct" and that these electors shall meet in their respective States at an appointed time—the date this year will be December 18—and officially choose a President and Vice President. Each State has electors equal to the number of its Representatives and Senators. Their ballots will not be officially counted till after the convening of the new Congress on January 3, 1945, or less than 3 weeks before the date, January 20, set by the twentieth amendment for the beginning of the Presidential term. There is thus but a very short interval for the breaking of a possible deadlock over the Presidency in the House. The Constitution puts no brake on the power of a State legislature to prescribe the manner in which the electors shall be chosen.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST SYSTEM

Arguing more than 100 years ago for the revision of the electoral-college system, a House Member pointed out that a State legislature could legally vest appointment of the State's electors in a "board of bank directors, a turnpike corporation, or a synagogue."

In practice, rival sets of proposed electors are chosen by the State party organizations and voted upon in State-wide elections. Fifteen States in recent years, including Missouri, have eliminated the electors' names from the ballot, allowing the voters to select them simply by indicating a choice between Presidential candidates, and the same result has been accomplished in New York and Rhode Island through the use of voting machines which omit the names of the electors.

The States, however, lack the power under the Constitution to go the whole way and abolish the office of Presidential elector.

Fair Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BOARD OF SELECTMEN,
Hardwick, Mass., June 19, 1944.

To the EDITOR OF THE WORCESTER TELEGRAM,
Franklin Street, Worcester, Mass.

SIR: The Democratic voters of the Third Congressional District are getting their first vivid impressions of the character and form of a purge attempted by an outside group which attempts to purge a man from public life. The present purge assumes particular significance because it is leveled against Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, who is recognized by Senators, Congressmen, Washington correspondents, and by the families of servicemen, and thousands of constituents in the Third District as the hardest working and the most effective Congressman sent to Washington from any Massachusetts district in the last four decades.

The test at the polls, if it may be classed as such, will neither reflect on the President to whom the Congressman has been loyal wherever the interests of the district permitted, nor upon labor whose rank and file knows of the PHILBIN traditional loyalty.

Unfortunately the interference of people from outside the district will force the present campaign to be settled on any and all but the real issues vital to the district and which an alert, responsive Congressman must always recognize. The people of the Third District are not so short of memory as to overlook the fact that their present Congressman has been identified with the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, which has made its influence felt in the State and National platforms as well as making these planks part of the statutes.

The Democratic voter who looks at the maze of charges and misrepresentations which are bound to be injected in this campaign by the invaders might find soothing relief in the documentary proof which is available and which further appraises the records of the men in Congress. A recent supplement appraises the records of all Congressmen on vital, progressive legislation.

This highly esteemed authority (the New Republic) places Congressman PHILBIN among the top four Massachusetts Congressmen whose record was predominantly progressive. This same analysis bring out in bold contrast the votes of Congressmen who had very few progressive votes and who nevertheless escaped the wrath of purgers.

On the three vital "Foreign Affairs" bills, Congressman PHILBIN is credited with progressive votes—a 100-percent record for the sane, responsible internationalism which would steer our Nation out of future wars. The Congressman's votes on social legislation and agriculture are in the majority progressive, with the votes against the O. P. A. being the exception. Would these "giant-killers" tell the voters of the third district that their Congressman should have remained indifferent when arrogant bureaucrats flaunted them in the critical periods of fuel and food shortages?

In the votes on taxes and inflationary control, Congressman PHILBIN's votes were identical with the top four and the other Massachusetts Congressmen. The vote on the Bates resolution reflected the temper of the feeling of the people of the Third District over the acute fuel shortage.

Congressman PHILBIN voted prolabor in the acid test of the Smith-Connally bill. Responsible labor men in Washington know that Congressman PHILBIN can be counted on in all legislation vital to labor.

And, finally, this appraisal of the record of Congressman PHILBIN gives him a clean bill of health on the civil liberties bills. We might add that these invaders coming from an environment where civil liberties are more honored in the breach than in the observance might be inclined to overlook the fact of Congressman PHILBIN's progressive votes on the poll tax and on the soldiers' vote bills.

From the account of the analysis prepared by the New Republic, it is clear that the motives of the men who would beat Congressman PHILBIN are not because of his lack of sympathy for labor or for the President, but more because of personal pique, jealousy, or the desire to convert our Congressman into a feeble and futile rubber stamp.

The critics of Congressman PHILBIN, if they are to deserve the right to scold an able, responsive, go-through Congressman, must be able to say something good or else detract from the esteem from their representations. They must not underestimate his valiant fight for deserved veterans' legislation; his pronounced effectiveness, even as a first-term Congressman; and his efficient staff and personal effort which accommodates well over a thousand constituents each week.

The issue is very simple. The voters will either renominate their Congressman with a record majority, or they will administer a stab-in-the-back that will not only show their ingratitude but will lose the district.

Very truly yours,

WITOLD J. MICKELK,
Selectman.

HARDWICK, MASS.

Information for Servicemen, Veterans, and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, one of our duties here in Congress is to keep the people of our districts informed of the benefits we in Congress have made available to the service men and women, veterans and their dependents. The fact that we have received so many inquiries regarding the simplest benefits suggests to me the need of a digest of our laws relating to veterans, service people and their families, that can be used as a handy reference and can be sent by the families to their service men and women so that there may be no misunderstanding between them of the protection both have under our laws and the need for careful attention to the details and promptness in making application therefor.

One can see at a glance that the Government of the United States is liberal with those who are wearing and have worn the uniform of their country; our servicemen are the best paid and the best equipped in the world; our veterans and their dependents receive more adequate care than any others in the world. Because of the different kind of warfare which has developed, the needs will change and many future requirements will have to be met, but up to the present time I think we have provided very handsomely for our service families. We have a special duty to both our veterans and their dependents, to help them readjust their lives to the new conditions that have been imposed upon them. I am very proud that I have had a small part in providing these advantages, especially the educational features, in my work as a member of the Education Committee of the House of Representatives.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

Dependents of all grades of enlisted men and aviation cadets of the Army and Navy are eligible to receive a dependent's allowance from the Government in addition to the serviceman's allotment. Those men and women serving as officers come under another system. The allowances provided by the Government are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife and one child, $72, and $20 for each additional child. Note: If the divorce or separation order of the court does not call for alimony or separate maintenance, the wife will not receive any allotment, and in case of a court order providing alimony or separate maintenance, she will get no more than the amount fixed by the court.

Class B dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is substantially but not completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37.

Class B–1 dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $50 plus $11 for each brother or sister; two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $68 plus $11 for each brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

It is important that men and women with dependents make application through their commanding officers for allotment and allowance, as these benefits will begin the date application is filed. Allotments are compulsory only for class A dependents. If the service man or woman for some reason or other fails to make application or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out; the Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children and dates of birth. In case a man is reported missing in action, the allotment and allowance continue to be paid for a period of a year, unless in the meantime his status is definitely determined.

Parents and brothers and sisters who can prove dependency can receive an allowance at the same time as wife and children. Parents can get an allowance from more than one son or daughter in the service. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son or daughter in the service, they get $68 per month. Now, if another son or daughter in the service helped support these same parents, they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

The agency for the Navy having jurisdiction over allotments and allowances is: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.; the agency for the Army is: Office of Dependency Benefits, War Department, 213 Washington St., Newark, N. J. If you experience any difficulty, contact your Congressman.

TEMPORARY AID FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Sometimes cases of extreme hardship arise involving dependents of servicemen. Many dependents, and even members of the armed forces themselves are not fully acquainted with the two emergency agencies set up for the express purpose of helping such persons in need. These two agencies have branches all over the country. They are the Army Emergency Relief Fund, whose functions have recently been assigned to the Red Cross, and the Navy Relief Society, which also can be reached through the Red Cross.

Any member of the armed forces in the Army can appeal to the Army Relief Fund, represented in all camps, or through the Red Cross if the soldier is not at camp, for needed immediate financial assistance. He will receive courteous and willing assistance at all times. The fund is also open to all dependents of men and women in the Army and anyone needing relief should get in touch at once with this fund through the local Red Cross.

Any serviceman or servicewoman in our naval forces or his dependents can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. To get immediate action, it is advisable to take the case up through the Red Cross.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

This benefit is payable to all honorably discharged personnel of our services whose rank is below captain in the Army, and lieutenant senior grade in the Navy. Payments are made in the following sums: Personnel with less than 60 days' active service, $100; personnel with 60 days or more active service none of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $200; personnel with 60 days or more active service, any part of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $300. Whenever mustering-out payments amounts to more than $100, payments are made in monthly intervals of $100 each. Servicemen who are discharged at their own request are not entitled to muster-out pay.

FREE MEDICAL AND NURSING CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF MEN IN OUR ARMED FORCES

Under this plan a wife of any man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service. If the doctor does not have these blanks, write to the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Missouri State Board of Health, Jefferson City, Mo., and ask them to send a blank to you. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2 at once and send it immediately to Jefferson City for approval. It is important that wives apply for this in early pregnancy; the State board of health will not approve payment of the doctor, hospital, or any service, before the application is made out. In the case of emergency, be sure that the doctor makes application for you within 48 hours after service is rendered. If the application is not made within 48 hours, no bills for medical or hospital service will be paid. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse; no money is given to the wife. This service is extended to wives and infants of servicemen in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, but not to any other foreign country.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY PENSIONS

Our honorably discharged veterans of all wars are entitled to a pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by their service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10-percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as a hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month.

The disability claim is filed by the veteran for benefits payable to him as the result of injury or disease resulting from military service. The award of compensation is based on the degree of disability which is determined according to the Veterans' Administration schedule provisions. Any disability, except misconduct, is compensable if it is as much as 10-percent disabling. This application is known as form 526. It is simple to execute and seldom does one have any trouble answering the questions. Additional evidence is seldom required. This is particularly true on the adjudication of the initial claim. No subsequent formal claim need be filed. If the veteran is dissatisfied with his present rating, he can submit medical evidence to this effect.

However, it should be borne in mind that the doctor's statement must state not only his diagnosis but sufficient findings to warrant it. It is essential that this evidence show, or at least indicate, a higher degree of disability than the present evaluation. Upon receipt of competent medical evidence, the Veterans' Claim Service will authorize an official physical examination for rating purposes, thereby reopening the case for further consideration.

Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred from one Veterans' Administration facility to another, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for settlement, veterans should file claim on proper form which will be supplied them by any Veterans' Administration facility, or the local representative of the American Red Cross. If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

READJUSTMENT TO CIVIL LIFE

Education: One of the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights offers an education to any man who served for a period of 90 days, on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice, up to $500 per year for tuition and books, and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if single and $75 if he has dependents. In no event shall the total period of education exceed 4 years. There is also a provision for part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

A veteran also has the right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities, extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Application for education and training should be made to the Director, Servicemen's Education and Training, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

Loans for the purchase or construction of houses, farms, and business property: Loans provided for the above-mentioned purposes or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000. Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions. The interest rate must not exceed 4 percent. The loan must be practicable and suitable to veterans' circumstances. The loan must be repaid in 20 years. Application must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

Employment of veterans: A veteran of any war, honorably discharged from any one of the services, has the right to register for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service. He should contact his local United States Employment Office in his home town or county.

Unemployment compensation: There is also a provision for unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed. To be eligible, the person must reside in the United States; be completely unemployed, or if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week; be registered with and report to a public employment office; be able to work and available for suitable work.

Any person will be disqualified if he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; if he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work offered; if he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; if he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS AS A RESULT OF LOSS OF SON, DAUGHTER, HUSBAND, OR FATHER

There are four money benefits provided for the dependents of a deceased veteran: 6 months' gratuity payment, monthly insurance payments (if the serviceman applied for insurance), monthly pension, and back pay.

Gratuity: The gratuity is a lump-sum payment equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received at the date of death. In addition, the dependents of any private or seaman who dies in foreign service receive 20 percent of his base bay, and the dependents of any officer who dies in foreign service receive 10 percent of his base pay. If the serviceman was in either the flying service or submarine service, his dependents receive, in addition, 50 percent of his base pay. There is also a longevity provision in addition to the above amounts.

The gratuity is automatically paid to a wife of a deceased veteran, or if there is no wife, it is automatically paid to the surviving child or children. It is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters of an unmarried serviceman. The serviceman should designate some one of this latter class to receive it; however, if he does not, they may apply for it. If two parents survive, the amount is divided between them. A grandparent must show an insurable interest in order to receive it.

Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to: Gratuity Pay Branch, Finance Office, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Monthly insurance payments: This insurance is not paid in a lump sum; it is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary—the older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy a beneficiary over 30 years of age will receive $55.51 a month for 240 months. A beneficiary over 30 years of age will get a guaranteed 120 equal installments—and if they survive beyond 120 months it is paid for life. Under a $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $35.10 monthly, and so forth.

It would be well to have parents and next of kin check with the men and women in service to see that all insurance policies are in order and in the hands of the beneficiaries. An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of half blood. There is nothing to prevent a parent or brother or sister from being the beneficiary of more than one serviceman.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check their insurance policy now. See that everything is in order now. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A little care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen. I would suggest that you send your serviceman this pamphlet so that he may check all matters pertaining to his beneficiaries.

Monthly pension: This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, they are not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased serviceman can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month. Two parents, $25 each. Widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child. No widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38; no widow but two children, $33 equally divided, with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100.

The fact that a widow, a child, or parent gets the insurance, does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect both insurance and a pension.

Back pay due the serviceman: When a casualty occurs, that serviceman or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. All this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to: Finance Officer, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Headstone for grave: Any person may make application for a headstone for the grave of any veteran of any one of the Army or Navy services whose service was honorable, to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Burial allowance for any war veteran: After honorable service, reimbursement for burial may be allowed, not exceeding $100, on burial, funeral, and transportation expenses. Application should be made to Director, Dependent Claims Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, his minor children or adult unmarried daughters.

WRITE FOR OTHER INFORMATION

It is exceedingly difficult to cover all the details of benefits available to veterans of this and previous wars. I have tried to sketch briefly the benefits particularly relating to World War No. 2, as many pamphlets have been printed covering the provisions for veterans of other wars. I merely offer this digest as a guide to servicemen, veterans, and their dependents. If anyone has special questions or individual problems not covered in this summary, I suggest you

write to me personally, to the following address: MAX SCHWABE, Room 334, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Permanent Nurse Corps in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I introduced the following bill in an effort to secure an adequate nursing staff to care for our disabled veterans:

A bill by Mrs. ROGERS to provide for the establishment of a permanent nurse corps in the Veterans' Administration

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, hereinafter referred to as the Administrator, is authorized and directed to establish in the Veterans' Administration a permanent Nurse Corps to be known as the Veterans' Administration Nurse Corps and hereinafter referred to as the Nurse Corps.

SEC. 2. The Nurse Corps shall consist of the following members: 1 superintendent of nurses with the rank of colonel; 6 officers with the rank of lieutenant colonel; 73 officers with the rank of major; 160 officers with the rank of captain; 800 officers with the rank of first lieutenant; 15,000 officers with the rank of second lieutenant, and such other commissioned, noncommissioned, enlisted personnel and civilian employees as may be deemed necessary by the Administrator.

SEC. 3. The superintendent of the Nurse Corps shall be appointed by the President, upon the recommendation of the Administrator, and shall be responsible to the Administrator for the nurse service of the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 4. After the original appointment to the grade of superintendent of the Nurse Corps, a vacancy occurring in that grade shall be filled by appointment from members of the Nurse Corps who have served not less than 2 years in the grade of lieutenant colonel.

SEC. 5. No commissioned officer shall be appointed in the Nurse Corps or promoted to a higher grade or rank until his or her professional, mental, moral, and physical fitness to perform all the duties of the assigned rank or grade have been established to the satisfaction of a board consisting of Corps members to be appointed by the Administrator in accordance with regulations to be promulgated by him.

SEC. 6. The rates of pay and allowances, increase of pay, transportation of property, retirement or pension benefits, rights under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, entitlement to hospitalization and other gratuities and privileges for commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Nurse Corps shall be identical with those provided for personnel of the corresponding rank and status in the United States Army.

SEC. 7. Members of the Nurse Corps may purchase commissary or other supplies in or through the Veterans' Administration, the War and Navy Departments in accordance with regulations to be jointly promulgated by the Administrator, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, under as nearly the same conditions as are practicable and as are applicable to members of the Regular Establishment.

SEC. 8. The Administrator shall prescribe the rules and regulations governing the conduct of personnel and regulations respecting the internal administration of the nurses.

SEC. 9. The Administrator shall establish and maintain a Nurse Reserve Corps of officers and enlisted personnel to which there shall be appointed such nurses as are found qualified on examination in such numbers and ranks as are deemed necessary by the Administrator to fill any vacancies or meet any emergent conditions. Members of the Nurse Reserve Corps may be assigned to active duty whenever needed, and any member of the Nurse Corps may be transferred to the Reserve for any period during which his or her services on active duty are not required. Regulations may provide for longevity and other credits for service in the Reserve as well as active service in the Nurse Corps.

SEC. 10. The superintendent of nurses, under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, shall from time to time appoint a board of not less than three nor more than five officers of the Nurse Corps to determine charges of inaptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct of any member of the Nurse Corps, and if such charge or charges are sustained shall recommend reduction in grade, retirement, or discharge from the Nurse Corps of such member. Any member so discharged for inefficiency or inaptitude shall be entitled to one month's pay at the rate of pay in effect at the time of discharge for every completed year of service in the Nurse Corps not in excess of 6 years, but no additional pay shall be allowed to a member discharged because of misconduct.

SEC. 11. Commissioned officers and enlisted personnel of the Nurse Corps may be detailed for service with the Nurse Corps of the Army or the Navy, and commissioned or enlisted nurses of the Army and Navy may be detailed for service with the Nurse Corps of the Veterans' Administration when such detail will promote the public interests without, however, in any wise impairing the efficiency of the service for the purpose for which the same was created and is maintained.

SEC. 12. The Administrator, in his discretion, may grant members of the Nurse Corps leave of absence for 30 days per annum, without deduction of pay. Such leave may accumulate annually for a period not in excess of 3 months.

SEC. 13. The Administrator, upon recommendation of the superintendent of nurses, may employ such personnel in addition to the personnel of the Nurse Corps on a full time, part time, or fee basis at such rates of pay as he may prescribe.

SEC. 14. The Nurse Corps shall be entitled to use the insignia of service and rank as may be prescribed by the Administrator, and the appropriations of the Veterans' Administration shall be available for the expenses deemed necessary and appropriate to carry out these and other provisions of this act.

SEC. 15. The Administrator is authorized to enter into agreements or contracts with the War Department and the Navy Department for the purchase of uniforms, accouterments, equipment, and other supplies for the Nurse Corps.

SEC. 16. Appointments to the Nurse Corps shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator and without reference to other laws pertaining to civil-service employees of the United States, except that appointment of a member in the Nurse Corps shall not be construed as depriving any member of the Nurse Corps of any rights or the continuance of any rights which such member may have secured or may hereafter secure as a civil-service employee.

SEC. 17. All acts or parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby modified accordingly.

Keep the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the statement made by Britain's Minister of Production, Capt. Oliver Lyttelton, of the inner war cabinet, on Tuesday, June 20, 1944, was the most ridiculous and insidious that has been made, in my opinion, by a responsible person during this terrible and tragic war.

At an American Chamber of Commerce luncheon, he said in referring to lend-lease: "Japan was provoked into attacking the American at Pearl Harbor. It is a travesty on history ever to say that America was forced into the war. Everyone knows where American sympathies were. It is incorrect to say that America was ever truly neutral even before America came into the war on an all-out fighting basis."

It is inconceivable that a member of the inner war cabinet or any person with a responsibility would willfully and intentionally make such a misstatement of facts. It is a travesty on the purposes for which we are fighting to make such an incorrect statement.

Anyone who knows anything about the history of the Japanese aggression and attitude toward this country knows the statement was wholly incorrect and unjustified. Everyone knows of the Japanese aggression that started in 1931. The efforts of this country to keep the world at peace are also known by everyone who has followed these developments.

Japan has through these years deliberately pursued her notorious conquest which ended with the unpardonable attack on Pearl Harbor. Secretary Hull correctly denounced the statement immediately and though the people of America view the statement as idle talk and incorrect, it is unfortunate that it was ever made.

The Washington Post of today has a very good editorial expressing a practical view as well as a clear one, and I include it herewith:

FAUX PAS

There were grounds for Secretary Hull's indignation over Mr. Oliver Lyttelton's speech in London. Mr. Lyttelton, who is Britain's Minister of Production, and a member of the War Cabinet, said that "Japan was provoked into attacking the Americans at Pearl Harbor." The observation was subsequently amended, but the damage had been done. Mr. Lyttelton, who ought to have more common sense and more political sense, merely repeated a piece of foolishness which the bitter-enders toward the President used to utter. They had been silenced by facts which would convince a school boy. Thus the prospect had been opened up in the last few weeks that there would be no dissension on issues of either war or foreign policy in the coming campaign. Obviously Mr. Hull, who has been laboring patiently in the last 6

months to take foreign policy out of politics, could not allow the Lyttelton remark to go by without instant repudiation.

The long history of Japan's aggressions since the invasion of Manchuria in 1931 is a rebuttal of Mr. Lyttelton's assertion. Japan by that act flouted the Kellogg Pact. Secretary Stimson even at that time wanted to take action in defense of American interests. The Nine Power Pact was the next multilateral arrangement to go into the discard. Japan likewise tore up her arms agreements with this country. In addition, the war lords started to move the Nipponese armies into China proper and didn't stop till they were at Camrah Bay, whence they overlooked the Philippines. In the process, American lives and property and even warships were attacked. Japan, indeed, had closed almost all the accesses to the Pacific when this country began to take alarm. Then, in response to public pressure, we clapped embargoes on American exports to Japan, and war became inevitable.

Mr. Churchill is reputed to have wondered only a short while before Pearl Harbor when the United States would wake up to the Japanese menace and take military as well as economic action. Pearl Harbor supplied the awakener. It was all of a piece with a campaign of aggression which, as the Japanese themselves aren't loath to admit, was intended to make the Pacific a Japanese lake. Mr. Matsuoka, when he was foreign minister of Japan just before war broke out, outlined the great Japan as including all of Oceania as well as the "coprosperity sphere" of half of Asia. That in all these circumstances Japan can be held to have been "provoked" into action at Pearl Harbor is a gross misreading of history.

My Record in Opposing F. E. P. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Committee on Labor is now conducting hearings on the Scanlon bill (H. R. 3986) to make permanent the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee, commonly referred to as F. E. P. C. I desire to go on record as being utterly opposed to any such legislation and expect to fight it with all the force at my command.

I think the committee would better serve the public interest and the unity now so much needed in the war effort if it would abandon any such effort and announce to the Congress and the country that the States and local governments are ready, willing, and able to fairly and equitably adjust all problems regarding fair employment of their citizens.

The present agitation is incubating and promoting race feeling and prejudice rather than discouraging it. The people of the South are a just and fair people. In my section white and colored people have lived and worked together in harmony and contentment for many years, under existing segregation laws which must not be changed. If the uplifters and bureaucrats will leave us alone, we will work out the problem in fairness and justice to all.

I also oppose and bitterly resent the procedure recently resorted to in this House to tack the so-called F. E. P. C. as a rider on to a necessary and essential war appropriation bill. I protest the parliamentary tactics employed. Same was confusing and calculated to mislead the reading public. Some newspapers of high standing carried stories that did not reflect the true situation. I spoke with vigor against that item and voted against it at every opportunity.

I was one of those who demanded a roll call record vote on the Tarver amendment, which was denied. I still hope the Senate will strike out F. E. P. C. and I will continue to work and vote against it if the bill comes to the House.

The remarks which I made in the House denouncing F. E. P. C. just before the Tarver amendment was voted on to deny it any funds was as follows:

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think the gentleman from Georgia has made a very excellent statement. I shall vote for his amendment to strike out the entire appropriation for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. I think this organization has committed some violent abuses and, as the gentleman says, has rendered a disservice, and created a disunity in time of war. In addition to specific instances of meddling cited, I have in mind the instance of the Dallas News, wherein the Dallas News advertised, "Wanted: Colored man." And this organization, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, took that up with the Dallas News and said they had no right to use the word "colored" in an advertisement, that it was discriminatory as to race, and demanded that this ad should not be used. The News wanted a colored man, and not a white man, for a particular job; but they must not so advertise for fear of offending the colored race. An agency which has no more sense than that should be abolished. (P. 5029, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 26, 1944.)

Speaking of fair practice, I want the record to show, and every Member of this House will bear me witness, that I was one of those who voted to strike out the F. E. P. C. item when we lost by four votes, and yet certain persons with selfish interest, opposed to me in my district, are deliberately seeking to misrepresent my record and leave the impression that I voted for the F. E. P. C. There is not one word of truth in this statement and the voters will not be deceived by any such unfair practice or tactics. The people I represent believe in and practice fair play.

I did, on final passage, vote for the war appropriation bill which carried over a billion dollars for 16 essential war agencies, and made funds available for our fighting men all over the world, the major part of which was for ships to transport our armed forces and take their supplies. The vote on the war appropriation bill was 247 for and 58 against. Judge TARVER, of Georgia, the author of the amendment to strike F. E. P. C. from the bill, and who led the fight, was one of those who voted as I did, as did a majority of those who voted for the Tarver amendment. I am proud of that vote for the war appropriation bill and willing to defend it. I also take pride in my record of having supported the war policies, and the appropriations to carry them out 100 percent. This course I shall continue to pursue until the war is won and peace is restored. I shall continue to place the necessities of war above every other consideration. I shall continue to work and vote for returning service men and women and help to see to it that they are provided with hospitalization, compensation, employment, and education. I was one of those who gave active support to the recent G. I. bill which was sponsored by the American Legion.

When the armistice comes, as we all hope and pray it will soon, I shall devote my best efforts to the adoption of a treaty insuring, if possible, an enduring peace.

I am one of those who believe that had we followed the advice of Woodrow Wilson, our boys would not now be fighting in every corner of the world. I want to make certain this time that the boys of the next generation do not have to undergo the same experience. I am ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Furthermore, under appointment by Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, I served for many months on a committee who have been working on a post-war foreign policy. My experiences on both these committees will enable me to make a contribution in planning for a just and lasting peace. This I would prefer to do above all else.

Evasion of Hog-Marketing Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

EVASION OF HOG-MARKETING REGULATIONS

Whereas we, the undersigned local representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture, acting under instructions from our superior officers, in 1943 urged farmers to maintain a high rate of pork production as a patriotic duty, assured that they would at least receive the Federal W. F. A. floor price for their hogs; and

Whereas farmers did respond by producing for the 1943–44 market one of the country's largest hog crops; and

Whereas farmers in marketing their crop have been forced to accept prices much below the floor price established for the area and promised them by the Government; and

Whereas farmers have been obliged to submit to unusual, unorthodox, and unethical practices on the part of buyers in their

(buyers) effort to bypass the intent of the floor regulations; and

Whereas pork products are retailed to consumers on the basis of O. P. A. ceiling prices independent of prices paid to the farmer; and

Whereas packers are subsidized $1.30 per hundredweight on all pork products slaughtered (regardless of weights) to enable them to pay floor prices or better for live hogs: Be it hereby

Resolved, That we, the undersigned members of the United States Department of Agriculture War Board for Lagrange County, Ind., petition the respective Federal authorities in charge:

First. To keep faith with hog producers by making the support prices apply to all weights of hogs thereby eliminating "floor dodging."

Second. To provide that packers who resort to unusual practices not common prior to floor regulations, thereby securing unusual shrink in weight or otherwise evading the intent of the floor's objective, be made to disqualify themselves for subsidy payments in so doing;

Third. To investigate the hog-marketing system in this area; to withhold subsidies past due from all packers who have in any way evaded, or colluded with others to evade the intent and purpose of the floor; and to make the withholding retroactive on all such evasion purchases; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the War Food Administration, the Office of Price Administration, the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress for this county, the National and State United States Department of Agriculture War Boards.

OSCAR I. CHRISTNER,
Chairman, Lagrange County Agricultural Adjustment Association.
ARTHUR L. CAIN,
Manager, County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.
LEWIS PRICE,
Field Agent, Albion Production Credit Association.
R. L. CASE,
County Agent, Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service.
ROY M. WILSON,
Farmer Member.
CHAS. D. EMMITT,
Farmer Member.

PRICE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NORTHEASTERN INDIANA HOGS

Whereas W. F. A. hog price ceiling for the northeastern Indiana area are 10 cents per hundredweight lower than are the ceilings for the central Indiana area; and

Whereas the hogs from the two areas are consigned largely to the same eastern packers; and

Whereas the hogs from the two areas are believed to be of the same grade and quality; and

Whereas the freight rates from the two areas to slaughterers are practically identical; and

Whereas W. F. A. ceilings are said to have been determined on the market histories of the respective areas, indicating a long time discrimination against the northeastern Indiana area: Be it hereby

Resolved, That we, the undersigned members of the United States Department of Agriculture War Board, for LaGrange County, Ind., petition the Federal Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, and the Director of the Purdue University Agricultural Experiment Station, to (1) establish the cause or causes for discrimination in price against hogs marketed from the northeastern Indiana area, and (2) that State and Federal agencies with authority take the necessary action to correct and eliminate said discrimination in price ceilings and market practices; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be submitted to all Federal and State agencies concerned, and to the press.

OSCAR I. CHRISTNER,
Chairman, LaGrange County Agricultural Adjustment Association.
R. L. CASE,
County Agent, Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service.
ARTHUR L. CAIN,
Manager, County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.
LEWIS PRICE,
Field Agent, Albion Production Credit Association.
ROY M. WILSON,
Farmer Member.
CHAS. D. EMMITT,
Farmer Member.

Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that our State Department found it necessary to dismiss Hjalmar Procope, the Minister of Finland, for activities on his part said to be "inimical to the United States." No Bill of Particulars of the charges were made public and I am not able to conclude upon what basis such charges were made. Furthermore, I am a plain citizen and not a diplomat and have never been able to understand the intricacies and niceties of diplomatic maneuvering. I am very certain, however, that diplomatic maneuevering is the thing that lost the peace for us at Versailles and is very likely to lose it for us again if our dealings with other nations are based upon diplomatic horse trading instead of direct, outspoken, and straightforward action.

There is no substitute for straightforward dealing between nations, no matter what terminology you apply to such relations. Diplomats usually speak a strange tongue and in a manner calculated not to be understood by the common citizen, and sometimes I fear that such language is even misunderstood by members of their own cult. In any event, their pronouncements are usually couched in vague and complex verbiage, capable of interpretation or misinterpretation, as the case may be, by the diplomats to whom they are directed, while the average person is rarely able to do more than guess at their meaning. The world's diplomats of today have done an excellent job of confusing the aims and ideals for which we fight in this war.

Under diplomatic interpretation it is possible for Russia, who is an ally in our war against the Nazis, to remain friendly with Japan, an equally deadly enemy of this country. While I do not speak as an expert, the tremendous advantage that would accrue to us in our fight in the Pacific were Russia to break off friendly relations with Japan, is not disputable. How many American lives this action would save and how much it would shorten the war no one can say with certainty. But it is reasonably certain that such action on the part of Russia would be of inestimable benefit to us. Mr. Stalin, however, has very little interest in our fight in the Pacific because he knows it is a job we will have to finish with or without assistance.

Everyone agrees on the desirability of getting Finland out of the war. The Finns themselves would like to be at peace. This war has not been of their choosing, as they were forced into it by the war machines of two equally ruthless aggressors. To say that Finland should withdraw from the war on terms that mean her complete annihilation as a sovereign state, is like saying that peace is desirable even though it means the complete enslavement of the nation and its people. No nation in Europe outranks Finland in its fair and honest dealings with this country. They are a plain, honorable people. They want nothing more than to be left alone so that they may live a peaceful, democratic existence and keep the sovereignty of their government and its people intact. Surely, they are entitled to this fundamental birthright of free people everywhere.

Industrial Survey and Statistical Data on Cleveland and Cuyahoga County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the city of Cleveland, Ohio, could well be the industrial heart of America, situated as it is just halfway between the Pittsburgh-Youngstown district and the Detroit-Toledo district.

The Great Lakes district has produced a third of all the war and combat equipment for our armed forces.

Aggregate war contracts of the Nation up to May 1, 1944, totaled $189,471,000,000 and the Great Lakes district turned out $61,258,000,000 of this vast production for war.

The share of the Cleveland community proper is an outstanding achievement in the world-wide battle of production.

Although this is a global salt-water war, Cleveland has made a remarkable record in the production of various types of ships and maritime equipment. It has produced $1,100,000,000 worth to help keep our flag flying in all corners of the world seas. Cleveland-made mine sweepers and subchasers are helping to fight the Axis on all the far-flung battle fronts.

Industrial equipment produced here for our armed forces amounts to $1,417,-

000,000. Of aircraft and aircraft parts, the city has had awards totaling $956,000,000.

Ordnance contracts total $766,000,000, and other supplemental contracts, $248,000,000.

This makes a grand total (as of May 1, 1944) of $4,487,000,000. Almost 84 percent of this vast total is for expendable material in the Army or Navy service.

Besides its hundreds of small shops and factories, Cleveland has 306 plants employing 100 to 500 people, 55 plants employing 500 to 1,000, and 57 plants employing over 1,000.

Forty-two new plants were started in 1943, using 196,660 square feet of floor space and 259 old plants added 1,923,568 square feet of space at a cost of $22,568,816.

Fifteen Cleveland factories are making landing-craft parts.

Below are the industrial statistics for the last 4 years:

	Workers	Pay roll	Product value
1940	147,000	$221,250,000	$1,165,000,000
1941	185,770	338,038,240	1,674,000,000
1942	216,000	413,100,000	2,175,000,000
1943	247,000	600,000,000	3,100,000,000

It is interesting to note that while from 1940–43 the number of workers increased only 69 percent, production and pay rolls nearly tripled.

Another interesting fact is that in the first 4 months of 1943, Cleveland workers produced more than they did in the entire year of 1940.

These things should be a source of pride to every Clevelander and to labor especially.

The Pabst Post-war Employment Awards Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following plan on post-war employment submitted by W. E. Greenway, 123 Bellevue North, Seattle, Wash.:

The plan herewith submitted provides for post-war employment, the conserving of our natural resources, the buying and the storing of material from other countries that may be necessary for a prolonged war and the keeping of the United States in a state of almost instant readiness to repel invasion by a foreign foe.

It is now known by many that our boasted unlimited natural resources are not unlimited but are being rapidly exhausted.

Our better grades of coal may not last for another century. The same may be said of our iron, copper, lead, zinc, and many other minerals so necessary for a prolonged war. Our forests are being depleted. Everything that might be used from them is not being used. Much useful material is being left to rot on the ground.

An intelligent way must be found to conserve our natural resources, if for no other reason than because of military necessity.

We have been forced to call upon all classes of our citizens to bear arms or to work in essential war industries. We have discovered that millions of our men and women are not up to physical standard because of undernourishment, lack of education, or lack of training in the arts and sciences.

As a military necessity it behooves the United States to see to it that our men and women are always in good health. The Army and Navy medical staffs should have the care of our citizens and provide medical and dental care at Federal expense. Those who prefer to employ private physicians should not be denied that right, but, nevertheless, always subject to Federal supervision.

To be in a position to repel invasion, we need millions of trained workers, soldiers, sailors, and professional men and women. It shuld be the duty of the Federal Government to provide for the education and training of artisians, scientists, physicians, dentists, and specialists. Those undergoing training should be supported by the Federal Government. Private schools that comply with Federal regulations should be encouraged and open to all who elect to use them.

It should be the settled policy of the Federal Government not to permit the exporting of any raw material nor manufactured article that may cause a shortage in the event of another war.

Tin and other metals of which we are short, rubber and other vegetable products such as quinine, etc., should be bought in large quantities by the Federal Government and stored in suitable places as a reserve to be used in national emergencies.

Coal, oil, iron, copper, zinc, and other minerals should be held in reserve ready to be used in the event of another war. Substitutes should be used wherever possible. The manufacturing of subsitutes and the gathering and raising of substitute materials will give employment to thousands. The Federal Government should buy coal, oil, and forest lands and hold them in reserve.

It will be cheaper in the long run for the American people to have to pay more for substitutes than to import substances from abroad. We should import crude rubber in large quantities, yet we also should manufacture synthetic rubber. Import taxes can equalize the costs of substitutes and help support the Government.

It is not seriously disputed that for years previous to this World War No. 2, millions of our people were unemployed, or employed at substandard wages, or worse, were forced to apply for public work which was but a poor substitute for doles.

All American workers should be paid living wages. With that end in view, a United States Labor Board should be established. Its duties to be the setting wages for every worker in America. The Labor Board should invite representatives of unions to meet with representatives of nonunion workers and employers of labor. The first duty of those so meeting is to decide what is a fair living wage to be paid to the humblest adult men and women workers. Next will come the fixing of fair wages for skilled workers, specialists, scientists, physicians, dentists, and teachers and white-collar workers. The findings of the Labor Board to be published and in such manner that all Americans may be able to compare the wages to be received by the many classes of American workers. The findings of the Labor Board to become the law of the land. Of course the United States Labor Board may revise the rates from time to time when injustice seems to have been done. But the revisions must apply to all workers in that class.

Forty-four weeks of 40 hours each shall be considered a fair year's work for an American worker. In time when America is rehabilitated, the working hours per week may be reduced with the end in view of keeping all workers employed.

Workers should be encouraged to form themselves into unions. Production in the United States will be best served when almost every worker is a member of a union. The first and the most important service unions can perform for their members is to represent them before the United States Labor Board. When the rates of wages to be paid to all workers have been set, unions should insist that their members receive that rate of pay. Grievances of workers should be handled by unions if the workers are organized. Working conditions, housing, safety devices, medical and dental care, eating houses (if provided by their employers) and the educational facilities for the children of the workers and recreational facilities are all proper subjects that can best be obtained when insisted upon by unions. Complaints of workers when not adjusted between workers and their employers should be settled by the United States Labor Board and decisions reached without undue delay.

Until the huge American war debts are paid, all able-bodied Americans should do their share in the essential work to be done to make the United States ready for another war. Workers may quit their employment at their option, but must find other work considered essential to future war efforts or for the general welfare. If America is to be put in a position to repel invasion, it will take years of work by all. We must all work for the next few years.

The staffs of engineers and assistants of the Army, Navy, Air Forces, and other departments of the Federal Government should immediately be greatly enlarged. All the engineers who can be spared from our present war efforts should be set at work surveying and planning for thousands of miles of trunk highways and have some of the plans ready when peace is restored. This one effort will give employment to millions of our workers released from the armed services.

Other engineers should draw plans after surveying possible dam sites for hydroelectric development. When a plant is completed and the necessary power lines installed and equipped and current is ready for delivery, then the people who reside in such areas should be restricted in their use of oil and coal as fuel as a conservation measure. The Federal Government to own and operate the lines and plants and sell the current at cost plus a retirement sum necessary to repay the Government for the money spent in providing such facilities. Coal and oil must be reserved in sufficient quantities to meet the requirement of our armed forces in the event of a blockade. The manufacturing of the articles necessary to put the road building and the hydroelectric schemes in operation will give work to millions.

Every American worker is entitled to decent living quarters. Slums must be abolished. If their owners will not abolish them, then the Government must compete with them. If that is not always practical then slum dwellings should be bought by the Federal Government after an appraisal, then demolished and decent housing erected in their places.

Rentals for housing of workers to be fair and just to both tenant and owners. Costs, facilities, services, and maintenance to be considered. Housing for the lowest paid workers to be provided first.

Industries employing many workers should be as near as possible to the source of supply of the largest amounts of raw materials to be used.

The retail sale prices of food, clothing, and other necessities of the American people should be fixed by the Federal Government. Prices must be such as to insure the paying of the established rates of wages and also to permit a reasonable profit to farmers, merchants, manufacturers, and all others who render essential services toward producing and keeping up sufficient supplies of such things.

The very old, the very young, and those unable to work because of illness or other disabilities should not be permitted to suffer. They should be assisted from Federal Social Security funds.

A Social Security Board should be established to collect at the source from workers and others, funds to maintain the necessary training facilities for all Americans who care to use them. It will be the duty of the Social Security Board to provide the money necessary to pay for the medical and dental care of all Americans who need such care and are unable to pay for them. But none are to be denied the right to employ their own physicians and dentists.

Private property rights must be respected and private industry encouraged. But nothing is to be permitted that will hinder preparations for the defense of our country nor that is detrimental to the general welfare.

The Federal Government must insist that neither race, color, nor religion shall be permitted to affect the rights and opportunities of American citizens.

Tragedy of Versailles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William C. Bullitt from Life for March 27, 1944:

TRAGEDY OF VERSAILLES—A VETERAN OF THE CONFERENCE OF 1919 ANALYZES THE MISTAKES OF THE LAST PEACE

(By William C. Bullitt)

It is a tale that is told, from which we may draw the knowledge and comprehension needed for the future. The disproportion between the quarrels of nations and the suffering which fighting out those quarrels involves; the poor and barren prizes which reward sublime endeavor on the battlefield; the fleeting triumphs of war; the long, slow rebuilding; the awful risks so hardily run; the doom missed by a hair's breadth, by the spin of a coin, by the accident of an accident—all this should make the prevention of another great war the main preoccupation of mankind.—Winston Churchill, 1929.

The Treaty of Versailles at the close of the last World War established an uneasy armistice—not peace. Nations learn by trial and error. Can we learn from the errors of those who made the Treaty of Versailles any lesson which may help us to establish at the close of the present war a peace which may endure?

He who attempts to answer this question honestly must confess that, at best, he can bring only a small light into the darkness which shrouds the present and the future of mankind. Since the outbreak of the war in 1914 the speed of change in human life has become too great, the pattern of evolution and revolution too intricate, for a finite mind to comprehend.

Man's control over the forces of inanimate nature has been increasing with incredible speed; but man has acquired little, if any, increased control over the forces of his own nature. In the laboratories of the world new instruments of war—like the atomic bomb—are being perfected; instruments which will make the largest blockbuster of the present day seem a child's toy. If man cannot increase his control over the envy, hatred, malice, and cruelty that well up within his own nature, he will use his increasing control over the forces of inanimate nature to destroy the major portion of the human race and all the fairest creations of civilization.

This moral question underlies all problems of enduring peace and no finite intelligence can answer it. Easy answers can be given by glib columnists and clever propagandists; but in truth, the pattern is understood by God alone.

Was there ever a chance, then, that the Peace Conference of Paris which produced the Treaty of Versailles might have created an enduring peace?

These seemed to be a chance. World conditions were extraordinarily favorable. Germany, Austria-Hungry, and Russia had all been defeated and were all powerless. Italy was a great power of the second rank, and her Christian tradition had not been perverted by Mussolini. Japan was also a power of the second rank and was stepping softly, subtly, toward her distant objective of conquering China and controlling the Pacific. Force, overwhelming force, was in the hands of the United States, Great Britain, and France. They were all democracies. Their peoples were deeply and sincerely devoted to liberty, democracy, and peace. And their leaders—Woodrow Wilson, Lloyd George, and Clemenceau—seemed to have in their hands the power to remold the world into a form close to the desire of all sane men for justice, liberty, and peace.

Why did they fail? Why was the treaty they signed at Versailles a tragedy that involved all the world in suffering?

There was no villain in the tragedy. But each of the chief actors had the defects of his qualities, as well as the qualities of his defects.

Clemenceau was a magnificent old fighting man whose courage had carried France from a dark hour to victory. Intelligent, straightforward, brusque, intense in his loves and his hatreds, he was dominated by a passionate desire to make France secure against attack by Germany. He had seen German soldiers overrun France in the war of 1870, when the populations of the two countries were relatively equal. He had seen Germany grow into a colossus compared to France, and then in 1914 attack again. He knew that France had escaped defeat at the Marne by a miracle, and that the united efforts of Great Britain, Russia, Italy, the United States, and a host of lesser allies had been needed to help France win the victory which had just been won. He was doubtful that France could ever aagin gather such a constellation of allies. And always present in his mind was the terrible fact that the victory to which he had led France had cost the French 6,161,000 casualties, while the whole British Empire had suffered 3,190,000, and the United States only 350,000.

Clemenceau's heart was with his friends who lay dead along the Marne and the Chemin des Dames and at Verdun. He felt that all the bravest and best of the French had been killed, and that France would be poor in leaders, as in soldiers, for at least a generation. To strengthen France against Germany was, he believed, not only a service to France but also to all Western civilization, since the defeat of France by Germany would place in mortal peril not only all other Nations of the continent of Europe but also Great Britain.

He did not believe that the proposed League of Nations would change men's hearts. He was skeptical of the value of such an organization until Colonel House—who was Woodrow Wilson's closest friend—suggested to him before the Peace Conference that the Covenant of the League might bring the American Army and Navy immediately to the aid of France in case of future German attack. Then Clemenceau became the advocate of a stronger League than either Wilson or Lloyd George wanted. His representative on the League of Nations Commission fought day after day for the creation of a permanent international police force, with a permanent general staff, to enforce peace.

Clemenceau was French policy. Lloyd George, the British Prime Minister, was a brilliant Welsh solicitor representing the interests of the British Empire. Clever, charming, adept at playing on the vanities and weaknesses of his opponents, able to make the worse appear the better reason, he was a smooth lawyer serving a great client—Britain.

Four centuries of unswerving British policy had laid down for him the course he must pursue. Philip II of Spain, Louis XIV of France, Napoleon and, finally, William II of Germany had all learned to their cost that Great Britain would go to war rather than permit any great power to dominate the continent of Europe.

This British persistence had its roots in the conviction that if any single power should control Europe, Great Britain would not be strong enough to withstand attack by that power; to prevent domination of Europe by any power was, therefore, a matter of life and death to Great Britain.

Lloyd George did not have to invent the policy created by this conviction. Persistently throughout four centuries Great Britain had followed the policy of trying by diplomacy to weaken the strongest state on the Continent of Europe and to build up a coalition of weaker states against it under British leadership. If the strongest state could be kept from dominating the continent by peaceful means, so much the better. If war was necessary, then Great Britain would not hesitate to make war.

This policy of self-preservation for Great Britain was known as the policy of the balance of power in Europe. It had acquired a bad name. For Great Britain logically treated her friend and ally of today as her possible enemy of tomorrow. And, after victory, Great Britain never desired to see her chief ally too strong or her conquered foe too weak—since in the next round she might need her conquered enemy as an ally against her present friend.

The balance of power was the major policy that Lloyd George represented at the peace conference in Paris; but there was a subsidiary policy as well. That was the policy of adding to the British Empire bits of land in all portions of the earth. The German colonies in East and West Africa, the German islands in the Pacific, the Turkish possessions (Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, and Arabia) offered immense spoils. It was Lloyd George's task to acquire for the British Empire as much of the spoils as he could.

The idea of the League of Nations offered him possibilities both for gaining control of new territories and for implementing the policy of the balance of power. The British recognized quickly that, while annexations were frowned upon by world opinion, a control almost equivalent to annexation might be acquired by accepting a mandate from the League. Moreover, in the service of the balance of power, the proposed League might become a useful mechanism by which to mobilize the weaker nations of Europe

against the strongest nation of Europe. And the League might bring to Great Britain, in case of war, the immediate support of the United States.

The British, therefore, wanted a League, but they did not want a strong League with an army and a general staff such as the French wanted and they did not want to have to promise unequivocally to go to war in case of aggression against a member of the League. They wanted to have their hands more or less free to tolerate minor aggressions—such as subsequently came in Manchuria and Abyssinia—which did not intimately affect the safety of Great Britain or threaten to produce domination of Europe by a single power.

To make France secure was Clemenceau's passion. To preserve the balance of power and acquire additions to the British Empire were Lloyd George's tasks. To establish peace on earth forever was Wilson's dream.

In this day of hatred, cruelty, battle, and death, let no one scoff at Wilson's vision of the future. In his aim he was eternally right. And the world is suffering now not because his goal was wrong but because he did not know how to reach his goal.

Like all other men, Wilson had his shortcomings. He had learned to coin phrases that moved men's hearts. But he had acquired a faith in words that made him sometimes consider a word a deed, a phrase an act. His vision of the peace conference was a picture of statesmen being so uplifted by his appeals that they would become drunk with the spirit of self-sacrifice, and in that spirit make a just and lasting peace.

He had such faith in the power of his words that he neglected to take elementary precautions to prepare the way for his appeals.

His first great opportunity to get rid of the secret treaties between the Allies, and to pledge the Allies to a peace of reconciliation, came shortly after the United States entered the war, when Mr. Balfour, foreign secretary of Great Britain, visited America. The magnitude of this opportunity can scarcely be exaggerated because Balfour was obliged to tell Wilson that the position of the Allies was desperate; that Russia was likely to make a separate peace; that morale in France was collapsing; that Great Britain's financial condition threatened calamity, and that the United States must carry a burden in the war enormously greater than Wilson or anyone else in the United States had anticipated.

At that moment the fate of the Allies was in Wilson's hands. They were totally dependent for their lives on men, money, munitions, food and supplies of all sorts from America. At that moment Wilson could have got rid of the secret treaties and begun the work of turning the war into the crusade for peace which he had proclaimed.

Wilson had his opportunity then, but he did not use it. After consultation with Colonel House he decided not to demand of Balfour the elimination of the secret treaties. He did not even ask to see them.

(One was the secret treaty between Japan and Great Britain by which the British Empire got the German islands in the Pacific south of the equator and Japan got the German islands north of the equator—to capture which American marines and soldiers and sailors and aviators are now giving their lives.)

Wilson allowed himself to be persuaded, without any specific information being given him, that the British Government would approach the peace conference in his own spirit. Thus he lost the opportunity to prepare the way for the peace he hoped to make.

MR. WILSON'S LOST OPPORTUNITY

Many other such opportunities arose during the next 17 months. Russia's Soviet government made a separate peace with Germany, and the remaining Allies continued to be dependent for their lives on the United States until the collapse of the German Army in October 1918. At any time during that long period Wilson might have used his power to bind the Allies to make the sort of peace he wanted. He made no attempt to do that. He stated America's war aims in his Fourteen Points speech and in many other eloquent, moving and noble addresses. But he did not pin down the Allies, or attempt to do so, until after the German collapse.

Similarly, he neglected elementary precautions to insure the passage by the Senate of the treaty of peace. He appealed for the election in November 1918 of a Democratic Congress. But the voters gave the Republicans a majority in both House and Senate, and former President Theodore Roosevelt declared to the world: "Our allies and our enemies, and Mr. Wilson himself, should all understand that Mr. Wilson has no authority whatever to speak for the American people at this time. His leadership has just been emphatically repudiated by them."

A large group of Republicans, which included former President Taft and Elihu Root, former Secretary of State, did not agree with former President Roosevelt. They favored a League to Enforce Peace. They had great influence not only in the country but also in the Senate. They proposed to Wilson that, if he would include in his peace delegation two strong Republicans, they would do all in their power to obtain ratification of the treaty of the Senate. Wilson ignored their offer.

With the secret treaties ahead of him and an unreconciled Republican majority behind him, Wilson on December 4, 1918, boarded the *George Washington* and set out for Europe.

He was supremely confident of his ability to give the world the peace he had promised. The wild applause which greeted his arrival in Paris, the intense enthusiasm of the crowds in London, and finally the delirious reception accorded him in Italy—where peasants were burning candles before his photograph—confirmed his belief in the power of his words and his mission. He was, indeed, at that time—so far as any man can be—the moral leader of mankind. And when on January 7, 1919, he returned to Paris from his visit to Italy, he was convinced that the peoples of Europe would rise and follow him even against their own governments.

No program for the conference had been agreed upon. Clemenceau had proposed that the terms of peace to Germany should be drawn up first and the Covenant of the League of Nations second. Wilson insisted that the League of Nations should be established before the peace terms were discussed.

He said to Colonel House that he intended making the League of Nations the center of the whole program and letting everything revolve around that. Once that is a fait accompli nearly all the very serious difficulties will disappear." His theory was that establishment of the League of Nations would make "safety antedate the peace" and thus facilitate his task of persuading the statesmen assembled in Paris to behave in a truly Christian spirit.

Wilson had his way and it was agreed that the Covenant of the League of Nations should be drawn up before the terms of the treaty were considered. Neither Clemenceau nor Lloyd George sat personally as members of the commission to draft the Covenant of the League, but Wilson did.

On the drafting of the Covenant he worked enthusiastically and excellently. He had little free time to give to the military, economic, and territorial problems of the conference. But on January 24, 1919, the question of mandates was taken up in the Council of Ten. The British presented a resolution declaring "that in no circumstances should any of the colonies be returned to Germany." And Lloyd George added, "In behalf of the British Empire, I would like to say that we are opposed to a return to Germany of any of these territories under any circumstances."

Frequently Wilson had expressed his opposition to annexations; and Point Five of the Fourteen Points, which the British and the other Allies had accepted as the basis for the peace, read: "A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that, in determining all such questions of sovereignty, the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the Government whose title is to be determined."

Thus Wilson faced his first test on peace terms. The moment was extraordinarily important, because the question involved not only the fate of masses of people but also the issue as to whether or not Germany was to be offered a genuine peace of reconciliation of the sort that Wilson had promised.

DESTRUCTION OR RECONCILIATION?

Wilson knew that there were only two possible methods of preventing Germany from attempting by war to avenge her defeat. The first was to render Germany impotent, by annexing large portions of her territory, by dividing what remained into three or four States, by wrecking her industries and lowering her standard of living to such a point that her birth rate would fall and her citizens would emigrate. The second was to offer Germany a genuine peace of reconciliation.

Wilson, and everyone else in Paris, knew that the worst possible treaty would be one which neither reconciled Germany nor rendered her impotent. To leave Germany burning with a passion for revenge and at the same time to reduce her strength only temporarily would be to prepare the way to a new world war, a war of revenge—the war which became Hitler's war.

Long before the Peace Conference, Wilson had chosen the course of reconciliation. And shortly before the German surrender he had reasserted his intentions in his address of September 27, 1918, saying: "First, the impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just."

To believe in the possibility of reconciliation with Germany was by no means so difficult at the time of the Peace Conference as it is today. The Prussian militarists had been discredited. Nazi-ism had not been invented. Germany was in the throes of becoming a democratic republic controlled by a Socialist Party so tender-minded that it would not even shoot political murderers. Wilson's hope to establish a peace of reconciliation depended on the continuance and growth of this democratic, almost pacifist, trend in Germany. He had no evidence that some of the Socialists might secretly be working with the Prussian militarists. And the very life of democratic Germany seemed to him to depend on a fair embodiment of his promises in the peace settlement, since a settlement not in accord with the letter and spirit of the Fourteen Points would tend to turn Germany over to the apostles of revenge and war.

Wilson's reply to Lloyd George's demand that Germany should lose all her colonies, therefore, was awaited with acute anxiety because his answer would indicate the manner in which he intended to battle for his Fourteen Points—the fifth of which was at stake.

"President Wilson said that he thought all were agreed to oppose the restoration of the German colonies."

There was no battle.

COLONIES: FIRST OF MANY STEPS

Wilson had been persuaded that Germany did not deserve to have any colonies. Thus

he took the first step of many that made it difficult for any German to regard the Treaty of Versailles as a fair embodiment of the Fourteen Points or the offer of a peace of reconciliation. And the danger became evident that peace might be allowed to fall between two stools: Germany would neither be rendered impotent nor be reconciled.

This was the only concrete question of peace terms which Wilson decided before his return to America on Feb. 14, 1919.

On that day before his departure from Paris he read to the plenary session of the peace conference the Covenant of the League of Nations. He was a very tired but a very happy man. "People that were suspicious of one another can now live as friends and comrades in a single family, and desire to do so. The miasma of distrust, of intrigue, is cleared away." He said that—and he believed that.

Before leaving for America, Wilson instructed Colonel House to work out with the leaders of the Allies the military, territorial, reparation, and economic clauses of the treaty.

House began his work hopefully. But by March 3, 1919, the major demands of the Allies had been revealed to him and in despair he wrote: "It is now evident that the peace will not be such a peace as I had hoped, or one which this terrible upheaval should have brought about."

Wilson returned to France on March 14, 1919, full of fight, hoping that "by making safety antedate the peace" he had made it possible for him to lift the negotiations to the level of Christian ideals. House told him that the establishment of the League had not in any way reduced the demands of the Allies and advised him to accept those demands quickly. To take House's advice was to abandon his belief in his own mission—and he rejected it.

The very afternoon of his arrival in Paris he met Clemenceau and Lloyd George. He was determined to make no compromises. But he began his battle with them by making an extraordinary concession. In a moment of enthusiasm he agreed to make a treaty guaranteeing that the United States would go to war immediately on the side of France if France should be attacked by Germany. He did this for the same reason that he had insisted on guaranteeing the peace before its terms were fixed—in order to "make safety antedate the peace" and also to get rid of the French contention that France would never be secure against attack by Germany unless the French Army should occupy permanently the west bank of the Rhine.

Nearly all Americans at the Paris Conference felt sure that the Senate would never ratify this treaty of alliance and believed that Clemenceau had been deceived by a promise that never would be made good. But Clemenceau accepted the illusory guarantee.

WILSON THREATENS TO GO HOME

On March 27 Clemenceau demanded a 30-year occupation of the Rhineland and the annexation of the Saar. The next day Wilson, in a burst of irritation, replied that the French were bringing up territorial questions that had nothing to do with the war aims of anybody, that no one had heard of their intention to annex the Saar Valley until after the Armistice had been signed. Clemenceau returned an angry answer: "You are seeking to destroy France." "That is untrue, and you know it is untrue!" said Wilson. Clemenceau answered that if France did not receive the Saar he would not sign the treaty of peace. Wilson replied: "Then if France does not get what she wishes, she will refuse to act with us. In that event do you wish me to return home?" "I do not wish you to go home, but I intend to do so myself," said Clemenceau, and stalked from the room.

When Wilson asked Clemenceau the question "Do you wish me to return home?" he was thinking seriously of breaking up the peace conference, cutting off further financial aid to the Allies, denouncing Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Orlando as enemies of lasting peace and returning to America on the *George Washington*.

The power over the Allies which he had possessed before the Armistice, when they were dependent for their lives on America, had in large measure disappeared. They no longer needed our men and munitions, and we needed their ships to bring our soldiers home. But Wilson thought they still needed our money. And he felt that both his financial weapon and his moral authority were strong. But his moral authority also in large measure had evaporated. It had sprung, in part, from the perfection of his phrases which held out hope of peace to all the world; but, in greater part, it had sprung from the physical power of the people of the United States to save the Allies from destruction. Propagandists in England, France, and Italy had been depicting him as an ignorant egotist who thought he was a Christ. In France, only the Socialists and some of the Radical Socialists (who in spite of their name were neither radicals nor socialists but "liberals") were strongly in favor of a peace of reconciliation. In Great Britain the Labor Party, the trade-unions and some of the liberals were heartily with Wilson, and some of the trade-unions were ready to go so far as to call a general strike against Lloyd George. Moreover, Wilson knew that if he should break up the conference and go home he would be denounced throughout the United States—except by the "liberal" section of the Democratic Party which controlled few votes in the Senate or the country.

He was caught on the horns of a terrible dilemma. He felt that if he should sign a treaty the terms of which were not "just and right" he would himself sow the seeds of new wars and betray the hopes of the world. He knew that if he should break up the conference he would precipitate a political battle in Europe and America of epic dimensions, and that he would have few friends. In despair, he longed for the power over the Allies which was his before the Germans collapsed and he wished, too late, that he had used it while he had it.

On April 3, 1919, he suffered a nervous and physical break-down.

"He was seized with violent paroxysms of coughing, which were so severe and frequent that it interfered with his breathing. He had a fever of 103°. * * * His condition looked very serious."

SICKBED NEGOTIATIONS

But the work of the conference had to go on; and 2 days later Lloyd George, Clemenceau, Orlando, and Colonel House met in his study; and Colonel House walked back and forth through the door in the bookcase which separated Wilson's bedroom from his study to keep him informed of the progress of their negotiations.

Reparations were under discussion. Wilson had already yielded to the demand that pensions and separation allowances should be included in the reparations bill to Germany. He had also ordered the American experts to cease fighting for his original position that a definite sum for Germany to pay must be named in the treaty. But he was still under the illusion that he would not have to make further compromises and that Lloyd George would support him in insisting that the total reparations payments must be limited to the amount Germany could pay in 30 years. To Wilson's horror, House came through the door and reported that Lloyd George opposed any limitation either of years or of amount to be paid.

The following day, Sunday, April 6, Wilson—still ill in bed—sent for the American peace commissioners and outlined to them his objections to the terms that Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Orlando were trying to write into the treaty. "It was determined that if nothing happened within the next few days the President would say to the Prime Ministers that unless peace was made according to their promises, which were to conform to the principles of the Fourteen Points, he would either have to go home or he would insist upon having the conferences in the open; in other words, to have plenary sessions with all the delegates of the smaller powers sitting in."

The evening of the same day, April 6, 1919, Wilson went over the whole situation with his closest intimates. He then gave orders that all further advances of money from the United States to Great Britain and France should be stopped, and that the *George Washington* should return to Brest so that he could leave for America if he should be unable to get the sort of peace he sought for the world.

When Clemenceau, referring to Wilson's purpose in ordering the *George Washington*, said to Admiral Grayson, Wilson's physician and intimate friend, "It is a bluff, isn't it?" Grayson replied with entire sincerity, "He hasn't a bluffing corpuscle in his body."

Late the following afternoon, to various friends, Wilson again expressed his determination to fight. But the next day, April 8, 1919, when he met the prime ministers for the first time after his illness, he yielded, and accepted tentatively the "compromise" on the question of reparations.

WEAPONS LOST WITHOUT KNOWING IT

Any remnants of an inclination to fight which may have remained in Wilson were removed by two telegrams, the first, from his White House secretary, Joseph P. Tumulty, saying, "The ordering of the *George Washington* to return to France looked upon here as an act of impatience and petulance. * * * A withdrawal at this time would be a desertion." The second telegram was from the Secretary of the Treasury and said that financial arrangements already had been made with the British which would cover their requirements to July 1, 1919, and that commitments for loans to France already made by the Treasury would cover future French requirements so completely that only temporary inconvenience to France would be caused by a refusal of new loans.

The financial weapon on which Wilson had counted had slipped from his hand without his becoming aware that it was gone.

Thereafter Wilson excluded all Americans from the meetings of the four and gave orders that minutes of the meetings should not be given to any American. Lloyd George had Sir Maurice Hankey to assist him, Clemenceau had Mantoux, Wilson had no one. Alone, he agreed to the transformation of the 14 points into the Treaty of Versailles.

Wilson had a powerful conscience and he could not commit an act which was evil unless he could convince himself that it was somehow good. He escaped from his dilemma by persuading himself that the League of Nations would alter all the unjust provisions of the treaty. Again and again he said to his friends, "I would never have done that if I had not been sure that the League of Nations would revise that decision."

He was entirely conscious that the League as it stood could not revise the treaty and was essentially a mechanism to guarantee the permanence of the treaty. But he convinced himself that the League in time would be made stronger until it should become a true parliament of man, and that it would then revise the treaty.

As soon as Wilson achieved the belief that the terms of the peace were mere temporary expedients which would be rewritten by a permanent and powerful League, he made his compromises quickly. On April 7 he had been convinced that he should break up the conference rather than accept bad terms. One week later, April 14, the treaty

was so far advanced that the German Government was invited to send delegates to Versailles to receive it. It was actually handed to them on May 7.

By the terms of the treaty, Germany lost:

The districts of Moresnet, Supen, and Malmedy to Belgium.

Alsace and Lorraine to France.

The Saar Valley to control by an international commission pending a plebiscite to be taken after 15 years. The Saar coal mines ceded to France.

Northern Schleswig to Denmark.

The southern half of Upper Silesia, a large part of the Posen and Bromberg areas, and a corridor to the sea—which cut off East Prussia from the body of Germany—to Poland.

The city of Danzig—to be administered by the League but its foreign relations controlled by Poland.

The city of Memel to the Allies.

All her colonies—under mandates. The Cameroons to Great Britain and France, Togoland to Great Britain, Southwest Africa to the Union of South Africa, East Africa to Great Britain and Belgium. Her islands in the Pacific north of the equator to Japan; those south of the equator to Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand.

Also her rights and properties in the Chinese province of Chantung—to Japan.

Also all her treaty rights, capitulations and concessions in China, Liberia, Siam, Egypt, and Morocco.

All German state and private property abroad, including the property and stations of German missionaries.

All vessels of the German merchant marine exceeding 1,600 gross tons and half the vessels between 1,600 tons and 1,600 tons, and one-fourth of her trawlers and other fishing boats—mostly to Great Britain under a provision for ton-for-ton replacement of Allied shipping lost during the war.

As many billions as the Reparations Commission might choose, or be able, to take from her—the sum being unlimited either in magnitude or in number of years to be paid.

The German Army to be reduced to 100,000, with guns and ammunition in proportion, the rest destroyed. Abolition of conscription. Destruction of all fortifications. Absolute demilitarization of all German territories on the west bank of the Rhine and in a zone 50 kilometers deep on the east bank of the Rhine.

German Navy to be surrendered and thenceforth limited to six small battleships, 6 light cruisers, 12 destroyers, and 12 torpedo boats. Complete destruction of naval works and fortifications within 50 kilometers of the coast.

Destruction of all army and navy aircraft and other air material, and absolute prohibition of naval or military air forces.

These were a few of the principle provisions of the Treaty of Versailles. There were a vast number of other provisions; among them those that dealt with war criminals—including the Kaiser—and those which put the chief German rivers under control of international commissions.

The cumulative impression produced by the treaty was one of rancorous severity. Yet the treaty was by no means so severe as it might have been. Germany was not destroyed or cut into pieces. She was rendered powerless—for the moment. She was not rendered permanently impotent.

On the other hand, the peace was clearly not a peace of reconciliation which gave the new-born German democratic state a real fighting chance to survive and uproot forever the militarism which had been rooted so long in the soil of Brandenburg. There were within the treaty too many talking points for specialists in hatred—like Hitler.

The most atrocious provisions of the treaty were those dealing with reparations. They seemed to promise that for an indefinite future the entire German race would have to labor for the Allies. In reality, they were so unworkable that they produced financial and economic chaos in Germany and had to be revised—and in the end Germany paid only what gullible American private investors gave her in loans.

Along with these provisions of the Treaty of Versailles went other provisions which technically were parts of other peace treaties or agreements. Their authors did not design them to assist the German apostles of revenge to overrun Europe, but they tended to produce that result.

VIENNA BEGAN TO STARVE

Austria-Hungary was cut into small bits. The economic unity of the basin of the Danube which had been maintained by the Hapsburg monarchy was split into 5 pieces with tariff walls between, making them too weak economically to resist the thrust of Germany. Vienna, a noble city of 2,000,000 which had been the capital of an empire of 52,000,000, was made the capital of a tiny state of 6,000,000 and forthwith began to starve. Two hundred and fifty thousand Austrian mountaineers of the Tyrol, of purest German stock, were given to Italy. Hungary was whittled down to dimensions that gave her a series of mortal grievances against Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. And Fiume, the logical port of Yugoslavia, went to Italy in spite of Wilson's efforts.

Russia, torn by 21 different civil wars, was the great unrepresented at the Conference of Paris. The Soviet Government made a proposal on March 14, 1919, good until April 10, 1919, to the Allied and Associated Governments, that there should be an immediate armistice of 2 weeks in all the former territories of the Czar's empire, and that a conference should meet to discuss peace on the basis that all de facto governments which had been set up in the territory of the former Russian empire and Finland should remain in full control of the territories they occupied at the moment the armistice became effective. The Soviet Government at that time controlled only the Moscow, Leningrad, Vologda, Kazan, and Samara areas, the northern Ukraine, and a portion of White Russia. Lenin's proposal meant, therefore, that the Soviet Government offered to give up, at least temporarily, the whole of Siberia, the Urals, the Caucasus, the Archangel and Murmansk areas, Finland, the Baltic States, a portion of White Russia, and most of the Ukraine. Furthermore, Lenin agreed to recognize the Czarist debts.

Lloyd George was much interested by the proposal but feared to champion it because of the opposition of Northcliffe and Churchill, Wilson was too ill and too burdened by his troubles with Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Orlando to turn his mind to it. The consequences were momentous. Indeed, the world does not yet know what the consequences may be. And Wilson's decision not to burden what he was fond of calling his "one-track mind" with Russia may well, when the history of this century is written, turn out to be the most important decision he made in Paris.

Under mandates, Lloyd George acquired for the British Empire control of Iraq, Trans-Jordan and Palestine, while the French got Syria and Lebanon.

Japan acquired by the Treaty of Versailles not only the German islands in the Pacific, north of the Equator but also control of the Chinese province of Shantung.

Wilson felt bad about this article of the treaty. "He said he had been unable to sleep the night before, thinking of it * * * He knew * * * that he would be accused of violating his own principles but, nevertheless, he must work for world order and organization, against anarchy and a return of the old militarism."

LLOYD GEORGE IN "A PERFECT FUNK"

To the Chinese, the delivery of a province of China to the Japanese militarists seemed a queer way to work against militarism, and the Chinese government refused to sign the Treaty of Versailles. And the opponents of the treaty in the Senate were given one of their most effective arguments against ratification.

After the terms of the treaty had been communicated to the Germans, Lloyd George returned to Paris from London in a state of mind which Wilson described as "a perfect funk."

He had carried the treaty proudly to London but, in spite of the fact that he had garnered for the British Empire a new imperial domain in Africa, the Near East and the Pacific, he had been criticized by his associates in London because the treaty, in their opinion, made France too strong and Germany too weak and, therefore, threatened to upset the balance of power in Europe. Thenceforth, British policy toward the continent was controlled by this thought.

Wilson was intensely irritated by Lloyd George's last-minute conversion to the doctrine of milder terms for Germany. "These people that overrode our judgment and wrote things into the treaty that are now the stumbling blocks, are falling over themselves to remove those stumbling blocks," he commented.

The stumbling blocks were not removed.

On June 28, 1919 the Treaty of Versailles was signed.

Wilson commended it, saying, "It ends once for all an old and intolerable order * * * There is ground here for deep satisfaction, universal assurance and confident hope."

He had escaped from a conscious sense of guilt by clinging firmly to the belief that the League of Nations would become a parliament of man which would alter the imperfect terms of the treaty. To believe that was not easy. To believe that the league ever would grow into an instrument powerful enough to revise the treaty if it should be weakened further by "reservations" was almost impossible. The Republican majority in the Senate was hostile to Wilson and was opposed to some of the terms of the League Covenant and insisted on adding reservations to it. Wilson would not accept the reservations, which were associated with the name of Senator Lodge, Republican chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. In consequence, when the Treaty of Versailles, with the Lodge reservations, came to a vote in the Senate in November 1919, Wilson requested the Democratic senators to vote against it—and ratification of the treaty was defeated by a vote of 39 in favor, 55 against.

There were many other votes in the Senate, but in the end the United States did not ratify the Treaty of Versailles. And the alliance with France, for which Clemenceau had bartered military occupation of the west bank of the Rhine, was not even submitted to a vote in the Senate.

Clemenceau failed to obtain security for France. Wilson failed to establish an enduring peace. Lloyd George achieved a glittering surface success since he preserved the balance of power in Europe and acquired some spoils for the British Empire. But, in truth, he too failed. The greatest of British interests is peace; and 20 years after his bright triumph Great Britain was at war and close to destruction.

MANKIND WAS THE LOSER

There was no winner in the tragedy of Versailles. The whole of mankind was the loser.

From this sad story of good intentions leading only to a new world war, a few conclusions may, perhaps, legitimately be drawn:

(1) At the end of each great war comes a period when the world is in flux and may be molded by the leaders of the victorious powers into a better or a worse form. That moment of great opportunity passes quickly, and the world congeals in the new mold fixed by the peace settlements. If the settlements are wise, the world may enjoy a period of peace. If they are unwise, the world will be shattered soon by war.

(2) The political, economic, military, and moral march toward wise terms of peace must begin long before the defeat of the enemy. Unwise terms of peace—even terms desired by our allies—must be excluded by binding international agreements while our allies are dependent on us for their preservation. We must use our power while we have it. Wilson did not use his power while he had it.

(3) Good intentions are not enough. The organization of peace is a more difficult problem than the organization of war. Foresight and many preparatory decisions and acts are vital if the moment of opportunity is to be seized. We have to know what we want, plan how to get what we want and act in time, unless victory is to be barren of peace. A staff for the organization of peace, working in close contact with the President, is no less necessary than a general staff for the organization of war.

(4) By our Constitution, the Senate has coordinate power with the President in the matter of treaties. A close coordination of thought, intention, and will between the President and the Senate, therefore, is essential so that the President will not negotiate treaties which the Senate will reject and the Senate will not reject treaties negotiated by the President.

WE CANNOT RESIGN FROM THIS EARTH

(5) Since man is acquiring increased control over the forces of nature without acquiring increased control over the forces of his own nature, new weapons of war are placing unprecedented means of destruction in the hands of beings who have not evolved greatly since the dawn of recorded history. The problem of international morality, therefore, underlies all problems of lasting peace. A minimum of human decency and good faith between nations is essential for the conduct of world affairs in peace. Rightly the people of the United States feel kindly toward nations that do not do unto others what they would not have done unto themselves. Rightly we hate dictators who use the lie, the pledged word given and broken, propaganda that makes black appear white, "fifth columns" and threats of force as their habitual weapons in international affairs. They are the enemies of international morality—and of peace.

(6) We as a Nation cannot resign from this earth. We cannot escape the consequences of unwise settlements in Asia and Europe which will produce new wars. We shall be involved in those wars.

(7) The problem of peace in Europe, where 400,000,000 of the most highly endowed people of the earth are concentrated in a peninsula projecting from Asia, is—as it was in Wilson's day—the central problem of world peace. It is such a difficult problem that, at times, we are inclined to give up hope that Germany can be incorporated in a decent society of European and international law, and that Europe can be organized in a peaceful federation of democratic states. In weariness we are tempted to try to wash our hands of the problem.

We cannot wash our hands of it. If we try to do so, we shall suffer physical consequences in war; and we shall suffer moral consequences. We cannot escape history. Pontius Pilate washed his hands, and the world has never forgiven him.

Entertainment Industry Emergency Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a statement and a program adopted by the Entertainment Industry Emergency Committee, which was organized immediately following the Detroit riots of June 21, 1943, by a group of interested people in the theater, radio, and picture business for the purpose of stimulating interest in the danger of riots, and then set about arranging a national broadcast on the subject. This was sponsored by more than 150 leading people in the entertainment world, including such persons as Maxwell Anderson, Jean Arthur, Ralph Bellamy, Erskine Caldwell, Ilka Chase, Duke Ellington, John Garfield, Benny Goodman, Max Gordon, Lillian Hellman, Jean Hersholt, James Hilton, Miriam Hopkins, Thomas Mann, Groucho Marx, Paul Muni, Jean Renoir, Elmer Rice, Billy Rose, Lawrence Tibbett, Orson Welles, David Selznick, and many others.

The statement and program follow:

The most vicious result of a vicious mind is the concept of the right of one man to subjugate another. The history of man has been his fight against that conception. Always men have stood up to fight against it. We are fighting against it now. White men, black men, and yellow men all over the world are giving their lives by millions; they believe in the equality of man, and are now dying to secure it. Here at home we are denying that equality to the very men who are fighting to give it to us.

For many generations the Negro citizen, whether by custom or local ordinance, has too often been denied his constitutional rights and privileges. Such denials have always been illegal and immoral. The dangers of such denials are now, in wartime, thrown into bolder relief.

It may be said that in time of war it is unwise to emphasize internal stresses within our country. But they have been tragically emphasized for us in the violent anti-Negro outbreaks which have come to the surface in recent months in Detroit, and more recently by the clashes in New York. Steps such as we advocate should have been made in time of peace. But they were not made and we find curselves now in a war of national survival with an ancient injustice clogging our national effort. To say that the Negro is better off than he was before the Civil War is only to say that in fact the lot of all men has improved since those days. But to say that a man is better off is not to say that he has yet been accepted as a full citizen with the rights of other citizens. This fact has become more noticeable under the strain of emergency organization and the building of a great army. And it is a fact which is known to our allies, to our enemies, to the neutrals, and to all those in any country who might fear that they will be mistreated by us. Our attitude toward the Negro is alienating hundreds of millions throughout the world whom we need as friends and who might otherwise be our friends. It is poisoning morale within our own country and giving our enemies a deadly effective propaganda weapon.

We of the entertainment industry recognize that we have a peculiar responsibility in that we are engaged in bringing ideas to audiences which include our whole population. This responsibility we can use in such a way that it will contribute to national unity.

For the present, and for our own industry, this much we propose:

1. We ask that the writers of books, plays, radio scripts, motion pictures, short stories, and comic strips cease telling the pre-Civil War lies about the Negro. The Negro is not a man with a razor in his hand, or a woman with a handkerchief on her head; they are not happy-go-lucky illiterates, clowns, cowards, superstitious, ghost-ridden, liquor-drinking, chicken-stealing, watermelon-eating, jazz-crazed Aunt Jemimas or Uncle Toms who at their worst are villains and at their best slavish admirers of their white superiors. We wish these dangerous vilifications to stop forever. The Negro is as legitimate a hero or a villain as the rest of us, and should be so treated.

2. We ask the theater, radio, dance bands, night clubs and symphony orchestras to insist that discrimination against the Negro artist, musician, and other performers cease. The Negro artist is to be judged on his merits as an artist and not on the color of his face. The Negro needs a job as desperately as anybody else.

3. We ask that the moving-picture industry, the director, the writer, the actor, the technician, and, above all, the producing company, face out and find a solution for the prejudices of southern customers and the prejudices of southern theater owners. These prejudices have far too long controlled the industry's ability to treat seriously and justly of the Negro. The moving-picture industry should not be asked to make this fight unaided. The decent southerner, who has always been ashamed of the savage and vulgar prejudices of the South, must come to the aid of the moving-picture industry and come quickly.

We of the entertainment industry are conscious of the considerable contributions which have been made to our democratic culture by the Negro people. These contributions highlight the task of the entire entertainment industry, in all its creative and technical branches, of treating the Negro problem in full truth with full seriousness. It is a sharp and tragic problem running through our country like a wicked and unattended epidemic. We must move forward, in our way, and help solve it. And we must move now.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, "Undercover" should not include Capt. Oliver Lyttelton.

The House was in session 10 hours today—the longest this year, on the longest day.

Two men may be drafted at the Chicago convention by delegates who are above the draft.

Two things hurting the Republican Convention: the lack of a contest there, and too much contest over there.

Surely nothing will prevent the recess tomorrow night, not even U. N. R. R. A., about the last source of contention.

They eliminated a clause in a soldier-preference bill which would have given benefit to a husband of a deceased service woman.

The first landing on the beachhead of perpetuity will be in Chicago, June 26, the place where our new foreign policy of "quarantine" was handed down.

There is greater satisfaction this week-end on the successes of three battle fronts than any previous time. We hope Congress will be reconvened because of victory, soon.

The wife of the Member who moved to strike out the enacting clause, killing the WASP bill, sat in the gallery, unknowingly, beside the lady officer who most wanted the law.

Mr. Baldwin's transfer from the head of Farm Security to second place to Hillman on C. I. O. political action is proving to be, from disclosed evidence, an effort to seduce the farm element through that agency, if possible.

All should be vitally interested in the processes that choose a President. A President could use influence enough to lead to the bitterest ends. He could take your son, brother, husband, or father and send him to foreign soil to die. He could.

Post-War Highway Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Governor of Massachusetts:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
State House, Boston, June 7, 1944.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: This afternoon Representative Edward Staves, of Southbridge, who is the vice chairman of our post-war highway commission, came in to see me. This commission, as you know, is comprised of members of the department of public works, other State officials, and members of the legislature. Its duty is to make plans for post-war highway building.

Naturally we are much concerned with what the Federal Government does on this subject. Staves points out to me that under the original bill (H. R. 2426), in which the Federal Government is asked to appropriate $3,000,000,000 on a 75–25 basis, the total cost to Massachusetts will be $125,000,000, and the total receipts in Massachusetts will be $72,000,000.

A group from various States, of which Staves is one, has proposed H. R. 4853, as amended, in which the Federal Government is asked to appropriate $2,000,000,000, of which the total cost to Massachusetts will be $124,000,000, and the receipts in Massachusetts $114,000,000. Naturally, under these circumstances, the second bill seems to be very much more favorable and a fairer one to us in this State.

I have stated many times publicly and privately my feeling that while the States and the municipalities have saved much money during this war, and while at the same time the Federal Government has had to bear the cost of the war, and to do so has gone heavily into debt, I believe that the municipalities and the States should not go to the Federal Gorvernment for financial assistance except in extreme cases. Consequently, I am not heartily in favor of either of these bills. However, the cooperative road-building plan has worked out better probably than any other Federal-State cooperative undertaking.

If there is to be a Federal appropriation on this subject, naturally I hope you will use your influence to pass H. R. 4853, as amended, rather than H. R. 2426. Possibly, there may be other bills or amendments of which Staves is not informed, but I am glad to endorse his position on this subject with the qualification as above stated.

Best regards to you.

Sincerely yours,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Governor of the Commonwealth.

P. S.—I am sending an identical letter to Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN.

Some Evidence Backing View That United States Is Unprepared for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Chicago Daily News, by Edwin A. Lahey:

SOME EVIDENCE BACKING VIEW THAT UNITED STATES IS UNPREPARED FOR PEACE

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

The other day, in an unaccountably ponderous vein, this column became pessimistic about the ability of America to protect itself against the ravages of peace. I'd like to pursue this depressing line with some evidence to the effect that (a) as a nation we are unwilling to face the cold probabilities of the post-war era, and that (b) we are trending toward a state of hopeless disunity which will make it difficult to agree on methods for maintaining full employment, which is the essence of the problem ahead of us.

It may seem a little silly to be discussing this, when the front page is filled with news of the B–29, with the increased tempo of the invasion, and with the counteroffensive of the Nazi rocket bombs. But like the last act of a Wagnerian opera, this deafening clang of noise might be followed abruptly by the overwhelming silence of peace. It may be later than we think.

JOB PROBLEM UNSOLVED

Issue (a) cited above requires that we honestly and frankly face the fact that "private enterprise" as we know it, and as political ostriches like Harrison Spangler speak of it, has not demonstrated that it can solve the problem of unemployment. The obvious next step, if capitalism is to prove its right to exist as a system of distribution, is a compensatory economy in which public spending fills in the inevitable valleys in the business cycle, thus maintaining a reasonable stability of the national income.

But when you look over the field of public expression, you find most men with their heads in the sand, talking like Herbert Hoover in 1931, when he thought that all we needed was more confidence. There are some notable exceptions. Economists like Stuart Chase and Alvin Hansen have been assiduously warning us of the need of an economic system in which public spending acts as a backstop against depression. Wendell Willkie courageously takes the dilemma by the horns and warns his fellow Republicans that economic security for the individual is not incompatible with "free enterprise."

MINORITY VOICES INEFFECTIVE

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee last week also proclaimed the principle that while the job of providing full employment was one essentially for private industry, government in the future must stand by in readiness to provide employment in public works when and if private industry falters on the job. But these seem like lonely voices beating against the hard wall of indifference that runs through industry, Congress, and most of the President's advisers. Such minority voices do not enact adequate plans for protection from the impact of peace.

Item (b) cited above says we are trending toward disunity. This, unfortunately, is borne out by statistics of labor disputes. Theoretically industry and labor should be learning gradually to be getting along better. Perhaps this is true over the long run. The history of the National Labor Relations Board shows that each year the number of representation cases it handles is a higher percentage of the whole, while cases involving violations and complaints decline. This would tend to prove that employers have accepted the principle of collective bargaining.

W. L. B. LOAD UP ELEVENFOLD

But War Labor Board statistics knock out this comfortable theory, at least for the moment. During the first 6 months of the W. L. B.'s existence, from January to June 1942, it received an average of 50 disputes per week. From June to December of 1943 it received an average of 550 dispute cases per week, an elevenfold increase. The vast majority of these disputes were over petty matters, including standard contract provisions which are now being disputed by employers. The burden of work on the W. L. B. has increased so that the average dispute case now requires 4 to 5 months for adjudication.

These figures would support the statement that we are trending toward a dangerous disunity. The time would seem ripe for the President to recognize the certainty of peace and victory, and call a national conference of industry, labor, agriculture, and Government to see if they could not make a desperate effort at unity of purpose and evolve a blueprint to keep our economic structure going, come the end of the war.

English as a World Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Robert L. Owen:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 20, 1944.*

Re: English as a world language.

Hon VICTOR WICKERSHAM, M. C.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR VICTOR: During the last decades a wonderful revolution has been taking place in teaching the peoples of the world to read and write their own language by a few days of instruction through phonetic alphabets adopted and put into execution by over 300 nationalities. These alphabets differ from each other in the forms of the phonetic letters employed. They have one characteristic in common to them all, to wit: each letter represents one primary vocal sound and one only, which enables an illiterate person to read the alphabet in a few hours of instruction, and therefore to read their own language printed in this phonetic type.

After several years of intense study I have devised a phonetic alphabet of 42 letters with which any language in the world can be printed; by which any language in the world when so printed can be read and written by people knowing that language. They can learn this alphabet within 2 or 3 hours of instruction. They can easily read books printed in it in a few days of practice. They can learn to write it by hand almost immediately and with facility in a few weeks of practice. The global, phonetic, stenographic alphabet I explained to the Senate in a petition referred by the Senate to the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate Document 133.

I wish to explain this to the Senate and House of Representatives, and to the American people in a convincing manner which can only be done through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by using the Global type. This type will be available in a few weeks.

Using the Global letters in writing by hand enables an illiterate to write English or Russian or Chinese stenographically and at high speed after reasonable practice. Printing Russian in phonetic letters saves a substantial percentage of the paper which would be employed if printed unphonetically, but printing in English with the Global would save half the paper used for printing purposes. This means a possible saving in the United States of millions of dollars of printed paper per annum if adopted, or double the printed contents of books, magazines, and papers.

It would save half the cost of transportation by mail, express, and freight. It would save half the space of storage.

Above all by far in importance, it would save the youth and the illiterates of the world the enormous loss of time in learning how to spell unphonetic words used in English which take children 5 or 10 years of precious time at an impressionable age.

It would multiply the production of the mass of mankind through increased knowledge of modern productive processes and vocational instruction. This latter fact has been completely demonstrated by Russia and Turkey, and by the individual states in eastern Europe and northern Asia. Russia, using the phonetic alphabet as the basis of its educational system, has in two decades increased its production over 400 percent.

The world revolution in abolishing illiteracy and human ignorance and poverty has been making great strides in other countries through the activities of the Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature through the activities of the Reverend Frank Charles Laubach, Ph. D., who have taught nearly a hundred nationalities how to abolish illiteracy with the phonetic alphabets. These communities have received Laubach's instruction with joy and enthusiasm. In recent months many communities in the Caribbean and South America have received this system such as Jamaica, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Puerto Rico, and many others. These languages are widely distributed: 22 in the Philippines, 5 in China, 3 in Malay, 13 in Latin America, 4 in Mexico, and 5 in the Caribbean, 23 in India, 11 in Africa, 4 in the Near East and Hawaii.

Theodore Roosevelt when President instructed the Public Printer to adopt simplified spelling of 300 words as of economic importance. This list was prepared by the Committee on Simplified Spelling. It spelled "tho" in lieu of "though", etc. President Roosevelt referred to unphonetic English spelling as "foolish and fantastic." The unphonetic words of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary makes the appalling number of nearly 500,000 words, where two or more letters are used to convey the sound instead of one letter employed by the phonetic system.

President Roosevelt might be criticized for using the term "foolish and fantastic," but listen to what the greatest expert in the world on phonetic teaching, Laubach, says about the difficulty of teaching foreigners to spell and pronounce scholastic, unphonetic English words (Philippine Literacy Method, p. 2). "English is one of the world's worst-spelled languages. The letter 'a' has eight sounds, 'o' sixteen, 'c,' 'e,' 'g,' 'h,' 'i,' 'p,' 'r,' 's,' 't,' 'u,' 'x,' 'y,' and 'z' also have plural pronunciations. The foolish clause, 'though a tough cough plough me through', contains five pronunciations for 'ough.' Probably nobody in Oxford—or even in Boston—can pronounce every word in the Oxford Dictionary. There is no escape from it—we must learn each English word before we can be sure we are pronouncing it correctly, and that requires years." I have Dr. Laubach's letter commending my alphabet as the best he had ever seen.

I had a card from George Bernard Shaw favoring phonetic spelling dated April 28, 1944, stating that he was convinced on two points: "A. That the only argument strong enough to carry its adoption (phonetic letters) is its enormous saving of labor in writing, typing, printing; paper making and in wear and tear of machinery. The cost of spelling one sound with two letters is so prodigious that the initial cost of substituting a phonetic alphabet capable of representing every single sound in English speech by a single letter is negligible in comparison. B. As phonetic spelling with our alphabet is impossible without a very frequent indication of one sound by two letters, all attempts at it must be ruled out on economic grounds alone, to say nothing of the impression of illiterate misspelling which they make on educated people." Mr. Shaw condemns any attempt to spell phonetically with the old English letters and said that he "is interested only in a new English alphabet containing between 40 and 50 new letters to be used and taught concurrently with the old alphabet until one or the other proves the fitter to survive." It will be remembered that Mr. Shaw proposed to leave his entire estate to establish the phonetic system in spelling English.

I, myself, merely propose a method of writing English (and all other languages) with shorthand phonetic letters leaving the present English printing undisturbed, as it is of great value as it is, and there is no need for interfering with those who use it and will continue to use it. It ought to be known to all scholars because of the enormous literature already printed in it. Writing and printing with phonetic shorthand will quickly remove illiteracy and will enable people of all languages, by use of a universal alphabet, to learn the language of other people whose sounds they can read at sight with the Global phonetic, stenographic alphabet.

I recently received a letter from an accomplished teacher in our public schools which I think should be of interest as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C. *May 15, 1944.*

DEAR MR. OWEN: Answering your inquiry, I have taught two classes of children to read and write the Global Alphabet since January 1. They could read it after a few hours of instruction and have been pleased and interested with it. I have found no word in the English language that I could not write in the letters of the Global Alphabet.

One of my children of 10 years of age speaks Portuguese and I had her write in Portuguese the phrase, "Can we go home?" I translated this in the Global Alphabet and found that my children could immediately read and intelligently pronounce the Portuguese sentence. They were delighted to read the Portuguese. Of course, you would know this, but it surprised and pleased them because they could not read and intelligently pronounce the Portuguese as written in roman letters. The name of the child who speaks Portuguese is Helena Fonseca. Her father is a diplomat in the employ of the Brazilian Government. She is 10 years old.

Yours respectfully,

MRS. FRANCES D. DORMAN.

I propose teaching Portuguese and English by printing words and sentences of identical meaning, interlinear, using the Global Alphabet to enable Portuguese and English students to intelligibly pronounce both Portuguese and English at sight. Then the only thing they have to do is to remember the meaning of the word pronounced without any complications whatever in pronunciation or spelling.

By this mechanism an intelligent American should learn to speak Portuguese and understand it when it is spoken, within 2 or 3 months of study. Chinese, Russians, and others may learn English the same way.

In other words, the Global, phonetic, stenographic system offers the whole world a mechanism by which the people of the world can learn conversational English with great speed through bilingual books printed in Global. An available plan and text for all the leading languages is immediately available. With 1,200 words business and social conversation can be carried on in any language. And the knowledge of 1,200 words, which could be learned in 60 days at 20 words a day will open the door to any desired larger vocabulary. Suitable books in Global using familiar phrases and common words and containing a glossary of 5,000 words can be easily printed and sold for 25 cents apiece at a profit. In this way the spoken English words can be heard intelligently by radio receiving sets throughout the entire globe and the voice of America and of English-speaking people make known the value of the new world which is soon to emerge, "When the war drums throb no longer and the battle flags are furled in the parliament of man and the federation of the world."

My dear Victor, may I not beg you and your colleagues in Congress to give your sympathetic cooperation in the war on illiteracy and poverty and in the mechanism to

enable the people of all nations to better understand each other and bring about a new world of abundance, peace, and friendly international cooperation. With governmental support English can be made a world language inside of 2 years. When this is done, radio will do the rest with perfect ease and we shall indeed have a new world of understanding and peace.

With kind personal regards,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

What This Country Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the chief exponent of business in this country, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and many other related organizations appear to be seeking a solution of this country's financial and business problems. The desks of the Members of Congress are deluged with communications from these organizations and individuals in every walk of life proposing plans and seeking to influence Congress in support of some particular program.

With all the legislative expedients that have been proposed and tried, I still adhere to the simple formula I have suggested to the national chamber in response to their letter and inquiry with my reply submitted herewith.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, June 21, 1944.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE, M. C.,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: You are, no doubt, acquainted with the United States Chamber's program on national affairs. Today more than 1,200 local committees are endeavoring to bring to the memberships of local chambers and the public generally unbiased information on national issues. We are not striving to influence public sentiment but, rather, to develop sound convictions on issues of national importance. We have proceeded upon the theory that if our businessmen and citizens generally are in possession of all of the facts upon definite issues, they will in the majority of instances act in the public good. The studies that we have made available to these committees, as you know, dealt with both sides of an issue, with equal attention being given to both sides.

We are planning a rather active summer and fall campaign for these groups and would like very much to provide them with a list of the issues which Members of Congress believe to be the most vital, and which will be determined in the coming 12 months. Because of the truly educational aspects of this program, we felt that you would be willing to give us just a few minutes of your busy day.

Enclosed you will find a check sheet listing several issues which we believe are waiting for solution; there may be others that you would care to add. Won't you check this sheet for us so that we may have the benefit of your thinking on this subject? No signatures are necessary. The only record we will make is whether the check sheet came from a Member of the Senate or the House. A stamped envelope is also enclosed for your convenience.

Awaiting with interest your reply, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. HAZEN,
Executive Assistant,
Department of Governmental Affairs.

[Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. Department of Governmental Affairs, Washington, D. C., June 21, 1944]

CONGRESSIONAL CHECK LIST OF LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

FINANCE

1. Post-war tax provisions to stimulate flow of private investment capital. Major_____. Minor_____.
2. S. E. C. security regulations. Major_____. Minor_____.
3. Reduction of Federal civil operating expenditures. Major_____. Minor_____.

PRODUCTION

1. Contract termination. Major_____. Minor_____.
2. Disposal of surplus war property. Major_____. Minor_____.
3. Reconversion of industry. Major_____. Minor_____.
4. Labor relations. Major_____. Minor_____.

AGRICULTURE

1. Parity formula. Major_____. Minor_____.
2. A. A. A. amendments. Major_____. Minor_____.
3. Subsidies. Major_____. Minor_____.

FOREIGN COMMERCE

1. International peace organization. Major_____. Minor_____.
2. International commercial policy. Major_____. Minor_____.
3. International industrial and trade combinations and agreements (cartels). Major_____. Minor_____.
4. International monetary stabilization plan. Major_____. Minor_____.
5. U. N. R. R. A. Major_____. Minor_____.

VETERANS

1. Demobilization. Major_____. Minor_____.
2. Employment—
(a) Unemployment compensation. Major_____. Minor_____.
(b) Supplemental assistance. Major_____. Minor_____.
3. Education. Major_____. Minor_____.

HOUSING

1. Government housing projects. Major_____. Minor_____.
2. Federal assistance to private construction activities. Major_____. Minor_____.

TRANSPORTATION

1. Post-war national transportation policy with particular reference to cooperation of all transport agencies. Major_____. Minor_____.
2. Participation of Federal Government in construction of highways and airports. Major_____. Minor_____.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

1. Federal policy relating to power projects and their competition with privately owned utilities. Major_____. Minor_____.
2. Administrative procedure. Major_____. Minor_____.
3. Price control and rationing. Major_____. Minor_____.
4. Post-war compulsory military service. (Over-all post-war military plans.) Major_____. Minor_____.
5. Post-war public works program. Major_____. Minor_____.
6. Clarification of antitrust laws. Major_____. Minor_____.
7. Aids to small business. Major_____. Minor_____.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1944.

Mr. JOHN C. HAZEN,
Executive Assistant, Department of Governmental Affairs, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAZEN: Answering your inquiry of June 21, what we need and what we must have before your chamber or any other uplift group can get very far in advancing the welfare and prosperity of the country is a program that would give this country a sound, adequate, workable money system that would provide sufficient cash with which to conduct the Nation's business, and a strong Federal Trade Commission with adequate laws to protect free enterprise from the restraints of unfair competition and unfair trade practices—as a means of giving the law of supply and demand the way to bring the price structure into adjustment.

When you and your members recognize this need and are ready to lend assistance to achieving these objectives, I shall be ready and most eager to cooperate to this end.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Beaver-Mahoning Canalization Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, May 2, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, in opposing the Beaver-Mahoning canalization project I do not want to be misunderstood as opposing waterway improvement and development for increasing water transportation. In fact, I advocate such development when it can be clearly established that any given project is to promote the general public welfare. There is no evidence that this project is essential to the war effort and its benefits would be enjoyed by a very restricted area. In view of these facts, I question the wisdom of constructing a project of this magnitude in time of war when we have a shortage of manpower and material. If the project is in any way justified, it would be far better to construct it in the post-war period when labor and material more than likely will be looking for a market.

I am pleased to remind you that during this emergency our private transportation facilities have met all demands made upon them. There has not been any serious transportation bottlenecks of long duration. Our railroads have moved greater tonnage and a greater number of passengers, including millions of servicemen, all with reduced personnel, equipment replacements not available, and repair material greatly reduced. The railroads of this country, and this includes both management and labor, have done a miraculous job. Few Americans are fully aware of the enormous job their railroads are doing to help win the war. Railroad labor is the best managed and there has been no labor difficulties such as occurred too frequently in other classes of industry. We

Americans should not forget that in successfully handling this war job the railroads are giving another fine example of free enterprise, rising to meet a great national emergency in a way to confound the theorists ready to believe that free, private enterprise has had its day.

The railroads are not seasonable. They move 24 hours a day, 365 days in the year, over snowcapped mountains in subzero weather and across scorching deserts. It would be manifestly unfair and inconsistent, as well as economically unsound, to impose further tax burden upon these facilities and their employees in order to subsidize competition. Hundreds of thousands of our best families are dependent upon them for a source of income. Any disruption to the orderly operation or lessening of employment by these facilities would have a far-reaching effect.

I hope the committee will not approve the project at this time.

What About the Veterans of World War No. 2?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, these are days of peril to millions of our soldier citizens now standing poised on the brink of the invasion. While every contemplative mind realizes the magnitude of the job to be done none for even a moment has any doubt about the ultimate victory.

How well are our boys trained? How well are they equipped and officered for the attack. The answer to those questions is a matter of heartfelt concern to every man, woman, and child in these United States.

Mr. Speaker, these are equally momentous days for the General Staff of our Army and our Navy. For months that staff has been engaged in coordinated strategic planning, directing task maneuvers and training millions of our men for the titanic struggle impending. Of a certainty we in Congress as well as all at home must steel ourselves for news of losses among our troops. That these losses will be kept to an irreducible minimum has already become evident by the unfolding plan of aerial attack and the enemy destruction by air now under way.

I wonder how many realize that each night more than an entire military division numbering from 12,000 to 15,000 men now penetrate 500 miles into the very heart of the enemy stronghold by way of aerial warfare. Think of the hundreds of divisions or millions of men, the length of time it would take and the losses that we would encounter if our infantry and artillery had to fight their way 500 miles across enemy-held and fortified territory to reach objectives, which under the present plan are attacked again and again every few hours by the men of the Air Corps.

Mr. Speaker, the 1,200 to 1,500 bombers that roar out of hangars in England each 24 hours carry with them the equivalent of a division of infantry or of artillery. They have been and are continuing virtually to put thousands of cannons right up against the belly of the German Army every hour of every day. They are blowing the tracks from under the German railroads. They are blasting the waterworks and their bridges off piers and abutments. They are splintering the very floors from under the feet of factory workers in the Nazi munitions and armament factories and production lines.

Mr. Speaker, it is my studied conviction that when the chronicles of this struggle are spread across the pages of history, to the ingenuity, the sagacity and the planning of the General Staff of the United States Army and Navy will go the honor of having won the most brilliant military victory ever to be achieved by any nation in all history.

The process of "softening up" if not actually destroying every possible enemy defense is now under way. How long before the invasion actually begins, if as yet determined, is a matter known only to a few.

Now Mr. Speaker, a great sage once said: "If you want to get a really important thing done quickly, go to a busy man." It is truly comforting and inspiring, to know that even at such a critical time as this, that one charged with carrying a large part of the burden of responsibility of the Armed Service Forces of the United States in all parts of the world, could and would even now for a moment step out of his character as a military leader long enough to bespeak the great humanism which so long characterized him to his brother officers.

I make reference to a speech made a few days ago by Lieutenant General Somervell, the commanding general of the A. S. F. Weighted as he is by the burden of his charge today—it is highly commendable for him to take time, and spend of his energies to pose the problem of troops that he will take back to these United States in a post-war world.

Speaking in behalf of the wounded and discharged soldiers before the Cleveland Advertising Club, General Somervell said in part:

As commanding general of the Army Service Forces of which the Medical Corps is part, I pledge * * * that every soldier * * * will have the finest medical attention possible and * * * that these wounded soldiers of ours have given and will continue to give so much that whatever we attempt to do for them in return will be all too little.

But no matter how skilled our surgeons, no matter how thoughtful and careful our nurses, there is another element in the care of these wounded men for which we must depend on you * * * the people. It is you, their neighbors, who can make these soldiers realize that they are wanted here, that their suffering and their courage and their patriotism have not been unnoticed and unappreciated. You, by your hospitality, can lighten the load these men must bear.

I know that you only await the opportunity to show them and through them the people of America how deeply you appreciate the sacrifices these soldiers have made. The comfort and cheer and the * * * good warm hospitality that you can offer them will be the medicine they most need.

The Army realizes its duty to these men and it will not shirk that duty! Every effort will be made to repair each broken body and make it as nearly whole as is humanly possible. But even when this has been accomplished our responsibility does not end. When medical science has done all it possibly can do, the Army has a further duty to these men. It recognizes its obligation not only to restore them to civil life at the earliest possible moment, but to help them in their efforts to become self-reliant, self-supporting members of their communities.

To that end the Army Medical Department and the Army Service Forces as a whole are working out a program right now, in conjunction with other government agencies, to aid every individual wounded soldier in reestablishing himself in the civilian world. In cooperation with the Veterans' Administration, Selective Service, the Civil Service and United States Employment offices and the American Red Cross, we rapidly are pushing forward our plans.

It isn't the Army's particular task to fit these wounded men for civil life. We are not legally responsible to any man after we discharge him from the hospital and from the service. Our official duty ends with the process of mustering out.

But let me say, here and now, that the Army recognizes its moral obligation to every man wounded in his country's service, and that we're going to see that obligation through to the end. * * * We're not going to let any bureaucratic barriers stand between the returned, wounded soldier and every comfort and every care that it's possible to give him. We're going to help each individual man, not as a case number, not as a card in the files, but as a human being to whom we owe more than we ever can repay. The Army gladly accepts this responsibility and—the Army isn't going to let a single wounded soldier down.

We have recently established in the Army a division of personal affairs. It is designed to give individual, personalized service of whatever kind is needed to our soldiers and our discharged veterans and their families. It's a place to which our men can turn when they are troubled. In time of peace the Army looks out for its own and I see no reason we shouldn't do the same thing in time of war.

We don't intend to usurp the rights or assume the responsibilities of other governmental agencies. There's enough of a job to be done to keep us all busy. We simply intend to act as the advocate of the individual. We intend to supplement the work the other organizations are doing, not to duplicate or try to do their job. We intend to step in quickly in emergencies. We intend to act fast. Every disabled war veteran is going to have every advantage that the Army can give him and he's going to have that advantage right away.

There aren't going to be any soldier apple sellers on the street corners after this war if we can prevent it, and there aren't going to be any wounded soldiers sleeping in parks or lodged in jails. The best we can do for these men isn't good enough, but we will do our best.

I'm not nearly as much concerned about some soldier getting some advantage he doesn't deserve as I am about a wounded soldier not getting all the advantages he does deserve.

What these men have done for us cannot be added up on any cash register. We've got to keep that fact constantly in mind. We've got to remember that they weren't getting any overtime pay for the 24 hours a day they put in on the battlefront. They weren't laying aside any funds for the reconversion of their lives to peacetime activities after the war. And they didn't lay down their guns when conditions got too hard to bear, either.

They just kept on fighting till they couldn't fight any more.

The spirit in which we tackle the job ahead of us is all important. Helping our wounded soldiers is a privilege, not a chore; it is something to look forward to with pleasure, to accomplish with enthusiasm, and to look back on with satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, in the days to come when we in this House are concerned with the problem of the reconversion and of disposing of Federally owned defense plants, let us remember General Somervell's concern for the men, which he, as Commanding General of the A. S. F., brought into service and trained for battle, and when they had achieved the victory, he brought them back to these States from overseas.

Let us in the spirit in which he spoke remember that the human rights of returning soldiers must be considered far and above the property rights of bond and share holders, even though they be the properties acquired by this Government through the sale of Victory bonds—for without the sacrifices made by our soldiers—both the people and their war plants would have fallen into the bondage of Nazi slavery and supremacy.

Mr. Speaker, let us in this House all join to make good General Somervell's pledge that:

There aren't going to be any soldier apple sellers on the street corners after this war if we can prevent it, and there aren't going to be any wounded soldiers sleeping in parks or lodged in jails. The best we can do for these men isn't good enough, but we will do our best.

Two Great Compacts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we trace proudly the history of our country back to the Mayflower Compact signed by a group of the very first intrepid settlers of this great continent. Those people were called Pilgrims and their landing upon Plymouth Rock is one of the proudest moments in the history of our country.

It is, I think, significant that throughout the Nation members of the Congregational, Christian, and some other churches are now signing, in the interest of world peace, a world-order compact patterned after the historic Mayflower Compact.

This world-order compact was recently signed by all the members of the Community Church at Claremont, California. Among those signing this compact at Claremont were a considerable number of people who make their residence in what is known as Pilgrim Place, a group of homes set aside for retired Christian missionaries. It is also significant that whereas the Mayflower Compact was signed on the rock-bound coast of New England at the eastern extremity of our great country, the signing of this world-order compact by the particular group about whom I am speaking, took place on the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

It is most earnestly to be hoped that the same spirit which guided the first Pilgrims to a safe landing upon Plymouth Rock, may likewise inspire us, that we, led by such devoted people as the residents of Pilgrim Place, may in this modern day establish a true and lasting peace and thus carry forward worthily the work begun here in America by those Pilgrims who first ventured here to build a new world of peace and freedom.

Address by the Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, at a special convocation of Princeton University, June 21, 1944:

Up to today I had always assumed that when any man reached the phase where he received academic degrees without solid scholarly accomplishment he was an obvious candidate for the stuffed shirt club, or, to use the classical name for it, societas pseudo-optimatum, meaning the society of the pompous.

When President Dodds reported the great honor conferred upon me by the board of trustees I demurred because of my belief that the degrees of a great university should be reserved for scholars and gentlemen. I pointed out that I was certainly not a scholar and there was a great deal of dubiety about my being a gentleman. Dr. Dodds, however, with that gentle but firm authority that has characterized his career as the head of Princeton, mildly suggested that I leave the propriety of such awards to the judgment of the trustees, implying possibly that this was one local power not yet garnered by the bureaucrats of Washington. There was no further argument, and so here I am.

One of the collateral advantages to the recipient of such an honor is that, in addition to the honor itself, it is customary for him to make some observations which may or may not prove beneficial to society. I propose to take brief advantage of this. I assume that this audience was not collected by force and that those who succumb to boredom have ready access to many exits.

UPS AND DOWNS BETWEEN WARS

In the 25 years between the first World War and the second, this country went through alternate phases of enlarged ego and abnormal inferiority. In the twenties we thought we had found the answer to the problem of full employment for our people and economic security for the individual—that we were at the beginning of a constantly rising curve of prosperity. In the decade that followed we were attacked by grave misgivings about our economic system and even by some misgivings about our Government, call it democracy, representative-republican government, or what you will.

At times there were even evidences of admiration of Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy. Efficiency, always appealing to the American mind, seemed to be associated with their concepts of government. What those who praised them overlooked was that it was efficiency gained at the sacrifice of human and spiritual values without which the foundations of the state become rotted timber.

There were misgivings about the ability of democracies to fight, to wage war against these superefficient States. Yet democracy has proved to be a match for, and will prove to be the master of, these supermen and their war machines. It was a democracy, England, that "precious stone set in the silver sea," that stood alone between Hitler and a conquered Europe in 1940.

The Russians, after the Germans hit them in 1941, took the full impact of the German power, struck back with a fury and ferocity that amazed the world, and shattered Hitler's great dream of a drive to the east.

But let us never forget it was the little island of England in the summer of 1940 and in the hard and bitter months of 1941 that bore the full brunt of the German Luftwaffe and finally drove it out of the English skies. The pitifully small but gallant forces that England could spare for the campaigns in Greece, Crete, and north Africa were decimated and battered, but never beaten. Let us not forget that although, as someone said to me in London, in that bleak winter of 1941 "there was no light in the tunnel of darkness," the fires of the English spirit never died.

DEMOCRACY IN TRIUMPHANT ACTION

That was democracy. That was the despised, weak and spineless country which the Germans had decided must vanish before the thundering machine of German efficiency. The glorious deeds of the Russian Army can never be forgotten, but it does not detract from its achievement to remind ourselves that it was the English people and the English will that baffled Hitler.

In the Orient another dictatorship, another of the efficient Fascist governments, was preparing a blow against another democracy. The Japanese looked upon us as a great sprawling people afraid to fight, afraid to die, a people who thought of our purses rather than of our honor. At the prepared moment, December 7, 1941, the Japanese struck, while Fascist partners applauded.

And what did this democracy of ours do? It shook itself from its isolation and insulation, took a mighty breath, and went to work. Two years later it had trained and equipped a huge army and a strategic air force greater than that of any other nation. It had built a navy in terms of both sea and air power greater than the combined naval strengths of the rest of the nations of the world. While doing this it turned out munitions of war for its allies as well as itself; it produced ships and material that enabled the British and ourselves to harry the German submarine from the Atlantic; it equipped divisions of the renascent French Army; it helped to feed the peoples of our allies and of North Africa and Italy; it chased—and I say that advisedly in the light of today's news—the Japanese Navy out of the Pacific back close to its home waters and it will continue to chase them.

All of this was done by a nation functioning under that supposedly weak form of government, a democratic government.

These two impotent democracies, England and America, sustained the violent attack of enemies which had been arming for two decades, took the shock, and came back to begin the march with their great Russian ally to the victory which is now in process.

Democracies have proved that they can withstand the shocks of war. Is there reason to lack confidence that with equal will and with equal sacrifice they can withstand the shocks of peace?

AMERICAN ECONOMY SWAMPS AXIS

I have said that in the 25 years between the two World Wars there had grown up misgivings about our Government and about our economy. Neither was perfect, but I submit that they are the rock against which the Axis forces have struck and been splintered. The economy of the United States, even that sometimes abused sphere of activity known as business, produced an industrial organization and a productive machine which have been able to pour out the torrent of weapons which today is swamping our enemies, and I mean that literally. Those vulgar people known as business men, those brash and indecent characters who write advertising to stimulate consumption and create customers—they had created demands and markets which had developed American factories to a productive power that even the national socialism of Hitler, with the full might of his government back of him, could not match.

The American economy and American business in time past built railroads, utilities, created a market for 5,000,000 motor cars, laid the foundations of a gigantic steel industry—and every one of these industrial units has contributed to the winning of the war. They are the framework and the fabric upon which our vast production has been based.

And American labor, which during wartime has been evolving its position in our society, has been awakening to the responsibility which new privileges and power have given it—free American labor has worked in a way that the Axis nations, using the Gestapo and the machine gun as incentives, could not match.

Should we assume that this system which rolled back the tide of the new barbarians of the twentieth century, should we assume that this economy, this Government, will fail in peace?

I don't believe we need make any such assumption. The times ahead are full of varied and complex problems, but they are certainly no darker than those days in the winter of 1941 when, as I have said before, for the British there was no light in the tunnel.

But if democracy is to work when we undertake to wage peace instead of waging war, there are certain affirmations we need to make to ourselves. When we no longer have the driving urge of our national safety to give us unity and common will, there are certain things we shall have to do to give our democracy the health and vigor to meet the great problems of peace. I shall touch on only a few.

PEACETIME NEEDS OUTLINED

First. We shall need to maintain a strong economy. By that I mean an economy healthy in terms of employment, with wages adequate to maintain the consuming power of our 135,000,000 people; an atmosphere of confidence in which businessmen can take those ventures upon which a sound economy must rest; a realization on the part of labor of its new powers and responsibilities and willingness of labor wisely to use that power and to meet those responsibilities.

The Government must do its part, and it will be a big part, in making the transition from war to peace. It must keep some of the controls exercised in war, but it should keep them for as short a time as possible. It may have to make bold and imaginative use of Government credit, but it must do so with the objective of getting the wheels of private enterprise turning as quickly as may be. It must use its powers, which include the use of credit, not with the objective of creating the state socialism which started Hitler and Mussolini on their road to power and ruin, but to return our economy to the general framework of individual effort upon which the country has been built.

Second. We must recognize that we shall be one of the three great anchors of stability in the world. We must continue to be good neighbors, but our good neighborliness must rest upon sound conditions at home, without which the wish to help our neighbors may be an idle wish.

Third. We must face the fact that whether we like it or not we are not immune from the disease of war wherever and whenever war starts in the world. We must face the fact that an act of aggression against China, Poland, or France, or any other country, automatically becomes an act of aggression against ourselves, because such acts are committed by men and nations who recognize only the law of might. We must not allow our own idealism and our hope for a permanent quarantine of war to persuade us to disarm.

WORLD COOPERATION FOR PEACE

Fourth. We must face the fact that while the guaranty of permanent peace can be obtained finally only by some form of world cooperation, it cannot come overnight or spring full-blown from the ideal itself. We must realize that such an organization will have to be built brick by brick. In other words, I suggest that we move surely rather than too swiftly in the building of an international organization which is to provide a permanent framework for peace among nations. There must be some general outline of a pattern toward which we move, but it should be a pattern sufficiently elastic to accommodate itself to reality rather than to force realities into a rigid and inelastic plan. The stairway to the goal of perfect human relations, whether between men or nations, cannot be compassed in a single leap.

Fifth. We must face the fact that while this organization is in the process of construction peace may be obtainable only through the existence of the armed force of the United States and her allies. As Prime Minister Smuts has said, "Peace without power remains a dream." And I suggest here what I am sure you will agree with, that one of the great elements in the pattern of our military power will be that service which I have the high honor to serve, the sea and air power of the United States Navy. We must not destroy our existing naval power when the war is over, or accept limitations upon our ability to add to it, either qualitatively or quantitatively, while others who have no real faith in the possibility of world peace are left free to arm.

Sixth. We must provide the means in some way to create a greater number of trained public servants, men whose task it will be not to create policy but to master the facts and to correlate and state the facts upon which policy is based. This problem must be faced in terms of providing adequate pay, a position of prestige, and retirement security. By so doing I think it is not impossible that we can obtain for the public service men with the same high standards of ability and character as are attracted to service in the Army and Navy.

I suggest we start by increasing the pay and prestige of those who represent us in the Congress of the United States, and that we think twice before we too quickly and too casually reproach these men or subject them to thoughtless pressures. We cannot expect devoted service and high patriotism unless the men we elect to public office can stand or fall on great, not petty, issues.

We face a world in which we must conduct ourselves as adults and not as adolescents. It will be a world which will move at a higher tempo and will not permit us to leave all things to chance rather than to plan. This will require sincere, thoughtful, and wise men in the Congress, and trained men in continuing positions of the executive departments.

Finally, we must see to it that institutions such as this university, with a history closely intertwined with that of the Nation itself, shall have adequate scope for development and service. I am a believer in the part the privately endowed liberal arts college has to play in the Nation and in the world. I believe in it now with a greater conviction than I did when I was a student on this campus. The Navy during this war has seen a great need for specialized and technical training, but it has also recognized the need for developing the character upon which leadership must rest.

In recent years there has been some tendency to introduce sweeping changes in the methods of education; it has gone so far as to be termed in some quarters a "revolution" in education. I am not quite sure what it is designed to achieve, except that I gather in some way it will produce greater scholarship and a more perfectly balanced human thinking machine.

Some of this goes so far as to ridicule games and competitive athletics as a valuable part of college life. I think that these undoubtedly qualified and able proponents of such changes overlook some of the foundations upon which education must be built. The concept of education, it seems to me, means not merely the creation of a good mind, but also a sound body. I am sure that every hour spent at Princeton in games and athletics, whether intercollegiate or intramural, has been productive of practical good for the Nation.

TARAWA CITED AS EXAMPLE

I am reminded of a saying of Admiral Stark, that "guts as well as guns are necessary to win battles." No one can deny that the bruising contacts of football and the physical and spiritual discipline that goes with it have assisted our men in many lands and on many seas. I went to Tarawa last winter, and even though I arrived long after it had been taken, I still could see the intricate and efficient network of defenses built by the Japs, and I marveled at the cold and unflinching courage that drove the marines of the glorious Second Division ashore in the face of the murderous fire of those defenses.

Those qualities are not attributable solely either to a superefficient mental training or to physical development. They come from the combination of the two, which create character—character which can face death against high odds when the chips are down.

The liberal arts college is one of the foundations upon which our democracy is built. It may have to receive some financial aid from the Federal Government, but that aid must never carry with it a mortgage upon intellectual and spiritual freedom. It will help and be helped by the State universities. Its curriculum must return, if our Navy experience is any index, to certain basic compulsory courses rather than allowing complete freedom of selection to its students. It must recover its ability to turn out men soundly trained in mathematics and sciences as well as in the broadening humanities. There may be some argument on this, but I would even like to see Greek and Latin restored to their ancient glory.

The liberal arts college such as Princeton, drawing as it does its students from every State in the Union, embodying, as I know from my own experience on its campus, the broadest and most generous principles of democracy, must continue if a free and developing America is to continue.

American Slovaks of New York Support Fourth War Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the Fourth War Loan drive, thousands of American Slovaks of the State of New York raised over half a million dollars as a result of their energetic, patriotic campaign to do their bit for their country. One of the purposes of the campaign was for the purchase of a Flying Fortress to be named "Slovaks of New York State."

Again, under the leadership of the Reverend Florian C. Billy, O. M. C., pastor of SS. Cyril and Methodius Church, Schenectady, N. Y., State chairman of this drive, American men and women of Slavic descent are demonstrating their loyalty to their country by a house-to-house canvass to raise $6,000,000 in as short a time as possible. From the Thirtieth Congressional District of the State of New York, comprising the counties of Hamilton, Montgomery, Fulton, and Schenectady, canvassers are daily reaching into the homes of various individuals, working toward the completion of the drive. Since the previous drive, many of the sons and daughters of these loyal Americans, who were then serving their country in the armed forces, have paid the supreme sacrifice for their devotion to duty and country. Many of them have performed deeds of valor and heroism that have brought from their superior officers words of praise and commendation. It is thrilling to be able to publicly speak of the patriotic services rendered their country by these individuals, and to place upon the records of their country a testimonial of fidelity and patriotism.

International Monetary Fund Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Lord Keynes on the international monetary fund debate, House of Lords, May 23, 1944:

My Lords, it is almost exactly a year since the proposals for a Clearing Union were discussed in your Lordship's House. I hope to persuade your Lordships that the year has not been ill-spent. There were, it is true, certain features of elegance, clarity, and logic in the Clearing Union plan which have disappeared. And this, by me at least, is to be much regretted. As a result, however, there is no longer any need for a new-fangled international monetary unit. Your Lordships will remember how little any of us liked the names proposed—bancor, unitas, dolphin, bezant, daric, and heaven knows what. Some of your Lordships were good enough to join in the search for something better. I recall a story of a country parish in the last century where they were accustomed to give their children Biblical names—Amos, Ezekiel, Obadiah and so forth. Needing a name for a dog, after a long and vain search of the Scriptures they called the dog "Moreover." We hit no such happy solution, with the result that it has been the dog that died. The loss of the dog we need not too much regret, though I still think that it was a more thoroughbred animal than what has now come out from a mixed marriage of ideas. Yet, perhaps, as sometimes occurs, this dog of mixed origin is a sturdier and more serviceable animal and will prove not less loyal and faithful to the purposes for which it has been bred.

I commend the new plan to your Lordships as being, in some important respects (to which I will return later), a considerable improvement on either of its parents. I like this new plan and I believe that it will work to our advantage. Your Lordships will not wish me to enter into too much technical detail. I can best occupy the time available by examining the major benefits this country may hope to gain from the plan; and whether there are adequate safeguards against possible disadvantages. We shall emerge from this war, having won a more solid victory over our enemies, a more enduring friendship from our allies, and a deeper respect from the world at large, than perhaps at any time in our history. The victory, the friendship, and the respect will have been won, because, in spite of faint-hearted preparations, we have sacrificed every precaution for the future in the interests of immediate strength with a fanatical single-mindedness which has had few parallels. But the full price of this has still to be paid. I wish that this was more generally appreciated in the country than it is. In thus waging the war without counting the ultimate cost we—and we alone of the United Nations—have burdened ourselves with a weight of deferred indebtedness to other countries beneath which we shall stagger. We have already given to the common cause all, and more than all, that we can afford. It follows that we must examine any financial plan to make sure that it will help us to carry our burdens and not add to them. No one is more deeply convinced of this than I am. I make no complaint, therefore, that those to whom the details of the scheme are new and difficult, should scrutinize them with anxious concern.

What, then, are these major advantages that I hope from the plan to the advantage of this country? First, it is clearly recognized and agreed that, during the post-war transitional period of uncertain duration, we are entitled to retain any of those wartime restrictions, and special arrangements with the sterling area and others which are helpful to us, without being open to the charge of acting contrary to any general engagements into which we have entered. Having this assurance, we can make our plans for the most difficult days which will follow the war, knowing where we stand and without risk of giving grounds of offense. This is a great gain—and one of the respects in which the new plan is much superior to either of its predecessors, which did not clearly set forth any similar safeguards.

Second, when this period is over and we are again strong enough to live year by year on our own resources, we can look forward to trading in a world of national currencies which are interconvertible. For a great commercial Nation like ourselves this is indispensable for full prosperity. Sterling itself, in due course, must obviously become, once again, generally convertible. For, without this, London must necessarily lose its international position, and the arrangements in particular of the sterling area would fall to pieces. To suppose that a system of bilateral and barter agreements, with no one who owns sterling knowing just what he can do with it—to suppose that this is the best way of encouraging the Dominions to center their financial systems on London, seems to me pretty near frenzy. As a technique of little Englandism, adopted as a last resort when all else has failed us, with this small country driven to autarchy, keeping itself to itself in a harsh and unfriendly world, it might make more sense. But those who talk this way, in the expectation that the rest of the Commonwealth will throw in their lot on these lines and cut their free commercial relations with the rest of the world, can have very little idea how this Empire has grown or by what means it can be sustained.

So far from an international plan endangering the long tradition, by which most Empire countries, and many other countries, too, have centered their financial systems in London, the plan is, in my judgment, an indispensable means of maintaining this tradition. With our own resources so greatly impaired and encumbered, it is only if sterling is firmly placed in an international setting that the necessary confidence in it can be sustained. Indeed, even during the transitional period, it will be our policy, I hope, steadily to develop the field within which sterling is freely available as rapidly as we can manage. Now, if our own goal is, as it surely must be, the general interconvertibility of sterling with other currencies, it must obviously be to our trading advantage that the same obtains elsewhere, so that we can sell our exports in one country and freely spend the proceeds in any other. It is a great gain to us, in particular, that other countries in the world should agree to refrain from those discriminatory exchange practices which we ourselves have never adopted in times of peace but from which in the recent past our traders have suffered greatly at the hands of others. My noble friend, Lord Addison, has asked whether such an arrangement could be operated in such a way that certain markets might be closed to British exports. I can firmly assure him that none of the monetary proposals will do so, provided that if we find ourselves with currencies in a foreign country which we do not choose to spend in that country, we can then freely remit them somewhere else to buy goods in another country. There is no compulsion on us, and if we choose to come to a particular bargain in the country where we have resources, then that is entirely at our discretion.

Third, the wheels of trade are to be oiled by what is, in effect, a great addition to the world's stock of monetary reserves, distributed, moreover, in a reasonable way. The quotas are not so large as under the Clearing Union, and Lord Addison drew attention to that. But they are substantial and can be increased subsequently if the need is shown. The aggregate for the world is put provisionally at £2,500,000,000. Our own share of this—for ourselves and the Crown Colonies which, I may mention, are treated for all purposes as a part of the British monetary system (in itself a useful acknowledgment)—is £325,000,000, a sum which may easily double, or more than double, the reserves which we shall otherwise hold at the end of the transitional period. The separate quotas of the rest of the sterling area will make a further large addition to this. Who is so confident of the future that he will wish

to throw away so comfortable a supplementary aid in time of trouble? Do the critics think it preferable, if the winds of the trade cycle blow, to diminish our demand for imports by increasing unemployment at home, rather than meet the emergency out of this fund which will be expressly provided for such temporary purposes?

I emphasize that such is the purpose of the quotas. They are not intended as daily food for us or any other country to live upon during the reconstruction or afterwards. Provision for that belongs to another chapter of international cooperation, upon which we shall embark shortly unless you discourage us unduly about this one. The quotas for drawing on the fund's resources are an iron ration to tide over temporary emergencies of one kind or another. Perhaps this is the best reply I can make to Lord Addison's doubts whether our quota is large enough. It is obviously not large enough for us to live upon during the reconstruction period. But this is not its purpose. Pending further experience, it is, in my judgment, large enough for the purposes for which it is intended.

There is another advantage to which I would draw your Lordships' special attention. A proper share of responsibility for maintaining equilibrium in the balance of international payments is squarely placed on the creditor countries. This is one of the major improvements in the new plan. The Americans, who are the most likely to be affected by this, have, of their own free will and honest purpose, offered us a far-reaching formula of protection against a recurrence of the main cause of deflation during the interwar years, namely, the draining of reserves out of the rest of the world to pay a country which was obstinately borrowing and exporting on a scale immensely greater than it was lending and importing. Under clause VI of the plan a country engages itself, in effect, to prevent such a situation from arising again, by promising, should it fail, to release other countries from any obligation to take its exports, or, if taken, to pay for them. I cannot imagine that this sanction would ever be allowed to come into effect. If by no other means, than by lending, the creditor country will always have to find a way to square the account on imperative grounds of its own self-interest. For it will no longer be entitled to square the account by squeezing gold out of the rest of us. Here we have a voluntary undertaking, genuinely offered in the spirit both of a good neighbor and, I should add, of enlightened self-interest, not to allow a repetition of a chain of events which between the wars did more than any other single factor to destroy the world's economic balance and to prepare a seedbed for foul growths. This is a tremendous extension of international cooperation to good ends. I pray your Lordships to pay heed to its importance.

Fifth, the plan sets up an international institution with substantial rights and duties to preserve orderly arrangements in matters such as exchange rates which are two-ended and affect both parties alike, which can also serve as a place of regular discussion between responsible authorities to find ways to escape those many unforeseeable dangers which the future holds. The noble lord, Lord Addison, asks how the fund is to be managed. Admittedly, this is not yet worked out in the necessary detail and it was right that he should stress the point. But three points which may help him are fairly clear. This is an organization between governments, in which central banks only appear as the instrument and agent of their government. The voting power of the British Commonwealth and that of the United States are expected to be approximately equal. The management will be in three tiers, a body of expert, whole-time officials who will be responsible for the routine; a small board of management which will make all decisions of policy subject to any overriding instructions from the assembly; an assembly of all the member governments, meeting less often and retaining a supervisory, but not an executive, control. That is perhaps even a little better than appears.

Here are five advantages of major importance. The proposals go far beyond what, even a short time ago, anyone could have conceived of as a possible basis of general international agreement. What alternative is open to us which gives comparable aid, or better, more hopeful opportunities for the future? I have considerable confidence that something very like this plan will be in fact adopted, if only on account of the plain demerits of the alternative of rejection. You can talk against this plan, so long as it is a matter of talking—saying in the same breath that it goes too far and that it does not go far enough; that it is too rigid to be safe and that it is too loose to be worth anything. But it would require great foolhardiness to reject it, much more foolhardiness than is to be found in this wise, intuitive country.

Therefore, for these manifold and substantial benefits I commend the monetary proposals to your lordships. Nevertheless, before you will give them your confidence, you will wish to consider whether, in return, we are surrendering anything which is vital for the ordering of our domestic affairs in the manner we intend for the future. My Lords, the experience of the years before the war has led most of us, though some of us late in the day, to certain firm conclusions. Three, in particular, are highly relevant to this discussion. We are determined that in future the external value of sterling shall conform to its internal value as set by our own domestic policies and not the other way round. Secondly, we intend to retain control of our domestic rate of interest, so that we can keep it as low as suits our own purposes, without interference from the ebb and flow of international capital movements or flights of hot money. Thirdly, whilst we intend to prevent inflation at home, we will not accept deflation at the dictate of influences from outside. In other words, we abjure the instruments of bank rate and credit contraction operating through the increase of unemployment as a means of forcing our domestic economy into line with external factors.

Have those responsible for the monetary proposals been sufficiently careful to preserve these principles from the possibility of interference? I hope your Lordships will trust me not to have turned my back on all I have fought for. To establish those three principles which I have just stated has been my main task for the last 20 years. Sometimes almost alone, in popular articles in the press, in pamphlets, in dozens of letters to the Times, in textbooks, in enormous and obscure treatises I have spent my strength to persuade my countrymen and the world at large to change their traditional doctrines and, by taking better thought, to remove the curse of unemployment. Was it not I, when many of today's iconoclasts were still worshippers of the calf, who wrote that "Gold is a barbarous relic"? Am I so faithless, so forgetful, so senile that at the very moment of the triumph of these ideas when, with gathering momentum, governments, Parliaments, banks, the press, the public, and even economists have at last accepted the new doctrines, I go off to help forge new chains to hold us fast in the old dungeon? I trust, my lords, that you will not believe it.

Let me take first the less prominent of the two issues which arise in this connection. Namely, our power to control the domestic rate of interest so as to secure a cheap money. Not merely as a feature of the transition, but as a permanent arrangement, the plan accords to every member Government the explicit right to control all capital movements. What used to be a heresy is now endorsed as orthodox. In my own judgment, countries which avail themselves of this right may find it nesessary to scrutinize all transactions, so as to prevent evasion of capital regulations. Provided that the innocent, current transactions are let through, there is nothing in the plan to prevent this. In fact, it is encouraged. It follows that our right to control the domestic capital market is secured on firmer foundations than ever before, and is formally accepted as a proper part of agreed international arrangements.

The question, however, which has recently been given chief prominence is whether we are in any sense returning to the disabilities of the former gold standard, relief from which we have rightly learned to prize so highly. If I have any authority to pronounce on which is and what is not the essence and meaning of a gold standard, I should say that this plan is the exact opposite of it. The plan in its relation to gold is, indeed, very close to proposals which I advocated in vain as the right alternative, when I was bitterly opposing this country's return to gold. The gold standard, as I understand it, means a system under which the external value of a national currency is rigidly tied to a fixed quantity of gold which can only honorably be broken under force majeure; and it involves a financial policy which compels the internal value of the domestic currency to conform to this external value as fixed in terms of gold. On the other hand, the use of gold merely as a convenient common denominator by means of which the relative values of national currencies—these being free to change—are expressed from time to time, is obviously quite another matter.

My noble friend, Lord Addison, asks who fixes the value of gold. If he means, as I assume he does, the sterling value of gold, it is we, ourselves, who fix it initially in consultation with the fund; and this value is subject to change at any time on our initiative, changes in excess of 10 percent requiring the approval of the fund, which must not withhold approval if our domestic equilibrium requires it. There must be some price for gold; and so long as gold is used as a monetary reserve it is most advisable that the current rates of exchange and the relative values of gold in different currencies should correspond. The only alternative to this would be the complete demonetization of gold. I am not aware that anyone has proposed that. For it is only common sense as things are today to continue to make use of gold and its prestige as a means of settling international accounts. To demonetize gold would obviously be highly objectionable to the British Commonwealth and to Russia as the main producers, and to the United States and the western allies as the main holders of it. Surely no one disputes that. On the other hand, in this country we have already dethroned gold as the fixed standard of value. The plan not merely confirms the dethronement but approves it by expressly providing that it is the duty of the fund to alter the gold value of any currency if it is shown that this will be serviceable to equilibrium.

In fact, the plan introduces in this respect an epoch-making innovation in an international instrument, the object of which is to lay down sound and orthodox principles, for instead of maintaining the principle that the internal value of a national currency should conform to a prescribed de jure external value, it provides that its external value should be altered if necessary so as to conform to whatever defacto internal value results from domestic policies, which themselves shall be immune from criticism by the fund. Indeed, it is made the duty of the fund to approve changes which will have this effect. That is why I say that these proposals are the exact opposite of the gold standard. They lay down by international agreement the essence of the new doctrine, far removed from the old orthodoxy. If they do so in terms as inoffensive as possible to the former faith, need we complain?

No, my Lords, in recommending these proposals I do not blot a page already written. I am trying to help write a new page. Public opinion is now converted to a new model, and I believe a much improved model, of domestic policy. That battle is all but won. Yet a not less difficult task still remains, namely, to organize an international setting within which the new domestic policies can occupy a comfortable place. Therefore, it is above all as providing an international framework for the new ideas and the new techniques associated with the policy of full employment that these proposals are not least to be welcomed.

Last week my noble friend, Lord Bennett, asked what assumptions the experts might be making about other phases of international agreement. I do not believe that the soundness of these foundations depends very much on the details of the superstructure. If the rest of the issues to be discussed are wisely settled, the task of the monetary fund will be rendered easier. But if we gain less assistance from other measures than we now hope, an agreed machinery of adjustment on the monetary side will be all the more necessary. I am certain that this is not a case of putting the cart before the horse. I think it most unlikely that fuller knowledge about future commercial policy would in itself make it necessary to alter any clause whatever in the proposals now before your Lordships' House. But if the noble Viscount meant that these proposals need supplementing in other directions, no one could agree with him more than I do. In particular, it is urgent that we should seek agreement about setting up an international investment institution to provide funds for reconstruction and afterward. It is precisely because there is so much to do in the way of international collaboration in the economic field that it would be so disastrous to discourage this first attempt, or to meet it in a carping, suspicious, or cynical mood.

The noble Lord, Lord Addison, has called the attention of your Lordships to the striking statement made by Mr. Hull in connection with the National Foreign Trade Week in the United States, and I am very glad that he did so. This statement is important as showing that the policy of the United States Administration on various issues of political and economic preparation forms a connected whole. I am certain that the people of this country are of the same mind as Mr. Hull, and I have complete confidence that he on his side will seek to implement the details with disinterestedness and generosity. If the experts of the American and British Treasuries have pursued the monetary discussions with more ardor, with a clearer purpose and, I think, with more success so far than has yet proved possible with other associated matters, need we restrain them? If, however, there is a general feeling, as I think that there is, that discussion on other matters should be expedited, so that we may have a complete picture before us, I hope that your Lordships will enforce this conclusion in no uncertain terms. I myself have never supposed that in the final outcome the monetary proposals should stand by themselves.

It is on this note of emphasizing the importance of furthering all genuine efforts directed toward international agreement in the economic field that I should wish to end my contribution to this debate. The proposals which are before your Lordships are the result of the collaboration of many minds and the fruit of the collective wisdom of the experts of many nations. I have spent many days and weeks in the past year in the company of experts of this country, of the Dominions, of our European Allies and of the United States; and, in the light of some past experience I affirm that these discussions have been without exception a model of what such gatherings should be—objective, understanding, without waste of time or expense of temper. I dare to speak for the much abused so-called experts. I even venture sometimes to prefer them, without intending any disrespect, to politicians. The common love of truth, bred of a scientific habit of mind, is the closest of bonds between the representatives of divers nations.

I wish I could draw back the veil of anonymity and give their due to the individuals of the most notable group with which I have ever been associated, covering half the nations of the world, who from prolonged and difficult consultations, each with their own interests to protect, have emerged, as we all of us know and feel in our hearts, a band of brothers. I should like to pay a particular tribute to the representatives of the United States Treasury and the State Department and the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, whose genuine and ready consideration for the difficulties of others, and whose idealistic and unflagging pursuit of a better international order, made possible so great a measure of agreement. I at any rate have come out from a year thus spent greatly encouraged, encouraged beyond all previous hope and expectation, about the possibility of just and honorable and practical economic arrangements between nations.

Do not discourage us. Perhaps we are laying the first brick, though it may be a colorless one, in a great edifice. If, indeed, it is our purpose to draw back from international cooperation and to pursue an altogether different order of ideas, the sooner that this is made clear the better; but that, I believe, is the policy of only a small minority, and for my part I am convinced that we cannot on those terms remain a great power and the mother of a commonwealth. If, on the other hand, such is not our purpose, let us clear our minds of excessive doubts and suspicions and go forward cautiously by all means, but with the intention of reaching agreement.

Who Can Answer This Question?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks I have been endeavoring to find someone among the Bye Boys or the bright young economists who could give one single reason why more milk subsidy per hundredweight is paid in one State than is paid in another State.

The planners even have two different subsidies within one State.

The following letter shows the subsidies by States:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 19, 1944.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR REID: This is in reply to your letter of June 3, requesting a list of the dairy production payment rates in the various States and the rates proposed beginning September 1, 1944.

The rates on butterfat are now 6 cents per pound in all States. They will be increased to 10 cents per pound in all States on September 1, 1944.

On whole milk sold, the rates per hundred pounds now vary from 35 cents to 65 cents, with the following States in the indicated rate zones:

1. Thirty-five cents: Tennessee (except 2 counties), Idaho (except 10 counties), Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky.

2. Forty-five cents: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama (except 2 counties), Mississippi, Louisiana, 2 counties in southwestern Tennessee, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, California (except 8 counties), Oregon, Washington, and 10 counties in northern Idaho.

3. Fifty-five cents: Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, and 8 counties in southern California.

4. Sixty-five cents: North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and 2 counties in southern Alabama.

All of these rates on milk will be increased by 25 cents per hundred pounds on September 1, 1944, to levels of 60, 70, 80, and 90 cents for the areas indicated.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, the place to get increased milk production for the Nation is where they have the cows, where they have the families to care for them, instead of where they depend upon $200 per month hired help; and where they have the equipment and transportation needed to handle and process the product. It is hoped that sometime, somewhere, someone will realize there is not much in 100 pounds of milk that is not in 10 pounds of cheese, 50 cans of evaporated milk, or in 5 pounds of butter, plus 8 pounds of powdered skim milk.

The difference in subsidies is all the more questionable when one realizes that the States receiving the large subsidies had a ceiling on protein feeds as much as $10 per ton less than the fixed ceiling price on protein feeds in the States receiving the smaller subsidies. Such unfair procedures may be in keeping with the wishes of the Governor of North Carolina, but they do not make sense to one who believes in rulings and laws for all and not for the few.

Should We Lend-Lease the New Deal Purge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSIE SUMNER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker should we lend-lease the New Deal purge?

Apparently the new dealers including the State Department have started to try to purge members of the British Parliament for saying the same thing some of us Members of the United States Congress said at the time about the way President Roosevelt was dragging our country into war before Pearl Harbor.

Perhaps international alienation of affections can be averted if it is pointed out now that the purge did not work successfully against Americans—indeed,

quite the contrary. Probably it will not work against the British either. The purge in Britain might be quite a job because Sir Oliver Lyttelton will not be the only member of Parliament, nor even the only member of the Cabinet, unable to repress his feelings. For instance, the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, in effect said the same thing in Parliament on January 28, 1942, as follows:

> It has been the policy of the cabinet at almost all costs to avoid embroilment with Japan until we were sure that the United States would also be engaged. On the other hand, the probability since the Atlantic Conference, at which I discussed these matters with President Roosevelt, that the United States, even if not herself attacked, would come into the war in the Far East and thus make the final victory assured, seemed to allay some of these anxieties, and that expectation has not been falsified by the events.

In other words they "planned it that way."

Can You Explain This?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the cheese industry in Wisconsin has made every effort to increase production, but there are so many performances taking place in the various governmental agencies it is most difficult for the industry to maintain itself.

In 1942 we saw the United States Department of Agriculture promise one thing and do another; we saw the Food Distribution Administration arbitrarily take 3 cents per pound off the price of cheese after the producer was given certain definite promises. We saw the Secretary of Agriculture fix the price of cheese in December 1942 without consulting the cheesemakers, the farmer, or the industry when the law stated that he should. The O. P. A., through its freight-rate set-up, arranged prices so that some States get 2 cents per pound more for their cheese than Wisconsin farmers. We now see, and have seen, the War Food Administration pay a milk subsidy in some States of 65 cents per hundredweight, and in Wisconsin they pay 35 cents, or on a 10-pound-per-hundredweight-cheese yield per 100 pounds of milk—an advantage of 30 cents per hundredweight, or 3 cents per pound for the cheese. I ask if there is any reason to be surprised to learn that while some other States show an increase in cheese production, Wisconsin is either just holding its own or falling below last year's production figures?

Is it any surprise to find the following classified ad in the June 15, 1944, issue of the Waupaca County Post of Waupaca, Wis.:

> Wanted: Two licensed cheesemakers, American cheddar, work in California, family transportation paid, $200 per month, Army production work at present, post-war security, W. M. C. rules apply. Apply United States Employment Service, City Hall, Appleton, Wis.

If California is provided a larger subsidy for milk and is set up to receive 2 cents more per pound for its cheese, as a result of the rail charge differential, is it any wonder that they can use the United States Employment Service to get them some cheesemakers from Wisconsin, where the governmental agencies have put their unfair and senseless rulings into operation? After these unfair rulings have been set up is it not all the more ridiculous to see another governmental agency, such as the U. S. E. S., to which millions of dollars have been appropriated to solve the manpower problem, become a party to such an unjust approach to the problem of food production. It becomes more apparent each day that we have too many fiber boys carrying on the food program. This should be given the personal attention of the Manpower Commissioner.

Nearly 200 small cheese factories have already been closed in Wisconsin and additional closings can be expected as the planners entice the needed supply of Wisconsin cheesemakers to other States where the governmental agencies fix higher prices and larger subsidies. This is especially true when we realize that the States with high subsidies had a ceiling on protein feed which was $10 per ton below the ceiling price in the States receiving the lower subsidies.

Correspondence Between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the exchange of letters, dated June 17, 1944, between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Poland, His Excellency Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, prior to his departure from this country:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
June 16, 1944.

His Excellency STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK,
Prime Minister of Poland.

MY DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: I wish to take this opportunity, just before your departure, to wish you a safe return after your most welcome visit to Washington.

I particularly desire to express to you the pleasure I have had in seeing you again, which enabled me to have most frank, sincere, and friendly exchanges of views with you on the many questions which are of mutual interest to us.

I need hardly tell you how much the American people admire the courage and fortitude of the Polish people, who for almost 5 years have borne with brave and stout hearts the cruel hardships of war and oppression. Their steadfast determination to be free again and the indomitable spirit of their fighting men constitute the best pledge that Poland shall reassume her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

The forces of liberation are on the march to certain victory and the establishment of a peace based upon the principles of freedom, democracy, mutual understanding, and security for all liberty-loving people.

Permit me to express again how much I appreciated the opportunity of renewing our acquaintance. I feel that such personal exchanges of views cannot but contribute to mutual understanding.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. President, I am deeply touched and most sincerely grateful for the great kindness and hospitality which I have received from you during my visit. May I thank you from the bottom of my heart for all the proofs of your kindness and for giving me so many opportunities of seeing you and of having frank talks with you on the vital subjects and problems which affect Poland and Europe now and after this war.

I should like to thank you not only for your most friendly and kind reception but especially for your deep and so broad approach to the problems of the future.

The ideals and principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the "four freedoms" of which you are the initiator are for us Poles in our hard fight for the speedy liberation of our country that encouragement and inspiration which we most need on our way of struggle, suffering, and work.

The loss of individual freedom and of all that man possessed has strengthened in the Polish people their love, respect, and yearning for that freedom. The fate of the people shared by all social classes irrespective of their origin and religion has brought man closer to man in my country so strongly that it has cemented the foundations of democracy and created the conditions necessary to mutual understanding and collaboration. This love of freedom increases the striving to make it secure when, after the final victory, it will be necessary to build new foundations for nations and peace-loving peoples.

I leave greatly impressed by the conversations which I was privileged to have with you, by your views, and your wide knowledge of human and national problems.

I would be very happy if the few modest suggestions which you gave me the opportunity of contributing in our talks could even in the slightest way serve the common cause and be of some use to you, Mr. President, who is leading your Nation in this great fight for the common cause together with your allies, giving so much of yourself and carrying so great a responsibility as regards the fulfillment if the ideals with which you have inspired the hearts of the soldiers and fighters for freedom.

Accept, Mr. President, the assurances of my deepest gratitude and of my highest consideration.

S. MIKOLAJCZYK.

Part of Congressman Philbin's Record of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I have prepared a chronological summary of part of my record of service.

January 1943: P. A. W. takes steps to increase supplies of fuel oil in Boston area as result strong appeal by Congressman PHILBIN.

The Petroleum Administrator for War allocates additional shipments of fuel oil to Ware as result strong plea made by Congressman PHILBIN following receipt of wire on January 15, 1943, from Joseph J. Barbiaz, Chairman, Fuel Oil Panel, Rationing Board, Ware.

January 1943: Congressman PHILBIN is assured by P. A. W. that a 25 percent cut in fuel oil for the municipal lighting plant at Hudson will be rescinded so that war industries in that community and in nearby Stow may continue to produce a steady flow of war supplies. Some 10 important war industries would have been seriously affected by the proposed cut.

[From the Worcester Telegram]

HUDSON AVERTS OIL SHORTAGE THREAT—ACTION OF REPRESENTATIVE PHILBIN CREDITED WITH KEEPING WAR PLANTS GOING

HUDSON, January 9.—A serious threat to local war industries because of the fuel oil shortage was temporarily averted this afternoon by the prompt action of Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, according to Manager Thomas Walsh, manager of department. Representative PHILBIN succeeded in having the usual monthly allotment of fuel oil released to the municipal light and power plant after plant officials had been notified their allotment would have to be cut 25 percent.

Manager Walsh had announced earlier today that he had been notified by his suppliers of the cut. Such a reduction would have seriously hampered the war effort, as there are some 10 industries here engaged in war production and dependent upon the local light and power department for electricity.

APPEALS SENT OUT

As a result of this notice, officials immediately sent appeals to all New England Representatives and Senators in Washington seeking relief. According to word received here, Representative PHILBIN, recently seated, contacted the First Service Command Ordnance Department in Boston and told officials there of the serious consequence that would develop unless some relief was given. As a result, the Sun Oil Co., which furnished the oil, was contacted and agreed to release the full quota for this month at least.

In addition to a possible curtailment of war production, local citizens and the entire poulation of the town of Maynard would have been affected. Maynard purchases electricity with which to run its pumping station to furnish the town's water supply from White Pond. If this circuit had to be shut off, it would mean that the town would be without water.

Local officials stated that the relief received today was only temporary and the outlook for next month remained gloomy. As a result, all citizens were asked to conserve electricity, and one street light circuit on the south side of Main street was not turned on tonight.

The plant consumes approximately 4,500 gallons of fuel oil per day, or about 135,000 gallons a month. According to the notice received from the suppliers, the monthly amount was to have been cut by 30,000 gallons.

THREE HAVE WON E AWARD

Of the plants engaged in war production, three have already been awarded the Army-Navy E for excellence in production. They are the Lapointe Machine Tool Co., the Universal Boring Co., and the Victory Plastics Co.

Manager Walsh said it would be next to impossible to convert to coal because of the huge expenditure involved. The plant operates with Diesel engines. A new one was recently installed at a cost of more than a quarter of a million dollars.

It was announced that it might be possible for some of the plants involved to switch to the New England Power Co., but this plan would mean a complete shutdown for as much as a week or more. Manager Walsh said that it would take nearly a month for the local power plant to switch to the New England Power Co. to obtain electricity and relay it to consumers.

February, 1943: Congressman PHILBIN obtained oil for Arden Mills, Fitchburg, so that operations could be resumed after plant had been closed by oil shortage.

[From the Worcester Telegram]

FITCHBURG MILL TO RESUME FULL-TIME OPERATIONS

FITCHBURG, February 24.—All employees of the Arden Mill of the American Woolen Co. will return to work on a full-time basis tomorrow, it was announced tonight by Percy L. Schutt, resident agent.

The mill, which manufactures cloth for the armed services, has been only partially operated since Monday night, due to lack of adequate supplies of fuel oil.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, wired the local management tonight that an agreement has been reached by company headquarters and the War Production Board, so that the mill will be furnished with sufficient oil to carry on until the plant's heating and power system can be converted from the use of oil to coal. The plant employs about 540 persons.

February 1943: A serious situation is averted in the Warrens, Spencer, and the Brookfields when Congressmen PHILBIN obtains vitally needed allocation of fuel oil from P. A. W. for many homes in that area. "As spokesman for the group which wired you relative to the fuel oil crisis, may we express our deep appreciation for your very prompt reply and report. It gives us the feeling that we have a public servant in Washington, who is on the job watching out for our interests," writes Harlow E. Jones, of West Brookfield.

February 1943: Congressman PHILBIN assists woodworking plants in the Gardner area in obtaining contracts from Smaller War Plants Corporation.

February 1943: Congressman PHILBIN obtains assurances from War Department and Petroleum Administrator for War that an uninterrupted supply of fuel oil will be maintained for Uxbridge mills doing war work. "The Waucantuck Mills organization is fully cognizant of the untiring efforts you are exerting in behalf of this mill to enable us to maintain our part in the war production plan. It is certainly a reassuring and encouraging factor to know that our Member of Congress is so vitally interested in our effort. We appreciate it deeply." Thus writes Edward D. Brady, vice president of this company.

March 1943: Congressman PHILBIN cooperates with firemen stationed at Fort Devens, in adjusting pay situation at that Army post.

April 1943: Congressman PHILBIN obtains assurances from National War Labor Board that it will consider a petition for reconsideration of its original decision, disapproving a wage increase for members of the Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees, A. F. of L., Fitchburg and Leominster Local.

April 1943: Congressman PHILBIN helps in obtaining priorities for truck for Hudson Highway Department.

May 1943: Congressman PHILBIN seeks extension of bus service by Worcester Street Railway Co. for residents of Douglas and East Douglas.

May 1943: Congressman PHILBIN cooperates with Three Rivers Chamber of Commerce in seeking to halt removal of a spur track from main line of Boston & Albany Railroad to Bondsville.

May 1943: Congressman PHILBIN cooperates with city officials of Gardner in having airport used by Civil Air Patrol.

May 1943: Congressman PHILBIN makes strong plea for W. P. A. workers losing annual leave with discontinuance of W. P. A. Some 3,000 workers all over the country affected.

June 1943: Congressman PHILBIN helps to alleviate serious corn and feed shortages in third district. He obtains part of shipment of wheat moving in from Canada via Great Lakes.

June 1943: Congressman PHILBIN obtains 200 rolls of turkey netting for members of Massachusetts Turkey Growers Association.

[From the Marlboro Enterprise]

SHIPMENT OF POULTRY WIRE HAS ARRIVED—TO BE USED BY TURKEY GROWERS; APPROVED BY W. P. B.

MARLBORO.—Attorney Fred L. Williams, president of the Massachusetts Turkey Growers Association, announced that the first carload of poultry wire has arrived here at the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad station since restrictions were placed on its manufacture. It was shipped from Joliet, Ill.

Congressman PHILBIN, of Clinton, was contacted by the association and he in turn got in touch with the War Production Board and persuaded them to release the wire. Marlboro will be used as the distribution center for the wire.

The turkey is a big source of food and it consumes less food than any bird or animal for the amount that they produce. The Government has asked the Nation's turkey growers to provide 10,000,000 pounds of meat for shipment to the men overseas, and the Massachusetts growers have been called on to produce 400,000 pounds.

June 1943: Congressman PHILBIN obtains necessary priority from War Production Board to install necessary lighting for municipal parking lot at Marlboro, obtaining a favorable review of application following preliminary disapproval by the W. P. B. in May. The War Production Board gives permission to the Worcester County Electric Co., of Southbridge, to install necessary street lighting on Lebanon and Snow Streets in that community. Congressman PHILBIN receives plea from Southbridge town officials on June 17 and War Production Board gives permission to use necessary critical materials on June 19, 1943, following intercession of Mr. PHILBIN. Earlier application had been disapproved.

July 1943: Congressman PHILBIN helps to obtain Army troops to harvest apple crop in central Massachusetts.

[From Webster Times of July 8, 1943]

ENLISTED PERSONNEL MAY BE USED TO HARVEST CROPS—CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN'S STATEMENT

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 8.—Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, today was assured by Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, the Adjutant General, that in the event of an emergency in Webster and surrounding communities due to the shortage of available farm labor, enlisted personnel stationed in the Massachusetts area could be called upon to help harvest threatened crops.

As a result of Mr. PHILBIN'S inquiries concerning the possibility of using the services of men in the armed forces to help farmers in this section because of the serious shortage of farm labor throughout the State, the commanding officers of all posts, camps, stations, divisions, and lower separate units of the United States Army located in Massachusetts and other New England States, have been authorized to permit soldiers to engage in farm work in communities within easy traveling distance of the various Army units during normal off-duty periods.

In the event of the threatened loss of a crop, these same commanding officers were authorized to grant passes for farm labor purposes not to exceed 3 days on any one occasion.

Mr. PHILBIN said that many discussions were held by the Committee on Military Affairs, of which he is a member, on the vital problem during the past few months, and stated that he was very much pleased with the helpful and cooperative attitude of War Department officials. The provisions, under which the farm labor plan will operate in this area, were outlined at length in General Ulio's letter to Congressman PHILBIN, excerpts of which follow:

"This service is contingent upon the fact that the soldier concerned desires permission or a pass; such action will not interfere with the customary employment and regular engagement in farm work of local civilians; will not interfere seriously with training, and no expense to the Government will be involved.

"Farmers or farm organizations in need of emergency aid in harvesting crops should contact the commanding officer of the nearest military establishment.

"In cases of extreme emergency to prevent the loss or destruction of a food crop vital to the war effort, a plan has been worked out by the War Manpower Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Department whereby troops as units may be used as farm labor. A pertinent provision states that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission will receive from the Secretary of Agriculture and review requests for use of troops in cases of this nature. The requests are evaluated in accordance with carefully worked out standards and if the War Manpower Commission determines the situation to be an emergency and other means are not available, it then certifies the requests for use of troops to the War Department for consideration."

Congressman PHILBIN added that he would be pleased to cooperate fully with all local groups seeking assistance from the various field commanders in the Massachusetts area for the use of troops for farm labor.

"I am gratified with General Ulio's pledge of cooperation in harvesting crops," said Representative PHILBIN. "It is high time some responsible government official gave constructive, helpful attention to the sorry plight of our farmers, small businessmen and consumers. But this concession is merely a palliative. I will press for more basic and far-reaching remedies."

July 1943: PHILBIN is the only Member of Congress from Massachusetts to protest the bombing of Rome.

August 1943: Congressman PHILBIN cooperated with town officials of Hudson in helping obtain release of a new fire truck for that community. Equipment finally obtained at a later date.

August 1943: Congressman PHILBIN assists town officials to obtain town water project for Hudson. Necessary priorities obtained from W. P. B. and final approval obtained from F. W. A., in conjunction with efforts of Senator WALSH.

August 1943: PHILBIN only Massachusetts Member of Congress to intercede with Children's Bureau of United States Department of Labor so that Federal funds may be made available for emergency maternity and child care benefits to wives of Massachusetts servicemen. Constituent makes inquiry concerning the E. M. I. C. on August 13. Is advised August 17, that Massachusetts has not yet made application for these funds. Cooperates with State officials in expediting action on application when it is sent to Washington, and on August 30 is advised by Miss Katharine Lenroot of the Children's Bureau that funds for Massachusetts are approved that date.

[From the Hudson News-Enterprise]

CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN REPORTS ON EMERGENCY RELIEF

The following communication was received early this week from Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN: "In response to my previous inquiry asking the chief of the United States Children's Bureau why funds for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the service had not been made available for Massachusetts, I received today the following message from Katherine F. Lenroot, chief, Children's Bureau: 'Funds for emergency maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in service are allotted to States upon approval by the Children's Bureau of a plan of administration for such services accompanied by request for funds. Massachusetts State Department of Health has not submitted plan or requested funds for these services under approved plans. Eligible persons request authorization for medical or hospital care from State health department through their physicians. Advise discuss with Dr. Getting, State health commissioner, reasons why Massachusetts has not submitted a plan.'

"Accordingly, I requested appropriate officials of the State board of health to advise why Massachusetts has not applied for this important aid which Congress intended should be made available to prospective mothers who are the wives of boys in the service. Today I was pleased to receive a reply from Commissioner Getting of the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, indicating that his department has filed an application for this very important emergency maternity and infant care for soldiers' wives and hope it will shortly be acted upon favorably in Washington."

September 1943: Congressman PHILBIN obtains release of N. Y. A. equipment for use of city of Gardner so that special training courses may be continued in that community. Town officials of Spencer, endeavoring to obtain release of a truck for the highway department of that community and unable to obtain delivery of order placed in November 1941, asked Congressman PHILBIN to intercede in August 1943. On August 31, 1943, Congressman PHILBIN obtains preliminary approval of release of equipment from regional office of Defense Transportation officials and follows up application in Washington, obtaining final release from O. D. T. on September 4.

[From the Spencer (Mass.) Leader of October 29, 1943]

CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN GETS ACTION ON TOWN TRUCK

After nearly 2 years of endeavor, Spencer has at last received delivery of a new truck to urgently needed for the highway department. After all other efforts by the selectmen had failed, Armand Jalbert, our street commissioner, and Edward Gaudette, clerk of the board of selectmen, made a visit to Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN at his Clinton office and laid their case before him. The result of this conference is indicated by the enclosed correspondence, which we reprint:

TOWN OF SPENCER,
OFFICE OF BOARD OF SELECTMEN,
October 19, 1943.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Sometime in August I called on you at your office in Clinton, with Mr. Jalbert, our superintendent of public works, relative to the purchase of a truck to be used in conjunction with the work of the highways, sewer, and water. Needless to say that all efforts by the board of selectmen in the past had failed to get release of this truck, which had been ordered way back in November of 1941.

I have just received word from Mr. Jalbert that the truck in question was delivered to him about a week ago, and it is for this reason that I am writing you. May I, therefore, express my personal appreciation for the very efficient and effective way in which you handled this most vexing problem for the town of Spencer. I am very certain that the people of this small community will be very appreciative this coming winter, when it becomes known that this truck will play a very important part in keeping our roads open from snow, and, incidentally, we all shall lose no opportunity to tell of the part that you so graciously played in securing for us a piece of badly needed equipment, which we had, up to the time you intervened, been unable to secure.

Please accept my thanks for a job well done, and may I remain

Very sincerely yours,
EDWARD GAUDETTE,
Clerk of the Board of Selectmen.

October 1943: Maynard Highway Department obtains release of two trucks in order to carry on needed work through efforts of Congressman PHILBIN.

[From the Maynard Enterprise]

MAYNARD TO PURCHASE NEW SNOW-LOADER—PRIORITY ARRANGED THROUGH CONGRESSMAN; EXPECT EARLY DELIVERY

MAYNARD.—Through the efforts of Congressman PHILIP PHILBIN, the superintendent of streets, Raymond Sheridan, was able to secure the necessary priority to purchase the snow-loader and two trucks which were approved by the voters at the last town meeting. The superintendent was granted a hearing at the Congressman's office at Clinton while he was home during the period Congress had adjourned. He gave Mr. Sheridan a most welcome opportunity to discuss his difficulties and assured him of his every assistance. His efforts culminated in his receiving the necessary document within 48 hours of the conference.

It is expected that the trucks will be ready for delivery about October 15. The snow-loader will be here early part of November.

[From the Worcester Gazette of November 19, 1943]

PHILBIN SCORES SHIPMENTS OF TURKEYS TO FOREIGNERS

WASHINGTON, November 19.—Reports foreign civilians will get large quantities of American turkey meat Thanksgiving, while

many American families get it in the neck, brought hot demands for complete details from several red-faced Government agencies today by Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN (Democrat), Clinton. Besides these strong indications that Americans may feast mainly on globaloney Thanksgiving, while foreign civilians help us celebrate the holiday by eating our turkeys, Government muddling may also cause extreme black-market turkey deals that will make Thanksgiving turkeys available only to plush purses, Mr. PHILBIN explained.

"There has been brought to my attention news reports from foreign sources indicating American turkeys are being shipped abroad for use of civilian populations," Mr. PHILBIN said.

"So far," he continued, "I have been unable to get substantiation of these reports, and several Government bureaus have denied such shipments have been made.

"If it is a fact turkeys are being shipped abroad for civilian populations while our own people are being left without, it is a matter that should cause the deepest concern.

"I have asked the Army, Navy, Lend-Lease, War Food Administration to give me full details about this matter."

Declaring O. P. A. has failed to set a practical price ceiling on turkeys so that they can be sold without a loss, Mr. PHILBIN said he had been informed extensive preparations are already being made to corner remaining supplies of turkeys and sell them at skyrocketed prices in black-market operations, while few turkeys remain obtainable at ceiling prices.

Already, he explained, the influence of this black-market plot is being felt, indicating there is evidence the supply is being cornered by operators who expect to sell turkeys on Thanksgiving Eve at prices up to 80 cents a pound and beyond.

"This black market may be responsible for the present extreme shortage of turkeys," he said. "From many points I have received indications of very marked shortages. While the armed services have made very substantial purchases, there should remain out of our large production enough turkeys to give every community a fair share."

He said he did not have complete figures as yet of total purchase by the armed services. However, he said, he believes turkey production this year was at record rates, approximating 200,000,000 pounds, or more than a pound for every man, woman, and child in this country.

[From the Marlboro Enterprise]

WILL RELEASE TURKEYS FOR CIVILIAN SALE—ATTORNEY F. L. WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT OF ASSOCIATION WAS AT MEETING

MARLBORO—Attorney Fred L. Williams attended a conference in Boston with Lieutenant Colonel Merrill and Major Brown, both Army Ordnance Corps officers, and George A. McLitchie, civilian turkey procurement agent for this area. The conference concerned the releasing of turkeys for civilians in New England.

It was revealed that turkeys are ready to eat but that the Army cannot provide anyone to take and kill them. It was learned that no one thought they could afford to because of the expense involved.

Attorney Williams said a protest will be made to Congressman PHILBIN and a conference will be arranged in behalf of the turkey growers. He also stated that there will be a release of turkey for civilians within a few days. This condition was brought about through the efforts of Congressman PHILBIN to relieve the meat shortage.

Attorney Williams stated that there will be a meeting of the Turkey Producers Association at Lakeville Conn., October 18. He is president of the association and also a member of the executive committee in New England and one of the largest turkey growers in New England.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

TURKEYLESS THANKSGIVING SEEN, PHILBIN BLAMES O. P. A.—PRODUCERS FACE LARGE LOSS AS FOWLS CONSUME ADDITIONAL FEED GRAIN

(By Willard Edwards)

An administration muddle may keep the Thanksgiving tables of hundreds of thousands of Americans bare of turkey while despairing farmers watch countless fat gobblers consume precious grain in their barnyards, it was disclosed last night.

The folks at home may not even have the consolation of feeling that the absence of the traditional bird is the gain of the armed services here and overseas, it was reported.

PHILBIN REVEALS SITUATION

Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat of Massachusetts, disclosed this situation. He terms it an O. P. A. absurdity eclipsing that agency's previous best effort in confusing the home front.

PHILBIN said he had made strenuous efforts to convince the O. P. A. that it should change the position which threatens to ruin a $100,000,000 industry, but had been advised that nothing could be done.

The War Department's laudable efforts to see that every fighting man and woman gets turkey at Thanksgiving and Christmas enters into the story, but PHILBIN stressed that the O. P. A.'s attitude is keeping the birds away from the armed services as well as the civilian market. Meanwhile, farmers who have been encouraged by the Department of Agriculture to raise more turkeys as a substitute for meat face drastic losses.

ORDER ISSUED IN AUGUST

The Army issued an order last August 1 putting an embargo upon 10,000,000 pounds of dressed turkey for fighting men abroad before turkeys could be released to civilians. The order asserted that the turkeys, frozen and dressed, should be on the docks by September 15.

The embargo was expected to be lifted by October 1 but up to the present it is still in effect. Meanwhile, reports have spread that the amount desired by the Army has risen to thirty or thirty-five millions of pounds. The amounts actually purchased by the Army thus far appear to be a military secret.

Machinery was set up designating certain official processors who were authorized to purchase live turkeys from processors and sell them to the War Department.

The O. P. A. meanwhile ordered price ceilings maintained at last year's levels despite evidence produced that the cost of production, due to increased labor and feed costs, had arisen 29 percent nationally, averaging about 6.3 cents per pound extra, and 34 percent in the New England area.

The price fixed to be paid by the Army was 40 cents a pound and the retail ceiling price averaged 51 cents a pound in the Worcester-Boston market in which PHILBIN is interested.

The official processors found themselves unable to purchase live turkeys at the ceiling price of 35 cents a pound and processing them for sale at 40 cents, without standing a heavy loss, according to PHILBIN. The result: Few turkeys for the Army and no turkeys for civilians while the Army embargo continued to stand.

WOULD ACCEPT LOSS

Many producers would be willing to take a loss for the sake of sending turkeys to the armed services overseas but the processors find themselves unable to absorb the heavy losses which they would face, it was statcd.

Lifting the O. P. A. ceiling prices by a few cents a pound would straighten out the whole situation, but PHILBIN was advised curtly by an O. P. A. Poultry Division official that "we must hold the line on consumer prices."

"Turkey producers were more than willing to cooperate gladly in the project to get turkey to the boys overseas," PHILBIN remarked, "even though the price to be paid by the Army was inadequate and the growers, especially in the East, would take a sacrifice on every bird sold."

Most turkeys are full-grown now and every day they remain in their pens costs the grower money in feed, it was pointed out.

In the Boston area Maj. Gen. Sherman Miles, of the First Service Command, has granted exemptions in three cases to permit civilian sales, PHILBIN said, and the Army attitude has been most cooperative. But the present spread between the selling price to growers and the selling price to processors remains unattractive to both and the apparent outcome, he remarked, will be no Thanksgiving turkey for the great majority of civilians and little for the men in the armed services.

December 1943: Congressman PHILBIN receives assurances from War Department that discharged vets of World War No. 2 are not signing away any rights when signing Army papers to the effect that they do not desire to file a claim with Veterans' Administration at time of their discharge.

December 1943: Congressman PHILBIN seeks veterans' hospital for Third Congressional District, also establishment of district Veterans' Administration offices in Worcester and Springfield. Also addition to Veterans' facility at Rutland Heights and a centrally located veterans' building in downtown Boston.

December 1943: Congressman PHILBIN obtains prompt release of lumber inventories of Gardner furniture manufacturers so that uninterrupted production schedules are maintained.

He makes a strong appeal to War Production Board and United States Navy lumber coordinating unit to expedite action on lumber inventories and receives speedy cooperation on the part of Government officials. In addition, PHILBIN seeks additional imports of Canadian lumber to help ease desperate lumber shortage in United States in order that employees of furniture manufacturers in Gardner, Ashburnham, Winchendon, and other communities in the Third District may continue full employment.

[From the Worcester Telegram]

GARDNER MARINE NOT DEAD, AS WAS REPORTED

GARDNER, December 7.—Pvt. (1st cl.) Ronald E. Sargent, 22, United States Marine Corps, listed as killed in action in a telegram received by his wife on November 8, is not dead but is wounded, and is responding to treatment, according to word received by his wife, Mrs. Sylvia Allen Sargent, of 29 South Main Street, early this afternoon.

Mrs. Sargent was notified by telegram from United States Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, that her husband is alive and responding to treatment somewhere in the South Pacific. The Marine Corps notified Mrs. Sargent last week that two reports had been received concerning Private (1st cl.) Sargent, one that he had been killed in action, the other that he was wounded. Mrs. Sargent herself received a letter from Private

(1st cl.) Sargent, believed to have been written November 18, in which he said he had been wounded.

The definite word from Congressman PHILBIN ended the confusion arising from the conflicting reports. Private (1st cl.) Sargent, son of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence H. Sargent, of 197 Pine Street, entered the Marine Corps October 7, 1942, and was married April 9 of this year.

[Editorial in January 7, 1944, Leominster Enterprise]

ADDRESS BY THE CONGRESSMAN

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, recently addressing the Leominster Rotary Club, spoke with flashing emphasis in discussing government and governmental trends.

The Congressman dealt with his subjects without equivocation. He offers no compromise and will accept none in his contentions centering on the declaration that the fundamental principles of government, on which the Nation builded to greatness, must be preserved.

The proper assumption and exercise of power by the executive, the judicial, and the legislative branches of government were as warmly and as stoutly advocated on the one hand as on the other as he searingly assailed government bureaucracy, rather than through the accepted principles of constitutional procedure.

In attention-compelling language, the Congressman said of free enterprise:

"Free enterprise is not an attribute of great wealth alone. It does not exist solely for the talented and the favored. It is the valued possession of every person who seeks to advance himself. It is the boon of the professional man, the small businessman, the farmer, the artisan—the safeguard of the ambitious and the industrious, for it gives to the humblest, most inarticulate citizen the chance to improve his lot and join the populous ranks of those who have won their substance by the use of their own talents and the fruits of their own toil."

In the address, which touched upon a number of phases of current economic conditions and affairs of Government, there were statements or conclusions, in some cases, that would, of course, create differences of opinion.

Other schools of thought would probably question them sharply, but there are few who would question the deep sincerity of the speaker, as set forth in frankness of statement, and forthright manner of delivery in enunciating warmly defended principles and beliefs.

War Production Board grants necessary priority to town of Spencer on January 6, 1944, to purchase a new fire-truck pumper. Although this type equipment is badly needed for war purposes, Congressman PHILBIN makes a strong argument in behalf of town officials, citing the recent fire which destroyed the Spencer Methodist Church and the difficulty in obtaining parts to repair old pumper. Applications reach W. P. B. December 29 and Congressman PHILBIN obtains approval within less than 10 days.

[From Worcester Gazette]

EGG PRODUCERS PROMISED RELIEF

WASHINGTON, January 6.—War Food Administration has promised prompt action will be taken starting this week to relieve New England farmers of an extremely low egg price now prevailing because of a glut of eggs on the New England market, it was disclosed today at the office of Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN (Democrat, Clinton).

Starting this week, W. F. A. will begin buying through its regional offices the surpluses of some dealers. This is slated to start Thursday and the purchases will be made from the first dealers with large surpluses who offer the eggs at a reasonable price, it is explained. Later, more eggs will be bought, and ultimately some sort of price-support mechanism is slated to be set up to assure New England producers a fair price, it is announced.

At present, it was explained, the tremendous surplus of eggs in Massachusetts and New England generally are selling as low as 29 cents a dozen, considerably below O. P. A. ceilings under which eggs were selling up to 63 cents a dozen. New England, it is pointed out, has no price support, but in the South a price support of 46 cents a dozen wholesale for medium eggs has been set up.

Accordingly, PHILBIN's office said, W. F. A. will attempt to correct the discrimination against New England producers by buying up some of the surplus now to bolster prices and ultimately establishing price floors.

January 1944, introduces H. R. 4000, to defer woods labor.

[From the Gardner News]

PHILBIN WINS FIRST ROUND IN PULPWOOD SUPPLY FIGHT

WASHINGTON, January 22.—Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of the Third Massachusetts District, today won the first round of his battle to assure a continued supply of pulpwood to the paper mills of the country when legislation he introduced this week was referred to the powerful House Military Affairs Committee, of which he is a member. His bill, numbered H. R. 4000, seeks deferments for workers engaged in timber or pulpwood and logging operations by amending the Selective Training and Service Act and has a very important bearing on the Massachusetts' paper, paperboard, and products industry, the Commonwealth's second largest industry with an annual production of goods valued at $148,914,616 last year.

"So great has become the shortage of pulpwood and other materials used in the manufacture of paper products that 4 large mills on the west coast have been forced to close," said PHILBIN. "Other mills through the country have been forced to curtail their operations and the more than 60 paper and pulp mills in Massachusetts are beginning to feel the pinch of the scant raw-goods supply and are operating at a greatly reduced scale. With further curtailments in immediate prospects, I am most apprehensive that unless the manpower shortage in the logging industry is relieved at once, very serious consequences will ensue."

While the small pulpwood production touches upon industries on a Nation-wide basis, such as manufacturers of packaging and wrapping paper, newspapers, cartons for the shipment of essential military supplies, and other products, PHILBIN expressed fears that the situation in Massachusetts would soon become acute.

PHILBIN proposed two remedies, in addition to legislation he is sponsoring to have wood labor classified as essential, to help clear up the pulp shortage.

1. Lifting of what amounts to an embargo on the export of logs from Canada to the United States, PHILBIN said he was seeking the intervention of Secretary Hull and the State Department to make possible a decided increase of pulp logs to our domestic industry.

2. Making badly needed equipment available to produce pulp wood in the Pacific Northwest, which has been diverted to other uses. PHILBIN said he was taking this particular matter up further with W. P. B. officials.

February 1944: Congressman PHILBIN calls upon War and Navy Departments to furnish discharged vets with mustering-out-pay application forms.

February 1944: Congressman PHILBIN is the only Massachusetts Member of Congress to protest closing of Army Emergency Relief offices in Massachusetts. Later, General Miles advises a personal affairs liaison officer is being attached to the Worcester Veterans Center as convenience for Third District veterans and their families.

PERSONAL AFFAIRS OFFICE LOCATED IN WORCESTER—TO DEAL WITH ALL PROBLEMS

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 25.—A Personal Affairs Division of the War Department to handle all types of problems of enlisted personnel and their families has been set up in Worcester as a convenience to residents of the Third Congressional District, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN (Democrat), of Clinton, was advised today by Maj. Gen. Sherman Miles, commanding general of the First Service Command. A special office has been set up at the Worcester Veterans' Center, 58 Front Street, Worcester, where a personal-affairs liaison officer has been assigned to deal with all types of problems relating to servicemen and their families.

The setting up of this center came soon after PHILBIN protested against the closing of the Army Emergency Relief offices at Worcester, as being detrimental to the interests of his constituents and while Army emergency relief activities are now being handled through local Red Cross chapters, it is felt that the new personal affairs division office at Worcester will be in a position to render the specialized type of service, with the exception of the allocation of funds, that was available from the Army emergency relief office in the Federal Building, Worcester. This office is now closed.

In a recent letter to Representative PHILBIN, General Miles stated:

"The mission of the personal affairs division is to provide all possible information and assistance on personal matters to the soldier and his dependents and the veteran and his dependents.

"The facilities of the service are available to the soldier through the personal affairs officer at the various posts and camps. To aid and inform the dependents of our soldiers and the veteran and his dependents, I have assigned personal affairs liaison officers at the Boston Veterans' Information Center at 7 Beacon Street, Boston, and at the Worcester Veterans' Center at 58 Front Street, Worcester, Mass.

"Also, these individuals adjacent to First Service Command Headquarters (editor's note: 808 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston) are welcome to call upon the Personal Affairs Division here for information and assistance with many personal problems that arise from time to time to vex the soldier or veteran."

PHILBIN also offered his continued assistance to all residents of the third district in solving the personal problems of soldiers or their dependents, stressing the fact that he welcomed at all times inquiries for information or help that came from servicemen, returned veterans, and their families.

National War Labor Board at Boston finally approves vacation pay for employees of the Curtis Shoe Co. and Diamond Shoe Co. at Marlboro on March 3, 1944, following a stalemate of several months. Congressman PHILBIN cooperates fully with officials of the Marlboro Shoeworkers Union, making strong plea to Chairman Wallen, of the N. W. L. B., on January 10 after having case

transferred from Washington to Boston for consideration. Vacation pay is first disapproved by N. W. L. B. shoe panel. Review of case results in favorable finding later. Dennis Maher, president, Marlboro Shoe Workers' Association, wires on March 6: "In behalf of our membership, I wish you continued success and many thanks for your courtesy and cooperation."

[From the Marlboro Enterprise]

DECISION IS DUE THIS WEEK ON VACATION PAY—CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN HAS FOLLOWED CASE CLOSELY; RELEASES TEXT OF TELEGRAMS SENT DURING MONTH

MARLBORO.—The New England War Labor Board regional office at Boston will reconsider this week its recent decision on vacation pay for 935 workers in the Curtis and Diamond shoe firms. Congressman PHILIP L. PHILBIN, of Clinton, has followed the case closely and has been in constant touch with Saul Wallen, chairman of the War Labor Board, and President Dennis Maher, of the Marlboro Shoe Union.

Following is a series of telegrams sent by Congressman PHILBIN and replies he received during this month in relation to the vacation pay question.

Wire from Saul Wallen received late Friday, February 11, evidently prior to formulation of wire by Dennis Maher relative to congressional investigation of W. L. B. and its subsequent receipt by Congressman PHILBIN on Saturday, February 12. The text follows:

"Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,

"House of Representatives:

"On February 10, 1944, the War Labor Board denied the vacation pay in the Curtis and Diamond shoe cases, with the qualification that this decision is without prejudice with respect to a 1944 vacation.

"NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD, REGION 1,
"By SAUL WALLEN, *Chairman.*"

Text of wire to Dennis Maher, February 12:

"DENNIS MAHER,

"President, Marlboro Shoe Workers, Inc.,
"Marlboro, Mass.:

"Deeply regret to have to advise Boston Regional W. L. B. denied vacation pay in Curtis and Diamond shoe cases on February 10, according to information wired me by Saul Wallen, board chairman. This decision, I understand, is without prejudice with respect to a 1944 vacation. If there is anything further I can do please let me know.

"Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN."

Text of wire sent February 16:

"Saul Wallen, regional N. W. L. B. Director, 209 Washington Street, Boston, Mass. Workers in Curtis and Diamond Shoe factories in Marlboro very much disturbed about regional office decision denying vacation pay and have demanded congressional investigation. They point to other factories doing similar work where vacation pay has been given. Will appreciate your review of this matter.

"Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN."

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
Boston, Mass., February 17, 1944.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: I am replying to your telegram of February 16 relative to the Curtis and Diamond Shoe cases.

The Regional Board voted to deny the request by a vote of 4 to 2 for approval of the vacation pay for 1943 because the application for such approval was made in December 1943, 6 months after the vacation period. The Board reasoned that because of the lapse of time between the taking of the vacation and the request for payment for the vacation was so great that the matter was really a disguised wage increase which probably would not otherwise have been approved under the wage stabilization policy.

I have, however, just completed a conference with Judge Simoneau, representing the union; Mr. Curtis and Mr. Ruben, representing the companies, and Mr. Sugarman, counsel for the companies. During the conference, additional facts were elicited which accounts for the long delay for the taking of the vacation and the filing for approval of vacation pay. At my suggestion, the company and the union will jointly petition the Board to reconsider its decision and I have promised them that I will bring the matter to the Board within a few days after receipt of the petition. I have every hope that the matter will be satisfactorily resolved although the final decision rests with the Board.

Please be assured of my appreciation of your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

SAUL WALLEN,
Chairman, Regional War Labor Board, Region 1.

Text of wire sent February 19:

"Dennis Maher, president, Marlboro Shoeworkers Union, Marlboro, Mass. Pleased to advise W. L. B. has responded to my strong intercession of last Wednesday asking for review of cases of your union regarding vacation pay and such review will be made within few days shortly after receipt of your union and company joint petition. I have urged expedition and favorable action and hope to be able soon to send you word matter has been satisfactorily adjusted.

"Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN."

LOCAL SHOE WORKERS JUBILANT OVER WAR LABOR BOARD EDICT—VACATION PAY CHECKS ISSUED AT CURTIS FACTORY YESTERDAY AFTERNOON; DIAMOND PAYS OFF NEXT WEEK

MARLBORO.—Over one thousand shoe workers employed in the Diamond and Curtis factories are jubilant today over the announcement that their union, the Marlboro Shoe Workers Associates Incorporated, has won its fight to have the New England War Labor Board approve the vacation plan agreed to by them and the manufacturers. Vacation pay checks were distributed yesterday afternoon to 330 workers in the Curtis plant while 675 in the Diamond factory will get theirs next week. The vacation pay will total approximately $22,000.

Workers entitled to the vacation pay were those employed continuously for 1 year as of July 1, 1943, 40 hours straight time and 20 hours straight time for those employed for 6 months continuously as of July 1, 1943. The vacation pay was based on the second quarter before the vacation of July 4, 1943, conforming with W. L. B. regulations.

Today the workers complimented their leaders and Congressman PHILBIN for their efforts in their behalf to obtain the approval of the War Labor Board for vacation pay.

The union and the manufacturers entered into a vacation-pay-plan agreement early in the fall. At the time the War Labor Board had approved vacation pay agreements between workers and about 40 manufacturers.

A few weeks ago the War Labor Board disapproved of the plan and the workers in these factories staged a 1-day walkout. A mass meeting was held in High School Assembly Hall where John Sullivan, of the Dispute Division of the War Labor Board, heard arguments put forth by union officials and members. They voted to return to work on the promise that every effort would be made to get the War Labor Board to reconsider the decision.

Union officials, President Dennis Maher, business agents Francis Cain and Henry Hanson and the union legal counsel, Attorney Edward T. Simoneau, worked hard on the case. Late in December, when the War Labor Board had not rendered any decision, the local union telegraphed Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN. He immediately contacted authorities in Washington and had the case transferred to Boston. A few weeks later the Board rendered its adverse decision.

Congressman PHILBIN again delved into the case and telegraphed Saul Wallen, Chairman of the War Labor Board, that in view of certain facts and concrete evidence, the local union demanded a reconsideration of the case or would seek a congressional investigation. A few days later Chairman Wallen held a personal conference with union officials, their counsel, and local manufacturers.

Congressman PHILBIN in a telegram informed the local union after that meeting the War Labor Board announced it would reconsider the case if the union filed a request. This was done and the union was promised action sometime this week. The War Labor Board took up the case again yesterday and approved the vacation pay plan between the workers and the manufacturers of the Diamond and Curtis companies.

April 1944: Congressman PHILBIN expedites action on Leominster Child Care Center, FWA project.

May 1944: Congressman PHILBIN speeds review of case of employees of Lucite plant of Doyle Works, E. I. Dupont de Nemours and Co., Inc., of Leominster, pending for some time before National War Labor Board at Boston.

June 1944: Congressman PHILBIN works in behalf of passage of Bolton bill to commission Army and Navy nurses, both in committee and on floor of the House.

Congressman PHILBIN helps establish sub-station for Cleghorn section of Fitchburg, to be opened July 1, 1944.

Congressman PHILBIN works actively in behalf of the New England area during severe oil and coal shortages.

[From the Worcester Telegram]

HUDSON POWER DEPARTMENT SEEKS AID TO AVERT OIL SHORTAGE

HUDSON, March 31, 1943.—Faced with the threat of a serious curtailment in the fuel-oil supply, officials of the Hudson Municipal Power and Light Department today sought assistance from Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN and received notice tonight he will do all possible to have a sufficient amount of oil allocated to keep the plant in operation.

Thomas A. Walsh, plant superintendent, was notified by the company which supplies the plant that there will be a seasonal cut of 75 percent in the allotment it will have available. That does not mean a cut of that size in the amount the local plant would receive but would entail a serious cut, it was stated.

Mr. Walsh immediately contacted Congressman PHILBIN and was informed tonight the latter is doing all possible to get the oil company to allocate enough oil to supply the needs of the plant. Also, that he has contacted Washington authorities regarding the matter.

Oil-burning Diesel motors generate all electricity for the town, including the industrial plants, nearly 85 percent of which are engaged in war work. It was pointed out by officials that it would be impossible to convert the plant to use coal and the only alternative would be to purchase electricity elsewhere, a procedure that would be prohibitive because of the cost with no assurance a sufficient supply could be obtained to meet the complete needs of the town.

Early in February Congressman PHILBIN succeeded in having the normal quota of oil supplied to the plant for at least a month when the situation appeared serious.

[From the Hudson News-Enterprise]

LOCAL FUEL-OIL OUTLOOK BETTER—NEW, FIVE POINT PROGRAM TO BE ANNOUNCED—CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN GETS O. P. A. ASSURANCE

WASHINGTON, May 20—In response to his repeated criticisms and demands for a revamped fuel-supply program for New England next winter, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of the Third Massachusetts District today was assured by Joel Dean, Director of the Fuel Rationing Division of the Office of Price Administration, that proposed changes in the rationing program would do away with much of the hardship and suffering of last winter.

As a result of persistent suggestions for improvement made to the O. P. A. by Congressman PHILBIN and other members of the New England delegation, a five-point program has been drawn up by the Fuel Rationing Branch, O. P A., the preliminary draft of which is ready for submission to top ranking officials in the O. P. A. hierarchy. Little inside opposition to the proposed changes is expected and formal announcement may be made in the near future to local rationing boards. The program includes the five following main points, Congressman PHILBIN was advised:

1. Simple honor system reapplication blank.

2. Consumers urged to fill tanks during the summer.

3. Simplifying coupon mechanics which will result in decreasing the number of coupons required.

4. Simplified plan for small users, mostly kerosene users.

5. Ration banking for the industry and for large consumers.

The second proposal is in direct line with suggestions made by Congressman PHILBIN as a result of correspondence with constituents in his district. In order to do away with the chaotic conditions that prevailed during the severe winter of last year, it was suggested that consumers be allowed to fill their tanks to capacity during the summer months so that, in turn, dealers would be able to face the coming season's first cold snap with full tanks and continue replenishing their supplies from the curtailed allotment of oil expected for this area during the winter months because of military needs.

Last winter, many dealers were caught short right in the middle of the season and were unable to obtain supplies because of the diversion of tank cars for military purposes and other factors. The "full tank" clause is intended to permit dealers and consumers to pile up full supplies during the summer. O. P. A. officials are also expected to grant larger rations to owners of small homes.

Representative PHILBIN is also strongly urging extension of the proposed pipe line from Albany, N. Y., to Worcester for servicing central Massachusetts. He has also appeared before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, speaking in favor of the building of the New Jersey canal in order to accelerate the flow of oil to New England by barges, using an inland waterway system. In addition, because of Mr. PHILBIN'S special efforts, an uninterrupted flow of fuel oil was assured defense industries in Fitchburg and Hudson, and to many domestic users throughout his district when these firms and users were faced with severe shortages last winter.

Congressman PHILBIN today, in releasing a statement, made the following brief comment:

"The New England fuel problem is still certainly most critical. It must not be left again, as it was last year, to the vagaries of the trial and error method. The proposals of O. P. A. have some promise. Petroleum Administrator for War, with Secretary Ickes and Administrator Davies in charge, has exhibited good intelligent judgment and has given indefatigable attention to the problem.

"There is no speedy total remedy for New England oil shortages; in fact, next winter they may well be expected in some degree to extend to coal. But whatever relief can be given lies in the application of good, old-fashioned common sense and practical business judgment. The administration must lean more for guidance and assistance on established, experienced businessmen and less upon theoretical bureaucratic pay-roll sinecurists.

"The oil distributors, large and small, know this problem better than anyone through years of practical experience. They understand not only problems of distribution but also those of transportation which have been raised by the need of rationing. They are patriotic and anxious to serve the Nation by giving the Government fullest benefit of their broad experience and business judgment. They ought to be let in on the ground floor of this entire fuel shortage situation, which hinges so largely, we are assured by the Government, on the needs of the armed forces.

"Future large-scale military programs which we may assume to be fairly close at hand, will heighten these shortages. Let us all get together to solve these problems so vital to New England. Let the Government take us all into its confidence and service—consumers, oil and coal men, transportation, the press and radio, Members of Congress, and others anxious to help. Between us, if we are given the chance to work together, we ought to be able to get the best results for New England next winter. For my part, I will continue my cooperation with all these groups so that our consumers will be spared privation, our industries kept going. I hope the Government will do likewise."

[From the New York Sun]

MASSACHUSETTS DEMANDS COAL—WALSH AND PHILBIN SAY SHORTAGE IS SERIOUS

BOSTON, Aug. 18.—A serious shortage of coal in New England threatens to have worse effects than the shortage of oil last winter, Senator DAVID I. WALSH (Democrat, of Massachusetts) and Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN (Democrat, of Massachusetts) said today.

In a joint statement forwarded to Secretary Ickes and O. P. A. authorities in Washington, they emphasized that the situation was desperate and urged immediate shipment of "very substantial tonnages of anthracite coal into New England."

They pointed out that last winter many consumers converted to coal "in the belief and with at least implied assurance, that adequate supplies of coal would be available this winter.

"It is now apparent that this will not be the case, but, to the contrary, New England will be faced with greatly reduced supplies of coal, especially the kinds used by ordinary domestic consumers."

Senator WALSH and Representative PHILBIN said that "the stocks of distributors and retail dealers on hand at present are at the lowest point in many years."

They declared that the total amount of hard coal shipped to New England from January, 1943, to the end of July was almost 500,000 tons less than that shipped during the corresponding period of 1942.

"Facts are available which show that the supply of coal which went into New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and other States for the last coal year greatly exceeded shipments of the previous year," they added.

"It is stated by responsible authorities that the increase in New York alone was over 1,000,000 tons over the previous year.

"Neither the profits of coal operators, the activities of racketeering black market manipulators, the inertia of Federal bureaus or any other consideration should be permitted further to delay the prompt shipment of anthracite coal to our distressed people so that dealers' inventories may be replenished and the gravest crisis avoided."

[From the Woonsocket (R. I.) Call]

UXBRIDGE'S MEAGER COAL SUPPLY TOLD SENATE AS FAMINE EXAMPLE

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 26.—Citing Uxbridge as one of the Massachusetts communities where an acute shortage of coal exists, Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN of the Third District, said today that the unusual low stock pile of coal in Massachusetts, as of April 1, 1943, was one of the contributing factors to the present critical situation.

Comparing 1942 stocks with those of 1943, PHILBIN presented voluminous data to the United States Senate special Maloney committee, investigating current coal and fuel shortage in New England, showing that Uxbridge had 126 tons of anthracite on hand on April 1, 1942, as compared to a new low of 66 tons on April 1, 1943, according to figures given him by Director John P. McBride of the division on the necessities of life of the Massachusetts Department of Labor and Industry.

Sixty-ton drop

"This is a loss of 60 tons for just one community," said PHILBIN, "and there are corresponding proportionate losses in every community in the Commonwealth."

Testifying before the committee, PHILBIN stated: "We have had strikes, some transportation troubles, some considerable increase in demand, and I am willing to make allowances for all these factors in a reasonable way.

"But I do insist as the representative of my people, that if these coal shortages exist, every possible, practicable measure be taken to relieve them and the available supply of coal be apportioned and distributed as equitably as it is humanly possible to do so among the consumers, large and small, and of every kind and character."

Makes suggestions

The Massachusetts Congressman made several suggestions, which are now under study by the Senate committee.

"I believe there have been certain omissions, discriminations, and faulty distributions made in the New England area which ought to be immediately corrected," said PHILBIN, in making the following proposals:

"First, if there is any question about the authority of the Solid Fuels Administrator to deal with all phases of this problem, let it be resolved at once.

"I understand that somewhat over 15 governmental agencies have something to do with the over-all fuel situation in Massachusetts, which presumably have parent organization in Washington."

Need practical directors

"Outstanding, well-known, capable, and experienced coal men who understand the particular supply and distribution methods of the New England area and who have the confidence of the people, ought to be put in charge of allocating coal and be given full and unquestionable authority to act to relieve our precarious situation. It is clear that theoretical bureaucrats cannot solve this problem.

"Secondly, I believe we ought to determine immediately to what extent, if any, overpurchasing of coal by the armed services has contributed to these coal shortages.

"We might well explore the posibilities of reallocating any excess or surplus coal now in possession of the armed services and also stop the building of unecessary inventories, if we find they are being accumulated."

Would pay more

"Thirdly, if miners wages could be adjusted and the ceiling prices on coal adjusted by O. P. A. our desperate consumers of New England would certainly be willing, in order to get coal, to pay this additional cost."

PHILBIN told the committee he was not in favor of rationing coal at this time. "I hope and believe the dealers can work out this problem," he said.

"But I likewise believe that the machinery ought to be set up by O. P. A. to ration coal whenever it becomes really necessary, and thus insure to all our consumers, irrespective of their station in life, an equitable and fair share of available coal supplies."

Rations, if necessary

"It is also my opinion that provision should be made at once to supply New England with additional soft coal so that the people may be saved from hardship if anthracite proves insufficient to meet their needs.

"However, may I add that I would regard both rationing and the use of soft coal to be justifiable only if all other measures should fail."

[From the Worcester Gazette]

PHILBIN DEMANDS COAL BE RUSHED TO STATE

WASHINGTON, November 24.—Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN (Democrat), Clinton, Mass., rushed a plea to Petroleum Administrator Ickes, O. P. A. Chief Bowles, and Economic Stabilizer Vinson today to have whole trainloads of hard coal made up immediately and hurried to Massachusetts to relieve acute shortages.

At the same time, PHILBIN called on the three for an immediate adjustment of the coal price ceilings so coal may flow promptly into Massachusetts and New England.

Stating coal will not flow from the mines until the newer higher price ceilings are put into effect, PHILBIN said: "It is clear by now that the coal will not be moved until coal price increases are authorized and I urge you to do everything you can to bring about appropriate price ceilings at the earliest possible time. Senator WALSH (Democrat), Massachusetts, joins me in this request."

[From the Leominister Enterprise]

PHILBIN SAYS MORE COAL ALLOCATED—CONGRESSMAN WIRES OF ACTION TAKEN AT CAPITAL

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN in a wire sent here today from Washington announced the allocation of more coal to Leominster to help relieve the current shortage. The Clinton Congressman has done considerable with solid fuels officials in Washington in seeking car allocations for Leominster.

The wire follows: "Solid Fuels in response to my intercession, today advised me that one carload of chestnut has been allocated to Leominster Fuel Co. to help ease the shortage in Leominster. This is in addition to two cars of coke diverted from Massachusetts stocks about which I advised city officials last Monday, January 17, and one carload of anthracite released from coal fields for shipment to City Coal Co. Am continuing my eoffrts and will keep you advised."

Some time ago Mayor Mathias LaPierre sought the assistance of Congressman PHILBIN along with that of United States Senator DAVID I. WALSH and United States Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., in relieving the coal shortage situation here.

[From the Worcester Telegram]

REPRESENTATIVE PHILBIN URGES NEW COAL PRICES TO FILL NEW ENGLAND BINS—APPEALS TO THREE UNITED STATES AGENCIES FOR ACTION

WASHINGTON, November 16.—Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN (Democrat), of Clinton, Mass., appealed today to the three Government agencies handling coal price questions to fix a definite ceiling price on coal "with all possible speed" so that supplies may be replenished in New England.

"Now that the miners are back at work, it is of paramount importance that new ceiling prices on coal be established at once," PHILBIN wrote to Solid Fuels Administrator Ickes, O. P. A. Director Bowles, and Economic Stabilization Director Vinson.

"Adjustments ought to be made which will permit the general public to absorb the increased cost, as it is willing to do, in order to be assured of being supplied with coal as quickly as possible.

"If Economic Stabilization Director Vinson sits on the lid too tightly, it will surely explode and we will have the aggravation of black-market coal."

S. F. A. SET TO EASE NORTHEAST COAL SHORTAGE—BLACKSTONE TO GET FOUR CARLOADS AT ONCE

WASHINGTON, November 29.—Representative PHILBIN (Democrat), of Massachusetts, after a lengthy conference today with officials of the Solid Fuels Administration, disclosed that while there was no guaranty that dealer inventories of anthracite could be built up to avert widespread hardship in New England this winter, a program for meeting emergencies had been worked out.

PHILBIN said he was assured that action was being expedited in getting coal into distressed areas of Massachusetts, but he was told that soft coal would have to be used by New England consumers before the end of the winter.

Divert hard coal to northeast

Hard coal ordinarily scheduled for the West and Middle West, PHILBIN said, was being diverted to New England to help relieve the coal shortage there, and should be arriving today or in the very near future.

Adjustment of price ceilings on anthracite freed some of this coal, previously held back because of uncertainty over prices, the Congressman said.

PHILBIN said in a statement after his conference with Solid Fuels officials that the S. F. A. is fully conscious of the extreme shortage of anthracite coal needs for our people.

But, he added, the agency is handicapped by limited personnel and limited funds. He said urgent appeals of dealers and consumers numbering 1,500 in Boston and 1,000 in Washington were going unanswered because of this lack of personnel.

PHILBIN late today was informed that immediate steps were being taken to get four carloads of hard coal to the town of Blackstone, Mass., where the need for prompt action was certified by the O. D. T.-Solid Fuels advisory committee. The shipment was allocated at once to meet the hardship in the community which the committee found resulting from lack of fuel.

[From the Spencer Leader]

PHILBIN REPORTS ON COAL SITUATION

WASHINGTON.—Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN of the Third Massachusetts District has conferred at length with officials of the Solid Fuels Administration with regard to the desperate coal situation in Massachusetts. While he was given every assurance that action was being expedited in getting coal into distressed areas in the State, these officials made it clear that no dealer inventories of anthracite coal could be built up to meet the dire hardship he predicted when real cold New England weather sets in.

PHILBIN was told that probably before the end of winter, soft coal would have to be used by consumers in New England. He also received assurances that hardship cases would be given special attention by Solid Fuels regional officials working in conjunction with the State emergency board recently set up.

The Massachusetts Representative also received the encouraging news that anthracite coal originally scheduled for the West and Middle West was now being diverted to New England to help relieve the situation in that area.

PHILBIN was advised that on the day following Solid Fuels recommendation of adjustments of price ceilings, large shipments of coal were sent to Massachusetts from the coal fields, which should be arriving in Massachusetts coal yards this week. PHILBIN had previously recommended speedy adjustment of these ceilings to O. P. A., Solid Fuels, and Economic Stabilization Director Vinson on the assumption that New England families would be willing to pay higher prices for coal provided they could get supplies. While price discussions and interbureau wranglings were going on in Washington on these price ceilings for coal, processors were holdinp back shipments to New England, he said, thus preventing shipments of badly needed supplies.

PHILBIN commented as follows, upon emerging from his talk with Solid Fuels officials:

"I am satisfied that the Solid Fuels Administration is fully conscious of the extreme shortage of anthracite coal needs for our people. However, it is being handicapped in its action by limited personnel and limited funds With all the money that is being wasted by nonessential government agencies, it is paradoxical that some provision cannot be made promptly to set up staffs here in Washington and throughout the country to cope with this situation. So limited is present personnel that urgent appeals of dealers and consumers numbering into the thousands remain unanswered. On November 25, I was told, unanswered mail had over 1,500 pieces in the Boston office while is passed the 1,000 figure in the Washington office.

"To try to relieve this condition, I have taken the following action:

"First, I have requested Senator MCKELLAR, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, to speed up consideration of additional appropriations for Solid Fuels Administration, thus permitting the hiring of additional personnel and, secondly, I have asked the Civil Service Commission to make a survey of some of the less essential government agencies here in Washington in an effort to have assigned badly needed stenographic, clerical and administrative help to Solid Fuels.

"For the information of coal dealers, Solid Fuels proposes to receive requests for coal through O. D. T. Solid Fuels advisory committees set up in each community in Massachusetts, which in turn will be approved and forwarded to Washington. The intention is to permit consumers and dealers to use this machinery to bring the more desperate needs to the attention of the Government, but I have suggested that red tape be cut and that so far as it is possible, the matter be handled by the coal industry and dealers with a minimum of Government interference.

"I also urged that compliance officials be sent to the mines so as to insure that none of the coal destined for New England is diverted to other parts of the country.

"The inability to procure personnel was particularly amazing to me. If sufficient help to answer letters, telegrams and do ordinary administrative work cannot be procured from other government agencies, then the Solid Fuels Administrator ought to call for volunteers from other government agencies in Washington and in Boston and in other cities where regional offices are located.

"Developments in the coal shortage situation have become so serious, in my opinion, that they are likely to have a direct bearing on the successful continuance of the war effort, and for that reason, I believe many

patriotic women would be glad to offer their services in the event regular employees cannot be obtained.

"Another distressing fact disclosed at the conference was that no dealer inventories whatsoever may be built up. Consumers will have to be supplied virtually as the coal is received, according to officials. I do not believe that this method will work because at the height of the severe winter season the ordinary dealer will have the greatest of difficulty in serving consumer needs from arriving cars of coal. Yet I suppose half a loaf is better than none.

"The Solid Fuels Administration has refused to accede to my request that entire trainloads of cars be sent to Massachusetts to build up coal inventories, though I believe that this would be an excellent way of enabling coal dealers to get some supply ahead. This method was used to get oil to New England last winter and I see no reason why the same method cannot be employed to build up coal supplies for the emergency period bound to ensue when cold weather comes.

"I want to assure the coal dealers and consumers of the Third District that I am pressing daily for favorable action on their requests for inventory adjustments and additional coal supplies. I will continue to give personal and careful attention to the individual situations of the cities and towns of my district. So grave is the coal shortage we must give it unremitting service if we are to avoid real hardship."

A Good Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include an article written by Mr. Lowell Mellett, and published in the Washington Evening Star, June 22, 1944. The article follows:

HOUSE MERCHANT MARINE'S COMMITTEE PRAISED FOR PLANNING PEACETIME SHIPPING

(By Lowell Mellett)

SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, of Virginia, and his House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries are rendering the American people another real public service.

This committee was the principal author of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, under which one of the greatest jobs of the war was made possible. Now, taking time by the forelock again, it is seeking to assure a merchant marine fitted to America's needs after the war, seeking to prevent another shipping debacle such as that which followed the First World War.

To this end the committee is receiving information and opinion from the Maritime Commission, from the men who man the ships and from the men who expect to own them, or considerable part of them, when war shipping gives way to peacetime commerce. There is reason to believe that the committee will come up with a bill calculated to promote the national interest and protect the private interests of all those properly concerned.

FOLLOWED MESSAGE

The act of 1936 followed a message of the President in which he said:

"In the event of a major war in which the United States is not involved, our commerce, in the absence of an adequate American merchant marine, might find itself seriously crippled because of its inability to secure bottoms for neutral, peaceful, foreign trade.

"In the event of a war in which the United States itself might be engaged. American flag ships are obviously needed not only for naval auxiliaries, but also for the maintenance of reasonable and necessary commercial intercourse with other nations. We should remember lessons learned in the last war."

By "lessons learned in the last war," the President had in mind that we were caught wholly unprepared at that time to move men and materials in our own ships; he must also have had in time the great shipyard at Hog Island and its delivery of ships—after the armistice.

The act of 1936 provided a ship-building program that would give this country 500 new modern vessels in the course of 10 years. By the time of Pearl Harbor 200 of these ships had been built and the Maritime Commission had acquired the necessary know-how that enabled it to shift to a wartime shipbuilding schedule almost overnight. Old yards were vastly expanded and new yards were built. Men and women—nearly 100,000 women—were recruited and training courses opened. Some 700,000 workers were presently on the job in yards that operated 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

FREE OF STOPPAGES

In passing, it should be noted that this program has been carried through almost literally without a strike, sit-down, or lock-out.

The result was 728 ships, totaling 8,018,000 deadweight tons, built in 1942, and 1,949 ships totaling 19,297,000 tons, built in 1943. The rate of production in 1943 was five ships a day. The rate this year is the same.

Without these ships and the 140,000 trained seamen who man them, we would not have an army of millions overseas, completely equipped and supplied; without this achievement of American shipyards and merchant marine, our allies could scarcely have held out. It has been the greatest shipbuilding and ship operating job in all history.

Chairman BLAND and his committee now are thinking about the future, the problem of what to do with our ships and our seamen when the war is over. They have ideas of their own, and are listening to all comers. There is significance in the fact that nobody has come forward with a proposal to junk the ships, as was done in the years following the last war. Instead, there seems to be a general determination that the United States shall continue to have a great merchant fleet, one equal to our needs.

Wake Up, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Congressman FRED E. BUSBEY, which will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of Tuesday, June 20, on pages A3165 and A3166, should be read with a great deal of interest and concern by every Member of the Congress.

The subject matter of the speech, "Wake Up, America," is certainly very timely and should be taken to heart by every voter in the United States.

FRED E. BUSBEY is a Member of Congress from Illinois, and exceptionally well qualified to speak on this subject, as he is a Member of the House of Representatives' World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, a Member of the House of Representatives Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, and is a former Director of Americanism, American Legion, Department of Illinois.

A Mayor Looks at Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET O'NEAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address by Wilson W. Wyatt, mayor, city of Louisville, Ky., and president, American Society of Planning Officials, at the joint meeting of the American Society of Planning Officials and the National Association of Housing Officials, Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Ill., May 3, 1944:

We are developing ghost areas. We call it blight. Our oldest residential streets are now lines of boarding houses. Their value is half, a quarter, a tenth of what it was. Our business areas are gradually moving away from the sections our fathers knew as the centers of thriving commerce. And in the wake of this movement we see a dilapidated obsolescence. People are moving out, farther and farther. As values decline, taxes go up in order that the budget may be balanced, for most city treasuries are largely pegged to real estate. We are casting off our old buildings like old clothing, and leaving them to disuse and decay. We cannot shrug our shoulders and just call it fate. Some even put blinders on and call it progress. But however we name it, it's waste and extravagance. And here is something that private enterprise, unaided and on its own, can do nothing about. If this is permitted to go its decadent way to its inevitable result, it means, at the worst, the death knell of our cities. Or at the very best it would mean much more public housing than we care to contemplate.

At one time we regarded housing as coming only within one category—private housing. For the past decade we have dealt with housing in two parts—private and public. Actually housing, like Gaul, is divided into three parts—private, public, and urban redevelopment, the latter to be done by private enterprise, but with sufficient public machinery and assistance to make it possible. If the proper legal machinery is established by the Federal Government, the respective State governments, and our cities urban redevelopment contains the greatest conceivable promise for the post-war period—for private enterprise because of the billions of dollars of construction it would bring about; for cities because of the blighted areas which would be reclaimed; for people because of the modern, livable, convenient homes they would enjoy.

Urban redevelopment has reached an advanced stage of general talking. But the time for talking is past. We must have action if the job is to be done. The problem is so complicated and so vast that it calls for the active cooperation of several groups. Working together they can do the job. I suggest that one representative of each of the

following organizations get together promptly and tackle this job: The National Association of Housing Officials, the American Society of Planning Officials, the American Municipal Association, the United States Conference of Mayors, the Council of State Governments, the Urban Land Institute, and the National Committee on Housing.

For decades we have witnessed gradual but fatal dry rot spreading in concentric circles from the hearts of our cities. The problem has been too much like the weather—everyone talks about it but no one ever does anything about it. And acting alone, not one of these organizations can get the job done. I am satisfied that if this group will tackle the job jointly, the solution can be reached. If this is done, the possibilities are limitless—for private enterprise, for our cities, for people.

Public housing has done a good job in this country. As evidence of this, it is gaining in public acceptance month by month and year by year. There are two suggestions, however, which I should like to make: First, that local management authorities should have the greatest possible local autonomy, more than they now enjoy; and second, that payments in lieu of taxes should be increased. Had the National Housing Agency at the outset adopted the present policy, public housing would have been spared many a headache and public acceptance would have come much sooner. The present policy is not too bad while abnormal wartime rents are being paid, but as these decline the present formula must be liberalized, with the objectives, as the minimum, that sums equal to pre-project taxes be paid local governments.

Situation in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of some encouragement that more and more nationally known writers are commencing to appreciate the gravity of Japan's latest moves in China, to which I made reference in remarks which appeared in the RECORD of April 19, 1944. Another writer, who has now come to see the picture in the same light, is Maj. George Fielding Eliot. In an article entitled "Situation in China," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 20, 1944, Major Eliot said as follows:

SITUATION IN CHINA

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

On June 11, Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault, commanding the United States Fourteenth Air Force in China, returned from an inspection of the bases under his command and made a statement which deserved far more attention from the press of this country than it received. General Chennault was discussing nothing less than the future of the war against Japan and was pointing out the course which Japan is taking in order to consolidate what the Japanese high command doubtless hopes will prove an impregnable position against future attack, even by the combined forces of the United Nations.

General Chennault points out that the Japanese, in their present drive on Changsha and south of that point along the Hankow-Canton Railway, are trying to build up a "west wall," based on the railway, for the defense of the Chinese coastal region and of "Formosa as a keystone of their empire." This is vitally important. Remember that our great amphibious efforts in the Pacific are directed toward the Chinese coast, and that domination of the waters between Formosa, the Philippines, and the coast of China is probably essential to our success.

Those parts of the Chinese coast still in possession of the Chinese armies and accessible to Americans coming from the sea are largely in the Province of Fukien, opposite Formosa. If the Japanese could obtain possession of the whole course of the Hankow-Canton railway, they could then, behind this shield, proceed to mop up Fukien and the coastal region generally, thus providing an adequate backstop for Formosa. So far, they have never been able to do this; but then they have never made any serious attempt to do so, because as long as Formosa was not menaced from the sea, it did not matter very much that the Chinese still held most of Fukien. Now it does matter, for it is of life and death consequence to the Japanese that American and British air power should be denied secure bases on the continent of Asia, the only secure base area from which the Japanese main islands can be subjected to continuous and effective air attack.

General Chennault further notes that the Japanese have resumed their endeavors to reopen the Peiping-Hankow railway, the northern half of the main trunk line across China. They had it once, but they lost a good part of it to Chinese counterattack while they were diverted by the powerful Chinese resistance at Loyang. Now Loyang has been taken, and they are back on the railway and seem to be retaking the lost portion fairly rapidly. The great importance which the Japanese now attach to possession of this railway is here apparent: For when this writer last had an opportunity to devote a column to the war in China, Loyang was holding out, Chinese counterattacks were pressing ahead, and it looked like the same old familiar story of Japanese successes followed by Japanese retreat.

The Japanese would not have it so this time. They put in more and more of their good troops from Manchuria. They seem determined to get that railroad, rebuild it and start it running, and they seem just as determined to carry on their success right down to Canton, thus establishing a rail line of communications from Manchuria to the coast of the South China Sea, capable of carrying up to 100,000 tons of freight a month, and of supporting considerable armies along its course—a line of communications far superior to anything which the Chinese can hope to command in the same area. The Japanese, in so doing, would make up (at least in part) for the severe losses to their merchant shipping, on which their forces in South China have hitherto been dependent, and they would cut off all access by land to the air bases which now attack that shipping along the coast, and which in future may support major attacks on the Japanese mainland.

The problem of our amphibious power on reaching the strategic triangle above referred to (between China, Formosa, and Luzon) would be not a landing and establishment of bases on a friendly coast, with Chinese aid all ready for us, but one of the most difficult forced landings that we have yet undertaken, immeasurably complicated by the vast problems of distance and of lack of strong friendly base areas close at hand.

It is not too much to say that in all likelihood the successful completion of the present Japanese drive for possession of the Chinese railways may prolong the war against Japan by a year or even 2 years.

In effect, the Japanese are trying to build themselves a secure continental stronghold backing up their island empire. They foresee, says General Chennault, the day when they will have to retire from the outer fringes of their present area of domination. They are being pushed back now from the Pacific islands, from Dutch New Guiana, from north Burma. Their dwindling merchant marine cannot much longer maintain, nor their dwindling naval and air power protect, the vast overseas lines of communication on which they are dependent. Therefore their final dependence must be on their Army, which has as yet not been seriously engaged with Allied forces except in minor detachments.

A Word to the Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have just read with a great deal of interest an editorial entitled "A Word to the Wise" in the June issue of the Foreign Service magazine. As the membership knows, this magazine is the official publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I commend to all of you the editorial to which I have referred. It will be well worth the time of Members of all parties to read this and to consider it most seriously and earnestly:

A WORD TO THE WISE

Delegates to the impending national political conventions will be wise if they resist the temptation to make the subject of post-war veteran welfare a political issue in the 1944 campaign. They will be fooling only themselves if they forget that neither of the major political parties can rightfully take exclusive credit for all the veteran welfare laws which the Congress has adopted since Pearl Harbor.

Those who frame the formal platforms should remember that this Nation's responsibility to its veterans represents a sacred obligation—one which should never be smeared by cheap politics or campaign demagoguery.

Most men in service know that their post-war welfare will be governed primarily by the economic conditions which prevail in the United States. They regard civil-service jobs, pensions, hospitalization, employment preference laws, unemployment insurance, vocational training and similar legislative benefits as relief measures only.

America's civilian soldiers, sailors, and marines are realists because of their military training. That's why they understand no factory can employ veterans to produce goods than can never be sold—that there can be no security for veterans who take up farming if farm products must be left to rot in the fields because prices are too low—that no firm can employ veterans as salesmen if the public lacks the necessary purchasing power.

The men serving in this war will never swap their votes for a synthetic prosperity created by public funds spent for boondoggling projects or leaf-raking jobs. They will not be fooled by candidates who promise them employment that smacks only of temporary relief.

On the contrary, they know that the welfare of the veteran, in the post-war era, will depend primarily upon the conditions which affect all citizens. In other words, the average G. I. Joe is convinced the preservation of

the American system is his strongest safeguard and this means political and economic principles dedicated "to the greatest good for the greatest number."

Because he is sold on this basic idea—G. I. Joe knows his post-war welfare will be best served only when organized labor, management, and the Federal Government agree to work hand in hand for the common good.

Political strategists who nurse the notion they can buy the so-called veteran vote with fantastic ham and egg prosperity schemes are due for a rude awakening when the ballots are counted next November.

Extending Mail Service Through Parcel Post by Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, to permit intelligent planning for future expansion of aviation, in relation to postal services, legislation is necessary.

In 1918 Congress appropriated $100,000 to establish the first air-mail route. The courage of the Post Office Department to undertake the transportation of mail by air when the public had little if any knowledge of this magic flying machine, as it was then called, deserves the commendation of everyone. Congress can feel justly proud of its contribution in the past. There are men here in Congress today who by their support and encouragement of aviation legislation made possible the present great advancement.

Postmaster General Frank C. Walker recently stated that the whole country looks forward to profound changes in the transportation of mail as a direct result of this war. The recent enormous growth in the transportation of mail by air forecasts the shape of things to come.

After the war, the Nation will have vast numbers of highly trained and experienced pilots, navigators, and technicians. What are their possibilities of employment in the field they have now been trained for? It should be our business to utilize effectively this vast potentiality.

Many pages could be written on aviation's contribution to this war but at least we can all agree that it has changed the whole war picture and will change the peace set-up. It is obviously not possible for us to rest on the laurels of those farsighted Congressmen who made possible the first transportation of mail by air. It is our duty to discuss the new problems and propose new legislation to fit this new day.

World War No. 2 has made the airplane business one of the very greatest of all our industries, as indicated by a capital expansion from $160,000,000 to approximately $12,000,000,000 in a few years. Approximately 6,000,000 men and women are now engaged in the various phases of this great industry. In the pre-war years, we looked to the automobile industry as one of the greatest giants of our time but the aircraft industry is conservatively estimated as three times larger than the automobile industry was in its peak period. Let me add in passing that the automobile industry is probably the largest contributor to aviation. But what of the future? Any aviation legislation affecting this country as well as pertaining to foreign countries will vitally affect the airplane industry. There will be a great surplus of planes, and the natural question will be, how to use these planes after the war. Many engineers have speculated on the prospects of using military planes for commercial purposes. How successful they may be in converting them will depend to a great degree on the purpose for which they may be used. We shall undoubtedly have huge military airplane fleets for the protection of the country after the war, just as we now have battleships. But that will not begin to take care of all of our stock. An industry which in the month of March, according to the figures of Donald Nelson, produced 9,300 planes, must look to new markets to utilize its huge productive capacity.

I am advised that prior to the war, commercial air lines had in operation only 350 planes. If we were to ask the airplane manufacturer today how long would it take them to produce these 350 planes, undoubtedly the time would be in mere days. How then can more planes be used?

These commercial air lines are naturally planning for the future as to what they will carry in the way of cargo.

Recently, the War Department stated that 2,000 soldiers of the Air Corps have already returned from World War No. 2. These soldiers will be attracted to this giant industry for employment. Many also will look to the air carrier. One air line stated that they not only expected to continue the employment of some 7,500 men and women now on its pay roll and have jobs waiting for their former employees who are now in the armed forces, but, with the great expansion in this line, to have employment for 10,000 additional persons. These highly trained and experienced pilots returning from the war can be used by commercial lines, but it will take much planning, and they look to us for legislation.

Much has been said in favor of sending most of the first-class mail by air. In July 1942 the Postmaster General said:

> The Post Office Department must be in a position in behalf of the public to take immediate advantage of the new possibilities for better and more economical postal service which will be available at the war's end. Mail handling equipment facilities for the distribution or the dispatch of mail, location of terminals, and the mail handling operating methods must be planned so that these new resources available to the Nation may be intelligently integrated into the Nation's Postal Service. Changes will be produced as revolutionary in the transportation and handling of mail as came with the railroad. This is not a visionary prophecy, but it is the considered judgment of many thoughtful men of sound technical training and business experience.

All admit that at least a great portion of the mail will go by air. I am advised that some 30,000 postal employees are now in the armed forces and they, too, look to the Post Office Department for employment and to new methods of transporting the mail.

I have been making a study as to the possibilities of making use of at least some of these planes and surplus pilots to permit the industry to continue the production of planes, possibly smaller-type planes, especially to serve the needs of small communities. I wonder if you realize, for example, of the 42,680 post offices almost two-thirds of these, or, to be exact, 25,773 of the 42,680 post offices, are located in small communities. These offices are known as fourth-class offices. There are not a dozen States that do not have more fourth-class post offices than all the other classes combined.

If for no other reason than those I have mentioned, and, I repeat, so that some of these planes and men can be converted from war to peacetime activities and so that the industries will be ready, legislation should be considered now. However, it is our first duty as legislators to recommend legislation which will permit the Post Office Department to give our citizens better and faster service for all classes of mail. The post office is charged by Congress to transport the mail by the fastest means available. Air mail is already accepted by the public as a faster service. Some may have complaints on the air-mail service today, and I believe you are entitled to some explanation of the conditions in this regard.

In passing let me say that the air mail has been increased by 250 percent and there has also been a great increase in the passenger service, despite the fact that only one-half the number of prewar planes are now available to commercial air lines. The Army still has approximately one-half of the commercial planes they took over at the outset of the war. I noted in a newspaper recently that the Army now states that all of the planes will be returned. That is good news for the Post Office Department. There should not be 1 day's delay in returning these planes now that the Army feels they can be returned. Officials in the Post Office Department believe that when these planes are returned the air-mail service will again be what the public is entitled to.

There are 29,000,000 persons now living on the farms. Prior to the war they did not, and after the war they would not, receive the benefits of air transportation unless we consider legislation which will make air parcel post possible. The farmer has every reason to expect, for example, day-old chicks of special stock from any hatchery in any section of the country to be delivered to his door by rural carrier. The same is true for the quick delivery of repair parts for machinery and for any other items necessary to modern farming.

I am sure I need not dwell on the importance of air service to farmers who may be stranded at harvest time with a broken combine. He should be able to get the parts he desires quickly, directly from the manufacturer, and have them

delivered to his door without making a special trip to town. Time is all-important to him. These farmers have surpluses of perishable foods which could be used if carried quickly by plane.

I mentioned perishables—fruits from the orchards of any section of the country. Time and heat are the enemies of perishable products. Refrigeration of the upper air can be put to work—already I understand it is possible to take a load into the upper air for quick freezing.

To complete aviation's contribution to our national transportation system, it must be extended to these rural communities as well as to many of these 25,000 small villages I referred to.

In 1912, when Congress passed the Parcel Post Act, it set up as its extent and usefulness as follows:

Domestic parcel post offers a convenient, quick, and efficient means of transporting mailable parcels to any post office in the United States or its possessions. The service reaches more places than any other transportation agency. It brings the producer and the consumer into closer contact, thus paving the way to reducing the cost of living and should be advantageous for the shipment of farm products.

Today we must add proper types of planes to serve these small communities if our Parcel Post Service is to be kept up to date. These small communities have every reason to expect the benefits of this faster means of transportation. Farmers today use the most modern machinery and devices manufactured. Recently the benefits of electrification have extended to these rural communities. They already have the finest schools with the best health programs and recreational facilities, and certainly they should have extended transportation by planes in the near future. The strength of any nation is particularly the vitality of its rural communities.

But how can these air carriers extend their service to small communities unless Congress proposes legislation for the convenience of the mailing public?

The Civil Aeronautics Board can prescribe a transportation cost on service basis only. The rate charged the public should be in keeping with the cost. The revenue on air mail over the expenditures would indicate that subsidy is not necessary. In the great industrial sections of our country, plans are now under way to take full advantage of air parcel post in selling their merchandise to all sections of the country. The larger department stores have already made application for helicopter service to deliver their parcels. The merchant in the smallest village can, if we enact legislation, have overnight service and access to the largest stock in the largest wholesale houses in the most distant point of our country. The market of today is but hours away from the smallest village. Legislation is necessary to provide this convenience to business houses throughout the country. It is necessary in order that the smallest town can be given the advantages of the large city near an airport. We shall have planes and pilots in abundance. We need imaginative legislation to put them to work.

Recently the medical profession developed a new drug called penicillin. This drug has been pronounced one of the greatest curers of all time. But, in order that the humblest dwelling or the poorest laborer may be able to take full advantage of this medical wonder, speed in transportation is of utmost importance. Every village in this country should be able to share in this great discovery as well as other benefits which the development of aviation has made possible.

As a member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Air Mail Service, I have been greatly interested in the promotion of the use of our greatly expanded air facilities to the needs of the people of America. The growth and use of first-class mail by air has been tremendous. In fact, the Postmaster General recently said that the pre-war volume of 20,000,000,000 pound-miles has now increased to approximately 80,000,000,000 pound-miles. Keep in mind that this has occurred with only one-half the number of planes which were available to the post office during the pre-war period! Also keep in mind that practically all this increase has been confined to first-class mail.

A great field for expansion of air mail exists in what is now the parcel-post classification. In order to develop this field, however, it will be necessary to establish competitive rates between air express, surface express, and the present parcel-post charges. At this point, I wish to insert a table showing a comparison of rates between these three services as now charged on a 10-pound package from New York City to various cities throughout the country. I chose a 10-pound package because in a recent Post Office Department report of 1943, the statement was made that 90 percent of all parcels mailed were under 10 pounds.

TABLE I.—*Comparison of rates, 10-pound package, merchandise*

From New York to—	Parcel post	*Surface express	Air express
Washington	$0.28	$0.41	$1.26
Chicago	.43	.75	2.84
Omaha	.77	.80	4.05
Los Angeles	1.17	1.50	8.40
Seattle	1.17	1.50	8.40

*Insurance included, value to $50.

According to these rates, therefore, we see that surface express is approximately one-third more than parcel post. Apparently this difference of rates is considered competitive as both parcel post and surface express do a thriving business. But now let us consider the present rates charged for air express. On further comparison we see that the air express rate is 7.1 times greater than parcel post and 5.3 times greater than surface express. Obviously, this great difference requires careful scrutiny. I have talked to several people who are interested in the development of air express service, both from the standpoint of progressive service to our people and from the standpoint of increasing the cargo loads of commercial planes. I do not pose as an expert on this subject, but I have confidence in the statements of these people who inform me that the present air express rate is excessive and that it must be lowered to a competitive basis if the people of America are to enjoy the benefits which the development of aviation has made possible.

I believe that further information on this important subject is in order. In view of the tremendous problem of unemployment which will face us when this war is over, it is my opinion that every phase of our industrial resources must be expanded. Certainly the expansion of the aviation industry in all its phases should be a component part of this industrial expansion. In order to promote the phase which deals with air express or air parcel-post service, I have introduced a resolution on this subject which I have asked to be included at this point.

H. R. 5070

A bill prescribing new postal rates for air mail other than the first class

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) of the act of June 12, 1934, entitled "An act to revise air-mail laws, and to establish a commission to make a report to the Congress recommending an aviation policy," as amended, is amended (a) by inserting after "air mail" the following: "of the first class"; and (b) by inserting at the end thereof the following: "On air mail of any class other than the first the rate of postage shall be that shown in the following table:

If both the post office of delivery and the post office of mailing, or any portion of the municipality, town, or village in which such post office is located may be included within a circle the diameter of which is:

More than 0 mile but not more than 600 miles, the rate of postage for each pound or fraction thereof shall be 44 cents.

More than 600 miles but not more than 1,000 miles, the rate of postage for each pound or fraction thereof shall be 48 cents.

More than 1,000 miles but not more than 1,400 miles, the rate of postage for each pound or fraction thereof shall be 54 cents.

More than 1,400 miles but not more than 1,800 miles, the rate of postage for each pound or fraction thereof shall be 60 cents.

More than 1,800 miles but not more than 2,200 miles, the rate of postage for each pound or fraction thereof shall be 66 cents.

More than 2,200 miles but not more than 2,600 miles, the rate of postage for each pound or fraction thereof shall be 72 cents.

More than 2,600 miles the rate of postage for each pound or fraction thereof shall be 78 cents.

SEC. 2. The amendments made by section 1 shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins at least 15 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

The reader will notice that I have included a table of distances and rates. I want to make it perfectly clear at this time that this table is included in the bill on a tentative basis—the basis for such rates has been reached through conversations with various interested individuals on this subject. It is my hope that hearings will be held on this bill during the latter part of this year. If these hearings are held by the subcommittee on air-mail service, it is my intention, as the chairman of this committee, to invite all persons interested in this matter to appear before our committee to testify regarding this important subject. It is my intention to give serious

consideration to the feasibility of establishing this new classification of air-mail service on the basis of reasonable rates which would not require a Government subsidy, to the end that citizens of this Nation might be able to take full advantage of air parcel post, which I believe to be practical and possible immediately following the end of the present war. Upon the conclusions of these hearings, it is my hope that H. R. 5070, properly amended, can be started through the necessary channels for legislative enactment.

Collier's Magazine Calls for Continuation of Dies Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I herewith call to the attention of the Congress and the country an interesting and informative editorial clipped from the June 24 issue of Collier's magazine.

Collier's agrees with that vast majority of Americans who feel that the work of the Dies committee must go on in the years to come despite the unfortunate fact that its able chairman, MARTIN DIES, has been forced by ill health to retire from politics. The forces seeking to undermine our American institutions here at home have not retired, Mr. Speaker, but rather they have renewed and reenforced their efforts to foist foreign isms and concepts upon an American public whom they hope to lull into indifference.

The techniques of un-American groups and individuals are cunning and well concealed. Nothing contributes to their defeat quite so much as the spotlight of publicity being turned upon their objectives, their methods, and their political manipulators. Therefore, as Collier's magazine recommends, this country can well continue to keep a congressional committee on guard to make sure that termites of Government do not gain too much headway in their attempts to bore from within to destroy the foundations upon which the American concept of providing a fair chance for a free people is based in this great and good Republic.

The editorial from the June 24 issue of Collier's magazine follows:

DIES DEPARTS

Representative MARTIN DIES, Democrat, Texas, has announced that he will not try for reelection, after 14 years in Congress, many of them spent as chairman of the Dies committee on subversive activities. Maybe he really wants to go back to private life; maybe he's afraid he couldn't win. We don't know and don't much care.

We are convinced, though, that DIES' committee performed services which added up heavily on the black side of the ledger, in spite of all the times DIES hit some innocent person or group.

This country has freedom of speech and press, at least up to this writing. It also has a goodish number of disloyal or misguided persons who are forever trying to bludgeon or bemuse Americans into changing over to communism, fascism, nazi-ism, funny-money-ism or some other ism. Most of these persons make a virtual trickery, deceit, and hitting below the belt. Because of the Bill of Rights, they have every leeway short of treason itself. This is all very well and makes life in the United States that much more interesting than the straitjacketed countries.

We wouldn't change this state of affairs if we could. But the bulk of us need a watchdog of the type the Dies committee has been—a group of official vigilantes—to keep exposing the tactics, pretensions, and plots of the would-be destroyers of democracy, and thereby to keep them cut down to their correct size.

For these reasons, we think DIES deserves the thanks of the American people as he leaves the congressional stage; and we're in favor of Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS' (Republican, New Jersey) proposal that Congress establish a permanent Dies-type committee.

Thomas Henry Cullen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS HENRY CULLEN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of TOM CULLEN while a Member of the House of Representatives was an irreparable loss. His membership in the New York State Assembly, as well as the State senate, was a picture of fine, loyal, and conscientious service to his district, city, and State.

His election to the House of Representatives in 1918 was another indication of the devotion of the people of his district and was a striking evidence of the faith and confidence they had in TOM CULLEN.

One of the occasions to which Tom often referred, and to which he pointed with pride, was his reelection to the Sixty-seventh Congress in 1920. It was with pardonable pride that he could look upon that election with satisfaction—he was the only Democratic Congressional candidate who was elected from Brooklyn in that year.

Like a true soldier, almost to the moment of his passing, he was actively engaged in his work as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and was in daily attendance on the floor of the House.

He loved life and good companionship, and his fondest desire was to spread happiness to all through his cheerful and happy disposition. Those who knew Tom found a loyal and true friend, a sagacious leader, and a conscientious counsellor.

His colleagues will miss him, his district has suffered a great loss, and our sympathy and condolence go to his bereaved family.

Memorial Stones for Service Men and Women Missing in Action or Buried at Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the erection of memorial stones in national cemeteries for certain servicemen and women determined to be missing in action or buried at sea. The reasons I have introduced this bill is because some of my constituents have written me asking if such stones could be erected in the national cemeteries. Upon inquiring of the War Department if this could be done, they informed me that the law provided only for the memorial stones to mark the grave where a body was actually interred. If, perhaps, the erection of such memorial stones in the national cemeteries in memory of those who have been lost can be any degree of consolation to their relatives, I think there is no question but what it should be done.

This bill does not make it mandatory upon the part of the Secretary of War to erect these stones. It provides that they shall be erected upon request of a member of the immediate family of the deceased. I sincerely request that when this bill is referred to the committee which has jurisdiction that that committee will give it careful consideration, and I would appreciate the assistance of other Members of the House in bringing about its favorable report and enaction into law.

Service Activities of the D. A. V.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE STARNES
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this forenoon my good friend, Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans—with whom it has been a pleasure to cooperate while in Congress—told me about a dinner given in the Yale Club in New York City last Wednesday evening by the Honorable Percy C. Magnus, chairman of the Disabled American Veterans' national service fund. This dinner, attended by many social-minded civic leaders, inaugurated a campaign to raise sufficient funds to enable the D. A. V. to so expand its present Nationwide set-up of full-time national service officers as to be able to extend needed technical advice and assistance to the increasing thousands of the disabled dischargees of this war. Several speakers at this dinner, including Gen. Frank

T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and two of his able Assistant Administrators, Col. George Ijams and Maj. O. W. Clark, attested to the value of the D. A. V.'s service activities, particularly as effective attorneys-in-fact between the Veterans' Administration and its disabled-veteran claimants.

No veteran organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of this essential post-war job than that maintained by the D. A. V.

FORMATION OF D. A. V.

Formed in 1920, and chartered by Congress in 1932, to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the Disabled American Veterans has been generally recognized as the official spokesman for America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law No. 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the D. A. V. is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities, incurred during or by reason of active war service in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War No. 2 are becoming active members of the D. A. V.

Had I been wounded while serving with our armed forces during World War No. 1, I would certainly have been proud to be a member of this select outfit.

During the more than 24 years of its service activities, the D. A. V. has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents. Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration.

D. A. V. NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Avenue, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the D. A. V. takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans' Semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, Attorney General's opinions, Comptroller General's opinions, Veterans' Administration regulations, service letters, Administrator's decisions, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the D. A. V. is James L. Monnahan, Esq., of St. Paul, Minn., who as a national service officer and department adjutant during the preceding 15 years, has had a broad background of experience which qualifies him to lead an organization composed exclusively of disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-manager of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has for many years been the depository for the funds of both the D. A. V., and of its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service bureau of the Disabled American Veterans has had offices in the Munsey Building in Washington, D. C., during the last 24 years.

It is headed by my good friend Millard W. Rice, as national service director, who is now the dean among the national legislative representatives of the several recognized veteran organizations, with energetic, affable, Thomas J. Kehoe as assistant national service director. The Washington office of the D. A. V. is now staffed by 14 service experts.

The activities of the nationally paid national service officers of the D. A. V., located in most of the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration and of its some 900 volunteer State and chapter service officers, also come under the supervision of the national service director.

All of these unselfish, self-sacrificing service officers are themselves disabled veterans, and therefore personally know of the difficulties and handicaps which have bafled thousands of disabled men.

These D. A. V. service officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the United States Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, these D. A. V. service officers are naturally more sympathetic and therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits which they have earned.

D. A. V. SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The D. A. V. has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, vocational training, civil-service appointments, private employment, and pensions for dependents.

During the past 15 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the D. A. V. have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled, 852,006; hospitalizations and examinations obtained, 141,373; and total monetary benefits, $60,311,266.14.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for more than 150,000 disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds or thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed for service reports.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the D. A. V. that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy thing to do, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually service-incurred or aggravated.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation, its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past as well as with those who are now baring their young breasts to the enemy, so that other young men, who in the future may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the D. A. V. to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

HOW D. A. V. SERVICE IS FINANCED

The D. A. V. has been able to maintain its extensive service program primarily out of funds contributed by disabled veterans themselves, by their payment of membership dues in the D. A. V., through its some 40 State departments and 900 chapters.

A national per capita tax of $2, plus a national service fee of $1, is paid each year to the national headquarters by every local chapter for each of its members.

Local D. A. V. chapters finance their own service and relief activities out of their portion of the annual membership dues, and by annual Forget-Me-Not Day drives, dances, and other projects.

Nationally, the D. A. V. has recently been endeavoring, with considerable but

not enough success, to raise needed service funds through the sale of Ident-O-Tags—miniature automobile license plates—to be attached to one's key ring. The value of this key insurance is indicated by the fact that about 1,200 sets of lost key rings are returned each week to their owners.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS' SERVICE FOUNDATION

To make possible a much-needed expansion of its rehabilitation activities, the D. A. V. is hopeful that understanding fellow Americans will help to build up a needed trust fund of up to $10,000,000 by generous donations to its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation, 546 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

This D. A. V. Service Foundation has seven trustees, five of whom each serve for 5-year terms, one expiring each year and replaced by another as confirmed by the national convention of the D. A. V., and the other two of whom automatically consist of the national commander and national adjutant of the D. A. V. These trustees serve without remuneration.

Donations received by the D. A. V. Service Foundation may be placed into separate State trust-fund accounts according to State of origin, for allocation to the D. A. V., when needed, for the expense of maintaining one or more full-time national service officers in each such State.

WHY D. A. V. NEEDS OUTSIDE HELP

Many eligible disabled veterans fail to become paid-up members of the D. A. V., and thus to help to maintain its Nation-wide service set-up on behalf of less fortunate disabled veterans, for varied reasons; some because they know very little about the D. A. V., some because of indifference, others because of selfishness, some because of negligence, and many others because they cannot afford it. If they all understood the implications involved, every service-disabled veteran would decide that he should belong to the D. A. V.

The American public is, I am confident, desirous of fulfilling its obligation that those who return from hazardous military employment in the armed forces of the United States, handicapped by some physical or mental scars incurred by reason of such active service, shall be adequately provided for by a grateful Nation.

Such a service program deserves the solid support of all service-disabled veterans and of all Americans.

COMMENDATIONS OF D. A. V.

Among many statements commending the D. A. V., and its rehabilitation services, the following are a few examples:

The purpose of your Nation-wide rehabilitation program * * * to extend needed assistance to members of our armed forces who become disabled, as well as to disabled veterans of the World War and their dependents, is, indeed, a worthy one and merits the full support of our citizens. (Franklin D. Roosevelt, President.)

Please express for me to the Disabled American Veterans my continued appreciation of their services to the country. (Herbert Hoover, former President.)

It is, therefore, particularly gratifying to me to learn of the plans of the Disabled American Veterans to expand its already extensive service program so as to make available to the handicapped servicemen of World War No. 2, who are coming out of the present conflict in ever-increasing number, the valuable advice and assistance it has long rendered their fathers of World War No. 1. These new veterans and their dependents also will need a helping hand, and I hope that the organization will meet with complete success in its campaign to provide now for the extension to them of its worthy activities. (Gen. John J. Pershing.)

During the last 24 years national service officers of the Disabled American Veterans have rendered valuable assistance to disabled veterans and their dependents and, incidentally, have facilitated the work of the Veterans' Administration and its contacts for such service claimants. Your national service officers, being themselves disabled veterans, can be most helpful in instructing and impressing claimants as to the necessary legal requirements and limitations under the laws enacted by the Congress. (Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.)

In spite of its small number, I feel that the Disabled American Veterans has, in the years since I have been in Congress, been the most effective organization for the benefit of the ex-servicemen. (Senator Bronson Cutting, deceased.)

The Disabled American Veterans are a heritage of proven patriotism. Let's serve God by serving humanity. (Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN.)

The Military Order of the World War passed a resolution endorsing the Disabled American Veterans * * * for the purpose of assisting disabled veterans in the preparation and presentation of their claims * * * a most important work. (Col. George E. Ijams, past commander in chief Military Order of the World War.)

I know of no organization that I can more heartily commend and support than the D. A. V., whose purpose is the rescue and helping of disabled veterans. Let us hope all loyal Americans will recognize the D. A. V.'s humanitarian objective and program as their opportunity to demonstrate loyalty and patriotism. The people of the United States must not and will not fail those who did not fail them. (Gen. Robert Lee Bullard.)

Be assured that we of the American Federation of Labor, who have long relied upon the principle that unity develops strength, look with favor upon the valuable service-giving activities of the Disabled American Veterans' organization. (William Green, president of American Federation of Labor.)

Labor's heart goes out to the disabled veterans, many of whom come from its own ranks, and we are eager to do everything we can to help these handicapped veterans and their dependents to secure the fair and generous treatment to which they are entitled. (Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations.)

It affords me real pleasure to heartily endorse the Disabled American Veterans * * * to assist individual deserving veterans in their local needs and in the technical prosecution of their equitable claims for compensation resulting from war-incurred disabilities. (James E. Van Zandt, past commander in chief Veterans of Foreign Wars.)

Helping disabled veterans to help themselves and getting the help of the Nation for those who need help, a big dividend-paying investment in real Americanism, is the self-appointed task of the Disabled American Veterans. (Representative ED. V. IZAC, of California.)

To see to it that worthy disabled veterans, of all of America's wars and their dependents, are enabled technically to establish their equitable claims for various types of benefits provided by existing legislation, the D. A. V. maintains the largest staff of nationally paid National service officers, one or more in nearly every regional office of the Veterans' Administration, of any veteran organization. (Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa.)

The D. A. V. is striving to see to it that justice is extended to the Nation's disabled war defenders of the past, present, and future. (Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, of Indiana.)

Americans who help to provide security for America's disabled defenders thereby help to provide security for America. (Senator HOMER T. BONE.)

This comprehensive program of the D. A. V. is well integrated, looking to the welfare of our country, our communities, and our comrades. (Representative JAMES H. FAY, of New York.)

The D. A. V. is helping to protect and to promote the best interests of disabled veterans, and of the general public, by maintaining and further expanding its national service bureau in Washington, D. C., and its Nation-wide set-up of national service officers. To do the job properly, however, the D. A. V. needs to have at least three or four times as many full-time national service officers as it now has. (Representative WALTER G. ANDREWS, of New York.)

Letter From a Fighter Pilot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, since this war began I have had the privilege of reading many beautiful and inspiring letters which men in the services have written home to their parents, but I have read none that surpassed in uplifting sentiment and patriotic fervor a letter that Capt. Tom Mutz, 24 years old, of the fighting marines, wrote to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank M. Mutz, of Indianapolis.

The letter was penned before Captain Mutz, a fighter pilot, departed for the far Pacific, where he was later wounded in action in the operations around Munda. With a piece of shrapnel still in his body he is now recuperating at Cherry Point, N. C., eagerly awaiting the time when he can return to active service.

Mr. Mutz, Sr., is president of the Peerless Foundry Co., of Indianapolis, and one of the prominent businessmen of our city. In my opinion, the letter Captain Mutz wrote to his parents is one of the classics of the war. Many citizens of our city have read it with admiration for the splendid qualities of mind and heart reflected by it. The letter is as follows:

DEAREST MOTHER AND DAD: Here is the letter that I both like to write and dislike to write. Tomorrow we are scheduled to board the ship which will take us wherever we may be going. I know how you must feel about my leaving the States. The following is the way I look and feel about it, and is the way you must look at it.

In my 22 years I have had everything a boy could want. I've had the love of the

two parents and a wonderful sister, this love making a home which was everything a home should be. Then comes the love of two great grandparents, and four grandparents, followed by aunts, uncles, cousins, and more distant relations. All of these people combined to give me a name which I can be justly proud of. Through these people and through myself there comes a list of friends many of whom have gone further than that which friendship demands. I've grown up with the constant help and guidance of these people. I have gone to school and later, to college, with every advantage of heritage and surroundings. I've had everything which a boy needs to shape a life of usefulness. My eyes have seen much of this country of ours. So you see that up to this point, I've had a sheltered and easy life. If I do not come back there is nothing to be sorry about because I have had all of these things. I've done many of the things I've wanted to do. I've seen many of the things that I've wanted to see. And I've had a lifetime of fun already.

Now, here is the most important thing of all. Up to the present time I've given nothing for what I have taken. And now I am at the age when usefulness to our society and to the world at large is expected of me so that my life will be justified in the eyes of God and man. What better thing could a man ask for than a chance to fight for what he believes in, fight to give the coming generations and the generation not yet born a chance to live a life like my own has been; a chance to play, to go to school and learn about a world, not just one race and one creed; a chance to love and be loved; a chance to see that greatness of this world that God has given us, and a chance to add their names to the long line of names of great men and women who have made names for themselves in every line of endeavor? When I think of this my heart swells up and chokes me. Here, very early in life, I'm given an opportunity to serve, to make the living of my life not in vain. Some men live a lifetime and do not achieve this distinction. They cannot say they helped to make the world a better place to live. But this world conflict has given me an easy chance and a big opportunity.

This is the way I want you to look at it. You have given me everything that it is in your power to give me. Therefore do not be dismayed. And my last request of you, already put so ably in words by a typical United States serviceman, is: "Do not pray only that I shall return, but that I will have the power to do my duty."

Your ever-loving son,

TOM.

Resolutions Adopted at Meeting Held Under Auspices of New York Latvian Benevolent Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions which were adopted by people of Latvian descent at a mass meeting held March 24, 1944, at New York City, under the auspices of the New York Latvian Benevolent Society:

Whereas the President of the United States on February 12, 1943, has stated: "It is one of our war aims, as expressed in the Atlantic Charter, that the conquered populations of today, the overrun countries, shall again become the masters of their destiny. There must be no doubt anywhere that it is the unalterable purpose of the United Nations to restore to conquered peoples their sacred rights. For the right of self-determination included in the Atlantic Charter does not carry with it the right of any government anywhere in the world to commit wholesale murder or the right to make slaves of its own people or any other people in the world"; and

Whereas as further stated by President Roosevelt, "And unless the peace that follows recognizes that the whole world is one neighborhood and does justice to the whole human race, the germs of another world war will remain as a constant threat to mankind"; and

Whereas the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have been recognized de jure by all independent nations of the world; and

Whereas the Governments of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have proved their abilities in administration of justice, in self-government, in establishing internal peace and material well-being on the principles of social justice and have carried out faithfully all obligations related to other nations; and

Whereas the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have a deep respect for civil rights, for religious freedom, family life, cultural, political, and economic rights of all peoples; and

Whereas the people of the Baltic states are neither of Teutonic nor Slavic origin; and

Whereas the Governments of Germany and Soviet Union have disregarded and abrogated all treaties with Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia under changing disguises such as the "ethnic kinship of the population," "strategic frontiers," "security from attack," and other constantly varying shams; and

Whereas the Red Army, with its imported commissars from Moscow imposed by force farcial one-party elections in the Baltic states for setting up communistic governments made to order in Moscow; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union enslaved, murdered, and exiled many people of the Baltic states and Poland to Siberian prison camps; and

Whereas the brutal Nazi invaders have imposed puppet regimes of Nazi Quislings in the Baltic states, and have enslaved, murdered, and exiled many Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian people to Germany, and have cruelly persecuted loyal Latvian citizens of the Jewish faith; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, aiming at the establishment of a European hegemony, has declared that Latvia is to be considered as one of the 16 Soviet states, thus disregarding the sovereign rights of the peoples of Latvia and willfully violating the principles of the Atlantic Charter; and

Whereas the Government of the United States, and freedom-loving nations of the entire world, have refused to recognize these transparent disguises of aggression and annexation as advocated by the Soviet Government; and

Whereas the Latvian nation and Latvians throughout the world remain unalterably opposed to all Soviet and German attempts to enslave them; and

Whereas the entire world knows that there are no civil rights or any autonomy for any individual or a nation under the totalitarian dictatorship of the Soviets: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our supreme confidence in the stated policies and leadership of the President, the Secretary of State, and the military and naval high commands of our country, and that we pledge our undivided support of the war effort and of the declared war-and-peace aims of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That we condemn the breaches of the principles of the Atlantic Charter perpetrated by the Government of the Soviet Union in regard to Latvia and other countries; and be is further

Resolved, That we appeal to our Government to exercise its offices with the Government of Soviet Russia, so that Russia abandon its ulterior designs against Latvia and other nations and return to the rule of justice and of law; that Russia liberate surviving Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian and Polish hostages; that Russia dismiss illegal impostors from its service and abolish its puppet regimes held in store for Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; ... that Russia live up to its promise of collaboration with the American and British democracies in establishing a just peace and international security; and be it further

Resolved, That we appeal to our Government to provide for the occupation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by naval and military forces of the United States and Great Britain; for the extension of joint United Nations relief and rehabilitation facilities to those countries, and for an unrestricted exercise by the peoples of the Baltic countries of their sacred right of choosing their form of government and of restoring their sovereign rights and self-government; and be it further

Resolved, That we appeal to the Executive Government and Members of Congress to reaffirm at this time the American determination to see the sovereignty and self-government of occupied countries, including the Baltic States, restored in the peace settlement and in the post-war international security system; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be mailed to the President, the Secretary of State, Members of Congress of the United States, and to the press.

JOHN LENOW, *Chairman.*
RICHARD HERMANSON,
Secretary.

Transportation Priorities for Furloughed Servicemen

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a brief moment to call to the attention of the Members of this House a situation which I feel is deplorable and of which I have been ashamed to some extent. I have introduced a bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy to provide priorities on all types of transportation to members of their respective branches of the armed forces of the United States who are on furlough from overseas service—including service in Alaska—or on furlough from service in the United States.

It is from experience that I have come to the conclusion that such priorities

should be provided for servicemen on furlough. I may say here that the two departments involved have established priorities in regard to commercial air transport. However, I must add also that the ordinary serviceman on furlough has the very lowest priority on this type of transportation.

There is no priority established for servicemen on furlough on other types of transportation such as railroad or bus lines. As an example of the reason why such priorities should be established, I want to point out that men in training in the United States are first alerted for overseas action and then they are given a furlough to visit their family for the last time before they embark and in many cases for the last time ever. But I have seen many of these servicemen whose destination is so far that travel by bus or day coach would be extremely uncomfortable and in many cases impossible. Owing to the fact that they never know when they will be alerted and when they are to receive a furlough it is impossible for them to make reservations in advance. Therefore a good deal of their time is taken in trying to get home and by the time they go home and return the trip has not meant very much because traveling has been so strenuous. Just recently a captain in the marines who had returned from active duty spent almost 3 days in Washington because he could get no reservation on the trains and his destination from Washington was a great distance; and each time he secured a reservation on a plane some higher priority took him off. These cases are more numerous than we think because it is only a few that we run into, many of these men doing the best they can without saying a word to anyone. Of course, the civilian who knows in advance when he proposes to take a trip, sometimes on business or sometimes for pleasure, has had ample opportunity to make his reservations far in advance.

This bill does not set forth the details of how the priorities should be worked out. It simply authorizes the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy to provide these priorities and they will have to work out the details.

It seems the very least that a civilian can do for these men who are fighting for us in the battle line is to give up his reservation when it is not absolutely necessary, that the men may have a few days in peace at home. May I request the assistance of every Member of this House who is interested in bringing about the passage of this bill.

Something More Than a Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reports from the battle fronts are showing the world that something besides a tree grows in Brooklyn. Many of our boys in various services are distinguishing themselves, and at this time I would like to say a word about the Brooklyn boys who have been decorated for outstanding heroism serving in the Corps of Engineers.

The first news from the front on D-day describing the fighting in France stated that:

Men of the Corps of Engineers paved the way for the successful thrust. * * * Under fire of German 88's, the engineers cleared the way for the Infantry through the inundated areas, * * * enabling the Americans to reach high ground and push on.

In this war of movement—movement of mechanized equipment and vast tonnages of supplies over great distances—the Army Engineers clear the way. The principal engineer activities have to do with movement—with mobility—with keeping the Army moving up to and on the field of battle. They build and they fight.

Engineers remove from the path of the Army obstacles that destroy or limit its ability to move. They help other units across the beaches in invasion. Engineer units are included in every division and other big ground and air combat teams. They do whatever is necessary to remove or make a safe route through minefields, ditches, walls, barbed-wire entanglements, and other obstructions which the enemy puts in the way of our own troops.

Engineers drop out of airplanes, with demolition equipment tied to them. Troops like these made the interior of Sicily sound like the Fourth of July a few minutes before our landing boats hit the coast. This was repeated on a larger scale in France. Engineers blast our enemy underwater barriers to permit landing boats to hit the shore in invasion. They locate and remove other obstacles to enable the assault infantry to snake through. Putting ashore in the first waves, with bulldozers and other equipment, they lay wire mesh over the beach to permit the vehicles of war to move, and they knock down bunkers to permit their passage away from the beach. They build roads, bypass destroyed bridges, and build bridges to keep the Army moving.

Above everything else, Army Engineers are soldiers. They have a glorious tradition as fighters. When necessary they move into battle and fight shoulder to shoulder with the Infantry and other troops. In New Guinea, they drove a Jap counterattack back into the sea, and they stopped the Japs' last suicide mission on Attu. They are especially trained in the assault of fortified positions, the hardest of all man-made obstacles for armies to overcome. Clearing minefields is another specialty of the Engineers.

Ernie Pyle said:

Scores of times during the Sicilian fighting I heard the expression by everybody from generals to privates that "This is an engineer's war." And indeed it is. Every foot of our advance upon the gradually withdrawing enemy was tempoed by the speed with which our engineers could open the highways, clear the mines and by-pass the blown bridges.

In his book reporting his observations on a globe-girdling tour, Senator MEAD, of New York, said:

This Engineers' war is nothing less than history's greatest construction job.

The Airborne Engineer battalions are equipped with light-weight machines for transportation by air. When the First Air Command Force carried Allied troops over the Japanese lines in Northern Burma, Engineers came in with the gliders to build the airstrips which served the troop-carrying and supply planes. Col. Philip G. Cochran, commanding officer, said:

The Engineers had a terrific loyalty and devotion to duty. They could have griped a little, but they didn't. They were always ready to go. We felt like they were part of our unit. The aerial engineers built eight fields where cargo and troop-carrying planes could land and approximately 100 strips for the light liaison planes.

Months before the invasion of France engineers in a daring scientific Commando raid conducted a private invasion to collect samples of French soil to be tested in England in order to prepare the way for landing of heavy material. This was necessary because tanks and guns are heavy and because the sands of Normandy can be treacherous.

The Corps of Engineers has come a long way since it was founded June 16, 1775, when Congress authorized Gen. George Washington's appointment of Louis le Begue du Portail, of the French Army Engineers, as Chief Engineer of the Revolutionary Army. Today it can be found all over the world—doing practically every job required by war.

Engineers build and operate portable pipe-line units which largely have taken over the tremendous job of moving fuels to combat areas. They fight fires, supply water wherever the Army goes, build and repair ports through which move the vast and unending flow of supplies that must keep apace a moving army.

In the river and harbor business, in war and in peace, since 1824 the engineers know boats. They handle a wide assortment of floating equipment, including port repair ships, seagoing dredges, assault boats, and rubber pontons.

Engineers are the Army's mapmakers. They are in the camouflage business. They operate utilities, run sawmills, rehabilitate oil wells. They are the earth-movers for the Army—moving dirt faster than it has ever been moved before. They clear the way.

General MacArthur tells us:

Engineer troops finishing an airport at Milne Bay to defend Port Moresby and Australia abandoned their equipment, unslung their guns and drove a force of attacking Japs back into the sea. * * * These are the same gallant Engineers who are building advance airdromes under fire as our operations press the war to the heart of the Jap Empire.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower states:

Land mines have been used so extensively in north Africa and Sicily that they are practically a new weapon. The Engineers—those unsung heroes of our antimine units—are mastering this trickiest of instruments from the armament of modern warfare.

Gen. H. H. Arnold declares:

I commend the magnificent work that aviation Engineer troops are doing in combat theaters overseas, in providing field airdromes in a hurry for our rapidly growing Air Forces.

Lt. Gen. Carl Spaatz informs us:

The Engineers did a magnificent job in north Africa. They built airfields faster than we could use them.

While Air Forces Capt. Richard C. Roderick relates:

If it weren't for the swell work of the Army engineers, I doubt that Attu would ever have been taken. The Engineers, with bulldozers, tractors, and every type of mechanical equipment, repaired our fields as fast as the Japs could bomb us.

It was General Pershing who said:

The scientist said it couldn't be done, but the damn fool engineer didn't know that—so he just went ahead and did it.

The Corps of Engineers is a wrecker of dire prophecies and a master of situations not in the books.

First "it couldn't be done" job was the Panama Canal. Entering the scene of dashed hopes, the Corps of Engineers built the "big ditch" in record time.

When the Alaska Highway was proposed a chorus of discouragement went up, "What about snow, muskeg, year-around frozen earth, mud, forest?" Army engineers rolled up their sleeves. "It shall be done," they said—and it was; 1,700 miles of it, months ahead of schedule.

Give an Army engineer enough mud, preferably waist deep, and he will do the impossible every time. In 17 days under fire engineers built more miles of roads over the squashy muck of Attu than the Japs had built in 11 months.

It used to take weeks, months to build landing fields. Engineers fixed that. They developed steel landing mats. Landing in Sicily with invasion troops, Army engineers built a complete airfield in 24 hours.

In 12 days Army engineers partially dammed up the mouth of a creek on the edge of Adak Island in the Aleutians, 'dozed a heavy fill into the lagoon, covered it over with steel mat, and turned it over to the Air Forces.

Other engineer developments to speed the war—demountable hangars that can be transported by plane, knock-down landing boats that save 50 percent of transport space, portable pipe lines to supply fuel to distant places and conserve motor vehicles.

Scratch an engineer and you will find a first-class miracle worker lugging around a neat bag of "enginuities."

Here are a few of the Brooklyn men of the Corps of Engineers who were given Army awards. This list is not complete by any means.

AWARD OF LEGION OF MERIT

Howard J. Hamann, technical sergeant, Engineer Topographical Company: For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services at Bizerte, Tunisia, from May 17 to June 7, 1943. While his organization was preparing a hydrographic survey of the port and lake at Bizerte incident to the planning of embarkation operations from that area, Sergeant Hamann, in charge of the project's field office, displayed qualities of resourcefulness and technical ability far above those expected from one of his rank. Assuming complete responsibility for the manifold details of field and office procedure, he performed the administrative phases and much of the actual technical work with a proficiency which enabled maintenance of a seemingly impossible rate of progress, and successful completion of this urgent mission well in advance of the schedule.

SILVER STAR MEDAL

George Biggert, private, first class: For gallantry in action at New Georgia, Solomon Islands, while courageously advancing under fire toward an enemy ambush, to safely evacuate a wounded comrade on July 27, 1943.

William H. Welch, private, first class: For gallantry in action near Tambu Bay, New Guinea, on July 20, 1943.

SOLDIER'S MEDAL

Edward Touhey, sergeant: For heroism displayed in Alaska Department on October 30, 1943. On this date, while engaged in dock construction, one of the members of the crew fell from the dock structure into rough sea below. Reacting instantly to the emergency, the two enlisted men named below [one of whom was Sergeant Touhey] leaped through a maze of temporary scaffolding and braces into the nearly freezing water and reached the unconscious soldier in time to prevent his drowning. The prompt action of these enlisted men in effecting the rescue with utter disregard for their personal safety reflects great credit on themselves and the military service.

Vito Saccente, private: Following an air raid, these men [one of whom was Private Saccente] discovered that an air-raid shelter, full of civilians, had received a direct bomb hit. The shelter was full of carbon monoxide gas from the explosion, but without thought of their own safety and at great personal risk, these men at once began rescue work and succeeded in bringing out 11 dead and 21 injured before they themselves became gas casualties and were removed to the hospital. The prompt and heroic action of these men reflects the highest credit to themselves and the military service.

Frank D. Calabro, private (first class): For heroism at Bougainville, Solomon Islands, on February 18, 1944, when he extinguished the flames of burning gasoline on the person of a soldier. By his presence of mind and unhesitating action, Private Calabro saved the life of his comrade at the risk of being seriously burned himself.

Salvatore DiScalfani, technician (fifth grade): For heroism at Ile Rousse, Corsica, on December 22, 1943. Several members of a boat crew were washed overboard by high waves. Technician DiScalfani was passing along the beach when he heard the one remaining member of the boat crew calling to him to help one of the men in the water who was in grave danger of drowning. Without regard to his personal safety Technician DiScalfani plunged into the sea fully clothed and went to the assistance of his fellow soldier who lost consciousness just as help reached him. Battered by the rough sea and weighed down by the limp body of the soldier, he fought his way to shore.

Peter J. Giambalvo, technician (fifth grade): For heroism at Monterey Bay, Calif., on June 23, 1943.

BRONZE STAR MEDAL

Charles M. Boye, technician (fifth grade): For heroic action in combat on January 6 and 7, 1944, during the battle for Mount Porchia, Italy.

PURPLE HEARTS

Alexander M. Fiedor, private (first class); Herbert I. Cohen, private (first class); Walter N. Syvertson, private (first class); Vincent J. Conselva, corporal; Louis G. Gonzales, corporal; William T. Lonngren, private; Abraham Hochstein, private (first class); Salvatore J. Laurice, private (first class); John A. MacIntosh, corporal; Samuel Sontag, private; Paul Bodner, technician (fifth grade); David J. Matthews, private; James Wells, private; John J. Urban, private (first class); Louis W. Donowski, corporal.

The Farmers of Puerto Rico Urge the Immediate Removal of Governor Tugwell

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the RECORD a copy of a resolution recently adopted by the Farmers' Association of Puerto Rico urging the immediate removal of Governor Tugwell. Also I include another resolution of the Farmers' Association of Puerto Rico protesting against the disapproval by Governor Tugwell of bills approved by the Legislature of Puerto Rico to foster the coffee agricultural industry. Also I desire to include a resolution adopted by the same association demanding of Congress the solution of the political status of Puerto Rico:

Resolution to demand the immediate removal of the Governor of Puerto Rico, Rexford G. Tugwell

Whereas the Governor, the Honorable Rexford Guy Tugwell, since he took charge of the Governorship of Puerto Rico, has not shown himself to be interested in the improvement of the sources of agricultural wealth of this country; and

Whereas the said official, Rexford G. Tugwell, has vetoed several bills tending to rehabilitate the coffee industry without giving any cause or reason which might have compelled him to take such a decision; and

Whereas we farmers of Puerto Rico are firmly convinced by the actions of this Governor that it is not his intention to help protect the development of our agricultural wealth; and

Whereas the farmers of Puerto Rico have the right to feel justly alarmed at this attitude of their Governor, which may lead to the misery and destruction of our economic life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this meeting of farmers, assembled in San Juan, P. R., this 21st day of May 1944:

1. To request, as we do hereby request, from the Honorable President Roosevelt the removal from office of Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell, Governor of Puerto Rico, inasmuch as if this gentleman continues in the governorship of this country, the longer he holds said office of Governor the more possibilities there will be for agriculture, our chief source of wealth, to suffer a collapse as a consequence of the actions of this Governor.

2. That copies of this resolution be sent to President Roosevelt, to the President of the National Senate, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to the chairmen of the congressional committees.

Resolution to protest against the disapproval by the Governor of the coffee bills passed by the legislature

Whereas the Legislature of Puerto Rico passed house bills 321 and 696 and senate bill 315, which, had they become laws, would have marked the beginning of a plan to cooperate in the rehabilitation of the coffee wealth of our island; and

Whereas it is generally known that the only forests that we have in Puerto Rico are our coffee plantations, which are necessary for agriculture in general and for the industrialization, electric power, and irrigation program, due to their retention of moisture in the soil; and

Whereas it is also generally known that most of the inhabitants of the disgraceful slums of our principal cities are made up of emigrant laborers from the coffee districts; and

Whereas the Chief Executive of Puerto Rico, unheeding the mandate of the people, as expressed by their legislature, pocket-vetoed the said bills without even deigning to offer excuses or reasons which, in his judgment, had prevented his signing such bills: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this meeting of farmers, assembled in San Juan, P. R., this 21st day of May 1944:

1. To protest, as we do hereby protest, at the inexplicable and most reprehensible attitude of the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Rexford G. Tugwell, in vetoing house bills 321 and 696 and senate bills 315, remaining deaf to the mandate of the people as unanimously expressed by their legislators, and thus leaving more than 20,000 coffee growers in a state of uncertainty which will hasten their total ruin.

2. To condemn, as we do hereby condemn, the indifference, the neglect, and the forgetfulness which our chief executive and his counselors maintain toward our coffee agriculture, without weighing the responsibility that they undertake by this procedure, and the serious damage that they are causing to our agricultural wealth, which represents the means of livelihood of more than one-fourth of our total population, and which guarantees the conservation of our forests and, with them, the water currents whose conservation our country so badly needs.

3. That copies of this resolution be sent to the Chief Executive, to the members of his Cabinet, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the chairmen of the Chavez and Bell committees of the Congress of the United States.

Resolution to ratify resolutions of previous meetings demanding the solution of the political status of Puerto Rico

Whereas the Puerto Rico Farmers Association has for many years been demanding, by its sovereign meetings and lengthy resolutions, from the authorities and from the Congress of the United States, the solution of the political status of Puerto Rico, considering that the present system of colonial government from which we are suffering creates uncertainty and prevents our energies from being directed along firm paths in the financial development of our country; and

Whereas despite these demands of the Puerto Rico Farmers Association and other similar petitions made by other financial, political, and social entities of Puerto Rico, it has not yet been possible to have the Congress of the United States define once and for all what our future is going to be with regard to our final political status; and

Whereas this situation prolongs the uncertainty under which we have been struggling for many years, stagnates individual activities, and every day complicates more our financial situation to such an extent that the present situation, which threatens to throw us into chaos along all lines, has already become unbearable; and

Whereas should the intention of Congress with regard to our political future, which is so intimately related to the social and economic future of this country, be clarified, our activities along all lines could be directed with a more certain orientation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this meeting of the Puerto Rico Farmers Association, assembled this 21st day of May 1944, in San Juan, P. R.:

1. To ratify, as we do hereby ratify, the resolutions of sovereign meetings previously held, demanding from the Congress of the United States the final solution of our present political status by abolishing the colonial system—from all points unfair—and to again demand, as we hereby demand, from the Congress, the authorities, and the people of the United States, that they define their intention with regard to our political future, radically abolishing the present colonial type of government from which we are suffering, and granting us the rights to which we are entitled as citizens of the United States.

2. That copies of this resolution be sent to the Presiding Officers of the National Congress, to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the press.

Faith in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the following release from the Bureau of Reclamation at Coulee Dam, State of Washington.

Nothing can destroy faith in the West—the faith of peoples in all parts of the country—so much as incidents like the sale of land by unscrupulous persons.

The release follows:

Advised that an aged couple recently had been induced to purchase land in the Columbia Basin reclamation project in eastern Washington on false pretenses, Frank A. Banks, regional director of reclamation, at Coulee Dam, Wash., today warned local people to obtain all the facts about the proposed development before buying.

"Anyone approached to purchase land in the project, to be irrigated by the Grand Coulee Dam, should write to the Bureau at Coulee Dam, Wash., to learn whether the land is actually in the project area, whether it has been classified as land that will be irrigated, and what the Government considers its true worth to be," Mr. Banks said. "There is no charge for this information."

The persons who were bilked by an unscrupulous land salesman—their names were not made known—reported they were told the land they purchased would be irrigated immediately after the war, when, as a matter of fact, it may be a long time before water can be made available for it.

Mr. Banks said that while reports of misrepresentation in the sale of Basin lands are few, the Bureau of Reclamation is anxious to nip speculation attempts in the bud.

"The Columbia Basin project will become one of the finest irrigated areas in the Nation, but it will probably be many years before it is fully developed," Mr. Banks stated. "In March 1943 Congress passed the Columbia Basin Project Act, and anyone contemplating the purchase of land should be thoroughly familiar with it. Our new pamphlet, Settlement of the Columbia Basin Reclamation Project, available free, explains the law in understandable language."

Mr. Banks emphasized that there is no good reason to hurry in the purchase of Columbia Basin land for irrigation purposes. Even though Grand Coulee Dam has been completed, a large pumping plant, reservoir dams, and an elaborate canal system must yet be built. It will probably be several years after the war before water will be available for any of the land, and some of it may not be irrigated for 20 to 25 years.

Lt. Joseph S. Lovett, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Armistice Day I was deeply impressed by the song, Hymn to a Hero, on Fred Waring's radio program. At its conclusion I learned that its author was a comrade of mine of World War No. 1, Joseph S. Lovett, of Brewton, Ala. He had written the hymn in memory of his hero son, Lt. Joseph S. Lovett, Jr., a pursuit pilot who was killed in action at Port Moresby, New Guinea, on May 4, 1942. Several days thereafter I wrote Comrade Lovett to express sympathy in his bereavement and congratulate him on this excellent hymn. In replying at about Christmas time he mailed me an equally excellent poem addressed to his son, It's Always Christmas Up There.

Sad though they be I have derived so much pleasure from reading them that I wish my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to also enjoy doing so. Hence I include them both in these remarks:

HYMN TO A HERO

Tonight beside the Coral Sea,
Where crosses stand so silently,
A boy is sleeping.
No more to fly, in rain and sun,
Through hail of death from bomb and gun;
His day is o'er—his work is done.
We are not weeping.

For through the days of war and strife,
Of these, for which he gave his life,
A boy was dreaming.
Was dreaming of God—to worship as we may,
Of home—where children sing and play,
And love—that makes our life each day
So bright and gleaming.

And now, beside the Crystal Sea,
Where peace shall reign eternally,
A boy is waking.
No more to fight, in rain and sun;
His night is o'er—his day begun.
And soon that road which he has won,
We will be taking.

—*Joseph S. Lovett.*

IT'S ALWAYS CHRISTMAS UP THERE

With songs of peace, good will to men,
Our hearts this day are filled.
We think of you up there, and then
Our fears for you are stilled.

We like to think of you, up there
With all that gallant band
Of heroes at the home base, where
The Lord is in command.

Where serving Him is full of joy,
And you can be the host
To show His wonders, to each boy
Arriving at the post.

Up there—'Tis not so far away—
As you have made us know;
For often, when we try to pray,
You're with us here below.

You're with us now, and through your eyes
A glimpse to us is given
Of peace, good will, that never dies
At home up there—in heaven.

We should be glad that you're not here,
Where we can see the gleam
Of Christmas light but once a year,
And heaven's just a dream.

—*Joseph S. Lovett.*

Labor's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial which appeared in the overseas edition of the Stars and Stripes calling attention to the excellent record of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, C. I. O. This editorial indicates that our armed services are not being fooled by the attempts on the part of the newspapers to create division between our soldiers and sailors and the war workers who are beating all production records to supply the men at the front with the weapons of war, but our men and women in the service are proud of the tireless efforts of union labor to prevent any interference with war production:

LABOR'S RECORD

Bad news travels fast. Labor strikes and lock-outs are no exception, for in time of war such news is sometimes sensational.

The loyalty of American labor, on the other hand, seldom makes the headlines, for in time of war such loyalty is expected and often taken for granted regardless of circumstances; but in fairness we would like to give you a report from the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America.

Recently this union issued a report to its members in the armed forces. Those on the job at home felt that those in the service should be told what they were doing to increase production and strengthen and stabilize the entire home front in their effort to back up the Commander in Chief in policies that would lead to the speediest victory and the establishment of a lasting peace.

Topping their long list of achievements was a record of no strikes since Pearl Harbor, for the electrical workers had given their solemn pledge to produce the war goods you would need without interruption, and they have kept their pledge. And while you G. I.'s may all be proud of your record in training and battle, the men you left behind on the production line are equally proud of the recent tribute paid them by the Under Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, who said: "As we turn toward the tougher struggle ahead, it is gratifying to note the excellent record made by your union in observance of its no-strike pledge. With that kind of backing our soldiers will move into the decisive phase of the war with an overwhelming superiority of fire power and equipment over the armies of Hitler and Hirohito."

The record of America's electrical workers has been supported by the vast majority of all labor in America. Strikes have been the exception, not the rule, and working men and women at home have broken every production record in their all-out effort to provide weapons of war on time to fill every need.

We are proud that we have been asked to pass this report on to you by those serving loyally on the home front.

U. A. W.-C. I. O. Reconversion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement adopted by U. A. W. war-policy division and released by President R. J. Thomas, June 21, 1944:

U. A. W.-C. I. O. RECONVERSION PROGRAM

I. THE NEED FOR ACTION

Everybody is talking about full employment. We propose to do something about it. The way things are going at present we are rapidly getting away from it.

The peak of war production is passed. Unless our armies experience reverses on a scale which none of us expect, the output of war equipment will decline from now on.

Employment in munitions industries has already dropped by 800,000 since the peak last fall. It is expected to drop by another million by the end of this year. The airplane industry alone, including subcontractors and suppliers, will drop off by at least 300,000, shipbuilding by some 200,000, steel and aluminum by perhaps 150,000, etc. In 1945, as everyone knows, the reduction in employment will accelerate even faster. Only large-scale military reverses can change the trend.

And from now on, with inductions into the armed services on the decline, reductions in war employment will be translated into unemployment or, in the case of some women, into withdrawal from the labor force completely. In either case we shall be moving away from our goal of full production and full employment. Preparations must be made now for prompt resumption of nonmilitary production.

II. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE U. A. W. PROGRAM

1. Winning the war is our most immediate task. There is nothing inconsistent between continued emphasis upon the overriding necessities of the war program and the need for the development of a reconversion plan. Uncertainties about the future are hindering war production. Workers, concerned about their future employment, are shifting out of war industries into what look like more permanent jobs. The development of a reconversion and post-war plan is a war necessity.

2. To achieve full production and full employment, it is necessary to plan ahead for the difficult period of shifting from war production to civilian production. I don't like the term "reconversion." It implies a return to an earlier situation. But a return to prewar production levels would mean unemployment amounting to fifteen to nineteen million. The type of planning that I think is necessary is not planning for reconversion but planning for full utilization of our material and human resources.

Such planning requires centralization of basic economic controls in a single governmental agency. There is no such agency now. The Kilgore bill and the George-Murray bill, both under consideration in the Senate, would establish such a central office for both war mobilization and for the handling of reconversion and post-war problems.

Such planning requires also a central planning agency. Congress tossed out the National Resources Planning Board; it is necessary to have in its place something similar. The Bureau of Programs called for by the Kilgore bill is such an agency.

3. Control over the reconversion process must be in the hands of a civilian agency. In connection with cut-backs, the armed services should, of course, have the final say as to their extent and timing, but the W. P. B.—presumably the Production Executive Committee—should determine which plants are to be cut back and in what localities.

4. Cooperation among labor, industry, and Government is essential to an orderly handling of the problems involved in reconversion and the post-war period. Labor should have representation on the Production Executive Committee of the W. P. B. In addition, the C. I. O. is on record as favoring joint industry-labor committees to advise on reconversion problems. The present W. P. B. set-up of separate industry committees and labor committees is not satisfactory. In addition, there should be regional joint committees. The Kilgore bill provides for joint industry and regional committees.

5. We do not question the central role of free—really free—private enterprise.

This does not mean, however, that industry should have the freedom to restrict output. What has made American industry great has been the initiative displayed in developing new products and improved methods, with resulting large national output. Tendencies toward restriction of output are contrary to the essence of the American tradition.

There are several corollaries to this point:

(a) We favor vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws to prevent any restraints upon production whether resulting from cartels, monopoly agreements, or patent licenses

which exclude or suppress competition and new production.

(b) The interests of small business must be protected. Small business should have access to surplus war materials, tools, and facilities, and should receive Government credits when necessary.

(c) It will be necessary to retain Government controls over prices and to continue necessary rationing restrictions.

III. SPECIFIC STEPS

1. After notification by the armed services of impending cut-backs in war production, the Production Executive Committee should notify management and labor at the earliest possible moment—preferably 90 days in advance—of the precise location of the cut-backs.

2. Work on scheduling the resumption of nonmilitary production for both domestic and foreign markets should begin at once in order that actual production may begin by not later than January 1945 on a scale adequate to reabsorb the workers displaced by curtailment of war programs.

Within the framework of an adequately planned program consideration should be given in the termination of war contracts to privately owned plants and to plants in loose labor market areas—thus expediting the resumption of civilian production with a minimum of dislocation.

Wherever it will not interfere with the war effort the War Production Board should authorize under appropriate controls the manufacture of machine tools necessary for the resumption of civilian production and should permit the employment of tool and dye makers and designing engineers—many of whom in the Detroit area are now, to all intents and purposes, idle—in planning civilian products.

3. Special emphasis must be put upon the development of a sound export program to facilitate the reconstruction and rehabilitation of war-torn areas and the industrialization of relatively undeveloped countries. Full production and full employment in this country after the war depends in large measure upon the successful development of a large export program. Such a program will be expedited by the development of trade agreements with other countries.

4. Even with adequate planning there must be provision for tiding workers over during the reconversion process. Both dismissal wages and an improved system of unemployment compensation are necessary. Any change in the unemployment compensation set-up to be satisfactory must recognize the national character of the unemployment problem. The extension of Federal control is essential. In this respect the Kilgore bill provides the most satisfactory solution. Dismissal wages are not an alternative to unemployment compensation but are better obtained by collective bargaining than by legislation.

5. It is necessary to develop a full-scale program of public works and housing to supplement if necessary private industrial activity. It is difficult to see how an adequate program can be worked out without the creation of a Government planning agency of the sort recommended in this program.

IV. LEGISLATIVE ACTION

We recommend the immediate passage by the Senate of legislation which embodies the principles expressed in the Kilgore bill, S. 1893. This bill, as I have indicated, would provide for a coordinated governmental set-up for handling both continued war production and the change-over to nonmilitary production; it would provide for a central planning agency; it provides for labor participation throughout at all levels; it offers an improved unemployment compensation system to help workers during the change-over period and to establish a floor to purchase power.

We are urging upon Senator MURRAY and Senator GEORGE the desirability of their agreement with Senator KILGORE upon a bill which will have acceptability. The Kilgore bill is already sponsored by eight members of the Senate Military Affairs Committee and by several others, including Senator PEPPER, who is a member of the Post-war Committee. I should like to call attention to the fact that the George committee in its most recent report (dated June 12, 1944), after discussing the various problems involved in reconversion, concludes with the following statement:

"Congressional attention to these matters cannot wait. Prompt action on them is of transcendent importance, and this committee feels most strongly that no extended congressional recess should be considered pending their disposition. The very destiny of the Nation may depend upon wise and prompt decisions in respect to them."

Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, an active member of Senator GEORGE's committee, has stated publicly that he favors along these lines "before any consideration is given to a summer Senate recess." (Letter to Governor Kelly, May 12, 1944.)

I am in complete accord with this expression of urgency on the part of the George committee and am hopeful that the members of this committee will be active in furthering legislation of the type which now finds its best expression in Senator KILGORE's bill.

Three Years Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., issue of June 22, 1944:

THREE YEARS LATER

At dawn on this day 3 years ago, heady with the wine of his immense victories in the west and dreaming a wildly vaulting dream of world conquest, Adolf Hitler turned suddenly to the east and let loose the lightning upon his whilom ally.

Though months earlier they had been warned by American officials that such an attack was coming, the stunned Russians were sent reeling back by its first awful impact. On to Leningrad. On to Kiev. On to Kharkov. On to Taganrog. On to Smolensk. Violence and more violence. Death and more death. Victory and more victory. There seemed to be nothing that could stop the mighty, the precise, the all-powerful Wehrmacht.

By summer's end in that fateful year, one could count on the fingers of one hand the number of British and American military experts who did not believe that Russia would be forced into an ignominous surrender within the next 60 or 90 days. Indeed, less than 4 months after he had opened his assault, Hitler himself exultantly proclaimed that "this enemy is already broken and will never rise again." Who does not remember those days? Who does not remember how in December, after Japan had struck at Pearl Harbor, the potential prospect for America was one of being eventually encircled by enemies holding sway in both the great oceans washing our shores—enemies in a position to use all of the British Isles, all of the continent of Europe, all of the Eastern Hemisphere against us?

The prospect, however, never materialized, for with unforgettable heroism and sacrifice, pouring out rivers of their best blood in defense of the land they loved, the Russian people somehow managed to hold on. But that was not the end of it: When the first agonizing winter was over, the Nazis struck again, this time in a fashion more deadly than ever—down into the Crimea, deep into the Caucasus, clear to Stalingrad astride the Volga. Now came the Red Army's blackest hour.

But now, too, came the turning of the tide, starting in September 1942. The Russians hit back at Stalingrad; Montgomery smashed Rommel at El Alamein; British and American armies invaded north Africa; and all the while our allied air power in Britain was striking with ever-mounting violence at the heart of the Reich.

The rest of the story is too fresh to need reviewing. A glance at the map is enough to remind us of all that has happened since Hitler reached the floodtide of his conquests at Stalingrad. Today, with a new front expanding ominously against him in France and with other fronts in the making, everything is in such swift ebb for this man—this man who planned never to fight anything but a one-front war—that no matter where he casts his eyes, whether up or down or around him, he can see nothing but catastrophe bearing relentlessly down on him.

As for the German people, on this third anniversary of the invasion of Russia, they must begin to realize that Hitler has led them at long last to the edge of a fearsome abyss and that millions of their youth have died for nothing better than his warped ambition which, in its wreckage, adds up to one of the most wicked and appalling futilities in the history of the world. This day, then, while a fit time for mutual Russian and allied congratulations, is for the Reich a time for the deepest kind of contrition and remorse. Never, certainly, was it better or more grimly demonstrated that they shall perish by the sword who live by it.

Recognition of Yugoslav Government of Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, the valiant people of the Balkans have been suffering under the domination of the Hitlerite Fascist's boot since the Nazis came to power in Germany. From the very first day when the Nazis came to power, they have been pouring agents through the Balkans intent upon dividing and conquering the little brave people of these small countries and converting them to slavery under the "master race." Of all the peoples of the Balkans, one group more than any other has resisted from the very first the Hitler intimidation. It has fought back inch for inch, foot for foot, and yard for yard against the terror and torture of the Nazis. That group is the free people of Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, Yugoslavia, like so many other countries, has had its "quislings."

There have been many in Yugoslavia who are not averse to kneeling and groveling before the Fascists; boot lickers for a pound of silver for the blood of their neighbor's veins. There are some, Mr. Speaker, who first saw fit to fight and later on, wearying of the struggle, weak at heart and weak of mind, sold out to the would-be conquerors. But the very weakness of its leaders seemed only to add strength to the people's movement for the liberation of Yugoslavia, and out of the chaos which rose from Hitler's invasion of the Balkans in 1941 has come one man and one group which has never swerved from its determination to carry on the good fight against our common enemy. That is the partisan movement of Marshal Tito, the dynamic, brave, fiery leader of the free peoples fighting fascism in the mountains, the cities, the villages, and the fields of Yugoslavia today.

At this very moment, side by side with our own boys, uncounted numbers of whom have parachuted into partisan territory to take up the fight, and side by side with our heroic British allies, Marshal Tito's forces continue to plague the Nazis at every point.

Who are the people who fight with Tito? The people who fight with Marshal Tito are the free people of Yugoslavia. The National Liberation Army banded together under Tito is composed of Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Montenegrins, and Macedonians. It is composed of members of the Christian Socialist Party, the Social Democratic Party, the Communist Party, the labor unions, and the Slovenian Catholic Party. In its ranks are Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in proportion to the relative strength of each of these groups throughout all Yugoslavia. Its members know no party, know no race, know no separate creed, but only the common struggle against the common enemy.

While the traitors of the King Peter government have been busy carrying on continued collaboration with the enemy, Marshal Tito and his National Liberation Army have never ceased to fight and fight hard; yet our Government still permits agents of the proven traitor, Mihailovich, to use funds of the King Peter government to propagandize against this great hero, Tito, in the United States.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are still those in our State Department who try desperately to rescue the discredited Mihailovich clique from the oblivion into which it has so correctly sunk.

We must demand, Mr. Speaker, that the funds of the Yugoslav Government in the United States be transferred at once to the representatives of Marshal Tito and the national army of liberation which so valiantly fights our common enemy.

While our own fighting sons, brothers, and loved ones are dying on the beaches and the hills of France at the hands of the Nazis, we are making a mockery of the crosses which lie over their heads by permitting the continuance of the anti-Tito propaganda machine which has trafficked so viciously with the enemy under our very nose.

In my own State of Washington, reside many thousand Yugoslav Americans. They are a splendid, hard working, patriotic people—the finest type of American citizens. Those Yugoslav Americans are unanimous in their support and faith in the government of liberation in Yugoslavia. They are united in calling upon our Government to freeze the funds held in this country by the royal government in exile. They demand that these funds be diverted to the use of its partisan armies under Josip Broz and to the restoration of their country after the war.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out further that the Senate in the State of Washington has unanimously passed a resolution urging recognition by our Government of the liberation government of Yugoslavia, and the freezing of the funds now held by the royal government in exile.

Mr. Speaker, I submit we should join our efforts with the Yugoslav Americans of our country in bringing about full recognition to the liberation government of Yugoslavia.

Importation of Food Grains Duty-Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my views on H. R. 4788, a bill extending for 180 days the period during which certain grains and other products may be imported from foreign countries free of duty. At the conclusion of my own remarks I am placing in the RECORD two letters written by Marvin Jones, Administrator of the War Food Administration, one addressed to Hon. R. L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and the other to Hon. HIRAM JOHNSON, Senator from California, both under date of June 20, 1944.

On December 8, 1943, the House passed House Joint Resolution 171, which permitted the importation of certain grain free of duty for a period of 90 days. Later this was extended for another 90-day period by H. R. 4410. The pending legislation would extend the time for another 180-day period. At the time this legislation was before the House I stated that the approval of this legislation would not be of assistance to the livestock, dairy, and poultry producers of the Nation. Six months' trial has demonstrated that my statement was correct. Enactment of H. R. 4788 would not only extend the legislation previously approved, but greatly expand it. Therefore, I am opposed to its enactment. There can be no argument over the fact that there is a great need for feedstuffs for livestock and poultry producers, but enactment of this legislation would not solve the problem. The Commodity Credit Corporation is actively purchasing and importing large quantities of grains and feed. They have sufficient funds and an effective organization to make these purchases. The tariff is no factor. The importations are limited only by the quantity of grain available and transportation. Six months operation of H. R. 171 have proved these facts. Our livestock and poultry producers have not received additional grain and feed, but under present legislation our Government has been forced to pay millions of dollars to foreign countries who increased the price of these imported feeds the full amount of the tariff. For instance, on the importation of flax the Canadian Wheat Board increased its selling price by 30 cents a bushel and the Mexican producers increased their selling price the full 32½ cents per bushel. There is absolutely no justification for taking money out of the Federal Treasury to pay increased prices to foreign farmers when it does not bring in additional grains.

It seems to me that the taxpayers of our Nation are entitled to some consideration and therefore I must oppose this legislation.

The letters referred to follow:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 20, 1944.

Hon. R. L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: Reference is made to your letter of June 9, transmitting two copies of H. R. 4788, a bill extending for 180 days the period during which certain grains and other products may be imported from foreign countries free of duty, and requesting our comments and recommendations in connection with this proposed legislation.

In examining this bill we note certain major points of difference as compared with House Joint Resolution 171, which was approved December 22, 1943, and H. R. 4410, which was approved March 29, 1944, the latter extending the duty-free period to June 20, 1944. Among such difference the following may be mentioned:

1. The proposed duty-free period which would extend through December 17, 1944, is twice as long as in either of the other bills which were approved.

2. The list of duty-free products is extended to include many items of relatively minor importance as feed.

3. The use provision for feed "for livestock and poultry" is dropped except with respect to wheat. This is particularly important in the case of rye, barley, and oats which have other uses than for feed. Oats for food use was included as a Senate amendment to H. R. 4410 before it was adopted.

4. The wheat import quota is removed.

Of these changes by far the most important is the removal of the import quota. It is the opinion of this Administration that it would be unwise to take this action, particularly in view of the prospective record 1944 United States wheat crop. It should be noted that the present regulations governing the import quota on wheat exempts imports by the War Food Administration and thus makes it possible to import wheat in such quantities as may be needed in particular feed deficit areas. The removal of the quota would permit indiscriminate wheat importation.

We also believe it would be unwise, in case the duty-free entry period is extended, to

specify a period longer than the 90 days included in previous legislation, in view of prospective uncertain marketing conditions confronting United States producers of the commodities specified in H. R. 4788.

With respect to the actual experience under duty-free legislation on certain grains and feed products, which has now been in effect for nearly 6 months, the following observations may be of interest to your committee. The War Food Administration realized at the outset that the legislation might not fully accomplish the desired objectives, but in order that everything possible might be done to help the feed situation, the enactment of the original bill for a 90-day period was favored. In March, when H. R. 4410 was under consideration, War Food Administration officials testified before the Senate Fiance Committee regarding the effects of Public Law 211. It was pointed out at that time that the results of the legislation had not been fully effective from the standpoint of increased supplies and reduced prices to farmers in the United States.

Transportation and the availability of foreign supplies have been the principal factors limiting feed imports. The foreign selling price has been correspondingly increased in some cases, notably for barley, oats, and flaxseed from Canada, and on flaxseed and oilcake and meal from Mexico. With particular reference to flaxseed, there is attached a copy of a letter recently sent to Senator JOHNSON of California. This letter points out that the duty-free importation on the specified commodities has, in some instances, represented the transfer of moneys from the United States Treasury to foreign countries instead of reducing costs to users of feed in the United States.

For the reasons given above, we are not in favor of the enactment of H. R. 4788.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

JUNE 20, 1944.

Hon. HIRAM JOHNSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: This is in reply to your letter of May 25 with which you enclosed a letter from the Pacific Vegetable Oil Corporation regarding flaxseed.

The statements contained in this letter are substantially correct. Public Law 272, Seventy-eighth Congress, provides for the duty-free importation of flaxseed and several other commodities, with the announced intent of increasing the supplies of feed available to American producers from foreign sources. Officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation representing this administration were asked to testify before the Senate Finance Committee at the time this bill was under consideration.

They testified at that time that the removal of the duty on flaxseed would neither increase the quantities of oilseed meal available nor make such meal available at reduced prices. The demand for flaxseed in this country was such that with or without the duty every available bushel was being imported for which shipping space could be found. It was, therefore, pointed out that the net result of the cancelation of the duty would be a proportionate increase in the selling price of flaxseed asked by foreign producers. As a matter of fact this is exactly what has happened. The Canadian Wheat Board increased its selling price on flaxseed by 30 cents per bushel, and Mexican producers increased their selling price by the full 32½ cents per bushel. (The cancelation did not affect the Argentine market as purchase program).

Public Law 272, Seventy-eighth Congress, expires on June 20 and the Department has been requested by the House Ways and Means Committee for a report on H. R. 4788, to extend for an additional 180 days the period during which certain grains and other products may be imported from foreign countries free of duty. Enclosed is a copy of our adverse report which is being forwarded to you for your information.

Sincerely,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

A Union Educates for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Milwaukee Journal:

A UNION EDUCATES FOR DEMOCRACY

The United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O., has published for its members a Guide to Political Action, which is one of the most intelligent bits of political education that has come to our attention.

This 160-page booklet, simply written, stresses the need in a democracy for participation in politics. It tell union voters that political activity is not necessarily dirty activity; that when it is, the voter must get in and clean it up—not just run away.

"Politics is the science of making democracy work," says the guidebook. "The days of a labor boss promising to deliver labor's vote are over. Nobody delivers labor's vote. Labor does not seek to control the Government or influence governmental action out of proportion to labor's own democratic strength. The cause of labor and the Nation is identical."

Typical of much of the sound context of the booklet is this paragraph:

"Organized labor must find the closest possible working relationships with all business interests who are today working wholeheartedly for the winning of the war. Labor must join hands with all sections of patriotic industry and business, large as well as small, regardless of past differences, if it means adding strength to the move for victory during and after the war."

That is pretty good counsel. So is the admonition to union members that they must work for a better deal for Negroes in the field of labor, and must combat anti-Semitism and other types of racial prejudice.

The only partisan touch is contained in a few paragraph favoring reelection of President Roosevelt. This is not out of place in the booklet since this C. I. O. union has officially endorsed the President. Otherwise, the Guide to Political Action is broadly educational in the working of democracy. It explains the election laws of every State; maps the congressional districts; lists the Congressmen, the congressional committees, and the membership of various governmental agencies.

American Government would be better if voters as a whole were given the same kind of political education that this union attempts for its members.

Freedom for the Man on a Furlough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared recently in the Atlantic City Press, written by Ruth Milett:

FREEDOM FOR THE MAN ON FURLOUGH
(By Ruth Milett)

Some time ago I wrote a column urging parents to let their sons spend their own furloughs, instead of spending the furloughs for them by lining up family dinners with all the distant relatives included, dragging the tired men around to see people they don't care about, and so on.

Today a letter came from a marine in the South Pacific saying: "Thank you for explaining something to our parents that we could not very well explain to them ourselves." He went on to say he thought he would get a furlough soon, but that there were so many things he wanted to do, and the time would go so fast, he was hoping against hope his family wouldn't have a lot of things lined up for him to do.

He was anxious to get home—but he wanted home to be the way it was when he was a part of it. He didn't want a lot of extra fuss made. Most of all, he didn't want to be paraded around and made to talk about the fighting he had been through.

It is kind of pathetic to think that men who have dreamed of home for a year or two get afraid when their leaves are about due, that somehow those leaves won't be just as they want them.

A family can make it all right if it will remember just one thing: "It's Johnny's furlough—and nobody ought to try to spend even a small fraction of it for him. It's his to do with exactly as he dreamed he would."

Stop Crippling Dairy Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERLIN HULL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, for weeks past, Members representing the dairy districts of the Northwest, whence comes more than half the dairy products needed for our armed forces, the civilian population, and lend-lease shipments, have been receiving hundreds of letters as to the plight of the dairy farmers in their endeavors to comply with Government demands for greater and greater production. The lack of farm labor grows more and more acute as the War Manpower Commission continues to press for more young men for the armed forces, and for war industries.

Coupled with this dairy farm situation is that created by the drafting of young men from the creameries, cheese factories, and milk condensaries. Wisconsin produces one-eighth the Nation's supply of butter and more than one-half its cheese. Crippling of the operations of these dairy plants by taking their essential workers from them, not only shortens the Nation's food supply, but it also involves the waste of the precious milk which Wisconsin cows are so bountifully providing. These dairy plants are essential industries, just as vital toward the winning of the war as other war industries. Without them farm production cannot be carried on in sufficient volume to win the war. To cripple their activities by unwise manpower policies is just as detrimental to our supreme war effort as any other policy directed to that end.

It is not possible for me to publish all the letters of protest which I have received. With other representatives whose districts are vitally affected, I have entered repeated protests without avail. A letter from Milton H. Button, director of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, recites some of the many endeavors of that great State department to direct attention to the serious situation which grows more serious daily, without its protests receiving deserved attention.

More than 2 months ago, Warren W. Clark, associate director of the Wisconsin College of Agriculture, made a survey of the situation in the cheese industry and sought to obtain the intervention of General Hershey, without result. In a letter regarding the conditions in the cheese factories, Mr. Clark says:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, April 14, 1944.

You have no doubt already had your attention called to the very serious situation which faces the Wisconsin cheese industry through the operation of the recent policy of National Selective Service headquarters in drafting all men between the ages of 18 and 26 for military service, with certain exceptions. My purpose in addressing you is to provide information on this situation which you may not have conveniently available and which you may find helpful in considering the problem.

Much of the following information has already been transmitted to General Hershey by Col. John F. Mullen, State director of Wisconsin selective service, but up to the present time no relief has been provided. I am also furnishing Judge Marvin Jones, of the War Food Administration, with this information. My feeling is that this situation needs to be remedied, not because of the results which the drafting of young cheesemakers would have on individuals, important as these may be, but because of the very serious effects which widespread drafting of young cheesemakers will have upon the production of milk and cheese for the national war effort.

In the 1,623 cheese factories in Wisconsin there are 1,475 men, 18 through 25 years of age. One hundred thirty-five of these men are the sole operators of one-man factories. Their drafting will close most of those factories. About 400 men, 18 through 25, are employed in two-man factories, and about 900 men of the same ages in larger factories.

This morning I was told of an operator in a one-man factory in Clark County who was ordered to take a pre-induction physical examination. His absence for the day left absolutely no one in his community who could take care of the milk delivered to his factory. The report is that farmers located a State cheese inspector in another part of the county, surrounded him and insisted that he make the cheese for the day in their factory to prevent the loss of the milk.

About 75 percent of our cheese factories are located in sparsely settled rural communities. The established custom is to use cheesemakers' sons and young, healthy and strong farm boys as trainees in the plants. Factories are unable to hire labor from urban areas or from older-age brackets due to the generally prevailing low-wage scale, the long work schedule (7 days and 70 to 80 hours a week), and the heavy physical labor involved. Women are not generally adapted to this work for the same reasons. (Cans of milk weigh around 115 pounds, cheddar cheese around 75 pounds, and Swiss cheese drums 175 to 225 pounds.) Single men are generally employed because they can board and room with the cheesemaker in the living quarters above the factory. Married men are not attracted to the industry as helpers because of the absence of living quarters for families and the inconvenience and difficulties of daily transportation from urban centers.

There are absolutely no replacements available for trained cheesemakers included in this group and a considerable portion of the experienced helpers cannot be replaced for the reasons stated above.

State selective service headquarters estimates that of the nearly 1,500 young men now working in cheese factories it is imperative that at least 550 be deferred to prevent loss of food and reduction in milk production. My own judgment is that unless an even larger number is deferred there will be serious difficulty in handling milk in the cheese areas through the flush season which is now coming on.

I am receiving reports from county agents and others in various parts of the State indicating material increases in the rate of milk production over the same period of 1943. For example, the county agent in Pepin County has collected figures showing that farmers in that locality are producing 11 percent more milk than they did at the same time a year ago. A condensery operator in Door County is receiving 12 percent more milk from fewer patrons then he had a year ago. The Badger Consolidated at Shawano reported 2 or 3 weeks ago that over the previous 30-day period they had received 6 percent more milk per patron than they did a year ago. Other less definite reports indicate that in many sections of the State there is a material increase in milk production. Professor Froker of the College of Agriculture estimates that our plants are now handling 40 percent more whole milk than they did in 1939, of which about half is due to an increase in production of milk and the other half due to shifting from farm separated cream production to delivery of whole milk.

This situation is significant because it means that milk which is now going to cheese factories could not be manufactured in other plants in this State during the coming flush period, even if it were desirable to do so. In fact, I have reports of condenseries which are unable to handle all the milk which they are getting now and are shipping part of their normal receipts of milk to other condenseries for processing. With the spring flush coming on, this situation will become more serious due both to the normal seasonal increase in milk and the removal of young men by draft from the other milk-processing plants.

I need not include to you a statement as to the importance of the Wisconsin milk industry in the national food program, but many other people, including, I presume, General Hershey, may not realize that Wisconsin produces one-eighth of all the milk in the United States and half of the cheddar cheese produced in this country. Approximately one-half of all the cheese bought by the Government for the Army and lend-lease purposes comes from Wisconsin.

Of course, if nothing is done to retain these young cheesemakers in their factories, there will still be cheese made in Wisconsin, but the production of this type of food will be badly disrupted and considerable amounts of milk will spoil or will be fed to livestock. I sincerely hope the National Selective Service headquarters can be convinced that this situation should be handled with judgment and not find it out by experience when it is too late.

Respectfully yours,

W. W. CLARK,
Associate Director.

Mr. Speaker, among others of prominence in Wisconsin much concerned with conditions which are growing worse instead of better, is Kenneth W. Hones, of Chippewa Falls, president of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, a farm organization whose membership rolls embrace the names of thousands of dairy farmers. Mr. Hones is a farmer, living in the heart of the dairy country. He knows of conditions first hand. He set forth his views in an emphatic letter to General Hershey. It is a fair statement of what must be expected in the way of lowered production of dairy products unless prompt relief is afforded.

The following copy of the letter of President Hones to General Hershey may well receive attention and consideration by our administration directors:

WISCONSIN FARMERS UNION,
Chippewa Falls, Wis.

Gen. LEWIS HERSHEY,
Selective Service Administration,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: No doubt by this time you know about the dairy plant help situation in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Iowa, and the other dairy States. There is great pressure for me to come to Washington, but work here makes it impossible at the present time.

Unless dairy plants are classified as essential war plants, and skilled workers (such as cheesemakers, buttermakers, intake and testers, pan operators, dryer operators, truckers) are classified as essential war workers and given a nondraft classification, there will be millions of pounds of milk that will spoil and never be processed if production comes through, as all indications point that it will.

There are no men left here to take their place. It takes many months to train these men, and only young healthy rugged men can stand this kind of work. As we farmers understand it, dairy products are the most vital food product today. Farmers are, more than ever, being forced to produce a higher quality and more of it. We have prepared to do it at great expense of increased herds, machinery, and extra feed acreage. But what good is it going to do to produce the milk, when we have no one to haul it—or when it reaches the plant have it sour before it can be processed, or of course not processed at all after it spoils? A man can only do so much in a day. These men are at their peak load right now.

Plants are taxed to capacity now. Who is going to pay the farmer for the lost milk? How can a quality product be made to ship around the world without the essential skilled help in the plants? If the dairy plants and cheese factories are going to be dismantled of their men, why don't you

announce it now and tell farmers to sell their cows so we won't have all this lost milk?

If the skilled help in the plants are going to be taken, then every plant will have to reduce its processing volume to the available manpower, and farmers will have to deliver on a reduced percentage quota so all can deliver some milk. Dairy plants are much different than any other food processing plants. It may be hard for the Army and Navy Departments to understand that not even they could convince "bossy" to produce only at such times and in such quantity as they see fit to give her the men to take care of her highly perishable product. The four spigots under a cow cannot be turned off or on at the command of a general.

Most of these skilled men are unfortunately under 26 years of age, but that is of no consequence because the selective service is now inducting them over that age right along.

The whole question is—do we want processed dairy products, or don't we?

If not, which is the assumption now, then it is your duty to so announce it to the farmers right now. We know all about the importance of the men for the armed services. We know all about the need of manpower for the Southern Pacific, India, Italy, the invasion, and all that—but what we who are producing from daylight to long after dark want to know is, Do you want our boys over there to eat or not?

If not, tell us, and tell them, too. We cannot produce and process dairy products without the barely essential manpower.

An appropriation had better be set up now to pay the farmers for lost milk or the manpower policy had better be changed before it is too late. It certainly does not look patriotic to us to set up a manpower program which threatens to waste the food that is produced. It is far from fulfilling the obligation to the farmer to have him produce it and then lose it. This is not the same consideration, which has, at all times, been given the manufacturers of all other war goods. They get their pay plus a guaranteed profit.

We farmers are asking now for a showdown on the whole question of production. This also takes machinery and other farm supplies into consideration. The current practice of changing Agriculture's status every 24 hours is getting beyond reason of any sound business judgment. Farmers cannot change their production plan to meet such type of operations on a moment's notice.

Hoping we may receive the necessary consideration before the trouble starts out here, I am

Sincerely yours,

K. W. HONES,
State President.

Bureaucracy Versus Democracy in the United States Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1944

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a speech made by Lawrence Sullivan, noted writer and author of the current best seller Bureaucracy Runs Amuck. This address was delivered April 3, 1944, before the Economic Club of Detroit. Mr. Sullivan was introduced by Mr. Waldo C. Granse, president of the Detroit Bar Association. Mr. Granse's introduction of the speaker and the address follow:

Mr. WALDO C. GRANSE. Members and guests of the Economic Club, the subject to be discussed today, Bureaucracy versus Democracy, in the United States today and tomorrow, bears a rather legal sounding title. Of course, a lawyer (with customary brevity) would have contracted the printing of versus to vs. However, since the title connotes a controversy our speaker might feel more at home with a brief general introduction of the case. At the outset, I want to make it clear to you members of the jury that, like Mr. Sullivan, I also appear for the defendant.

Next to winning the war as soon as possible, no other national development in progress during recent years is more alarming to millions of Americans than the apparent changes which are taking place in our concepts and in the form of our Government. While it is natural for some persons to question and resist so-called progressive reforms which interfere with established practices, I believe most of us recognize that changes in our democratic processes of government are inevitable and ofttimes beneficial. But to those who are close to the present picture, and who are experiencing first hand the shackles, waste, delay, and duplication of American energy, half bureaucratic, half free enterprise, there can well come a sense of futility and despair.

I think that you can never do anything effectively by halves. I have no doubt that in waging war—totally bureaucratic Germany and Japan are more efficient than democratic America. But who wants total bureaucracy in the United States? That is exactly what we are fighting against on foreign soil. Are we going to permit it to seep in on our own soil? Nor do I have any doubt that Americans working cooperatively under the uniform and unified direction of our Government, on a basis of mutual trust, free to develop their proven genius and capacity for production and distribution of materials and foodstuffs, are far more effective (even in times of war) when unhampered by myriads of governmental bureaus, commissions, regulations, and Executive and administrative orders which have the force of law.

Most of our citizens have but a comparatively small and circumscribed direct contact with such governmental agencies, and consequently little chance of realizing their far-reaching effect on our present, and possible future way of life. But when an elevator operator commented to me the other day on the phase of O. P. A. rationing that the Government is making cheaters and liars of the American people, I see a ray of sunshine in our common thinking.

Fortunately, there are some men in and out of Government service who have the ability to ascertain the broad scope of bureaucratic control now in vogue, its motivating forces and its implications, and who also have the independent position and courage necessary to bring the facts home to our people. Our speaker today is one of those men. With 25 years' experience as a journalist, writer, and publisher, most of them in Washington, he has displayed a knack for getting the facts on economic problems and national and international relations. He now directs his own economic news service, National Business News from the National Press Building, Washington.

Mr. Sullivan has written a number of books and his most recent book, Bureaucracy Runs Amuck, is one which you certainly should read. It is selling so fast that you might have a little difficulty in getting a copy locally, but the book can be obtained through the publisher, Bobbs-Merrill Co., New York. A condensed summary appears in the April issue of the Reader's Digest on page 104, under the title "The World's Biggest Payroll."

By the way, Mr. Sullivan, I hope that Mr. Crow has forewarned you that we in Detroit are captivated by the charm of names and clans. We expect great things from men with well-known names, and since your name looms heavy in both the journalistic and pugilistic fields, you should have a Detroit audience convinced before you start.

So, with confidence that all of us are eagerly awaiting to hear from you in person, I am pleased to introduce Mr. Lawrence Sullivan. [Applause.]

Mr. LAWRENCE SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mr. Granse.

Gentlemen of the Economic Club of Detroit, you gentlemen honor me with your mere presence here today in the midst of a busy day in the Arsenal of Democracy, and I shall hope to return the compliment twofold—first, by being brief, and secondly by confining myself to matters of public records which may be verified from official documents in the "arsenal of bureaucracy." [Laughter.]

After about 18 years of intimate daily contact with the Government agencies in Washington—but never having been on the Government pay roll aside from a brief turn in the Army 25 years ago—I still approach this living reality of bureaucracy with something approaching awe, for I have found that bureaucracy is a many-sided monster. He can come at you from a dozen directions all at once—as all of you well know who fill out the production reports, the tax returns, inventory forms, and material questionnaires, or who must answer the antitrust suits. No question is too inconsequential or too trivial to find a place in the Government questionnaire, and it must be answered in triplicate.

Strange as it may appear to you men who are straining every energy in the battle for production, antitrust suits are very much a part of the war picture and war activity in Washington today.

I could cite the record of one great industrial concern—one which is liberally loaded with millions of dollars in vital war contracts—which has received 47 Army and Navy E awards for excellence in production since the summer of 1941, and in the same period this company has been called upon to appear and answer 10 antitrust suits initiated by the Department of Justice.

Well, those men are developing a sort of complex about it. Every time they get a fourth Army or Navy E in any one plant they begin to look around for their legal fox holes, for they know on averages another antitrust suit is coming over the hill pretty soon. [Laughter.]

And that, gentlemen, is the experience of the E. I. du Pont Co. of Delaware.

Bureaucracy is a practical beginning toward absolutism in government. Here is the way the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary puts it, and I quote from his reports:

"Contrary to all our philosophy of government, we have placed in one appointed personnel all three powers: they make the rules, they construe the rules, they enforce the rules. When one of these people goes to an ordinary private citizen he goes to him with all the powers a king ever had. The citizen has no power to resist, practically speaking, the mandate of an agent of these bureaus."

Those are the words of a man who has been in the House of Representatives for more than 35 years, and he is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. And that, gentlemen, is the first challenge of bureaucracy versus democracy today.

Let me say at this point that I have assured your cordial and energetic president,

Mr. Crow, that I propose to present a constructive discussion.

I begin with the assumption that we all look forward to the same great ends in national policy—to keep these United States a going concern, solvent, strong, free, unafraid, and, above all, at peace with itself.

If we achieve these things, we need have no concern about secondary issues and policies in Government. To a free and solvent America, to an America no longer throttled and distracted by the demoralizing pulling and hauling of imported class warfare and alien doctrines of collectivism—to such an America all things will be added.

I say this because I am convinced that our prevailing American bureaucracy is deeply infected by a systematic infiltration of alert and aggressive job holders who are sincerely sympathetic toward various forms of European collectivism and that this group, entrenched in every department, are warping and distorting some of the primary powers and authorities of Government to their own ends—ends concerning which the great body of the American people have not the slightest or remotest conception.

Now, all this has been going on for about 10 years. The resulting administrative confusions and social bewilderments present a challenge, not only to the whole concept of free enterprise but also to the very roots of our constitutional tradition of checks and balances in public power.

And this challenge, unless it is met by an informed and intelligent public opinion, may become grave and menacing in the post-war period; because the record shows clearly that while our military services are smashing through to a certain and conclusive victory in this stupendous global war, many of our civilian bureaus and boards and commissions and offices and administrations in Washington already are digging in for post-war permanency. We see that on every hand in the Capital today—plans to continue this or that program or agency indefinitely.

Bureaus die hard—and the war agencies, as the recent Baruch report warned us, almost certainly will stretch themselves to find essential and inescapable peacetime functions, just as we saw the relief agencies of 1933 to 1939 continued as war agencies long after all need for the original programs had disappeared. This was true particularly of the W. P. A. and the N. Y. A.; and it still is true of some of the crop-control programs—several of which even today are being maintained intact, despite the fact that every former urge toward limited agricultural production now has given way to a crying world-wide demand for more and more food of every sort.

Thus does bureaucracy tend by instinct to move in ruts and rigid routines. It simply cannot adjust itself to sudden and unexpected developments. It operates largely by what it calls national planning, and by the time the master plan is discovered to be a mile or two wide of the mark, the administrative machine still must grind on and on until a new plan may be devised, approved, and established.

To illustrate this, as recently as February of last year the Labor Department reported that we still had 158,000 youngsters employed on relief programs of the National Youth Adminisration. But a very small footnote at the bottom of the page observed, "Beginning in July 1942, the N. Y. A. was considered a training program for war work rather than a relief program."

That is the formula—the relief program of yesterday is the war program of today, and tomorrow by a swish of the pen it will again be a relief program.

I hope that you gentlemen will not be dismayed by this volume. I am not going to read it all.

It comprises about 2,000 pages of testimony before the House Naval Affairs Committee regarding some difficulties encountered at the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, on Long Island, in the production of naval planes.

I brought it along because I want to read a passage from the testimony of Mr. Thomas V. De Lorenzo, president of Local 365, U. A. W.-C. I. O., at Brewster.

I think this testimony bears pointedly on this whole subject of "Bureaucracy versus Democracy," because it illuminates a problem which it seems to me lies at the very core of the discussion—the diffusion of administrative authority among 10 or a dozen agencies all in the same general area of national policy.

You all know the story of delayed production at Brewster. It has been told many times in the press. There have been six changes of management since November 1940, but never any change in the labor picture. And now we hear rumblings of another change coming over the hill.

Well, the Naval Affairs Committee decided to have a look-see; and in due course called Mr. De Lorenzo as a witness. He appeared on November 4, 1943, about 5 months ago.

This record shows that during the summer of 1942 the Navy decided to stop producing dive bombers at Brewster and switch to fighters.

Mr. De Lorenzo testified that his men did not like the idea of switching from one type plane to another. They urged management to head off the change.

The president of the company responded that he could not tell the Navy what type of combat planes it should order. Whereupon, Mr. De Lorenzo set out—as he put it—to "raise a little hell."

Here is the testimony (hearings, p. 2978):

"The CHAIRMAN. To raise what?

"Mr. DE LORENZO. To raise a little hell.

"The CHAIRMAN. A little hell?

"Mr. DE LORENZO. Yes, sir; anyhow, to make a long story short, we came down here again and we got the same brush-off. This time, to be sure that we were absolutely on the record, we wrote a number of letters. We wrote a letter to Chairman VINSON, July 22, 1942, protesting the change from the dive bomber to the fighter. We wrote a copy of that letter to the Truman investigating committee, to Donald M. Nelson, and also Secretary KNOX, DAVID I. WALSH (chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee), and to President Roosevelt."

Nevertheless, Rear Admiral John H. Towers, then Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, insisted that the dive bombers were obsolete under the new plan of strategy, and that he wanted fighters for the new carriers that were coming off. So, the switch was made, but not before Mr. De Lorenzo had received the written promise of Admiral Towers that lost time incident to the change-over would be held to an absolute minimum.

"That is what you were mainly interested in, wasn't it?" the committee chairman asked (hearings, p. 2982).

The witness responded: "No, sir. Two things I was interested in: No. 1, employment of the members, and No. 2, production."

"The CHAIRMAN. You put the first one, the employment of the members, and second, the production?

"The WITNESS. Well, it would be a very hard choice for me to make in my official capacity as a president of a local union. I put the employment of the members first. Perhaps as a citizen and not as an officer of the local union, I would put production first.

"The CHAIRMAN. You don't think because you are a union president, Mr. De Lorenzo, that that relieves you of your obligations as a citizen of the United States, do you?

"The WITNESS. They are both the same, sir. You couldn't have one without the other.

"The CHAIRMAN. But you thought that the union situation came first?

"Mr. DE LORENZO. That is what I am being paid for, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am asking. Do you think you should put the union above your country?

"The WITNESS. They are inseparable, sir; you cannot put one above the other because you cannot have one without the other in this country. In other countries you can't have either.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, if that is your view, there is nothing more I can say about it.

"The WITNESS. It is my view, sir."

Now, there you have it. Just a shade of doubt, if you please, whether the interest of a particular local on Long Island is on a par with the national interest in wartime.

This, I contend, is the second great challenge of bureaucracy in America today.

The administrative system in Washington which made such a congressional inquiry even necessary is a quick thumbnail epitome of the whole problem of government by Executive order.

What in the world has happened in this great country of ours that the United States Navy in time of war, must first obtain the approval and consent of a local union chief before it may change from one type of plane production to another?

Now this Brewster case is not an isolated incident. There have been many congressional inquiries into Federal labor policies as they touch war production—notably by the Smith committee, the Truman committee, the Senate Small Business Committee, and the Byrd committee.

As long ago as November 1937, Admiral William D. Leahy, then Chief of Naval Operations, and now White House Chief of Staff, submitted in his annual report to Congress the observation that strikes were delaying the naval rearmament program. He pointed out that 53 destroyers were under construction during that year, but only 2 of them, 2 out of 53, had joined the fleet. Then his report went on:

"Twenty-three of these vessels have been delayed in joining the fleet by strikes, late delivery of material, and necessary changes during construction."

Another report from the Navy covers a strike here in Detroit in August to October 1939, precisely coincident with the outbreak of the war in Europe.

Inquiry disclosed that this strike had halted production on airplane bearings and castings for both the Army and Navy. After the strike call, management was not permitted to ship even the parts already completed and packaged.

So, the Navy sought permission to ship the completed parts in its own trucks. But this permission, too, was also denied by the C. I. O.

This strike began on August 29, and work was resumed on October 8, a delay of 41 days.

The Navy's report added that this delay hit not only aircraft production, but also several parts for a special type of marine engine then being developed in the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

Failing to obtain permission to ship the completed parts, the Navy next asked permission of the C. I. O. to ship its own secret dies and patterns to another plant, to avoid closing down production lines on both aircraft and marine engines at the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

And here are the words of the Secretary of the Navy on the results of that plea:

"The representatives of union local 208 were given full access to the files of the Navy contracts and they were informed that the delay in releasing patterns for delivery was seriously jeopardizing the manufacture of airplane engines at the naval aircraft factory.

"At the end of the discussion the union representatives stated that as the strike situation stood at the present time their answer

was emphatically 'No,' and they would not let patterns or inspected castings be removed."

That strike continued for 11 days longer.

Now, this sad spectacle of the United States Navy grovelling before local union chiefs for permission to move its own dies and jigs from a struck plant, or pleading with another local for permission to switch from one type of production to another—these things demonstrate with great force what is almost certain to happen in any given field of public administration when the authority of government is scattered or spread too thin. This diffusion of authority, the inability of the bureaucratic system to center real decision in one competent and experienced administrator, is the crowning weakness, the darkest sin, of the bureaucratic method.

Let us look at this whole area of labor administration to see how the principle of diffusion has worked out there during the last 10 years.

Today we have the greatest army of Federal labor administrators and boards and committees in all our history. Yet it is safe to say that never have our industrial-relations policies and programs been in a more unhappy muddle.

Up to 1933 the labor policies of the National Government were administered through a single Cabinet department—the Department of Labor. This centralization of authority established a degree of administrative responsibility and public accountability. But today there are no less than 17 different Federal agencies charged with various phases of labor and manpower administration.

The Labor Department still carries on with 6,000 employees, but now we have the National War Labor Board with 3,000; the National Labor Relations Board with 700; the Railroad Retirement Board with 1,700. Next we have the Employees' Compensation Commission with 500, the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee with 100, and the National Mediation Board with 89.

This gives us altogether about 12,000 Federal employees engaged exclusively in labor administration.

But this is not all. We also have the Labor Policy Committee in the War Production Board, and a Labor Policy Board in the Department of the Interior, and the Labor Standards Division in the Department of Labor. There is the Labor Supply Committee in the War Manpower Commission, and the Management Labor Policy Committee in the War Production Board, and the Labor Advisory Committee in the National Research Council. Next we have the Petroleum Labor Policy Board in the Department of the Interior, and the Advisory Committee on Standards for Employment of Women, and the Building Trades Stabilization Board of Review, and the Committee on Economic Security, and the Federal Committee on Apprentice Training, and finally the Liaison Office for Personnel Management in the Office for Emergency Management.

On might be inclined to say that this would be about enough labor agencies in any one government. But on top of all this we also have the War Manpower Commission, and on January 31 of this year the War Manpower Commission employed 25,957 full-time workers.

Thus we now have about 38,000 Federal personnel engaged in the formulation, administration, supervision, and enforcement of the several facets of national policy touching manpower and labor.

Now, 38,000 people, gentlemen, is more than normally would be gainfully employed in a city of 100,000 population. So, you just take a city of 100,000 people and wipe it off the map and say, "They are down in Washington administering our labor problems." That is what it amounts to economically; and this does not include, of course, the 23,000 full-time civilian employees of the Selective Service System, who administer the military draft.

If we include these selective-service people, the total administrative personnel handling our labor and manpower programs adds up to 61,000 full-time paid civilian employees, exclusive of the military personnel assigned to these various activities throughout the country.

That is the up-to-the-minute picture of bureaucracy running amuck in the field of labor administration, and the broad, general results we all know.

But what we are likely to forget, as we examine the details of administrative machinery in any one area, is that precisely the same runaway expansion has been recorded during these last 10 years in every other major field of Federal authority.

Everybody knows from his daily experience what has happened in the realm of agricultural production, and food processing, and distribution. To a greater or lesser degree, we have seen the same thing in social security and public welfare; we saw it for a time in the handling of the synthetic rubber program, in petroleum, coal, transportation; we have seen it in aviation, in radio, and in the almost unmeasured expansion of Federal functions in the field of Government loans to industry, agriculture, housing, and public works.

The most complex holding company structure in the world today is wholly-owned by the Government of the United States. One Cabinet member in Washington now is director of 33 Government-owned corporations.

Putting this all together we see that in 10 years we have created about 200 new Federal agencies. The combined pay roll of the civil government has expanded from 560,000 in 1933 to 3,300,000 on February 1 of this year, and all this expansion is exclusive of the military personnel, although it does include, of course, the civilian employees of the Army and Navy Departments.

Now these figures mean that today we have 1 full-time Federal worker on the Government pay roll for every 41 people in the national population, against only 1 for every 200 in 1933.

Or we may make this comparison: Over the last 10 years the population of the country has increased by roughly 10,000,000 people and in those 10 years we have put 2,500,000 on the Federal pay roll.

I submit that no nation can go on very long adding every fourth member of the population increase directly to the Government pay roll.

That is the third immediate and urgent challenge of bureaucracy versus democracy.

Now, of course, it is necessary to increase the Federal working staff in wartime, particularly in the military departments.

But the Byrd Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures has pointed out in an official report that only 46 percent of our Federal civilian pay roll, less than half, are actually employed in activities directly connected with the prosecution of the war.

Here is what the Byrd committee reported:

"It can be said unequivocally that our own Government is the chief offender in the entire country from the standpoint of wasting and hoarding manpower."

Maybe this would be a good place to start on this terrific manpower problem which confronts us. The Byrd committee thought so, for they added in their report:

"Excluding those engaged in mechanical and construction work, one may say that fully one-third of the entire remaining civilian personnel of the Federal Government could be dismissed. Rather than impairing the necessary functions of government, this action would result in greater efficiency, provide manpower for industry and the armed forces, reduce the cost of government, and aid substantially in the successful prosecution of the war."

So it simply is not the truth to say, as do some defenders of bureaucracy, that all this headlong expansion and bureaucratic spending is in pursuit of the war effort. One instance will illustrate what Senator BYRD is driving at. In the last 12 years our Federal appropriations for Indian Affairs have increased roughly from $17,000,000 to $35,000,000. Now this is an increase of 106 percent in a 10-year period which saw an increase of only 10 percent in our Indian population.

If time permitted we could review comparable figures for every major peace-time activity in Washington. This is not a war of Red skins. The Indians are not fighting the war alone. [Laughter.]

Now all this headlong expansion of the Federal Government far beyond either the practical needs or the economic resources of the country, is bad enough in its own right.

But there is yet another aspect of the problem. Many of these new Federal workers, particularly in the so-called Executive order agencies, are known to be identified with or active affiliates of, or sympathizers with, Communist-front and party line organizations in the United States, or red-fringe organizations in the United States, and many of these people in the Federal service are convinced and sincerely believe that the American Constitution is outmoded and that the American system of free enterprise is all washed up.

As long ago as January 1940 a committee of the House submitted the names of 563 of these people who had been identified.

The President of the United States denounced that committee report as "cheap" and "sordid."

About 2 years later the same committee submitted another report and sent it directly to the Attorney General, and this list carried 1,124 names. This is the original certified copy of that letter to the Attorney General and here is a list showing the distribution of those fellow travelers in the different departments of the Government. [Showing letter.]

I will not read them all, but a few will indicate the disbursion: In the Department of Agriculture, 207; Federal Security Agency, 145; Department of Labor, 98; War Department, 45; Navy Department, 40. And so it runs through every branch of the Government in Washington. Wherever you turn, whatever your line of activity, you are sure to find there in the agency a loyal cell of fellow travelers, watching operations, warping programs, thinking up those damnable questionnaires which it will take busy men a day or a week to answer.

Now 5 people on this list were getting salaries of $10,000 a year or more, and a total of 370 of them were getting salaries of over $3,000 a year. So, this is not a list of elevator operators and custodians. This list to my mind explains a great deal of what has been going on in Washington these last 10 years.

Our Government is a bureaucratic surrey with a red fringe on top. [Applause.]

Several years ago another committee of the House discovered that the Chief Economist for the National Labor Relations Board was a member of the executive committee of the Conference for Progressive Political Action.

The letterhead of this organization carries this arresting slogan:

"It aims to inspire the workers to take control of industry and Government, abolish the present capitalist system and build a workers' republic."

Now when this evidence was presented to the committee, the Chief Economist for the National Labor Relations Board denied ever having subscribed to such a program, but here is the letterhead with his name on it—and the quotation I have just read to you—as a member of the executive committee; and

there are on that list two other men who are now with the Government—one of them in the O. P. A. at $5,600 a year and the other one in O. P. M., now W. P. B., at $5,600 a year.

Well, this proved to be pretty strong meat for Congress and the next time the N. L. R. B. appropriation bill came by, they just abolished that job. They said, "We cannot have men like that in the National Labor Relations Board making labor policy, making labor decisions all over the country."

So, he was dismissed, but where do you think he is today? On January 16, 1943, he was appointed Assistant Chief of the Labor Division, in the War Production Board. And he is still there.

Now I hope that you gentlemen will not misunderstand what I am saying about this fellow traveler infiltration. I am not saying that a majority of the United States Government or even a considerable minority are Communists or Fascists or in sympathy with any other form of European statism.

But what I do say is that there is in the Federal establishment today a closely knit network of aggressive communism, which reaches to every branch and department of our Government, and that these cells, if you please, of Euro. ean collectivism look forward to, and plan for, a wholly new structure of government and economic life in these United States.

They look forward to an economic system rationed and regimented to the last shoe lace and the last ounce of tapioca.

They look forward to, and plan for, a national system of completely socialized medicine, universal labor conscription, a regimented agriculture, and absolute Government control of both production and distribution through labor-management plant committees and industry advisory committee in O. P. A., W. F. A., and W. P. B.

To sustain all this set-up financially, they are developing a new theory of economic perpetual motion, which teaches that the more you spend the richer you are, and the greater the Government deficit the less the people owe—because they owe it only to themselves.

Now after 10 years of all this, we are going to end up sometime in the next year or two facing a national debt of $1,500 or $2,000 per capita. That means $7,000 for the average family, and on the long-pull, we shall face a contraction of perhaps 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 in our total gainfully employed, and there will be a tremendous reservoir of savings. We might have to be fighting off inflation if we do not get into production quickly when the war job is done.

I feel perfectly certain that this Nation has the energy and skills and resources to cope successfully with these post-war problems.

But I insist that if we are going to pull out, we must give America her head. We must release once more the unmeasured driving power of free enterprise, freedom of contract and security of individual thrift against wild and reckless government spending. We must face the reality that Social Security reared on the quicksands of Federal deficits are neither social nor secure; and finally we must root out of our legal structure forever that absurd, demoralizing and utterly un-American law which begins with the premise that employer and employee are natural enemies who may not even speak to each other except under the tutelage and watchful eye of a Federal agent. [Applause.]

The solutions which we bring to these post-war problems must be American solutions sprung from the instincts of freedom and the unquenchable aspirations of liberty. Our programs must be practical, they must be stated clearly so that people will know where they are going and what they are supposed to do; and they must be honest.

If we try any other approach, we will gamble needlessly and dangerously with the richest heritage and the brightest promise for human welfare that the Almighty God ever has entrusted to the guardianship of a people.

Specifically, we must have tax policies designed to raise revenue, not to remake and reform America.

We must restore a monetary system which will encourage investments in the future of America.

We must set down the principle in law that the right to work is more sacred than the right to strike. [Applause.]

And, finally, we must uproot the spendthrift bureaucracy—this Frankenstein monster—and re-affirm in Government the ancient virtues of prudence, thrift, and the honest day's work.

Let us have the courage to set America once more on these, the true paths of her national character and greatness.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Farm Security—C. I. O. Political Action—Pegler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks and print two editorials, I am inserting the two written by Westbrook Pegler, appearing in the Washington News of June 20 and 21. This is an interesting and startling statement of facts, which confirms the suspicions of many and vindicates those who prophesied that Mr. Baldwin's association with Sidney Hillman meant an effort to inveigle as many farmers as possible into that perniciously active communistic set-up to aid the fourth term and to help Russianize the Congress:

[From the Washington News of June 20, 1944]

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, June 20.—Long distance telephone records subpenaed by the Dies committee have revealed a close relationship between the political action committee of the C. I. O. and the following:

The White House and Mrs. Roosevelt, Vice President HENRY WALLACE, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Justice, and various regional directors of the Farm Security Administration having power to exert strong political and economic pressure on farmers.

Numerous calls to regional F. S. A. offices were made in most cases by C. B. Baldwin, assistant director of the political action committee, who resigned his job as Chairman of the F. S. A. in Washington to become actual manager of the P. A. C.'s campaign to elect President Roosevelt for a fourth term and Mr. WALLACE for a second term and to defeat a select list of aspirants for the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Sidney Hillman, P. A. C. chairman, is president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, C. I. O., and recently has been denounced by David Dubinsky and other right-wing union radicals, as leader of the Communist Party in New York, now known as the American Labor Party.

Baldwin has held various key jobs in Washington ever since 1933, when he caught on as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture under WALLACE. He became Director of the Farm Security Administration in October 1940. The phone calls indicate a strong continuing interest and influence in the F. S. A., while he is on leave serving with the political leader of the New York Communist faction of the union movement.

The slips showed 28 calls from the New York headquarters of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee direct to the White House, including one from Hillman to Mrs. Roosevelt and another from Hillman to David Niles, formerly Nyhus, of Boston, one of the President's selfless assistants with a passion for anonymity and for left-wing politics. Hillman also called Vice President WALLACE. Baldwin is recorded as having made three calls to WALLACE'S office.

The Hillman-Baldwin-Communist group of the C. I. O. has defeated for renomination both MARTIN DIES, of Texas, and JOE STARNES, of Alabama. STARNES is a member of the Dies committee.

Records show, according to the Dies committee, hundreds of calls from the P. A. C.'s New York headquarters to various Government officials, particularly in the Department of Justice, and in the Department of Agriculture, which controls the Farm Security Administration and the fortunes of many farmers through its local agents scattered everywhere.

[From the Washington News of June 21, 1944]

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, June 21.—Yesterday I reported that the Dies Committee had subpenaed long-distance slips of the telephone company which showed that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee had been carrying on conversations with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and two of the President's anonymous political secretaries at the White House, with Vice President HENRY WALLACE and his secretaries, with Attorney General Biddle, and with Farm Security Administration regional directors. These telephone slips showed further that C. B. Baldwin, a New Deal farm bureaucrat from the beginning of the administration in 1933, and now Political Action Committee assistant director, had telephoned several of his old subordinates in the F. S. A. in regions where the P. A. C. was opposing the renomination of Congressmen and Senators whom it had marked for defeat. Until recently, Baldwin was F. S. A. chief.

The factual report was long and left no room for interpretation. Today we may study the meaning.

Chairman of the P. A. C. is Sidney Hillman, president of the C. I. O. Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Hillman came to the United States in 1907 as a Russian refugee from the Czars and if he ever worked at all at any laborious trade, his experience was brief for he acquired the sedentary, political job of union president in 1914 and has held it since. He had preoccupations which made it inconvenient for him to take part in World War No. 1. In May 1940, President Roosevelt appointed him to be the "labor" member of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense. Later he was appointed to a position in the Office of Production Management.

A few months ago Hillman allied himself openly with the Communists of the C. I. O. in New York in a fight for control of the synthetic, left-wing political organization known as the American Labor Party. The right-wingers fought him but Hillman and the Communists won. The A. L. P. thereupon became the successor to the Commuist Party, which announced its own dissolution. Meanwhile, Hillman, proceeding with the organization of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, had proposed that in New York State all workers be compelled to join unions and pay a political income tax to the committee for use in the fourth-term campaign.

In his years in the Farm Security Administration, Baldwin built an organization within the Government which reaches into every farm county. It is organized and equipped for political espionage propaganda and coercion. Its regional directors were Baldwin's subordinates, and would be his subordinates again should Mr. Roosevelt be reelected and should Baldwin care to resume the job from which he has technically resigned. Practically, he is merely on leave and on loan to the C. I. O. for the duration of the campaign.

The long-distance calls discovered by the Dies committee were not personal calls. They were official calls made from the headquarters of the P. A. C. and charged to the committee. Hillman, Baldwin, and others made 28 such calls to the White House alone and many other calls to F. S. A. regional offices. Yet the Roosevelt Party and the P. A. C. would maintain that there is no connection between the White House, or the F. S. A., and the committee. The C. I. O., for its own part, insists that the P. A. C. is a gratuitous and independent organization, unconnected with the Roosevelt party.

Mr. Biddle, one of those who was called by long distance from the P. A. C.'s headquarters, has given an opinion that its "educational activities," are legitimate and contrary to no law, although thus far it has raised $700,000 for the fourth term campaign, has access to millions more, and is campaigning for him and his chief throughout the country.

The seizure of the telephone records was a high-handed operation. In total effect, the information thus obtained, however questionable the method, plainly shows that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, heavily infested with Communists, is an auxiliary of the Roosevelt fourth-term party on terms of intimate consultation with Mr. Roosevelt, David K. Niles born Nyphus, and Jonathan Daniels, the President's confidential political agents in the White House, with Vice President WALLACE and with the Departments of Justice and Agriculture.

To Clean the River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the June 21, 1944, issue of the Chicago Daily News:

TO CLEAN THE RIVER

All up and down Lake Michigan high water is tearing out beaches, undermining bluffs and banks, encroaching on property and threatening shore-side buildings. The lake was very high last year. It is still high, and may go higher. But in Chicago, the river that should flow fresh and clear through the heart of the city lies stagnant, an open sewer, disgusting no less to smell than to look at.

The river is stagnant because locks have been built to keep it stagnant; otherwise, more water might flow through it out of the lake than the 1,500 cubic feet per second fixed by the Supreme Court in 1938, on complaint of the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and others who claimed that Chicago was lowering the level of the lakes.

It has never been proved that reversing the Chicago River appreciably lowered the lake level. Compared to the vast volume of water involved, the Chicago flow seems insignificant. The rise and fall of the lakes seems rather to be vaguely governed by some kind of long-term weather cycle.

The question we wish to raise again is this: Whatever the Supreme Court has said or may say, does it make any sense, does it help anyone, does it satisfy to any degree Wisconsin, Michigan, and the others, to condemn Chicago to live by an open sewer, when the lake water is at a level so high it is actually destroying property? We do not see how any fair-minded person can answer this other than in the negative. We think that the plaintiffs should waive their legal rights while the water is high, and allow Chicago to flush out the stagnant river.

Another Launching Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., June 22, 1944, relative to the launching record at the Neponset yard in connection with landing craft infantry:

ANOTHER LAUNCHING RECORD—WELDERS' RACE PUTS LANDING CRAFT AFLOAT IN 7 HOURS

BOSTON, June 22.—An LCI (landing craft infantry) was launched today 7 hours after 300 workmen started assembling the prefabricated 150-foot vessel, to break the previous record for this type of construction by several days.

"We could do it all over again right after a couple of hours' rest," said a spokesman for one group of welders at the George Lawley & Son Corporation's Neponset yard.

Only the yard's regular crew worked on the craft. Officials, who had hoped to make the launching within 18 hours, expressed amazement.

While the prefabricated stern section, standing alone on the ways, the section immediately behind the bow was lowered into place by a huge crane at 7:03 a. m. Twelve minutes later the bow was laid in place, and 15 minutes after that the middle section was hoisted down.

Each of the sections immediately was fitted perfectly together and the welders went into action. Other workmen installed piping, wiring, and other equipment. As each welded seam was completed, water was pumped into finished compartments to test their tightness, then pumped out again.

At 1:57 the craft slid down the ways.

The Truth in Regard to the Yugoslavian Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been much in the press in recent weeks in regard to the Yugoslavian situation, and particularly in regard to Tito.

Under present war restrictions, news in regard to our allies—or, for that matter, any foreign country—is not printed unless it has the approval of the Office of War Information, of which Hon. Elmer Davis is Director.

I have followed with a great deal of interest the releases in regard to Yugoslavia, and I cannot understand why the Director of War Information is feeding Communist propaganda to the American people in regard to the conditions in Yugoslavia.

The American people are led to believe that Tito and his Partisan army has the support of the people of Yugoslavia, whereas, as a matter of fact, that is not so—General Mihailovich, the commander in chief of the Yugoslavian Army and also the minister of war of the Yugoslavian Government in Exile, has the support of the people of Yugoslavia.

Yugoslavia was overrun by the Nazi hordes on October 6, 1941, and under the magnificent leadership of General Mihailovich, the people have been bravely fighting the savage invader since that time.

It would appear from recent international political incidents that the United States has forsaken two of its oldest allies in this war—Poland and Yugoslavia. Poland was the first country to be invaded by the Nazi, and since September 1, 1939, has been valiantly fighting the Germans. Certainly, Poland and Yugoslavia, which were among the earliest to suffer the devastation of Axis aggression, deserve to be honored by every member of the United Nations, and particularly by countries which did not experience the blow of the Axis aggressor until much later, such as our own Nation, on December 7, 1941, and the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941. However, that does not appear to be the case, and is a matter to be greatly deplored and one which deserves the protest of all honest men who seek nothing of selfish gain for themselves out of this terrible Global War.

I wish to call attention to a sequence of events, with respect to Yugoslavia, which will correct the false impression given the American people by the propaganda released by the Office of War Information.

On May 5, 1944, General Velebit, chief of Tito's military mission to England, said that Tito had an army of 300,000 fighting men and that Tito has liberated and now controls two-thirds of the territory of Yugoslavia. We have been given to understand through public anouncements made by such authorities as Prime Minister Churchill that because of the vast army Tito has, it is the basis on which Great Britain, primarily, and the United States, secondarily, has switched their support from General Mihailovich to Tito. In brief, the fact that Tito is supposed to have liberated and now controls the major portion of the territory of Yugoslavia and that he has a larger and a more active fighting force opposing the Nazis than General Mihailovich, with some 300,000 men as against 16,000 under General Mihailovitch, as charged

by Tito, or 40,000 as claimed by General Mihailovitch.

The only honorable reason which the American people and the Allies can accept for abandoning General Mihailovich, who organized and maintained Yugoslav opposition to the Nazis ever since May 20, 1941, and for switching our support now to Tito who did not emerge as a leader of any opposition to the Nazi until the middle of 1942, would be only if it were true that Tito has won the support of the Yugoslav people, and General Mihailovich has lost the support of the people to such an extent that he is now able allegedly to muster no more than 16,000 men under arms, and that he has ceased—or practically ceased—to fight the Nazis, but the facts are just the opposite as have been revealed by recent events.

On May 25, 1944, a German broadcast reported a surprise raid on Tito's headquarters by a few hundred Nazi parachutists. For 3 weeks this report remained unconfirmed by Allied sources. Then in a dispatch by Reuter's, the semiofficial British news agency, there came confirmation that Tito had fled his mountain retreat. The Reuter's said that the sudden German attack necessitated the transfer of Tito's headquarters from one part of Yugoslavia to another. But finally the truth came out as to Tito's whereabouts; it was established that he had fled to Bari, Italy. Coincidently, Reuter's reported that Tito is conducting negotiations with the new Yugoslav Premier, Dr. Ivan Subasic, somewhere in Yugoslavia. That also appears to be not so. The fact appears to be that the negotiations are being conducted in Italy.

This sequence of events now raise questions which go to the very heart of the publicly announced reasons for switching Allied support from General Mihailovich to Tito.

The Nazi raid on Tito's headquarters exploded the myth of Tito's claim that he had 300,000 followers. No sensible person, whether they had military training or not, could be lead to believe that 300,000 men, secure in mountainous terrain, in a country where they knew every mountain pass and trail, could be dispersed—yes, annihilated—by a few hundred enemy parachutists. It also raises the question as to how it would be possible for a few German troops to drop from the skies and recapture the liberated territory claimed to comprise two-thirds of Yugoslavia, causing Tito to flee from his liberated territory and take refuge under Allied guns in Bari, Italy.

In reality Tito's army never did consist of more than a band of Communist followers, and because of Great Britain's wish to appease Stalin, they have been supporting Tito and have withdrawn their support from General Mihailovich, and the United States has apparently acquiesced to Great Britain's wishes in the matter.

In view of Tito's claims as to the enormous size of his army and the territory he is supposed to have liberated, which propaganda has been disseminated to the American people by the Office of War Information, there arises now in the mind of any fair-thinking person doubt as to whether any of the claims made by Tito or in his behalf are true or ever were true.

This is obviously a most important question, and if Tito's claims are not, or never were true, what are the reasons for switching Allied support from General Mihailovich to Stalin's satellite, Tito? There is no need to exaggerate the import of these questions. There is no need to go to the extreme of denying or questioning the probable fact that Tito has been engaged in some military activities against the Nazis, and that he has helped to harass the foe, and there is no reason to belittle what Tito has actually done, and on the other hand, there is no need to exaggerate.

It is, indeed, unfortunate that the American people have been led to believe by releases of the Office of War Information and with statements of so-called facts which appear to support their contentions that Tito is the "whole show" in the Yugoslav opposition to the Nazis and that he has the unqualified support of the people of Yugoslavia.

It is reasonably clear, however, to anyone who takes the time to examine the facts, that Tito's activities against the Nazis have been grossly misstated—small skirmishes were exaggerated into great campaigns—small bands of partisans were exaggerated into great armies, negligible hit-and-run raids against minor villages and uninhabited places were exaggerated into great military triumphs, and the passage of a handful of partisans through some tiny village was exaggerated into the imaginary capture of hundreds of great towns and thousands of miles of territory.

In fact, there is still fresh in our memory the reports released through the Office of War Information from time to time as to how Tito had invaded Hungary, Austria, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Italy—of all these reports, the only one that now bears the faintest semblance of truth is the report that Tito invaded Italy. We now know it was not at the head of a victorious army, but as a refugee under the shelter of American and British arms, a leader who deserted his followers after a few hundred German paratroopers landed in their midst and captured two-thirds of his men; then by some means, the so-called great Tito was able to escape, leaving a greater portion of his followers to be either killed or captured by the Germans.

The only explanation for the wild exaggerations of Tito's activities against the foe and the withholding of news from the American people as to the true situation in Yugoslavia is the desire of the O. W. I. to play ball with those who are charged with the responsibility of dishing out propaganda as to the British foreign policies. All that the American people know of what has been going on in Yugoslavia are through releases of the O. W. I., which come to us principally from London, or from Cairo and Bari—all three of which are centers of British control and British censorship.

It is indeed most significant that when the United Press attempted to send one of their correspondents to Yugoslavia at the invitation of General Mihailovich so that the American public could obtain direct information, that the British detained the United Press correspondent in Cairo for 3 months until the United Press abandoned the effort in exasperation.

It is equally significant that when two correspondents were sent from Cairo to Yugoslavia, that they were John Talbot, representative of Reuter's, the semiofficial British news agency, and Stoyan Pribicevich, Life and Time magazines correspondent who had for over 2 years been one of Tito's leading propagandists in this country, and, incidentally, Talbot and Pribicevich were sent not to both General Mihailovich's and Tito's headquarters in Yugoslavia, but only to Tito's headquarters.

General Mihailovich, as commander in chief of the Yugoslav armies, has extended repeated invitations and requested that Allied correspondents be permitted access to his headquarters and to the Yugoslav territory which he controlled, but to no avail. These facts tend to impress the fair-minded observer that a deliberate effort has been and is being made to obscure and minimize the efforts of the duly designated field commander of the legitimate Yugoslav Government, while, at the same time, false propaganda is being spread for the purpose of building up Tito's prestige.

We know what has happened since the exposure of the Tito hoax. Even now, the new Yugoslav Premier, who was recently appointed by King Peter under British pressure, continues to negotiate with the discredited Tito in Bari, Italy, with a view to saving Tito's prestige and position.

We note that the new Yugoslav Premier, Dr. Ivan Subasic, himself is unable to obtain the support of the Yugoslav people. We note that for more than a month he has been attempting to form a cabinet and that none of the political parties of Yugoslavia will permit their representatives to enter that cabinet.

Who is Dr. Subasic whom Churchill has forced upon King Peter? One of the most significant answers is provided by The Bulletin, published by the Communist pro-Tito propaganda machine in the United States, which even before—and after—his appointment as Premier carried his name as an honorary member.

Recently a United States military mission returned to the United States from Yugoslavia. This mission was comprised of two American Army officers who spent 6 months with General Mihailovich. The American officers were able to make first-hand inspection tours of areas comprising about three-fifths of the territory of Yugoslavia, all under the control of General Mihailovich.

I understand on reliable advices that the American military mission reported that General Mihailovich obviously had the support of the Yugoslav people in their fight against the Nazis, that he was energetically opposing the enemy in the field and harassing the Nazis throughout the length and breadth of that unfortunate land.

There is more than an inference that the report of the American military mission has been suppressed because when a request was made on the floor of this House that the two American officers who had spent more than 6 months with General Mihailovich in Yugoslavia be summoned to testify and render a report to the Military Affairs Committee of the House, both officers were cautioned against speaking on the subject, and one of them was almost immediately thereafter transferred to duty in China. The fact that these officers were not permitted to testify and the circumstances surrounding the suppression of their report as to General Mihailovich's activities, whereas the O. W. I. has been consistently issuing releases as to Tito's activities and his prestige should be explained to the Congress and the American public.

The surprise raid of a few hundred German parachutists with one pin thrust completely exploded the Tito hoax and myth, and has demonstrated that the "Partisan army" of 300,000 is a fantasy of someone's fevered imagination, and it follows that the alleged "liberation" by Tito of thousands of miles of Yugoslavia is one of this war's tremendous lies which has been broadcast to the American public by the O. W. I. for the purpose of building up Tito's prestige and his communistic following.

The true facts expose the real situation in Yugoslavia—that the majority of the people of Yugoslavia do not support the partisans and that Tito does not have the support of the Yugoslav people.

Why, then, does the American Government policy, complaisant and compliant under British pressures which cannot bear open and honest scrutiny permit itself to be used to foist an odious Communist regime upon an unwilling people and to force Tito down their throats?

Why, also, does a compliant American foreign policy, tied as a tail to a British kite, permit the idealistic motives of the American people in this war to be twisted and perverted by the ruthlessness of power politics of other nations into serving ends that the American people, if they knew the truth, would never sanction?

Now that the Tito hoax has been exploded, is there some other reason why we continue to permit the American people to be misled as to what is really going on in Yugoslavia? And why does the United States find it necessary to abandon the valiant General Mihailovich, under whose leadership the brave fighting men and women of Yugoslavia have been fighting the Nazis since their country was invaded?

If there is any reason why our Government should cast aside General Mihailovich, the American people have a right to know what it is. If there is none, we have no reason to permit the continuing betrayal of the Yugoslav people and their Government-in-exile at the behest of the secret policy of another nation. The situation involves the honor of our Government's foreign policy, based upon the provisions of the Atlantic Charter, and in the coming days of peace may affect our own national interests.

This is an all-out war effort—we should give every assistance to all of our allies because they are fighting the Germans and every effort that is being put forth against the Germans—it matters not how small it may be—will save the lives of American fighting men. The people in the occupied countries—Poland and Yugoslavia—cannot fight barehanded—they must have supplies and materials, and when our support is withdrawn from these recognized governments, the war effort is being handicapped. The eyes of the people of Poland and Yugoslavia are turned towards America for aid and assistance—they are depending upon America to bring about their deliverance—yet with more than 4 years of warfare behind them, they have not had delivered to them supplies and materials. It is true that the underground in both Poland and Yugoslavia are doing excellent work in harrassing the Germans and sabotaging their military machine, but they could do far better work if they were given supplies and materials, and despite the many promises, they are becoming disallusioned because the supplies and materials promised have not been forthcoming. I am at a loss to understand why, and, in my opinion, the Congress and the American people should be given an explanation.

Challenge in Tennessee to the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Captain Lowe, of Knoxville, Tenn.:

Tennessee has a glorious history. Heretofore our citizens have assumed leadership in the affairs of the National Government. Business interests because of T. V. A. influence and the general awakening to the industrial value of the South are beginning to locate manufacturing plants within our boundaries. We sprang from and were reared by the purest American stock. We are expected to lead in formulating policies for the democratic way of life. Also this is a time when subversive interests are seriously challenging our democracy and when New Dealism and Government bureaucrats are talking about the outmoded "horse and buggy days."

We have just passed through a period which is fast leading us toward a socialistic Government.

Such is the view of Malcolm McDermott, a lifelong Democrat, former dean of the University of Tennessee Law School, and now dean of the Law School at Duke University, when he said in a condensation of a speech delivered in the fall of 1943 before members of the North Carolina bar:

"We are having foisted upon us national socialism, that is none other than the German system of government."

Dean McDermott points out in his speech that while delivering lectures in Germany he closely studied the German system and points out 12 steps in governmental activities which brought on socialism in Germany and then proceeds to say in substance that our Government has taken the most of these socialistic steps. If his conclusions are correct, unless we soon stop these trends, we will also become a socialistic nation which would swallow up the common man and make us all slaves to a system that we do not want.

The Democratic Party is responsible for these socialistic trends. It has sent swarms of New Deal carpetbaggers to meddle into our purely local affairs. Government agents and bureaucrats legislate, regulate, order, and direct.

This socialistic New Deal party organization is supported and partly kept in power by the Tennessee New Deal party, which is owned and directed body and soul by a political dictator. This dictator has the power to, and does, crush all effective oppositions in the party, much to the disgust of the rank and file. The Democratic Party in Tennessee has lost to the New Deal political dictators and bureaucrats, its soul and will to fight.

The Tennessee dictator has made it necessary for the citizens desiring to continue constitutional government to support the Republican Party if they expect to get relief. These citizens are hopeful that the Republican Party will accept the challenge and make a vigorous campaign. The State is one place where these socialistic trends can be defeated.

The independent voter, the real American in Tennessee needs, can have, and should have, a party in power that has a practical program which will save democracy, save free enterprise, and save individual initiative, and, at the same time, meet the needs of the people.

Our way of life is at the crossroads, one road leading to democracy, the other to socialism. Whatever has been the previous attitude of the Republican Party, they cannot now afford to be timid. Our citizens cannot be timid when democracy is in the balance.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men.
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and misery.
On such a full sea are we now afloat;
And we must take the current when it serves,
Or lose our ventures."

John Sevier was not timid when our way of life was threatened.

George Washington was not timid when our way of life was threatened.

Andrew Jackson was not timid when our way of life was threatened.

Will Republicans be timid when our way of life is threatened?

We are in the middle of a change and unrest.

We are about to enter into the post-war period when currents of thought and action will be clashing, sometimes involving individual or group security which if not soberly and intelligently but emphatically handled, may entirely change our way of life.

If these different currents of thought and action are to be fused into a progressive, unified program, the next Government must be directed by men who through experience can sense and understand the way our people feel about their individual and group problems which are different, depending upon the different circumstances surrounding their rearing and the duties of their daily activities.

Those gains made in recent years which meet the needs of the people and improve the American way of life must not be dis-

carded or abandoned. We all realize that government should progress, that we need to make many new improvements, but we do insist that while making these improvements it is not necessary to destroy free enterprise, individual personality, or the American way of life.

The Republican Party, if it expects to win, must be able to sense the change in the philosophy of our citizens returning from the battlefield. "There are no atheists in fox holes." The same stimuli that prompts this statement also causes the soldier to see through the sham in many of our practices. They are impatient with the greediness and selfishness and with the amateurish way of practicing the Golden Rule. Their experience of being face to face with death brings a new and deeper concept of the meaning of life. The soldier gets a new meaning for brotherly love, service, and cooperation for progress. If their problems of readjustment are approached with understanding, their reentrance into civilian life can be made easier and their experience more valuable to the state.

The Republican Party, if it expects to win, must demonstrate it has the ability to sense the problems of the farmer during the transition or change from an agricultural to an industrial society. The farmer loses his employees to industry because of higher wages. He must pay high prices for machinery and commodities to satisfy his daily needs. For these he needs cash. He is all tangled up in reports and directives. He longs to be let alone.

The Republican Party if it expects to win, must demonstrate it has the ability to sense the relative value of a school teacher as compared with other vocations of life, their yearning for an adequate program to abolish illiteracy in Tennessee, and their disappointment because of our low standing in educational circles.

To the child, the teacher is the hero or heroine. What the teacher says goes, even over what the parents say. Proper child training requires a teacher well trained professionally. The school teacher feels the injustice of providing social security for other walks of life but no retirement system for teachers.

The Republican Party, if it expects to win, must demonstrate it has the ability to sense the indignant feeling of an employer who must employ some people whose primary interest is putting in the time and drawing a check instead of doing a good job. Many feel rebellious to a system which encourages a standardization of work instead of one which encourages in each individual a desire to achieve as much as possible. The business executive has no hours. His staying in business depends upon production and service. He feels he is considerate of his employees and pays many of them more than they are worth. He is worried and harassed by many of his employees, the Government administrative agencies, and red tape. He lies awake at night trying to devise ways and means to stay in business, to continue to pay his faithful employees and satisfy a group of stockholders and a board of directors who demand profits. He longs for the freedom from worry and the physical strain which in many instances cause premature death.

The Republican Party, if it expects to win, must demonstrate it has the ability to sense the anxiety and the worry of the small businessman over his future prospects. He is now hampered and hamstrung with reports, regulations, and directives, which he does not understand. It must believe that the future of democracy depends upon the independent small businessman and that his prosperity is of paramount importance.

The Republican Party, if it expects to win, must demonstrate it has the ability to sense the soul of labor organizations and labor leaders who strive to make it possible for laborers to obtain the necessities of life for themselves and children. These leaders want the children of laborers to have an equal opportunity for an education. They want the laborer to have some reasonable security from want during unemployment, accidents, sickness, and old age. The laborer wants a reasonable amount of time for recreation and self-improvement. He feels the sting of his economic instability.

The labor movement feels that it represents a large block of our citizens and that it should have effective representatives in the formation and execution of governmental policies, much in the same manner as other groups now have.

The Republican Party, if it expects to win, must demonstrate it has the ability to sense the feeling of the criminal and know something of the causes of crime. He should know the feeling of a man who tries to keep up with the Joneses, who tries to keep the respect of his neighbors but, because of his inability to cope with our economic system in the orthodox way, through weakness, seeks a short cut by unsocial acts in order to reach his goal. Our scientific knowledge should be utilized to rehabilitate the criminal, both for his own good and for the protection of society.

The Republican Party, if it expects to win, must demonstrate it has the ability to sense the anxiety and worry from trying to rear children in a society where they are many times tempted beyond their ability to overcome. Those who have tossed on a bed at midnight and wondered where was their boy or girl, know how parents yearn for wholesome environment and recreational centers.

The Republican Party if it expects to win, must demonstrate it has the ability to sense the deep desire and determination of all our citizens in whatever group or economic level, to preserve democracy as we know it, the capitalistic system and free enterprise. No one wants more than just compensation in proportion to his ability, his energy expended and services rendered. Given equal opportunities with a minimum of security, we are willing to accept personal responsibility for our status.

The Republican Party if it expects to win, must believe in the ability of our people when properly informed, to govern themselves.

The Republican Party if it expects to win, must demonstrate it has the ability to sense the willingness of our people to fully cooperate and endure anything to win the war and at the same time sense the yearning of the people for the influence of the State in helping obtain modification of unfair regulations and directives now sometimes imposed upon some of our citizens. The party must sense the desire of our people for the help of the State in movement to return after the war to a fair and understanding democracy.

Only such an understanding can successfully chart a program through the changes now taking place and the post-war problems which will preserve free enterprise, individual initiative, and democracy, all of which all of us are willing to defend to death.

The independent voter in Tennessee wants the opportunity to vote for a party which cares for our way of life, and which has a practical progressive program that dignifies personality, has an unshakable belief in the supremacy of the right, and the determination to see it through.

The independent voter—and these are votes upon which the Republicans must depend for election—want a candidate who is capable of and will pitch his claim upon issues transcending party politics. Good American citizens realize the issues are too fundamental, and too serious to be handled through the narrow vision of any group, be it a political organization or otherwise.

The issue is: Socialism or democracy; rule by dictators or the people.

Citizens may think we Republicans are weak, but the issues require that we take long chances. "Let us then be up and doing with a heart for any fate." Will inaction make us stronger? By quitting will we be stronger? When will we be stronger? Not when the New Deal has finished sending great swarms of agents to meddle into our every activity of life. Not when bureaucratic government has enslaved us. Not after inch by inch our individualism has been destroyed. Not when free enterprise is destroyed. Not when a bureaucratic government directs our daily activities. Not when socialism has us by the throat and choked out our will to fight.

We are not weak if we make use of our God-given right as a citizen. Armed with the righteous cause of democracy we can succeed. A retreat means submission to socialistic slavery. God forbid that American citizens would take this lying down.

The battle does not go to the side with the greater numbers. It goes to the vigilant, to the energetic, to the strong willed, to the right side. God still directs the destinies of men. Being in the right, I, for one, have absolute confidence that ways, which at the beginning are not discernible, to bring about victory will appear as we go along.

Republicans of Tennessee we must realize that we are now face to face with an opportunity to save the American way of life. There is no other group willing to carry the banner. Where does the individual American citizen stand; for New Dealism or Americanism? What are individual Republicans willing to do that democracy may be preserved?

A small amount of work upon the part of each Republican or each citizen in Tennessee, would bring tremendous dividends—save us from slavery. Are you willing to do the work necessary to inform every citizen in Tennessee of the issues and the result of failure? Are you willing to assume the responsibility imposed upon you as a citizen in a democracy?

What would the soldiers at Runnymede do if they stood where you stand today, with an opportunity to accomplish so much by doing so little?

What would our forefathers do if they stood where you stand today, with an opportunity to accomplish so much by doing so little?

What would the soldiers of the Revolutionary Army do if they stood where you stand today, with an opportunity to accomplish so much by doing so little?

What would the soldiers of the Blue and the Gray do if they stood where you stand today, with an opportunity to accomplish so much by doing so little?

What would our soldiers in England, in Africa, in the Pacific, in every place in this global war do if they stood where you stand today, with an opportunity to accomplish so much by doing so little?

We know what they would do. They would work until every citizen in Tennessee knew the issues of this campaign. They would know that democracy had a chance. They would have the will and determination which brings success.

What will we do with our opportunities? In proportion as we love our democracy, as we love the American way of life, as we love our families, let every Tennessee citizen resolve to give every spare moment from now until the election in the interest of democracy. In this battle for democracy and free enterprise against New Deal socialism we must do our best or the forces of socialism and destruction will break through and the battle will be over.

In the face of such fundamental issues, we Republicans dare not be afraid. We dare

not hesitate. In the words of Mordecai when he challenged Esther to save her people, the individual voter challenges the Republicans of Tennessee to save our people when they say, "Who knoweth but thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this."

Review of Out of Debt, Out of Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks herewith a review of my book Out of Debt, Out of Danger, which appeared in the June 1944 issue of Land and Home, the official publication of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference:

A splendid critical analysis on a much controverted governmental problem—National Financing. Not only is a readable and wholly satisfactory history of our national debt delineated, but also is lucidly exposed the complex ramifications of the workings of the Federal Reserve Banking System. That this system has aided, abetted, and increased our national debt is clearly proven; that it should be replaced by a system of coinage in the hands and under the direction of Congress where the Constitution properly and rightfully puts it, follows with inexorable logic.

Thus by history and by destructive and constructive criticism, Congressman VOORHIS admirably accomplished the threefold purpose of his book: (1) To show that it is wrong for the Government to borrow money by "selling" interest-bearing bonds to banks in return for demand-deposits credits newly created upon their books for the express purpose of purchasing these bonds; (2) to show what can be done to keep down very substantially the increase in the interest-bearing public debt; (3) to show how the public debt can and ought to be reduced after the war.

Supplying Civilian Goods to Liberated Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted to me, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter which I received from the Honorable Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, relative to the work done by the Army in supplying civilian goods to liberated Italy.

It is to be noted that the supplies which have been sent by the Army command have been sent as a result of its military operations. Liberated Italy has not yet had extended to it the benefits of the Lend-Lease Act and it is obvious that the early designation of liberated Italy as a lend-lease country will go a long way oward improving the plight of the Italian people.

It is sincerely hoped that conditions will soon be such as to justify the early designation of liberated Italy as a lend-lease country.

The letter follows:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1944.

Hon. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CAPOZZOLI: I am writing you in response to your request to Mr. E. E. Hunt, Chief of the Italian Division, for information concerning civilian supply in Italy.

The primary responsibility for supplying civilian goods to Italy rests with the Army. The F. E. A. has a staff which assists the Army in planning and to some extent in the procurement of needed supplies. I have taken a deep interest in the economic aspects of the Italian situation, and, in December, I sent a mission to Italy to report to me on conditions there. To date, quantities of flour, meat, cheese, sugar, milk, medical supplies, and clothing, some soap, some newsprint, and a few other miscellaneous supplies have been sent from the United States to Italy for civilian consumption. Other supplies, including fuels, have been sent from the United Kingdom. I understand that the food problem has been quite acute as a result of the extreme disorganization of the internal economy of Italy caused by Fascist maladministration and military operations, and a harvest which was smaller than anticipated. However, I believe every effort is now being made to bring in the essential minimum needed.

The exact quantities of food and other supplies shipped are confidential since they tend to reveal the amount of shipping available and the success of our supply lines. If you want the exact figures you might request them from Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring, head of the Civil Affairs Division of the War Department who will be able to supply you with whatever information is no longer restricted as a military secret.

The responsibility for civilian affairs in Italy is concentrated in the Allied Control Commission, a joint British and American organization subject to the theater commander, which advises and supervises the activities of the Italian Government. Requests for essential supplies for the Italian civilian population originate in the Allied Control Commission and are referred through military channels to the United States or Great Britain. The American share of the supply responsibility is borne principally by the Army in accordance with the President's letter to the Secretary of War dated November 10, 1943. The bulk of the necessary supplies, including such important items as food, and medical and sanitary supplies, are procured and paid for directly by the Army out of Army appropriations as a measure of military necessity. With respect to certain other items which to date have been of lesser importance, the Army has requested the F. E. A. to make procurement. To finance these purchases, which so far have not reached any substantial dollar volume, the F. E. A. uses funds which were made available by the last Lend-Lease Appropriation Act for the needs of liberated areas. It should be noted that all that F. E. A. does in this connection is to act at the request of the Army and to make purchases on the basis of requisitions submitted by the theater commander.

The total value of the American share of civilian supplies provided to date, exclusive of these minor F. E. A. purchases, is in the neighborhood of $75,000,000. When these supplies arrive in Italy they are paid for in lire by Italian distributors or by the Italian Government.

Although the benefits of the Lend-Lease Act can be extended to foreign governments engaged in common struggle against the enemy, Italy has not yet been designated a lend-lease country, and is therefore not entitled to the benefits of the Lend-Lease Act. The supplies which we send there are requested and controlled by the Army command as part of its military operations.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

Emergency Medical Service of New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted to me, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I received from one of my constituents, Dr. O. I. Bloom, relative to the efficient work performed by the emergency medical service in New York City in connection with a recent incident in that city, in which nearly 500 people were overcome by chlorine gas.

I agree with Dr. Bloom that the results achieved by the emergency medical service in New York City, in connection with the named incident, speaks volumes for the patience exercised by the members of that service in the frequent practice drills which it had undergone since its establishment.

Dr. Bloom's letter follows:

NEW YORK, *June 19, 1944.*

Hon. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The recent incident in New York in which nearly 500 people were overcome by chlorine gas from a leaking cylinder will be, we hope, the closest that our country will ever get to an enemy attack from the air. Yet the incident served as a demonstration of how well our great city is prepared for such an enemy attack.

Within a few minutes after the leak was detected and struck its first victims, the emergency medical service of the city of New York was mobilized and in action. Doctors, nurses' aides, stretcher bearers, and ambulances were at the scene of the incident; every affected individual received first aid and about 400 were taken to hospitals. With the cooperation of the other protective services of the city, the incident was handled with a smoothness and dispatch that were the results of scores of practice drills which the service had undergone since its establishment. The fact that no deaths resulted from this incident is a tribute to the emergency medical service which was organized before Pearl Harbor and which has been brought to its present peak of perfection under the continuous direction of the Honorable Edward M. Bernecker, M. D., commis-

sioner of the department of hospitals of the city and chief of its emergency medical service.

Very truly yours,

O. I. BLOOM, M. D.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement made by me before the House Labor Committee in support of my bill, H. R. 3986, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Chairman NORTON, gentlemen of the committee, I am appearing before you today in behalf of H. R. 3986, a bill which I introduced in the Congress. This bill prohibits discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. This is the first time the committee has had before it the unlimited opportunity to make plain to the American people that a man's race, creed, color, or where he came from has nothing to do with whether he will be allowed to earn a living.

There are nearly 1,000,000 Negroes in the Army, Navy, and Marines. The men on Bataan were largely of Mexican origin from Arizona and New Mexico. The first heroes of our war were of many religions, colors, and national origins. Their names tell the story dramatically. We all remember Kelly, Levin, Gentile, and Dorie Miller. If our returning servicemen, who fought side by side with these heroes, are barred from jobs because of color, religion, or national origin, what a hollow thing our victory will be.

If there is any more vicious denial of American democracy than discrimination in jobs because of a man's race, creed, or color, I cannot imagine what it is. The only thing worse than discrimination against a man because he belongs to a union is discrimination because a man is a Negro, a Jew, a Catholic, or because his ancestors came from another country. This gnawing evil is a slap in the face to every decent American who believes in American fair play. The Supreme Court, in the case of *New Negro Alliance* v. *Sanitary Grocery Co.*, in 1938, said:

"The desire for fair and equitable conditions of employment on the part of persons of any race, color, or persuasion, and the removal of discrimination against them by reason of their race or religious beliefs is quite as important to those concerned as fairness and equity in terms and conditions of employment can be to trade or craft unions or any form of labor organization or association. Race discrimination by an employer may reasonably be deemed more unfair and less excusable than discrimination against workers on the ground of union affiliation."

The man who spoke for the Supreme Court in those words was Mr. Justice Owen J. Roberts, who can certainly not be called a radical.

On 23 different occasions in the last 10 years, the Congress of the United States has outlawed racial and religious discrimination in legislating for public-works projects, the Civilian Conservation Corps, unemployment relief, civil service classification acts, the training of civilian aircraft pilots, the National Youth Administration, the Selective Service and Training Act, the training of defense workers, the building of public works necessary to the defense program, and the Cadet Nurses Corps for Government and civilian hospital service.

This is the time for the Congress of the United States to say to the people of America that their Government guarantees their right to jobs, regardless of their color, race, or their form of divine worship. This is the time to say to the world that we in America mean what we say when we tell them that this is a land of opportunity in which a man can go as far as his ability can carry him. This is the way to show the people of the world that we practice what we preach. Unless and until we guarantee by law that a man's ability is his only restriction, just so long will everyone hold extreme reservations about our real democracy.

Everyone knows that today, as in the past, large groups of Americans are prevented from earning a decent living and improving themselves solely because their skin is dark or their forefathers came from overseas or they worship God in different ways. This is the situation my bill is designed to change.

My bill, H. R. 3986, has 16 sections. Section 1 sets forth its findings and declaration of policy. Namely, that the Congress finds that discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry foments domestic strife, prevents full use of manpower, and burdens interstate commerce; and that it is the national policy to eliminate such discrimination in employment relations, subject to the control of the Federal Government.

Section 2 provides that the right to work without discrimination is a constitutional privilege and immunity which cannot be abridged by any State.

Section 3 defines the unfair employment practices which are the heart of the bill. Employers are forbidden to discriminate against any person because of his race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry with respect to the hire, tenure, or terms and conditions of his employment. Labor unions are likewise forbidden to refuse membership and otherwise to discriminate against any person because of his race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. Both employers and labor unions are forbidden to discriminate against any person because he has filed a charge, testified, or assisted in any proceeding or because he has opposed a discriminatory employment practice.

Section 4 defines the scope of the bill, the jurisdiction covered by the bill. This bill applies to any employer who employs more than five persons and who is engaged either in interstate commerce or in performing work under a contract or subcontract with a United States agency. It applies also to any labor union having five or more members in the employ of one or more employers subject to the act.

Section 5 of the bill creates the Fair Employment Practice Commission, composed of seven members appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for 7-year terms. The original seven members hold office for terms from 1 to 7 years. Each member receives $10,000 annually.

Section 8 provides that the personnel, books, records, and funds of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, created by Executive Order 9346, are transferred to the new Commission. And section 9 provides that the Commission may investigate cases and conduct hearings anywhere in the United States or any Territory or insular possession thereof.

Section 10 sets forth the procedure by which the Commission handles cases. After a charge is filed alleging that an unfair employment practice has occurred the Commission will begin an investigation. If the investigation reveals that the charge is substantially true, and an informal adjustment cannot be made, the Commission may hold hearings at which all parties may produce evidence, issue orders based on the record of the hearing, and petition a United States Circuit Court of Appeals to enforce its orders.

In this respect the Commission would function in the same manner as other administrative agencies, such as the Federal Trade Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may take an appeal to the circuit court. The Commission may award back pay and compel the reinstatement or hire of employees, in the same way as the National Labor Relations Board.

Section 11 gives the Commission the power to administer oaths and compel by subpenas the attendance of witnesses or the production of evidence. These subpenas are enforceable in the Federal district courts. Under section 12 the Commission may issue rules and regulations, including those further defining its procedures, which become effective 60 days after transmission to Congress, unless Congress amends or nullifies such rules by appropriate legislation or adjourns within 10 days after their submission.

Section 13 requires all firms contracting with the United States to include in all their contracts a provision obligating the contractor and his subcontractors not to discriminate in employment. Unless the Commission directs otherwise, no contract may be awarded to any person found by the Commission to have violated the act for 3 years from the date of such finding.

Section 14 prohibits willful interference with agents of the Commission. Such interference is punishable by a year in jail or $5,000 fine, or both.

Section 15 sets forth the definitions of terms used in the act. Interstate commerce is defined to include commerce in the District of Columbia or any Territory.

Section 16 states that this act shall be known as the fair employment practice act.

This is a summary of my bill.

As you gentlemen know, there is presently in existence the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, which was created under Executive Order 9346 a year ago. The F. E. P. C. was first set up in June 1941, and for the past 3 years has been buffeted about from pillar to post. Since last August it has set up regional offices throughout the country. This marked the beginning of real operation of the agency. During the 10 months ending April 30, 1944, it has received 3,419 complaints, which, together which the 1,016 cases inherited from the former committee, made a total case load of 4,435 cases. During the 10-month period ending April 30, 1944, it has closed 2,286 cases. Of these, 879, or about 40 percent, have been classed as satisfactorily adjusted. Six hearings have been held. Its case load as of May 1, 1944, was 2,149.

All this represents a very creditable performance, for the agency has no power of any sort. Everything is done on the basis of persuasion. The F. E. P. C. has no subpena power and no enforcement powers. It cannot go to a Federal court for the enforcement of its directives. As a matter of fact, its directives are simply recommendations to the parties. When the parties refuse to follow the recommendations, the F. E. P. C. has only two courses of action open. It can recommend to other Federal agencies that certain privileges be denied to the violating party, privileges such as priorities. This it has never done. Even if it so recommended, these other agencies could simply refuse to follow the recommendation. Lastly, the F. E. P. C. can certify the case to the President. This it has done once, in the famous Southern Railroad cases. These were certified in December 1943. The matter was given by

the President to a special commission to attempt to adjust the matter. This commission has held several meetings, but nothing has been announced in the way of adjustment.

Gentlemen, let's not deceive ourselves or the public. Without a statute carrying definite powers of investigation and enforcement, no agency can do much more than attempt informally to adjust ugly situations. If someone decides to ignore the Committee, there just isn't much that can be done about it.

What is needed to cope with this problem is a permanent agency backed up by a statute. It is the history of every administrative agency. Until the Congress passes such a statute, it is a mockery to say that the problem of discrimination in employment is really being tackled.

One word more. This bill has nothing to do with racial equality or social equality. It simply says that all people must have an equal opportunity, according to their abilities, to work for their living regardless of their race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

I ask you gentlemen to report this bill to the House with a recommendation that it be passed.

Mr. Dooley, the Supreme Court, and the Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the June 21 issue of the Chicago Times:

Mr. Dooley once observed that the Supreme Court decisions "follow the election returns." Whether or not that's true, Americans insist that presidential electors at least should do so. Democratic procedure requires that.

Will the coming Presidential election be an exception?

Threats by southern Democrats, notably in Texas and Mississippi, have raised that question. The threats boil down to this: Unless the "rebel" southerners get their way at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago next month, their electors will ignore the party nominees and vote for two other persons. They might even vote for the Republican nominees. Or they might vote for persons not even mentioned at this time for President or Vice President. They could cast their votes in the electoral college so that no candidate would obtain a majority, thus throw the election into Congress. Then the House of Representatives would elect the President and the Senate would elect the Vice President. The people would be left in the cold.

A good many Americans, who believe that the people elect the President, undoubtedly will be shocked to discover that the Constitution permits such flouting of the will of the voters. For technically and legally the people have no direct voice in electing their President. The closest the people come to choosing their top officials legally is to express their preference for a set of State electors, who do the actual voting for President and Vice President. If the electors decide to ignore the popular vote, then all the people do is to select proxies to act for them. Most proxies follow the instructions of their principals—those who chose them. But if the Texas-Mississippi idea prevails, the proxies, or agents, would be bigger than the principals.

FOUNDERS DIDN'T TRUST THE PEOPLE

It is not accident that the electors legally may exercise independent judgment. Our founding fathers—not all of whom had confidence in the collective wisdom of the people to shape their own destiny—definitely intended that the people should not choose the President or Vice President. It was argued that the people could not be expected to be sufficiently informed, because communities were isolated and communication was slow in the early days of the Republic. A candidate for President couldn't get around and make speeches everywhere.

Alexander Hamilton, in one of the Federalist papers, put the case this way:

"It was * * * desirable that the immediate election should be made by men most capable of analyzing the qualities adapted to the station and acting under circumstances favorable to deliveration. * * * A small number of persons, selected by their fellow citizens from the general mass, will be most likely to possess the information and discernment requisite to such complicated investigations."

Hamilton also argued that choosing a President by action of a small group of electors, rather than by direct vote of the people, would make for less tumult.

Actually, this scheme was never effective. In the first two national elections, Washington was the unanimous choice for President. Later, political parties grew up and the electors came to be considered mere figureheads, who automatically fulfilled the wishes of their respective parties. For the democratic spirit began to grow.

Does the country want to return to the Hamiltonian theory, by which a President would be selected by proxy? That would mean, of course, a retreat from democracy.

It's our opinion that the southern Democrats who are toying with this idea would be better advised to abandon their scheme. We do not believe that the people of the South will want to be thus disenfranchised. For if they cast their votes for the Democratic candidates, they have a right to expect that those votes will be counted. And other Americans have the right to expect the same thing.

One good result should flow from this situation. This is the launching of an overdue movement for amending the Constitution so that it will conform with what has been custom for 150 years. In this case, at least, the written Constitution should be brought into line with our unwritten law. For our unwritten law, which decrees that the electors shall follow the election returns, is part of the American system as it has developed since Hamilton's day.

Our President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a splendid song entitled "Our President," written by William C. Gould, Sr., of Dorchester, Mass.:

OUR PRESIDENT

(Dedicated to F. D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, 1944)

Our President, now the head of our Nation,
Has thrice been tried and true
Who stands behind Old Glory
Our emblem, Red, White, and Blue.
Lend a hand to our great land
And back our President in his stand!

Listen to our President's plea
To keep America safe and free
Pray to God in Heaven above
To protect the land that we all love.

American people must all awake
For the cause of our freedom
Before it may be too late
To all mothers in their suspense
Who offer their sons for its defense
On land, in air, and on sea.

May our God in heaven guide this man
To keep invasion from our land.
May Congress give him their consent
For they, the people, represent
Justice and honor is all that he asks
Stand by our President in his great task.

When Most Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco News of June 19, 1944:

WHEN MOST NEEDED

At the time when San Francisco and the bay area will need it most Congress kills the agency created by President Roosevelt last year to coordinate the work of all civilian Federal war activities. Known as the President's Committee on Congested Production Areas (a misleading and forbiddingly obscure name), the local branch set up here was most successful in ironing out tangles between the multifarious Federal agencies.

At that time they were stepping on each other's toes, quarreling over priorities, duplicating efforts, and all trying to win the war single-handed. Each was entirely sincere in its conception of its own importance. The coordinator was able to call their chiefs together, show them the whole picture, and persuade each to fit his individual activities into a concerted whole.

It worked. War effort flowed more smoothly thereafter and has continued to do so. Now Congress, claiming the committee no longer is needed, refuses new appropriations for its work. It dies June 30.

Unless some agency is set up to take its place, conditions in this busy area, becoming busier every day as the time for the final big push against Japan approaches, will revert to the chaos of a year ago. That will be unfortunate, possibly actually threatening to delay the day of victory.

We have no idea what can be done to fill its place. Possibly bureau chiefs, having learned the advantage to them of coordinated effort, could provide for continuation of some form of routine consultation with each other. Perhaps some one existing agency could take on the job of coordinator.

Something of the kind ought to be planned on a permanent basis in connection with post-war development of the bay area. Success of the Federal effort is the best argument for setting it up on a permanent civilian basis.

We commend the thought to State and municipal authorities who now are approaching the problems of bay-area industrial and economic integration.

Our Lot in Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

OUR LOT IN LIFE

Two old oaken buckets once hung in the well
At opposite ends of the chain—
One made of existence a hideous hell,
And always rejoiced to complain:
"They send me back empty, each time I come up,
To dive to the depths of the well—
They pour from me always the last cooling cup,
And drop me back down to my hell."

"I, too, go back empty," the other replied,
But cheerfully sang he this hymn,
"As often as empty I bottomward ride,
I rise again full to the brim—
I'm happy to bring from earth's cisterns below
The thirst-quenching liquid of life,
Supremely essential to all things that grow
In this world of struggle and strife."

Thus daily these buckets hung there in the well,
In passing, to sing or complain—
One going to heaven, the other to hell—
At opposite ends of the chain—
Proclaiming a truth, too well known to deny,
That every man's pleasure or pain
Depends upon whether, when things go awry,
He's looking for loss or for gain.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Let's Do It Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to many Members of the House, as well as to millions of people throughout the country, that Discharge Petition No. 17 has been signed by over 200 Members. There is excellent prospect that the required number of 218 may be obtained before the proposed congressional recess for the national convention period. After the long wait of years, it now seems likely that the Townsend measure may be brought out of the Ways and Means Committee and submitted to the House for discussion and decision. To the millions of people who have been warmly advocating the Townsend plan, it has seemed strange that with months and years devoted to the discussion of social security, the rules of Congress have served to prevent even a committee hearing, as well as to prevent an opportunity to have the whole subject of old-age assistance taken up in the House and finally acted upon.

It is true that we are in the midst of a great World War, and that measures relating to that war are of paramount importance. But there are many domestic problems of importance which have been taken up and solved as we have included in congressional activities measures relating to relief and rehabilitation involving the expenditures of billions in foreign lands. Certainly, the time has come when the welfare of millions of our own people of advanced years should receive consideration. Let us hope that as soon as the recess is over the House will promptly take up the Townsend measure and as promptly act as liberally as we have upon U. N. R. R. A. and numerous other such broad programs.

Much has been said about the increased cost of living due to the war. The O. P. A. has been set up and millions spent to prevent inflation and protect the consuming public. Wage standards have been established in which the increased cost of living has been recognized.

Repeatedly the attention of Congress has been called to huge profits made by contractors and industries engaged in supplying our armed forces. Corporation profits generally have been steadily increased in the war period and continue to be. The plight of the white-collar workers is often referred to, and that of the farmers who maintain a wonderful record of production, notwithstanding shortage of help and lack of facilities, are of frequent discussion in the national press, as well as in Congress.

Still, the matter of an old-age pension plan has been held in abeyance while the hundreds of thousands of those receiving such assistance from the combined Federal, State, and county treasuries have been compelled to get along as best they could on their meager allowances. The high cost of living has affected them even more seriously than most others. It has compelled them to do less and less with the little they receive from the combined treasuries, each of which has been drawn upon heavily by the war and its costs.

Old-age assistance is a Federal problem, even more so than some of the plans at present in operation for foreign relief. Congress has been liberal with those of other countries, some of which are not directly connected with the war. It now should give its full attention to enacting into law a program for the aged and persevering people of our own land who in their prime contributed by their endeavors to the building of a Nation whose power is exemplified in the victories of our fighting forces on every front. A Federal old-age assistance program is an essential wartime measure, and action now may help to obviate its still greater necessity in the post-war plans. Let's do our full duty now.

Yes, Sir; I Do Peek Under the Bed, Mr. President; There Is Stuff There To See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Ralph E. Oberholzer, from the Red Oak (Iowa) Express:

YES, SIR! I DO PEEK UNDER THE BED, MR. PRESIDENT, THERE IS STUFF THERE TO SEE

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am one of those who "sees things under the bed," one of millions to whom you referred in your press conference Tuesday.

You seem to laugh and scoff at those of us who are suspicious, superstitious, and afraid of New Deal goblins and ghosts. But fear is not so lightly put aside.

I've been seeing things under the bed since 1932—strange things which have caused insomnia and distraction. Funny boogy men have been changing my way of life with bold determined hypnotic regularity.

No longer do I have to look under the bed to get the shivers. Gremlins and dodo birds now roost on the bed posts because space under the bed is too crowded. New ghosts are out for all to see.

When I got the jitters in 1933 and took my first peek under the bed, you were there refusing to reduce expenditures 25 percent and refusing to curtail Government employees—a pledge which you had made.

Next time I took a look, there you were with N. R. A. and a program to regiment my family. You had a bible of fixed, top prices, that I had to assess against my customers or you proposed to send me to Leavenworth.

Again I peeked under the slats and this time you and some Harvard boys were planning to pack the Supreme Court with faithful adherents who would do your bidding, approve laws to your liking, regardless of their constitutionality.

This looking under the bed business became a chronic pastime. There was always something new there. One time your henchmen were with you, and you as President of all of us, set out to eliminate from Congress, and purge from your party, any man who had dared to stand against you and stand by his convictions. That looked like an upsurge against democratic government.

Under my bed I found you holding conclaves with leaf-rakers, outhouse builders, and wasteful spenders—then came 3,000,000 of your faithful admirers whom the taxpayers had to support on your machine pay roll.

One night I found the business-wrecking crew—the fellows who told me how much and how little I could pay my fellow workers—how short or how long they could work—who said they couldn't work unless they had a number—who demanded endless and multiple reports—who dared to tell God that the sun was rising at the wrong time, so they changed the clocks.

I peeked one time and saw HENRY WALLACE distributing a quart of milk to every Chinaman, Hottentot, and African and charging it all up to us Americans, or was that a dream?

On another look you were distributing $30,000,000,000 in gifts—you call it lend-lease—to good neighbors with no strings attached. That was our money. And there was gossip under the bed about us feeding and policing the whole world—quite a chore, even for goblins—yes; quite a bedtime story, too, that Winston had told you.

Believe it or not, Eleanor was there one time with a social-planning and communal-housing pipe dream that frightened the whole household. We all got on our knees to look at her. Her experiment was made, and it failed at our expense, but she rolls on nonchalantly.

There was the under-the-bed scene where you wanted to discard the office of Budget Director so there would be no accounting of funds—you and your pals could spend as you please—well, you do, anyway, for that matter. Congress has never voted a subsidy, yet you and your colleagues pay them out. How cum?

I caught Leon Henderson under the bed one night making plans to ruin American economy. What he started is still a hair-raising bedtime story in O. P. A. effrontery. Imagine a fair and square government severely penalizing its citizens for minor and innocent infractions. Imagine a democratic government hoarding things from its people in a land of plenty. Yes; there are Gestapos under the bed.

Don't tell me that Mr. Biddle wasn't under the bed last week boasting of your autocratic power. Mr. Biddle looked into the crystal and came up with this shocking statement: "The President has a great constitutional reserve of power"; and Biddle maintained that no business of any kind is immune from that power. That can mean only one thing—Presidential dictatorship.

At the same time an O. P. A. understudy was telling the United States Supreme Court that the President could take over any business in the land at any time for any cause. In plain words, the President and the "palace guard" are whatever they want to be, and the Attorney General's rulings are based on New Deal theories, not on constitutional government.

Yes, Mr. President; I've been seeing things under the bed. Your bedtime stories and Mr. WALLACE's lullabies do not remove the fears or relieve the insomnia. Eleanor keeps me awake, too.

I still peek under the bed—there is stuff to see. I'm afraid of the New Deal goblins, and admit it.

You've pulled the wool over my eyes; now pull the sheet over my weary head. Good night.

The Highway Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hartford Courant of June 21, 1944:

THE HIGHWAY GRAB

Representative WILLIAM J. MILLER, of the First Connecticut District, on Monday fired the first gun in what may be protracted congressional battle over the formula to be used in apportioning Federal moneys among the States for the construction of highways. The proponents of changing the present formula so as to give more weight to traffic needs and less to area and road mileage lost their fight in the Roads Committee. Highway Commissioner William J. Cox, of Connecticut, has been among the leaders of the opposition to the present law, which is weighted in favor of the geographically larger States with a low density of population.

Under the bill as reported to the House, Connecticut taxpayers would contribute $36,295,000 annually toward post-war Federal aid highway construction, but the State's portion of the total fund would be only $11,595,000. Obviously it would be cheaper for Connecticut taxpayers to do their own roadbuilding without Federal aid, instead of contributing $2,487,000 to Texas, $1,111,000 to Georgia, $1,205,000 to Iowa, and various amounts to 31 other States, only 2 of which, Maine and Vermont, lie above the Mason and Dixon's line and east of the Mississippi River.

Congressman MILLER and Commissioner Cox are not altogether unalterably opposed to the principle of subsidizing other States. Their attack is directed primarily at the gross inequities that would prevail if the bill as reported is passed. That bill contains a provision that municipalities should share in a percentage of the funds allotted to the States. A few examples contrasting cities with about equal populations will show the soundness of the argument against the proposed measure: Bakersfield, Calif., $130,000—Reno, Nev., $4,400,000; Moline, Ill., $135,000—Fargo, N. Dak., $2,130,000; Medford, Mass., $140,000—Jackson, Miss., $1,780,000; Auburn, N. Y., $92,000—Albuquerque, N. Mex., $2,320,000. These are not isolated comparisons, they can be duplicated many times.

If this road bill should become law, it would represent the largest money steal through legislative sanction in the history of the Nation. The logrollers who have jammed through Congress notoriously indefensible river and harbor bills or tariff legislation would look like pikers when compared with the supporters of this program for Federal aid for roads. If the western and southern Congressmen have a reasonable sense of fair play, if they are not too earnestly concerned with buying votes with the money of eastern taxpayers, they will join with the Congressmen from the Eastern States in writing in the proposed legislation a fair formula.

Such a formula Commissioner Cox has proposed. Under it the Federal funds would be allotted on the basis of 30 percent for urban population, 30 percent according to motor-vehicle registrations, and 40 percent under the old formula that gives equal weight to area, population, and post-road mileage.

To this Federal-aid program for roads there is another aspect: This partially centralized authority over the country's highways may cost the taxpayers of Connecticut a cool $24,700,000 a year—the difference between what they contribute to the Washington pool and what they are handed back by the have-not-but-want-more States. Centralized government is expensive in more ways than one.

Preservation of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on the evening of June 22, over Station WMAL of this city and the blue network, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] delivered a most interesting and informative address on the subject Preservation of Freedom. I ask that the address may be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American people are on the eve of the two most important political conventions—ever held in the history of this Nation—the decisions which will be reached—and, the results which will flow from these decisions, may well change the destiny of this Nation.

Out of one of these conventions, will come the leadership which will determine the course of the Ship of State.

The delegates to these conventions have been chosen by an intelligent, informed, and united citizenry who have placed in them their faith and trust. Will they assume that responsibility and select a leadership that will guide America aright in the stormy years that are to come?

The decision is now in their hands; it will determine whether we are to retain constitutional government—our free enterprise economy—and our free political society; or whether all that our heroic men and women, are fighting for—shall be lost here at home, after the conflict at arms has been won.

It is well to remember the words from the lips of Abraham Lincoln:

"This Nation was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

The greatest of our liberties—is our freedom of speech. It underlies all honesty in Government—all freedom of worship—and provides our greatest antidote to every infection in the body politic.

In the exercise of this freedom lies our power, to redress grievances—to right wrongs—and to triumph over every threat and danger to our way of life.

In the exercise of this freedom lies the American traditional way, of resolving every crisis, by bringing out, even the gravest issues, into the light of day—out into the open—where we can talk them over, and determine our course of action.

It is for the future of this freedom that more than 10,000,000 American men—are carrying on—far and beyond the call of duty, on scores of battlefields on foreign fronts.

We whose lot it has been to participate, only indirectly in the war, marvel at the ingenuity, the energy, and the courage which have made our victories possible. At this very moment, after the first sharp thrust of invasion settles into the steady rhythm of a gigantic offensive, our admiration knows no bounds—and our gratitude no words.

We are on the road to victory. Winning the war is a nonpartisan job. It has been assumed by all loyal Americans without regard to party, race, or creed. It is high time that we give full credit to our armed forces, in whom we have all confidence. Our military leadership will carry the burden of the war just as efficiently, just as effectively, just as successfully under a Republican administration as under any other.

Our fighting men know, far better than we, how futile their striving would be, as an end in itself. They are sustained by a faith in their American heritage—which has found its way into the very blood that they are now pouring out on the altar of freedom. They have left with us the sacred task of guarding and protecting this heritage, looking unto us to keep it undefiled.

Our tasks—which they have placed squarely in our hands to complete—may turn out to be more difficult than theirs.

They are asking, "What are our peace aims? Why do we keep silent on foreign policy?"

What hope does the President hold out to our men who are now fighting and dying on the battle fronts that their most sincere prayers will be answered? What commitments have been made? Why does not this administration give our fighting men and all citizens the answers to these questions?

God help us if in this dark hour we continue to leave our people unenlightened or the suffering peoples of Europe without a future.

Our forces are fighting for peace and freedom for all peoples. They demand no less now—from their statesmen.

At the Mackinac conference the Republican Party provided a foreign policy. It was proclaimed throughout the world. It is no secret. It is not hidden. It is understandable. It has a practical approach and will assure a practical solution.

It has invited all Americans "to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness."

It further provides "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world" without overriding the sovereign rights of the American people.

Over the entrance to our Nebraska State Capitol is an inscription that runs something like this:

"The salvation of the State is in watchfulness of the citizen."

The dominant issue on the home front is whether our constitutional form of government will survive.

No more solemn warning was ever uttered than when Woodrow Wilson said:

"The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death because the concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties.'

Ours is the solemn duty of providing, in the next 4 years, a representative government that derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. This is our only hope against the threat of tyranny.

Under the guise of war emergency, we have traveled a long way down the road to dictatorship through bureaucratic control. Federal activities encroach on every phase of American life—in the roads we build; in the crops we plant; in the charity we dispense; in the goods we buy and sell; in the food we eat or would like to eat; in the taxes we pay—everywhere is the heavy hand of the Federal Government.

There are millions of our boys and girls, our young men and women, who have never known but one President. After 11 years, a totally alien concept of government has invaded the American way.

There are now scores of bureaus which have unlimited power over the purse strings of the Treasury, many of which are beyond the authority of the Government Accounting Office and certainly beyond the reach of Congress and the people.

During these years we have watched bitter attacks on our Supreme Court, undermining the authority of law.

We have watched government by legislation superseded by government by edict.

We have watched foreign influences infiltrate into bureau after bureau, until today the American people are confused, bewildered, and fearful of the future.

The changes that have been wrought are nowhere so well defined as in the words of President Roosevelt himself, who on January 3, 1936, warned the American people:

"In 34 months we have built up instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government, this power is wholesome and proper; but in the hands of political puppets, of an economic autocracy, such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people."

Certainly no one will deny but that this statement has come true in our beloved America.

In my work in the Senate I have heard heart-rending stories from harassed businessmen—from farmers beset with conflicting regulations and regimentation—from retailers squeezed between increased costs and lowered discounts—from manufacturers begging for material allocations.

Continued government by Executive order will surely crucify American industry and labor on the cross of bureaucracy.

Individuals and industry alike are saddled with a tax load unprecedented in the history of our Nation. None of us rebel at paying our full share of the cost of war, or of supplying the much-needed arms and equipment for our fighting forces. But we do object to the needless squandering of the people's money on extravagances—on nonessentials—and on inefficiency.

We also object to a global policy that buys foreign friendships with American dollars—and subsidizes foreign production at the expense of American enterprise. Such a policy and program can only mean a lowered standard of living—and this is something for labor to be thinking about.

The other course is clear. It appeals to men and women who refuse to be shackeled regardless of party affiliations. It means to Democrats and Republicans alike that they sound a warning to the New Dealers that they will not subjugate their independence to any individual or group. It means that they must throw off the yoke and walk out as freemen.

I have been steeped in the tradition of American freedom. Our forefathers left a heritage of loyalty to American ideals. They charged their sons to maintain love of country above all else, to continue the precepts laid down in the American Constitution. I can accept no alternative. I do not believe the American people want a substitute.

Fellow Americans, the Congress is but a reflection of your own hopes and your own fears. It represents your abilities, your successes, your shortcomings, and your failures. Congress is you, the people.

When the Executive fights the Congress, the Executive fights you; when the Executive attempts to override the Congress, then the Executive attempts to override you.

The strength of Congress is measured in exactly the same ratio as your own strength. The strength of congressional conviction is the strength that flows from the minds of the citizens of the United States. The Congress is all that stands between a free people and tyranny.

Our duty is to renew our faith in ourselves, in our American institutions, in our American form of government. Unless we adhere to those principles, we shall have failed to carry on the precepts of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness handed down by Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, and other patroits who placed love of country above personal gain or glory. That kind of leadership abounds in America, leadership that will promote the peace of the world and confidence and stability at home.

America has had a demonstration of an autocratic, centralized administration that has employed power politics. For America's sake, this continuity of power must be broken. We must re-create the American way of life.

The time has come for Americans to apply themselves to these problems with all the strength, courage, and intelligence at their command.

Are these conventions to be just political gala events where, behind the fanfare of bands and cheering, fateful decisions are made in smoke-filled rooms and delegates are told whom they shall choose?

Or will these conventions be held in keeping with the spirit of the men who are making the invasion? The delegates to these two political conventions hold America's future in the hollow of their hands. Their decisions demand American answers and American solutions.

God grant that they will have the courage to fulfill the trust that the American people have reposed in them as they choose the leadership that will guide America in the coming years, the most critical years in all American history.

Lake, Stay 'Way From My Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune:

LAKE, STAY 'WAY FROM MY DOOR

Chicago officials who have been striving for years to increase diversion of Lake Michigan waters into their sewage-disposal canal undoubtedly are greeting gleefully the news from Milwaukee that an unusually high lake level there is damaging lake-front improvements.

The Chicago plea for increased diversion, supported by dire warnings of an incipient epidemic, always has run up against contentions of other Great Lakes port cities that further diversion would leave their docks high and dry. Federal controls now limit the volume of water which Chicago may take from the lake for sewage-disposal purposes.

A Federal beach erosion board visited Milwaukee a few days ago to determine what means of protection should be adopted to save Milwaukee's receding shore line, marked by crumbling sidewalks and lake-shore embankments protecting paved streets and lakeside buildings.

Can it be, Chicago diversionists may well ask, that Milwaukeeans will rally to the support of her Illinois neighbor's diversion plea as the best means of keeping her own shore line intact?

Monetary Stabilization Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement, which was published in the New York Times:

MONETARY STABILIZATION PLAN — DOUBT IS SHARED THAT CONGRESS WOULD APPROVE MORGENTHAU PROPOSAL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The New York Times of today carries a strong editorial expressing doubt as to

whether Congress would approve of the plan for monetary stabilization which Secretary Morgenthau proposes to advance at the forthcoming conference at Bretton Woods. We fully share that doubt. As yet we have to find a single member of the Republican Party (and our inquiries have been confined to the Republican Members) who approves of what he conceives to be Secretary Morgenthau's proposal.

We fully recognize the moral and practical responsibility of this Nation to participate in the reconstruction of the devastated countries. Such participation does not require an international stabilization fund at this time.

We further recognize that stabilization of currencies is an essential to the long-range continuance of foreign trade. Stabilization of currencies is, however, dependent on sound economies of the various nations; hence, stabilization is attainable only after reconstruction has been successful. A stabilization fund created at this time would surely be doomed to failure. Its only purpose now would be for furnishing reconstruction funds through an international pool, the great bulk of these funds coming from the dollars deposited therein. We prefer to retain control over those dollars.

We feel that the first step on our part should be the creation by the Congress of an American Reconstruction Fund under the supervision of an American Board of Directors, confirmed by the Senate, the fund to act separately or in joint account with foreign governments, individuals, or corporations, to extend or guarantee short-term and intermediate credits to finance seasonal operations, to provide for longer-term productive loans, and to make gold loans to furnish a basis for sound currencies; provided, however, that all such loans or credits are made in consideration of approved plans seeking to balance the budget of the recipient country.

CHARLES S. DEWEY, Illinois; CHARLES A. EATON, New Jersey; WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota; J. ROLAND KINZER, Pennsylvania; RICHARD P. GALE, Minnesota; HAL HOLMES, Washington; HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Oregon; JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, New York; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey; CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, Indiana; JAY LEFEVRE, New York; FRANK CARLSON, Kansas; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; C. E. HANCOCK, New York; JOHN VORYS, Ohio; CHRISTIAN HERTER, Massachusetts; CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Connecticut; CARL HINSHAW, California; J. WADSWORTH, New York; PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Iowa, and EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Massachusetts.

WASHINGTON, *June 21, 1944.*

The Montgomery Ward Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on the Montgomery Ward case, broadcast on June 10, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The strange case of Montgomery Ward & Co. is a mystery no longer.

Brushing the wisps of straw from his hair and reluctantly coming out from behind the cracker barrel of his "corner grocery" (gross sales in 1943—$600,000,000), that mistreated "unarmed storekeeper" from Chicago, Mr. Sewell Avery, launched his own private D-day invasion in Washington this week and disclosed everything.

Mr. Avery—and we have his word for it—is the innocent victim of a plot, a gigantic conspiracy to force Montgomery Ward to obey "an unfair and illegal" order by his Government not to impede the war effort. And who, in the midst of the most terrible war in history, is a party to this intrigue? Who, with the Nation straining to prepare an invasion which will decide the fate of the world, called "time out" to join this mighty cabal against a corner grocery?

We have Mr. Avery's word for that, too; the Post Office Department, the National Labor Relations Board, the War Labor Board, the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the President of the United States.

That is Mr. Sewell Avery's story, and I am happy to say that he is stuck with it.

Fortunately, the truth of the Montgomery Ward case is neither mysterious nor obscure. It is a very simple, though not a very pleasant, story. It begins back in January 1942—a few weeks after Pearl Harbor—when American industry and American labor signed a "no strike-no lock-out" agreement on the basis of which the President established the National War Labor Board to make peaceful settlement of wartime labor disputes.

Of course, Montgomery Ward was not a party to this agreement, was not bound by any such silly nonsense. "Ward's had no voice in the selection of those who, as representatives of industry, attended the conference in December 1941," the company proclaimed in large newspaper advertisements a year later. "Ward's has never ratified the results of that conference."

Certainly not! The sovereignty of Montgomery Ward & Co. was at stake; and, war or no war, Mr. Sewell Avery would not submit differences with his employees to the machinery for peaceful settlement to which the rest of American industry was patriotically submitting and on which depended an uninterrupted flow of production and the successful prosecution of the war. The "corner grocery" had not "ratified" the agreement.

Adhering doggedly to this position that it was not bound by and therefore would not comply with the no strike-no lock-out agreement, Ward's in December 1943 notified the union in its Chicago plants that it would not recognize the union or negotiate the renewal of a collective bargaining agreement—already renewed for 1 year only at the direct request of the President of the United States—because, the company said, the union no longer represented the employees.

There must first, said Ward's, be an election among the employees to determine whether the union still represented them. Whereupon the War Labor Board directed the company to maintain the status quo—to continue the contract under which it had already operated for a year—for a period of 30 days to permit the National Labor Relations Board to settle the issue of representation by an election.

This Ward's refused to do. It refused to extend the agreement even for the limited period necessary to settle the matter of representation in an orderly and peaceful way. As a result, a strike was called in the Chicago plant of Montgomery Ward which employed approximately 6,500 persons.

There then came on April 5, 1944, a final directive order of the W. L. B.—joined in unanimously by the industry as well as the public and labor members of the Board—who condemned the company's wanton destruction of the status quo as unfair and as making impossible the conduct of a fair and orderly election.

Remember, this directive was signed unanimously, by all members of the War Labor Board—industry, labor, and public. It is perhaps significant, in this connection, to note Mr. Avery's insistence that the industry members of the W. L. B. do not truly represent American industry. They are, he says, "under pressure" to vote along with the labor and public members of the Board, and he, Mr. Avery, "could name better men."

The clear implication in this is that the position of Montgomery Ward & Co. represents the attitude of American industry toward unions, toward labor, and toward cooperation in the war effort. The clear implication in Mr. Avery's denunciation of the industry members of the War Labor Board is that Montgomery Ward, the one company in the United States which has refused to obey an order of the President as Commander in Chief, truly represents American industry.

But I digress. With Ward's sit-down strike against maintenance of the status quo, even for 30 days to permit an election, and with the calling of a strike by employees of the Chicago plant, the War Labor Board was faced with a serious situation. For a "corner grocery," Ward's is a tremendous establishment, with more than $600,000,000 annual sales to upward of 30,000,000 customers, many of them farmers who depend on mail-order houses for essential articles—farm equipment, machinery, supplies, electrical, heating and plumbing apparatus.

Furthermore, the War Labor Board believed that as a result of the strike and of the company's refusal to accept the orders of the Board, there was an immediate danger that strikes would break out in the other plants and facilities of the company elsewhere in the United States. Transportation unions in Chicago were refusing to make deliveries to or accept deliveries from the company plants there; and strikes did break out shortly in Ward plants at Kansas City, Mo., and Springfield, Ill.

Faced with this serious situation and with the obstinate refusal of Ward's to comply with its order, the War Labor Board certified the case to the President. The President, as he had done in a dozen or more cases—including 1,700 bituminous coal and anthracite mines—ordered Ward's Chicago plant seized and operated by the Government to assure an uninterrupted flow of production and no interference with the war effort.

We are all familiar with what happened then, with the ejection of Mr. Sewell Avery from his office—an incident which, by the way, Mr. Avery now admits he deliberately forced upon the Government to "dramatize" the situation. We are also familiar with Mr. Avery's pious declamation—echoed by a majority of the press and many radio commentators—that legal and orderly process demanded testing of the Board's order in the courts before resorting to actual seizure.

But it was the Government's position from the start—and it was so stated emphatically by the Attorney General—that directive orders of the War Labor Board were not reviewable by the courts and that the Government had, in fact, exhausted every peaceful and orderly process before resorting to seizure. This has been the Government's position from the beginning, a postion which recently was completely sustained by the courts.

At this point, I cannot refrain from noting that in a majority opinion a Senate Judiciary subcommittee—without calling witnesses or honoring the request of the Attorney General

to appear—concluded that "the National War Labor Board had the right to seek, and the Board should have sought, a Federal court order" to enforce its directives against Ward's. In the subcommittee report the majority relied solely on a decision involving the Board and Ward's in the District of Columbia, ignoring two other court decisions clearly supporting the Government's position.

But the issue was decided on June 2—a week ago—in a decision handed down by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the New England trucking company case. Unequivocally, the circuit court held that "it is clear and undisputed that no statute authorizes review of the War Labor Board's order. * * * The legislative history of the War Labor Disputes Act implies a positive intention that these orders should not be reviewed."

In its decision the circuit court examined the course of the War Labor Disputes Act through the Congress, noted that proposed amendments to authorize court enforcement or review of the Board's orders were rejected, and concluded that it was the obvious intention of Congress that the legislation did not authorize such applications to the courts. "No one," the court said, "could maintain either judicial or administrative proceedings against the appellants upon the authority of the Board's orders."

In short, as the Government has contended all along, the Federal courts have no authority to enforce directives of the War Labor Board.

There is another interesting thing about this opinion. The court answered the argument that the orders of the War Labor Board had to be reviewable, because if the order was not complied with the President might take over the plant involved. The court said: "Neither the broad constitutional power nor the broad statutory power of the President to take and use property in furtherance of the war effort depends upon any action of the War Labor Board." This was exactly what the Attorney General had argued.

For the record and for the benefit of my colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, I am going to make another point about this language. It expressly recognizes that the President has two kinds of power, both of them broad. One the power under the statute and another separate power under the Constitution. This was the same conclusion that the Attorney General reached in his opinion to the President.

This, then, is the "history" of the Ward case. Let me emphasize the word "history." It is important. It is important because it means that all these facts, all the "history" of the case up to and including the controlling opinion of the circuit court of appeals to which I have just referred, were fully known to Mr. Avery at the time this week he testified before the House committee investigating the Ward case.

Despite this fact, despite his full knowledge of the Court decision, Mr. Avery was still trying this week to put over on the public the completely discredited thesis that the Government could have obtained court review before seizing the Ward plant in Chicago, if it had "wanted" to.

It is as plain as a pikestaff that Mr. Avery wants to remain sovereign, that he does not intent to relinquish any of his "right" to do as he pleases regardless of the law, regardless of the public interest, and regardless of the war. Nothing short of that will satisfy him.

I believe that the whole fake controversy which Mr. Avery has conjured up—the phony cry for "court review" and the phony cry of "conspiracy"—is best described by Malcolm Bingay, of the Detroit Free Press, who said some weeks ago:

"To me it seems supremely asinine to contend that a government in wartime can take a man away from his family, his property, and his job to fight for his country and to give up his life—which no court or no act of Congress can restore to him—but it must not interfere with an angry old gentleman who wants to settle a private feud with a man named Roosevelt who happened to be President."

Wolves in Sheep's Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Wolves in Sheep's Clothing," delivered by me before the Union League Club, at Chicago, Ill., on June 20, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The first thing I want to do in my talk today is to pay my respects to the "smear brigade," who for 10 years have sought to intimidate the American people. First they began by charging every man who did not believe in all the philosophies of the New Deal, with being economic royalists. In the second campaign they charged every man who opposed the New Deal with being opposed to the great principles of public welfare and with being opposed to doing anything in behalf of the great rank and file of the common citizens. In the third campaign the smear brigade charged every man who opposed the New Deal with being an isolationist. And today every man who opposes the New Deal is being smeared by these New Deal stooges and charged with being unpatriotic and interfering with the effort of America to win the war.

Well, now, you people who are listening to me know that all of these charges are nothing more or less than political propaganda, distributed by the New Deal "flunkies" of Franklin the Fourth to mislead the people and to intimidate men in public life. During the time I have served in the United States Senate it has been my privilege to observe the attitude of both Democrats and Republicans, the attitude of New Dealers and Anti-New Dealers; I have seen the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote pass appropriations that run into the billions of dollars leaving the expenditure of this money almost solely to the discretion of the executive department of government, which is responsible for the conduct of the war. I have seen all kinds and forms of legislation, which the Commander in Chief said he needed in order to expedite the winning of the war, passed by the Congress of the United States. And I say to you that any fair-minded man who wants to be honest knows that there is no division of sentiment in the Congress of the United States, and there is no division of sentiment among the people of the United States when it comes to supporting the war effort—all American citizens have been giving and are now giving support to winning the war, and they will continue to give this support.

The President of the United States has received almost 100 percent support from the Congress of the United States on every legitimate war measure; he will continue to receive such support from me and from other Members of Congress regardless of their views on domestic issues. And these paid propagandists of the New Deal who would lead you to believe that there is any division in the minds of the American people on the question of winning the war and of making any sacrifice necessary to win the war, are seeking to mislead the people; they are misrepresenting the facts, and they know they are misrepresenting the facts.

I want to say to you people who are listening to me today, you may do as you think best, but so far as I am concerned, I do not propose to allow this smear brigade to intimidate me and force me to support them in legislation dealing entirely with our domestic affairs and thereby aid them to use the war effort as a camouflage to cover up their real design to change the form of the American Government and convert it into a socialized dictatorship. I challenge the smear brigade to do their worst. I ask no quarter, and I expect to give none. I believe in the fundamental principles of the Constitution of the United States, and I am opposed to converting this Government into some kind of "ism," whether it be Nazi-ism, fascism, or communism, because regardless of which "ism" you pick, it will mean dictatorship; and I am opposed to it and expect to fight it.

Now, since I have made this very frank statement of my position, I want to discuss with you frankly some issues dealing with domestic affairs. I want to say to you, it is my most definite and considered judgment that we have in powerful places in Washington today Communists, fellow travelers, and other New Deal theorists who have their minds made up definitely that during the post-war period they will be able to finally accomplish that which they were not able to accomplish during the pre-war period; and that is, to convert this Government into a socialized, communized, regimented, centralized dictatorship. They believe they will be able in the post-war period to finally establish on the banks of the Potomac a government wherein will reside not the public servants of the people, but the rulers of the people.

The New Deal Supreme Court has already commenced talking about the rulers of the people, not the public servants. So far as I am concerned, I expect to fight this process. Some of my personal friends have asked me the question: "Why are you so concerned about the future of this Nation? Why are you so fearful of the post-war period?"

Well, I want to tell you why. The main reason I am fearful of this Washington Dynasty of New Dealers is the fact that they have not been honest with the American people. They gained power by deception. They have sought to maintain themselves in power by covering up the truth. They have sought to change our form of Government without letting the great rank and file of our people know what they were doing. I am fearful of men whom I regard as dishonest anywhere, but I am especially afraid of deception, deceit, and dishonesty in high governmental places.

Now, I realize that these charges which I am making against this New Deal bunch are serious charges, and I say that no man should make such charges unless he is prepared to prove them by the record. So let us take a look at the record. Let us compare their promises with their actions.

When the people turned the Republican Party out and put the Democratic Party in back in 1933, they took this action on the solemn promises of those who were authorized to speak for the Democratic Party. Promise No. 1 was that the innumerable number of Government boards and bureaus which the Republican Party had allowed to be built up in Washington would be abolished

and that there would be left only the few necessary and essential Government agencies to serve the people and that the power which had been concentrated in Washington in these governmental departments would be returned to the State or returned to the people. That was the promise. Now what is the record?

The record is that the New Deal had long before we ever entered the war created so many new Government agencies and they brought into Washington so many more people to live off of the public pay roll that the most profitable business in the United States was the building of apartment houses, not in the District of Columbia because they soon filled that up, but over in Virginia to house these hundreds of thousands of employees who had been brought into our Capital City.

Promise No. 2, that they would return to the States authority which had heretofore been taken away from the States. What have they done?

They have created in almost every one of these bureaus a new kind of bureau which they have called regional bureaus. These regional bureaus are so constructed that they very carefully avoid ever following the lines of any one State, and by this process they seek to concentrate all power in Washington and then to completely eliminate State and local government by the delegating of certain powers to the regions which were formerly exercised by the States.

Another promise they made when they went into power was that they would cut the cost of Government in the United States at least 25 percent. Well, now, what about the performance of this bunch when they actually gained power?

Never before in the history of any nation on the face of the earth was money so lavishly appropriated and expended as during the first 10 years of the reign of the New Deal—before we entered the war. And please bear in mind I am not talking about war expenditures, but I am talking about pre-war expenditures. This gang of New Dealers built the public debt during this period to a figure far in excess of the figure which it went to in the First World War. That, my friends, is how they made good on their promise of economy to the American people.

When this gang of New Deal philosophers were elected to public office it was on the promise that the Government must be so reorganized and conducted that it would restore confidence of business in our Federal Government. How did they proceed to restore confidence?

They did it by branding every man who was diligent, who saved his money, and who sought to invest money wisely and maintain business as an economic royalist and as an enemy of good government. The New Deal was not in power long before a businessman had to be vouched for by some fellow traveler before he could get inside one of these Government bureaus to transact business necessary for the maintenance of his industry. How did they make good on their promise to restore to the people the right to own their own business and to look after their own affairs?

I will tell you what they did. They started out and they regimented every line of business to the point that practically no decision could be made by the individual man without consulting with some bureaucrat in Washington or some of the stooges of these bureaucrats who swarm over the countryside. America was flooded with rules and regulations; the people have been confused as never before. They started out with the N. R. A., and when the Supreme Court plucked the feathers of this old bird and threw him out the window they went out and picked him up and decorated him with a bunch of red feathers and called him the O. P. A.

When the war started, they immediately took over the dairy industry in America, and their first move to solve the feed problem was to ship cottonseed meal from Texas to Illinois cows, and they shipped soybeans from Illinois to feed Texas cows. Over a long period of time they killed the cows and the pigs to produce a shortage of meat, and then they proceeded to ration beef and pork.

Now I say to you that the record proves without any question of doubt that, as stated awhile ago, the New Deal gained power by deception, and has maintained itself in power by misleading the people. Some may say that these are harsh statements. My answer to that is that all I have done is to quote the record; I have given you the facts. I would not be seriously concerned about the future of government in this country if I thought our leaders in public office intended to be honest with the people, if they intended to tell the people actually what they were seeking to do. But I do not think they are. I think they are trying to mislead the people. Day after day, you hear brilliant speeches made about a great social-security system which they want to establish in America. You hear brilliant statements made about what a great social-security system they have already established.

Well, now, of course, the facts are that the billions which have been poured into the laps of the American people during the 10 years before we entered this war were not honest dollars, that had been collected in the ordinary process of tax collection, but they represented dollars that the Government had borrowed from the people. In this great experimental scheme of 10 years they had spent all of the money they could collect in taxes and in addition they had expanded the public debt, together with commitments and guaranties of the Federal Government to more than sixty billions of dollars.

When this bunch sent out a subsidy check or a Social Security check, they did not put a little note in the envelope and say to the man who received it that they had executed a mortgage on the future income of himself and his children in order to get the money.

Now I do not want anyone to deceive himself. I do not want anyone to think that when the war started these New Dealers came to Washington, because they did not have to come—they were already there—the Communists, the Socialists, the ex-I. W. W. labor leaders, the labor-leader racketeers, the patronage dispensing bureaucrats, and the political contractors were already in Washington thoroughly established. They had been doing business on the banks of the Potomac for 10 years. They had the inside track on everything. They are still on the job, and all they are waiting for is for the war to be over in order that they may proceed immediately to complete the task which they had started out to complete; and that is, to change our form of government, abolish free enterprise, and establish state socialism.

I say to you it is time that these governmental termites were driven out of the temple of democracy in Washington, D. C. I say to you that it is time we liquidated the New Deal. And I want to see the liquidation begin in the President's office and continue down through the Congress of the United States and the boards and bureaus of the United States. I want to see the American people reestablish democratic government in America.

Now I want to make another charge, then I want to prove it by the record. I say to you that these New Dealers in Washington could on the record be convicted of theft, because what they have done is to steal the machinery of the Democratic Party and to convert it to their own use as a vehicle to promote the New Deal Party. The New Deal Party is not the Democratic Party. It has not even a speaking acquaintance with the principles of government as laid down by the patron saints of democracy in America.

Again let us go back to the record. You gentlemen who are listening to me, remember when under the reign of the New Deal a letter was sent by the President of the United States to a Member of the Congress, expressing the hope that the Congressman would not allow any fear as to the constitutionality of a law to deter him from supporting that law. You have observed under the New Deal the tendency to concentrate all the power of the Government in the hands of the executive department. You saw this tendency long before we entered the war. Let me quote from George Washington on that subject:

"It is important that the habits of thinking in a free country inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of powers of one department the encroachment upon the power of another department. Encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all departments into one and thus create a real despotism."

Now let us go to a real source of authority as to the principles of the Democratic Party. I wish to quote to you a statement of Thomas Jefferson:

"When you consider the general tendency to multiply offices and to increase expenses to the ultimate term of burden which the citizen can bear, it behooves us to avail ourselves of every occasion to take off the surcharge of government, that it may never be said that after leaving labor the smallest portions of its earnings on which it can subsist, government itself consumes the whole residue of that which it was instituted to guard."

Now, my friends, have you seen or heard anything from this gang of fellow travelers in Washington, camouflaged and traveling under the banner of democracy, that even resembles this philosophy of government? Let me quote a little more from Thomas Jefferson. Let us see what Thomas Jefferson believed about this philosophy of the New Deal that all of the power should be concentrated in Washington that the Government in Washington should order the daily lives of all our people. Here is what Jefferson said:

"I believe this the strongest Government on earth. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be entrusted with government of himself; can he then be trusted with government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern us?"

Did you ever read a stronger or more convincing statement than this in behalf of government by law and not government by men? Now, my friends, you know ever since the New Deal went into power we have been having these big Jackson Day dinners where all of the faithful servants of the New Deal Party pay $100 a plate to go into the coffers of the party. I say to you that I think it would be far more in keeping with their philosophy if the New Deal would celebrate the birthday of Karl Marx instead of the birthday of Andrew Jackson. Let us compare a little of the philosophy of Andrew Jackson with that of the New Deal. Here is what Jackson said about observing the Constitution:

"When an honest observance of the Constitution cannot be obtained from communities like ours, it need not be anticipated elsewhere, and the cause in which there has been so much martyrdom and from which so much was expected by the friends of liberty may be abandoned and the degrading truth that man is unfit for self-government admitted; and this will be the question if expediency be made the rule of construction in interpreting the Constitution."

Now, my friends, compare that with the philosophy of the New Deal who would have you believe that the Constitution of the United States belongs to the horse-and-buggy age.

Now let me quote a little more from Andrew Jackson. Let us compare his philosophy with the New Deal philosophy which preaches the doctrine that the Federal Government can do anything it wants to. Here is what Jackson said:

"We should constantly bear in mind the fact that the considerations which induced the framers of the Constitution to withhold from the Federal Government the power to regulate the great mass of business and concerns of the people have been fully justified by experience."

Compare this with the philosophy of the New Deal that the Federal Government should regulate everything and then listen to this piece of political wisdom from Andrew Jackson:

"No people can hope to perpetuate their liberty who long acquiesce in a policy which taxes them for objects not necessary to the legitimate and real needs of their government."

Now, let us compare this New Deal philosophy of the indispensable man with the statement of President Harrison, made 100 years ago:

"Republics can commit no greater error than to adopt or continue any feature in their systems of government which may be calculated to create or increase the love of power in the bosoms of those to whom necessity obliges them to commit the management of their affairs; and surely nothing is more likely to produce such a state of mind than the long continuance in an office of high trust. Nothing can be more corrupting, nothing more destructive of all those noble feelings which belong to the character of a devoted republican patriot.

"When this corrupting passion once takes possession of the human mind, like the love of gold it becomes insatiable. It is the never-dying worm in his bosom, grows with his growth, and strengthens with the declining years of its victim. If this is true, it is the part of wisdom for a republic to limit the service of that officer at least to whom she has entrusted the management of her foreign relations, the execution of her laws, and the command of her armies and navies to a period so short as to prevent his forgetting that he is the accountable agent, not the principal; the servant, not the master."

My friends, I believe I have proven to you from the record the charge I made a while ago that the New Deal Party is not a Democratic Party; that it has stolen the machinery of the Democratic Party and converted it into a vehicle to preach the doctrines of Karl Marx.

And if you need any further evidence that the New Deal Party has gone communistic, if you need any further evidence that they are guilty of theft, you who have read the papers recently have seen that evidence, because they have not only stolen the machinery of the Democratic Party, but they have stolen the platform of the Communist Party, and the Communist Party has gone out of business and is now endorsing the New Deal.

Let me conclude what I have to say today by urging the great rank and file of the people of America, regardless of whether they are Democrats or Republicans, to go to the polls in November 1944, and join in a general house cleaning in Washington. Let us send the "yes men" and the fellow travelers and the New Deal stooges and the communistic termites back home. Let us put an end to the doctrines of the indispensable man. Let us once and for all liquidate these socialistic boards and bureaus. Let us put an end to the situation where a white man has to paint his face with black cork and march down the sawdust trail of the New Deal to the national anthem of Karl Marx before he can make contact with a Government official in Washington.

Third Anniversary of Entry of Soviet Union Into the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me last night at Madison Square Garden, New York, at a meeting sponsored by the Russian War Relief organization, in observance of the third anniversary of the entrance of the Soviet Union into the war.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Three years ago this morning, in the year minus 991 of the thousand years of Fascist rule which Hitler boastfully promised his people, that still legendary "Little Corporal," ever aping Napoleon, entered upon the last act of his Napoleonic drama, Russia and downfall. This great would-be world traveler discovered the reverse of what Columbus learned, namely, that if he went east he would soon be sailing west.

Today, with 988 years of his vaunted millennium yet to go, this devil of earth, pressed from every side by those who have come to avenge his heinous deeds, can daily and hourly hear the strokes of the Big Ben of doom.

For Hitler's mortal wound, for breaking and tearing apart his once great army, all the world, friend and foe alike, pays homage to the terrible glory and grandeur of Russian arms. For all time good men and women, even little children, will speak of the matchless heroism of the Red Army and the Soviet people upon whose unconquerable spirit the storms of fascism and tyranny broke with all their fury and were relentlessly rolled back.

Upon the old lands of ancient Russia freedom has not only had a new birth but found a new savior.

It is a glorious comradeship which we have today among those who fight the hideous monsters who a little while ago threatened the earth. Never have those who fought common enemies been so much one in concert of action, in singleness of spirit and purpose. No tribute upon our landing from the west upon the coast of France has been more generous or more worthy than that of Joseph Stalin, the world's greatest general, who speaking of that magnificent assault said: "The history of war does not know of any such undertaking so broad in conception, so grandiose in scale, so masterly in execution." Prime Minister Churchill has ventured the possibility that even this summer, or this year, might see the happy end of the war—the final choking and throttling of the enemy—V-day.

I come here tonight to speak to you and to speak to my fellow Americans not merely about the glory of Russian arms, or about a victory which is assured. These things all the world knows.

Joseph Stalin and the Soviet people are realists. They are grateful for our tributes and our praise, but they want to know what America and Americans are going to do after V-day. So do all those who now fight with us. What concerns us all, therefore, is whether America and Americans are this time to keep their rendezvous with destiny, or whether we are again to betray our own dead and our allies as we did a quarter of a century ago.

There are ominous signs of a second betrayal in the political skies. While the best and strongest of our people die for democracy, there seem to be many determined that their victory shall be in vain. Where are all those who prayed that Hitler might destroy the Soviet Union? Where are all those who decried lend-lease to Russia when this juggernaut assailed her? What is the meaning of the willingness of Senators to denounce in this day, when we are fighting shoulder to shoulder, Joseph Stalin as a great enemy? Why do great newspapers still disseminate vicious and false propaganda against the Soviet Union and strive to fan the flames of prejudice against such an ally, such a friend? What is the purpose of those who seize upon the barest threads of rumor to try to drive a wedge between us and the Soviet Union, between Britain and America, between the people and their President and Government, to undermine the people's confidence in their allies and their own leaders?

We see a Congress in war, a Congress which ordered men to war and many to death, wilfully and purposefully denying to fighting men the chance to vote because some Senators and Congressmen feared their vote. We see hundreds of thousands of men and women, the fathers of fighting sons, of daughters who are nurses upon the battle fronts, and loyal auxiliaries, disfranchised because they cannot or do not at an appointed time pay a sum of money for the privilege of voting. We see the most diabolical conspiracy in American political history, planned with the masterful strategy of an assault upon the continent of Europe, executed with the boldness, thoroughness, and daring with which an Eisenhower assaults Normandy, to deny whole States, millions of Americans, the right to vote for the nominee of one of the Nation's dominant parties, even if he be the President of the United States and the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy.

We hear the rumblings of so-called revolts, not revolts against tyranny, but to set up a tyranny upon others. We behold a picayune Judas who once was a pigmy Secretary of War, and an embittered old man, now rich, who is remembered as a Senator, not for what he built but for his part as one of the demolition squad of the League of Nations, and a man in whose breast hate of another war President reached its zenith, and others of their kind, gathering in a national council to assault not their country's enemy, but their enemy, the Nation's President.

We cannot fail to see the scheming care with which some who seek high office screen their real sentiments and aims from the public eye, or by skillful and guileful blandishments speak words designed at the same time to encourage and to delude those who believe in world peace and in international working together to make better the good earth.

The crisis now is not upon the battle front but upon the home front, for it is here that the final victory must be won, or all is lost. It is time for Americans to speak up and to speak out if they believe in democracy abroad and at home. If we are not to lose

the final battle, the might of American opinion must be mobilized behind principles and programs which will assure beyond any doubt that we not only shall do our part in keeping the peace of the world and promoting its welfare, but as God has set us to do we shall lead the fight and in a manner worthy of our might show the way to others. If we in our hearts covenant that we will honor our debt to our allied and our own dead and mangled, we will promise the living and the dead that we will let no other little group of willful men, we will let no Senate, we will allow no sinister forces, whether they be selfish or dangerously shortsighted, this time to dishonor our obligations, deny us our full part in rebuilding the broken world.

You and I know that those three giant leaders who, like a triple Atlas, have held the world of freedom upon their shoulders, have laid the foundations of an accord among nations and peoples upon which may be built the grandest edifice of world security and prosperity man has ever seen. From the Atlantic Charter to Cairo, where the Orient joined the Occident, to Teheran, the ever-broadening path of world peace stretches. The world organization to come after the war, through which we shall all work together as we have fought together, is already conceived and aborning.

But you may depend upon it, it will be subjected to every possible assault by those among us who are the isolationists, the imperialists, or the exploiters. They will attack this organization as they will attack any government in America which will fearlessly protect the economic and civil rights of the many against the totalitarians among us.

From however many directions the attack may come, it will be like this global war—one in strategy. It will have a supreme general staff. It will have its daring commandos, the demolition squads, its sappers, its heavy artillery, its well-organized services of supply, and, of course, its fifth column and its minister and organs of propaganda. It will be the more dangerous because the whole army will never be visible and like fifth columnists will appear behind a front of patriotism and high purpose.

Let us now, before the eagerly awaiting world, take concrete and positive action to assure that this plot against democracy at home and cooperation abroad shall not succeed. Let us come out unequivocally for a general world organization with power to keep the peace and to promote the welfare of all peoples. Let us not place our reliance in men or parties who subscribe to international collaboration with a big "but," who cautiously spin out webs of verbiage which commit us to nothing, or who maintain a pregnant silence until they are forced to issue a platitude guaranteed neither to offend or enlighten anyone.

Such men simply do not have the stature—do not possess the qualities of leadership—that will be required in the crucial days ahead.

Let the Congress of the United States now provide for the machinery which will break the stranglehold that, under our present treaty-making procedure, a small but determined minority can exercise over the attempt to set up such an organization.

Let the Congress now specifically renounce the undemocratic two-thirds rule for the ratification of treaties and agree that our international relations shall be governed by executive agreements ratified by a simple majority of both Houses of Congress. Let Congress now provide that the time for a vote on international agreements may be decided by a simple majority of either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

And let this audience, as well as all other democratically minded people, serve notice now to the nominating conventions of both parties, that they will support them in a decision not to recognize any delegation, or the authority of any group, that seeks to circumvent or subvert our time-honored electoral procedure and substitute the rule of a small oligarchy for the expressed will of the majority of the people.

Let the Congress now also lay the foundation for a sound and prosperous post-war economy. Let it give assurance that we will utilize the tremendous productive capacity we possess for getting more, and better, and cheaper goods into the hands of the people of the Nation and the world—give a pledge of a job and a decent standard of living to every returning soldier, to every discharged war worker, to every white-collar worker, and to every woman who wants to remain employed in all America.

This being an election year, we can expect more than the usual amount of acrimony and vituperation on the home political front. That I can assure you from recent personal experience. Those who think they can gamble with the Nation's destiny in pursuit of their own selfish interests; those who think we can safely return to pre-war unemployment; those who would destroy labor unions and collective bargaining by playing off soldiers against war workers, white-collar against industrial employees, women workers against men, or race against race, had better beware. They will be doing the work of Hitler after Hitler is dead.

For though we may sentence Hitler, though we may hang him from the highest tree in Russia, though we may bury him and his ideas under the Ural Mountains, the democratic forces of all mankind will have to stand on his grave for a long time to make sure that those ideas do not rise again.

The real secret weapon upon which Hitler most relied was disunity among the people in the countries arrayed against him, and disunity among the Allied countries themselves.

Since I last spoke on this rostrum, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of resumption of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, there have been developments of the greatest importance.

The air has been further cleared of the hobgoblins so industriously conjured up by the anti-Soviet and isolationist press. We have laid many ghosts and legends. We have exercised the specter of international superstition with the bell and candle of logic and information. And on June 6 the first pair of boots that splashed into the water off a beach in Normandy broke the last remnant of the power of Hitler's most dangerous secret weapon.

This meeting is sponsored by Russian War Relief, an organization which has played an outstanding role in fostering good will and understanding between the people of America and those of the Soviet Union. We know from people who have visited Russia how truly appreciative the Russians are of the supplies this organization has sent, and I hope that during the next year our people will give even more unstintingly from the relative bounty they still enjoy.

Before closing, however, I should like to speak for just a moment about the war relief that Russia has given us.

In return for the tremendous quantities of lend-lease materials we have sent to Russia, what has Russia given us in reverse lend-lease? In return for the war relief goods we have shipped to her, what has she given us in terms of war relief?

Russia has given us 7,800,000 dead or captured Germans.

How many American boys could 7,800,000 Germans kill in the course of the war? Allowing 1 casualty of ours to 8 of theirs, which is a fair figure for an American to shoot at, this means that Russia has given us as a gift the lives and futures of 1,000,000 American boys.

Did I hear someone complain about the transfer of a cruiser to the Russian Navy?

American planes are now based on Soviet soil. American blood is running as freely as Russian blood, cementing forever the destinies of our two great Nations. With the mutual confidence and respect born of common devotion to a great cause, the peoples of the two Nations echo the historic words of their leaders spoken at Teheran:

"Emerging from these friendly conferences we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

"We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit, and in purpose."

It is that Russia to whom we give our solemn pledge of enduring friendship here tonight.

The Constitution Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL
OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Constitution Forever, delivered by me before the American National Democratic Committee at Chicago, Ill., on June 19, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The greatest task confronting this Nation at this time is to win the war and return the youth of America to their homes. I believe everybody in the United States agrees that that is our number one task. I believe the American people are united almost 100 percent on that idea. The United States Congress is 100 percent united on that idea. It has been my privilege to be in the United States Senate ever since this war started. I have observed legislation that has come before that body. I have seen appropriation bills measured in billions of dollars to carry forward this war effort passed by both Houses of Congress and the expenditure of the money left almost wholly within the discretion of those charged with carrying our war effort forward. I have seen those appropriation bills passed by practically unanimous vote. I have seen other legislation come before the Congress which vested in the Executive department, during the war period, vast powers which the Executive department said it should have in order that the war effort might be expedited. I say to you that in so far as prosecuting this war is concerned, the President has had, and now has, practically 100 percent support from the Congress in doing all those things necessary to bring the war to a successful conclusion. And this support has come not only from the Democrats, but it has likewise come from the Republicans. In other words, I believe that any honest citizen must admit that patriotism and love of country is not a thing on which the Democratic Party has a monopoly. Certainly it is not a thing on which the New Deal Party has a monopoly. So with a full realization of the fact that ever since I have been in the United States Senate I have given 100 percent support to every war measure and with the knowledge in my own mind that I expect to con-

tinue to follow this course, I can stand before you with a clear conscience that I have done my duty as a public servant to advance the war effort. Yes, we as a people are united almost 100 percent on our war effort. Therefore it is not necessary for me to discuss that subject at this time. We are not united 100 percent on problems affecting the home front. Therefore, it is these home front problems that I shall discuss now. Just as I stand before you with a clear conscience that I have done my duty as a public servant to advance the war effort, I also stand before you with a clear conscience as I assure you that ever since I have been in the United States Senate and that so long as I remain in public life, I intend to do everything I can to drive out of the temple of government in Washington all the despoilers of democracy, bungling bureaucrats, and fellow travelers who have regimented themselves under the banner of the New Deal Party and have stolen everything we had in the Democratic Party, except our principles.

When I say that I say it with the full knowledge that every man who has seen fit to question the domestic policies of the New Deal has been smeared from head to foot by the New Deal mud daubers and charged with being unpatriotic and with sabotaging our war effort. But the only weapon of defense the New Deal has is their mud balls. So when I toss a few nice clean hand grenades of truth and facts over into their camp, I expect them to throw them back, all covered with mud. But it was Confucius who once said that "He who throws mud has the dirty hands." So far as I am concerned the lines are drawn and the battle is on. As I go forward to fight for these principles of democracy, I ask no quarter and I do not expect to give any. The issue will be decided at the election polls this year. There the people will decide whether or not we are to maintain constitutional government in America. They will decide whether we are to have a government by law, or junk the Constitution and hereafter have a Government by Executive order and bureaucratic edict. I hope we have in America enough men and women of courage and determination who are willing between now and election day to stand on the front lines and fight the battle for constitutional government. While our boys are fighting and dying on foreign battlefields for the principles of constitutional government, I hope that those who are left on the home front will not prove to be slackers who can be bought by bureaucratic patronage or intimidated by the smear artists, muck-rakers, and fellow-travelers of the New Deal party. At this time while our expenditure of public funds exceeds that of any nation on the face of the earth; at this time when the whole economic power of this Nation is being used to make war; at this time when we are accumulating a debt which will tax the resources of America for another hundred years; at this time when our boys are fighting and dying on foreign battlefields, and the mothers of America tossing on tear-soaked pillows all through the long nights, is it not pertinent for us to ask one question? That one question is, "What are we fighting for?" As far as I am concerned, I believe the young manhood of America who are in the battle lines know what they are fighting for. I believe the great rank and file of the people of this Nation know what we are fighting for. I believe you and I know what the aspirations of the American people are. And I tell you furthermore and with emphasis that I am thoroughly convinced we are not fighting for what these fellow-travelers and bureaucratic bosses in Washington are trying to do to us.

I tell you that we are not fighting this war for a new kind of government in America. We are fighting this war that we may reenforce the foundations to maintain the kind of government in America under which this Nation has grown to be the greatest nation on the face of the earth. The youth of America are fighting this war and the American people are sacrificing because we know that this is the only government in the world where a constitution has been adopted which carries a full and complete guarantee of those fundamental principles of government upon which the liberty and freedom of individual citizens rest. In plain English, our boys are fighting and dying on foreign battlefields today and we here at home are sacrificing today to maintain exactly the kind of government that our forefathers established for us when they wrote the Constitution of the United States of America. Why is it that since we entered this war we have been able in a period of a little more than 2 years to far outdistance and overcome everything that the totalitarian governments of the world had been able to do during the past decade? I will tell you why. It is because the Government of America is based on a system of free private enterprise. It is a government of free men. It is the kind of government built on the theory of rewarding mankind for success and penalizing him for failure. It is the kind of government which has depended for its strength and power upon a strong people, and not upon a strong government. It is a nation that since its inception has recognized the fundamental principle that whenever a government became strong, the people became weak. We have had a demonstration of the fact that free men if given an opportunity will, upon their own initiative, meet and solve problems which no bureaucratic government on earth can ever solve. What are we fighting for? We are fighting for the kind of government we had. I am concerned about the future of the United States and I think it is time that every citizen should be concerned about it. For many years the control of the government has rested in the hands of two major political parties—the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. These parties have represented, in years gone by, two different fundamental points of view on economic problems, but both parties have at all times stood for the fundamental principles of the Constitution of the United States.

Therefore, regardless of whichever party happened to be in power, the people had assurance that neither was knowingly going to absolutely destroy constitutional government. They might differ violently within certain fields, but there was always a feeling in the minds and hearts of the great rank and file of the people that neither of these two great parties actually intended to change our form of government. But about 10 or 11 years ago the theorists and fellow-travelers who were thoroughly soaked in all of the various foreign "isms" of Europe took over control of the Democratic Party and we no longer have, when viewed from the standpoint of fundamental principles, any Democratic Party left. We have a New Deal Party, and there is not even a remote resemblance between the doctrine of the New Deal Party and the fundamental doctrine of the Democratic Party. The New Deal Party has proven for 10 or 11 years that they had no interest in the Democratic Party except to use its machinery to perpetuate itself in office. The New Deal Party has stolen everything the Democratic Party had except our principles, and they tried to make up for not stealing our principles by stealing the Communist Party platform. By so doing they expect to get the votes of both the Democrats and the Communists. That may not be bad political strategy, but it certainly does create grave danger to our American form of government. If any of you folks have had any doubts about the fact that the New Deal Party is a communistic organization, then I think those doubts should have been removed a few days ago when the Communist Party in the United States dissolved and announced that they would support the New Deal Party. The New Dealers try to drown out the voices of everybody else by shouting loudly their plea for unity. I think we all believe in unity when achieved by proper methods. But I say to you very frankly that I am opposed to unity on fundamental principles of government if the way by which we must achieve unity is to join the Communist Party. I am concerned about the future of America during the post-war period and I will tell you why I am concerned about it. If this vast concentration of power on the banks of the Potomac were something that had come about since we entered the war and if I could look upon it as a temporary expedient to deal with war problems and war problems only, I would not be concerned.

But, my friends, for 10 long years before we entered the war, there had moved into Washington the greatest host of fellow travelers, Communists, theorists, and nitwits that had ever assembled before in any civilized nation. For 10 years the Treasury of the United States was thrown wide open to finance all of these socialistic theories and socialistic schemes by which these young Harvard graduates who are hardly dry behind their ears, expect to make over the world. For 10 long years before we entered the war an I. W. W. card or a membership card in the Communist Party or an exalted office in the C. I. O. was a passport to places of authority in what we have been told was a Democratic Government. We saw the Chief Executive of this Nation seek to jam through Congress a bill to destroy the power of the judiciary. What was not accomplished by the failure of that bill to pass was accomplished by another method. We have seen through the process of long tenure in office a Supreme Court appointed in the United States whose economic philosophy is acceptable to the New Deal. We have seen the principles of government laid down in the Constitution and as advocated by Thomas Jefferson thrown in the trash can, and the governmental philosophy of the Communist and of the Socialist Parties substituted therefor. We have seen the Congress of the United States apparently forget the Constitution. We have seen the Congress of the United States for 10 years before we got into the war allow the bureaucrats to write the laws and these Congressmen under the lure of bureaucratic patronage and under the whip of Executive power convert themselves into "yes men" and perform like trained seals, doing the bidding of their master and voting for every measure they were ordered to pass. * * * We have seen this New Deal dynasty set up the machinery for the biggest racket the world has ever seen, for the purpose of perpetuating itself in power. This racket consists of laws and edicts which transfers to a gang of labor-leader racketeers, one of the powers delegated by the people to the Federal Government in section 8, article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America, the "power to lay and collect taxes." This system gives to the labor-leader racketeers power to tax honest laboring people for their jobs and take the tax out of their pay envelopes before the workers even see their pay, and to prohibit free American workers from working on certain jobs unless they do pay the tax. From this swag taken by the labor-leader racketeers, campaigns are paid for to help reelect the Members of Congress and the President who set up the legal authority for the racket.

I say to you, my friends, that with this record before us and with the knowledge of the fact that during this war period these Communistic leaders and these fellow-travelers have simply used the war effort to entrench themselves in power, and with the knowledge that they are still in Washington and they still believe in this philosophy of

government and with the knowledge that the Congress of the United States for 10 years performed as slaves for this bunch, I say to you that I am concerned about the post-war period. I wonder if the great rank and file of our people have stopped to think what it means if we abandon the principles of a government by written Constitution and a government by law and substitute therefor a centralized government by men. Let me remind you that whenever you give up constitutional government, you give up the guaranty of freedom of religion; you give up the guaranty of freedom of the press; you give up the protection of the guaranty of your personal rights as written in the Bill of Rights; you give up the doctrine that the Government exists for the people, and accept the doctrine that the people exist for the Government; you give up the last written guaranty of property rights, and you give up the last guaranty of protection of the minority. The Constitution was written to protect the individual in his personal rights; it was written to protect the individual against the encroachment of all-powerful governmental bureaus; it was written to protect minorities against the mob and against the majority; it is the foundation upon which our whole system of individual liberty and freedom rests. These fellow-travelers who have junked the fundamental principles of democracy and substituted therefor the foreign "isms" all based on powerful governmental control; these fellows who did this before we got into the war and who expect to complete the operation when the war is over; this bunch who stole the machinery of the Democratic Party and who have kept the wheels of this machinery greased with public patronage paid out of the Federal Treasury, call it the New Deal Party between elections and only call it the Democratic Party when they are out after votes. I charge that this theft of the machinery of the Democratic Party and these destructive practices which have been put into effect by the New Deal, were dishonest in their conception and they have perpetrated, under the guise of democracy, a fraud on the American people. Elected to public office on a pledge to reduce the cost of the Federal Government 25 percent, they proceeded to spend all the money in the Federal Treasury and build a public debt, in round figures, of $60,000,000,000 before we even got into the war.

Elected to office on a pledge to drive the Government bureaus out of Washington and stop the growth of the Federal Government, they have multiplied these bureaus without limit before we ever got into the war. They had so expanded these bureaus and boards that the District of Columbia was not big enough for the bureaucrats and their flunkies to live in, and they spread over into different States and were still crowded. Elected to public office on a pledge to the American people that they were the champions of States' rights and local government, they sought, before we ever got into the war, by the process of organizing regions throughout America, to destroy our State governments and substitute therefor the rule of the bureaucrats by regions and not by States. This gang of New Dealers, who went into power with a promise of giving the people an honest government, economically administered, long before we entered the war, drained the States and local governments dry with high taxes and then forced the States and local governments to come to Washington and sit on the steps of the Capitol with a tin cup in their hand and beg for a part of the money back which they, themselves, had contributed to the great governmental slush fund. Long before we entered the war, this gang of New Dealers, masquerading under the guise of the Democratic Party, told the people that all could live in luxury and nobody would have to work if we adopted their plan of taxing all the income away from the people and taking it to Washington and then allowing all this vast horde of governmental bureaucrats to take out what they wanted and reapportion the balance back home to the people. Another thing that made the sins of the New Deal even worse than they otherwise would have been is the fact that they were not honest with the people in what they have done. They did not tell the people that every dollar which the Nation has represents the labor of some man or woman. They did not point out to the people that government within itself has no money except as it takes it away from the people. They did not tell the people that when the Government was acting as Santa Claus and distributing bounties to some classes of our people, to get their votes at reelection time, that this distribution was being made out of borrowed money and that, in fact, what they were doing was simply piling up public debts which your children and my children and their children must pay some day.

Now I say to you that all of this is history. This took place before we entered the war. But the same gang with its field marshals and communistic brigades are still in Washington and they are still in places of power; their philosophy of government has not changed and I warn you that just as soon as the war is over they most definitely intend to resume their operations right where they left off when the war started. They definitely intend to make America over, they definitely intend to destroy the power of State government, and they definitely intend to destroy the power of local governments and to substitute therefor a powerful national government in Washington and regional government throughout the Nation. They are firm believers in the doctrine that man exists for the government and not that government exists for man. They are firm believers in the doctrine that it is a disgrace to work and an honor to loaf and they have enacted legislation that tends to encourage some people to embrace that doctrine. Their policy is to praise the indolent and belittle the thrifty. They have preached a doctrine that it is a virtue to spend and a crime to save and they expect to resume the preaching of this same doctrine. I warn you folks that when this war is over we will have a debt of probably $300,000,000,000. I am not an alarmist and so far as I am concerned I believe that if we go back to the fundamental principles of the Constitution, if we will guarantee and maintain the rights of free private enterprise, if government will become the referee and resign as captain on the team, if the government will perform its functions and leave the citizens to perform their individual functions, the enterprise and the initiative of America will make itself felt, and we will pay this $300,000,000,000 debt and at the same time meet every legitimate responsibility of government. But this will be possible only on condition that we will again dignify those fundamental principles of government upon which this Nation was built. We must reestablish the belief that work—work—is honorable and that idleness is degrading. We must again become a Nation that believes in the individual responsibility of man. We must reestablish our economic system on a basis where reward goes to intelligent effort and where energy and free private enterprise are not denounced and destroyed. It is high time for you people to realize that we have in Washington a government now that pins roses on labor leaders who defy Government orders and throws out into the street businessmen who contend for the right of a trial in the courts of law.

I say to you who are listening to me today, that the time has come for the people in America to wake up. The time has come for the people of America to realize that for 10 long years before we entered the war you have had men in the Congress of the United States who performed like trained seals and voted for every New Deal measure they were ordered to vote for. It is time for the people to realize that this process has robbed the legislative branch of government of its power and of its dignity. It is time for the people to realize that the executive branch of government for 10 years has been willing to make deals in political campaigns with the crookedest political machines that ever ran some of our States and cities. It is time for you folks to realize that we have substituted in Washington for constitutional government another kind of government and that is the kind which lives by Executive decree and bureaucratic edict. We have had a Government in Washington which preached the doctrine that the way to have more is to produce less; a Government which desires to trade the alluring promises of a tricky dictatorship to the American citizens for their rights and privileges as free-born Americans. Let us remember that Washington is still controlled by these same theorists, Communists and fellow-travelers who killed all the pigs so we could have more meat, plowed up the cotton so we could have more clothes, who increased the public debt so we could have more money. Let us remember that it is out of the brilliant minds of these bureaucratic bosses sitting behind mahogany desks in Washington who hire college professors to write 10-page orders to tell lifelong butchers how to cut a steak. It is these brilliant theorists who in one bulletin forbid the farmers from raising grain and feed and in the next bulletin tell them how to mix the feed they didn't raise and feed it to their cows that have already been slaughtered to prevent starvation. There is still in power in Washington the same gang that thought up the N. R. A. and the famous blue eagle. That was when we had a Supreme Court, however, and it pulled the tail-feathers out of the blue eagle and threw it in the trash can. Since then, the Constitution got thrown in the trash can and the blue eagle was dragged out of the trash can, restuffed, and draped with the American flag and mounted on a new pedestal labeled O. P. A. It is the same old bird with a new name. What the N. R. A. did to the people of this Nation in the early days of the New Deal was only a dress rehearsal to what the O. P. A. has done to us in the latter days of the New Deal. But it's still the same old twisted New Deal philosophy. And I warn the citizens of the United States that there is only one remedy and that is to have a complete and thorough house-cleaning in Washington. The house-cleaning should begin in the White House and make a clean sweep on through the Senate and House of Representatives. I, for one, believe that the Constitution of the United States should be so amended as to provide in the years to come that no man could serve in the office of President, Vice President, Senate, or House of Representatives for a period of more than 6 years. When you let men stay in Washington too long, they come under the control of the bureaucrats and the lobbyists and they cease to represent the people. I think that after 6 years in Washington, we should permit these men to go back home and try to make an honest living under the laws they, themselves, have passed. If we would return America to the rule of the people; if we would guarantee the maintenance of the principles of the Constitution, then I say to you that this house-cleaning in Washington is in order and is long overdue. So far as I am concerned I am not bothered when the house-cleaning comes about, whether it results in moving out Republicans or Democrats, but I do hope you move out every one of the New Dealers. What I am concerned about is that when the house-cleaning is completed we will have in Washington men who believe in spending their time trying to find out how to run this Government according to the principles of the

Constitution of the United States of America, and not men who spend their time trying to think up ways to evade the Constitution. Let us dedicate ourselves to the task of saving the Constitution of the United States of America, and thereby save America.

Review by Hon. Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania, of the Book Arithmetic or Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Princeton Alumni Weekly by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], class of '94. The article is a review of the book entitled "Arithmetic or Revolution," and is a very interesting and intellectual discussion of it.

There being no objection the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARITHMETIC OR REVOLUTION—SENATOR GUFFEY HAILS ARTHUR DUNN'S CONCRETE SOLUTIONS FOR OUR PROBLEMS

(By JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, 1894)

Arithmetic or Revolution, by Arthur Dunn, 1895. Guild of American Economists, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City. $1.

Arthur Dunn, 1895, had two sons (1921 and 1922) in World War No. 1; his third son, Lt. Walter Dunn, 1932, U. S. N. R., is in this war. It was, therefore, natural that the chief purpose of Arithmetic or Revolution" was to abolish war.

The book is written in popular style—has a swing and a punch from cover to cover. It encompasses a lot of ground. The space allotted permits comment on only a few of its most important highlights.

These are:

1. The bloody cycle which starts with war when there are more jobs than workers, followed by peace when there are more workers than jobs. The unemployed "march on Rome" or "burn a Reichstag" to put in power a dictator who has promised them jobs. He makes good by building a giant military machine. Other nations do likewise in self-defense—then comes war again. We are in the first phase of the second bloody cycle. Full employment and general prosperity exist only when we murder each other. No nation has yet solved unemployment by peacetime production.

We can all agree with Arthur that there is something basically wrong with that kind of a world.

2. Paul G. Hoffman has said: "Unless a higher level of employment is achieved in the post-war world there will be no capitalistic system in 5 years after the end of the war."

How does our leadership propose to provide post-war jobs?

Walter Lippmann agrees with Arithmetic or Revolution that there is no difference between the programs of the New Deal and Republican leadership. The technique of both is social security and a big backlog of public works. Indeed, the Republicans would expand social security to cover everyone. Public works will require deficit financing—a palliative. Towering upon a $300,000,000,000 base of the Federal debt it will eventually lead to revolution.

Arithmetic or Revolution presents a cure for unemployment and definite mechanisms for application of the cure. There are no generalities in this book.

3. The complete set-up for a global organization to make the United Nations powerful enough to enforce peace and intelligent enough to eliminate the causes of war. The voting power of the member nations will be the stumbling block. This is overcome by an original and unique device which will promote the practice of democracy throughout the world.

4. Arthur Dunn's program anticipated much that has been done by the United Nations and much that will undoubtedly yet be done. As Sterling North, the brilliant reviewer, has written "For instance, Dunn's brilliant suggestions, 'what to do about Germany,' have six more points than Wilson's, all of them trenchant."

5. Arithmetic or Revolution presents an opinion that the poll tax is unconstitutional. Already the book has inspired the formation of Parents and Wives of Fighting Americans, Inc., which proposes to see that all the armed forces get a square deal during their absence and upon their return. This organization is behind the fight in Virginia to test the constitutionality of the poll tax. Moss A. Plunkett, a leading Virginia lawyer (whose son was killed at New Guinea), and Arthur Dunn are volunteers to argue the case before the United States Supreme Court.

Don't read Arithmetic or Revolution if you wish your convictions to remain frozen—and remember, you can't change the truth by calling it names.

Eric A. Johnston writes: "The mere fact that Mr. Dunn is author of the book assures its timeliness and value."

Judge Jackson, editor of the Roanoke Leader, says, "Every American should read Arithmetic or Revolution. Every professor of economics should use it in his teachings."

To this I agree, and I shall urge the same in my speech about Arithmetic or Revolution on the floor of the Senate.

Message From General Eisenhower on Eve of Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it has been my good fortune to have a copy forwarded from England of a message from General Eisenhower to soldiers, sailors, and airman of the Allied Expeditionary Force, issued from the supreme headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force, on the eve of the invasion. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that those who have not had the opportunity of reading it in detail will have that privilege, which I have had.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME HEADQUARTERS ALLIED EXPEDITIONARY FORCE

Soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the Allied Expeditionary Force:

You are about to embark upon the great crusade toward which we have striven these many months. The eyes of the world are upon you. The hopes and prayers of liberty-loving people everywhere march with you. In company with our brave allies and brothers-in-arms on other fronts, you will bring about the destruction of the German war machine, the elimination of Nazi tyranny over the oppressed peoples of Europe, and security for ourselves in a free world.

Your task will not be an easy one. Your enemy is well trained, well equipped, and battle-hardened. He will fight savagely.

But this is the year 1944. Much has happened since the Nazi triumphs of 1940–41. The United Nations have inflicted upon the Germans great defeats, in open battle, man-to-man. Our air offensive has seriously reduced their strength in the air and their capacity to wage war on the ground. Our home fronts have given us an overwhelming superiority in weapons and munitions of war, and placed at our disposal great reserves of trained fighting men. The tide has turned. The free men of the world are marching together to victory.

I have full confidence in your courage, devotion to duty, and skill in battle. We will accept nothing less than full victory.

Good luck. And let us all beseech the blessing of Almighty God upon this great and noble undertaking.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Freight Rate Discriminations: The Nation's Post-War Transportation Problem No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Freight Rate Discriminations: The Nation's Post-War Transportation Problem No. 1, delivered by C. E. Child before the Atlanta Rotary Club, Atlanta, Ga., January 10, 1944.

I have an estimate from the Government Printing Office that it will cost $208 to print the address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The South has shown, especially in recent years, very lively concern about freight rates. The Transportation Board of Investigation and Research, of which I am a member, is also interested in the subject. Our Board was created by the Transportation Act of 1940 to make investigations and reports to the President and Congress on the relative economy and fitness of rail, highway, and water carriers, to determine the service for which each is best adapted, and what policies should be adopted so that each type of carrier can best be developed to provide a national transportation system adequate for our national commerce and national defense. We have been studying the performance of the carriers, the

cost and efficiency of their services, the traffic handled, and the rates charged throughout the country. We have made a special investigation of the railroad rate structure and its effect upon the economic development of the country. From the studies we have made and are making, I have personally come to the conclusion—and it should be understood that I am today giving you my individual views—that the first essential of providing an adequate national transportation system is the readjustment of the freight rates and rate relationships of the railroads and other carriers, so that each rate will be fairly compensatory for the service performed, so that every shipper and locality will receive equal treatment in relation to the service rendered by the carrier, and every type of transportation can find its true economic place by attracting the traffic which will come to it through the charging of rates fairly related to its costs. I shall try to give you some of the facts and reasons on which my conclusions are based.

Everybody who gives any thought to the subject realizes that because transportation is a vital necessity in the production and distribution of goods, the growth and prosperity of a nation or a region are profoundly affected by the cost and dependability of transportation service. Every civilized people looks upon transportation, because of its primary importance, as a public service to be promoted and regulated or operated by the state for the general welfare, rather than a mere private enterprise of the carriers. It has been a settled rule of law, running back through the centuries, that the services and charges of common carriers must be just and reasonable, and must be extended to all alike, without unjust discriminations. The doctrine of "equality of opportunity" became a basic principle governing transportation services, even before we adopted it as the cornerstone of our whole democratic system of government.

But the adoption of a rule is one thing, and enforcement is another. The transportation history of the United States has been a constant struggle for better and more economical transportation, and to eliminate discriminations. The railroads have, from a very early date, considered it to their interest to discriminate in their rates and charges—to charge what they thought the traffic would bear, rather than to make like rates for like services to all customers. Preferential rates were made when railroad managers thought they were necessary to attract or hold traffic and were denied where such necessity was not recognized. In practical effect this has given large shippers, controlling much traffic, lower rates than smaller shippers; localities enjoying the competition of numerous carriers—especially where there was competition between rail and water carriers—lower rates than localities not having the benefit of such competition. Carriers tried to make up their losses on competitive traffic by charging higher and higher rates on noncompetitive traffic. These processes operated practically unchecked during the period of rapid railroad growth of the past century. The whole rate structure became a fabric of discriminations. Of course, this was very satisfactory to those who were getting the benefit of preferential rates. Many an industry and many a community owed its growth to such preferences. But the resulting disadvantages and injustices to others became intolerable. The courts provided inadequate remedies for enforcement of the law of equality of treatment. Congress, after much deliberation, attempted to remedy the situation by passing, 57 years ago, the original Interstate Commerce Act, which created the Interstate Commerce Commission for the express purpose of wiping out discriminations and forcing the railroads to charge just and reasonable rates to everybody alike. No legislation was ever more enthusiastically hailed as the dawn of a new era of opportunity, on the one hand, and more bitterly resisted, on the other, as destructive of private enterprise and prosperity. Litigation in the courts and technical defects made the act ineffective for 20 years. Amendments by Congress, in 1906, made the law workable. Since that time, by numerous amendments and additions strengthening the act, the Interstate Commerce Commission has been given powers to prescribe and establish such rates as it considers to be just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory, not only for railroads, but also for pipe lines, highway and water carriers.

This has provided machinery for wiping out discriminations, but the process of wiping them out has proved to be slow, uncertain, and expensive. Over all these years discriminations have become powerfully entrenched in the railroad rate structure. Large interests, communities, and localities, which have been benefited by discriminations, consider it necessary for their well-being that they be continued—even that they have a vested right in their continuance. Conservatism is always slow to adopt changes which are disturbing to established institutions. Reluctance to change long-established practices under which investments have been made and business has been built up has frequently made difficult the removal of inequalities. In the process of deciding complaints inequalities have been condoned or approved and precedents established giving sanction of law to the very practices which the law was intended to condemn.

The Interstate Commerce Commission sits much like a court, deciding rate complaints on the evidence brought before it, according to its best judgment in the light of the legislative policies laid down by Congress and interpreted by the courts. The Commission has succeeded in wiping out many discriminations; many others, however, have been found by the Commission not to be unlawful within the meaning of our present statutes; and still many others have not been touched because they have not been brought formally before the Commission for determination and disposition, or because proof of unlawfulness has not been adequate.

Some technical requirements that must be met to prove that discriminations are unlawful are: first, the conditions under which the transportation service is rendered must be shown to be substantially similar and, second, it must be shown that the discrimination is injurious and, third, the carrier committing the discriminatory act must have the power to correct it. Differences in competitive conditions, and in the degree of competition between carriers are regarded as a justification for inequalities in rates; and, since differences in competitive conditions are the principal cause of discriminatory rates, this makes the motive the justification of the act, and throws the door open for the maintenance of discriminatory practices where the stresses of carrier competition have resulted in granting preferences to localities and industries to the disadvantage of others.

A great obstacle to the removal of discriminations has been that, until recently, very little has been known about the cost of rendering a particular transportation service. It has been known, of course, that costs varied roughly with the distance, but it has been thought that cost per mile varied with the density of traffic, and was higher where the traffic was relatively light, and lower as the volume of traffic became greater. Under this theory, of course, regions of heavy traffic density would be entitled to lower rates than those where traffic had not been built up. Later studies have proved this theory to be false. We know now that the cost of handling traffic a given number of miles averages about the same in one part of the country, as compared with another. In the meantime, however, a great many rate decisions have been handed down approving lower rate levels in regions enjoying heavy density of traffic than in those of lighter traffic density.

Regional rate equalities have caused some of the most serious difficulties. The regional development of the railroads in the East, South, and West, with few railroads crossing the regional boundaries, resulted in the establishment of separate and unlike systems of rates in each of these areas. In the eastern region, extending north of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers, from the Mississippi to the Atlantic coast, where population and industrial development were more advanced and widely diffused than in the others, there was an early tendency toward uniformity of rates, and the policy of the railroads was to make rates on raw materials and finished products which were favorable to the production and distribution of manufactured products throughout the territory.

The southern and western roads followed quite different rate-making theories and practices. The southern roads were built from the ocean, Gulf, and river ports into the interior; each road tried to develop traffic to and from its particular ports, moving the raw products of the interior to the ports and manufactured products inward. Later, as the lines interconnected and consolidated, a few main interior railroad centers, such as Atlanta, were given rates competitive with the ports, but generally speaking, rates between interior points in the South were kept on much higher levels than rates to and from the ports. Manufacturing in the South was very limited, so there was little inducement to establish rates for the widespread development of local industries. In individual cases, special rates were made for the products of southern factories. The policy of the southern railroads was to make relatively low rates for the movement of southern raw materials through the ports and gateways, and relatively high rates on manufactured products from the gateways, with still higher rates for local traffic between the small interior points. Where competition existed between rail and water lines, rail rates were drastically lowered to take the business away from the water carriers. There was little semblance of uniformity or equality in the rate structure that grew out of these policies.

In the West, as in the South, rates were made up to encourage the movement of raw materials, with little regard to the development of manufacturing, except in individual instances. The main terminals and gateways were given preferred rates over other points.

Interterritorial rates were not established between any of the regions, except where they were forced by competition. As a rule, the interterritorial rates were the combination of the rates to and from the border point, making a through charge from a point in one territory to a point in another much higher than the rate for similar distance within either of the two territories.

Under the Commission's regulation, rates have become more uniform within each region, but dissimilarities of rates in one region as compared with another have been largely retained. In the three main-rate territories—the South, the East, and the West—these rate dissimilarities have been so great as to constitute a distinct bar to commerce between the regions, and have tended to perpetuate within each region the pattern of development that was already there, with manufacturing predominating in the East and the production of raw materials predominating in the South and West.

During all of this time that rates were becoming established on regional lines, vast and revolutionary economic changes were taking place. Big industries and mass production were supplanting small industries and handcrafts. Farms were becoming mechanized. Our pioneering days were com-

ing to an end. We were losing our export markets for agricultural products, and forced to turn to our own factories, more and more, to use our raw products, to supply our finished goods, and to provide employment. The East was better adapted, economically and by its transportation rate structure to profit by these new conditions than the South and West. The population and the wealth of the country centered more and more in the eastern manufacturing districts, and the disadvantages of the southern and western raw materials-producing areas became relatively greater than ever.

The First World War gave a temporary burst of prosperity to the whole Nation. Agricultural and industrial output greatly expanded, with the industrial expansion mostly in the East. Wages, prices, and rail rates were greatly increased. Transportation demands and shortages made us keenly aware of the need for more and better transportation facilities. Amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act, immediately after the war, placed added responsibilities upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to maintain adequate railroad rate levels and preserve railroad financial credit. Billions of dollars of added capital went into enlargements and improvements of railroad facilities. The Federal Government inaugurated a vastly enlarged program of water navigation improvements. The Panama Canal was opened to commerce. The great fleet of ocean vessels that we had built during the war were put to use in coastwise, foreign, and intercoastal trade. The private automobile came into universal use, and induced us to build a network of hard-surfaced highways all over the Nation. Over these highways, the motor truck, which had come into extensive use for the first time in the war, quickly became an important and indispensable carrier of freight. New pipe lines were built to supply the needs of the motor cars for gasoline. The agricultural boom collapsed with the end of the war, but the expansion of industry and transportation proceeded at a dizzy pace—with the greatest expansion in the East—until the great depression hit us in 1929. Our vastly enlarged transportation now had to try to live on only 50 percent of the 1929 traffic. Waterway and highway facilities continued to expand during the depression, as part of our public-works program, and air carriers, another war baby, aided by public airport and airway construction, began to loom up as a new competitor.

The railroads, alarmed at last over the threat to their supremacy as a near monopolistic transportation agency, began to clamor for increased regulation and taxation of their competitors, for curtailment of the Government program of water and highway improvements, and for greater leeway to allow them to cut rates as they saw fit, to meet competition of water and highway carriers. The railroad rate structure, with relatively high rates on manufactured articles and other traffic, formerly thought to be noncompetitive, was entirely unsuitable for the new competitive conditions. Highway carriers and water carriers stepped in to take the high-rated traffic, and new water routes in the interior took part of the lower-rated bulk traffic. These new competitive conditions were especially disturbing to railroad rates in the South and West, where it appeared they would provide at least a partial remedy for the rate disadvantages of shippers and industries in those areas. With the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railroads embarked upon a new and vigorous program of cutting rates where necessary to hold their traffic, in the face of the new competition. New rate discriminations appeared. Carrier revenues suffered. The Commission joined with the carriers and shippers, who felt that the new conditions were operating to their disadvantage, in urging more regulation. Congress was persuaded to place the motor carriers, with some exceptions, under regulation of the Commission in 1935, and the water carriers in 1940. Since then, as a means of stabilizing the rate structure, the rates of motor carriers, and to a lesser extent of water carriers, have been made to conform more or less closely to the railroad rate pattern. It is realized, however, that this is a temporary stopgap, and the real problem of devising a rate structure which will permit each type of transportation to develop in its proper economic field and enable shippers to get the benefits of each, remains to be solved.

The Second World War has only temporarily ended the economic problems of the depression. With the close of the war, it will be more important than ever that we have economical and efficient transportation to maintain full production and employment throughout the country. We know now, as we never did before, that we must maintain a transportation plant in this country capable of quick enlargement to handle all peak and emergency loads. It was pure luck that we had a surplus transportation capacity when we entered the war. Without it, we might have lost the war. We cannot afford to trust to luck in such a vital matter in the future. But what are we going to do with all our ships and airplanes, the new barges on the rivers, the new pipe lines, the new trucks and busses, the locomotives and cars that will be built in our war-enlarged factories, as soon as they stop building for war? And how many factories can be kept going, against the handicap of discriminatory freight rates?

Undoubtedly, the public will demand that each form of transportation be given fair opportunity to render the best and cheapest transportation service it is capable of giving. But neither efficiency nor economy comes through cuthroat competition, under which the larger and stronger carriers deprive smaller operators of adequate traffic and thereby increase their costs and decrease their efficiency, and finally force them out of business, while at the same time the stronger carriers weaken themselves by performing uneconomic services at inadequate revenues. Nor does the public benefit by such cut-throat competition, which breeds greater and greater rate discriminations and inequalities, gives the benefit of low rates to shippers and localities where competition for traffic is heaviest, and penalizes those in the lighter-traffic areas, adds to the advantages of those already strong and deprives others of the opportunity to compete.

The establishment of a proper rate structure lies at the heart of the transportation problem and of the economic problems which will immediately confront us as we pass from war to peace. The only rate policy which can possibly give each type of transportation a fair chance to develop, give the public the benefits of the inherent advantages of each type of carrier, and give every industry, throughout all parts of the United States, a fair economic chance to produce and market its products and maintain full employment, is one which will provide uniform treatment for all sections by maintaining rates for every type of commodity and for every length of haul which bear their fair share of the cost incurred by the carrier performing the service.

The Board of Investigation and Research, in a summary report, filed with the President and Congress last spring, House Document No. 145, and in a more voluminous detailed report, filed in the fall, House Document No. 303, found that the existing regional differences in class rates were not justified by differences in cost of rendering the service in the various regions, by differences of the composition of the traffic, or by any other transportation conditions; that, in view of the similarity of these conditions throughout the United States, Congress should amend the Interstate Commerce Act, declaring that it is in the interest of a proper development of the country as a whole to establish a uniform classification of freight and a uniform scale of class rates for transportation of freight by railroad throughout the United States, with only such departures from uniformity in particular cases as may be necessary to provide adequate transportation service or adequate carrier revenues in particular areas, or otherwise to correct inequitable conditions. The Board recommended that the Interstate Commerce Commission be directed to prepare a proposed uniform classification and uniform scale of class rates, and after holding hearings giving everybody an opportunity to present their views and criticisms; to establish within 3 years such new uniform classification, and rates, with such exceptions as were found to be justified. It was the Board's view that, without such a specific declaration of policy by Congress, the Commission could hardly be expected within a reasonable period of years to revise the rate structure in a way different from and contrary to the customs and practices, and its own rulings, of the past. After the filing of the Board's report, a number of bills were introduced and are now pending in both Houses of Congress, which are intended to carry out the Board's recommendations. It is expected that hearings will be held on the bills in the near future, by the Interstate Commerce Committees of the House and Senate.

The railroads are bitterly opposing these bills, and through their representatives and spokesmen throughout the country are urging shippers and the public generally to write their Senators and Congressmen, demanding that the bills be defeated. Pamphlets have been published by the Association of American Railroads and by various regional associations, giving their arguments against the bills. A pamphlet reflecting these arguments has also been issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Shippers of the Eastern States, actively supported by the Governor of New York, the Governor of Indiana, and other eastern governors and State officials, have organized what they call a National Freight Rate Conference, to oppose these bills in order, according to a recent Indianapolis newspaper story, "to offset the attempts of Southern States to clip by congressional legislation the rate-making powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission."

Opposition has also been expressed to the bills by some spokesmen for southern shippers of heavy commodities, who consider it would be injurious to the movement of their products on special commodity rates if southern rates were equalized with the East. There has even been some opposition voiced on the part of those who are seeking uniform rates for the South, on the ground that legislation should not be attempted while their complaints demanding equalization are pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission for decision.

The railroad arguments are that freight rates are now and must continue to be made to meet the varying needs of commerce and shippers throughout the country; that the present rates encourage manufacturing, as well as the production of raw materials in the South and West; that the proposed bills would freeze the rate structure into an arbitrary, rigid, uniform pattern under which commerce could not move; that raw material rates would be increased drastically from southern and western producing points to eastern markets; while rates on manufactured goods would be drastically reduced. This, it is urged, would enable eastern manufacturers to take the business away from southern and western manufacturers in their local markets, and both the raw materials and finished goods of the South and West would

stop moving; and thus, according to the arguments, everybody, including the railroads, would be ruined. The industrial interests in the Eastern States agree generally with the railroad arguments, except they deny that the eastern manufacturers would gain any advantages over southern and western manufacturers. They fear, on the contrary, that the eastern manufacturers would be put out of business through the loss of their present rate advantages, and that this would cause a shifting of industry from the East to the South and the West. Aside from this inconsistency, the opponents are unanimous in condemning the bills as a vicious form of political or legislative rate-making, and that Congress, by usurping the functions and overriding the policies of the Interstate Commerce Commission, would cause great injury to the commerce of the country, which has been built up under the present rate system.

These arguments, it seems to me, quite obviously misrepresent what these bills are and what they would accomplish. To charge that a declaration of transportation policy by Congress would be political rate-making overlooks the fact that Congress has the sole power and duty to declare transportation policy, and that the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is a creature of Congress, has no power to act except through the directions given to it by Congress through specific legislation. The Interstate Commerce Act, in its entirety, is nothing but a declaration by Congress of transportation policy and of the manner in which it shall be carried out. The proposed bills would not take away from the Interstate Commerce Commission its powers, but would simply give the Commission the policy under which it is to act, leaving to the Commission the carrying out of that policy—which is just what all of the other provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act do at the present time. It is equally absurd to contend that the bills would require the substitution of an arbitrary, inflexible system of rate-making, unsuited to the needs of commerce, for a flexible, workable system which is designed to meet commercial needs. The bills would only require uniformity of rates where no good reason exists for inequality. They would merely give practical effect to the long-recognized, but long-violated, principle of equality of opportunity by substituting the rule of equal rates for equal services for the rule of charging all the traffic will bear; and by substituting for the rule that discriminations are right unless they are proved to be unlawful, the rule that discriminations are unlawful unless they are shown to be right. Such a rule of rate making could be harmful only to those who enjoy unwarranted preferences and advantages.

What about the argument that the present system of rates has promoted manufacturing, as well as raw-material production in the South and West? You have heard it stated that the South is developing industrially by leaps and bounds, that during the past 20 years it has had greater relative growth of industry than any other part of the country; that present freight rates do not discriminate against southern manufacturers or keep their products out of the East, but are protecting southern manufacturers against the competition of the eastern manufacturers in southern territory. What are the facts?

The comparative development of the South and East, as of the year 1939—the last pre-war year—may help to give you the answer. The figures I shall give for the South are for the eight Southeastern States comprising southern rate territory—Louisiana and Virginia are not included because Louisiana is mostly in southwestern rate territory, and Virginia is mostly in eastern rate territory. For the East, I have taken the States from Wisconsin and Illinois east, and north of the Ohio River, including Virginia and West Virginia, which comprise eastern rate territory.

Southern territory comprises 13 percent of the Nation's area. It contains 16 percent of the population and 16 percent of the gainful workers of the country. Eastern territory has 15 percent of the area, 53 percent of the population, and 55 percent of the gainful workers. The East, with an area only slightly greater, has more than three times as many people and gainful occupations as the South. This is not because the South lacks natural resources, but because the East is a highly developed manufacturing area and the South is not. The South provides employment for about the same number of men as the East in producing raw materials—each area employs 39 percent of the United States total. But in manufacturing and construction, the South employs only 12 percent and the East 69 percent of the United States total. The South has more farmers than the East—30½ percent of the Nation's total is in the South and 26½ percent in the East. The South has a few more workers in forestry and fishing than the East—the percentages being 56 for the South and 34 for the East. But in mining the South falls far below the East—13 percent of the Nation's total is in the South and 54 percent in the East. This is not because the South lacks minerals.

The coal resources of both areas are of high quality and practically unlimited in quantity. But the coal production of the South is only one-eighth of the production of the East, and more than half of the South's relatively small coal production is shipped to eastern consumers. Of the all-important industrial mineral, iron, the South's natural resources are far ahead of the East's. The South's iron-ore reserves are more than one and one-half billion tons, greater even than Minnesota's. The East's iron resources are negligible—the ore for its steel industry comes from Minnesota. Yet, the South converts less than one-tenth as much iron ore into steel as the East. Over a third of the South's scanty iron and steel production consists of pig iron. Nearly a fourth of that is shipped to the East as a raw material for further manufacture. The South's whole production of iron and steel is substantially less than its consumption—which is only 6 percent of the national consumption—whereas the East produces nearly 90 percent of the Nation's iron and steel, and consumes nearly 80 percent.

In dollar values of things produced, the disparities between the South and the East are striking. Here are the figures: In 1939, the South's gross agricultural income was 16 percent of the United States total. The agricultural income of the East was 34 percent of the country's total—the East's farm products were worth more than twice those of the South. The East's forest products had a value slightly more than those of the South, the South's percentage of the United States total was 23 and the East's 24. The mineral products of the East had six times the value of the minerals of the South. In total value of raw materials, the East was nearly three times as well off as the South; the southern percentage being 13 and the East's 34, of the United States total. The value of the South's manufactured products was only 8 percent of the United States total, and of the eastern manufacturers, 72 percent. In total value of raw and manufactured products combined, the South had 9 percent of the Nation's total and the East, 65 percent. This corresponds with the percentages of income in the two areas, which were for the South 9 percent, and for the East 64 percent of the United States total.

This situation is, of course, reflected in the volume and character of the South's railroad tonnage, as compared with the East. The Board's study of railroad traffic moving in 1939 show that the South shipped only 12 percent of the national rail tonnage, and received only 10 percent. A third of the tonnage shipped went outside of the South and 20 percent of the tonnage received came from outside of the South. The East shipped 60 percent of the Nation's total tonnage, of which only 5 percent went outside the East. It received 64 percent of the Nation's tonnage, of which only 11 percent came from outside the East. Further light on the South's relatively small outflow and inflow, and its relative dependence upon outside markets, both for its raw materials and finished products, and on the relative self-sufficiency of the East, is gained by looking at the tonnage of raw materials, semiraw and processed commodities, and finished manufactures. In the raw-materials group, the South shipped 12 percent of the Nation's total and 36 of its production went outside of the South. The East's production of raw materials was 61 percent of the Nation's total, and only 3 percent was shipped out. Of semiraw and processed materials, the South produced 15 percent of the Nation's total, and shipped out 25 percent of that; the East produced 48 percent and shipped out only 6 percent. In the finished manufactured articles group, the South produced only 7 percent of the Nation's total, and, even of that small production, shipped out 45 percent, whereas the East produced 76 percent of the national tonnage of finished goods and sent only 14 percent of that outside of its own territory. It is true that, during the past 20 or 30 years, some lines of manufacturing in the South have had a substantial growth, but the southern manufacturing industries which comprise a sizable proportion of the Nation's total are relatively few.

The greatest growth, according to the traffic statistics, has occurred in the textiles, tobacco, furniture, a few kinds of paper and pulpboard, and aluminum. Desirable as these additions to the South's manufacturing production have been, they still fall far short of what would seem to be the South's reasonable possibilities in these lines. About 40 percent of the raw cotton of the South and Southwest (other than export), shipped in 1939, moved north for manufacturing, and a large part of the South's textiles consist of the rougher and simpler fabrics—the North still leads in the manufacture of the finer finished goods. The East manufactures more tobacco than the South—a third of the South's tobacco leaf is still shipped north for manufacturing. The South is better supplied with the raw materials for furniture manufacturing than is the East, but the South produces, in terms of tonnage, only a third of the furniture, other than metal, and only 7 percent of the metal furniture. The East produces more than half of the furniture, other than metal, and more than three-fourths of the metal furniture.

The South produces 18 percent of the wrapping paper, 25 percent of the paper board, 10 percent of the building paper; the East produces 59 percent of the wrapping paper and bags, 53 percent of the paper board, 75 percent of the building paper, and practically monopolizes the production of high-grade paper and paper articles. The South and the East together make most of the aluminum of the country. The South ships its aluminum to the East for manufacturing; aluminum articles are made almost exclusively in the East. The South ships most of its peanuts to the East, and buys back from the East its peanut candy and other peanut products. The South's cottonseed oil goes north for production into soap and food products. The South produces 20 percent of the fruits and vegetables of the country, as compared with 21 percent produced in the East. But the South produces less than 4 percent of the canned food products, and the East produces 55 percent.

These figures make clear where the South's

troubles lie. Its manufacturing production is very low in relation to the East. Its lack of factories limits its production of raw materials, especially of minerals and high-grade agricultural products, limits its population and its job opportunities, and cuts its average income, per employed person and per capita, to less than half of that of the East. The South has two workers producing raw materials to one producing manufactured goods. That does not mean that the South is producing too many raw materials—its raw material tonnage is in fact far below the East's—but simply that it is not manufacturing enough, even, of the raw materials it produces. The East has three workers engaged in manufacturing to one producing raw materials, but the East has as many raw materials workers as the South, and the value of their products is three times the value of the Southern raw products. The East is using its raw products, as well as a substantial percentage of the raw products of the South and the West, and by so doing provides in one corner of our country, containing only 15 percent of the area and not disproportionately supplied with natural resources, more than 53 percent of our people with better jobs and higher incomes than any other part of the United States.

In order to attain a comparable prosperity, the South needs to increase its production of raw materials; it needs greater and more diversified agricultural production; it needs, above all, to convert more of its raw materials in to finished products.

Someone may point to the new war industries which have been established in the South and say the picture I have been giving you of your economic development is now out of date. It is true you have more industrial plants now than you had in 1939, but so has the East and so has the West. The relative situation has not substantially changed. Proportionately, more war factories have been located in the East than anywhere else, and, according to a recent study of the Census Bureau, there has been a net loss of industrial workers from the South and gain in the East, since the war began.

If the South is to develop diversified manufacturing, conditions must be attractive for small miscellaneous industries of all kinds, as well as for large industries. In terms of freight rate, every manufacturer, no matter where he is located, should have, as nearly as possible, equal treatment compared with his competitor in shipping both raw materials and finished products. In the East, such a rate policy prevails now and has prevailed for years. As a general rule, any manufacturer, large or small, shipping between any two points in Eastern territory, has a mile-to-mile parity, or an approximate parity of rates on his inbound raw materials and on his outbound finished products. In the South, on the other hand, favorable rates on either raw materials or finished products must be obtained by individual negotiation and voluntary concessions granted by the carriers, or through long-drawn-out, expensive proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission. The long-standing policy of southern railroads of making rates individually for each industry, on the basis of what they think the traffic will bear, is unfavorable to the growth of miscellaneous manufacturing, especially small manufacturing, throughout the area.

It is my opinion that a congressional declaration of policy requiring the removal of rate inequities would be beneficial, rather than harmful, to carriers and shippers of all kinds, as well as to the general public in every part of the country. Such a declaration would help, rather than hamper, the Interstate Commerce Commission in carrying out its duties, because it would provide a definite rule of rate making, giving clear authority to depart from the outworn traditions, precedents, and findings of the past. It would help the South and the West, by affording them greater opportunity to develop their unused natural resources, provide greater employment, and higher incomes and standards of living. It would help the East, because the East cannot permanently prosper if the development and prosperity of the rest of the Nation are retarded. Greater production and higher living standards in the South and West mean more business and more customers, in the long run, for eastern business. It would help the railroads and the other carriers, because greater production and higher living standards would mean more traffic, and the elimination of discriminatory rates would provide fair opportunity and fair compensation to every carrier.

I think it is, therefore, of very great importance at the present time that you in the South should continue to support your Senators and Congressmen, your governors and State officials, and shippers' organizations who are fighting against discriminatory freight rates; that you should urge, and enlist if possible, the support of people in other parts of the country who believe in the doctrine of equality of opportunity, as an economic as well as a political principle; that you should ask for this support, not only in the West but in the East, and among railroad and other transportation men, as well as from citizens generally; that you should ask the railroads, and other supporters of the propaganda against the pending anti-freight-rate-discrimination bills, to reexamine their arguments against the bills, and if they find that their arguments are false or mistaken, to withdraw them. There should be no sectionalism, no partisanship, no strife between big shippers and small, or between railroads and shippers or between railroads and other carriers, in the determination of a sound transportation policy for our country. And you should let your Senators and Congressmen know that you will support the efforts that they make to establish fair and nondiscriminatory rates throughout the whole United States.

The B–29 Fortress Attack on Yawata, Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, one of the most vivid and interesting stories of the present war, which has come to my attention, appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune of June 17, 1944. It is entitled "Eyewitness Writer Tells of Yawata Bomb Attack—Utahan Navigates super-Fortress in Raid on Jap Works."

This article tells the story of one of our B–29 super-Fortresses from the time it left its China base, made the trip to its target at Yawata and returned. Boys from all sections of the United States were members of its crew.

The article is doubly interesting to me because 25-year-old Capt. Reimar Peterson, of Gunnison, Utah, was the navigator of this great super-Fortress. His home, Gunnison, Utah, is a quiet country town of not more than 1,000 inhabitants; and when it is remembered that these country boys so recently taken from their country homes have, in such a short time, mastered the technicalities and the engineering problems necessary to pilot and navigate a super-Fortress from a China base to Japan and back, it is almost incomprehensible. However, the magnificent job that our American boys did on this great bombing mission to Japan indicates without question that they have mastered these difficult problems; that they have become the greatest technicians in the war; that their fine technical training combined with incomporable equipment and the dauntless courage that every American fighting man is noted for makes them the masters of the enemy whenever and wherever they meet him.

I am sure that every Senator will get a thrill out of reading this wonderful story.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the story be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRITER TELLS OF YAWATA BOMB ATTACK—UTAHAN NAVIGATES SUPER-FORTRESS IN RAID ON JAP WORKS

(By Clay Gowran)

ABOARD A B–29 SUPER-FORTRESS OVER THE YELLOW SEA, June 16.—The super-Fortress *Nightmare* has just carried me away from the flak-spangled, searchlight-swept skies over Yawata, Japan.

Behind us as we settle down on our return flight is a blazing cauldron of fire which was Japan's largest iron and steel works, producing one-fifth of her high-grade steel. In the longest raid in the history of the war United States superbombers have just struck for the second time at the sacred mainland of Japan.

The *Nightmare* is one of the super-Fortresses of the previously secret Twentieth Bomber Command, which for more than a year had been grooming planes and crews for what happened Tuesday night.

It was worth waiting for—those 4 minutes we spent in our bombing run, pinioned by a half dozen searchlights and tossed and rolled by countless flashing bursts of heavy caliber antiaircraft guns.

FLAMES CLIMB HIGH

So was the sight of the great plant several thousand feet below us in the crystal-clear sky, belching great surges of flame some hundreds of feet into the air as it was blasted by the guns of our American bombers.

This probably will be a very unpolished story, but who could remember all the details of a trip to hell and back at some 200 miles an hour? I am writing at the corner of the navigator's table with a pineapple-juice crate for a seat and a hooded black-out light for my only illumination.

Ahead of us stretches more than a thousand miles of danger and hazards before we reach our home base. We have stirred up a hornets' nest. Now we have to go home through it.

To watch the crew of this plane you would think that bombing Japan was just an ordinary day's business.

The plane's commander is 28-year-old Lt. Col. Robert B. Sullivan, Los Angeles, who looks much older than he is, because of the 900 combat hours he flew in a B–17 during 7 months of service in the South Pacific.

COPILOT'S FIRST RAID

The copilot is Lt. Robert R. Marshall, 24, Champaign, Ill., who is just as calm despite the fact that this is his first raid, although he has been flying for the Army for 3 years.

We have just finished fighting the Japs and now we have another bitter battle on our hands. That is the fight to get home, to make our gas stretch out to cover all these hundreds of miles of Yellow Sea and occupied China which lie between us and safety. The pilots sit nursing every extra foot out of every gallon of gas.

Behind them, Flight Officer Calvin Hagins, 26, Johnstown, Pa., our flight engineer, glues his eyes to his instrument panel watching head temperatures, air speed, and his other precious indicators. Beside me sits Capt. Reimar Peterson, 25, Gunnison, Utah, checking and double checking his navigator's charts.

Others of the *Nightmare's* crew are Lt. Walter Dinnison, 27, Pierce Idaho, bombardier; Lt. Eddie Williams, 22, York, S. C.; and Lt. Maurice Blum, 27, New York City, whose occupations are secret.

Staff Sgt. David Miewski, Mt. Vernon, N. Y., is right gunner; Staff Sgt. Melvin Breshears, Wirt, Okla., tail gunner; Technical Sgt. Chapman, Bloomville, N. Y., left gunner; Sgt. Dan Yahnke, Culver City, Calif., senior gunner; and Technical Sgt. Salvatore Tambascio, Newton, Mass., radioman.

WAITING WEEKS

Correspondents and the crews of the Superfortresses had been waiting for weeks for action. Finally, Thursday noon it came. We were called together in a rough briefing hut surrounded by closely spaced sentries. Col. Richard Carmichael, Austin, Tex., and Olean, N. Y., the good-looking, 31-year-old commander of the group to which I was assigned, gave it to us simply.

"Gentlemen, you have been waiting a long time for someone to say, 'Tonight we attack Japan.' That time has come. Tonight your target is the Imperial Iron & Steel Works at Yawata on the north tip of Kyushu. There you will find tremendous coke ovens, huge rolling mills, and great open-hearth furnaces. It is the largest works of its kind in Japan. Destroy it."

From maps we learned more about Yawata. It lay on the sickle-shaped Maeda anchorage of important Wakamatau Harbor. Around it were railroad tracks for supplying it, and the anchorage itself provided facilities for ships bringing in raw materials and embarking with unfinished war products. We would make our approach from the northwest, striking inland across the anchorage and over the tracks, and drop our loads on the works itself. It was a target we could not miss, open-hearth furnaces to the left, converters to the right, and great coking ovens in the dead center of our target run.

START IN RAIN

Late Thursday, in dreary, rainy weather, we climbed aboard the *Nightmare* at its China base. Probably the biggest thrill, next to the actual bombing, was getting the *Nightmare's* far more than 100,000 pounds off the soggy runway built for her and the others of her brood by 95,000 Chinese laborers.

As Sullivan gunned her west, we sat taut in our positions. She gained speed so slowly. Marshall's voice came over the interphone, "80 miles an hour, 90, 100, 110." A warning cry came from Hagins, "Cylinder head temperatures, No. 2 engine, approaching danger point."

With only hundreds of feet of runway left, she lifted, bounced, then lifted again and staggered off over the ditches and bushes marking the end of the strip.

A word about the *Nightmare* herself. Sullivan and his crew gave her the name because they say she was destined to keep the enemy awake.

On her streamlined nose is the body of a beautiful, unclad girl. But in place of a girl's head is the ghastliest horse's head imaginable with a foaming mouth and ugly red eyes.

The flight to Japan was uneventful. Gaining altitude we swung almost due east and settled down to the long grind as night swept down over China's terraced hillsides below us.

HITCHHIKING FLY

Tambascio nudged me and pointed to a housefly crawling across his desk. "He doesn't know where he's going. Sure picked a hell of a wagon for a ride." I watched the fly. I could sympathize with him. I began to wonder what I was doing here.

During almost 8 dreary hours to the target we listened to music obligingly transmitted by radio Tokyo and radio Saigon. Shortly after reaching the China coast we picked up radio Shanghai. Apparently the Japs never knew we were coming because Tokyo played on the air during the entire raid.

About 10 p. m., (western China time) we reached the Yellow Sea and saw lighthouse beacons flashing off the right wing. Then hours later came a sharp bank to the right. We had reached tiny Okino Island, off the coast of Kyushu, our destination.

We caught our first glimpse of what lay in store. A red ball of fire 10 miles inland showed that other bombers had visited the steel works before us. Searchlights combed the skies and bursting antiaircraft shells lit up the sky.

Dinnison's voice came on the interphone, "Navigator, how long to the target?" Peterson answered "Eleven minutes."

We closed our prominent lights and the fire ceased, then by ones and twos the searchlights came on again, reaching with long tentacles of silver.

FIRE PLAINLY VISIBLE

The fire at the plant was plainly visible now. It seemed to have spread over a vast acreage. Occasionally a blast would send flames leaping hundreds of feet toward us.

"Steady on target run," called Dinnison, crouched over the bombsight. Standing between the two pilots, I watched the searchlights. Two formed in front of us and seemed sure to get us, but at the last moment swung open and we passed through untouched.

Suddenly our plexiglass nose glowed as a light somewhere ahead caught us. Immediately five others swung and pinned us, then the guns opened up. Unable to deviate from the bombing run, we had to sit there and take it.

Looking ahead, I saw at least a dozen heavy caliber guns flashing. Red tracers from smaller guns flicked by. The sharp rack of shells bursting around us smacked our eardrums. The ship quivered and tossed in the turmoil of the barrage. With a shower of sparks and flame something hit us.

For ages we held our course, the pilots crouched in the cockpit to keep from being blinded by those damned lights which never lost us. Finally Sullivan's voice came, "Are bombs away, Dinnison?" No answer. Again Sullivan, "Are bombs away?"

TASK COMPLETED

Then followed Dinnison's voice, "Yes, sir. Sorry, my interphone came undone." "O. K., let's get the hell out of here," said Sullivan.

With the lights still on us we pulled up sharply to the right, then dropped in a steep bank. Reluctantly the lights left us and the guns quieted, one by one. Our aft guns chattered and the last light flicked out as Chapman's excited voice came over the interphone, "I got that —— right down the center of the beam."

Nose down, we poured on coal and roared away from Yawata as its fires grew fainter and fainter in the night. Occasional new bursts of flame showed other superbombers at work behind us, hammering Japan where it hurts most.

FIRES VISIBLE AFAR

Breshears at the tail guns reported that lurid explosions and towering flames from the steel works were still visible when we were 100 miles from the target. Every few moments great blossoms of fire would bloom skyward.

But we had other worries. Worriedly chewing his lip, Peterson moved his pencil along the line of our homing course. In the dim light I watched that 5-cent wooden pencil cross the Yellow Sea and the coast of China, wend its way slowly through occupied China, and finally mark an X far, far away across the map. That marked our base.

In turns the rest of us sipped pineapple juice and munched on the inevitable Spam sandwiches. As we ate, there in the depths of the super-Fortress, we talked about the raid. The biggest question was, Why were there no Jap fighter planes around? The conclusion was that the big American bombers had caught Japan and gone before protection could be got up.

As we sat and talked and dozed, the *Nightmare* droned on and on westward into the night.

NEW WORRIES AT DAWN

The remaining night hours provided slight relaxation for the *Nightmare's* exhausted crew. The plane was wrapped in stormy weather and, barring collision with another super-Fortress or a wandering Jap interceptor, we were fairly safe, but dawn brought new worries.

Daybreak caught us still deep in Jap-held China. With no other friendly Chinese anywhere in sight, we waited gloomily for the swarms of Jap fighters that we thought surely would come. A few minutes later Dinnison gave a strangled cry over the interphone and pointed directly down. There, only about 6,000 feet below, was a Jap airfield, the big runway bordered with interlacing taxi strips and revetments.

But apparently the Japs were still unaware or ignoring the fact that we had blown their biggest steel works off the map. Not once during the grueling trip home did we sight an enemy ship. Finally, worn out by the weight of the heavy combat gear we wore, we began shedding, and there was a lot to shed. Flak helmets, calk vests, life vests, parachutes, first aid kits, canteens, jungle kits, flight helmets. We had gone in on Japan prepared to walk or row back if necessary.

LIKE SLEEPWALKER

About 6 a. m., Marshall crawled back into the navigator's compartment for a moment. At the controls since the previous afternoon without a minute off, he looked like a sleepwalker. Hanging at his dials and switches seemed to have aged him years in those interminable hours.

Shortly before 8 a. m., hoping for the best, we started to let down from 10,000 feet through heavy cloud layers. Again the *Nightmare's* luck held. Just as we broke out of the overcast and picked up the grayish, rainswept hills of China, Tambascio suddenly jumped to life at his radio. A few minutes later he crawled forward to Sullivan with a big smile across his tired Italian face. He had contacted the base and been given homing directions.

We knew where we were. An airfield, hot coffee, ham and eggs were waiting for us a few miles farther on.

The *Nightmare* had taken her 13 men to Japan and brought us home again.

Captain Peterson is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Peterson and husband of Mrs. Maralene Henry Peterson, all of Gunnison, Utah.

He entered the armed forces in October, 1940, trained in California and Florida and was assigned overseas in November, 1942, according to his parents.

He was stationed in the Southwest Pacific theater of war, serving in the Solomon islands and participating in the American raid on Midway, they said.

"We can't describe the pride we feel in knowing our boy participated in Thursday's historic raid," his mother said when informed of her son's exploits.

The Theaters and War Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Theaters Division of the War Activities Committee of the War Manpower Commission, calling attention to the splendid work which is being done by the theaters of this country in connection with war activities.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are approximately 17,000 motion-picture theaters now operating full or part time in the United States, of which 16,432 are members of the theaters division, war activities committee.

When the present global conflict commenced, approximately 50,000 theaters equipped for motion-picture sound projection were in operation throughout the world. Slightly more than one-third of the world total was in the United States.

It is estimated that in 1943, American theaters communicated with an audience which purchased 90,000,000 paid admissions each week.

The total average weekly attendance in civilian theaters in 1944 bids fair to be even larger while United States Army theaters will reach a uniformed audience of 200,000,000 soldiers in domestic training camps and bases.

Each year some 500 new feature-length films, 700 short subjects of 1 or 2 reels each, and 520 single reels of news released at the rate of 10 issues per week, enter the stream of current exhibition.

American theaters have also included in their regular programs during 1941-44 informational films made by the Office of War Information, by the industry upon themes suggested by the O. W. I., and the armed services.

This war information is released weekly through the industry's war activities committee which has pledges from 16,432 exhibitors that they will transmit to their theater audiences such information pertaining to the war which the Government deems important to victory.

Feature pictures shown on theater screens since Pearl Harbor and acclaimed alike by film critics and popular audiences have included such outstanding films as White Cliffs of Dover, Destination Tokyo, North Star, This Is the Army, The Human Comedy, Watch on the Rhine, So Proudly We Hail, Stage Door Canteen, Air Force, The Moon Is Down, Journey for Margaret, Sahara, Victory Through Air Power, Hitler's Children, Saludos Amigos, Mrs. Miniver, Random Harvest, Wake Island, Captains of the Clouds, and Eagle Squadron.

Similarly, among the 683 short subjects entering the channels of wartime theatrical communication were the following dealing either with themes pertinent to the war effort or important in their own right as contributions to general information and inspiration: Alcan Highway, Amphibian Fighters, Army Chaplain, Leathernecks on Parade, Letter to a Hero, Private Smith, Seventh Column, Silver Wings, Task Force, This Is Fort Dix, Women at War, Health for Defense, Main Street on the March, The Spirit of Democracy, The Battle for Oil, Flag of Mercy, West Point on the Hudson, and Soldiers in White.

A study of the 520 reels of news transmitted to the theate. audience during 1943 reveals that there were more than 4,000 separate pictorial subjects of clips, encompassing 1,446 different news events of national importance.

Of these clips, 39.8 percent portrayed activities of the fighting forces of the United Nations on global battle fronts; 19.6 percent dealt with United States armed forces at home; 7.7 percent brought vital messages from war agencies or other home-front news to the screen; 7.4 percent reported on war production in the arsenal of democracy; 3.9 percent pictured events among our good neighbors in Latin America and elsewhere; and 21.6 percent (11 percent of total footage) was on nonwar themes.

As extracurricula activities of United States theaters in wartime, it might be cited that during the Third War Loan Drive the theater industry was credited with War bond sales of $1,909,889,196.

In 1943 three major theater collections resulted as follows:

Infantile paralysis	$2,122,340.37
Red Cross	4,122,008.27
United Nations relief	1,625,000.00

In 1944 the collections from the infantile paralysis campaign exceeded $4,000,000, and the Red Cross moving picture collections were in excess of $6,000,000.

The moving-picture industry was credited with selling more than 12,000,000 E bonds during the Fourth War Loan.

Presently the industry is participating in the Fifth War Loan campaign which continues from June 12 to July 8, 1944.

In addition to their day-in-day-out sales job, the theaters prepared bond premiere performances at which new pictures were shown without charge to buyers of E, F, and G bonds as a price admission, the entire cost of the showing being absorbed by the theaters and the owners of the film.

The war activities committee of the motion picture industry spent in the sale of War bonds during the first four bond campaigns $396,000 of the industry's money for the national campaigns. The thousands of local campaigns conducted by individual exhibitors in their communities cost hundreds of thousands more.

The action of the British Government in reopening the motion picture theaters of Great Britain within a few days after the outbreak of the present war, in spite of the destruction wrought by bombs and fire and the continuing danger to life and limb, again dramatized the indispensability of the motion picture in maintaining and strengthening wartime morale.

Out of a total of 5,835 motion-picture theaters in Great Britain, 5,231 are now open in spite of the destruction wrought by bombings.

The increasing importance of the communication services rendered by the theaters is demonstrated by the current action of the War Production Board in authorizing the construction of 48 new theaters in critical areas where additional thousands of workers for war plants are congregated.

The motion picture is one of a community's most important and generally used meeting places. In addition to employment as an entertainment and communication medium the average motion picture theater is used as a meeting place for civic groups and for every variety of civic endeavor.

Chairman Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, on June 3, 1944, wrote the War Activities Committee:

"We are working on a plan for the recognition of some of the communities and industries which have made particular contributions to the war effort in the organization and utilization of their local manpower resources.

"As you know, the War Manpower Commission has given broad authority to its local offices in working out their own manpower problems. In Washington, over-all policies and procedures are established. Our 12 regional W. M. C. offices—and through them, area and State offices—have full initiative and responsibility for application of these policies to local situations. While we continue to guide the national manpower program from Washington, we have found that communities have shown outstanding ability in meeting their labor needs through the organization of management-labor committees and cooperative controls.

"We have in mind the development of a series of recognition programs which are to be known as National Salutes to Manpower. We have specifically in mind the recognition of outstanding work accomplished by several industries. Among these we should like to give credit nationally to the motion-picture industry for its achievement in aiding the mobilization of manpower for the war effort. This includes not only the producers, stars, and exhibitors, but the rank and file of the industry itself, who have made it possible to carry forward the important calls for manpower.

"In line with the War Manpower Commission's plan to recognize other communities and industries throughout the country, we are considering a salute to the entire motion-picture industry through a public celebration staged at your convenience. I would like to have some of our people discuss this with you with a view to setting some of our plans into action."

Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, in a meeting at the Willard Hotel in Washington, stated to a thousand community leaders:

"Military morale cannot be separated from civilian morale. It is dangerous for us to rely too much on military equipment. All armament must be backed and inspired by invincible resources of the human soul."

Hon. Frank Knox, former Secretary of the Navy, on the same occasion, stated:

"Nations survive not alone because they possess implements of war or masses of men, but because they possess indispensable morale. Those who are dealing with the strengthening of national morale are engaged in a national defense effort as vital as any."

The importance of military morale to victory in war was appropriately emphasized by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff.

"No matter how fine and how abundant your equipment, if you do not have morale you might as well save your money. My daily mail emphasizes that morale is the crux of our problem."

On December 18, 1941, the President of the United States addressed the following letter to Hon. Lowell Mellett, appointing him as Coordinator of Government Films:

"The American motion picture is one of our most effective media in informing and entertaining our citizens * * * I want no restrictions placed thereon which will impair the usefulness of the film, other than those very necessary restrictions which the dictates of safety make imperative."

Pensions and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, taxation is one of the most important things engaging our attention at this particular time for upon the way we use our tax moneys will depend the future prosperity of this country. There is nothing that we can turn our attention to that is of more importance. Most people believe, as I do, that taxation should be a beneficent thing, helping all the people, not a penalty imposed upon us. A genuine gross income tax is the fairest, most just, and useful tax that can be conceived. I have given deep study to the analysis of the sales tax, that is coming to be looked upon as the only salvation of our debt-ridden country.

A genuine sales tax should be one that would tax everybody at the same rate on whatever they sold for profit; the laborer and the white-collar worker on their wages or salaries, and the manufacturer and wholesalers, as well as the great service organizations should be compelled to pay at the same rate on what they sell for profit. There is sound sense in this contention. There is one thing that we must all use if we are making a living; that is the public market. There is nowhere else that we can sell that through which we make a living. So the use we make of the market—the dollar sales we make in it—should be the basis upon which our tax should be levied. The laborer who sells his labor for $5 a day should pay the same rate only as the millionaire who sells a thousand dollars' worth of goods or services in the market each day. If every individual and every business organization in the country paid at the same rate on their gross sales the rate could be very low and the revenue enormous. No one would escape paying his just share. Obviously, the gross income tax is nothing more nor less than a genuine gross sales tax imposed upon all incomes alike. This, Mr. Speaker, is sound reasoning.

Now what is done with our tax moneys is of profound importance to all of us. Yet how little we know, or seem to care, what is done with them. There is one thing that tax money should be compelled to do at all times, that is, to build and maintain an ever-expanding market demand for goods and services. Without an ever-expanding market, our modern, expanding, scientific production will run away ahead of our consuming ability and we shall have to shut down on production until consumption catches up. These shutdowns throw men out of work. When men in large numbers are thrown out of work, their buying power disappears and the market suffers. When the market suffers for customers, everybody suffers, people are afraid to venture on new enterprises, all of us pinch our pennies and dollars and we have a depression.

So the advocates of the gross-income tax say that we should set aside a certain percent of our tax moneys for the purpose of insuring a steadily growing market for everything that we have to sell. They demand that 3 percent of all the gross volume of tax money collected should be turned into the channels of trade each month through the hands of that portion of our population who are classified as unemployable. They claim, and justly, that if society will not employ the helpless ones it should at least put them in position to help build the market by giving them a liberal allowance each month and see to it that the allowance is spent for goods and services. It matters not who spends money. What does matter is that money must be spent by this Nation in ever-growing amounts if we are to keep producing in ever-growing quantity.

So these good people are insisting that we adopt a new insurance idea. They say, "Let us have a national, mutual, endowment insurance for all citizens, protecting them from birth to death against the hazards of life, such as sickness, crippling accidents, the feebleness of old age—any and all things that incapacitate people from earning a living." They would have us collect a special tax on all gross incomes to maintain this insurance. They say that according to census reports there are about 12 percent of our people who are classified as unemployable, if all the old above 69 are included. This 12 percent are now denied access to the market except in a very limited way. The market suffers accordingly. To give them a liberal insurance allowance which they would be required to spend in the market would stimulate the market in every nook and corner of our country, for this 12 percent of the population who are unemployable are found everywhere. What a market we could have if every community found itself receiving each month a liberal income from the 12 percent of the community who are now helpless so far as building the market is concerned.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the International Labor Organization now holding its conferences in Philadelphia are advocating the same principles that this group is advocating, namely, abolition of all poverty, the spending of money by everybody, and a social order in which every citizens would have an equal opportunity to develop his talents to the utmost. In essence they advocate the very principles that the Townsendites are advocating. Yet, like so many of our post-war planning bodies they enunciate principles but fail to show us how to put those principles into operation.

There is a bill in Congress which suggests how to do it, H. R. 1649. Yet the Congress has turned up its nose at this legislative proposal without giving it more than a cursory glance. And I suppose it will continue to do so in the way of all legislative bodies, until a national calamity overtakes us that will scare the living daylights out of us, just as the war did a few years ago.

What a chance there is now for a few wise men to step forward and guide the destiny of our country into peaceful and prosperous ways. What a yawning abyss awaits us if statesmanship is lacking. Our country entailed a loss of not less than a trillion dollars worth of business during the 12 years of depression, which wise statesmen might have averted. The effects of the depression were the direct cause of this world war in which we are ensnared and which will cost us in the long run another trillion dollars. Is it not about time that we should begin to consider ways and means of insuring ourselves against depressions and the wars that bring on depressions? Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to study a national insurance plan against depressions and wars; against want and misery and ignorance and crime; a plan that will come as near to bringing about the world of brotherhood, so sought after at this time, as it is possible for us to find.

Oklahoma's Soldier's Vote Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House to the new soldier's voting law, recently passed by the Oklahoma State Legislature at the instance of Gov. Robert Kerr.

I believe it sets a new note in attempting to guarantee to all the men and women in the armed services of this Nation from Oklahoma their chance to vote a full State and Federal ballot in both the primary and general elections.

It amends our State law in many particulars and particularly makes it easy for every soldier to vote. Any relative or even friend can ask that ballots be sent to any Oklahoma soldier and it will be sent. State and county election boards will check carefully to avoid duplication.

Through a very ingenious folding ballot, perfected by Hon. William Cordell, secretary of the Oklahoma Election Board, the full ballot will be mailed and returned, all in one compact ballot.

Because of Governor Kerr's strong influence in securing passage of such an excellent and liberal vote law and because of his clear explanation of it, I am inserting it in the RECORD herewith:

VOTES FOR OUR BOYS

I share the pride and gratitude of all Oklahomans for the Oklahoma war-ballot law, which was passed at the extraordinary session of the nineteenth legislature and approved by me as Governor on April 19, 1944. This war-ballot law is quite lengthy, but is simple in operation, and in my opinion is one of the best laws of its kind passed by any State in the Union. It makes it very easy for the following to vote: Members of the armed forces of the United States, all the merchant marines of the United States, those

serving in the American Red Cross, Society of Friends, Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or any unit service organization attached to and serving with the armed forces. The law also applies to the husband or wife of any of the above-mentioned persons.

REGISTRATION NOT NECESSARY

Registration is not necessary under the provisions of the act. The voter is entitled to vote in any regular primary, special or general election for electors of the President and Vice President of the United States, United States Senator, Representative in Congress, or State officers, including members of the State legislature, and all county officers who are nominated and elected by the county at large. The voter can also vote on all State questions submitted at any of these elections.

HOW TO GET BALLOT

All applications for an Oklahoma war ballot must be made to the secretary of state. These application blanks may be secured from the office of the secretary of the county election board in each county. There are three forms of State application blanks. One is for the absentee voter to use when he makes application himself. A special form of application is available for the husband or wife of the absentee voter to use in requesting a war ballot for their own use. The third form of request is for use by the parent, husband or wife, adult child, brother or sister, or friend in requesting that a war ballot be sent to any absentee voter. State war ballots and county war ballots are mailed direct to absentee voters by the secretary of the state election board pursuant to applications received by the secretary of state.

BROADER THAN UNITED STATES ACT

The State fully recognizes any application sent in by any of the above-mentioned absentees for the Federal ballots for President, Vice President, United States Senators, and Congressmen. The Federal law made no provision for the husband or wife of such absentee voter to secure a Federal ballot. I think most of our absentee voters will use the ballot provided by the State law instead of the one provided by the Federal law because this gives him an opportunity to vote not only for State and county officials, but also Federal officials, including the President, all in one ballot.

ACT IMMEDIATELY

You should see to it that an application blank is obtained from your county election board and mailed to any absentee voter mentioned above at once. This should be taken care of as soon as possible so that the absent voter can send his application back to the Secretary of State, who will see to it that a ballot will be forwarded immediately to such absentee voter.

The members of the State legislature took into consideration the Federal law and the laws passed by many of the other States permitting absentee voting. I think the Oklahoma war-ballot law is the easiest one to follow that has yet been passed by the Federal Government or any State. Ballots will be mailed by the State election board immediately upon receiving application. I know that you are interested as much as I in seeing that every qualified absentee voter has an opportunity to vote.

APPLICATION ESSENTIAL

Ballots cannot be mailed, however, without an application being filed. In view of the fact that you can apply for a ballot to be sent to any member of your family or to any friend or friends, I know that you will help see to it that all the Oklahoma service men and women receive a ballot for the primary and general election this year. I hope that every relative or friend of anyone entitled to vote under this law will apply to the secretary of the county election board for a ballot to be mailed to the absentee voter if there is any doubt at all as to whether or not the voter himself has made an application. The State will check carefully to see that there are no duplicate ballots counted.

Labor Situation in Northwest Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an interchange of correspondence between Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C., in reference to the labor situation existing in northwest Louisiana.

The letters are as follows:

MAY 2, 1944.

Hon. PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman, War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCNUTT: I am protesting to you, in the strongest manner possible for one public official to courteously protest to another public official, the most unwise policy of the War Manpower Commission in continuing its active efforts to divert labor from the north Louisiana area to the west coast. Thousands upon thousands of dollars have been spent uselessly in attempting to find labor for diversion purposes, and this money is still being spent to the detriment of the taxpayers and to the injury of the war effort. Our people in north Louisiana are having to go out of the business area of that locality to import into that locality necessary workers, and at the same time the policy of the War Manpower Commission is to deport workers to the west coast knowing we will have to import others to take their places.

I am chairman of a subcommittee that recently has found, according to testimony of your own experts, the critical shortage in the lumber and pulp business is actually hurting the war effort. The Selective Service has had to send out a special directive to try to make up this shortage of lumber and pulp workers, which is so very serious to the war effort. These and other basic war industries are suffering very heavily at the present time in this area, and your policy of continuing to attempt to divert workers from northwest Louisiana is a great mistake and an actual injury to the war effort.

I am sure that you are personally not aware of this situation, though I did mention it to you when you appeared before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives many months ago. I trust, however, that when you have given it your personal attention some action will be taken promptly to correct a mistaken policy that is stirring up our people and causing a severe strain upon the war program in northwest Louisiana.

With continued assurances of high regard, I am

Sincerely yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 12, 1944.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOKS: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 2, in which you bring to my personal attention what you believe to be an unwise policy of the War Manpower Commission in endeavoring to divert labor from the north Louisiana area to the west coast. I have noted with interest your point of view and comments on this general policy, and the adverse effect you anticipate upon employers in your district in need of workers.

While I am not certain that a particular recruitment program is being carried on in your area, it is presumed that the operations of the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission are being conducted in line with the Commission's general purpose and under the following described policy and procedure. However, to meet certain critical demands of the Government for workers in production of the highest priority on the west coast, and due to the critical need for workers to man the program in question, intensive efforts are made to recruit men even in shortage areas. There are no critical labor shortage areas in your section of Louisiana, Shreveport and the several others classified being in group III—"areas in which slight labor reserves will remain after 6 months."

I believe that the following statements will give you a true picture of the War Manpower Commission's policy respecting this type of recruitment by the offices of the Employment Service. It must be understood that the functions of the Employment Service are Nation-wide and cannot be confined to any State or area if we are to accomplish the purposes expected of this agency on a national scale.

The Commission advertises for and accepts labor needed by certain essential activities in labor shortage areas from sections of the country where there exists a permanent or temporary surplus of labor which can be used elsewhere to the advantage of the war effort. The Nation-wide facilities of the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission make feasible a procedure wherein such available labor may be obtained and referred to areas of critical labor shortage. A further purpose to be accomplished is to bring into the labor pool men and women who before have not been regarded as workers. It is recognized that only by the enlargement of such a pool can sufficient workers be found to meet the constantly increasing demands of our war production.

Through the active participation of the Employment Service in this labor recruitment, assurance is given that workers who are needed locally and who have some skill or training which can be used nearby in some essential activity are eliminated from consideration for transfer to distant points. Local advertisements of the Employment Service specify that no applicant need apply who is presently employed in essential industry or agriculture. This "screening" of the applicants by local officials tends to prevent their leaving the community; in fact, the agent of the prospective employer does not interview the applicants until they are cleared by the local office.

Our experience is that the controlled-hiring procedure of the War Manpower Commission eliminates any serious effect upon the labor situation in areas where these recruitment campaigns are conducted. I feel you have been misinformed if you think our policy and procedure involve waste of taxpayers' money and injury to the war effort. On the contrary, through these means only has it been found feasible to make best

use of all available manpower, and to use it when and where it is most needed.

Incidentally, while the facilities of the local Employment Service offices are made available to employers at a distance, the costs of the campaign, including the newspaper advertisements, are paid for by the prospective employer and are not borne by the Employment Service.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. MCNUTT, *Chairman.*

JUNE 28, 1944.

Hon. PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman, War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCNUTT: Your letter of May 12, 1944, relating to the drain on the manpower situation in north Louisiana was received in due course, and I have read its contents very carefully. Since this date the campaign of recruitment of labor in this area continues. Appeal is constantly being made that the offices of the United States Employment Service are available to recruit persons for work on the Pacific coast. The appeal carries with it inducements to common laborers, mechanics, artisans, and all types of skilled labor, always with the promise of transportation and high wages. The drain continues in spite of the need of labor in northwest Louisiana for agriculture and for war work.

Numerous large war industries making shells and bombs, as well as a multitude of other war needed articles, are located in this vicinity, and they too vie with the Pacific coast advertising and with your recruiting campaign for the labor available. I do not know that your classification indicates north Louisiana as a critical area, but I do know it is a matter of fact a critical labor area, and this recruitment campaign for the Pacific coast is not helping the war effort in this locality.

In addition to this, I am constantly in receipt of communications from farmers in this area complaining about the lack of farm labor. I quote a letter just received from a large farmer in Caddo Parish, La., to wit: "The drain of farm labor goes on—flashy advertisements in the daily papers—promises of higher wages, and so forth. Two women and one man left this week—I have abandoned 100 acres and—75 acres—and more will follow, and if this keeps up somebody will get hungry directly.

"This 175 acres were food acres—I expect there is little you can do about it, but I was letting you know so that you would be posted."

I read recently that on the Pacific coast, as well as in other parts of the country, a reconversion for peacetime work in small plants is proceeding. I note the closing down of war industries on the Pacific coast and elsewhere in the country. In the light of the fact that the War Production Board has seen fit to permit certain plants to reconvert their machinery to the civilian program, I do not see how you can justify a continuous drain of labor from my section of Louisiana. The result of your program is to build up one section at the expense of another.

I realize that from your high position as head of the Federal security agencies, you are not in a position to get around a great deal, although I hope you have not lost the "common touch." You are, however, in authority, and it is your executive orders which are perpetrating what I believe is a grave injustice upon a great section of the southwest. I am, therefore, making another appeal to you in the light of the new developments emanating from the War Production Board in the matter of reconversion of plants to civilian use. I hope you will see fit to reach a conclusion more favorable to my section of the United States.

Very sincerely yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

Cotton Farmers Far From Being Satisfied With Present Legislation—Cotton Should Be 40 Cents Per Pound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the cotton farmer today, more so than at any other time, resents the way he is being kicked around, abused and discriminated against.

The recent amendment known as the Bankhead-Brown amendment to the O. P. A. Act, wherein it is anticipated that the cotton farmer will be able to secure parity for his cotton, is a step in the right direction but it is far too short a step in the opinion of 99 percent of the cotton growers of the United States. These farmers, year in and year out, who have produced tremendous quantities of one of the basic commodities that is vital to our war effort, so necessary to our well being and essential to our every day life, are as reasonable and tolerant as any large farming group in this great country of ours

With high wages for industrial workers, high wages for most employees, high prices for fertilizer, farm labor, seed, and machinery necessary in the production of one of the most essential materials for war—cotton—unless the cotton farmer receives a substantial increase in the price of cotton, he will go down on record as being the lowest paid group of any class of people in this great country. The price of cotton could well be raised and the ultimate price to the consumer would not be affected or increased. From surveys made by impartial groups there is a terrific spread between the price the farmer gets, the big prices the textiles get, and what the consumer pays today. As an example, for a bale of cotton the farmer gets $100 and yet the consumers pay for that same bale of cotton, made into dresses, the amount of $22,560. Who gets the difference? Clearly not the farmer. The cotton farmer's costs have doubled in most instances and in some cases they have increased threefold. Yet the price of his cotton has remained practically the same. In many instances he has received less money for his cottonseed than he did prior to this war. He knows, just like we know, that the manufacturer and the textile mills are getting the price that he deserves and there is no argument that the cotton farmer needs his share of the profits far more than the manufacturer and the textile industry, as they are showing tremendous profits and gains at this time.

It is not sufficient for those high in authority in Washington to say that the South, wherein the bulk of all the cotton is produced, is the "economic problem-child" and therein let the matter drop after the utterance of these words. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when the cotton farmer should be treated fairly and squarely and we can never have a well-balanced Nation where one group of farmers, such as the cotton farmer, is treated with intolerance that is being handed him at this time. There always comes a time when you can stretch the string too far and take the pitcher to the well once too often and that time has about arrived for the cotton farmer. It isn't that the cotton farmer wants an unreasonable price—all he wants is a fair price, which he is not receiving at this time.

None of us want inflation and yet this is one of the many arguments that is used to keep the cotton farmer in economic distress. Yet, if the price of cotton were raised to 40 cents a pound that increase would cause no inflation, as such a defense in reality is just a myth. In business the textile industry is selfish. It buys on the lowest market when it comes to buying cotton and sells on the highest market when it comes to selling the finished cloth. With a powerful lobby behind them they have successfully maintained this method of doing business for many years. Today they have amassed such gigantic profits that it is astounding.

I do not blame the cotton farmer because his problem should warrant immediate steps to remedy same. Unless this is done not only the South but the entire Nation will suffer.

The Congressmen from the various cotton States and districts of this Nation have fought hard and long, yet the fact remains, that in comparison to the entire Nation we are but a minority and unless the rest of the Congressmen from the other States awake to the true facts of the situation, the whole Nation is bound to suffer. Naturally, the Bankhead-Brown amendment which raises the price of cotton to some degree is a help in just the same manner that a half a cup of water would help though it would not necessarily save a man's life who was dying from thirst. Notwithstanding, it would certainly help for the moment and do a lot better than no water at all, and so with this Bankhead-Brown amendment let us look upon that as one step in the right direction and keep on moving forward until the cotton farmer gets what he is entitled to—just common, reasonable justice.

Labor Unions Have Done a Good Job in the War Effort—A. F. of L. Has Done a Wonderful Job at Bogalusa, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the American Federation of Labor in Louisiana has contributed a tremendous part in the war effort. As we all know, Louisiana has some of the most vital, essential, and necessary war industries located there.

In my particular congressional district one of the largest paper mills manufactures paper, cardboard, and cardboard containers, a large percentage of which goes directly to the war effort. The entire personnel of this paper mill, namely, the Gaylord Container Corporation, is organized by the A. F. of L. and has in its membership as fine a labor group as could be found in any industry in America. These men work in three shifts and the operation is continuous both day and night. There is no absenteeism and every man feels that it is his patriotic duty to work just a little harder and do a little more in the manufacture of vital war necessities. I personally know that the loyalty and patriotism of these three shifts of workmen have made the production record possible in this paper mill in Bogalusa. I know these men personally and on many occasions it has been my privilege to talk to them, to see them, and to watch them work, which is indeed a revelation. It has been my good fortune to attend some of their labor meetings and I can assure the membership of this House that they have one of the finest labor organizations in the world at Bogalusa. Unfortunately, due to some faulty leadership of organized labor in other parts of the country, some people try to use that as a means to discredit all labor unions. Nothing can be more unfair than to apply this method of criticism to the A. F. of L. in Bogalusa. The fact that they have been organized by the A. F. of L. and are today united in one union makes it possible for the wonderful production record that they have established. I feel sure without any fear of contradiction that this wonderful record would not have been possible had it not been for organized labor.

Then too, organized labor has done so much for the city of Bogalusa, one of the most progressive and active cities of 18,000 people that you can find anywhere in America. The union has various programs, not only for its membership but for the entire city as well. The union has contributed and played a major part in the civic life of the city and in every civic organization. As an outstanding example, it erected an honor roll of every member of the armed forces that went into service from the city of Bogalusa, and to see this tremendous board with the names of all the brave youth of the city of Bogalusa, which is located right in the heart of the city, is indeed an inspirational sight. It is impossible to separate this labor organization and the members of this organization from the community itself, as it is as strong and important an integral a part of Bogalusa as are the buildings, the homes, and the inhabitants of the community itself. Here is one place that we can all look with pride and be able to say that organized labor not only clicks, not only plays an important part in the lifeblood of this city, but we can take off our hats and without the slightest exaggeration say that they have done a wonderful job in the production of essential material for our war effort and thereby have set a great record.

Destruction of Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my remarks on the closing day of the session should be in the nature of a complaint, particularly against the War Department.

However, I was shocked to learn that on Wednesday, June 21, 1944, employees of that Department went into the Tunxis State Forest at East Hartland, Conn., and deliberately destroyed buildings which had been erected for the use of the Civilian Conservation Corps and had been under the care of the Army since the use of Camp Robinson was discontinued.

The employees came with a large bulldozer which they rammed into each of the 20 buildings until they were all collapsed. They then burned the lumber, including large timbers.

Today the newspapers carry a story that lumber is so scarce that W. P. B. is putting all of it under controls as of August 1. Yet the Army burns 70,000 feet of usable lumber in an area where the farmers are having trouble getting material for necessary repairs to their farm buildings.

The only excuse that has so far been offered for this wanton destruction of critical material is that "Army red tape" would take so long to unwind if the lumber was to be sold or given away, that it is easier to just burn the material.

Competent builders, who worked on the buildings at the time of construction, say that most of the lumber could have been salvaged and was entirely usable as well as being badly needed by farmers in the neighborhood.

I have written the Secretary of War asking an investigation and report of this extravagance, and I think Congress should insist that this wastefulness be not repeated.

Admission of European Refugees Into the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article by Mr. Westbrook Pegler.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAST PERFORMANCE SUGGESTS REFUGEES WILL NOT BE REPATRIATED

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, June 14.—Always a champion of unpopular and losing causes, I find myself skeptical of President Roosevelt's notice to Congress that 1,000 European refugees will be brought to the country immediately and confined in a vacated Army camp and his assurance that, when the war is over, they will be repatriated. This Nation has immigration laws adopted for the purpose of excluding undesirable persons. These laws have been administered insincerely in recent years and evaded often, as in the flagrant case of Mrs. Earl Browder, an active alien Communist posing as a harmless and nonpolitical housewife. The people of the United States are the sole authority on desirability and yet, in justice of them, it must be admitted that the provisions which they have adopted for their own protection are extremely liberal and more so than those of the other countries in the family of more or less free nations on our side of the war. Nevertheless, even this generosity has been flouted openly in recent years by the admission of individuals in the guise of visitors who were legally ineligible to settle here when it was known that real conditions would make it impossible to deport them, regardless of their active conduct, or their attitude toward the American form of government.

Past performances in many fields instinctively suggest that the promise, that these refugees will be repatriated after the war and meanwhile restricted, will not be kept. Past performances suggest also that once a principle has been conceded by the importation of 1,000 European aliens with no pretense that they are eligible or suitable for permanent residence here, the number that will be brought in later will be limited by shipping facilities, individual pull exerted through personal friends and organizations within the United States, and public tolerance. The latter will be a weak and leaky barrier against the immigration of Communists and others who won't like our way of living and doing, and will do their damnedest to make us live and do their way; and against continental crooks who would be no asset to any nation. The public tolerance operates through Congress and Congress is beset and bedeviled by propaganda and pressure which attacks as a Fascist and a bigot any man who, in the interests of his own country and his own people, undertakes to restrict immigration to those who have something to offer. It is almost heresy to say that not all immigrants and refugees are ennobled by their sufferings abroad, but there is nevertheless much biographical data to prove that many who came here shortly before the First World War for asylum from European tyranny did not join the native American youth in destroying those tyrants, but joined alien groups and movements and tried to destroy the American system, instead. The whole, native public is not organized to counteract the pressure on public men exerted by the organized pressure groups which call the United States a melting pot but, in reality, have in mind something more like a central park of the entire world where anyone may enter as a matter of right.

The United States is, in reality, an exclusive organization. It has rules of eligibility and, like most of our unions, reserves the right to reject applicants who do not meet certain requirements. These restrictions are unjust to no foreigner, because no foreigner has any rights in the matter. If he is admitted to residence and later to citizenship, that is a privilege, not a right. The United States can decide to exclude all immigration, if it comes to that, and to restrict the right to vote and hold public office to natives and, I believe, should do so.

Obviously the first 1,000 are to be just a sample because 1,000 refugees, more or less, in southern Italy would make no appreciable difference in the problem of feeding and governing the region. But to this country the difference could and probably will be great with other thousands following on, with the conditions of their immurement gradually relaxed and with carefully selected distress cases flaunted in the public eye in an appeal for sympathy and unwary kindness, all for the purpose of revising the law retroactively to confer legitimate immigrant status on unselected thousands with complete disregard of the legal standards of desirability.

Of course, this is all based on an assumption that there will be not 1,000 but many thousands and that, once they are here, that will be the last the country will hear of their return to Europe after the war. That assumption, in turn, is based, however, on such precedents as the great but forgotten New Deal unemployment census, and the aluminum pot collection, which never were heard of again.

Louisiana Congressman Tells in Letter of His Work and Accomplishments in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter from a constituent, Mr. Alfred Bateman, of Gonzales, La., and my answer to his letter:

GONZALES, LA.

Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: The other day several farmers were discussing why you should be reelected either without opposition or by an overwhelming vote and pointed out your fight there in the halls of Congress for the farmer.

A little argument arose as to the extent of some of the things that you had done for this district and this community in your capacity as Congressman. I would appreciate it if you would drop me a line and set forth as near as possible in detail the exact accomplishments as far as us folks are concerned. I have agreed to place your answer on the bulletin board here with our association so that all the farmers can read same.

The sentiment in this parish for your reelection is overwhelming, and I understand it is like this in other parts of the district.

Please allow me to express our sincere appreciation of the great fight you put up for the strawberry growers this season when we had such an unfortunate crop failure.

Yours truly,

ALFRED BATEMAN, *Manager,*
Ascension Farmers Cooperative Association.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. ALFRED BATEMAN,
Secretary, Ascension Farmers'
Cooperative Association,
Gonzales, La.

DEAR ALFRED: Many thanks for your kind expressions contained in your letter. I was indeed both pleased and gratified to know that you and the other farmers are so staunchly behind my reelection.

In answer to your request, I shall try to set forth some of the things that I have accomplished as your Congressman for the Sixth District of Louisiana.

1. Introduced a bill to give the late Gen. Billy Mitchell, one of America's greatest heroes, a posthumous Congressional Medal of Honor.

2. Introduced a bill to provide for reduced railroad fare for all members of the armed forces.

3. Introduced many other soldier bills, including a bill for soldiers' bonus, Supreme War Council, etc.

4. Introduced a bill for Federal pensions payments to all needy persons in the amount of $40 per month.

5. Prevented strawberries from being declared nonessential, thereby fixing it so that they could be transferred in iced refrigerator cars the same as in the past.

6. Secured for the high school at Pine, La., a permit to rebuild the school that had burned down, when the W. P. B. previously refused such permit.

7. Cooperated to secure the now famous pencillin medicine for the Baton Rouge Hospital and the hospital at Bogalusa in order that persons desperately ill could have access to this new wonder drug in order that they could be cured.

8. Voted for all soldiers' bills, including the recent G. I. bill, which is the finest piece of legislation for the armed forces that was enacted by Congress.

9. Secured for the third ward of East Baton Rouge Parish 2,500 feet of 4-inch pipe in order that the people of the third ward, where the defense plants are located could have sufficient water supply.

10. Secured a new housing unit which was badly needed at Slidell through the F. H. A.

11. Secured for the city of Baton Rouge hundreds of new housing units that were so badly needed there.

12 Aided, assisted, and cooperated with the Higgins Industries in New Orleans as well as other defense plants located in Louisiana.

13. Helped secure for L. S. U. several special units for specialized training for men in the military service.

14. Urged that the defective runways at the Hammond airport be replaced and today with the facilities recently enlarged that airport is one of the finest in the United States.

15 Cooperated with the officials of Baton Rouge to keep the abattoir or slaughterhouse from being permanently closed down by the O. P. A. The slaughterhouse has been open ever since and has been the main supply of meat to the people of Baton Rouge.

16. Secured an order to keep the minimum carload weight of potatoes at 30,000 pounds.

17. Secured for the farmers of Tangipahoa Parish an order allowing for mixed cars of potatoes, peppers, and other vegetables to be shipped under maximum icing.

18. Aided many farmers and small manufacturers in securing farm equipment, necessary machinery and priorities for same.

19. Fought to get a better price for dairymen who were not being treated fairly by the O. P. A.

20. Worked with other officials to get the price on Irish potatoes raised and was successful in raising both the ceiling and support price, which was so essential due to the blight on the potato crop this season.

21. Cooperated with various sawmills in the Sixth District and was successful in aiding them in many ways.

22. Supported all cotton legislation, including the Pace bill, the Bankhead bill, and the Bankhead-Brown amendment to the O. P. A. Act.

23. Secured for many sheriffs and officials in many parishes equipment for their defense organizations.

24. Secured for the dairymen in many communities additional feed where it was vitally necessary.

25. Fought for the sugar growers' interests and especially the small cane grower.

26. Seeured boilers for tire recapping machines and secured priority for various filling stations in the sixth district.

27. Answere the request of all businessmen, whether large or small. Did everything possible to aid them and secure whatever priorities were necessary in the continuance of their business.

28. Helped to straighten out many an allotment that in some instances were badly tangled in order that those who were left behind by the boys in the armed forces would receive their just and proper allotment checks promptly.

29. Secured for the Manchac Bridge repairs on Highway 51 below Ponchatoula and the necessary priority in order to completely rebuild this bridge which serves one of the most important highways in the United States. W. P. B. had previously refused these priorities to the State highway department.

30. Secured for the farmers permission to use all sirup cans available for canning their sirup.

31. Aided and cooperated with every defense industry in Baton Rouge, Bogalusa, and other cities of the Sixth District.

32. Voted against all wasteful and extravagant expenditures of money which were not connected with the war effort.

33. Voted for all appropriations for the Navy, the Army, and other branches of the armed forces in order to assure victory in this global war.

34. Cooperated with both the labor union and the management of the Baton Rouge Bus Co. and was successful in getting an increase of pay and averted a strike, which was desired by both the workers and the management.

35. Cooperated with the Canulette Shipbuilding Co. of Slidell with naval officials here in Washington in order that work could be speeded on some important naval vessels that they were constructing.

36. Was successful in keeping a ceiling off strawberries in 1943 and kept off the ceiling in 1944 until over two-thirds of the Louisiana strawberry crop had been shipped. To do this it was necessary to put forth a tremendous amount of energy and even went so far as to go into the United States Supreme Court, representing the State of Louisiana, who in turn was represented by Gov. Sam Jones. In doing this both Governor Jones and myself worked together to aid the strawberry farmers in every possible way.

37. Prevented the A. & P. chain stores and General Foods of New York from taking advantage of the strawberry growers and lowering the price on cold pack below 15 cents per pound. The price ranged from 16 to 25 cents per pound, which greatly aided the strawberry growers.

38. Voted with the war effort and with President Roosevelt on every measure that would aid the war effort.

39. Voted on all domestic issues the way that I believed the vast majority of the people of the sixth district desired me to vote.

40. Worked with the tung oil industry to keep the price from being lowered. All in all I have worked and thereby used all of my talents and energy trying to give the people of the sixth district the best possible representation. I realize that you had tremendous faith and confidence in me and I believe in the job I have done I have kept faith with each and every one of them. Many a night I have worked until late hours seeing to it that every request, no matter how large or small, was taken care of and doing my best to fulfill same in the best possible manner.

Never has a single letter—and I have received thousands of them—gone unanswered and every telegram was answered promptly.

No request has been too large or none too small for me to try to fulfill.

In conclusion, I want you to know that I shall continue to do everything possible by using my efforts, my talents and my energy in order to serve the people of my district.

With kindest personal regards to you and the other members of your association, I am

Sincerely yours,

JIMMY MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

Russia and Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article entitled "Russia Warned Not To Impose Will on Poland."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA WARNED NOT TO IMPOSE WILL ON POLAND

NEW YORK.—Thirty-six educators, jurists, publicists, labor leaders, and churchmen today warned Russia that the stand of the Soviet Government in the Polish border dispute might alienate American friendship.

The American leaders also warned in the statement that if Russia continued to follow policies in contradiction to the Atlantic Charter and the Moscow Declaration there would be a revival of isolationism in the United States.

"If Russia values America's friendship, as we believe she does, she must not use her power to impose either an unjust frontier or a puppet government upon the Polish people," the statement said.

"Russia must choose. She can impose her will, but she cannot impose it without estranging millions of Americans whose opinions may be decisive in the development of our foreign policy."

The statement added that "if we are left uncertain whether or not Russia intends to disregard the feelings and convictions of millions in the United Nations there exists an urgent danger that Americans will revert to isolationism."

The Press in a Year of Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Colorado Editor for May 1944, entitled "The Press in a Year of Crisis."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESS IN A YEAR OF CRISIS

(By Irving Brant)

(Irving Brant was associate editor of the Des Moines Register and Tribune for 3 years, editor and editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Star for 5 years, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Star-Times for 8 years. Recently he was editorial writer for the Chicago Sun. He is author of Dollars and Sense, Storm Over the Constitution, James Madison—the Virginia Revolutionist, Road to Peace and Freedom. Mr. Brant was guest speaker at Newspaper Week in 1937.)

From time to time in the past 25 years, I have spoken and written about the shortcomings of the American press, especially in relation to the political and economic life of the country. Perhaps that makes anything I write merely one more chapter in a Jeremiad. However, when that word is used, too often we forget that the unpleasant prophecies were fulfilled. Jeremiah saw the fall of Jerusalem, and it can hardly be said that he lived in more parlous times than ours.

Looking back at these criticisms, I think it can fairly be said that they apply with greater force today than when they were originally made. Every evil and dangerous tendency growing out of the dependence of newspapers upon other business, out of the development of newspapers as big business, out of the helplessness of financially weak newspapers, out of the drift toward monopoly, and out of the egocentricity of some who wield great power, is steadily being accentuated.

POWER OF OWNERSHIP OVERIDES OTHER INFLUENCES

In the working staffs of newspapers, there is perhaps a stronger desire than ever before to resist these tendencies. At least, news and editorial writing staffs have made no voluntary shift corresponding to that of owners and managers. Hence there is a sharper cleavage than ever before between ownership and management on one side, and newspaper writers on the other. The only general exception is a partial one in the highly paid field of syndicated writing, where the economic pull upon the recipient of an ultra-large income is the same as upon owners and managers. That pull sometimes is and sometimes is not resisted. In journalism as a whole, the power of ownership is so complete that it overrides all contrary impulses. Seldom indeed does this lead to the liberalism of a Marshall Field or the enlightened conservatism of Eugene Meyer.

Taken as a whole, the newspapers of the United States are now moving toward a proud distinction. They promise soon to become the No. 1 problem of the country. Perhaps they are that already, because of the way they are hindering, instead of helping, an economic transition which in the next half century will make the present world unrecognizable. At a time when all the channels of information should be freely open to thoughts upon the manner and nature of this change, and when editors should be probing the political and economic realities of a changing world, American journalism allies itself stubbornly with those who refuse to admit that any change is coming. Thus it helps to convert evolution into chaotic frustration and heightens the likelihood of its going from that into revolution.

FREEDOM IMPOSES A DUTY

In saying this I do not mean to put American journalism upon a lower level than the press of other countries. Outside of the United States, the British nations, Sweden, Switzerland, and a very small part of Latin America, virtually the entire press of the world is a slave press, pursuing a course which is good or bad (but generally bad) according to the dictates of the government controlling it. Because the American press is free of Government control, it has a corresponding duty to make the best possible use of its freedom. Because it is not free of economic control, either from outside pressure or the inner pull of superficial self-interest, it does not fulfill the obligation which lies upon it.

During the year of crisis, 1944, the United States will go through a test almost without precedent among the great powers of the world. It will undertake both to win a war and conduct a national political campaign. There are few Americans and few newspapers (outside of the fascistic and traitorous "poison press" which is protected by the freedom it would destroy), who would consciously subordinate the winning of the war to political considerations. But who will challenge the truth of the following dual assertion?

1. Many politicians and many newspapers are willing to gamble on a possible loss in the war in order to gain an assured personal or party advantage in politics.

2. Few politicians and few newspapers are willing to risk a possible political loss in order to gain an assured advantage in the war.

POLITICIANS AND NEWSPAPERS OBSTRUCT REFORM

During the past 2 years we have seen the Government's fight against ruinous inflation made more difficult, indeed half frustrated, by political hatchet work against Government officials working to control prices. David Ginsburg, the most valuable man in the O. P. A., was driven out of office because he was its most valuable man, not merely because he was a Jew. Politicians and newspapers have gambled with the country's security, and jeopardized the future value of their own property, for immediate political ends.

In department after department of Government, vitally needed administrators have been hounded into uniform, in order to create an impression that the Government is a refuge for slackers, or to break down particular kinds of administrative work, or to discredit men of a certain political outlook, or to vent and propagate racial and religious prejudices. Politicians have led in these cowardly and venomous attacks, but newspapers have abetted them, either by active editorial support, or by news reports slanted to give them dignity and force.

We have seen American newspapers, as a class, build prejudice against labor unions, not by seeking out and dealing with the real sins in some of them, but by treating the one-quarter of 1 percent of time lost through wildcat strikes as if these microscopic work stoppages represented general sabotage of the war effort. Labor's no-strike pledge was fulfilled 99.75 percent in 1943. That makes it just .21 percent purer than Ivory soap. How many newspapers have put that fact before their readers? How many newspapermen, reading it here, will verify the statement and publish it? By failing to tell the truth about labor, or rather by creating an impression opposite to the truth, they have jeopardized the war effort. They have done so not only by impairing the morale of labor in the face of a rising cost of living, but by building up inflationary forces which hope to drive that cost still higher by weakening organized labor as a force against inflation.

Finally, the newspapers of the United States as a whole, have never awakened to the fact, and therefore have never aroused the people to it, that Nazi Germany is an infinitely greater menace to the United States than Japan. Our military high command knows that this is true in the field of strategy, and has waged the war accordingly. It is likewise true in the field of ideology. Nazi ideas, such as racial superiority, distrust of democracy, the rule of brute force, and other denials of the principles of our Declaration of Independence, are subtly

insinuated into American thought, with no effective rebuttal from the American press. Newspapers and politicians have made a political football out of military decisions whose actual effect has been to save millions of American lives, and our national freedom as well, by preventing us from facing at last the combined forces of Japan and a triumphant Germany.

This has been due, no doubt, to ignorance rather than malevolence. Yet I have a feeling that the military education of the press would have proceeded much more rapidly if the political implications had been reversed.

FAILING TO GIVE TRUTH IN POLITICS

What will be the role of the press in the coming Presidential election? If the spring planting fortells the autumn harvest, this will be a year in which the press, ostensibly independent, will devote its news and editorial columns more completely than ever before to a one-sided presentation of issues and personalities to the public. I have in mind two recent occurrences.

In a recent congressional by-election in Denver, one of the candidates was a wounded major of Marines who up to the time of his nomination had been the toast of the Denver newspapers. In the 4 weeks preceding the election, I am informed, his name appeared only twice in the leading Denver daily. None of his speeches or activities were reported. The other Denver newspaper on the orders of an absentee owner, gave him treatment almost as shabby. He was defeated. I refrain from comment, and proceed to the other incident.

In February of this year, Governor Bricker, of Ohio, a candidate for President, went to Washington and held his first press conference with the keen-minded news sleuths of the National Capital. They asked him pitfall questions, and he fell into every hole. Before the conference was halfway over, the correspondents were winking and grinning at the blundering remarks of the unfortunate Governor. They then went back to their offices and wrote up the interview. Almost every article telegraphed out of Washington was a political build-up for the Ohioan. No reader would gain the most remote idea of what it would actually mean if he should be elected President of the United States in a period of crisis such as the one we are living in.

Let me emphasize that, in saying this, I am not expressing any general adverse opinion about Republican candidates for President. (I happen to regard Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, and Senator BURTON, of Ohio—both Republicans—as two of the best-fitted men in the United States for the Presidency, although their fitness seems to be a political handicap.) The point I make is that the newspapers are not fulfilling the duty of a fress press to tell the truth, when it is not the kind of truth that is pleasing to newspaper owners or the business community.

Finally, let me ask this question: Why is President Roosevelt the only person seriously discussed for the Democratic nomination for President? In part, of course, it is because he is our national leader in time of war, and also has world-wide prestige. But suppose there were no war and no grave international questions to deal with. The Democrats would then be confronted with the choice of renominating the President as their still strongest candidate, or of choosing between (a) some follower of the President who has been weakened by years of assault in the American press, or (b) some Democrat who escaped that handicap because he is indistinguishable from a conservative Republican.

EMPHASIS AND DISTORTION DESTROY INTELLIGENT POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

The fundamental reason for Mr. Roosevelt's renomination 4 years ago, in my opinion, was the effective teamwork between such reactionary Democrats as MARTIN DIES, and the greater part of the American press, in wielding a hatchet against all Democrats who might have arisen to leadership of the progressive political forces. Similar attacks left the President unscathed only because of the office he holds, but had a far-reaching effect in congressional elections. I regard this as one of the most dangerous political developments of the present century. Looking at the part played in it by the press, it is immaterial whether it is best for the country to have a progressive or a conservative, a Democrat or a Republican, for President. The danger lies in the fact that the newspapers of the United States, by the cumulative effect of emphasis and distortion, consistently destroy intelligent political leadership for a large part of the country's population.

If this should lead to the triumph of a Fascist demagog in the post-war economic crisis, the credit for destroying American liberty will belong chiefly to our newspapers. The judgment, however, will not be recorded in their columns. It will be written as an epitaph upon the gravestone of a free press.

Unfounded Fear of Communism Blinds Many To Greater Nazi Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Edwin A. Lahey, which appeared in the June 7 issue of the Chicago Daily News:

UNFOUNDED FEAR OF COMMUNISM BLINDS MANY TO GREATER NAZI MENACE

WASHINGTON, June 7.—The political thought in the years preceding this war was dominated by a fear of Russia and of the spread of communism, and by the uneasy hope that perhaps Hitler and the Nazis would be gentlemen and not carry their aggressions too far. Had not this sterile kind of thinking prevailed in the 1930's, had not the political leaders of the world allowed their fears of the Soviets to blind them to the real and wicked nature of nazi-ism, a squad of tough coppers could have written the end to Hitler early in the game.

It seems to me that same type of thinking not only prevails today, but is being strengthened. If such thinking was fatal to the peace of the world before, will it be any less fatal to us in the future?

BOUNDARY NOT QUESTION

We have been reading a lot about the boundary dispute between the Polish Government in exile and the Soviet Union. We will be reading more of this during the visit of the Polish Premier, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, whose arrival in Washington was announced by the State Department Monday, a week after the conclusion of a blistering Congress of Polish-American societies in Buffalo, where one of the delegates who counseled moderation in the Polish-Russian dispute was escorted from the hall to the hisses of "Bolshevik" from the other delegates.

Yet it appears that the question of the eastern boundary of Poland is not the essence of the bitterness between the neighboring Slav nations. Everyone agrees that the boundary could be fixed to the satisfaction of everyone but a radical right-wing fringe of Polish nationalists who insist on a restoration of 1939 borders. The critical aspect of the dispute is the belief of the Poles that the Soviet Union does not intend to respect the integrity and independence of the Polish state that does finally emerge from the war.

FEAR FRENCH REDS

Our approach to the problem of a government for liberated France is complicated by a fear of Communist influence in that government, and a Red purge of suspected collaborationists in France. Similar fears delayed for a long time our assistance to Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia. No doubt the same kind of apprehension about the Reds was in the mind of Prime Minister Churchill when he publicly played footsie with the little weasel who sits on the steaming caldron of resentment among Spanish workers and peasants. Some of the Romans who greeted our Fifth Army troops wore arm bands bearing the hammer and sickle and waved red flags. I have no doubt that this incident will precipitate a good many tremors, and perhaps further confuse our administration of the liberated territory of Italy.

This Red phobia is an inferiority complex developed by the industrialized nations over the years. Communism cannot stir the common people of a nation that meets and solves its social and industrial problems as they arise, and the ability to do those things is the only weapon we need for protection against communism.

NAZIS ARE REAL THREAT

Yet the Nazis will be the main threat to the peace of Europe when Nazi Germany is defeated. When the German people, under the surveillance of the Allies, make their first halting steps back toward self-government, the Nazi underground will be at work. If the Nazis themselves could not destroy underground resistance in 4 years of occupation of a demoralized nation like France, who is going to root out and destroy the underground conniving of hundreds of thousands of ruthless, unmoral men who have been trained for a decade to believe in their infernal destiny as masters of the world? They will take over and vitiate every people's movement that arises in Germany.

The Nazi underground will be the real people to fear, not the Russians. If we didn't suffer from this Red phobia, it might be a good idea to turn the job of policing postwar Germany over to the Russians. They know how to find a Nazi, and what to do with him, better than the rest of us.

When the History of World War No. 2 Is Recorded A. J. Higgins Will be Written Indelibly Therein as One of the World's Greatest Industrialists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, down in the deep South there is a man by the name of A. J. Higgins, who stands today as one of the Nation's foremost industrialists. He is perhaps the greatest builder of boats in the world today.

SUCCESS OF INVASION DEPENDS ON THESE BOATS

With the successful invasion of France where our beachhead has definitely been established on the Normandie Peninsula,

a feat of military genius has taken place which never before has ever been paralleled in the history of all mankind. Without Higgins landing boats this invasion, as well as all of our other invasions, might not have been successful.

Every successful invasion must have many kinds of craft but there are two in particular, invasion barges to carry the soldiers to the beaches, and the tank lighters to put those iron monsters pounding the shallow surf for a foothold on the shore, if such invasion is to be successful. Few if any invasions have taken place in this war without Higgins PT boats, Higgins invasion barges, and Higgins tank lighters.

CAREFULLY DEVELOPED

These Higgins landing barges, PT boats and tank lighters did not just happen overnight. On the contrary, it took a tremendous amount of hard work, sweat, disappointments, and the tenacity of a bulldog to develop them. I recall several years prior to this war seeing a man by the name of A. J. Higgins run a weird boat high upon a concrete sea wall and over a strip of ground at full speed. Some people said he was crazy. On one occasion the Navy officials shook their heads and inquired as to the amount of life insurance this fellow Higgins carried. It took a long time for naval officials to become sold on these boats during that period. At that time all Higgins received was headaches, heartaches, hell, and high water.

FIRST ASSEMBLY LINE

Then came America's participation in World War No. 2 and with it came the Higgins assembly line, the first in American boat-building history. Three floors of boats moving in rapid motion from the beginning to the finished production was the set-up at the City Park Higgins plant. Once the orders for these boats slowed down, but not Higgins. He kept building boats. Up and down the Industrial Canal little could be seen except Higgins boats. Once a spectator stated, "Higgins will wind up eating those boats if he isn't careful." But Higgins kept on building boats. Then the rush orders came and an unprecedented number of boats were delivered in a record time. This was one of the many times that Higgins looked ahead and could say "The hell it can't be done."

TREMENDOUS JOB GIVEN HIGGINS

So many officials high in Government affairs were attracted to Higgins that one morning this boat builder woke to find himself with the biggest contract ever given a manufacturer for Liberty ships. Higgins went to work, to streamline production with an assembly line. Insurmountable odds had to be overcome to produce one large Liberty cargo ship a day, but Higgins was well on his way, and that perhaps was his trouble, he was too far on his way and he was progressing too rapidly. Like a bombshell his contract was canceled as his dream, his ambition, his impossible feat was about to come true. Too much pressure from his competitors, who expected him to fail and they could not compete with him if he succeeded. The close approach of his apparent goal of success caused, in effect, his greatest defeat at the hands of others.

ON THE CHIN, SAYS HIGGINS

With most men such a bombshell and shock would have caused their immediate surrender and retirement. Not so with Andrew Higgins; it just whetted his appetite all the more for success and apparently resulted in giving him even more self-confidence, that one thing he has seldom been without, and what has perhaps contributed more to his phenomenal success than any one attribute.

MUST HAVE ASSEMBLY-LINE PRODUCTION

Shortly after this skeptical cancelation that caused the run-of-the-mill remarks uttered by competitors, casual observers, and jealous enemies, "He's through," "I knew he was a flash in the pan," "Two months from now you won't hear the name of Higgins mentioned again," Higgins and I were standing near his boat plant on the Industrial Canal in New Orleans and I inquired, "What is that high steel shed and that hole being dug in that swamp going to be used for?" I further said, "Why use that swampland?" "Well," said Higgins, "you don't see any better land do you?" "No," was the reply. "Well, that, Congressman, is going to be an assembly line where oceangoing vessels of 170 feet and longer will start moving back here and end up in the water completed." I looked at Higgins and said, "Come on, quit your kidding, tell me the truth." "Well, we always put up the roof and then go to manufacturing and see who finishes first, the ones building the boats or the ones building the plant," explained Higgins. "Why we are finishing the concrete floor in that adjoining plant where we have been producing tank lighters for 6 months."

"Come back here in a few months, Congressman, and you will see how we produce those 170-foot ocean boats." And come back I did and here's what a saw. The 178-foot *Simon Bolivar* floating there in the water, the only seagoing ship in the world built on a continuous moving production line.

HIGGINS LOOKS SKYWARD

Not content with his champion assembly line production of streamlined ocean-going vessels after his hands had previously been tied by that unusual cancelation, while no other industrialist in the world has so far accomplished or mastered, but Higgins needed more work and contracts to keep his mind apparently occupied. He landed a whale of a contract to build cargo planes. After numerous troubles, red tape and interruptions, any one of which would probably spell failure to the average industrialist, Higgins was well on his way. Given specifications for plywood construction at first, this was later changed to metal, but that was okay to Higgins. To build a factory in that low land—all available land near New Orleans is low—is a major feat in itself, not counting the manufacturing of 50 or more different needed and necessary commodities of war, all the way from gun mounts to the largest cargo planes that fly.

ONLY WILLOW RUN LARGER

This aircraft plant is a revelation—the largest of its kind in the world except Willow Run at Detroit. It covers more than 45 acres. A half dozen baseball games and a dozen football games could all be in progress at the same time under this gigantic building.

The landing field adjoining is one of the largest in the world. Within the walls of this gigantic plant thousands labor day and night to make Curtis 46 cargo planes to carry men, munitions, guns, and military supplies to the boys at the fronts all over this world.

NOT LIMITED TO BOATS AND PLANES

Here are some of the products that are supplied to help lick the Axis. Higgins Industries manufactures Higgins plastics, radio telephones, torpedo launching tubes, airplanes, camouflage smoke generators, machine-gun turrets, Higgins marine engines, veneers, solar stills, torpedo fire indicators, helicopters, hypoid gears, motor-driven acetylene-burning machines, Higgins propellers, quartz (radio) crystals, armored support boats, vee drive gears, landing boats, release hooks, ramp locks, Higgins profile shapers, tank lighters, Higgins rudders, remote vacuum engine controls, gun cooling systems, marine mufflers, fuel strainers, Higgins turbine pumps, electrical distributor boxes, water reclaimer stills, telescopic steering wheels, amphibious vehicles, manual and electric ramp winches, fuel-line dehydrators, tow boats, rudder gear boxes, Higgins electro-mechanical steering control systems, remote-release controls for torpedo launching racks, patrol boats, bilge drains, fire boats, lumber products, steel tugs, salvage craft, Higgins patented steering wheels with spinning spoke, portable rehaul and launching trailers, motor gun boats, under-water exhausts, automatic switches for carbon-dioxide systems, barrage-balloon boats, tripping hooks, Higgins reversing or maneuvering rudders, cross-drive transmissions for multiple-engine installations, rescue boats, marine toilet flushing pumps, engine cooling systems, cargo ships, marine transmissions, buoy boats, bonded wood panels and shapes, gun mounts, motor torpedo boats (PT's).

PRAISE COMES FROM AROUND THE WORLD

Lord Mountbatten said:

Without the boats that Higgins manufactured the Combined Operations Command could not exist.

The late Secretary of the Navy Knox said:

The Higgins boat is a good boat.

Gen. Mark Clark's wife related:

Higgins workers are doing a wonderful job. I urge each and every one of you to donate more blood and buy all the bonds you can.

Columnist Tinney in her column Man of the Week wrote:

Andrew J. Higgins is an industrial commando, a boat builder who is a do-er and who also talks picturesquely.

Columnist George Adams in his column Today's Talk, wrote the following:

"The man with a plan." It could easily be applied to such figures as Henry Ford,

Henry Kaiser, or Mr. Higgins, for they have always been men with plans—that they have worked out in tremendous fashion.

Major General Smith, commander of Marine Amphibious Forces, in describing the successful capture of Tarawa, wrote:

Higgins boats did what was expected of them.

Tseliang Soong, brother of Madame Chiang Kai-shek, in a visit to Higgins plant in 1943, remarked.

The output of your plant is magnificent.

Admiral E. D. Cochrane, Chief of the Navy Department Bureau of Ships, said:

Hearty congratulations on the completion of the 1,000th tank lighter. Your successful efforts are deeply appreciated. The lighters are working around the world. You have every reason to be proud.

Senator MEAD, of the Truman committee, remarked:

You solve the problems on the job, and don't run to Washington or to the press. And that is why your record is an exceptional one. So what we need is probably more Higginses.

The Ithaca, N. Y., Journal wrote:

Men like Higgins refuse to be kept down. His bold plans startle conservative Government officials, but he seems to know how to deliver the goods.

Congressman LEONARD W. HALL, of New York, after a tour through Higgins Industries, remarked:

This is the first war plant I have been in where all employees were busily engaged in doing their duties and not standing around talking about last Saturday's football games.

Here is what Congressman O'BRIEN of New York said:

Your patriotism and your ability to produce is thoroughly appreciated by everyone, young and old, rich and poor. Your contribution, similar to the contributions of many others, will rapidly bring this war to a successful termination and lasting peace.

Louisiana Manufacturers Association, in a salute to men and women of Higgins Industries, wrote:

The Army-Navy E flag so proudly flying and the lapel pins being worn are symbols of a vital job that is being well done.

From a British Commando report:

Some R. A. F. crash boats will do the job, but best of all is the Higgins Eureka.

From various sources:

The Bureau of Ships is following with admiration the efforts you, the officials and workers of Higgins Industries, are putting forth to accompish the heavy task we have imposed upon you. (Bureau of Ships, U. S. Navy, Washington, D. C., April 1943.)

There is nothing like this plant anywhere in the United States. This should be advertised as an example of the new South. (Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy.)

They always delivered ahead of time and better than they promised. (Rear Admiral Emory Land, Chairman, U. S. Maritime Commission.)

The suitability and performance of equipment produced by Higgins industry which I have just seen on a 24,000 mile inspection trip is a tribute to the genius of American engineers and the skill of the workmen who made it. (Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, April 1943.)

Louisiana is proud to proclaim Andrew Jackson Higgins as its first citizen during this great period of national crisis. (Country Built by Men of Courage, by Hale Boggs, printed in the Washington, D. C., Pathfinder, January 1943.)

One of the Higgins motor torpedo boats stayed close to our transport for the entire 16 days of passage from America to Africa. Whenever our listening device picked up the sound of a submarine, the Higgins boat would move in a wide circle and gradually spiral to the center until it was directly over the sound. It would then let go a depth charge that almost blew the torpedo boat out of the water, but it kept right on its way. These active little boats were in no small way responsible for safety and effectiveness of the transport. (By a petty officer (name not given) who was a steward on a transport just before the African invasion. January 1943.)

I wish to say that our landings in the Solomons were made just as planned and just the way you taught us to do it at the school. And to show what thorough training will do, all was accomplished with a minimum of casualties. (By Second-Class Water Tender E. A. Weathers, U. S. N., who had attended the Higgins boat operators school. Written to Richard A. McDerby, senior instructor at the school. January 1943.)

Higgins says, "If I must take a fee for building cargo planes and engines just to make it legal, give me half of what anyone else is getting." This is really refreshing in view of the scandals about enormous profits in war contracts. (From Inside Washington, column by Elizabeth May Craig, January 1943.)

The South should take time off and drink a toast to Andrew Higgins for his action on a very important item—plywood. (Russell A. Cook, in a letter to the editor of the New Orleans States, June 1943.)

Higgins Industries again extends its war usefulness by taking a contract to turn out rapidly 100 small steel ships of a new design for the Army. (Times-Picayune editorial, June 1943.)

Higgins is a wizard on mass production. (Editorial in the Albany (Oreg.) Democrat-Herald, June 1943.)

Labor, men, material, and New Orleans generally are profiting in a large way from the Higgins industries. (Walter Parker, in the Official Daily Court Record, June 1943.)

Without the equipment you are sending us the Commandos could not function. (Hillary St. George, official historian of the British Commandos, in an address to Higgins employees, July 1943.)

Just what the Higgins plants are doing to help America win the war cannot be easily visualized by us people here at home. In Africa and in Sicily and in the Pacific isles Higgins boats are proving almost invaluable. (Editorial in the New Orleans States, August 1943.)

The men and women of Higgins are doing the impossible, and they are doing it well. Andrew Higgins, that doughty dreamer and mighty maker, is the world's greatest builder of small boats, a man to be proud of. And the workers of Higgins are men and women for all of us to be proud of, because it is they who have molded these weapons for attack out of wood and steel. (Senator KILGORE, of the Truman committee, August 7, 1943.)

No matter what the terrain may be, or whether a body of water is shallow or deep, a Higgins boat is tough enough to make the grade satisfactorily. (From the Berlin, Ind., Times of September and October 1943.)

Wherever fighting men have come to grips with the enemy on isles and continents, Higgins landing boats and tank lighters have been there to speed the men to the beachheads. (Editorial in the Shreveport Journal, October 1943.)

It is the presence on the American scene of such men as Higgins * * * that promises most for peacetime industry and commerce. (Editorial from the San Antonio, Tex., Express. October 1943.)

Our soldier boys can rest assured that so long as such men as Higgins are in the world, tyranny will be swept from the world, and their every effort and sacrifice will not have been in vain. (George Matthew Adams, as printed in the Times-Picayune.)

As the showings at Salerno and Tarawa suggest, the United States today possesses an incomparable fleet of Higgins boats. * * * To fill the hurry-up call for additional landing equipment, the W. P. B. probably has called in Andrew Jackson Higgins, the New Orleans boat builder whose genius for organization and knack for getting things done in a hurry are needed now. (Editorial, San Antonio News, Dec. 13, 1943.)

We used Higgins personnel landing boats and tank lighters. They lived up to what was expected of them. Higgins PT boats were used extensively to chase off the Jap Navy (Sgt. Ray Goodman in Nov. 26, 1943, Times-Picayune interview describing the first Marine landing in Guadalcanal Island.)

Then I ran to the beach with a couple of corpsmen and unscrewed three machine guns from Higgins boats. (Lt. Com. G. M. Bruce, describing to Associated Press a Jap attack on a United States naval field hospital on Bougainville Island, Nov. 15, 1943.)

I have not been dry a single day since I splashed ashore from a Higgins boat. (Frank Tremaine, United Press correspondent, describing Bougainville Island landing.)

We landed on Choisel Island, near Bougainville, in Higgins boats without opposition. (Pvt. (1st cl.) F. J. Jagone, Marine paratrooper, to Associated Press, Nov. 5, 1943.)

These battalions and others supporting the three landing teams went shoreward in Higgins boats. (Richard W. Johnston, A. P. correspondent, describing the successful Marine attack on Tarawa, November 26, 1943.)

This production and performance record of Higgins is unequaled. Andrew Jackson Higgins can be said to be the number one boat producer in the Nation. You men and women of Higgins are doing the impossible and you are doing it well. (Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of the Truman committee.)

People work for other men but they work with A. J. H. (Higgins Industries foreman.)

Today's Noah is Andrew J. Higgins of New Orleans, who might have been a Methodist but is now, like his predecessor, a transportationist. (Liberty magazine.)

On this Thanksgiving Day let us thank God for Higgins Industries labor and management which has given us the landing boats with which to conduct our north African campaign. (Lt. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower.)

My over-all impression is the same as that of every citizen of New Orleans where Andrew Jackson Higgins has dreamed dreams and worked for them for years—namely, that Higgins has plenty on the ball. (Donald T. Wright, in Waterways Journal, November 20, 1943.)

Happily, we've had the weapon to meet them—PT boats—and they've certainly gone to town. Hundreds of the barges have been sunk and thousands of Japanese soldiers have been lost. We frequently knock off 10 barges a day around New Guinea. (Navy Secretary Frank Knox, December 15, 1943.)

Getting back to the Higgins gigantic airplane factory, where cargo planes are produced and wing panels for Curtiss Wright at Buffalo are manufactured. When you talk to A. J. Higgins there he says, "With me it is anything from boats to ships to planes to helicopters."

New Orleans is one of the large cities in the country that is busily engaged in the manufacture of material and vital commodities for the war effort. One out

of five factory workers in the great city of New Orleans work for Higgins Industries.

HIGGINS HAS SCHOOL

Over 2,000 students have been trained in the last 18 months at the Higgins Boat Operators and Marine Maintenance School.

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

So remarkable have been the accomplishments of this modern industrial wizard that the Office of War Information has filmed a motion picture of the life and accomplishments of A. J. Higgins, which is being distributed at this very moment to 33 foreign countries.

To sum it all up in a few words, it might be well to quote what a soldier said as he emerged from the Higgins plant, "It is so gigantic and remarkable that it takes your breath away. It is almost too fantastic and too great to be true. But that is why we have the equipment to win this war."

G. I. Joe Wants A Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, in order to meet the many requests that I have received from all over the world from G. I. Joe, I am introducing a bill today to grant preferences in the disposal of surplus war property to veterans.

One G. I. Joe—Sgt. Harold Ungar—awaiting D-day in England had this to say:

While on tour of duty here in England, we have noticed the staggering amount of equipment of every description, and with the islands throughout the Pacific theater similarly equipped, we began to wonder what will happen to much of it when this war is over—which we are determined to end soon.

Discussion during rest period is somewhat as follows:

Jack Trumbal of Boston, Mass.: "My brother is in Italy and when this war is over we hope to buy a launch from the Army or Navy and convert it into a fishing boat and then we can make a living all right. That's all we want."

Willard Wozniak from Ohio: "If I could get two good tractors and a six-by-six off the Army at a cheap price I could farm my brothers land much better and the whole family would be better off."

A Pennsylvania trucker said: "Before I got into the war I was saving to buy a good Mack tractor and trailer, but along came the war and all my savings are gone. But if the Army will sell me this job here I'm driving, it certainly would go a long way toward helping me get set after the war."

The same stories are told in the professional bracket and by the small businessman who is now in uniform.

The general idea is that there must be some feasible plan whereby this equipment and merchandise can be made available to the veterans at the most reasonable consideration through an agency established by the Government and which would not involve any middleman.

I agree with Sgt. Harold Ungar's plan. It is sound, sensible, and feasible, and I hope the House committee will give it prompt and favorable consideration. This is only a small consideration to grant our gallant boys who are giving so much for all of us.

The bill I have introduced is as follows:

A bill to grant preferences in the disposal of surplus war property to veterans, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established the Office of Surplus War Property, at the head of which shall be a Director appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEC. 2. The Director may employ and fix the compensation, within the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923 as amended, of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. It shall be the function of the Office of Surplus War Property:

(1) to centralize, so far as is practicable, in one disposal agency responsibility for the disposal of all property of the same type or class;

(2) to exercise general supervision and direction of the transfer of any surplus war property in the possession of any Government agency to any Government agency;

(3) to supervise disposal of surplus war property so as: (a) to insure the most advantageous deal to the Government; (b) to discourage and, if possible, to prevent disposals to speculators; and (c) to encourage sales to ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen in acquisitions of such property for the establishment and maintenance of their own small businesses or farms.

Off My Chest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in my remarks a splendid statement by Mr. Philip Wylie entitled "Off My Chest" which was reprinted through the courtesy of the Miami Daily News, Miami, Fla.

Westbrook Pegler, America's stuck whistle, stopped his Johnny-one-note campaign against crooks in labor long enough the other day to mutter that there wasn't any anti-Semitism in America—just people worrying about it—and what was all the fuss? Well, some of my best friends are anti-Semites. I know that the very great majority of Americans do not take part in this sinister fad, polls have made that clear, but there is too much of it here in Miami, and in New York, Boston, and Chicago for the comfort of common citizens like me. To say it doesn't exist is like putting a brick on the safety valve. That's what a column is, isn't it, Peg? People like you and me ought to use a pound of steam and the free press to get the record straight. Jews can't. They would be arguing against those who have already condemned them. That leaves us. Wherefore, your analyst is putting out an extra.

I have heard hundreds of malicious charges brought against the Jews by people I know, most of whom should know better. These charges are always of two kinds, either charges that could be made with exactly equal truth against all humanity, or lies. The people who make them are unable or unwilling to check fact and find out truth. So they repeat lies without the slightest realization of their origin of their monstrousness.

They blame Jews in particular for those human failings of which we are all guilty equally, and which have led to the misery of this hour—though it is plain even to them that the Jews have suffered most from it. That lack of logic, of heart, of wisdom, is at once the saddest and the snidest of man's weaknesses. Numberless times in his history he has punished one group or another in spiteful vengeance for some calamity brought about by the greed or the stupidity of all groups together. Hitler did it most recently to Jews, then to Protestants and Catholics. Shall we follow him?

To be an anti-Semite is to repudiate our Constitution and to deny every syllable of meaning in the story of America. People don't think of that, but every law we have made is based upon the principle of the individual and his rights. Talk does not often lead to chaos. But there has never been a chaos that was not preceded by talk, much talk, all prejudiced, ignorant, underground, dishonest, and evil. My mean-talking friends are not planning action. The very thought would make them shudder. But the tone their muttering takes is the sort that can stampede idiots—and has done so a thousand times. They are people who should not stand as poor examples to the less intelligent, the less decent, the vicious, and morally deficient.

They just don't reason. They tell me—all of them—that some of their best friends are Jews and that there are "fine" Jews. Five minutes later they belittle and demean Jews—thus thrusting knives in the backs of those "best friends." They are too empty-headed to perceive that, by everybody else, their Jewish friends are automatically included in their generality. That is one measure of their stupidity. They ought to know, if they are over 10 years old, that the proportion of fine people among Gentiles runs just the same, to the last decimal point. And they should remember that whenever a group is disenfranchised or destroyed, mankind then has the tyrant or executioner to deal with. In such a case it would be—themselves. Finally, they should have been taught this truth: Those who persecute one group inevitably turn upon others. I daresay 50 percent of the anti-Semitic talkers known to me are also anti-Catholic. Suppose their words, which have the same darkling color that made pogroms in Europe, become reality? Against whom would they strike next?

But let us half-suppose it. Like the shrewd hillbilly in the fable, let us turn propaganda into imagined reality. If it happened—what? Suppose all Jews vanished at the stroke of midnight. What evil would be undone? What blessing would result? What's this talk all about?

The next day, there would still be as many crimes committed, per capita. Prisons would remain proportionately as full. The incidence of gangsters and rapists would rise slightly. The number of corrupt political leaders and office holders would hardly diminish by a handful. We'd lose ground in the war, where hundreds of thousands of good Allied soldiers were missing, and because the Axis would lose nobody. No problem of the peace would change a hairbreadth. Even Palestine would then be the Arab problem it always was. The strikers would still strike; John L. Lewis and Petrillo would still haunt us. There would be 4 percent more food—but distribution would

buckle, 4 percent more material for clothes—and nobody much left to make clothes, and, of course, taxes would rise 4 percent. The movies and the radio wouldn't miss a beat, in spite of what the anti-Semites have said. Only the quality would suffer. The market would sag, but not collapse, for there are not that many Jews in it and the average Jew is poor, in spite, again, at the illiterate folklore.

No gain. What loss? Well—most of the people who make America laugh would be gone, for one thing, and many of the people who touch our hearts every day; poets, writers, dramatists, journalists, best-loved radio and movie stars and musicians—thousands upon thousands of these. You can write the list yourself. We'd lose hundreds of great philanthropists, myriads of lesser ones, and hundreds of thousands of the kindest people in America besides. Our culture would be knocked out and the throat of our mirth would be cut. Quite a loss. But it's nothing. We'd lose so many scientists that the progress of man would be set back the length of your whole lifetime. We'd lose the millions of babies and adults their research was going to have saved. We'd lose thousands of men now thinking up instruments of victory—and all the uncountable engines they would have invented for the empire we call the future. If we had caused this, we'd lose the American Constitution and its Bill of Rights, our security, everybody's liberty, our self-respect, and the immortal souls of those who had contributed to the measureless catastrophe even by talk. "Information, please," would be wiped out. We'd lose Barney Baruch and Hedy LaMarr and Albert Einstein, and—hell!

Think. Think honestly. That's all it takes.

P. S.—In the brief moment it took to set down the above facts, Mr. Pegler has changed his mind. He now sees that there is anti-Semitism. But, he says, it is the doing of Marshall Field and PM. They are responsible (in Pegler's nervous, fast-shifting brain) for every bit of the bigotry of unassimilated Americans and for the thoughtless cruelty of those other Americans who haven't a right to the dignity of that name. Marshall Field and PM, eh? If that's true, then Pegler is responsible for all the strikes, and by his own definition. Come, come, pal. Get that whistle jammed on the old tune again. The new note's sour and screechy.

Hebrew Committee of National Liberation Launched in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an article appearing in the current issue of the Answer:

HEBREW COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL LIBERATION LAUNCHED IN WASHINGTON

For the first time in 1809 years (the last Hebrew revolt under Bar Kochba was crushed in 135 C. E.) a unified group of Hebrews have joined together to redeem the Hebrew national sovereignty and establish, in exile, the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation. The new committee, as the temporary trustee of Hebrew national interests, will apply to the Allied powers for the same degree of recognition now accorded other committees of liberation in exile, it was announced by Peter H. Bergson, head of the Committee of National Liberation, at a press conference May 18. The press conference took place in the newly-established Embassy at Massachusetts Avenue in Washington. This building formerly housed the Iranian Embassy.

Though the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation is being only now officially organized, the activities of its members on behalf of the Hebrew people of Europe and Palestine are well known the world over. It was this group who initiated, prior to the outbreak of the war, the gradual evacuation of tens of thousands of Hebrews from the menaced zones in eastern and middle Europe, to Palestine. In the United States, some of its members initiated, as spearheads in the fight for the survival of the Hebrew people, the following organizations in this country: The American Friends of a Jewish Palestine, the Committee for a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestine Jews, the Emergency Conference and the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe, as well as the organization of the great documentary pageant. We Will Never Die, and the Nation-wide Proclamation on the Moral Rights of the Stateless and Palestine Jews.

Members of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation are now on missions in Europe, in the Middle East, in Palestine, and in England.

In announcing the formation of the committee, Peter H. Bergson declared: "What is happening to the Hebrews of Europe is not sudden. It is the culmination of centuries of oppression and persecution, of ghettos, pogroms, economic strangulation, and endless humiliation and insult. The Hebrew Nation can no longer endure the status quo. It has been swept away by an intolerable whirlpool of death and disaster. There is a limit to the blood and suffering any people can endure."

The Hebrew committee of national liberation has been organized to obtain recognition of the Hebrew people of Europe and Palestine as a sovereign nation with the right of self-determination. It will seek representation in the councils of the United Nations. It will demand the right for its Hebrew army to fight on an equal footing with other United Nations armies against the Axis.

While the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation will not press the settlement of political and boundary problems of Palestine until the end of hostilities, it will insist, however, on the immediate opening of Palestine to all Hebrews who can manage to escape from Europe today.

The ultimate goal of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation is the establishment of a free Palestine with the Arab population as partners in a democratic and civilized Palestine, and with a legally constituted international authority in control of the holy places of all faiths.

A CALL BY THE HEBREW NATION IN ITS STRUGGLE FOR LIFE AND FREEDOM

We Hebrews, descendants of the ancient Hebrew Nation, surviving today on God's earth in spite of the dreadful catastrophe of torture and death which has befallen our people, have joined together in the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation to dedicate ourselves and our lives to secure the deliverance and independence of the remaining millions of our desperate people struggling for life itself in the vast hell of German-occupied Europe.

What has happened to the Jews of Europe was not sudden. It is the culmination of centuries of oppression and persecution; of ghettos, pogroms, economic strangulation, and endless humiliation and insult.

In the present war, this cumulative attack has resulted in the staggering climax of 3,000,000 men, women, and children deliberately massacred.

In the face of such disaster, the bitter status quo of the Jew in Europe must give way to a new, bold, and total attempt at salvation.

These Jews, today, have no effective protection of citizenship from any nation. They can no longer be considered Rumanians, Hungarians, Poles, Germans.

Certainly, they are not Axis nationals. They have been, and are the first and bitterest enemies of the Axis.

They belong to no nation, and have no nation of their own.

That is why the murder of 3,000,000 Jews—a number as large as the total population of many a European nation—has been possible.

Common disaster brings them together, even as death has hunted them together.

We therefore proclaim to the people of this land, and through them to all civilized men the world over, that the dry and tormented bones of the Jews in European lands have now been united; that the blood of our 3,000,000 dead has done more than fertilize the earth of the people who have murdered them. It has molded the survivors into a single living entity. It has brought forth a renascent Hebrew Nation.

The Jews who live today in the hell of Europe together with the Jews of Palestine constitute the Hebrew Nation.

There is no other nation to whom they owe allegiance but the Hebrew Nation.

It is as a part of these millions that we exercise the right of self-determination; that we proclaim the existence of the Hebrew Nation, and its determination to speak for itself and its elementary right to be represented by its own sons.

We confidently believe that the present-day heirs of the American Revolution will understand, recognize, and support us in this mortal struggle for our life and liberation.

It was, therefore, proper for us to choose Washington as the site for this historic rededication of the Hebrew Nation as a democracy. For Washington is the eternal symbol of democracy and of the greatness of the human spirit and if its revolutionary demand for justice, decency, and freedom.

Let it be clearly stated that the Jews of the United States do not belong to the Hebrew Nation. They are an integral part of the American Nation; an integral part of a Nation made up of people of every descent.

These Jews are Americans of Hebrew descent. They do not belong to the renascent Hebrew Nation any more than the Honorable Justice Frank Murphy belongs to the Irish Nation or Gen. William Knudsen belongs to the Danish Nation; though both certainly are proud of their ancestry.

And let there be no confusion because the vast majority of Americans of Hebrew descent are faithful adherents of the Jewish religion.

Hebrews and Jews are not synonymous terms. Religion and state are separate. The common adherence of members of the American Nation and of the Hebrew Nation to the Jewish religion is no different than the common adherence of Americans and Germans to the Protestant religion; or the common adherence of Americans and Italians to the Catholic religion. Everywhere in the world people share religions without sharing nationhood. The people of the Hebrew Nation, and Americans of Hebrew descent whose religion is the same, are no different. But, they still are members of different nations.

We proclaim that Palestine, in its historic boundaries, is the territory of the Hebrew Nation by the will of God as was set forth in the Bible. In our own time, this was politically ratified by 52 nations who, in 1922, "recognized the historic connection between the Hebrew people and Palestine."

Although it is the national territory of the Hebrews, Palestine is to be a free State in which the present Arabs and other non-Hebrew residents of the land will share full equality and privileges of citizenship and government, thus being full partners in the upbuilding of a free country in a democratic civilization.

In the present condition of our Nation, we are dedicated to only one task—the rescue of our people. We, therefore, proclaim that the Hebrew Nation postpones the settlement of the political and boundary problems of Palestine until after victory when, as one of the United Nations, we hope to partake in the post-war settlement of political territorial problems. Until that time we shall cooperate with and assist Great Britain as the Mandatory for Palestine.

We do however insist, in the name of humanity, that the right and the ability of all Hebrews in Europe to find shelter in Palestine be facilitated by the Mandatory Power, lest it be guilty of sacrificing them to their ruthless German murderers.

We proclaim the Hebrew Nation a co-belligerent in the United Nations' war against Axis tyranny.

Our dead, who have bloodied the steps of civilization, can no longer be considered useless victims of insane massacres. They are honored casualties in the United Nations' common war for freedom.

Our surviving 4,000,000 people in Europe are prisoners of war, and the International Red Cross should do everything it can to succor them even as it deals with all other prisoners of war.

But not all our people have been victims. We have contributed more fighters to the common struggle than most of the United Nations. Thousands of our men have fought and are daily fighting the enemy—whether as Hebrew guerilla units harassing the enemy's lines in Poland and Yugoslavia; whether in the numerous underground sabotage groups, or as regular fighters and commandos as part of the 30,000 Hebrews who are serving in the Palestinian regiments, and in other units of the British Middle Eastern Army. They have fought and died all the way from El Alamein to Cassino and from Syria to Addis Ababa.

Because we are, in fact, a cobelligerent against the Axis, we consider ourselves one of the United Nations and shall seek recognition as such.

And as the nation against whom more atrocities have been committed than against all the other United Nations combined, we surely should be represented on the United Nations Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes.

We also seek a seat on the board of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and on all other United Nations councils in which the interests of our nationals are involved.

The tens of thousands of Hebrew fighting men should now be given the elementary right to fight the Nazis under their own banner and in their own name—as the Hebrew army—with a status comparable to that of the armies of the other nations overrun by the Nazis.

These are the minimum needs of our nation at a time when the very existence of the people is at stake. Their denial by the United Nations would be contradictory to the very aims for which the war is being fought; would be a defeat of justice now and in the future; would be an endless threat to peace in the world of tomorrow. For in ignoring the principles for which the war is being fought, we can cheat no one but ourselves and our children.

The Hebrew Nation can no longer endure the status quo. An intolerable whirlpool of death and disaster has severed this status quo. There is a limit to the blood and suffering any people can endure.

In this spirit of desperation, and with humility and reverence, we of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation have undertaken to be the servants and spokesmen for the Hebrew Nation, until such time as our nation shall be free to elect its own spokesmen and representatives in a democratic form.

We solemnly swear to serve our Nation with all our energies and might and not to falter if we should need to sacrifice life itself. So help us God.

WASHINGTON, May 18, 1944.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES OF THE AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR A FREE PALESTINE

The Hebrew people of Europe and Palestine, acknowledged by no Nation, spurned and oppressed by many, seeking to make itself heard above the tumult of war and massacre whose chief victims they are, at last have found a voice to articulate their need. The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation has brought to America the urgent petition of a once-great nation for the right to sit in the councils of the United Nations, for the right to defend itself and to fight the common foe on the common battlefield, and for the right to preserve the lives of its people and secure their destinies in their own homeland.

Recognizing the validity of this demand for minimum human rights, the American League for a Free Palestine has dedicated itself to the full support of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation in its endeavor to gain for its people the rights of man while some still survive to enjoy them.

The American League for a Free Palestine is a nonsectarian organization established in the American tradition which, mindful of the genetic struggle of the American people, has always rendered aid and comfort to tyrannized or harrassed peoples seeking freedom through reconstitution of their own nationhoods.

Mineral Resources and Industrialization of the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the House committee to investigate the steel shortage from its inception. The committee's investigations early brought out the fact that the critical steel shortage we have experienced during this war is due almost entirely to the concentration of the steel industry in the hands of a few steel masters within a very limited area in the eastern part of the United States. As a result, members of this committee have urged appropriations be made to the Bureau of Mines to conduct explorations of our mineral resources over the entire country, and particularly in the West, with a view to bringing about a decentralization of the steel industry.

The Bureau of Mines made such excellent progress under the initial appropriation for this work last year that Congress has appropriated another $3,000,000 to carry on this work so essential to our national defense in time of emergency and the development of our peacetime economy.

The work of members of this House committee has been the only effective means of bringing to light what the mineral resources of our Nation actually are. The splendid results obtained by the Bureau of Mines as a result of its investigations is well recognized by the increase in this appropriation for the coming year as indicated by the following colloquy which took place on the floor of the House of Representatives when this appropriation was under consideration:

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, the Senate authorized $6,000,000, and the House is insisting on cutting it down to $3,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman feel that $3,000,000 is all that can well be spent at this time on this particular work?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman, more than that might efficiently be spent. On the other hand, the committee is recommending the full amount of the Budget estimate, which is 50 percent more than was used for this purpose last year. Again I might say to the gentleman that before the committee acted we called into consultation Dr. Sayers, who was very complimentary as to what the committee had done last year. There is no disposition on the part of this committee to unduly curtail the splendid activities of the Bureau of Mines in this connection. It is a great work. It has done a good job.

Mr. COOLEY. And if further funds are needed in the future, I understand the gentleman is in sympathy with the idea of providing those funds?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Absolutely, if the need is demonstrated.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Steel Shortage, of which I am a member, is appreciative of the splendid cooperation on the part of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I will say that the members of my committee feel very kindly and very appreciative for what the distinguished gentleman has done in this connection. He has made a valuable contribution to the war effort. It has been more than many of us realize.

Mr. WELCH. It will be recalled a deposit of tungsten was discovered in North Carolina as a result of the $2,000,000 made available last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. The estimated value of this deposit is over $15,000,000. Mr. Speaker, can we anticipate the committee will make further appropriations for pilot borings and explorations until the quantity and quality of iron ore and other critical mineral deposits in this country have been fully determined?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I think I can say to the gentleman without committing other members of the committee, that as long as the Bureau of Mines continues to use funds for this purpose to such good advantage, as it has in the past, there is no question but what the attitude of this committee will be extremely sympathetic and that funds will be available, just so long as the present splendid showing is continued.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of free talk going on with reference to the industrialization of the West. The work of members of this House Committee on

Steel Shortage is the first and only constructive action thus far taken to bring about such industrialization. The foundation of a strong western industrial economy is the development of our western heavy industry. This in turn is dependent almost entirely upon the development and utilization of our western mineral resources. A healthy steel industry, decentralized to use the native ores found in the various communities, is absolutely necessary.

Under the appropriations already made, the Bureau of Mines has already discovered a visible supply of high-grade iron ore in the Shasta Range, of over 60 percent purity, which can readily be processed by electricity available in almost unlimited quantities on the spot at the great hydroelectric power plant at Shasta Dam. Dr. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines, advises us that large quantities of other ores have already been discovered in at least four California counties alone, and that continued pilot borings will be made with a view to uncovering the full potential mineral-ore availability. By such steps in California and other Western States, our western heavy industry can be developed.

While They Are Dying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ochiltree County (Tex.) Herald:

WHILE THEY ARE DYING

Including the task of shampooing an elephant, there are at least a thousand jobs we'd rather not have. Top of the list would be that of trying to explain some of today's domestic headlines to a frontline fighter or a wounded boy in a foxhole.

"Sixty thousand workers out; 1944 strikes up 42 percent; Labor chiefs defied; Plane production crippled;" ("While we out here are dying, or preparing to die?").

We wonder if it isn't those who are labor's staunchest friends who find these things hardest to grasp, Labor's leaders who assume their responsibility as soberly as they assume their power and whose thoughts envisage the future—in short, those worthy of being leaders at all—cannot condone such short-sighted selfishness at America's expense.

It is they who, on several occasions have sat down voluntarily with the heads of business and management, solemnly and with anxious hearts, to find ways and means of keeping our country at fullest production of the weapons of war. They have found, as have business and management, that cooperation may be had without compromise of principles, when the very fate of our democracy is at stake.

That discovery can and should influence industrial relations for the better, now and in the peace to be won. As for those horribly inexplicable headlines—may their type decrease.

This Should Be Conclusive Evidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the C. C. C. Act guarantees the producer 90 percent of parity where the Secretary of Agriculture asked or asks for increased production.

The O. P. A. and W. F. A. have set up price schedules that allow the processors to obtain subsidies even though they buy the farmers' hogs at 50 percent or less of parity. The O. P. A. and W. F. A. combination then has not lived up to the 90-percent parity guaranteed by law, and they have not protected the producer in seeing that the producer receiving this 90-percent parity even when the processor was obtaining a subsidy based on a parity or above-parity price.

The following sales receipt obtained from the packer shows that three light hogs weighing 250 pounds sold for 3 cents per pound and for which the producer received a total of $6.60 or $2.20 apiece:

OSCAR MAYER & Co.

(The Wisconsin producer's most profitable market)

MADISON, *November 23, 1944.*

MARTIN RICE,
Plain:

Hogs	3
Weight, pounds	250
Price per hundred pounds	$3.00
Amount	$7.50
Deductions: Yard charges	.90
Net	6.60

Thank you.

Though the parity price of hogs was $12.10 per hundredweight the time these hogs were sold, the price received by Mr. Martin Rice, of Bancroft, was only 3 cents a pound at the stockyards and only $2.64 per hundredweight on the farm where the parity price really applies. This may be an extreme case but it is an example of the wide variation between promises and performances. These governmental agencies should follow the commitments very much more fully than they have in the past few years. It is not right nor is it in keeping with common justice when these agencies do not religiously fulfill their every commitment.

When the W. F. A. claim they have the legal authority to tell the country butchers that they must have a new slaughterhouse within 10 days or they will take their permits to butcher from them, it seems very apparent that the W. F. A. with the O. P. A. could see that the producer received a legal price for his hogs, and that the packer could be required to pay a parity price for the hogs if they are to be provided subsidies based on parity or above parity prices.

Vote—It Is Your Patriotic Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, we should make a start in taking an earnest interest in self-rule, and thereby insure for the future generations the implanting of a mighty good habit—that of being a real good citizen. It is a serious responsibility to be a citizen. Your first ethical duty in the field of public service is your duty as a voter. Use, protect, and cherish this right.

If we are to maintain a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, we must vote. Democracy depends upon it. A democracy is a group of people who get together in a common enterprise for the purpose of governing themselves.

Registered adult citizens, regardless of property or poverty, may vote. Our wishes can be best expressed through the ballot. You do not have to be a king or of nobility to have a part in our Government.

We as American voters should not be derelict in our duty, and we must not be negligent about taking part in our elections. Under a democratic system of government like ours, the character of the government is largely what the voters make it. Every voter is a part of the government. As such he has a distinct moral duty to exercise his franchise in such a manner as to bring about the best welfare of the Nation as a whole.

As a result of 50 years of agitation by those who felt that the discrimination against women was unjust and unreasonable, the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted, giving women equal suffrage with men. Since then women have taken a deep interest in elections.

You mothers, fathers, wives, sweethearts, and relatives of men in service should remember that the ballot is just as essential to the maintenance of good government in time of war and peace as arms and a willing soldier in time of war, especially when our servicemen are sacrificing their lives for the freedoms we enjoy.

There should be no indifference on our part. If popular government is to be a success, we must have an electorate not only intelligent and honest, but also wide awake and vigilant at all times.

Among the greatest dangers of popular government are indifference and neglect on the part of voters. We should be greatly concerned about the failure of our friends to vote. You should contribute your share by going to the polls and voting and urging your neighbors to do likewise.

We have no right to criticize unless we do take part in elections. To fully participate in the official activities of our Government is a patriotic duty, privilege,

and opportunity no citizen can afford to shirk because the majority rule is determined by the will of the people.

Russell O. Wirtz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege today to pay my respects to and to commend Mr. Russell Wirtz for heroic services performed in line of duty. I am sure that not only his friends and neighbors of the Eleventh Congressional District of New Jersey, but the entire country, are proud of his deeds. The following is a résumé of his heroic work, submitted to me by a friend of his:

Russell O. Wirtz, of Orange, N. J., was serving as galley man aboard the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey tanker *Esso Baton Rouge* when that vessel was torpedoed and sunk by an enemy submarine in mid-Atlantic. The vessel was attacked at dusk, the torpedo striking on the starboard side where it entered the fuel bunker and engine space. The vessel listed rapidly and seeing that the ship was sinking the master ordered the crew to abandon ship.

Wirtz, who had been taking a bath when the torpedo struck, dressed hurriedly and made his way to the boat deck where he found that No. 3 lifeboat had been demolished by the explosion of the torpedo. Several members of the crew had been injured and Wirtz assisted these into the port lifeboat together with a severely burned member of the armed guard.

With the crew safely in the lifeboats the vessel settled beneath the sea almost immediately. The crew were picked up by a British corvette that had already rescued over 300 survivors from other torpedoed vessels of the same convoy. Many of these survivors were injured and over 16 of them in the sick bay were suffering from severe burns.

Russell Wirtz, who in his earlier years had studied medicine and had a good practical knowledge of first aid, volunteered to care for the burned seamen as there was no medical officer aboard. He volunteered his services to Capt. James S. Poche, of the *Esso Baton Rouge*, to help the burned and injured men. Captain Poche secured the approval of the corvette's commanding officer and Russell Wirtz went to work immediately treating and caring for the men in the sick bay. He stayed below decks administering to these men for 13 days. Having lost his eyeglasses in the torpedoing, Wirtz was handicapped in his work and was forced to use a small magnifying glass borrowed from a member of the ship's crew when treating his patients.

Shortly after being rescued by the corvette, the crew of the *Esso Baton Rouge* were transferred to a Dutch passenger vessel and Wirtz remained behind to care for the injured. The corvette finally reached the West Indies port where the injured and burned seamen were hospitalized. Wirtz himself, at the point of exhaustion after 13 sleepless days and nights, was hospitalized and finally repatriated to the United States.

The commanding officer of the corvette in his report stated that had it not been for the work performed by Russell Wirtz in caring for the burned survivors, many of them would not have lived.

Wirtz is 52, makes his home in Orange, N. J., is married and has two sons in the Navy.

The Public Debt Picture Is Not Funny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest problems confronting this country at the moment is our public debt. I am a firm believer in the principle that what we owe we must pay and I am not one of those who feel that because we owe this debt to ourselves that we need not worry about it. Our country has achieved its present great position, in part, because of the soundness of its currency. To keep that standing we must face our financial present and future with honesty and realize that we cannot go on making appropriations without any consideration of the dangers we will surely face. My imagination finds it hard to envisage billions, let alone trillions, as some of our so-called advanced thinkers have, but we must look more closely into our financial picture and try to understand all its details.

We began the Second World War with a public debt of $65,000,000,000 and, in addition to this, we have already appropriated three hundred and forty-five billion of which two hundred and seventy-five billion has been obligated. Last fiscal year our national income was around $135,000,000,000 and this calendar year it is estimated our income will be between $155,000,000,000 and $160,000,000,000. Incidentally, for this year we face a $58,000,000,000 deficit according to figures recently issued by the Treasury Department and confirmed by me in conversations with Mr. Daniel Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

These figures present, in brief, a picture that calls for our most serious and careful study. While we cannot, under any circumstances, hold back necessary war appropriations we should, I believe, take stock of our resources, scrutinize all appropriation items more closely, do away with the wasteful and expensive cost-plus system of contracts, and impose a tax system limited only by our national need and our ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, editorials from the Helena Independent-Record, of Helena, Mont., dated March 5, 1944, and the Daily Missoulan, of Missoula, Mont., dated March 10, 1944. These editorials merit the attention of every Member of Congress because of their honesty and because, as is so aptly stated, "the public-debt picture is not funny."

[From the Helena Independent-Record of March 5, 1944]

THE PUBLIC DEBT PICTURE IS NOT FUNNY

Men who profess to know taxes best, are concerned over two increasingly popular methods of approach to the mountain of money we owe somebody or other. First, a certain school of economists put out the theory that as the Government makes the money there is no sense in paying it back. Just skip it, and go along as though nothing had occurred. Now come the cartoonists and some writers to poke fun at the fat Federal debt. A favorite line is, "We owe it to ourselves, so we don't owe it to anybody." That leads to the speculation, "If we don't owe it to anybody, it's funny we have to pay interest on it." But, say the more serious gentlemen, Americans are so hungry for humor they take the funnymen seriously to, in effect, support the balmy economists. How to kill this silly notion is really worrying some of our better minds.

[From the Daily Missoulan, Missoula, Mont., of March 10, 1944]

WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES

In a booklet composed recently by Don Herold, the Hoosier cartoonist, was a drawing of a little man with wild hair who was talking to himself about the national debt, which is now in the neighborhood of two hundred billion. "We owe it to ourselves," the zany was saying, "so we don't owe it to anybody." When somebody told him that the interest charge on the public debt was over three billion a year, he was very confused. "If we don't owe it to anybody, it's funny we have to pay interest on it," he mused.

The little fellow's bewilderment is, unfortunately, typical of that of many Americans who would like to dismiss the Federal debt with a shrug. The magnitude of our war expenses is so huge that the average person can't grasp it. He thinks of the interest alone on our debt as being over three billion; then he remembers that all of the income taxes collected from individuals in 1942 totaled only that amount, and he gives up. He says, "So what. We owe it to ourselves, don't we?"

We can't repudiate the national debt. The alternative then, is to knuckle down, pay currently as much of the war expense as we can and to look forward to a great many years of penny-pinching so that the interest and a small part of the principal remaining will be paid annually.

We can help ourselves greatly by being pennywise right now. Every needless public expenditure delays the day when the war debt will finally be paid. Governmental inefficiency wastes manpower as well as money and these extravagances are not to be countenanced. Taxpayer associations and citizen groups maintaining a watchful eye on public expenditures should be fully and universally supported and their worthwhile aims expanded.

It is only by a stern attitude toward our overwhelming future obligations that we can

preserve the things we are fighting for—the free enterprise system which allows us to choose our own job and to advance in it as rapidly as our talents and ambitions permit; the eventual repayment of the money we are new investing in War bonds; the perpetuation of the rights of property; the self-respect of the other nations of the world, whose destiny is inextricably interwoven with our own, and the myriad things that make life in these United States a certain, fruitful existence.

To John Boyle O'Reilly, Great Irish-American—A Tribute on the Hundredth Anniversary of His Birth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak at this time in tribute to the memory of a great Irish-American, John Boyle O'Reilly. This House will not be in session next Wednesday, June 28, but we may take this opportunity to pay a fitting and reverent tribute to this great patriot and poet on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of his birth at Dowth Castle, near the town of Drogheda in Ireland.

At the age of 19 O'Reilly became a member of the Tenth Hussars in Ireland. Not long after, burning with the desire for a free Ireland, he joined the Fenian Order and became one of its active members. As a result of his patriotic activities, at 22 he stood, convicted by an English court martial, under sentence of death. His sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. His jailers sought to break the spirit of this young and brilliant Irish patriot. They kept him in solitary confinement at Millbank Prison. They sought to crush his love of liberty by sending him to perform hard labor in the brickyards at Chatham Prison. They sent him to dank and lonely Dartmoor Prison. They could not break his spirit. Because of this he was sent aboard an English vessel to be transported in exile to Australia for the rest of his life. In exile he never gave up hope of escape, hope of striking a blow with all his power for the freedom of his beloved Erin. Aided by a friendly priest, Father Patrick McCabe, his chance to escape came in 1869; and, aboard a whaling schooner, he made his way over perilous seas to a haven of freedom, America. He arrived in Philadelphia November 23, 1869, and on the very day of his arrival took out naturalization papers to become an American citizen.

For more than 20 years O'Reilly lived and worked in Boston, a poet, a champion of the liberties of every people and every creed, a fearless editor of the Irish-American journal, the Boston Pilot, but, more than all this, a lover of American democracy, a tireless fighter for a free Ireland.

Through his poetry, which was read by millions in America, Ireland, and throughout the world, O'Reilly spread the rich gospel of freedom for all men. He was truly a poet of the people. His great poem, America, brought tears to the eyes of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant. When Grant heard O'Reilly deliver it with matchless eloquence at Detroit in 1882 he said, "That is the grandest poem I ever heard."

In America, O'Reilly speaks of his adopted country as a land where:

* * * here alone
Nor caste, nor kings, nor privilege are known.

And again:

Where every hand subscribes to every rule
And free as air are voice and vote and school.

Proud of his Irish birthright and of the unsurpassed patriotism of the tens of thousands of his fellow Irish patriots who came to America, he wrote in the Exile of Gael:

No treason we bring from Erin—nor bring we shame nor guilt!
The sword we hold may be broken, but we have not dropped the hilt!
The wreath we bear to Columbia is twisted of thorns, not bays,
And the songs we sing are saddened by thoughts of desolate days
But the hearts we bring for freedom are washed in the surge of tears,
And we claim our right by a people's fight outliving a thousand years!

O'Reilly wrote of the struggles for liberty of every people and of every creed. He was the poet of the O'Connell centenary, at the dedication of the monument on Boston Common to Crispus Attucks, at the dedication of the monument to the Pilgrims' landing at Plymouth. His was a sublime tolerance of all peoples and all creeds, a deep understanding of the need for real human brotherhood. He wrote:

Then drink, all her sons—be we Keltic or Danish
Or Norman or Saxon—one mantle was o'er us;
Let race lines, and creed lines, and every line vanish,
We drink as the Gael: "To the Mother that bore us."

As a fighter for a free Ireland, as a loyal American constantly urging highest devotion to the duties of American citizenship, as a devout Catholic, O'Reilly stands today a living inspiration to Irish-Americans and to all Americans.

As Irish-American boys march in the front ranks of our gallant armies on the beachheads of Anzio, of Normandy and in the Pacific, they must feel marching with them the deathless spirit of John Boyle O'Reilly, who when he was as young as they, like them, marched through the Valley of the Shadow of Death, fearless and unafraid in defense of democracy and human freedom.

Mr. Speaker, today 100 years later the Ireland which O'Reilly loved so well and for which he fought so bravely is still torn and divided. The northern counties are split off from the southern area of the beautiful Emerald Isle. Ireland is today still the symbol of the unfinished world symphony of free peoples and free nations. In this just people's war which all of us fight today, the way can and must be found to create a free and united Ireland, uniting the northern counties to the Republic of Eire, free to work out her own rich destiny of progress and liberty, choosing by the free will of her people to cast her lot as she has done for more than a thousand years on the side of human liberty; fighting with the United Nations against the Hitler world slavery—an Ireland where Irishmen of the North and South, without yielding any of their highest ideals and principles, serve their common country and work for a bright new world of freedom.

It is to the realization of this high purpose that the inspiration of John Boyle O'Reilly makes such a rich contribution.

John Boyle O'Reilly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute I dedicate to the late John Boyle O'Reilly:

JOHN BOYLE O'REILLY, 1844–1944

June 28 of this year marks the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of John Boyle O'Reilly, great Irish-American poet, patriot, and leader of social reform. Whether we think of him as poet of the people, journalist whose eager pen inveighed against tyranny, or hardy idealist who pitted himself against almost unsurmountable odds, we find, in these days of wrath and bloodshed, much that is as modern in his works as though he had written it for tomorrow's headlines.

For 20 years O'Reilly swayed thought and sentiment, not only in Boston, where he functioned as one of the great journalists of his century, but nationally and internationally as a force for reform, for the brotherhood of man and for the rights of the underprivileged. His early life was as swashbuckling and romantic as any adventuresome tale to come out in Hollywood's best technicolor, but in some measure it explains the all-embracing love for humanity that dominated his writings.

John Boyle O'Reilly was born in Castle Dowth, on the banks of the beautiful and historic River Boyne, in Ireland. His father and mother were teachers in the local school, which still stands next door to the crumbling, picturesque old castle. When young Boyle was just 4 years old, the terrible riots of '48 occurred, and his early life was filled with tales of the Irish patriots, of the persecutions of 1798, of the cruel regime of Cromwell, of the heroism of Robert Emmett, O'Connell, and Wolfe Tone. He listened by the hour to these stories, told him by his father and by the villagers, and his constant

question was always "When will the Irish rise again?"

Physically, he was a strong, handsome lad, small of stature, with flashing black eyes and even white teeth. He was extremely active, for all his long hours of listening to the tales of the older people; he could climb like an expert, and was never happier than when swinging from tree trunk to tree trunk through the birch forests, or plunging deep into the brisk currents of the Boyne. It was said of him that he could recite poems endlessly, and if he did not happen to know one suitable for an occasion he would make one up on the spot, with such persuasive eloquence that his audience was constantly in laughter or in tears.

After a few years under his father's tutelage he was apprenticed to a newspaper, the Drogheda Argus, and remained there 4 years. On the death of the proprietor of the paper he was released from his apprenticeship and went to Preston, England, where his aunt lived, and where he worked for 3 years on another newspaper. By now he was a young, ambitious man, and he returned to Ireland full of his ardent desire to take up a career of journalism. Instead of that he found himself enlisted in the Tenth Hussars.

Young O'Reilly made a good soldier, intelligent, obedient, and courageous. His superior officers liked him and urged him to take up a military career in earnest. But this was the early 1860 decade, and by 1865 every young Irishman, whether he lived in his homeland or in America, was caught up to some measure in the Fenian movement. The purpose of the Fenians was to obtain Irish independence by dividing the British Army against itself, thus obtaining about a hundred thousand picked troops for a free Ireland. O'Reilly plunged into this cause without reserve, and, when Fenianism came to an end he accepted his punishment. He realized that he would be caught and scorned the generous bribes offered him if he would reveal his fellow plotters. Along with other political prisoners he was sentenced to death; the sentence was commuted to 20 years at hard labor.

The unhappy story of O'Reilly's imprisonment and eventual escape is too long to do more than touch upon lightly. He was first placed in solitary confinement at Millbank, where he began to ponder the story which later appeared as Moondyne. After being moved about from one prison to another, and after attempting three escapes, he was sent to Dartmoor, in England, where he survived a year or more of the most unsavory prison conditions. Finally, he, along with 62 other political prisoners, was deported to a camp in Australia.

Here the treatment was somewhat better, and he was even allowed to print a newspaper for his fellow convicts. However, he was determined to escape and finally did so, through the help of a friendly priest, Father Patrick McCabe, who became interested in the young man's poetry and in his devout Catholicism, which never faltered, even during the arduous days of Dartmoor. He put out to sea in a small rowboat and was picked up by an American whaling vessel which eventually landed him at Liverpool. He escaped detection, and shipped for America, where his first act was to apply for citizenship.

American ideals and American democracy excited him; he soon made a name for himself in the world of journalism. His arrival in this country, in 1869, found the United States in the confused conditions that arose out of the Civil War, but O'Reilly was used to fighting, and he immediately took up the cause of the Negro and the American Indian. Now he was free to carry on his crusade for the under dog. He was particularly forceful, both in his prose writings and his poetry, in the cause of the soldier-convict.

He made connections with the Pilot, an influential paper in Boston, and in a short while he became the acknowledged leader of the Irish-Americans. He married and the marriage was blessed with four daughters. His home was soon a gathering place for the literary and political groups in Boston, and while he often declared, in public, that he would never tread the soil of Ireland again until the Irish were a free people, he managed to draw something of the atmosphere of the old country around him and many of the plans for Irish home rule were made in his drawing room.

He never stopped working in the interests of his friends who were political prisoners with him, and he actually succeeded in arranging the escape of a number of them. From first to last, in all that he did and said, he was altruistic and humanitarian to an extreme.

O'Reilly was only 56 when he died suddenly and unexpectedly. He was mourned both here and abroad; even in the House of Commons by a group of Parnellites. Eulogistic messages were sent to Mrs. O'Reilly by such personages as President Cleveland, Cardinal Gibbons, and Oliver Wendell Holmes. In 1897 the city of Boston unveiled a magnificent memorial to his memory, but somehow one likes to think that some of his heart, at least, lies in the memorial at Dowth Castle on the Boyne in his beloved Ireland.

O'Reilly's political and social speeches and journalism may become little known as time goes on, but some of his poetry, like his ideals, will live forever in the hearts of free men. His verse is roughly constructed, but always sure and strong, fanciful, tender, and majestic. One stanza can give its flavor as well as its ideas:

O blood of the people! Changeless tide,
through century, creed, and race,
Still one as the salt sea is one, though tempered by sun and place;
The same in the ocean currents and the same in the sheltered seas;
Forever the fountain of common hopes and kindly sympathies.
Indian and Negro, Saxon and Celt, Teuton and Latin and Gaul—
Mere surface shadow and sunshine, while the sounding unifies all!
One love, one hope, one duty theirs, no matter the time or ken,
There never was separate heart beat in all the races of men!

There is an ancient Gaelic tradition that the Milesians in their wanderings from eastern Europe through Africa and Spain to Ireland were inspired by a prophecy that they would eventually reach a land, a beautiful and glorious land beneath the setting sun, in which fortune and liberty would be forever theirs. Irish bards have envisioned Erin as this isle of dreams, but sometimes I like to think that the prophecy pointed not so much to Ireland as to the United States, the adopted home of John Boyle O'Reilly.

There is an affinity, a deep and abiding affinity between Ireland and America, for their ultimate ideals are the same. We are accustomed to hearing our people referred to as the "Fighting Irish," sometimes as though they fought solely for the pleasure of the row. I will gladly acknowledge that the Irishman enjoys physical contest, but you will search the records of mortal combat in vain for any instance in which a true Irishman was found enlisted in any cause except the cause of freedom. All their long story is the story of a fight for liberty.

Like John Boyle O'Reilly, the American citizen of Irish ancestry could do himself, his people and their principles most justice by putting himself most in harmony with their historic past and let his race find expression in him. When he does that he may be excelled in ability, he may be excelled in strength, he may be excelled in all the qualities of mind and body, but he will never be excelled in liberality, in virtue, or in loyalty; he will never be excelled in the qualities of soul which alone make and preserve freedom.

On the anniversary of the birth of that great poet-statesman, let each of us, as a tribute of respect and honor to John Boyle O'Reilly, dedicate ourselves anew to the defense of democracy.

I know of no epitaph, Mr. Speaker, to be applied to Mr. O'Reilly more appropriate than the words of Mark Antony as he looked down upon another who lay still in death—

His life was gentle and the elements
So mixed in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world
"This was a man!"

Attitude of Department of Justice Toward Insurance Companies—Statement by the Attorney General

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission given me during the course of the debate this afternoon I present for publication in the RECORD the statement submitted by the Attorney General of the United States to the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary this afternoon dealing with

the attitude of the Department of Justice toward insurance companies in the light of the recent decision by the Supreme Court in the Southeastern Underwriters case.

There being no objection, the statement by the Attorney General was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[United States Senate, subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, D. C., Friday, June 23, 1944]

The subcommittee met at 4:30 o'clock p. m., pursuant to notice, Hon. Carl A. Hatch presiding.

Present: Senators HATCH (presiding), O'MAHONEY, MURDOCK, and FERGUSON.

Senator HATCH. We discussed this morning in our subcommittee this insurance bill. There was not much difference as a matter of fact between Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator FERGUSON, but we thought this, with all the talk that is going on that perhaps the Department of Justice should not now institute a lot of prosecutions, and Senator O'MAHONEY reminded us of the public statements you had made. That is what Senator FERGUSON wants to know.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANCIS BIDDLE, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Attorney General BIDDLE. I guess he is entitled to it.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I felt surely you would want to put that statement in evidence.

Attorney General BIDDLE. I will offer the statement in evidence, so you may copy it. I made it partly because Senator RADCLIFFE was always concerned with this.

Senator HATCH. He is president of the Maryland Casualty Co.

Attorney General BIDDLE. After talking to Senator O'MAHONEY I said, "Senator, I think it is very appropriate I should make a statement when the Court hands down a decision," so I made this statement and the substance of it is——

Senator HATCH (interposing). The statement may be included in the record in full at this point.

(The paper referred to is as follows:)

"Since the decision of the Supreme Court on Monday some fears have been expressed that the decision will have the effect of invalidating State regulatory statutes. Similar fears were expressed at the argument of the case, but the majority opinion expressed the belief that these fears are exaggerated. The Department of Justice has no desire or purpose to break down State regulation. Its chief purpose has been to proceed against practices in interstate commerce which are clearly monopolistic or in restraint of such commerce. There need be no conflict between State regulation and the Federal prohibition against such monopolistic practices. As the Supreme Court said: 'Few States go so far as to permit private insurance companies, without State supervision, to agree upon and fix uniform insurance rates. Cf. *Parker* v. *Brown* (317 U. S., 341, 350, 352). No States authorize combinations of insurance companies to coerce, intimidate, and boycott competitors and consumers in the manner here alleged, and it cannot be that any companies have acquired a vested right to engage in such destructive business practices. Indeed the practices which are condemned by the Sherman Act have been imposed on the States by interstate private combinations.

"Some insurance groups have assumed because of former decisions of the Supreme Court that they were free to enter into combinations in restraint of trade or agreements tending to monopolize the insurance business, even though their activities were carried on in interstate commerce, or substantially affected such commerce. But, as the Supreme Court pointed out, the present case was the first in which the Court had been called upon to deal with the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the insurance business. It should be emphasized that the Supreme Court has never in its history said that the prohibitions of the Sherman Act do not apply to the insurance business. Earlier decisions of the Supreme Court relating to insurance involved State regulatory laws; none of them ever involved Federal statutes such as the antitrust laws. The decision Monday, involving a question never before decided, brought a needed clarification as to the application of the Sherman Act to this great and important business.

"Surely this most important business can be conducted in accordance with effective State regulatory laws without resort to private monopolistic and coercive practices which violate the Federal antitrust laws. The insurance companies now have the opportunity to change those rate-fixing and other practices which, under this decision, may be in conflict with the Sherman Act. The Department of Justice realizes that the insurance companies will need to adjust their practices so as to accommodate themselves to the Supreme Court's decision and will be guided by this consideration."

Senator HATCH. You may make your own comment.

Attorney General BIDDLE. What I said in this statement, and what I would like to repeat, is that the Department of Justice does not propose to make any campaign against insurance companies at this time. In fact, I can assure this subcommittee I have not been asked, nor has anybody in the Department of Justice considered taking any action against any insurance company or group of insurance companies until the States have had an opportunity to consider to what extent they may wish to amend their laws or until the Congress of the United States has had a full opportunity of considering whether Congress wishes to amend a Federal statute.

The particular pending case will not be tried this summer. I think it is not unfair for me to point out, as I have already, that that case was not merely a price-fixing case, but included very serious boycotting. It involved boycotting insurance companies, an agent who would not belong to an association, and therefore under the State laws of the State involved in which the association operated many of the acts alleged in the indictment would have been illegal.

I think it is pretty hard on insurance companies that after 75 years of not taking any action, they should now suddenly be declared criminal and therefore the Department has not only determined to give every reasonable time for the States and companies and the Federal Government to take such action as they might deem appropriate, but after consideration, after that period lapsed, we would consider bringing in bills in equity rather than criminal procedures, so the companies would have an opportunity of amending their practices, because it would be unfair to send a man to jail for something he considered legal.

Senator FERGUSON. Would you consider that same thing to be true from the date of the decision until Congress could act?

Attorney General BIDDLE. Certainly.

Senator FERGUSON. Because a man could not say from that day on that was the law.

Attorney General BIDDLE. That is right.

Senator HATCH. I think that just about clarifies it.

Senator FERGUSON. It would not be your intent while this committee was holding hearings to use evidence that we may obtain that there was monopoly and violation? I only say that because some people hesitate coming in because they say this could be a violation of the antitrust laws. Therefore they do not want to come before the Senate committee.

Senator O'MAHONEY. What you seek is a constructive solution of a very obvious problem?

Attorney General BIDDLE. Yes.

Now before I leave that, let me say this, Mr. Cahill has asked us to extend the time within which he can file a petition for reargument. Mr. Cahill being attorney for the insurance companies in the Southeastern case before the Supreme Court. I granted that time. That time has been extended and when we have also told him we would not try the case until August and perhaps not even then, but as I say, that is a very special case, so I do not want anything I have said to indicate I was not going to try that case.

Senator HATCH. For your benefit, I want to say also for Senator FERGUSON, there has been no attitude on the part of this committee to interfere in any way with your trials.

Attorney General BIDDLE. I know, but I think it ought to be put in the record.

May I say a word about our view of this conflict, because I do believe the problem is grossly misunderstood by the public generally and even by the insurance companies.

Senator HATCH. I do not think there is any question about that. It is certainly misunderstood. That is what Senator O'MAHONEY, Senator FERGUSON, and I were talking about on the floor of the Senate today. They just do not know what it is about. They say we are trying to destroy the insurance companies. I know you have no such idea about it, nor does anyone on this committee.

Attorney General BIDDLE. Just in connection with what you say, I have never heard anybody in the Department of Justice or the administration anywhere suggest Federal control of insurance companies.

Senator FERGUSON. Nor have you.

Attorney General BIDDLE. Nor have I. I do not at this time under present facts favor Federal control of insurance companies. I think State control is far more appropriate. Let me say this is——

Senator FERGUSON (interposing). Do you think rate bureaus are an evil that should be curbed? Is it your version at this time that is a violation of the antitrust law?

Attorney General BIDDLE. I think I can answer that better if I may state my theory and come to that later. I am not putting that off for a moment.

My theory is this, that our whole economic theory in America is prices and rates can be controlled in two ways. First, by the law of supply and demand, partly all prices are controlled by supply and demand. Therefore we have made it illegal for prices to be fixed on the interstate level because we think that free competition better serves the people in controlling prices. However, in a field where monopoly seems to be desirable, in a certain limited field, or where limited competition seems to be desirable in certain limited fields, in the fields of railroads and other public utilities, the public is protected by either Federal or State government fixing the rates, so that wherever rates are fixed by the appropriate body, the question of control then by ordinary means of competition is not involved.

I believe, therefore, that wherever the State fixes rates, and I say this from an economic and legal point of view also, wherever the State fixes or approves rates in the insurance field that those rates do not come in conflict when so fixed with the antitrust law, and we are then excluded.

Senator FERGUSON. And if the State permits them to be fixed?

Attorney General BIDDLE. No, I do not think that is true.

Senator FERGUSON. There are only a few States.

Attorney General BIDDLE. I was going to say that it seems that where the States permit rates to be fixed without exercising control the public remains unprotected.

Senator FERGUSON. I wanted to get that.

Attorney General BIDDLE. Therefore the large number of State acts which simply permit rate bureaus to fix rates do very definitely come in conflict with the Federal law. They are only very few States, Texas notably, which their rates, and it seems to me that if the States wish to be free of the compulsion of the antitrust law that they must take a responsibility of actually fixing the rates or proving the rates filed with them, because I cannot see otherwise how the public is protected.

Now there are 17 States, I think, which do not deal in their laws in any way with rates. So in a very large segment of this whole problem there is absolutely no regulation of any kind either by competition or by State control.

I would be very glad to find if this subcommittee felt it would be advisable to examine the whole structure of rate control, of insurance rates, in order to determine what Federal legislation might best conserve the State powers, and at the same time protect the general public because in certain sections of this country I do not feel the public is protected in the insurance field. That is my view.

There has been a great deal of discussion, State rates being set aside and the States being incapable of regulating State rates. Without reading it, I would like the reporter to quote on the record that portion of the Supreme Court's decision in the Southeastern case. I have marked it on pages 11 and 12 and 21 and 22, in which Mr. Justice Black pointed out that this decision does not interfere with appropriate State regulations, nor has the subjecting of industry in many other fields of public utility interfered with the right and duty of the States to fix rates.

(The excerpts from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States referred to are as follows:)

"Another reason advanced to support the result of the cases which follow *Paul* v. *Virginia* has been that, if any aspects of the business of insurance be treated as interstate commerce, 'then all control over it is taken from the States and the legislative regulations which this Court has heretofore sustained must be declared invalid.' Accepted without qualification, that broad statement is inconsistent with many decisions of this Court. It is settled that, for constitutional purposes, certain activities of a business may be intrastate and therefore subject to State control, while other activities of the same business may be interstate and therefore subject to Federal regulation. And there is a wide range of business and other activities which, though subject to Federal regulation, are so intimately related to local welfare that, in the absence of congressional action, they may be regulated or taxed by the States. In marking out these activities the primary test applied by the courts is not the mechanical one of whether the particular activity affected by the State regulation is part of interstate commerce, but rather whether, in each case, the competing demands of the State and national interests involved can be accommodated. And the fact that particular phases of an interstate business or activity have long been regulated or taxed by States has been recognized as a strong reason why, in the continued absence of conflicting congressional action, the State regulatory and tax laws should be declared valid."

Senator O'MAHONEY. I am advised, Mr. Attorney General, that this afternoon a meeting in New York of attorneys representing large insurance companies, particularly life-insurance companies, and they came to the conclusion that nothing in the decision interfered with State regulations. Of course, that has been my contention all along, that there has been no need of interfering, but there is a definite need in some fields supplementing State legislation in order to protect the public interest.

Senator FERGUSON. Senator, do you think that is true where a State law permits a rating bureau, or rather demands a rating bureau, and then after having rating bureau is a violation of the antitrust law?

Senator O'MAHONEY. No; where the State has taken positive action, I think it removes the rating bureau from the field of antitrust violation.

Attorney General BIDDLE. Senator FERGUSON, in your understanding of a rating bureau, the State bears before fixing any rate you——

Senator FERGUSON. Take Texas.

Attorney General BIDDLE. Texas is fine.

Senator FERGUSON. I think where the rating bureau fixes the rate, I think you violate the antitrust law; you can violate a Federal law and be in compliance with State law.

Senator O'MAHONEY. It is not the policy——

Attorney General BIDDLE. I want to assure the committee that if they did wish to go into the field a little further that I will hold hands off while you are investigating the whole subject.

Senator HATCH. I think that assurance from the Attorney General is very important. As a matter of fact, these companies have gone ahead and operated under what they thought was the law. I do not think they should be prosecuted, myself, criminally.

Senator FERGUSON. I do not mean that they have any criminal intent.

Senator HATCH. I do not think so either. I would be very happy if the Department of Justice would hold hands off until Congress can explore the whole field and enact what we think is proper legislation.

Attorney General BIDDLE. It is proper coordination between branches of the Government.

Senator FERGUSON. We do not have any right as Congress to ask that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I want to call the attention of the committee to the concluding paragraph of the comment on the decision, and outlining the policy of the Department, the Attorney General says:

"Surely this most important business can be conducted in accordance with effective State regulatory laws without resort to private monopolistic and coercive practices which violate the Federal antitrust laws. The insurance companies now have the opportunity to change those rate-fixing and other practices which, under this decision, may be in conflict with the Sherman Act. The Department of Justice realizes that the insurance companies will need to adjust their practices so as to accommodate themselves to the Supreme Court's decision and will be guided by this consideration."

Senator FERGUSON. As I understand it, Mr. Attorney General, it is not asked that the insurance companies immediately change their practice?

Attorney General BIDDLE. No.

Senator FERGUSON. Until after we can investigate it.

Attorney General BIDDLE. I think both things will probably be going on at the same time.

Senator FERGUSON. You do not consider if they do not immediately change while we are conducting hearings that therefore we would have criminal prosecutions?

Attorney General BIDDLE. No. There is no thought of that.

Senator HATCH. I want to say this for the record: I have listened to the Attorney General and I have never found anything which he said that sustained the thought that the Federal Government was going out and institute a whole lot of unnecessary prosecutions of people who thought they were complying with the law. I think the attitude of the Department of Justice has been very fine in this whole matter.

Attorney General BIDDLE. I appreciate that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I think I can say on the record that 4 years ago I was invited to Philadelphia to speak to the American Bar Association on this problem of this insurance. There was a difference of time between Washington and Philadelphia. Philadelphia had daylight saving time; Washington did not. I did not know Philadelphia was——

Attorney General BIDDLE. A little behind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In any event I arrived there after I was scheduled to appear, so I was late for my appointment and another gentleman was talking. The burden of his speech to the Bar Association was that the Government at Washington intended to lay its heavy hand upon the treasuries of the insurance companies.

Senator FERGUSON. Of course, we have some history.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The unfounded charge was being made that there was a definite purpose of the Federal Government to seize these funds. Well, fortunately, I came in after the meeting had begun, and not before, so that I was able to reply to that charge and to show that there was no basis for the charge. Fortunately, as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee which had studied the life-insurance field, I was able to say the Securities and Exchange Commission, which had participated in the study and which was represented on the Committee itself, had not ever suggested any such thing, that nobody had made such a suggestion to the Committee. It was never considered before the Committee that there should be Federal supervision or any attempt to take over the funds of life-insurance companies.

Therefore, I am very happy, Mr. Attorney General, you made the statement today that nobody in the Department of Justice ever suggested that.

Senator HATCH. Mr. Reporter, everything here you have taken down this afternoon may be given to the reporters.

(At 5 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned.)

Veterans' Rights Under the G. I. Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, this war will not go on forever. One of these days it will be over; I pray soon.

We will then face a tremendous problem. It will be a problem of returning all these fighting men and women, too, back into normal channels of civilian life. This is a most important problem because it affects 10 percent of our entire population. It is the most vigorous 10 percent of the Nation—the young men and women upon whom the future welfare of this country will depend. Every effort must be made that nothing will interfere with the physical and economic development of this segment of our people.

They will be coming back at a time when the country's national economy

may be under terrific strain, when millions now employed in war production may be laid off, plants may shut down; no one can accurately predict the shape of those things to come.

But one prediction can be made with certainty. The millions of men and women returning from the war fronts and camps will need jobs, money, training, hospitalization, and other assistance. They will expect stability and security, so that they can start rebuilding their private lives.

We must give them all that. It is the least we can do for them because they will have given us continued freedom and liberty.

The G. I. bill of rights will provide a sound, modest, constructive plan for dealing with the entire veteran problem of this war. It will substitute order and system for the chaos and confusion now existing as a dozen different Government agencies are quarreling over control of certain functions for veterans. It will centralize responsibility, reduce red tape, eliminate overlapping services, reduce costs, and, most of all, assure the new veterans of a decent break.

Under the G. I. bill which was passed by Congress, the veterans have the following rights:

TITLE I. HOSPITALIZATION, CLAIMS, AND PROCEDURES

First. Adequate organization of the Veterans' Administration to administer all veterans' benefits except employment.

Second. Adequate hospital facilities for the care and treatment of veterans for nonservice disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

Third. The right to have explained to him before discharge or release from active service all rights and benefits to which he may be entitled as a veteran, and an opportunity, if he so desires, to file a claim therefor.

Fourth. The right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefit in the use of such appliances.

Fifth. Adequate safeguards as against forced statements against interest.

Sixth. Adequate contact facilities in Army and Navy discharge centers, including those furnished by the services, by the American Red Cross, by national veterans' organizations, and by the Veterans' Administration.

Seventh. Prompt transfer of the essential records of service departments to the Veteran's Administration and prompt adjudication of claims for benefits.

Eighth. The right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service, (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (b) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (c) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (a) and (b) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

TITLE II. EDUCATION OF VETERANS

First. One year, or the equivalent thereof in continuous part-time study of education or training (a) at any school or institution of his own choice; (b) in any subject or subjects desired for which he is fitted.

Second. Not to exceed 3 additional years of education and training, dependent upon (a) length of service; (b) satisfactory progress in studies or training; (c) the condition that the person was not over 25 years of age at the time of entrance into service, or if over such age, that his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of entrance into service.

Third. Payment of all tuition and other fees, the cost of books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses not to exceed a maximum of $500 per school year.

Fourth. Subsistence allowance while pursuing education or training in the amount of $50 per month if without dependents, or $75 per month with a dependent or dependents.

Fifth. Part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance, but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

Sixth. The right to have released to him books and equipment furnished if he satisfactorily completes his course of education or training.

NOTE.—The right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

TITLE III. LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

First. Loans for the purposes stated or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000; (a) loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions; (b) interest rate must not exceed 4 percent per annum; (c) the loan must be practicable and suitable to the veteran's circumstances; (d) the loan must be repaid within 20 years; (e) the Government must have the right of subrogation to the extent of any guaranty paid; (f) the liability under the guaranty must decrease or increase with the decrease or increase of the amount of unpaid obligation; (g) the agreement must permit the Government to protect itself in case of default through the right to bid on foreclosure proceedings or to refinance; (h) the proceeds of the proposed loan must be used for one or more of the purposes specified and the circumstances must meet the specifications of the title.

Second. In the event a principal loan is made—or committed to be made—by a Federal lending agency, or to be guaranteed or insured by such agency, a loan for all or part of the balance of the purchase price may be guaranteed; (a) if it does not exceed $2,000; (b) if it does not exceed 20 percent of the cost or purchase price; (c) if the interest rate does not exceed by more than 1 percent the interest rate on the principal loan; (d) if the conditions otherwise meet those prescribed under (1) above.

Third. Any veteran eligible under title III shall also be eligible for the benefits of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant. Eligibility must be determined (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, (b) by the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE IV. EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

First. The right to registration for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service through (a) the United States Employment Service, (b) any State employment agency cooperating with the United States Employment Service.

Note: First. This right applies to any veteran of any war discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

Note: Second. While the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is responsible for veterans' employment, this is not a function of the Veterans' Administration, but is retained in the United States Employment Service.

TITLE V. READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

Unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed, subject to the following conditions:

First. The week of unemployment must have begun (a) after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the effective date of the act; (b) not later than 2 years after discharge or release from active service or the termination of the war, whichever be the later date.

Second. The person is not receiving subsistence allowance for education or training under title XI of the act, or increased pension for vocational training under Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Third. To be eligible, the person must (a) reside in the United States; (b) be completely unemployed, or if partially employed, at wages less than $23 per week; (c) be registered with and report to a public employment office; (d) be able to work and available for suitable work.

Fourth. Any person will be disqualified from receiving an allowance if (a) he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause, or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; (b) he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work or to accept suitable work offered; (c) he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; (d) he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

Fifth. Within the 52 weeks limit the total eligibility is determined by allow-

ing 8 weeks of allowances for each of the first 3 months of service, and 4 weeks of allowances for each month or major fraction thereof of service beyond 3 months.

Sixth. No allowance may be paid for any period more than 5 years after the end of the war.

Seventh. The allowance of $20 per week will be reduced by any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation—other than pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration—received by the veteran for the same period of time.

Eighth. Any person self-employed for profit in an independent establishment, trade, business, profession, or other vocation is eligible for readjustment allowances (a) if net earnings are less than $100 for the previous calendar month; (b) the amount of allowance to be the difference between the net earnings and $100 per month; (c) the conditions as to eligibility otherwise as provided in title V.

Ninth. Severe penalties are provided for fraud and misrepresentation in connection with claims for readjustment allowances.

Tenth. Readjustment allowance claims are to be serviced by State agencies or as to railway employees, by the Railroad Retirement Board.

Eleventh. Right of appeal from any such agency to the Administration of Veterans' Affairs is preserved.

Title VI. General administrative and penal provisions:

First. By definition "veterans" are included those who reside within the continental United States, several States, Territories, and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

Second. A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable is made a prerequisite to entitlement to benefits under Public Law No. 2, as amended, as well as this act. This will apply to (a) pensions, (b) compensation, (c) hospitalization, (d) domiciliary care, (e) vocational training, (f) benefits provided by this act.

The bill will prevent a repetition of the tragic mistakes under which World War No. 1 veterans suffered and will guarantee just treatment to our veterans.

Post-War Problems of the Building Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address of Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, before the annual meeting of the Building Officials Conference of America, Inc., at Boston, Mass., June 14, 1944:

I am very happy to be with you today, because you, as public buildings officials, and we in the Federal Works Agency, which is a construction arm of the United States Government, will have increasingly many problems in common.

For a long time I have felt that in the transition period immediately after the war we should be able to look to construction work of all kinds to make an important contribution to national economic stability; and it seemed to me that those of us who are directly interested in such activities should be preparing ourselves now to handle increased responsibilities.

The interest of the Federal Works Agency in the subject may be appreciated when the scope of our operations is borne in mind. F. W. A. has come to be identified with the administration of the Lanham Act, under which we are assisting communities in war-impacted areas to acquire and operate public facilities essential in the war effort, but actually the Lanham Act operations are a minor part of our responsibilities. The Agency includes the Public Roads Administration, which supervises all highway activities of the Federal Government in aid to States; the Public Buildings Administration, which is responsible for the erection, maintenance, and operation of federally owned buildings; and formerly included the United States Housing Authority, which was transferred to the new National Housing Agency for the duration under the President's War Powers Act. Other constituent units were the Public Works Administration and W. P. A., now in liquidation. Not only are our operations far-flung, but they go down to the grass roots of the Nation and involve the closest sort of cooperation between the States and local communities and the Federal Government.

In normal times construction accounts for from 10 to 12 percent of the national income. It is obvious, therefore, that a high level of construction after the war could make a most important contribution to general well-being. In a national annual income of $140,000,000,000, which is the figure generally mentioned as essential if we are to have something like full employment, the construction industry's contribution ought to be somewhere between 14 billion and 17 billion dollars.

But construction must be planned in all its details in advance of contract letting, and it is obvious that, unless the planning is completed before the close of hostilities, construction will not be able to play an important part immediately afterwards, and there may be no jobs in construction for war veterans or displaced war workers at a time when jobs may be desperately needed.

It is important, therefore, that the planning should be under way now, and it is equally important that we should know how much is under way. This we do not know. We do not yet know how much purely private construction to expect. We do not know how many businessmen already have draftsmen at work producing blueprints for new office buildings, stores, factories or apartment houses. My impression is that very little has yet been done by private business, for it seems logical to think that business men generally will be disposed to wait and see what the post-war situation is going to be before making capital commitments.

About a third of all construction in normal times is public construction. Here, at least, we have a pretty good idea what the need will be. During the war, public building, except for such as is directly essential to the war effort, is being postponed, so that the Nation is accumulating a large backlog of potential public work represented by the new schools, hospitals, highways, bridges, sewer and water systems, and so on, which would have been built over the last 3 or 4 years if there had been no war. In addition to this potential backlog is deferred maintenance work—the normal day-to-day minor improvements and repairs that would have been made had labor and materials been available.

This public portion of our desired post-war construction volume can be planned now—planned in all of its details, complete with engineering surveys, working drawings, site acquisition, specifications, and contract documents, all ready to go at the first indication there are not enough jobs in private business to go around.

I have tried very hard to find out just how much of this public work has been planned against demobilization day. The task has not been an easy one, because I have been given no authority to collect information on the matter, nor is there anywhere else in the Government any agency authorized to collect, classify, or tabulate such information. So far as I can find out, the amount of State and municipal planning under way is far too little to make any appreciable contribution to economic stability immediately after the war, and I have urged a modest amount of Federal assistance to the communities in order to stimulate the preparation of a really adequate program.

I thought my quest for definite information as to the amount of public planning now going forward would be in vain until, recently, I read the testimony given by Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, before the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. Johnston, as well as the Chamber, is opposed to Federal aid to States and communities for public works. His position is that the States and local communities are in a far better financial position than the Federal Government, and that they are not only capable of doing their own planning without outside assistance but are actually doing it. To quote his words, "The depression role of the States and communities as pauper and the Federal Government as prince has changed. It should remain changed."

Mr. Johnson told the committee that "recent surveys indicate that municipalities alone have ready for contract, or on the drafting board, or under survey, capital improvements valued at some $3,700,000,000. This," he added, "is not a mere listing of more or less desirable projects. It is needed work which is being put into blueprints * * * It means that we are assured that useful public works will provide their share of employment after the war."

I read that and exclaimed, "Eureka! In the words of the old hymn, 'This is the day I long have sought, and mourned because I found it not.' This is something definite to tie to."

But, being somewhat cautious by nature, I thought I had better get the actual figures on which Mr. Johnston's statement was based. So we asked the Chamber of Commerce and were told that, "No, the Chamber itself had no figures and that Mr. Johnston's statement was based upon material that had been collected by the American Public Works Association."

Now, it happens that Herbert D. Fritz, executive director of the American Public Works Association, also testified before the House committee. He said that the association had sent out questionnaires to a number of cities and had received replies from 68, ranging in size from Greendale, Wis. (population 2,700), to San Francisco. These replies indicated that one-twelfth of the cities in this group could have let contracts on January 1, 1944, for something like $50,000,000 worth of work. On the same day, the survey disclosed, surveys and plans had been instituted for capital improvements valued at around $140,000,000, and it was

interesting to note that preliminary surveys of a general nature have been started on projects aggregating about $440,000,000 worth of construction.

Mr. Fritz then went on to explain that the data, secured from "a fairly representative sample of the municipalities of the Nation, might be projected to provide a rough estimate of advance plan preparation of all cities under a million population. On this basis," he said, "it can be estimated that capital improvements valued at $550,000,000 were ready for contract on January 1, 1944, in the cities under a million population. By the same token, $1,600,000,000 worth of work was under survey or on the drafting board, and, if our studies are not too far out of line, a total of $3,780,000,000 worth of public improvements were being given preliminary study."

Mr. Fritz then threw in this caution: "Do not think that the last-named improvements (the $3,780,000,000 worth) are ready for contract. In many instances, 1-year, 2-year, 5-year, or 10-year programs are being listed and studied at this moment."

This, then, is where Mr. Johnston gets his figure of $3,700,000,000. As Mr. Fritz presented it, it did not pretend to be an actual tabulation. It was merely a projection on the basis of a very small sample. But when Mr. Johnston got around to using it, it was no longer a mere projection—a mere guess; it had become a recent survey that indicated that "municipalities alone have ready for contract or on the drafting board or under survey, capital improvements valued at some $3,700,000,000." Moreover, he said, "This is not a mere listing of more or less desirable projects. It is needed work which is being put into blueprints. * * * It means that we are assured that useful public works will provide their share of employment after the war." With due deference to Mr. Johnston, it very obviously doesn't mean anything of the kind.

Now, observe that Mr. Fritz didn't say that $3,700,000,000 worth of public improvements were on the drafting board or under survey. He simply said that they were being given preliminary study, which is something entirely different. That might mean actual work with rod and transit, but it also might mean no more than that some desirable projects had been mentioned by the mayor in an after-dinner speech.

Yet this is the data which, it appears, Mr. Johnston uses, without Mr. Fritz's cautious qualifications, to substantiate his position that an adequate job of public-works planning is being done and that no Federal assistance is necessary. He also fails to mention the fact that of the cities responding to the questionnaire of the American Public Works Association, 68 percent answered the question, "Do you feel that local advance plan preparation could be furthered by Federal assistance?" with an unequivocal "Yes." Mr. Fritz pointed out that his association is urging Federal participation to the extent of 50 percent of the cost of surveys and the preparation of detailed construction plans and specifications for needed and useful public works in the transition period.

But let's be generous. Let's assume that $3,700,000,000 worth of public work has been not merely talked about, that it is not merely in process of survey, but that it is actually planned in all its details with working drawings and specifications and contract documents, so that it could be let to contract within 24 hours after peace comes. The figure is impressive, but how does it stack up with past experience? We have some information on that. In 1939 regular expenditures for public works in this country, plus work relief, came to a little more than $4,000,000,000, so that the best we can hope for by Mr. Johnston's calculation in the first post-war year, when unemployment may reach maximum proportions, is a quarter of a billion dollars less than in the last full year before the war.

There are some other estimates of the volume of public work now in process of planning. The International City Managers' Association has made a survey, based on a larger sampling of municipalities, and estimates that American cities of more than 25,000 population are planning capital improvements to cost more than $4,500,000,000 during the first 5 years after the war. That gives us an average of $900,000,000 a year for 5 years, or about half the regular Government expenditures for public improvements in the tough depression year 1932. Moreover, from half to two-thirds of this sum will be spent on maintenance and not new construction, according to the City Managers' Association, whereas the figure cited for 1932 was all new construction in addition to maintenance.

The American Society of Planning Officials, commenting on the city managers' survey, observes that, "in spite of debt reductions and money saved, it seems fair to say that only a very limited amount of public works can be undertaken with presently foreseeable municipal funds."

If, after 2½ years of war, the best that American cities can do is adequately reflected by even the most optimistic of the estimates now available, it isn't good enough. Something must be done to stimulate planning, and that stimulus, in my judgment, will have to be some sort of Federal financial aid for plan preparation, either on a loan or grant basis. As Mr. Fritz remarks, "If you want the dough to rise, you have to put some yeast in it."

In advocating Federal assistance for planning I am not thinking or talking in terms of billions. I am thinking in terms of a few millions, perhaps about what the war is costing us every 12 hours, expenditure of which may mean the difference between success and failure. The Nation has a responsibility here, for it is a war-connected problem. The Federal Government cannot, through its war policies, disorganize the normal course of American life, draft the young manhood of the Nation, spend billions of dollars to stimulate munitions production with all that has meant in the way of reshuffling the lives of millions of men and women, and then, once the war is won, wash its hands of the consequences of its own policies and throw back upon the local communities or upon private business the problem of unscrambling the mess on the job front. I don't think we are going to accept Mr. Johnston's advice, fold our hands and wait for "George" to do it. If we do not mean to have a job program that will mean something in terms of bread and butter to our discharged servicemen and to our demobilized war workers, we might as well confess our moral and intellectual bankruptcy now.

Yet, more than jobs are at stake. Additional public facilities are needed on their own account and as an adjunct to that expansion of private business which we must have in the post-war period.

A well-planned program of public work, ready for use when and where needed, is one essential, but it would be a mistake to suppose that it alone will solve all of our post-war problems or that, alone, it will stabilize the construction industry. I am in agreement with Mr. Johnston on that.

In addition to public building, we should do everything possible to stimulate private building. Of course, the decision as to whether private capital will build in the immediate post-war period will be made by private capital itself. You and I cannot directly influence the judgment of the market, but we can, at least, do everything possible to remove unnecessary obstacles in the way of private building.

This would be a good time to reexamine our State and local building codes to see whether they still rest upon a logical basis or merely reflect accretions of rules and regulations imposed at the instance of various pressure groups.

Our experience has been that existing codes range all the way from the unbelievably lax to the almost prohibitively rigid. I know of one State with a plumbing code that, I was told by a local board of education member, needlessly added $70,000 to the cost of every $400,000 schoolhouse by its requirements as to the large number of toilets that must be provided. Repeated surveys had shown that all those toilets could not possibly be in use at one time, but there they stand in rows of glistening white.

We need also to be especially receptive to the new materials which no doubt will emerge from this war.

Sometime you ought to invite Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency, to tell your conference about the research work he is constantly carrying on in the fields of building design, building materials, and construction techniques. The ordinary architect designs a building and is then through with it. He may never see it again. The same is true of the ordinary building contractor. The Public Buildings Administration, on the contrary, not only designs and constructs buildings, but it has to live with them ever after. Consequently it has an enormous interest in the cost of their operation and maintenance.

In Washington alone, the Government owns or rents space in 383 buildings, so you can see the tremendous importance to the taxpayers of improving the quality of construction and reducing operating costs. Those 383 buildings represent 47,000,000 gross square feet of floor space. Imagine the economies that would result if you could reduce the cost of cleaning those buildings by as little as 1 cent a square foot. It would amount to nearly $500,000 annually, or about 5 percent of the total cleaning bill. Such economies are not to be achieved alone by time-motion studies of the techniques of pushing a mop around; they can be achieved also, and to an even greater extent, by eliminating crooks and crannies that require extra cleaning. Why, for instance, should baseboards be set out an inch or so from the wall, leaving a ledge for the charwoman to have to clean? Why not make them flush with the wall and bring relief to the poor woman's aching back?

Mr. Reynolds tells me that if he finds P. B. A. doing a certain thing in the same way for as much as 2 years in succession he knows it is being done wrong and that it is time to change. I suspect that is a humorous exaggeration, but it does emphasize a very proper concern about the danger of falling into ruts. There is no question that much of our architecture is purely traditional, loaded with "carry-overs" from grandfather's day.

To quote Mr. Reynolds, again, the time has come when design must be based upon a rational concept of use, with emphasis upon adaptability of space and minimum operating costs.

Take the matter of windows. A window exists for one purpose, and only one: To let light into the room. It isn't set into the wall just to look pretty, although, of course, it may have some decorative value. Its proper function is to let in maximum light, and anything that detracts from that function is worse than waste. This brings up the whole problem of window spacing, in which much research is being done. And it leads naturally into a study of the artificial lighting of interiors, with proper intensities for the work to be done. Colors of walls and floor coverings and reflecting surfaces of desks and equipment are also relevant. The National Electric Light Association has done a great deal of research into this subject,

and shown that for office work the intensity of the lighting can be stepped down if the paper and ink used are only of the right colors. It is safe to say that millions of dollars in light bills now wasted annually could be saved by a more intelligent use of lighting. In Government buildings hereafter we mean to save them.

Greater attention hereafter will be given to other mechanical features—such as plumbing, heating, and air conditioning. The double glazing of windows, to keep out summer heat and winter cold, unquestionably will come more and more into use. P. B. A. is running a number of studies on the insulation of outside walls, and also on solar heating. The one greatest source of heat in our solar system is the sun itself. Why not find a way to use it, and so cut down our fuel bills?

You will hear more hereafter of radiant heating, by which I mean the heating of large surfaces, such as walls, floors, and ceilings, rather than the often futile attempt to heat the atmosphere. I am told that in Des Moines, Iowa, there is an office building under construction, the walls of which are insulated with cork. Also in the walls heating pipes are imbedded. With radiant heating you will be as comfortable with a temperature of 65 degrees as you are at 70 with traditional heating appliance. Given a combination of radiant and solar heating, and next time we won't have to worry so much about our fuel oil coupons and labor troubles in the coal mines.

The problem of vertical transportation—which is to say, elevator service—is entitled to more study than has yet been given it. Mr. Reynolds tells me that in one of our Federal buildings the design called for 17 elevators. "But why 17?" he asked. "Why not 16 or 19?" He was assured that the matter had had most careful consideration, and that 17, no more and no less, was the correct answer. But using just about the same methods that a traffic engineer would apply to the development of a street layout, it was discovered that a high percentage of the traffic would be between the basement, with its cafeteria, and the third floor. What was done was to install 2 escalators—which can be operated at a power cost of less than 75 cents a day each per floor—and 7 larger elevators instead of 17. The savings included space that otherwise would have been wasted, plus the services of 10 elevator operators.

You are familiar with the traditional American post office. You enter the lobby and are confronted by a high partition, back of which the clerks work, with here and there a barred window labeled, respectively, "Stamps—retail," "Registered mail," "Parcel post"—and so on down the line.

What is the logic of this arrangement? There isn't any. I presume it was copied from bank architecture. It is interesting to note, however, that many of the banks themselves are getting away from barred windows. The post office in the future will have a simple counter on which the customer can rest his elbows and transact his business with a feeling that he is dealing with a human being and not a bureaucratic robot. We will give the clerk, and the customer too, plenty of elbow room instead of confining their transaction to a two-by-four slit in a grilled window. And you'll find that each clerk can wait on two or three times as many people in an hour as he can now in his little barred cage.

Returning to the subject of toilets—and you understand, of course, that my interest in them is wholly scientific—Mr. Reynolds predicts that in the future all fixtures, including wash stands and toilet seats, will be suspended from the walls and the partitions from the ceiling. The janitor will not then have to spend 2 hours a night on his knees scrubbing around the fixtures; he will clean the whole room in 5 minutes simply by turning a hose on it.

The work of the P. B. A. research laboratories is of significance, not merely to the Government and the taxpayers, but to all builders everywhere. Some building material manufacturers are engaged in research, usually limited to developing new uses for their own product, but the P. B. A., so far as I know, is the only agency in the country today that is conducting objective studies on a regular, continuing basis into the whole range of building materials, design, and construction. Perhaps it is the only one whose construction and managerial operations are on a large enough scale to justify the cost.

There is nothing secret about this work. The public pays for it and the results are public property. They are available to every architect, contractor, or building commissioner who cares to ask for them. They will more and more find wide application in the work of all builders and owners of buildings.

It is especially toward the newer ideas and the newer materials that I hope we will keep our minds receptive. They point the way to better conditions of living and working in the post-war world. And especially in the transition period they can perform an important service from which our whole economy can, and will, benefit.

Sermon by Rev. Joseph S. O'Connell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein a sermon preached by the Reverend Joseph S. O'Connell, pastor of the Roman Catholic Church of the Epiphany.

This sermon was delivered at a solemn high mass arranged by the Anawanda Club of New York City for all its members and the community to pray for the success of the invasion. The services were held on Monday morning, June 12, at 8 o'clock mass.

Father O'Connell is a distinguished prelate of the Catholic Church of New York City, having served for many years as the director of all the Catholic hospitals in the archdiocese of New York.

We gather this morning in these sacred precincts to acknowledge our dependence on God, our Father. In this hour of trial and anxiety we turn to Him who has given us so many and so great gifts and ask His further blessing on our country and particularly on our armed forces. Our purpose here this morning is fourfold. First, we place ourselves humbly at the feet of our Father, acknowledging our own short-comings and the favors we have abused, and we pledge ourselves so to live our daily lives that we might deserve His blessings on our efforts. Secondly, realizing the brotherhood in Christ that binds us together we join our efforts in prayer with the valiant deeds of our brothers in arms that success may crown our undertakings. Thirdly, conscious that this is not a 1-day affair we pledge to God our untiring efforts to please Him and to our fighting men our continued prayers to keep them. Finally, for those who shall never return we pray the mercy of God. We pray that those about to make the supreme sacrifice of life itself may die in His friendship and that all the war dead may enjoy that real peace, eternal peace, greater by far than the peace they are fighting for and which we hope soon to enjoy.

The Pittsburgh Courier Denounces Failure to Enact Anti-Poll-Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include herewith an editorial entitled "What Price Trickery," published in the Pittsburgh Courier, largest and most influential Negro newspaper. With a highly serious concern, not only for the Negro people, but for the future of democratic America this great journal, with over 1,000,000 readers, points with deep regret to the failure of this session of the Congress to enact H. R. 7, my anti-poll-tax bill. It indicates that Negro Americans, who are serving so gallantly in our armed forces in every theater of war and who are contributing their full share to our home-front war effort, have reached a political maturity. This is a welcome sign for all America. I invite the careful reading and consideration of my colleagues to this editorial:

WHAT PRICE TRICKERY?

Negro Americans have important lessons to learn from the gesture of the Republican majority in the United States Senate to sponsor a resolution calling for an amendment to the Constitution abolishing poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. No fair-minded person wishes to impugn the motives of the Republicans for this gesture. We will assume that it is genuine and honest. We cannot get away from the belief, however, that the same initiative and the same action should have been taken years and years ago; especially, when the Republicans had great majorities in both Houses of Congress.

Negro Americans have important lessons to learn from the recent failure of the Senate of the United States to enact a Federal anti-poll-tax law. We need to examine with thoughtful care all of the circumstances which led to the defeat of this vital measure.

Federal anti-poll-tax bills have been before the Congress for 6 years. Exhaustive congressional hearings on the bills have been held, with hundreds of witnesses. On two occasions 218 Members of the House of Representatives have signed a discharge petition to force consideration of the legislation because the Judiciary Committee of the House, with HATTON SUMNERS, of Texas, as chairman, undemocratically pigeonholed the bills. Twice the House of Representatives by a vote of approximately two to one adopted the legislation. Twice the Senate Judiciary Committee by a substantial majority reported favorably on the bill and placed it on the Senate calendar. Each time it has come to the floor of the Senate a majority of the Senators have publicly expressed themselves as favoring passage of the bill.

In the 6 years the bill has been pending in Congress it has amassed tremendous popular support. All sections of organized labor: The A. F. of L., the C. I. O., the railroad brotherhoods have worked actively for passage of the measure. Great numbers of church, women's, Negro, and civic groups have supported it. From the southern poll-tax States have come the support of thousands of white southerners urging its passage. Few measures have demonstrated such overwhelming popular support from all sections of America.

Not even the bitterest opponent of the Federal antipoll tax legislation denies the evils of the poll-tax system. Poll-tax requirements now inextricably imbedded in the State constitutions of eight Southern States were adopted between 1890 and 1908 for the express purpose of depriving Negro citizens of the right to vote. The men who wrote these provisions said this explicitly in the constitutional conventions of these States. The effect over the years of poll-tax restrictions, coupled with fraudulent practices in registering Negro voters, and, until recently, the white Democratic primary, has been to eliminate fully 95 percent of the Negro citizens of the South from any participation in the elections. These restrictions have barred 4,000,000 Negroes from voting. The cancer spread. Now 6,000,000 poor white citizens are also voteless. Corruption has crept into the system. Political machines, built upon the manipulation of large blocs of poll-tax receipts never seen by the voters in whose names they are issued, now dominate scores of large southern cities. From the poll tax States come Representatives to Congress, elected by less than 10 percent of the adult citizens, who year after year throttle the entire Nation with their reactionary control of the national machinery of legislation.

Nor should it be supposed that the fight to abolish the poll tax is a tempest in a teapot simply because of the seeming smallness of the poll tax levy. The poll-tax system is not as simple as that. One or two dollars is a sum of great proportion to a Negro sharecropper's family, whose total annual income may be less than $200. In Mississippi one has to pay his poll tax each year for 2 years prior to February 1 before he is eligible to register as a voter. In many of the States poll taxes are cumulative and payable far in advance of elections. These are real and not imaginary hardships, especially for people deprived of the opportunity to earn a decent living or secure an adequate public school education.

For 50 years these restrictions have robbed the Negro in the South of the right to vote. The price of his votelessness has been poor schools, urban and rural slums, miserable health facilities, indescribable poverty, lynchings, and mob violence—a total pattern of discrimination which has made him a second-class citizen.

With America engaged in a crucial war struggle for the very survival of her democratic institutions, the abolition of barriers which disfranchise 10,000,000 Americans becomes a vital necessity for victory. Such action would release tremendous pent-up energies of millions of voteless Americans, Negro and white, for the American war effort. It would give sorely needed assurance to Negro Americans, and to millions of colonial peoples of the darker races, without whose enthusiastic aid the day of our victory over Japan is long postponed, that the declarations of the Atlantic Charter are meant to bring freedom and democracy to all peoples. Thus the passage of the anti-poll-tax bill means the saving of the lives of tens of thousands of young Americans now dying for the democratic cause.

It is against this background of undisputed fact that Negro Americans and all Americans must judge the shameful hypocrisy which characterized the action of the Senate of the United States in killing the anti-poll-tax bill.

The leadership of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in the Senate engaged in tricky parliamentary maneuvers designed to confuse the American people, and to shift the blame for the shameful defeat of the bill to the other side.

In the interests of democracy it is necessary to cut through this camouflage and lay bare the facts.

Take first the role played by Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, majority leader of the Senate. He voted for cloture. He was on record to vote for the bill if it could be brought to vote. When his cloture motion failed, he told the Senate that he would vote to take the bill from the Senate floor, since he believed that without cloture the bill could not be passed and since continued filibuster would result only in preventing passage of urgent legislation vital to the prosecution of the war. On the surface, no one could ask for more than this.

But let us look beneath the surface. The anti-poll-tax bill was passed in the House on May 25, 1943. It did not reach the floor of the Senate for nearly 1 year. From May until November 1943 the delaying tactics of Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, were successful in keeping the bill bottled up in the Senate Judiciary Committee. Then, on November 12, 1943, the bill was reported out of the committee and placed on the Senate Calendar.

For 150 legislative days the bill stayed on the calendar without action. Senator BARKLEY says this was because the Senate could not interrupt its business of passing vital war measures. Yet for 71 of those days the Senate did not meet because it had no business of any kind to transact.

It lay within the power of Senator BARKLEY to force consideration of the bill as early as November 12, 1943, if not sooner. It lay within his power, and was his patriotic duty, to keep the Senate in session for as many days and as many hours each day as was necessary to defeat the treasonable filibuster of the poll-tax bloc. Moreover he knew that if the bill were on the floor of the Senate, no Senator on either side would dare refuse his request for unanimous consent to suspend, temporarily, debate on the measure to take up and dispose of any important war measure requiring immediate action.

But instead of pursuing this course—a course urged publicly in the Senate by his colleagues, Senators WAGNER and MEAD of New York—Senator BARKLEY prematurely introduced a cloture motion he knew would fail; and, then, after but 5 days of debate supported the motion of Senator CLARK of Missouri which killed the bill. Negroes in Kentucky should remember Senator BARKLEY this fall.

The conclusion seems inescapable that BARKLEY no more wanted to see the anti-poll tax bill passed than did EILEO of Mississippi. Both BARKLEY and BILBO seemed to fear the ground swell of public resentment which would have been certain to have arisen if the filibuster had continued several weeks; a public opinion that would have engulfed the filibuster and developed enough pressure to make certain a successful cloture vote. BARKLEY played ball with the poll-tax bloc. All his fine words cannot hide his ugly deeds.

But the duplicity of Republican leadership in the Senate is equally intolerable. During the present Congress on every issue in which the Republican Party had a vital stake, Republican Senators voted as a solid bloc. They could have done so on the anti-poll-tax bill had they not been so intent in making cheap political capital out of embarrassing the Democratic Party before the Negro voter. Instead, the Republican Senators adopted the two-faced policy of coming out for passage of the bill, but of having just enough of their number vote against cloture to defeat the cloture motion. Thirteen Republican Senators joined hands with the Negro-hating poll-tax Democrats to defeat cloture, knowing full well that without cloture all their fine talk about favoring anti-poll-tax legislation was sounding brass and tinkling cymbals.

Nor was the Republican leadership any more active than BARKLEY in forcing the measure to the floor of the Senate and keeping it there. It was Senate Republican Minority Leader WALLACE WHITE, of Maine, safe in the knowledge that he has few Negro voters in his State, who jumped to the support of CLARK of Missouri, BARKLEY of Kentucky, and CONNALLY of Texas in their successful effort to take the anti-poll-tax bill off the Senate floor. This was an act of deceit for which the Republican Senators cannot evade responsibility.

Negro Americans—nearly a million of us in the armed service of our country and millions more giving their best effort to the cause of a democratic victory—had a right to expect better treatment on this burning moral issue. We had a right to expect honest dealings from both Democratic and Republican Senate leadership, not double-talk.

We had a right to expect President Franklin D. Roosevelt to use his fullest energies publicly and privately for the passage of this bill. It was not enough for him to express disapproval of the poll-tax system. The abolition of the poll tax was a war measure of signal importance to America's war effort. Certainly the President missed his golden opportunity when he failed to call for the passage of this bill. He has called for must legislation before.

We had a right to expect that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, the leading aspirant for the Republican nomination, would do more than deliver himself of pious expression against the poll tax.

This is the way the matter stands today. There should not be a Negro American today who does not pledge himself to register now in order to cast his vote in the November elections.

The Negro vote is already of first-rate importance in the coming elections. But it can become much more powerful if the hundreds of thousands of women, of war workers and their families who have moved to different war centers, take steps now to register. In most States this is not too late. In most States tens of thousands of unregistered Negro citizens can make themselves eligible to vote by acting now.

To be eligible to vote is one thing. To have the will and the intelligence to cast a vote and to realize that wrongs may be righted only at the ballot box is a duty and a privilege.

Outstanding County Farm Family Forged Ahead During Last 3 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, do you remember the Oklahoma dust storms and the "Okies"? Here is a story of an Oklahoma farm family who stayed in Oklahoma, and last year won recognition as winners in a Farmers' Union State contest for showing the most progress of

F. S. A. families in five counties—and it is a story of a piece of Oklahoma land which never again will blow away. The story was published last year in the Progressive Farmer.

OUTSTANDING COUNTY FARM FAMILY FORGED AHEAD DURING LAST 3 YEARS

The Blanchard Osborn family on last Thursday received their recognition as winners in the Farmers' Union State contest for the best farm family showing the most progress in Farm Security Administration, district No. 5, consisting of five counties.

The Osborn family consists of father, mother, a son, Floyd 16, and a son, James 13. Before going into the accomplishments of the Osborn family for 1942 we will give you a little of their family history and background.

Mr. and Mrs. Osborn were both reared on farms and after their marriage, 18 years ago, started to farm for themselves as tenants. During the latter part of the twenties they were fairly successful, but due to drought, sickness, and depression in the thirties they lost all they had and during 1939, Mr. Osborn worked as a farm laborer. In November 1939 they applied for a loan from Farm Security Administration; with this loan of $590 they bought 3 cows, 5 work horses, 20 chickens, and farm machinery to start farming again on a rented farm. They made plans, kept records, and worked hard and were reasonably successful that year and increased their net worth from $465 to $640.

In 1941 Osborn was able to rent additional land and he and the rural supervisor thought that it would be to his advantage to change from horse power to tractor farming, so an additional loan was made to them for $795 to buy this equipment. At the end of 1941 their net worth was $2,446. When we visited in their home recently to obtain information for this story, Mrs. Osborn showed us the three record books which she has kept during the 3 years they have been financed by Farm Security Administration. The books show clearly the progress which this family has made on the road from farm laborers to farm owners.

MADE PLANS

On January 17, 1942, Mr. and Mrs. Blanchard Osborn, in conference with R. R. and H. M. supervisors, made written farm and home plans for the coming year. Through the year they consistently followed these plans as closely as possible. The record book which was kept up to date by Mrs. Osborn shows that these plans were well made since the actual operation in most cases ran close to the planned estimates.

For example, food planned to buy $140, actual $133; planned egg sales $375, actual $344; planned feed purchases $50, actual $60. The actual income from crops, however, far exceeded planned income as they had a bumper yield and higher prices than estimated. This increased income together with rise in prices caused the total amount actually spent for family living to be a little higher than planned; $438 actual, $389 planned. Some other things included in these plans and carried out in actual operation were as follows:

HOW IT WORKED

From plan to produce for home use: Fresh vegetables from garden, $58; milk, butter, cheese, $176; meat and lard from hogs and chickens, $122; eggs, $40; 400 quarts canned food, $100; stored food, 14 bushels, $20. Total, $516.

From record book (actually used), vegetables $85; milk, butter, $225; meat and lard, etc., $136; eggs $46; 380 quarts, $95; 18 bushels, $25. Total, $612.

At least part of the increased yields which the Osborns had was due to improved farm methods which they employed this year. On 40 acres of the farm land a heavy volunteer wheat growth was turned under in the spring before planting cotton. The yield on this land was 625 pounds lint per acre. Osborn also built up terraces, plowed during early winter on land that was not so sandy that it would blow, and left high maize stubble on all sandy land to prevent wind erosion. Better seeds and tillage Mrs. Osborn thinks was partly responsible for their increased garden production in 1942. For 1943 they will have irrigation facilities, and James, the younger son, is enrolled in gardening as one of his 4-H projects, so they are planning to produce a still better garden in 1943.

NEW TILE CELLAR

The Osborns have a new tile cellar which makes it possible for them to take better care of their canned and stored food supplies. Their household water supply is now much more convenient than before. A pump for the cistern is now installed in a little room just off the kitchen and they have put in a sink in the kitchen to carry off waste water. A new rug has been purchased for the living room.

They have not only produced more food for home use in 1942 than usual but have produced more eggs, pork, beef, and milk for sale than ever before. They have sold 1,376 dozen eggs, 460 pounds cream, 950 pounds beef, 132 pounds broilers and 580 pounds of pork. They also have 5 more beef calves which they are fattening out and 9 more head of hogs that will be ready to market soon, besides 3 bred brood sows that they plan to keep. They also sold 2 bales of long-staple cotton, besides 100 bales of ordinary staple cotton.

Of course, this year of good success has well repaid the Osborn family for their industry, planning and managing, by a large increase in net worth. Their record book showed their net worth at the beginning of 1942 to be $2,426, and at the end, $9,542. A net gain of $7,116. Their increased cash was well managed too. They first paid off $643 of their Farm Security Administration loan which was all of 1942, and almost all of 1943 maturities. Second, they made a $2,500 down payment on a good 160-acre farm which is the first they ever owned.

ENJOY NEW FARM

They moved to their new farm January 1, 1943. Third, they have a cash reserve in the bank with which to meet 1943 operating expenses and pay 1942 income tax. If they have sufficient money after paying their income tax they plan to make an additional payment on the remainder of their Farm Security Administration loan.

The entire Osborn family is active in the civic and social life of their community. They are members of and regularly attend a local church. James is a member of the 4-H Club, Mr. and Mrs. Osborn attend and assist in all group meetings which are held for the betterment of their local community. Floyd was enrolled in tenth grade and James in eighth grade in 1942, in Vinson School.

The financial progress of the Osborns from $465 in November 1939 to $9,542 in 1942, has been due to good planning, good managing, keeping records, lots of hard work, and taking advantage of every opportunity which came their way. The Osborns had never made a written farm or home plan nor ever kept records of their farm-and-home operations until they became Farm Security Administration clients. They are very appreciative of the financial and educational assistance given by the Farm Security Administration and both say that if it had not been for this assistance they would not have been able to go back to farming on a renter basis, much less own a farm.

Safe Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malvina Lindsay, from the Washington Post of June 23, 1944:

SAFE INVESTMENT

It was one of the first invasion pictures. A group of bodies lying limp on a stretch of rocky coast—somewhere in Normandy. She could not get the boy nearest the camera out of her mind. That strange still heaviness about his slim young body. His helmet, his pack, his battle equipment—all ready for the adventure that never came. He had dropped suddenly, face downward.

Who was he? A farm boy from Nebraska? One of the drugstore gang from a small town? A big city lad who used to dress up in his plaid coat and lavender shirt? Who at home was waiting anxiously for his letters, wondering what he was doing at that moment? What hopes and lives were tied up in him? What had been his thoughts, his dreams, his ambitions? What had he planned on doing "after the war?"

How he must have wanted to live. How stupid, how senseless that he had to die.

She felt suddenly a guilty sense of well being. Why should one person live and another die? No, now that was foolish, neurotic. Make the best of one's own life—that was the big obligation. She must go on downtown and do her shopping; stop in at the bank and buy a bond with that birthday money John had given her.

She thought with satisfaction as she made out her bond application how close she was to the $500 mark. That is, it would be $500 when she opened the safe deposit box along about 1954. A little nest egg like that might come in handy then. A trip perhaps, or girls might be having weddings. Anyway, bonds were a good investment. Nothing safer, the banker had said. "When United States bonds aren't any good, nothing is any good" those were his words.

And, as John said, where else could you put your money? Where could you get 2.9 percent and be absolutely safe. Besides, if you got in a pinch you could always cash them in—after 60 days.

She had a lot of things to do. She'd look for a print dress—a good print, restrained and smart. Subtle, with soft colors that would really do something for her. She needed it for those little "don't dress" occasions that were always coming along. She simply couldn't face the girls again in her old things. Then she really ought to pick up a new summer hat that would give her a lift. And maybe a summer handbag.

She happily visioned herself a new woman, smart and attractive, sailing into the next gathering. Eyes of friends and enemies alike lighted as they looked at her. Important persons included her in their bevies. Strangers gazed with approving curiosity.

She walked along in a glow, looking in the shop windows. And then suddenly she saw again the still bodies sprawled on the beachheads. Why did she have to remember that? Why did the papers print such things? Besides, what could she do about it? She was giving all she could; hadn't she bought a bond? Hadn't she bought what would be $500 worth of bonds? Wasn't that being

patriotic—even though it was a good investment?

She walked on absently, still seeing a mine-scarred coast strewn with lifeless youth. "A good investment." Ye-es; in all fairness, that was just what her bonds had been. That and nothing else. She might as well be honest. She had never given anything in her bond buying. Why—why she had never yet bought a real bond—a bond paid for with sacrifice. She turned abruptly and headed back toward the bank.

Let's Give the Super-Fortress a Real Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis Star has come forward with a suggestion which I think is worthy of the consideration of the highest authorities of our Government.

The Star proposes that the great superfortress which is striking terror to the hearts of the Nipponese shall be given a name more worthy of the dignity of its performance than B–29.

The Star has printed an editorial on this subject which I think will have the approval of the American people 1,000 percent.

It is as follows:

NEW FORTS NEED OWN NAME

The superfortresses have just begun to make history. They deserve more than a carry-over from a previous model for a name. They may have much the same lines as the famed fortresses that turned the tide of air war over Europe. But they are new and distinct unto themselves.

The old forts measure 103 feet 10 inches between wing tips and 74 feet 9 inches from nose to tail tip.

The supers are 141 feet 2 inches between wing tips and 98 feet from nose to tail tip. Huge avengers.

The superfortresses will range the globe under a command all their own. They should carry a name of their own as well—such as the American Eagle or Tornado.

Data Revealed by Dies Committee Shows Effort of Communist-Controlled C. I. O. Political Action Committee to Extend Activities Into Rural Areas Through Use of Government Employees—White House Tie-Up Also Indicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, un-American activities in this country are in the news again. This week evidence revealed by the Dies committee of this House has revealed that, flush from its victories in Alabama, California, Texas, and elsewhere, the Communist conceived and dominated C. I. O. Political Action Committee has reached its tenacles out into the rural areas and is trying to utilize intimidated and coerced Government employees to organize and deliver the farm vote to friends of the fourth-term candidate. A Federal statute known as the Hatch Act makes political activities on the part of Federal employees a direct violation of law, but in apparent gay disregard of the law of the land the campaign to gather in the votes by all means fair or foul seems to be well under way.

Many papers have carried accounts of the amazing revelation that the long distance telephone records of C. B. Baldwin, top drawer official of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee and former Farm Security Director, show a constant stream of telephone calls between his office and the White House and between his office and the telephones of present Farm Security Administration officials in the several States. The records further show that during primary campaigns in which the C. I. O. Political Action Committee was endeavoring to purge anti-New Deal Democrats the wires were kept especially hot between both the political wigwam of the C. I. O., the White House and the Federal employees who were the former subordinates of Mr. Baldwin and upon whom their erstwhile chief apparently now relies to deliever the votes his organization is seeking in the rural areas.

Members of Congress should not fail to read these disclosures as put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, of New Jersey. They appear on page A3250 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Lest it be erroneously concluded that only Republicans are disturbed by the powerful and potent purge being conducted by this Baldwin-White House-Federal employees axis, Members of Congress and others interested should also look on page A3179 of the Appendix of the RECORD and read the remarks of Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, a Democrat from Massachusetts. It should be said to the credit of Congress that Members of both major parties are greatly disturbed by the fact that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee has apparently received a green light to go ahead and purge candidates not approved by the White House palace brigade and by the further fact that Mr. Baldwin's long distance telephone records indicate that influence is being used upon public officials of executive department farm agencies in order to enlist their support in the political program of the C. I. O. labor union and its Communist hand maidens.

Westbrook Pegler, famous American newspaperman whose disclosures have so frequently won him the plaudits of patriotic citizens on previous occasions, has recently devoted two entire articles to this phenomenal new development in American political affairs. Under leave granted me by the House, I am including these two articles at this point as a part of these remarks.

Article by Westbrook Pegler under date of June 20, 1944:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, June 20.—Long distance telephone records subpenaed by the Dies committee have revealed a close relationship between the political action committee of the C. I. O. and the following:

The White House and Mrs. Roosevelt;
Vice President HENRY WALLACE;
The Department of Agriculture;
The Department of Justice; and
Various regional directors of the Farm Security Administration having power to exert strong political and economic pressure on farmers.

Numerous calls to regional F. S. A. offices were made in most cases by C. B. Baldwin, assistant director of the Political Action Committee, who resigned his job as Chairman of the F. S. A. in Washington to become actual manager of the P. A. C.'s campaign to elect President Roosevelt for a fourth term and Mr. WALLACE for a second term and to defeat a select list of aspirants for the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Sidney Hillman, P. A. C. chairman, is president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, C. I. O., and recently has been denounced by David Dubinsky and other right-wing union radicals, as leader of the Communist Party in New York, now known as the American Labor Party.

Baldwin has held various key jobs in Washington ever since 1933, when he caught on as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture under WALLACE. He became Director of the Farm Security Administration in October 1940. The phone calls indicate a strong continuing interest and influence in the F. S. A., while he is on leave serving with the political leader of the New York Communist faction of the union movement.

The slips showed 28 calls from the New York headquarters of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee direct to the White House, including one from Hillman to Mrs. Roosevelt and another from Hillman to David Niles, formerly Nyhus, of Boston, one of the President's selfless assistants with a passion for anonymity and for left-wing politics. Hillman also called Vice President WALLACE. Baldwin is recorded as having made three calls to WALLACE'S office.

The Hillman-Baldwin-Communist group of the C. I. O. has defeated for renomination both MARTIN DIES, of Texas, and JOE STARNES, of Alabama. STARNES is a member of the Dies committee.

Records show, according to the Dies committee, "hundreds" of calls from the P. A. C.'s New York headquarters to various Government officials, particularly in the Department of Justice and in the Department of Agriculture, which controls the Farm Security Administration and the fortunes of many farmers through its local agents scattered everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, the integrity of American elections is the keystone of freedom in this country. It was for this purpose that Democrats and Republicans joined together a few years ago to pass the so-called Hatch Clean Politics Act. However, no Federal statute can enforce itself. What is needed is a high-minded and right-minded Attorney General and Chief Executive who will enforce the law regardless of whether it is applied against the activities of political freinds or foes.

In the second of his two articles, Mr. Pegler implies that Mr. Baldwin has simply been loaned to the C. I. O. for the

duration of the political campaign because of his previous position as chief of the vast army of personnel with whom he is now in such constant touch by long-distance telephone as he performs in his new capacity as political generalissimo of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. Here, surely, is a form of lend-lease which must prove revolting to all freedom-loving Americans.

Let me now call your attention to Mr. Pegler's second article on this highly significant situation.

Article by Westbrook Pegler under date of June 21, 1944.

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, June 21.—Yesterday I reported that the Dies committee had subpenaed long-distance slips of the telephone company which showed that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee had been carrying on conversations with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and two of the President's anonymous political secretaries at the White House, with Vice President HENRY WALLACE and his secretaries, with Attorney General Biddle, and with Farm Security Administration regional directors. These telephone slips showed further that C. B. Baldwin, a New Deal farm bureaucrat from the beginning of the administration in 1933, and now political-action committee assistant director, had telephoned several of his old subordinates in the F. S. A. in regions where the P. A. C. was opposing the renomination of Congressmen and Senators whom it had marked for defeat. Until recently Baldwin was F. S. A. chief.

The factual report was long and left no room for interpretation. Today we may study the meaning.

Chairman of the P. A. C. is Sidney Hillman, president of the C. I. O. Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Hillman came to the United States in 1907 as a Russian refugee from the Czars, and if he ever worked at all at any laborious trade, his experience was brief, for he acquired the sedentary, political job of union president in 1914 and has held it since. He had preoccupations which made it inconvenient for him to take part in World War No. 1. In May 1940 President Roosevelt appointed him to be the "labor" member of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense. Later he was appointed to a position in the Office of Production Management.

A few months ago Hillman allied himself openly with the Communists of the C. I. O. in New York in a fight for control of the synthetic, left-wing political organizations known as the American Labor Party. The right-wingers fought him, but Hillman and the Communists won. The A. L. P. thereupon became the successor to the Communist Party, which announced its own dissolution. Meanwhile, Hillman, proceeding with the organization of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, had proposed that in New York State all workers be compelled to join unions and pay a political income tax to the committee for use in the fourth-term campaign.

In his years in the Farm Security Administration, Baldwin built an organization within the Government which reaches into every farm county. It is organized and equipped for political espionage propaganda and coercion. Its regional directors were Baldwin's subordinates and would be his subordinates again should Mr. Roosevelt be reelected and should Baldwin care to resume the job from which he has technically resigned. Practically, he is merely on leave and on loan to the C. I. O. for the duration of the campaign.

The long-distance calls discovered by the Dies committee were not personal calls. They were official calls made from the headquarters of the P. A. C. and charged to the committee. Hillman, Baldwin, and others made 28 such calls to the White House alone, and many other calls to F. S. A. regional offices. Yet the Roosevelt party and the P. A. C. would maintain that there is no connection between the White House, or the F. S. A., and the committee. The C. I. O., for its own part, insists that the P. A. C. is a gratuitous and independent organization, unconnected with the Roosevelt party.

Mr. Biddle, one of those who was called by long distance from the P. A. C.'s headquarters, has given an opinion that its "educational activities" are legitimate and contrary to no law, although thus far it has raised $700,000 for the fourth-term campaign, has access to millions more, and is campaigning for him and his chief throughout the country.

The seizure of the telephone records was a high-handed operation. In total effect, the information thus obtained, however questionable the method, plainly shows that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, heavily infested with Communists, is an auxiliary of the Roosevelt fourth-term party on terms of intimate consultation with Mrs. Roosevelt, David K. Niles born Nyhus, and Jonathan Daniels, the President's confidential political agents in the White House, with Vice President WALLACE and with the Departments of Justice and Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, members of labor unions and labor unions themselves have a right to endorse political candidates and to support or oppose candidates of their own choosing. If they wish to function as political parties, that is a matter for them to decide. Be it said to the credit of the American Federation of Labor, however, that, like the Railroad Brotherhoods and other substantial labor unions, it has consistently refused to become the cat's-paw or the spearhead for any political potentate or party. The American Federation of Labor is in nowise involved in the nefarious activities of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. It is only this committee, operating through such C. I. O. local unions as it is able to dominate, which applies a check-off from the worker's pay check, compelling him, frequently against his personal choice and convictions, to help finance candidates selected and approved by a small group of king makers who hope to secure dividends in legislation and in governmental favors for their political activities.

When the C. I. O. Political Action Committee uses its vast campaign war chest, however, to contact and coerce Federal employees on political matters, that is a matter of vital concern to every American as such political activities are in direct violation of Federal law and their unrestricted performance tends to destroy the very basis of Government by free elections.

Candidates endorsed by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee should be called upon to show their colors and either disavow their endorsement or admit in public that they are in league with a movement which, if successful in gaining control of the next Congress, may well have some fateful consequences for the future of this Republic.

Letter of Weber Show Case & Fixture Co., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WEBER SHOWCASE & FIXTURE CO., INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1944.

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Congressman SHEPPARD: After reading the Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS' speech which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 1944, I am demanding that certain statements made by the gentleman from Indiana be corrected.

With reference to Congressman HARNESS' statement "that the Globe organization has willingly cooperated in making its design and engineering facilities and its production methods available to the Maritime Commission and to private companies desiring to enter the field of all-steel life-raft production"—nothing could be further from the truth.

It was a generally recognized fact that because of our excellent equipment and personnel we were the logical company to manufacture life rafts on the west coast.

We repeatedly asked the Globe American Co. for prices on their stampings, the thought being that, in the interest of the war effort, it would alleviate the necessity of making a duplicate die for the stamping of the steel corrugates. However, it was not until we had received an actual order from the Maritime Commission that the Globe American Co. expressed a willingness to quote these prices. They then insisted that we send a man to their plant at Kokomo, Ind., before they would give us this quotation. We proceeded to do this at our own expense, and at no expense to the Globe American Co. When our engineer looked over the facilities at the Globe American plant, together with a sample life raft which they were testing, he came to the conclusion that because the Globe American Co. was many months behind in their delivery schedules and, in his opinion, would still not be on production for several months, that they were in no position to furnish the side corrugates for a raft. It was also our engineer's opinion that the way they were attempting to build a life raft was impractical, which has been proven by the fact that, after they were on production for some time, they stopped production and proceeded to revise their methods of welding to conform with our methods.

The statement made by the Honorable Mr. HARNESS that some $300,000 of the people's money went into the Weber buildings and machinery is completely erroneous. The only Government money invested in Weber's life-raft program was in connection with a rust-proofing process, which is a Coast Guard requirement, and the money involved was less than $120,000. The $300,000 referred to was money expended by the Weber Showcase & Fixture Co., Inc., of its own funds.

I would also like to call attention to the statement made by the Honorable Mr. HARNESS that its engineers visited the Globe plant to study and copy production methods worked out at no small private expense by the Globe organization—is erroneous—as

Weber's production methods are entirely different, and the purpose and outcome of our engineer's visit to Globe's plant was as outlined previously.

In referring to the prices which the Honorable Mr. LARNESS refers to, namely, a unit price of $1,449, one must take into consideration the quantities of the rafts involved; also, the added freight costs to the west coast. If we had been given a contract of the same magnitude as Globe American's, these prices naturally would have been substantially reduced as is evidenced by recent quotations we have made to the United State Maritime Commission for life rafts, which will be made available by us on request of the proper parties. Could it be possible in order to establish themselves in this field, the Globe American Co. took this contract below cost. This could be easily verified by whether or not they increased their unit price on the recent inquiry sent out by the Maritime Commission for 7,500 rafts which, from a successful and efficient manufacturer's standpoint, should have been lower than the original quotation because of the quantities involved and the fact that their inexperience and initial cost should have been overcome.

The inference made by the Honorable Mr. HARNESS that there could be collusion between the Peterson Manufacturing Co. of Portland, Oreg., and the Weber Showcase & Fixture Co., Inc., because their prices were identical on an inquiry for a small number of rafts, is purely coincidental.

For the Honorable Mr. HARNESS' information the Weber Showcase & Fixture Co., Inc., was the first in their industry to receive the Army and Navy E award for excellent production and is one of the few firms in the United States to have three stars on their pennant. Every product, including the liferaft which they are now building, has been outstanding in its field, and our company never at any time has had to stoop to collusion or any other unethical business practice in connection with any contract.

Our firm has enjoyed an enviable reputation for nearly 50 years prior to the war and has made an outstanding contribution to the war effort in war production, and we, therefore, feel that these facts should be brought to your attention so that they can be presented to the proper parties, as well as establishing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

WEBER SHOWCASE & FIXTURE CO., INC.,
PERCY C. HOUSE, *Vice President*.

Report From the Second District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the Second Congressional District of California is one of the largest districts in point of area in the United States. It covers approximately one-third of the total area of the State of California. It is over 600 miles long, air line, extending from Death Valley in southern California to the Oregon boundary line along the mountains of eastern California. It is a district of small communities and small business; its principal industries are mining, lumber, livestock, and agriculture.

The people of the Second District work in those industries and in its small cities and towns. They are the sturdy independent American type which has contributed so much to the advancement of our country. They are also friendly and generous and like to feel they have a personal friend in their representative in Washington. They have not hesitated to write me about their troubles during these hectic times. In the 10 months I have been their Representative I have worked toward the solution of their problems and a brief summary of some of them will, I believe, provide an interesting index to the thinking, work, and struggle of the people of one of the greatest and undoubtedly the most picturesque part of California.

THE EFFECT OF CLOSING THE GOLD MINES

California has always been famous as the land of gold. Most of that gold was discovered and produced in the second district. My distinguished predecessor, the late Harry L. Englebright, lived in Nevada City, which was the very heart of the gold industry of California. But when war came it was decided that gold production was nonessential, and the gold mines were closed down. I have always doubted the wisdom of that order. It salvaged a little manpower and machinery for the war effort and brought irreparable damage to the gold mines.

GOLD-MINE CLOSING ORDER LIBERALIZED

The impact of the closing order on the cities and towns built around the gold-mining industry can well be imagined. But they have continued to exist, somehow, and have not complained too much—they are willing to make any sacrifice necessary to the winning of the war. I have introduced a bill calling for the repeal of the order closing the gold mines, and although Congress has taken no action on that bill, my people are looking forward to the opening of the mines at the earliest possible date. The Mining Division of the W. P. B., under constant pressure from California Congressmen, like myself, has liberalized the gold-closing order to permit some of the mines to operate on a maintenance basis in order to keep them unwatered and their shafts in repair. Some mines are already a total loss. The cost of unwatering and retimbering will not be justified.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY TO GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Some of the operators of the gold mines may need Government assistance in reopening their mines in the form of loans—we think they are entitled to such help. No industry has been so completely stopped in this war. An automobile factory can make tanks; a sewing machine company, machine guns—but when the gold mines were closed they deteriorated. The Government should help that industry—a casualty of war—get back on its feet. I have introduced a bill authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to gold-mine operators as soon as the order closing the gold mines is withdrawn, and authorizing the R. F. C. to accept applications now so that these applications can be processed and ready for immediate action at that time.

STRATEGIC MINING BLOWS HOT AND COLD

Some of the gold miners turned to other types of mining of which we have an abundance—chrome, copper, manganese, tungsten, and others. These minerals were greatly needed in the early stages of the war. Our Government encouraged production and offered premiums for it. Our Government encouraged mining men to spend large sums in developing properties. Recently cut-backs have been ordered in many lines of these ores. In some instances this has left our mine operators holding the proverbial bag. Legislation must be enacted to bail out the war-induced—or rather I should say the Government-induced—investment of those operators who have not been permitted to produce sufficiently to liquidate their investments with a fair profit. Legislation of that type is pending now before this Congress and I hope will receive speedy and favorable consideration.

STOCK-PILING OF STRATEGIC MINERALS

As a further point in connection with the production of these strategic ores which we found ourselves so short of at the beginning of this war; a sound national policy is to encourage the continuance of domestic production of these ores. It is a matter of national safety. If the market will not carry the production then these ores should be stockpiled as a national asset for future emergency by our Government. The Government can lose no money in these indestructible stock piles of strategic ores; they will be a sound insurance policy for a future national emergency, and they will help to continue a domestic industry into the post-war period when every effort must be made to provide employment and maintain our national income at a high figure.

MINES AND MINING COMMITTEE STREAMLINED FOR ACTION

The Mines and Mining Committee of the House is preparing to handle the many and difficult problems facing the mining industry. Recently the committee was broken up into permanent subcommittees in order to facilitate the work on separate and distinct fields of mining. Those subcommittees are: (1) coal, (2) precious minerals and metals, (3) phosphate, potash, and other nonmetallics, (4) nonferrous minerals and metals. I have been made chairman of the Subcommittee on Precious Minerals and Metals; the people of my district appreciate that honor as a recognition of the importance of the district as a major gold-producing area. I have also been made a member of the subcommittee, headed by Congressman MURDOCK, of Arizona, on nonferrous minerals and metals. We are looking forward to a period of very great activity of these subcommittees in meeting the problems of the domestic miner.

PROBLEMS OF THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

The Second Congressional District is the largest grazing area in California.

From reports I have received, our stockmen have done fairly well financially—a deserved reward for a production beyond all previous records. They have had difficulty with their marketing. Both Loren Bamert, president, and Dan McKinney, secretary, of the California Cattlemen's Association, have made trips to Washington in connection with the rationing program. The recent reduction of points on some cuts of meat has helped some. The difficulty has been with the medium grades of beef. Feed conditions have made it difficult to bring animals to a good finish. There has been a backlog of medium grade animals which threatened to be disastrous in view of feed conditions. Some stockmen have unloaded at a sacrifice. Keeping the channels of trade open and flowing freely will be a continuing problem and one which those interested in livestock will continuously have to watch.

GRAZING IN THE NATIONAL PARKS

In connection with the feed shortage we tried to get the National Park Service to open the parks to grazing of livestock. An order was made allowing such grazing for purebred breeding stock, provided the application was approved by the Secretary of the Interior. This order was meaningless to my people because they have range cattle, and would not risk their purebred breeding stock to the hazards of a mountain range in any event. I tried in vain to get the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the National Park Service to modify this order to permit range cattle in the parks under conditions which would provide the livestock men some real help.

This week I introduced a bill to open the parks to grazing for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, and to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits for such grazing. We believe that such grazing can be permitted without permanent harm to the parks, and that it is more important to produce food for our people, our allies, and our soldiers than it is to save the grass at this time in the parks.

SHEEPMEN FACE DANGEROUS STOCK PILE

For the sheepmen, the most serious problem is the wool stock piles in this country, consisting of some one and one-half billion pounds of wool. This wool stock pile was started when the submarine menace caused a fear that imports might become difficult, and we could not risk a shortage. Since the submarine menace has abated we find our domestic producers faced with a stock pile which would break them if the war ended and the stock-piled wool was dumped on the market. Our proposed solution has been to end the imports, force the stock-piled wool into the market as fast as possible, and use as much of it as possible in the United Nations Relief Administration. The other day we wrote a provision into the U. N. R. R. A. appropriation bill requiring the use of wool stock piled in this country. This is a good provision, and we hope will remain in the bill. It seems foolish even to think of the U. N. R. R. A., a Government agency, going out and buying wool—particularly cheap foreign wool—when our Government has wool which it has bought and paid for in a stock pile which may break the American producer unless it is disposed of.

CONGRESSIONAL LIVESTOCK COMMITTEE

A development of interest to the livestock industry generally is the fact that the fight for the domestic wool producer brought together a committee of Congressmen from the 17 Western States which are primarily interested in livestock. This committee is headed by Congressman FRANK BARRETT, of Wyoming. I am the member from California. The committee is continuing to work for a solution of the domestic wool stock pile.

PREDATORY ANIMALS

Predatory animals have always been a headache to the livestock operator. There has not been the proper coordination between the various agencies—Federal, State, and county—trying to control the predatory animals. Next on the agenda of the livestock committee of the 17 Western States is a program to set up an over-all plan for predatory animal control in those States. Since the war the problem of predators has become worse and is taking a terrific toll on the livestock production of this country. Trained trappers and hunters are hard to get and generally are underpaid. We think the situation is deserving of Federal attention on a regional basis.

MEASURES VITAL TO LUMBER INDUSTRY PASSED

The timber resources of the Second District are huge—enough to furnish the entire demands of the United States for 7 years under ordinary peacetime consumption. Legislation of vital importance to the timber industry has recently passed the Congress. One is a measure providing for a sustained-yield program; thus, the communities depending on timber operations can plan for a stable future. Second, a measure providing for a survey of our national timber resources; this will enable us to plan our use of timber in order not to deplete this valuable resource. Third, a measure to increase the Federal contribution for fire protection from two and one-half million to nine million; every tree burned is an economic loss to the community where the fire occurred, and we cannot afford those losses.

RESEARCH IN FORESTRY

Of special interest to my district were the appropriations to continue the work of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine and the Institute of Forest Genetics at Placerville. The Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine has done some very fine work on insect control with stations located at Hat Creek, near Burney, and at Blacks Mountain, near Susanville, in my district. The Institute of Forest Genetics at Placerville is one of the only two experimental stations of its kind in the country and is engaged in experiments in tree breeding which may prove of vast value to the timber industry.

LUMBERMEN'S MANPOWER PROBLEM

Lumber is a number one critical material in the war production. Manpower has been the lumber operator's biggest headache. It is hard to reconcile the place lumber has as a critical material with the fact that it has been hard to defer superessential men in the industry.

I have been told by some lumber operators that the loss of as much as 1 or 2 men in a vital spot on their production line can shut down an entire shift. Sometimes these men are under 26. Recognizing the necessity of having young men in the armed forces it would nevertheless seem sound to defer the superessentials such as I have referred to. We are continuing at this time to try to convince Selective Service and War Manpower Commission of the wisdom of this course.

DEMAND FOR FARM MACHINERY

In the field of agriculture the chief calls on my office have been for farm machinery. The greatest demand has been for tractors, trucks, and side delivery rakes. Production of these items has been notably short and should be increased at the earliest possible time. A new directive by W. P. B. revokes quota restrictions for anyone who can make farm machinery equipment or repair parts in a small plant from surplus materials or other materials and parts which can be obtained with a AA-4 rating. This is a step in the right direction.

AMMUNITION FOR FARMERS

The farmers have been asking for ammunition to protect their crops. This is more important than the average person would suppose. The farmer uses his gun more than the city dweller thinks—in keeping the birds out of his almond and cherry orchards and other crops, and in shooting coyotes and other predators which, unmolested, take a terrific toll on his animals. Western Congressmen have particularly worked hard on this problem and the ammunition of the more generally used rifle and shotgun calibers has started to roll. Unless the war develops a need beyond expectation for small arms ammunition, it is reasonable to suppose that this problem will be met.

PRICE CEILINGS ON FARM PRODUCTS

The milk producers of my district have had a particularly bad time with O. P. A. At one time I had four different complaints pending in regard to the price ceiling on milk. One of them, Siskiyou County, is still unsettled. Slowness in getting farm production programs set up has been the cause of a great deal of criticism. Farmers have had to plant before they knew whether they were going to get a price they could work under. Some of them just did not plant, and in some instances those who did got caught under an unfavorable price ceiling, lost money, or barely broke even. Meanwhile the farmer producing the nonessential crops made a barrel of money. The recent amendment to the Price Control Act requiring ceilings to be set at least 15 days before planting time will, we hope, eliminate some of this difficulty and hard feeling.

TOO MUCH SPREAD BETWEEN FARM AND RETAIL PRICES

The farmers feel—and I think they are right—that there is too great a spread between what the producer gets and the retail price. The false impression gets abroad that the farmer is getting a larger percentage of this price than he really is. The spread must be adjusted and the public fully informed as to what the producer is actually getting. I saw cherries here in Washington selling for $1 a pound; little apricots, three for 10 cents, and other comparable prices on other fruits. The farmer does not get that kind of a price, or anywhere near it, and the public should be so informed.

KLAMATH WEED CONTROL

The Agriculture appropriation bill which recently passed the House had a little item of $10,000 of great importance to my district. Portions of it are infested with what is commonly known as Klamath weed—a weed which can ruin vast areas of productive land. In Australia they have a bug which eats Klamath weed, will eat nothing else, and when the weed is all gone will starve to death. The $10,000 is to bring some of those bugs to this country to see if they will thrive here and eliminate our Klamath weed. If the experiment works, it will save thousands upon thousands of dollars and thousands of acres of good land in California.

FEDERAL OWNERSHIP THREATENS EXISTENCE OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT

The most serious single problem faced by county governments in my district is the ever-increasing ownership of lands by the Federal Government. Ten of the eighteen counties I represent are over 50 percent owned by the Federal Government. I will not give figures for all the counties, but as an illustration, Alpine County, 90.67 percent; federally owned; Inyo County, 86.37 percent; Trinity County, 75.53 percent; and Tuolumne 72.53 percent. This does not count State-owned property in these counties or in the case of Inyo large areas held by the city of Los Angeles. Much of this is land held by the Forest Service and in the national parks. Needless to say, these counties cannot long exist if this continues. The tax bases of these counties are already seriously affected.

POSITION ON FEDERAL LANDS STATED

We take the position that these county governments are entitled to a payment in lieu of the taxes of which they are deprived. These county governments render service to the areas in Federal ownership for which they receive no tax support. In addition, if the western counties are to be the storehouse of the national resources and recreational areas for the benefit of the whole Nation, the whole Nation should be willing to contribute to the cost of local Government in those areas.

The problem is twofold: We must pass a law providing for tax equivalent payments, and we must stop further inroads of Federal ownership. The Public Lands Committee of the House, of which I am a member, is working on both these problems.

POST-WAR PLANNING

Notwithstanding the preoccupation of the people of the Second Congressional District of California with all of the foregoing problems which deal largely with the war effort and problems arising out of wartime regulation, they are looking forward to and planning for the peace. Communities are thinking and right down to the hard work of planning how much employment they can give to the returning servicemen in their own cities and towns and in local industry. I have been amazed at the detail and effort made in this direction and it is a true indication of the feeling of the people of their responsibility in making our democracy function in peace as well as in war.

ROADS AND AIRFIELDS VITAL

We have been doing some post-war planning here. My people are interested in the post-war plans for roads and airports. For the most part we live in a vast and mountainous area. We want better, swifter, and cheaper ways in and out of that area for our own people, the people who visit our great recreational places in peacetime, and for the products of our timber, mining, livestock, and agricultural operations. Better roads and more airports will give us better, swifter, and cheaper ways in and out; that is the key to our economic development.

The Roads Committee, of which I am a member, recently reported out the post-war road bill which we hope will be be passed. A national airport survey has been authorized in this House. I hope they will both be pressed swiftly and successfully through the Congress.

CONCLUSION

I have briefly mentioned over 20 separate items affecting the second congressional district. Necessarily this discussion of each item has been meager, nor have I mentioned a great many other matters which could properly be discussed. It is only a partial inventory of our problems, and I am sure has many points in common with a great many areas throughout this country. I invite the attention and interest of my colleagues in the House to the end that we may better understand our respective problems, that we may find a community of interest where we face the same conditions, and that we may more completely join together in the one objective we all must have of making the home front function smoothly and without friction in support of our fighting fellow Americans who are winning at such a price on the war fronts throughout the world.

National Tax Equality Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I inserted in the RECORD on June 3, 1944, the text of a letter written by myself to Mr. Ben C. McCabe, the president of the National Tax Equality Association, regarding the activities of that association in attacking farm cooperatives.

I now insert a copy of Mr. McCabe's reply to that letter, together with my answer to his letter to me:

NATIONAL TAX EQUALITY ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 6, 1944.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
Representative from California,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VOORHIS: In replying to your letter of May 29, let me first of all set down the basic philosophy of the National Tax Equality Association, in an effort to dispel from your mind at once any idea that we have an ulterior purpose or that we are trying to destroy cooperative organizations.

The National Tax Equality Association has a number of broad general objectives. It believes in the profit system under which this country has developed the highest living standards in the world. Its function is to bring to public and governmental attention, through research and the dissemination of information, the need for the elimination of all types of tax discrimination, and of other kinds of preferential treatment by Government that threaten the future of the profit system or result in unfair disparities among taxpayers or groups of taxpayers.

We believe that all forms of privately or publicly-owned businesses in any competitive field should be taxed on an equal basis. We believe that there should be no discrimination in the extension of governmental credit facilities for private and cooperative businesses, and that Government-owned businesses should be denied the use of free public funds and other privileges which give to them unfair advantages over businesses with which they compete.

In short, we believe that there should be equality of governmental treatment in all respects of private, cooperative, and governmental businesses.

The National Tax Equality Association recognizes fully the right of cooperative businesses to exist and to prosper as a part of free enterprise wherever and to whatever extent they prove their ability in doing business. Our only quarrel, insofar as cooperatives are concerned, is with preferential treatment accorded to them by Government in respect to taxation, credit facilities, and certain other factors having a direct bearing on competitive positions.

That such advantages do now exist is well recognized by many leaders of cooperation One quotation, from a statement made by Mr. A. G. Black, until recently Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, will suffice to prove that point: "Farmer cooperatives, as such, have been given by the people through their Congress, some very important advantages—advantages not accorded to privately or corporately owned business. If no changes are made in laws relating to these advantages, they are going to bulk larger and larger. For example, tax exemption under certain conditions, if there is no change, will result in a tremendous advantage to the cooperative form of organization. As taxes on private and corporate business increase, that advantage to cooperation becomes greater. Under conditions of low taxes, of course, it is of some advantage, but when taxes are absorbing a large part of the earnings of private business, the cooperative form of business really provides an enormous advantage."

You have called attention in your letter to various other problems of taxation which you believe are more important for our scrutiny than the exemption of the producer cooperatives from Federal income and excess-

profits taxation. Our own list, for the eventual study of our research department, is far longer than yours. It includes not only the subjects that you have mentioned, but also such matters as the tax exemption of Government-owned businesses, whose competition with banks, utilities, fertilizer manufacturers, and many other private enterprises is therefore placed on a wholly unequal and inequitable basis; the tax exemption of Government-purchased land, about which your own State of California is now trying to do something because whole counties have been driven to the door of poverty; the tax exemption of income-paying property owned by labor unions and other nonprofit organizations; social security taxes for revenue and not for security; inheritance taxes whose sole purpose is to consume wealth which would otherwise be employed in the building and development of new industry; punitive taxes of various sorts; sales taxes; and many others including a long list of inequities that are to be found in the laws of the various States.

Obviously, an association of limited resources cannot undertake to study all of these problems in the space of a few months, though I assure you that we shall get to them as quickly as possible. Obviously, too, the great majority of these problems must be classed as inequities and not as inequalities. The percentage depletion allowances which you say result in a tax subsidy of half a billion a year may be inequitable, but they are available to all the natural resource industries, regardless of form of organization—to the petroleum cooperative, for instance, as well as to the petroleum corporation.

The same is true of the tax-exempt securities, of the relief section of the excess-profits-tax laws, of the inequities inherent in inheritance taxes, personal-income taxes, social-security taxes, etc. Many of them must be considered as damaging to our total tax structure, but they are not offering advantages to some one form of business to the detriment and actual danger of a direct competitor.

On the other hand, however, the exemption from high Federal income and excess-profits taxes which is enjoyed by the cooperatives and the Government-owned businesses is an actual inequality in taxation because these businesses are in direct competition with independent, private enterprises which must pay what the Government demands or suffer dire consequences. Therefore, under the policy of protecting the American system which I have already stated to you, we have first undertaken the study of these definite and true inequalities.

It is, as I have said, the chief purpose of the National Tax Equality Association to equalize taxes among competitors.

Recently, some of the cooperative leaders have approached us with the suggestion that they would be happy to join with our association in a national movement looking to the substantial reduction of corporate taxes and the elimination of the double taxation on corporate income that now exists. Or, they have said, they would be willing to work with us for the imposition of a national sales tax to raise the necessary revenue to support the inevitable post-war national Budget of twenty to twenty-five billions a year.

In theory, such an elimination of the corporate income and excess profits taxes would bring about equality as between cooperatives and private enterprise, and if private business groups were given their choice they would choose this method. But we must be realistic. The present Federal income and excess-profits taxes on corporations are expected to yield in 1944 approximately $15,000,000,000—36 percent of the total estimated $42,000,000,000 revenue of the Federal Government for this wartime year.

When the war ends and the Federal Budget is balanced—as it must be if we are to escape ruin—the Government must for a considerable number of years levy the maximum taxes that the Nation's economy can support. The mass demand will be for a reduction in individual income taxes, and it would be political suicide for any administration to attempt to shift the 36 percent share now paid by corporations to individuals. As a practical matter, no substantial reduction in corporation income tax rates, except perhaps some reduction in excess profits rates may be expected for at least a generation following the war.

As for a Federal retail sales tax to supplement the tax on corporations, which some of our cooperative friends have suggested, the rate, to raise $15,000,000,000, would have to be 23.9 percent if the tax were levied on all retail sales of tangible commodities, with no exemptions; 32.9 percent if food sales were exempted, and 16.9 percent if the tax were levied on all consumer expenditures, including rents, services, etc. As a practical man, you can easily see how utterly impracticable such a procedure would be.

We have given these facts to the cooperative leaders who made the suggestion, and we have invited them to join with us by first accepting full equality of taxation, and by then making common cause among all businesses to seek such reduction in taxes as may be possible and as rapidly as possible.

Whether they will do or not remains for later determination. As you well know, the cooperative point of view is that their profits are in some way different from the profits of private enterprise, even though they are made by identical processes of buying and selling goods and services.

It is, however, our contention, supported by economic and legal opinion, that the earnings of a business, whatever its make-up, constitute profits which go to the owners of the business, and that the existence of profits is not dependent upon whether the owners are a corporation's investors or a cooperative's patrons.

Under this interpretation, if any business profits are to be taxed, then all business profits should be taxed, including those of the cooperatives and of the Government-owned businesses.

I have gone into this lengthy explanation because I want you to understand and to agree that the National Tax Equality Association has no animus toward the cooperative form of business and that such a statement as the one recently made by a cooperative leader—that the National Tax Equality Association is trying to strangle the cooperatives "by fixing it so they wouldn't have enough money for expansion"—is ridiculous on the face of it. Private business has survived and expanded in spite of high taxes, and will continue to survive unless unequal competition forces it to the wall. The cooperatives, under able management, can certainly do as well.

That the cooperatives will one day have to pay their share of taxes is admitted by some leaders. I commend to your consideration a paragraph from the book Cooperative Plenty, by the Reverend J. Elliot Ross, which is on the list of publications approved by the Cooperative League:

"But the present policy of the state in regard to the taxation of cooperatives would make little difference once we had a dominantly cooperative economy. For if cooperatives replaced most of what is today private-profit business, the taxes now paid by the latter would have to be paid by cooperatives or be obtained from some other source. This would hold true unless the Government could reduce its expenses and so needed less revenue from taxes."

If the cooperative leaders accept the fact that they must pay taxes on all their earnings, including patronage refunds, when they take over the Nation's Government and economy, it is entirely inconsistent to refuse to pay taxes in a day when the Nation's life is at stake.

I shall be very glad to hear from you again.

Yours truly,
NATIONAL TAX EQUALITY ASSOCIATION,
BEN C. MCCABE, *President.*

JUNE 21, 1944.

Mr. BEN C. MCCABE,
President, National Tax Equality Association,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. MCCABE: I am grateful for your kindness in answering my letter of May 29 as you do in your letter of June 6.

I am happy that you deny the charges made that your organization is in fact an anti-cooperative organization and that your principal purpose is to destroy cooperatives. I must admit to opinions and convictions that cooperative enterprise is one of the greatest agencies to further the public interest that our people have developed. And when we realize that all of our great religious organizations, all of our great national educational organizations, all of our farm organizations and all of our labor organizations, and in fact all of our national political organizations have endorsed and approved cooperative enterprise, it would seem that my conviction was not entirely a personal, or a prejudiced conviction. It would be difficult to understand how anyone interested in the public welfare could hesitate to support and further the development of cooperative enterprise.

It seems unfortunate that your organizations should, at this particular time, begin its operations by focusing all of its attack on cooperative enterprise. Naturally, I think that those interested in the public welfare and who were not entirely familiar with your organization would assume that you were intent upon preventing the development of cooperative enterprise and thus in effect were intent upon destroying cooperatives. I say that would seem to be unfortunate for your organization if its real purpose is not to destroy cooperatives. I use the phrase this particular time because I think that every informed person must know that we are in a period of tremendous change in this country and throughout the world. Powerful forces which had attained to great power in the pre-war world are struggling fiercely to retain that power and groups which believe there must be a better way, and an order which would express better the doctrine of the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount are laboring to accomplish their purpose. It is obvious that many organizations are being developed and are apparently designed to federate in a struggle to retain the old order regardless of consequences. Significantly many of these organizations are developed around the issues of taxation. Unfortunately there is quite a common opinion that your sector of the battle line was selected for the purpose of attacking and destroying cooperatives.

Unfortunately, also, much of your literature would seem to be designed to inspire fear on the part of "small businessmen." The small businessmen, in whom we must all be interested, is a victim of economic conditions long established and long prevailing. He is entitled to any help we can give him so that he may understand and know the facts. He should be helped to know that his greatest enemy and the force which has destroyed him is one force and only one force and that force is the force which has created monopoly in this country. He should be helped to know that everyone must concede, that cooperative enterprise is the only natural economic organization which can relieve us of the menace to our national welfare, the monopoly. He should be helped therefore to study and to

understand cooperative enterprise and to recognize that he has an ally and a friend in cooperative enterprise and that by associating his welfare with cooperatives, he can have his greatest hope for successful defense against the common enemy of democracy and of the public welfare, monopoly. I think it is fair to say that your organization has not yet made a contribution to the small businessmen and the public welfare in this respect but that on the contrary, through "fear" campaigns it may be doing tremendous injury to small business.

You advise me that your organization "believes in the profit system under which this country has developed the highest standards of living in the world." There are those, of course, who would point to "increasing tenancy and loss of ownership on the part of the masses of our people," to the experiences of 1929 and 1936 when complete economic bankruptcy was on our threshold and when only the power of government and the subsidizing hand of government sustained "business," when bread lines were the rule and not the exception; they would point to a nation then "underfed and underclothed and underhoused" and some of them would even point to this war and insist that it must also be considered to be in part at least a result of an economic system which failed to provide distribution commensurate with its power to produce. And there are many who will insist also that the bountiful blessings of God to our people in the establishment of a democratic form of government in our country, in the gift of tremendous natural resources, in the comparative isolation from the fierce competitive struggles in Europe and the fierce conflict of nationalities imposed immediately upon nationalities, in the gift of isolation from the centuries old and etablished nationalistic hatreds—that these gifts and many more of them were responsible, at least in part, for giving us a "high standard of living."

And I might add that there are very high authorities who will contend, and with facts, that in those countries where cooperatives have been well developed and where there has not been the benefit of the tremendous blessing God has showered on us, a standard of living as high and even higher than we have has resulted. I refer to the studies of Denmark and Sweden for example. I think we might refer to any one of a hundred communities in this country where cooperative enterprise has become very successful and demonstrate how the masses of our people are acquiring "ownership" through cooperative enterprise and how their "standard of living" has been improved vastly because of cooperative enterprise. The inevitable question would be whether other groups of people might not employ cooperation to improve their standard of living above that which they have had theretofore.

Your purpose of developing "information" and "disseminating" it to accomplish "the elimination of all types of tax discrimination" is a fine purpose if it is fulfilled. And it is a tremendous undertaking, which is pursued in the "public interest" should gain for you public commendation. Of course, and obviously, you would begin with study of the worst and most injurious examples of discrimination, which are most injurious to the public interest. That would be a test, I think. In my previous letter, I was raising that precise question and pointing out to you the discriminations which benefit the great owners of wealth and the monopolies and which cost the Government or the public tremendous sums of revenue, I think any reasonable and fair man would be justified in questioning then why you should turn all of your first effort and your first attack on "cooperatives", which may have (and I emphasize "may have" because there are many questions involved and which any fair man must consider before he would say "do have") very minor tax exemption.

We have on the one hand tremendous subsidies which are recognized as subsidies and which benefit powerful and wealthy persons and groups, subsidies which involve as much as a billion dollars.

You prefer to ignore these subsidies and set them aside for some future consideration.

We have, on the other hand, something described as subsidies for the farmers, the less wealthy, the class which has been driven down until more than 42 percent of farmers are now tenants and not owners. This thing which you believe to be tax exemption or a subsidy to groups of farmers constitutes at most a few million dollars.

Your organization develops its entire campaign of attack on these groups of farmers.

I ask you, in all fairness and candor, if there is not reason for question about the real motives of your organization?

And in this connection would it not be well to present all the facts before you boldly assert that cooperatives have had preferential treatment? Since you use the word "preferential," would you not be compelled, naturally, and if your interest was not to attack cooperatives only, to first examine into the establishment of many agencies of government throughout the years, the agencies which have made tremendous contributions to the oil industry and the coal industry and the lumber industry and to the banks, the agencies such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the agencies which through such work as was done by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation protected our insurance companies and our banks, in short the many agencies which were active throughout the period when tremendous wealth was concentrated in a few hands. If your appeal is to be an appeal to accomplish something in the public interest and not an appeal to arouse hate and fear, I ask you again why not deal with those instances of great preferential treatment.

Your purpose to inquire into all kinds of tax exemption or tax evasion is excellent, but I ask you again why you have not begun with the evasions which involve hundreds of millions, as much as a billion of dollars, and evasions which benefit the powerful corporations and monopolies and deal with them at the outset of your inquiry?

Certainly, I shall agree with you that you cannot deal with all of these in "the space of a few moments." But if a hospital is on fire and if a fire department ignores that fire but rushes off to devote all of its efforts to a fire in a small haystack, we question the intelligence and the competency of the fire department. Unless there is some motive, and usually a concealed and hidden motive, behind the actions of such a fire department, we would only declare that its managers were insane and dismiss them.

Yes, the "percentage depletion allowances" may be made to all producing oil companies. And I emphasize that depletion allawances are entirely justifiable and the oil producers are entitled to them. I am only referring to the subsidy which is in "percentage depletion allowances." There may not be preference between oil companies as a result of these allowances (although I believe there is) but there is preference as against other tax payers and therefore as against the public interest. Yes, these allowances may be available to a cooperative which is producing oil, but that does not justify the subsidy. If a cooperative is taking any such subsidy, and if it is apprised of it and of the facts, I would warrant the cooperative would be happy to have the law amended and if it would not, I would condemn it just as I would any other beneficiary of the subsidy.

Do you really contend that the tax exemption now given through ownership of what are known as "tax exempt securities," the tremendous advantages that result therefrom to the owners of great wealth are not of advantage to one form and many forms or institutions of business and to the detriment of others? I notice you refer to direct competitors and I wonder how you propose to define that term. For example, is a grocer in one part of a city a direct competitor with a grocer in another part of the city? Can we, if we are interested in the public interest, endeavor to restrict and refine our activities in that way. Is a cooperative in Kansas City a direct competitor with another business in Chicago? Or is an oil company which sells oil for heating purposes a direct competitor with a coal company which sells coal for heating purposes?

Frankly, Mr. McCabe, if we are really interested in such work as you are doing because of a desire to serve the public interest, do we not have to begin with the discrimination and the preference against the public interest and deal with the most flagrant cases at the outset?

Then I ask again, why your organization began with an attack on cooperatives and confined all of its activities to attacks on cooperatives?

In your letter you refer to your "policy of protecting the American system" but again we accomplish nothing in the public interest when we merely indulge in fact avoiding est when we merely indulge in fact avoiding, phrase making, and phrase parroting. Would you say, for example, what you must imply, that the cooperative system is not an American system and that the millions of our fine citizens who are engaged in cooperative enterprise are not Americans and are not devoted to the finest principles upon which our Government was founded? I am confident you would not and I shall grant and without hesitation that you would not. I am confident that you will agree that all of our religious organizations, our educational organizations, our farm organizations, our labor organizations, and our political organizations would not commend and approve and encourage something which was not expressive of the finest ideals of our system of government.

I am sorry to hear that any cooperative leader would even tolerate a suggestion that we should adopt a national sales tax. If anyone has, I wish he would first present to his organization his proposal and follow cooperative practice by asking the members of his cooperative to approve of his proposal. I am constrained to believe he would not remain long in authority in the cooperative. That belief is predicated on the conviction that cooperatives, through their constant educational programs, are developing understanding in these fields and no citizen, with any interest in the welfare of his fellow man, or with any interest in a fair system of taxation, can approve of a national sales tax. You know every authority in this field will agree on one general rule, that "a sales tax can only be defended on the ground of expediency, that it will produce revenue and that it cannot be defended on the ground of justice or equity."

I am ready and I am sure every cooperative leader is ready to consider the problem of taxation of corporations, and consider it on a factual basis. I am sure that committees of Congress will welcome all the help you can give them on that score.

You may know that many sound students of taxation contend that we should eliminate all corporate taxation but tax the entire net income of the corporations to the individual stockholders, and tax it to them regardless of whether the corporate income is distributed to them or held in reserves of the corporation. In other words, they contend that we might wipe out the tax on the United States Steel Corporation, for example, but compel the corporation to notify its stockholders that the total net income of the corporation was $100,000,000 and that the

stockholders' proportion of that income was $100,000 or $1,000, and the stockholder would then have to include that amount in his report of individual income. There is no doubt that would be a more equitable arrangement for the small stockholders and for the consumers who buy the products of corporations which in large measure pass on their corporate taxation to consumers and sometimes pass it on, pyramided. That proposal has been made before, and usually the large investors in corporations, and the few who through the system of absentee control of corporate reserves and control exercised despite the will of the small minority stockholders have opposed the plan. It seemed to provide just a bit too much of equity and equality, but if your association is striving for tax equality, this might be a cause to which you could give support.

COOPERATIVES SHOULD PAY THEIR SHARE OF TAXES

I repeat that there are general estimates that if every legal doubt is resolved as your association wishes to have it resolved, the total revenue to the Government from cooperatives through income taxation would be increased by some $200,000. I was willing to magnify that by 10 times and make it $2,000,000, or even if you will, $10,000,000. In any case the amount is so small that I personally hope the day may come when the cooperatives will themselves renounce even this small tax exemption in order to deprive their enemies of this handle on which to seize for the purpose of attacking their very existence.

If there is any income of cooperatives which is escaping taxation, the issue before Congress then is whether Congress desires to tax that income. As I recall, the exemption written into the law was written because of the desire of Congress to encourage and help agriculture. Perhaps your association can prove to Congress that the farmer is as fairly treated in our economy today as are the members of your association and the men who are contributing the money to your association. I say perhaps you can prove that, but from all the facts I have at my command I doubt it very much.

If a father and his 5 sons should pool their purchasing power to buy 6 suits of clothes and succeed thereby in saving $5 on each suit of clothes, does any one of the 6 have income of $5? If the 6 should decide to permit the total $30 they have saved to remain in the hands of the father for future joint purchasing, does the father have $30 of income?

If a father and his 5 sons, each operating separate farms, should agree to hire someone, call him a cooperative if you wish, to market their grain and the hired man does so and returns the proceeds of the sale to them, does the hired man have any income other than his wage or salary? That wage or salary income is not exempt from taxation now.

Does a commission firm or a brokerage firm which sells grain under an agency contract agreement have an income of all the money received for the grain and does he pay tax on it? You know he does not or the firm does not because it is not their income. The clients of the brokerage firm pays taxes on the money or income they receive through the brokerage firm and as a result of the sale of their grain, of course, as they do when a cooperative is the brokerage firm or commission agent.

The Constitution provides for taxation of income but patronage refunds when made by a cooperative or made by any other business cannot be classed as income to the cooperative or the business.

Any and everyone of your association members can enter into an agreement with their customers to return to them all of their "profits" and the corporations will not be taxed on that money returned. Certainly the customers will welcome such an agreement. And the corporations, like the cooperatives, will thus make a tremendous contribution to the public interest because they will increase the buying power of the consumers and thus help to solve the problem of unemployment, as cooperatives are now helping to solve it.

Everyone will agree with you, of course, that it is entirely inconsistent to refuse to pay taxes in a day when the Nation's life is at stake.

But surely you will agree that everyone pays taxes today and that unfortunately and because largely of our inability or incompetency to develop a perfect tax system, a disproportionate share of the burden of taxation falls on our less fortunate class, including the farmers whom your association is now attacking through attacks on the cooperatives they own.

If your association dedicates itself to a campaign to impose the burden of taxation according to the ability to bear the tax, everyone will commend its work as it demonstartes through its conduct that that is its purpose.

I am confident the farmers and the workers in cities and the cooperatives which they own will join with you and give you complete support in any such effort.

I shall be glad to hear from you again.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

Thomas Henry Cullen

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. THOMAS H. CULLEN, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks upon the life, character, and public services of the Honorable THOMAS H. CULLEN, Congressman from the State of New York, by inserting in the RECORD an extension of remarks by the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia:

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I speak for all the members of that committee who were deeply saddened by the death of one of its most valued and conscientious members, THOMAS HENRY CULLEN, of the Fourth Congressional District of New York.

Mr. CULLEN was a long a Member of the House of Representatives and at the time of his death he was the ranking Democratic member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

It is apparent by the tribute paid to him by his colleagues that they recognized him as a man of insight and wit. All those who know him well were comforted in times of trial by his ever radiant and generally sympathetic nature. This man's abilities were particularly helpful to me as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Mr. CULLEN was an excellent, industrious, and loyal committee member. He took the work of this committee seriously for he knew that its aim, like his aim, was to see that the best interests of the people of the United States were served always. Mr. CULLEN's keen mind brought to light many things that the committee might otherwise have missed. He demonstrated his remarkable ability and fund of knowledge during the hearings of the committee and exhibited a wide knowledge of the operation of the intricate Federal structure by the questions he asked. His remarks frequently brightened up long sessions dealing with involved matters. I feel sure that the people in his district will miss THOMAS HENRY CULLEN as their representative. I know that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures will miss Mr. CULLEN as a member and I will miss TOM CULLEN as a friend.

Committee on Fair Employment Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, it is to me a matter of great satisfaction that the appropriation for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice has weathered the storm. The adoption last evening of the conference report on the war agencies appropriation bill has put this appropriation in the clear after a stormy passage through Congress, where it encountered violent and unpredictable opposition at every turn.

To those who are unfamiliar with the governmental alphabetical agencies I will state that this is the appropriation to carry on the activities of the committee originally created by Executive order to detect and if possible prevent or eliminate discrimination in Government employment based on racial or religious grounds. The committee has done excellent work and has contributed materially to the national effort by tapping reservoirs of manpower that would not have been brought into the employment picture without its efforts. The director of the activity, Malcom Ross, has demonstrated ability and resourcefulness of the highest order in meeting and solving the delicate and difficult problems of racial discrimination in respect to employment.

While the committee might have been continued under Executive order without a direct appropriation, Mr. Ross very manfully and properly insisted that he desired to justify the existence of his agency to Congress, so as to secure congressional authorization, and an estimate was set up for it by the Budget Bureau in the amount of $525,000. In running the gauntlet through Congress that amount was scaled only slightly and the bill as it goes to the President carries an appropriation of $500,000 for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

While the amount allowed is fairly satisfactory, the branch of Congress which we in the House call the other body tacked on to the appropriation some provisions which, to my way of thinking, are ridiculous and which as a conferee I

vigorously opposed. One of these provisions, as adopted by "the other body," read as follows:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the compensation of any person to initiate, investigate, or prosecute any proceeding against any person, firm, or corporation which may result in the seizure or operation of any plant or other property of such person, firm, or corporation by Federal authority for failure to abide by any rule or regulation of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice or for failure to abide by any order passed by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

How any employee of the Committee who initiates an investigation would know in advance that it "may result in the seizure or operation" of a plant was beyond my limited comprehension. It seemed to me that if this remained in the bill it would hamstring the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. The conferees representing "the other body" finally agreed to substitute the words "seeks to effect" for "may result in," which was quite an improvement in language.

If I could have had my way all of the provisos would have been stricken out in toto, but the situation finally resolved itself down to "no provisos, no appropriation", and the friends of the Committee on Fair Employment Practice finally had to yield, which they did rather than see the entire appropriation go by the board.

I voted for the adoption of the conference report with much reluctance and for the reason so well expressed by Representative MARCANTONIO yesterday afternoon. It was that or nothing. I will hope that the provisos will not prove a real detriment to the continued successful operation of the agency and that next year we may be able to eliminate them entirely.

Pleadings in the Matter of Constitutional Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rollo Ellis, a citizen of California, has requested that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following appeal bearing upon what he terms to be a denial of his rights under the Constitution. In accordance with his request I am asking to include this material herewith:

PLEADINGS IN THE MATTER OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS BEFORE THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

MOST HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: As a native-born citizen of these United States, I come before thee, through your most honorable Member, Congressman JERRY VOORHIS of the State of California, pleading constitutional rights, which rights have been denied me and others by the courts of the State of California, in the matter of Dos Pueblos Ranch & Improvement Co. against myself, Rollo Ellis, et al.; and also myself, Rollo Ellis against Martin, Texas Co., et al.

Having exhausted all my capital funds, and having incurred considerable indebtedness in striving to safeguard my civil rights, and those of others, and being without funds, or resources, or other recourse to proceed further in the courts of this Nation, I come before thee, most honorable gentleman of the United States Congress, to plead that thy most honorable and just body, sitting in convention, do take such steps and initiate such action as is vested in thee by reason of said articles of constitution, which shall cause the inequities and injustices that have been done unto me and to many others, to be repaired and restored.

As authority for the correctness of procedure in laying this matter before your most honorable body, and your duty to perform in connection therewith, I beg to recite the following articles of the Constitution:

I. PREAMBLE

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

II. ARTICLE VI, PARAGRAPH II

This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

III. ARTICLE VII OF BILL OF RIGHTS

Right of trial by jury

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of the common law.

IV. ARTICLE XIV, PARAGRAPH I

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

V. ARTICLE XIV, PARAGRAPH V

The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article.

VI. ARTICLE VI, PARAGRAPH III

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executives and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution, but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

At the time the aforementioned action was commenced in the matter, Dos Pueblos Ranch & Improvement Co. against myself, Rollo Ellis et al., to nullify and quit all our right, title, and interest in and to said leaseholds, which are more particularly described in the body of the pleadings herewith, and on map thereof, said leaseholds were of a market value in excess of $500,000, and have an estimated potential value in recoverable petroleum of approximately $100,000,000. We were denied trial.

At the time my titles were clouded, in the matter of myself, *Rollo Ellis* v. *Martin, the Texas Co. et al.*, which clouding forced me to pray before the court for a good and sufficient title, said properties involved were of a marketable lease value in excess of $40,000, and said lands have an estimated potential value in recoverable petroleum of approximately $25,000,000. I have been denied trial.

The more complete details are set forth in the writings herewith, which were presented before the State bar of California and dismissed by them, as per letters attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Therefore, I now come before your most honorable body and pray for relief in equity and justice, in behalf of myself and all that inure through me, and in behalf of all people who likewise suffer.

Witness my hand and seal this 10th day of June 1944.

ROLLO ELLIS.

Born in Franklin County, Nebr., July 7, 1892.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Los Angeles, ss:

Subscribed and sworn to before me by Rollo Ellis this 10th day of June 1944.

GRACE V. SMITH,
Notary Public in and for Said County and State.

Inasmuch as the pleadings we have filed go into minute detail of events and things over a period of years, and are quite lengthy, I shall endeavor to write a more brief recapitulation.

RE DOS PUEBLOS RANCH & IMPROVEMENT CO. v. ROLLO ELLIS ET AL

This matter involves a community oil and gas lease on approximately 325 acres of the town site of Naples, Santa Barbara County, Calif., which is situated immediately west of the Elwood oil field. Said leasehold embracing approximately 80 percent of a community lease in which there were some 25 or more other participant lessors.

The lease was executed in the fall of 1930, and drilling was commenced within 60 days thereafter, and carried to a depth below 5,000 feet. Some good showings were encountered but on account of the depression temporary overproduction of petroleum, and acute shortage of finances, the well was not tested, and operations were suspended indefinitely by general agreement.

Drilling was resumed in the late fall of 1934, and carried to a depth of 6,446 feet, drilling through a considerable thickness of high-pressure gas sand, and coring considerable very rich oil sand. Bottom water, and the presence of vertical beds, indicating an edge condition, resulted in our decision to move inland, upstructure, and drill new wells and not spend any more money trying to complete this well, for the time being. In other words, we did not complete or abandon this well, but merely were suspending operation upon it until we did more drilling in other locations.

Though the Standard Oil Co. of California had previously condemned the potential oil possibilities of the property in no uncertain terms, and continuously voiced their opinion to damaging effect, they became greatly interested in our operation during the last 60 days thereof and purchased approximately 20 acres of our leasehold at a bonus price of $1,500 per acre, and made a tentative offer of a like cash bonus for the entire leasehold of approximately 400 acres, plus an overriding royalty, which was never agreed upon. Other large companies requested permission to be given a chance to deal for our property.

We were engaged considering these offers, reorganizing our affairs, perfecting minute details of titles, repairing equipment and

preparing new locations to drill, when within 90 days to the day that we suspended actual drilling, a quit title action was filed against me and my assigns.

The leasehold had previously been idle for more than 3 years and no contest of its validity was made. I had devoted 6 years of concentrated effort in making the geological examination, acquiring the community leases and causing said drilling to be done, and more than $150,000 had been expended by and through me in this work. Prior to the time I commenced leasing the properties, said properties did not have any lease market value, and thereafter only a speculative value until our well cored the very rich oil sand, after which time said leasehold did have a real value of great potentialities.

Said lease specifically provided that should I, Rollo Ellis, the lessee, default in any terms of said lease, in the opinion of said lessor, that notice was to be given, and time was provided for remedy. No notice of default was given.

The case came up before the superior court of Santa Barbara County on points of law and motion. A considerable portion of our answer to the complaint was stricken, and my counsel was denied right to amend. Upon request of counsel for the plaintiff the court then granted judgment against us on the complaint, without evidence, denying us trial.

We appealed to the Supreme Court of California, and when the case was heard the Presiding Justice made the statement from the bench to the general effect that our case was the most flagrant abuse of constitutional rights that had ever come before him. However, when decision was finally rendered six of the supreme court justices concurred with the superior court, that it was within its rights in granting judgment without trial, and the presiding justice did not write any dissenting opinion.

The information has since supplied us, that the Standard Oil Co. of California acquired all the right, title, and interest of the Dos Pueblos Co. to this leasehold and in reality it was they who engineered this method of justice. That the Dos Pueblos Ranch and Improvement Co. was their alter ego in fact.

Since our Constitution is quite clear that no person shall be deprived of life, goods, or property without trial, it is most evident that nine judges abdicated their oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

Therefore, the question before the Nation is, Has our Constitution been junked to permit these powerful financial organizations to reach out and take any property they may so desire, of which the foregoing case is only one example of a practice that has been rampant for many years? Not only here in the United States but a practice which has been employed by members of this same group, the world around, in their conquest of the valuable resources of our earth.

If civilization is to survive then the common law of our Constitution must survive, not only here in the United States of America, but throughout the world.

Therefore, in bringing this matter before the people of our Nation, I do so in the interest of every man, woman, and child who possess any love for home and country, and respect for God.

RE ROLLO ELLIS (MYSELF) *v.* MARTIN, THE TEXAS COMPANY, ET AL

This is a matter wherein, after extensive geological examinations and months of negotiations, I entered into a contract with a Mrs. Lillian J. Martin and Arthur B. Cameron to purchase all their right, title, and interest in and to approximately 290 acres of land and all their right and title and interest in and to the Estate Development Corporation, which said corporation held fee title to the majority of said lands.

The franchise to said Estate Development Corporation was in default and its name had been taken by others. No shares of stock had ever been issued, but the articles of incorporation declared three shares, one each to H. Ellis Martin, Lillian J. Martin, his wife, and Arthur B. Cameron. H. Ellis Martin had deceased and Mrs. Lillian J. Martin, his wife, was his sole and rightful heir.

I engaged legal counsel of Mrs. Martin's selection, who drew the contracts between us, which after much discussion and deliberation, were duly executed, at which time I paid unto Mrs. Martin and Cameron, one-half of the money agreed upon as the total purchase price. I advanced the lawyer his contracted fee, paid all back franchise taxes, coined and legally substituted the name of Malis Properties, Inc., as the name for said corporation.

The counsel had prepared an application to the Commissioner of Corporation, for permission to issue stock in said corporation, and to transfer same to me, and at the time said stock was actually assigned over and delivered to me, I was to pay the balance of the money.

On the day Mrs. Martin was to call at the attorney's office and sign said application, an attorney by the name of Phillip Richards called upon me and served me with a recention of contract upon the part of Mrs. Martin and proffered me the sum I had paid her, which I refused.

Phillip Richards then goes into court and has Mrs. Martin's brother appointed as executor for her deceased husband's estate, and they elect him to the board of directors of Malis Properties, Inc., which I had reorganized for them, and Mrs. Martin and her brother then execute a lease to the Texas Co., and assign over a considerable share of the company to Phillip Richards.

Upon contacting Cameron, he informed us that the plan was one that had been presented to him and Mrs. Martin some months previous by a land agent of the Texas Co., which included a propcsed scheme for eventually wiping out all interests of Mrs. Maud H. Hunstock, who held the mortgage on said land, and who, in fact, was the real owner of the property.

H. Ellis Martin, some years previous, approached Mrs. Hunstock with a plan that would permit him to take her lands and subdivide them and sell them off to colored people who were building a resort colony in that vicinity, where the County of Los Angeles had developed a small park for them, that embraced a nice clubhouse and an open-air swimming pool with bathhouse.

Martin, not having the funds, induced Mrs. Hunstock to permit him to operate on her capital investment. She assigned the property to the Estate Development Corporation, which Martin incorporated for that purpose, and took a mortgage back for the full sum, entering into a separate agreement to release any portion of said land from said mortgage contract, upon the payment of a sum of approximately $20 per acre.

Martin sold quite a number of parcels, but only a few of them were cleared from under the mortgage at the time of his demise, after which the corporation was permitted to go in default, hence the balance of the purchasers could not obtain title. Martin never paid any interest on the mortgage, nor taxes, and at no time ever had any moneys invested in said property.

When Mrs. Martin jumped her contract with me, Cameron refused to join with her, as at all times he had refused to be a party to their scheme, which he regarded as being unlawful and without equity. At a later date, I am informed, he did sell Attorney Richards all his right, title, and interest, so as to get out from under this uncalled-for litigation.

This group is now carrying forth with their plan to liquidate and void all of Mrs. Hunstock's interest.

In order to help finance this undertaking, I took a silent partner into the transaction, a man of considerable means, who deceased a few months later. When this trouble arose, he refused to accept the counsel I had selected, and at a later date he requested that I accept a counsel that an agent of his had selected, a Mr. Mortimer Kline. Appointments were made and I interviewed this counsel, or rather he cross-questioned me at length and asked to talk with Mr. Cameron. This was arranged, and he also interviewed my former counsel as well as Mrs. Martin's counsel, who had drawn our contracts, and then took the case.

From then on, the litigation progressed very slowly but evidently his work was efficient, as the court held all defendants to trial on all counts. Many months elapsed. I had gone to San Francisco on business and had taken suddenly ill and was confined to bed, where Mr. Kline reached me on the telephone, advising me that Secretary Ickes had offered him a high position as associate chief counsel for the Office of Petroleum Administration for War, which he was most anxious to accept, but could not do so unless I would release him as my counsel in this matter, which I learned for the first time, was set for trial in a couple of weeks.

After several conversations over the telephone, during the following 48 hours, I told him to get the case postponed or taken off the calendar and leave the papers and I would find some way of handling it, and he went off to Washington.

During the period that has since elapsed I made numerous attempts to engage new counsel, but in every instance they wanted money or interests of such proportion that I could not deliver. Finally I made contact with an attorney by chance, who thought he might like to gamble the necessary time and money, who started to check the status of the case and learned that my case had been dismissed from trial, on the grounds that I had not prosecuted the trial thereof, though the legal period as fixed by law had not yet expired.

Upon checking the matter further, I found that the defendants had gone into court unknown to me and filed a request for dismissal; that the records showed that notice had been served upon Mortimer Kline, who was still the attorney of record. Whether Kline received this notice or whether he made any effort to contact me I do not know, but the facts remain that the attorneys for the defense knew very well that Kline had gone into Government war service and that I had released him at great inconvenience and loss to myself, and that all able counsels were extremely busy and difficult to employ. The records also show that 2 days after my case was dismissed Kline filed an application to be released from the case, which was granted.

I submitted the general foregoing information in detail to the State bar of California, who gave me a short hearing before a two-man committee on the 6th of June 1944, and on the 7th of June they wrote me a letter advising me they had dismissed my matter as they had not found anything irregular.

As I prepared my data for the State Bar of California I forwarded copies to Congressman JERRY VOORHIS at Washington to use as he might see fit, then when the State bar rejected my plea for consideration of my constitutional rights I then prepared the foregoing prayer, and duly executed same and forwarded it to Congressman VOORHIS, to be brought before Congress.

All the foregoing is true, to the best of my knowledge and belief, and is being given in behalf of the well-being of all mankind in the service of God.

ROLLO ELLIS.

SUMMARY

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 6, 1944.*

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: May I beg your indulgence for a few minutes more while I lay before you the true underlying purpose that has motivated me in laying these foregoing matters before you. As I have previously stated, my individual losses are not very important to the bar association or the Nation, but the continuous indulgence in the practices that circumvent justice, is of great concern to our Nation and the world at large.

There is hardly one among us that would not like to feel that they were leaving this world just a little better place in which to live, by reason of our sojourn on earth. At this very time, a large percentage of our people are giving their every thought and effort, in hopes of devising means that will bring a lasting peace to this earth. My venture is that there is not more than one out of every thousand of our earth's people who secretly believe their best interests are served by war and strife.

As any learned medical man will tell you, or as you well know to be true in your profession, before any ill can be remedied, the cause of the illness must be located and treated. Just to place a bandage over the illness and cover it up, is but a blind-man's folly. Acts of man or men that are blind from within.

The general talk about is to the effect that we must maintain vast armies and enforce a peace upon the earth's people, through a form of subjugation; but I ask you gentlemen, did you ever know anything that was brought about by force that was healthy. Does the placing of a man in a strait jacket cure his ills. No you must first make correct diagnosis and treat accordingly.

Should it be your desire to give aid, even if only slightly, to the bringing about of a lasting world peace, within our hearts, within our homes, within our Nation and that world at large, then we must esek the truth of the cause of all the conflict that exists within our own souls—within our Nation and between nations.

Gentlemen, if you will but follow the trail I have laid before you, at the end thereof you will find this truth.

Slowly, but relentlessly, these powerful corporations are crushing the life out of the people of our Nation, and of all nations of the world. Operating through third parties who gladly serve for pay, now more commonly known as Quislings, they reach out with their all-powerful tentacles, grasp and destroy and take over. The success of their conquest depends upon indifference and disorganization. The history of Hitler's conquest in Europe so well illustrates this point.

The two cases I have laid before you are only two in thousands. If you see fit to follow through on these, and wish more, I will gladly supply you with a goodly number. If this monster has not yet entered your home, you need not have any feeling of neglect—give him time and he will be there.

When I first became active in the petroleum industry, back in 1921, the potential oil lands, and production of the Standard Oil Co. of California was confined almost exclusively, if not exclusively, to California, and their total holdings thereof was something in the neighborhood of 200,000 acres. Their subsidiaries of that time were inconsequential.

Let us take a look at their annual report for 1943. Therein they list 19 subsidiaries that are operating within the United States, and this list only includes a fraction of the corporations they control. So-called independent oil companies, such as Signal, that obtain every drop of gasoline and oil they market direct from the Standard plants, are not listed. Neither are the banking chains they control, either solely by themselves or in association with other corporations of the Standard group, nor do they list a long string of manufacturing concerns.

This report shows 3 Canadian subsidiaries, 6 in Central and South America, and 12 in other parts of the world, a total of 39 subsidiaries.

As we go a little further into this report on page 6, we find that they now own potential and proved oil holdings in 15 States and Alaska, which total 2,567,244 acres.

Over on the bottom of page 14 we find the listing of their foreign holdings, with a total of 284,378,620 acres, with an additional 2,343,360 acres in New Zealand in which their participation is only 50 percent.

Is it not rather strange that a corporation which has been so badly oppressed with overproduction and unbearable taxes over these past years, upon showing a portion of their take, should be found holding such a vast amount of loot?

Yes, gentlemen, it is mostly loot. I have watched them destroy, first one person here, a corporation there, a government here, a government there, in the same manner as Hitler knocked over Poland, then Belgium, France, and so on. All others have stood by, most indifferent at the time, each praying that they were going to be allowed to retain their possessions, believing that they were special favorites, but these monsters of greed, have no favorites, only while they can be useful tools. The men directing them have lost all sense of human decency. They are like Hitler—insane with power. All that matters to them is that every person, being, and thing must bend to their will.

With this picture in mind, if you will then just give consideration to the fact that the Standard of California is not the largest of the Standard family, which includes the Humble Oil Co., of Texas, and that for many years past the Texas Co. has been operating with them as sort of a brother-in-law. The total potential oil holdings of this group must aggregate well over 1,000,000,000 acres, only a small portion of which is developed.

In a booklet written by Mr. Wallace E. Pratt, vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, titled "There Will Be Enough Oil," he closes with this most disarming statement: "If political and social conditions over the earth could be modified to permit everyone to go about the job of oil-finding everywhere in the same way we have followed in the United States, there should be little difficulty in establishing petroleum reserves adequate for man's needs over the long future."

Mr. Pratt could not have spoken truer words, but he neglected to tell that outside of Russia and Mexico, where they were thrown out, that their group already control all the known petroleum resources of the world and that no one else but they are permitted to go about the business of finding oil, except in a small way, here in the United States, and then under handicaps they have imposed through their absolute control of the Department of the Interior of our Government, and the likelihood of being put out of business if successful.

We have been very short of oil to fight this war, for which many excuses carrying very little truth have been made. Many are meeting with great difficulty in carrying on their business for lack of gasoline, and many have already lost their life's savings and business by reason thereof.

Please believe me, gentlemen, it is the absolute truth, that had I been permitted to develop the properties I have acquired and the discoveries I have made during the past 20 years, there would be ample petroleum on the west coast for all purposes. Without taking into consideration all the other developments that have been eliminated in a like manner as have mine, the projects that I have mapped and furthered would be sufficient. Now because the legal profession and the newspapers have seen fit to stand by and watch the professional and economic destruction of scores like me, and say, "It just is part of the game," many must now give of their lives and all people must suffer.

Petroleum has ceased to be just a motive power. It is today the most widely used basic substance for chemicals, and in the manufacture of scores of products, not to mention that from this time on it will most likely control the rubber industry. Therefore in the control of the petroleum supply of the world lies the control of the economic and social well-being of the world. By and through the power of their wealth, Governments become but puppets.

Shall we go on like the drunkard, who hopes to find a cure for drunkenness, that will permit him to continue to drink, or the killer who strives to run away from his remorse and yet continues to kill, or shall we, as intelligent men, take recognition of the true cause of our ills and proceed in a sensible, honorable manner, to remedy them?

Laying this entire matter before the Congress of our United States is not done with any thought of suggesting that the Congress usurp rights to remedy these ills within other jurisdictions, but that the Congress may take recognition of this most destructive of all social evils, in the broader scope, and initiate such remedial steps as they may deem most effectual.

ROLLO ELLIS.

EXHIBITS

A. Copy of appellant's brief, L. A. No. 16,074, filed in appeal to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

B. Map of Naples-Elwood region, by Rollo Ellis.

C. A copy of a reprint of the general form of community oil and gas lease, that was initially compiled by me in the early spring of 1929. All Naples leases other than that of Wylie's, were executed upon the initial form and are of record in the records of Santa Barbara County.

I was not incorporated at that time, and have since made a few changes in the lease form.

On or about the year of 1933, upon the request of Bud Broomfield, then director of the land department of the Barnsdall Oil Co., I granted permission to the Petroleum World to use this form. Their attorneys made a few changes and the Petroleum World has published it ever since, it being Oil Age Form 87, that is now used almost exclusively for community leasing in California. It is only one of many contributions I have made to the petroleum industry.

D. A photographic copy of certain articles that appeared in the October 22, 1931, issue of the California Oil World, in which comments on the Naples well was made.

You will note that I advanced some new principles as to the source, generation, migration, and accumulation of petroleum, and that the editor commented that he was unable to find any geologists who would admit that they concurred with me, though he felt some of them must agree at least in part. All are accepted principles today.

I do not make this statement with any thought of boastfulness, but I do believe that if an impartial inquiry was made, that it would be determined that I have made some of the most outstanding contributions to the furtherance of the science of petroleum geology, of our age. Not being of the orthodox—nor of their flock—my works have been treated with bitterness, and ruthless destruction.

To aid our Nation in its period of suffering and peril, I offered to write a complete new treatise, embracing a more exact sci-

ence of petroleum geology, and give it to the world, if the Oil and Gas Journal, a national publication, would publish it, but they refused. This new knowledge, in the hands of the geological profession should expedite petroleum discovery at least 50 percent, if not more. So far, I have been able to utilize it with remarkable exactness.

E-1. Article in California Oil World, January 24, 1935.

E-2. Article in California Oil World, May 30, 1935.

Republican Reckless Sniping and Ingenuity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago our colleague from Illinois [Mr. MASON] advocated that a Democrat be nominated by the Republicans for Vice President. I do not know whether he had in mind the pseudo apostate Democrats Pettengill and John O'Connor, but I do know that no real, self-respecting Democrat could be induced to even consider such a ridiculous proposal.

This would indicate that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] recognizes, as do all other well-informed gentlemen, that the Republicans, if President Roosevelt will be induced to serve another 4 years, which I maintain he owes to the country and to the world, have absolutely no chance of victory in the forthcoming election, and in their desperation they are seeking to inveigle some apostate Democrat to aid them by giving color of respectability and efficiency to the Republican ticket.

The effusions of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] were followed by the criticism of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] of the President for giving Procope, the Finnish Minister, and 3 of his counsellors their passports, he charging that such was done at the behest of and to please the Russians. Well, Russia does not need our help in dealing with the few misled leaders of Finland who have refused to listen to Russia's modest and fair proposal for an adjustment and settlement of the boundary dispute and other factors created by the impending war. Fact is the Department of State had undeniable proof that the Finnish Minister and his counsellors were engaged in pernicious activities inimical to the welfare of the United States. They were keeping the Nazis and their satellites informed of our operations and trying to effect a cleavage between Russia and the United States.

Mr. O'Donnell in a recent press article in a local newspaper stated that Mr. Procope was a suave and affable gentleman but all his friendships and popularity acquired in Mrs. McLean's Friendship estate, the headquarters for the Fascists and Roosevelt haters, were acquired for a very definite, selfish purpose—for the sole purpose of inveigling unsuspecting but sincere Americans to subject themselves to an inoculation of hatred and distrust of the great Russia.

These meetings were known as the hotbed of Fascists and antiadministration and anti-Roosevelt clique. The statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] was made to prejudice the Finns in this country against our valued and able ally, Russia. He would have the Finns here build up a strong resentment among our people against the President and the administration. There are others who have been continuously sniping at the President and criticizing our friendly relations with and our aid to Russia. But most of them do not know what they think they know. For instance, we have by lend-lease furnished Russia only $4,250,000,000 of supplies since June 22, 1941, when Germany crossed the Russian frontier. I take it that such amount would equip the Russian Army about 7 weeks; but in return for such help we have had the pleasure and satisfaction of seeing the Russians hold and then turn back the most barbaric, ruthless, vile, mean, debased, and sordid war machine the world has ever beheld; to say nothing of our certain knowledge that Russian efforts and successes have saved many thousands of American lives.

It seems to me that these critics, instead of maligning the administration now, when our boys are fighting so bravely, tenaciously and successfully, with prospect of a reasonably early victory, on all fronts, should forget their selfish aspirations and attitudes and aline themselves with the majority of Americans who are wholeheartedly cooperating in an endeavor to rid the world once and for all of the most cannabalistic, insensate, unparalleled villainy the world has ever experienced. I wonder whether they appreciate the degree to which they undermine and impair the morale and stamina of our brave fighting men.

To an uninformed bystander it would appear, after reading these continuous but untenable attacks, that we are at war with Russia and not with the Nazis and the Japanese. They refuse to admit that the help we have given Russia has enabled her to do a very heroic and successful job, more than any other power, beyond question, toward bringing Hitler and his barbaric associates to their knees and a deserved total defeat.

In what position would the Allied Nations be if Marshal Rokossonvsky had not successfully turned back the Germans at Moscow, after they had entered the suburbs of that city in 1941; in what position would the Allied Nations be if Marshal Voronov had not beaten back the lousy Germans at Stalingrad in 1942 in the greatest and most momentous battle in all history?

Think of the more than a million Soviets who gave their lives to stay and ultimately drive back the savage Teutons, who had not mercy enough to kill a child or old woman with a bullet rather than bludgeon her to death, at Stalingrad, Orel, Kharkov, Smolensk, and Kiev. What would happen if the United States and Great Britain alone should have to face a German Army running free among Europe's 500,000,000 population?

Had we done two or three times as much as we have done for Russia that would not be enough to repay her for saving hundreds and thousands and thousands of lives of our American boys. Russia has thus far suffered about 7,500,000 casualties in battle, which number is more than all the servicemen we have in our combat units. Obviously no other country in the world could endure such losses and continue to fight so valiantly and successfully.

Russia is fighting not only for herself but for the liberty of all suffering mankind, for the permanent destruction of the German autocratic, militaristic caste, the most dastardly and cruel the world has ever seen, responsible for this war. The conduct of the Germans in dealing with prisoners of war and subjugated peoples does not even begin to be as merciful as was the conduct of Attila.

I cannot understand how a Member of Congress, sworn to safeguard and protect the rights and interests of America while she is in the most all-consuming war in the history of the world, when the very fate of all civilization hangs in the balance, when more than 10,000,000 of the flower of our manhood are under arms, fighting to preserve our form of government, our institutions, our freedom and our liberty, can permit himself to be used to weaken our military and economic positions. Perhaps such men do not mean to do so, but indirectly they are actually or potentially aiding our enemies, because all these attacks and charges and implications have been and are being used against the best interests of our country by our conniving, ruthless, lickspittle enemies. Every word uttered on the floor of the House that is favorable to the enemy cause is at once seized by Dr. Goebbels and broadcast throughout all Europe, especially Germany, and Japan, in an effort to stimulate and encourage all our enemies to persist at maximum resistance.

Even these purblind folk should open their eyes and minds and watch with gratitude, hope, and trust the advance of the great Soviety Army, remembering that we have contributed somewhat to the achievements of that great army in rolling back the tide of tyranny in freedom's darkest hour.

Do not these gentlemen realize the importance of our friendly relations with Russia? Which, in due course, will, no doubt, assist us in the complete elimination, for all time, of the most despicable, cruel, cowardly, mangey rats that ever infested this world, namely, the Japanese. I wonder whether these gentlemen who are overtly and covertly attacking the President realize what position we would be in if Russia had joined Germany, Italy, and Japan in war against the Allied Nations.

To My Colleagues in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, my talk here today is a rather unusual one for this body, but I feel out of courtesy to many of the Members, both Democratic and Republican, I owe a duty and an obligation. A great number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have inquired from me during the past few days as to why I was rejected by the Democratic organization in Brooklyn for renomination to my seat here in the House.

At the outset, I would first like to convey to my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, my most sincere appreciation for their expressions of respect, affection, and their desire to help with their time and their money in an effort to acquaint my constituency with their knowledge of my record as a Member of Congress. There can be no greater reward for any man who has served in this body than to know that he has the respect and affection of his colleagues. To me this memory will always be one of my richest treasures. However, let me assure you, my friends in the House, that I will return to office on January 3 next, for I am conscious that the people at home are aware that the congressional seat in my district is being made a political football by a small group of scheming, avaricious, and selfish ward heelers.

Mr. Joseph Madden, the district leader—in name only—who has denied me the nomination, knows that he cannot attack my record. He knows that I have sat in this body during the most trying times in American congressional history. I was here in the hard, crucial, trying days of the great depression when every congressional office was swamped with requests for help from decent, respectable citizens, and also from small business firms and corporations that made up the American scene. It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, to inform any veteran Member of this House what difficult days those were. One need not recount the feeling of gloom and despair that had settled all over the entire Nation. From that difficult period we moved into the neutrality, or pre-war stage, when perhaps the most controversial legislation the country has ever known was introduced, debated, and decided upon on this floor. Following this came the war period we are now going through, necessitating the continuation of long, hard sessions when a man's full time, full energies, and full intelligence had to be devoted to the interest of his district and his country.

During all of these years I was faithful to my trust and my people appreciated it. In the last Congressional election of 2 years ago I had the good fortune to be elected with a majority of 99,000, the greatest given to any Member of this House. In the course of the years which I have spent here, I have served on the following committees: Post Office and Post Roads, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, chairman of the Committee on the Library, Insular Affairs, Expenditures in Executive Departments, War Claims and Accounts. This service has given me a very broad knowledge of the doings of our Federal Government.

I have been most grateful for this training and have tried to pay back my debt to the people by giving them efficient and intelligent service as a Member of this House. Those who have turned me down cannot condemn me for the legislation which I have introduced. I was proud back in 1938 to be the sponsor of a resolution which prohibited the sale of helium gas to Germany. Also the author of a bill to extend the period of amortization for Home Owners' Loan Corporation mortgages to 20 years and at the same time reduce the interest rate to 3½ percent. Surely, they will not attack me on the ground that I was the author of the original $50 a month minimum pay bill for members of the armed forces.

I do not believe that they can object to my bill calling for a 2-cent mail rate in the city of New York, nor will they raise their voices protesting the $500,000-appropriation bill which the President signed this very day for the purchase of talking-book machines for those unfortunate blind who cannot use the Braille system. I defy my opposition to criticize any measure which I have ever introduced into this House or my voting record. Does Mr. Madden feel chagrined at my record on home owners' loan, social security, wage and hour, old-age pensions, or any of the other measures that benefited the great majority of the people of our country? Does Mr. Madden object to that phase of my public life where I repeatedly fought the erection of a bridge from Staten Island to Bay Ridge which would have destroyed the latter section, or was he opposed to my efforts to defeat the erection of a sewage-disposal plant in Bay Ridge? Did he dislike the fact that I had the Army and Navy desist from loading live ammunition off the Bay Ridge shore and had that work moved to Jersey?

The real reason for my rejection is that while Mr. Madden allegedly is the States committeeman of the district in which I reside, he is but a mere puppet whose strings are being pulled by a little Coney Island politician, Mr. Kenneth F. Sutherland, who has visions of grandeur in the creation of a political empire in the borough of Brooklyn. It is the open boast of this amusement-park lord that he controls the body, mind, and actions of Mr. Madden, and that he has selected a new leader, Mr. Julius Hollander, in the adjoining district. Likewise, he boasts of mastery over the second assembly district in Kings County.

Because I refused to subscribe to his political tenets, and because I believe that the people, and the people alone, should decide who their officials shall be, Mr. Sutherland, together with his agent, the 85-year-old Thomas Wogan, have applied the pressure to Mr. Madden and decided that I must go. Years of faithful service to my country and to my party are to be disregarded. The lust for power and arrogance of ward heelers necessitates the removal of a man of my experience in the National Legislature and the substitution in my place of a marionette wholly unfamiliar with legislative procedure, completely lacking in experience and training, and possessing only an ability to please and to be the yes man for these political heels.

My colleagues of the House, again my thanks. For your help I am grateful, but I feel that it will be better for me to wage my fight alone. I represent an intelligent constituency and I am willing to go before the bar of my people on my record and on my reputation, for I feel that their verdict will be a just one.

Summary of Legislation Passed by Seventy-eighth Congress, Second Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission granted me, I present for publication in the RECORD a summary of legislation passed by the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

MAJOR LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, JANUARY 11–JUNE 23, 1944

The major legislation enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is devoted to the inseparable aims of winning the war and assuring the peace to follow.

In achieving a stable and permanent post-war economy to which our men now far from their homes may return, the Congress and the administration have worked in unity and with singleness of purpose. The first great initial steps easing the demobilization of our fighting forces have been taken in the Vocational Rehabilitation Acts of 1943 and in the Mustering-out Pay Act of 1944, and the G. I. bill of rights of 1944. These are among the most important of a series of laws with other outstanding legislation which have been passed and which will be passed to aid the veterans in their return to normal peacetime pursuits and economic security.

The domestic front has not been forgotten; laws have been passed in this session providing aids to agriculture and industry, as well as to the individual citizen. The income tax has been simplified for the vast majority of taxpayers of this Nation.

Though the job of waging war is not yet finished, the final victory is clearly ahead. But the job of securing the peace is only just begun. We have thus dedicated ourselves to a lasting peace and

to an economically sound nation and world so that men of good will may in freedom create an era of greater understanding and of broader social and economic progress.

The summary is as follows:

AGRICULTURE—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

(Approved February 28, 1944. Public Law 219, 78th Cong.)

On February 28 the President approved the act of Congress continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945. The Commodity Credit Corporation had been created by Executive Order 6340 on October 16, 1933, as a lending institution for financing, carrying, and orderly marketing of agricultural products.

FARM WORKERS

(Approved February 14, 1944. Public Law 229, 78th Cong.)

Requiring 600,000 additional farm workers to meet the food requirements of the United States and the United Nations during the year it was necessary to provide for importing additional foreign workers to supplement the work of our own farmers. Accordingly Congress passed and the President signed on February 14 the joint resolution appropriating an additional $30,000,000 to that already appropriated in Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress.

ARMY

Appropriation

(Approved June 28, 1944. Public Law 374, 78th Cong.)

The President approved on June 28 the War Department appropriation passed by Congress providing $49,000,000,000 for the prosecution of the war. Of this amount, $15,434,814,000 was in new appropriations and $33,000,000,000 in reappropriations.

Army Nurse Corps

(Approved June 22, 1944. Public Law 350, 78th Cong.)

On June 22 the President approved the act of Congress providing for appointment of members of the Army Nurse Corps, and certain other female persons having the qualifications necessary for such appointment, as officers in the Army of the United States. This was an aid to the performance of medical duties by the nurses serving abroad or at home in giving them recognition and official standing within the Army.

Glider personnel

(Approved July 1, 1944. Public Law 409, 78th Cong.)

The Congress passed on June 22 and the President signed on July 1 the act providing that officers, nurses, and enlisted men required to take part in regular and frequent glider flights, shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay not exceeding $100 per month for officers and nurses and $50 per month for enlisted men.

CIVILIAN PILOTS—THE CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING ACT OF 1944

(Approved June 30, 1944. Public Law 391, 78th Cong.)

The Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 was extended for 2 years by act of Congress approved by the President on June 30. This act provided an assured reserve of experienced and trained pilots for war and peacetime needs of the Nation.

HEALTH—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

(Approved July 1, 1944. Public Law 410, 78th Cong.)

On June 23, Congress passed and the President approved on July 1 the act consolidating and revising the laws relating to the Public Health Service. Under the provisions of this act a more effective health service for civilians and the armed forces is achieved by consolidating under the Public Health Service (1) the office of the Surgeon General; (2) the National Institute of Health; (3) the Bureau of Medical Services; and (4) the Bureau of State Services. Reorganization of the various bureaus and divisions is authorized under this act; general powers and duties are prescribed as to research and investigations, Federal-State cooperation, hospitals, medical examinations, and medical care. The broad advances in medical research made during the war and carried out through numerous agencies, public and private, can be brought together and made of universal availability after the war in this consolidation of public agencies. The National Cancer Institute becomes a division of the Public Health Service under the provisions of this act.

LEND-LEASE AND UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Appropriations

(Approved June 30, 1944. Public Law, 382, 78th Cong.)

The Lend-Lease-U. N. R. R. A. Appropriation Act was passed by Congress and signed by the President on June 30. Appropriations for lend-lease and for the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration totaled $3,800,000,000. The increased tempo of the war and the successful operations opening the campaign for the liberation of Europe necessitated large appropriations by this Nation as its share in the work of beginning the reestablishment of normal economic and social conditions in the occupied countries.

Lend-lease extension

(Approved May 17, 1944. Public Law 304, 78th Congress)

The operation of Lend-Lease Act universally considered to be vital to the prosecution of the war was extended for 1 year by act of Congress approved by the President on May 17.

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Act

(Approved March 28, 1944. Public Law 267, 78th Cong.)

Congress passed and the President signed on March 28 the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Act authorizing an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 as the share of the United States in the work of the United Nations in providing aid and relief for the people of the occupied countries after retreat of the enemy and in assisting the occupied countries to effect the return of their refugees and prisoners of war and reestablish industries and agriculture. All the United Nations agreed to share in the cost of this organization and its work.

NAVY

Appropriations

(Approved June 22, 1944. Public Law 347, 78th Cong.)

The President approved on June 22 the act of Congress appropriating $27,569,798,301 for the Navy for the fiscal year 1945. Almost $5,000,000,000 is included for aviation, and authorization is made for future contracts of $3,600,000,000 to be made prior to July 1, 1945 for new aviation construction. $6,500,000,000 is provided for replacement and construction of vessels.

Landing craft

(Approved May 31, 1944. Public Law 322, 78th Cong.)

In anticipation of the requirements of the then impending assault on Europe, Congress passed and the President signed on May 31 the act authorizing conversion and construction of 1,000,000 tons additional of landing craft and district craft.

Navy Nurse Corps

(Approved February 26, 1944. Public Law 238, 78th Cong.)

On February 26 the President signed the act passed by Congress giving all members of the Navy Nurse Corps entitled to relative rank the actual corresponding rank. In this way the handicap between relative and actual rank was removed for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Independence

(Approved June 29, 1944. Public Law 380, 78th Cong.)

The Senate joint resolution outlining and defining the policy of Congress on the future independence of the Philippine Islands was approved by the President on June 29. The President is authorized to declare the independence of the Philippines as soon as normal constitutional processes are restored and prior to the date, July 4, 1946, previously set by law.

Rehabilitation

(Approved June 29, 1944. Public Law 381, 78th Cong.)

In order to aid in the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands and to hasten their independence, Congress passed and the President approved on June 29 the act providing for the Filipino Rehabilitation Committee. The Committee is authorized to investigate and recommend solutions on all matters pertaining to post-war economy, trade, finance, and economic stability in the islands.

POST OFFICE—POSTAL NOTES

(Approved June 28, 1944. Public Law 370, 78th Cong.)

On June 28 the President signed the act of Congress authorizing the Post Office Department to issue and pay money orders not exceeding $10 to be known as postal notes and costing 5 cents each. The Postmaster General is authorized to decrease or increase the the fee for the service to not less than 3 cents and not more than 6 cents as may be necessary. Since 70 percent of all postal money orders issued are for sums of $10 or less, the low fee set by Congress represents a saving to the millions of persons served by the 43,000 post offices of this Nation.

PRICE CONTROL

(Approved June 30, 1944. Public Law 383, 78th Cong.)

The President on June 30 approved the act of Congress amending and extending the Price Control Act of 1942 and the Stabilization Act of 1942. These acts had been passed and had successfully operated against the national dangers of inflation. In signing this act the President stated that Congress had performed a single service and had made clear that it was the wish of all that the line against inflation should be held.

REAL ESTATE

(Approved July 1, 1944. Public Law 401, 78th Cong.)

By act of Congress passed on June 22 and approved by the President on July 1 individual purchasers of real estate by contract under the programs administered by the Resettlement Administration and Farm Security Administration, were enabled to make prepayments of any portion of the balance if the contract had been in force for 5 years. Purchasers were thus able to effect savings in interests by reducing the balance and thereby the length of time which such contracts were entitled to run with interest payments.

SOLDIERS' AND VETERANS' BENEFITS

G. I. bill of rights

(Approved June 22, 1944. Public Law 346, 78th Cong.)

The Congress passed and the President on June 22 signed the act providing aid for readjustment to civilian life of veterans of World War No. 2. This was the so-called G. I. Bill of Rights. Provision was included for up to 52 weeks of unemployment compensation at the rate of $20 per week, with adjusted compensation for self-employed veterans restoring themselves to business rather than seeking employment from others; guarantee of 50 percent of loans up to $2,000 with interest of not more than 4 percent for veterans establishing homes or businesses; $500,000,000 was appropriated for increasing veterans facilities, including hospitals, and strengthens assistance for finding employment through the United States Employment Service; for education and training individual grants are provided of $500 per year plus monthly subsistence pay of $50 for single veterans and $75 for married veterans. This act is the basic law for further appropriations designed to finance the great task of returning the members of the armed services to civilian life.

Mustering-out pay

(Approved February 3, 1944; Public Law 225, 78th Cong.)

On February 3 the President signed the act of Congress providing for mustering-out payments of $300 for persons who had performed active service outside the continental limits of the United States; $200 for persons who have performed active service for 60 days or longer within the continental limits of the United States; and $100 for persons who have performed active service for less than 60 days. These payments were in addition to other benefits.

Pay increase

(Approved June 30, 1944; Public Law 393, 78th Cong.)

Congress passed and on June 30 the President approved the act providing for a pay increase of $5 per month for any enlisted man entitled to wear the expert infantryman badge and $10 per month for those entitled to wear the combat infantryman badge.

Pensions

(Approved May 27, 1944; Public Law 313, 78th Cong.)

Under the act passed by Congress and signed by the President on May 27, pensions were increased for veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from $40 to $50 per month, and in some cases increase was authorized to $60 per month.

Soldiers' Vote Act

(Became law April 1, 1944; Public Law 277, 78th Cong.)

On April 1 the Soldiers' Vote Act of 1944 became law. This law provided for absentee voting by members of the armed forces overseas by Federal ballot only in cases where the State ballot had been requested but not received by October 1. Controversy on the subject of the Federal ballot as it might affect State's rights had forced a compromise. The President had wired all State governors requesting information as to the extent soldiers might vote under the existing State law and whether the governors were disposed to call sessions, where necessary, to change existing law so that the soldiers might be enabled to vote in States where a change in law would be required. Answers proved to be widely divergent, half of the States were reported to be adverse to the use of the Federal ballot.

Taxation

(Approved July 3, 1944. Public Law 415, 78th Cong.)

On June 22 the Congress passed and the President signed on July 3 the act amending to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 by providing that personal property, income, or gross income of persons in military service shall not be subject to State or local taxes by reason of temporary residence; receipt of income, gross income; temporary location of personal property, within any such State or Territory. This act afforded to men in service relief from double taxation by State and local agencies.

TAXATION

Income tax

(Approved May 29, 1944. Public Law 315, 78th Cong.)

Congress passed and on May 29 the President approved the Individual Income Tax Act of 1944 which provided for simplification of the individual income tax beginning with 1944 and established a graduated rate of withholding at the source of income so that the entire tax liability on incomes up to $5,000 would be included in the portion withheld.

Revenue

(Became law February 25, 1944, Public Law 235, 78th Cong.)

The Revenue Act of 1943, which became law February 25, contains provisions for a simplified form of tax return; tax exemption for mustering-out-payments for the armed services; altered renegotiation of war contracts procedure; and a provision requiring labor unions, farm cooperatives and other non-profits organizations to file statements of financial returns with the Secretary of the Treasury.

WAR CONTRACTS—WAR CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

(Approved July 1, 1944. Public Law 395, 78th Cong.)

The War Contract Settlement Act of 1944 was passed by Congress on June 22 and approved by the President on July 1. Provision is made for setting up the Office of Contract Settlement with a director and a contract settlement advisory board composed of the Secretary of Navy, Secretary of War and heads of various other agencies to prescribe procedures, policies, standards, and principles to govern all Government agencies under this act. The director is authorized to appoint an appeal board to hear appeals from contact decisions of the various agencies. Each Government contracting agency shall establish methods for the determination of fair compensation in settlement of contracts and is authorized to settle all or any part of a contract by agreement under the contractor or by determination of the amount due on the contract. Contract settlements in excess of $50,000 are subject to review by a board of three or more members established by the contracting agency. Contractors are provided aids in adequate interim financing and partial payment of termination claims may be made or guaranteed through Federal Reserve banks or other private financial institutions. Adequate advance notice to the contractor of contract termination is here included. Upon demand by the contractor the agency concerned is required within 90 days to submit an estimate of the amount due under the terminated contract and to make a settlement of at least 90 percent within 30 days after delivery of the estimate. In cases of dissatisfaction contractors may appeal to the Appeal Board or bring suit before the Court of Claims or a United States District Court under certain limitations. The General Accounting Office is confined to determining after final settlement of a contract whether settlement payments to the war contractor have been made in accordance with the settlement and whether the records or information transmitted to it warrant a reasonable belief that the settlement was induced by fraud. If the General Accounting Office finds a reasonable belief of fraud warranted, it may so certify to the Department of Justice for investigation. Penalties for fraud are included within the provisions of this act. This act was passed after considerable revision and extensive committee hearings including all interested parties from industry and Government.

WAR POWERS

(Approved June 28, 1944. Public Law 378, 78th Cong.)

On June 28 the President approved the act of Congress extending for 1 year the President's authority to requisition property required for the defense of the United States.

Be Sure To Keep This Book for Future Reference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is well to let the people know what the duties and functions of a Congressman are. A Congressman is the people's agent in Washington. If for any reason any person has any problem with the Federal Goverment, these people should write their Congressman.

At the same time if these people have difficulty with State matters or local matters, such as the public-welfare departments, they should not write their Congressman because a Congressman has no authority over State or county matters.

In the 18 months that I have been in Washington, I am proud of the fact that so many people have written me regarding their problems. In the first 18 months of my term as Congressman more than 16,000 people have written me about problems pertaining to the Federal Government. This is an unusually heavy number of requests.

I am happy to report to the people of my district that out of these 16,000 people who wrote me I succeeded in solving their problems in more than 15,000 cases.

In other words, more than 15 out of every 16 people who wrote to me had their problems solved satisfactorily through my office. This is an unusually high average when we consider the nature of the problems that the people of my district wrote about.

I am happy to report further that every request that has been made of me, I worked to meet and fulfill; I am happy to report that all mail and all work, even a post card from the people back home, has received my personal attention.

Again, I invite the people of my district to write me and call on me if and whenever they have any problem which relates to the Federal Government. I

have helped more than 15,000 people of my district, and I may be able to help you if you need me. Simply write Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

This book contains important information for members of our armed forces, their kin, and their dependents. Be sure to keep this book for future help. You will find it very handy for many years to come.

Benefits for Servicemen, Ex-Servicemen, and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several times has it pointedly come to my attention that benefits intended by Congress for servicemen, ex-servicemen, and their dependents are frequently not received by them, mostly because of the failure of the potential beneficiaries to apply for such benefits.

Reading the technical language of all of the many laws pertaining to those serving actively in our Nation's armed forces, or to those who have so served, and to their dependents, would be very confusing. As chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the oldest committee in Congress having jurisdiction over legislation affecting veterans and their dependents, I have been intensely interested in such legislation for many years. Nevertheless, it is very difficult for me to coordinate all such legislation in my mind. Not all of such laws are applicable to all of such persons; in fact, most of them are applicable only to certain groups, under certain conditions.

How to bring order out of this chaos so that those in each such group might be put on notice as to the rights, privileges, preferences, and benefits to which they might be eligible, without requiring them to read too much about other benefits to which they could never be entitled, has been very baffling.

The key to the solution of this maze of material has, I believe, recently been fashioned by my good friend, Millard W. Rice, the national service director for the Disabled American Veterans, now the dean among the national legislative representatives of the several major veteran organizations and undoubtedly the best informed, among all the representatives of veterans' organizations, as to veterans' affairs and veterans' benefits.

Mr. Rice has compiled a brief outline as to all such benefits, a scanning of which will speedily inform any serviceman, veteran, or his dependent as to what governmental benefits, if any, he or she might be entitled to under the circumstances indicated.

Those who read such outline should be cautioned that more detailed information concerning each such point can be obtained from the Veterans' Administration, or other governmental agencies concerned with the application of the particular laws indicated.

Active servicemen, discharged veterans, and the dependents of veterans, have the privilege of requesting needed advice and assistance from the service officers of the several congressionally chartered service organizations: the Disabled American Veterans—referred to as the D. A. V.—which is composed exclusively of American citizens who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled while serving honorably in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war; The American Legion, composed of honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; the Veterans of Foreign Wars—referred to as the V. F. W.—composed solely of America's campaign-badge war, campaign and expedition veterans; and the American Red Cross. Most applicants would be wise to take advantage of the technical knowledge and experience of the service officers of such organizations.

Mr. Rice assures me that the outline prepared by him has been carefully checked by members of his staff and by the office of the legislative counsel of the Veterans' Administration to make sure of its accuracy.

I here insert the outline prepared by Mr. Rice, as follows:

OUTLINE OF BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN, EX-SERVICEMEN, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

I. BENEFITS FOR PERSONS SERVING IN ARMED FORCES

1. Base pay for enlisted personnel, beginning with privates or apprentice seamen, and up through seven grades to master sergeant or chief petty officer, is from $50 to $138 per month. Base pay for commissioned personnel begins with $150 per month for second lieutenants or ensigns. All base pay of enlisted men is increased by 20 percent and of all officers by 10 percent while on sea duty or serving outside the continental United States or in Alaska. Active flying duty, including flights in gliders, or active submarine duty increases the base pay by 50 percent, and active parachutist duty by $100 per month for officers and $50 per month for enlisted men. Increased compensation of $5 or $10 per month is provided for enlisted men of the combat ground forces of the Army entitled to wear the expert infantryman badge or the combat infantryman badge. Certain other pay increases are provided for special skilled or dangerous types of service. Longevity pay is provided by adding 5 percent to the base pay for each 3 years of active or Reserve service, up to 30 years.

2. Allowances, in varying amounts, for clothing, subsistence, and quarters made to officers and, under certain conditions, to enlisted men, and mustering-out payments upon their discharge from service are not subject to income tax.

3. During World War No. 2, after June 1, 1942, the dependents of any enlisted individual, male or female, with certain exceptions, of the first to seventh grades, upon a written application therefor by the service member or by or on behalf of a dependent in class A, class B, or class B-1 will be granted a monthly family allowance. The monthly allowance for a wife alone is $50; for a child alone, $42; for one parent alone, $50; and for a brother or sister alone, $11. Additional amounts are payable for additional dependents. The monthly pay of the service member will be charged with the amount of $22 per month, and an additional amount of $5 per month if the allowance is payable to more than one class of dependents. Class A includes a wife, child, or former wife divorced; class B includes a parent, brother, or sister dependent upon the enlisted man for a substantial portion of his or her support. Class B-1 includes a parent, brother, or sister dependent upon the enlisted man for the chief portion of his or her support. In the event of death during active service the next of kin is entitled to a gratuity equal to the monthly pay of the deceased for a period of 6 months.

4. National service life insurance, obtainable without examination during first 120 days of active service, or before August 11, 1943, whichever date is later, and thereafter if found by the Veterans' Administration to be a good insurance risk (with privilege of conversion after 1 year; mandatory conversion before end of fifth-policy year), in multiples of $500, from $1,000 to $10,000, for those in active service since October 8, 1940, maturable only by death of the insured, with proviso that premiums may be waived during continuous total disability, which commenced after he was insured, and before he became 60 years of age, and which has continued for 6 consecutive months.

5. Certain protection for those in active military or naval service of the United States, and to American citizens, under certain conditions, in the active service of some country allied with it during time of war, with reference to private life insurance and property rights, and personal indebtedness, when ability to meet obligations is impaired by such service, through judicial process, under Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended. (All matters affecting real or personal property rights should be referred promptly to competent local attorneys for assistance and advice.)

6. Naturalization as an American citizen by the easy petition method as to any alien while serving in the armed forces, as well as for certain war veterans.

7. Mustering-out payments for members of the armed forces, with certain exceptions, discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions on or after December 7, 1941, in the amount of $100 for those who served less than 60 days, $200 for those who served 60 days or more, no part of such service being outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, and $300 for those having performed active service of 60 days or more who served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

II. MONETARY BENEFITS TO VETERANS

1. Compensation or pension for disabilities proven to have been incurred in, or aggravated by reason of, active service in the armed forces of the United States, ranging from $6 to $300 per month, depending on the nature, degree, and permanency of disability, and the time of its incurrence, which includes the 15-percent increase effective June 1, 1944, in the monthly rates for World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans, and persons who served on or after September 16, 1940, where the disability was incurred under extra-hazardous conditions, and statutory awards ranging from $18.75 to $300 per month for certain disabilities, but, if single and without dependents, not more than $20 per month while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by any governmental agency.

2. Retirement benefits at three-fourths of base pay for certain Regular officers with permanent handicapping disabilities, or after a certain period for certain types of service, or/and the attainment of certain ages; and for certain emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers with permanent disabilities of requisite degree, clearly shown

to have been acquired in active service, in fact, in line of duty.

3. Pensions on the basis of age, degree of inability to earn a living, and/or length of service for—

(1) Civil War veterans, in the amount of $75 per month or $100 if in need of a regular attendant, and for Indian War veterans, in amounts ranging from $20 to $60 per month, or $100, if in need of an attendant, but not in excess of $50 as to those in a United States, National, or State soldiers' home on July 13, 1943, and only $20 while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration if the veteran has no dependents. As to those admitted to such home after July 13, 1943, the amount payable is subject to the $20 limitation.

(2) Veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion, in amounts ranging from $12 to $75 per month, plus varying amounts if in need of a regular attendant, with total not to exceed $100, but not more than $50 monthly as to those in a United States, National, or State soldiers' home on July 13, 1943, and only $20 while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by a Government agency, if the veteran has no dependents. As to those admitted to such homes after July 13, 1943, the amount payable is subject to the $20 limitation.

4. Pension of $50 per month for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 with 90 days or more of service and a discharge under conditions other than dishonorable or, if less than 90 days, if discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, who suffer with permanent total disability, regardless of service connection, if not due to misconduct. This rate is increased to $60 per month if rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or when the veteran, suffering from permanent and total disability attains the age of 65 years. (Only $8 per month is paid to men, without dependents, while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by a governmental agency.)

5. Enlisted men of the Regular Army, or of the Philippine Scouts, who have served 20 years or more and who have become permanently incapacitated for active service due to physical disability incurred in line of duty, may be retired at 75 percent of the average monthly pay received for 6 months prior to retirement. This retirement pay or so much thereof as would equal the amount of pension or compensation to which such person may be entitled, may be waived for the purpose of receiving pension or compensation.

6. Enlisted men in the Regular Navy whose service began after July 1, 1925, may, after 20 years' service, be transferred to the Fleet Reserve at one-half base pay received at time of transfer, and, after the completion of 30 years of service, are transferred to the retired list with 75 percent of the pay of their rank at date of retirement, plus all permanent additions thereto. If their service commenced on or prior to July 1, 1925, they may be transferred to the Fleet Reserve upon completion of at least 16 years' service, with one-third of base pay, and after 20 years of service or more, one-half the base pay received at time of transfer, plus all permanent additions. This pay is increased by 10 percent for all men credited with extraordinary heroism in line of duty, or whose average marks in conduct for 20 years or more shall be not less than 95 percent of the maximum. After 30 years of service they are transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy with 75 percent of the pay of their rank at date of retirement, plus all permanent additions.

7. Enlisted men of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, after 30 years of service, are entitled to retirement with monthly pay at 75 percent of their last base pay. Members of the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps may be retired after 30 years' service, or at the age of 50 years after 20 years' service. Temporary commissioned rank has been provided for members of the Army Nurse Corps and female dietetic personnel of the Medical Department of the Army with adjustment in their retirement pay on the basis of such commissioned service.

8. Statutory award of $10 per month is payable to all medal of honor men, age 65 years or more.

9. All monetary benefits from the Veterans' Administration are exempt from taxation, or claims of private creditors, or the United States except as to the indebted beneficiary, or overpayments or illegal payments by the Veterans' Administration, and are not liable to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process either before or after receipt by the beneficiary.

10. Adjusted-service credit up to $50, payable in cash, or, if more, an adjusted-service certificate based upon adjusted-service credit, for active World War No. 1 service in excess of 60 days, computed at the rate of $1 per day for domestic service, and $1.25 per day for overseas service, with maximum limitations, exchangeable for United States bonds bearing interest at 3 percent, redeemable at any time. In the event any allowance in the nature of adjusted compensation is hereafter authorized for World War No. 2 veterans, any benefits received by or paid for any such veteran under the so-called G. I. bill of rights will be deducted from such adjusted compensation.

11. Government life-insurance policies, as to death or total or permanent total disability in multiples of $500 up to $10,000 for insurable veterans of (1) World War No. 1 or World War No. 2, of peacetime servicemen who applied therefor prior to October 8, 1940, with lien loans permissible up to 94 percent of reserve value, at interest of 5 percent per annum.

12. Incompetent and minor beneficiaries generally receive their monetary benefits, if any, through guardians, whose accountings are periodically inspected by regional attorneys of the Veterans' Administration. However, recent legislation permits payment to the wife of an incompetent veteran having no guardian and of death benefits to a minor widow for herself and child or children.

III. MEDICAL TREATMENT AND DOMICILIARY CARE

1. Hospital treatment, or out-patient medical or dental treatment, including necessary medicines and prosthetic appliances, with institutional training in the use of such applicances, may be furnished certain persons medically determined to be in need thereof, for service-connected disabilities. Out-patient treatment may also be authorized for any nonservice-connected condition which is associated with and aggravating a service-connected disability, as adjunct treatment

2. Hospital treatment or domiciliary care for nonservice-connected disabilities under certain conditions may be furnished, when needed, for any war veteran not dishonorably discharged, or for any peacetime veteran discharged from service for disability incurred in line of duty or who is in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

3. Transportation to, and back from, Veterans' Administration facilities, when authorized in advance, for examination, medical treatment, hospitalization, or domiciliary care.

4. Clothing may be furnished at Government expense to beneficiaries receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities, when necessary for protection of health or for sanitary reasons and when such beneficiaries are without means and receiving less than $10 per month for their own personal use. Toilet articles, barber service, tobacco, etc., are furnished beneficiaries receiving hospitalization or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities, whose total income is less than $6 per month.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

1. Vocational rehabilitation, including placement in suitable gainful employment, furnished by the Veterans' Administration for service-connected disabled veterans of World War No. 2, including persons who served in active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, who are feasible therefor and in need thereof to overcome a service-incurred handicap, with training allowance of $80 per month, plus $10 if married, plus $5 for each additional dependent.

2. Education or training, not to exceed 1 year, at any institution of the veteran's choice, for veterans of World War No. 2, including persons who served in active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after 90 days' service or more or for disability incurred in service in line of duty, with not to exceed 3 additional years of education or training, depending upon length of service and other conditions, with subsistence allowance while pursuing education or training of $50 per month, or $75 per month if the veteran has dependents. Tuition and all other fees and expenses, not to exceed $500 per school year, are paid by the Veterans' Administration.

3. Guaranty by the Veterans' Administration of not to exceed 50 percent of a loan or loans the aggregate amount guaranteed not to exceed $2,000 for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property. Such loans may bear interest not to exceed 4 percent and are payable in 20 years. This benefit is available to World War No. 2 veterans and persons who served on or after September 16, 1940, the service requirements being the same as those for education or training.

4. Readjustment allowances of $20 per week for a period not to exceed 52 weeks for unemployed World War No. 2 veterans, including those persons who served on or after September 16, 1940, under the same service requirements as for education or training. Self-employed veterans earning less than $100 per month are eligible for readjustment allowances representing the difference between their net earnings and $100 per month.

5. A seeing-eye or guide dog trained for the aid of blind veterans may be provided blind veterans entitled to disability compensation. Also there may be provided mechanical and electronic equipment to aid them in overcoming the handicap of blindness. Blind veterans, as well as other blind individuals, are allowed to deduct $500 from adjusted gross income in determining net income under the Federal income tax law.

6. Certain preferences as to Federal civil service, as to physical and age prerequisites, examinations, ratings, appointments, retentions, and reinstatement of Federal employment are extended to qualified service-connected disabled veterans, war and campaign service veterans and the unremarried widows of such war and campaign service veterans, supplemented by extensive United States Employment Service, and Veterans' Employment Service, in every State, for all unemployed veterans, and an effective job counseling and employment placement service so as to provide the maximum of job opportunity, in the field of gainful employment. Any World War No. 2 veteran who applies therefor within 40 days after discharge, is entitled to reinstatement to the Federal position held at time of entering service, or to one of equal grade and pay, or to his previous private employment, where at all prac-

ticable for employer, enforceable by court order, if necessary.

7. Credit for all active military or naval service for Federal civil service retirement, with minor exceptions.

8. Credit for all active war service for railroad-retirement purposes.

9. Burial allowance, up to the amount of $100, may be paid as to any war veteran, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, or in receipt of pension or compensation, as to any veteran discharged from the armed forces for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

A United States flag to drape the casket, subsequently to be turned over to the next of kin, may be furnished as to any veteran whose death occurred after discharge from active service during any war or after serving at least one enlistment or by reason of disability incurred in line of duty. Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged as to any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, as to his minor children or adult unmarried daughters. The expenses incident to transporting the body of one who has died while in active service, or of a veteran who has died in a Veterans' Administration facility, to the place of burial, are, within limitations, borne by the Government. Headstone or marker—stone or marble—will be furnished for the unmarked grave of any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who died while in the active service.

10. Various benefits, rights, and privileges are also provided as to certain veterans, their dependents, and their organizations under State laws, as per the résumé thereof, recently published by the House Committee on Pensions, entitled "State Veterans' Laws."

V. BENEFITS FOR SERVICE WOMEN

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps which is no longer in existence, having been superseded by the Women's Army Corps, was an auxiliary component of the Army, and as such was not generally covered by laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, but its members are entitled to hospitalization and domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration. Members of Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps and Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard, which are components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, on the basis of active duty, are eligible for veterans' benefits.

As to rights to hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits, on a parity with war veterans, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the term "active military or naval service," includes active duty as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard. Members of the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard are also eligible for these benefits as members of components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard on the basis of active service in World War No. 2.

VI. MONETARY BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS

1. Death compensation or pension, under varying conditions, to widows and minor children (also including helpless children), and dependent parents, of those deceased veterans who die in service or as the result of service-connected disabilities.

2. Death compensation, in smaller amounts, under certain conditions, to widows and minor children (also including helpless children) of those deceased veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, who, at time of death, had some service-connected disability of measurable degree, even though less than 1 percent.

3. Death pensions, under certain conditions, to widows and minor children (also including helpless children) of deceased Civil War, Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion and Indian war veterans.

Important Message To Next of Kin of Men and Women in Our Armed Forces in Case of a Death Casualty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, at this time when many war casualties are in the offing it might do well to inform the people of my district just what dependents and next of kin are entitled to as a result of losing a son, a daughter, a husband, or a father on the many battlefields of this world. Should any death casualty occur it should be remembered that there are due the wife, children, parents and in some cases brothers or sisters the following:

First. A 6-months gratuity payment. If there is a legal wife this is first paid to her. If there is no wife, but there is a child or children, payment is next made to them. If there is neither wife nor child, the payment is made to the parents. If there is no wife, child or parents, payment is made to brothers or sisters, and if none of these next of kin are living, payment is made to grandparents. This payment is automatically made and no papers need be signed by the serviceman for his next of kin to receive this and no dependency needs to be shown.

The amount of this payment depends on the rank in service. If the casualty is a private it is $300. If the casualty is a corporal, it is $396. If the casualty is a sergeant it is $468. All cases are slightly higher when the casualty occurs overseas. The gratuity payment is six times the monthly base pay of the man or woman in service. This payment is made in addition to the insurance or any other benefits.

Second. Monthly insurance payments. This insurance is not paid in a lump sum. It is paid on a monthly basis depending on the age of the beneficiary. The older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy a beneficiary under 30 years of age will receive $55.51 a month for 240 months. A beneficiary over 30 years of age will get a guaranteed 120 equal installments, and if they survive beyond 120 months it is paid for life. The amount of monthly payment if the beneficiary is over 30 depends on the age of the beneficiary. Under a $10,000 policy a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

No actual policy is mailed out on national service life insurance. A certificate of policy is issued in place of it and this is mailed to whomever the service man or woman indicates to receive it. Oftentimes, he indicates himself to receive it and in other cases, his wife or parents. The certificate of policy does not indicate the name of the beneficiary and the person receiving it is not necessarily the beneficiary. These certificates of policy should be kept in a safe place as they are asked for at the time insurance is settled. If they are lost, no new one is issued.

An insurance policy taken out by men and women in our armed forces can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brothers, and sisters, including those of half-blood. No one outside of this group may be named as a beneficiary. When payment is made on the insurance it is made only to the person or persons named by the service man or woman as the beneficiary.

It is well for the parents and wives or others who might be named to check with the service man or woman to be sure that these insurance papers are all in order. If any next of kin has not received a certificate of policy and is sure the service man or woman has taken it out in his name, it is well to check to see why it has not been received.

Third. A pension. This pension is paid to a widow and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, they are not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent or can show present dependency upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased serviceman can get a pension at the same time as his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 per month. Two parents, $25 each. Widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child, subject to apportionment regulations; no widow but one child, $25; no widow but 2 children, $38, equally divided, with $10 for each additional child—total divided. Total pension as to widow, child, or children not to exceed $100.

Note: The fact that a widow, a child, or parent gets insurance or other death compensation benefits from the Government does not prevent them from getting a pension also and they need not figure them in when figuring income on pension application forms.

Fourth. Arrears of pay. When a casualty occurs that service man or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. For instance if the casualty occurs on the 27th of the month, he had 27 days pay coming. If the casualty occurs on the 15th of the month, he had 15 days back pay coming. Then, too, when soldiers or sailors are at the front or out to sea, they may miss several pay days and all of this back pay is due the nearest heir. The nearest heir of the

deceased service person should inquire about and collect this arrears of pay.

SUMMARY

Should there be a death casualty in your family, remember that there are four payments due the dependents: First, 6 months' gratuity payment; second, insurance; third, a pension; and fourth, arrears of pay. If there are any questions on these and especially for aid in filling out the necessary application forms for each benefit due, see your local veterans' service officer, or your local Red Cross chairman, or your local American Legion head. If there is any further difficulty, write to Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

My Labor Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I think I can say, not immodestly but as a matter of fact, that labor has never had a more sincere and true friend in the Congress of the United States than I have been during my service in this body. My own experience as a poor boy, brought up in the "school of hard knocks," has given me the deepest appreciation of the dignity of labor. It has taught me the great importance of protecting civil liberties, individual rights, and free enterprise. No administration of public affairs can be successful that does not deal fairly and justly with both industry and labor.

Because of my labor record the organizations that speak for labor have always endorsed me without fail. This year they are renewing their endorsements. The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, largest of the 21 railroad brotherhoods, led with its endorsement on April 20, when Martin H. Miller, national legislative representative of that brotherhood, wrote to me as follows:

The undersigned is advised by Mr. A. F. Whitney, president, that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, in consideration of your labor voting record and attitude on legislation of interest to the people, has endorsed you for nomination as Representative in Congress from the Eleventh District of Indiana.

INDIANA FEDERATION OF LABOR ENDORSEMENT

The Indiana State Federation of Labor has endorsed me for reelection this year in the following letter:

INDIANA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Indianapolis, Ind.

The following is an excerpt from page 1 of our list for the Eleventh Congressional District:

"LOUIS LUDLOW, 843 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis. Present Congressman. No better friend of labor ever represented Indiana in the Congress of the United States."

INDIANA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR.

Following are extracts from some speeches I have made in the House on matters affecting labor:

AGAINST SMITH-CONNALLY BILL

(In the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 8, 1943)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I have written to an esteemed constituent of mine stating the main reasons why I voted against the Smith-Connally bill and to uphold the President's veto of that measure. The letter is as follows:

JULY 10, 1943.

Mr. DWIGHT SHERBURNE,
The A. Burdsal Co.,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. SHERBURNE: I am glad you wrote to me in regard to my vote against the so-called Smith-Connally bill and my vote to sustain the President's veto of that measure.

You certainly are entitled to know what was in my mind when I cast those votes.

Without going into lengthy details, I will state some of my reasons.

In the first place, in all of these important matters connected with the prosecution of the war, I have felt it a duty to give much weight to the wishes of those on whom rests the responsibility of running the war. We are in a desperate conflict, that may last for years, and that certainly will test all of our resources. In such a situation, we must have leadership and unity behind that leadership. All of those responsible for running the war, the Commander in Chief, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Under Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of the War Production Board, that has to produce the materials of war, all asked that this bill be not passed, fearing it would create inharmony and slow up the war effort. We may not like our leaders, but as long as they are our leaders in the midst of a desperate war, I feel that we should go along with them unless there are the most imperative reasons to the contrary.

Then, too, I do not believe in hurting innocent people. My philosophy is to help, and not to hurt, those who are innocent and worthy. It so happens that I was in a position to have an inside view of this entire situation. I am a member of the small subcommittee of twelve on deficiency appropriations, which drafts the large appropriation measures necessary to carry on the war. Recently we had before us Donald Nelson, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and he gave us, mostly off the record, the war production picture. It was an amazing picture, far exceeding all expectation. The production has been truly marvelous. No boy on any of the fighting fronts has suffered for the implements he needs. On the contrary, implements in great abundance are piled up in warehouses and at terminal points, awaiting transportation facilities.

Mr. Nelson was unstinting in his praise of the part labor has performed in producing the implements of war needed to win the victory. In the light of his glowing testimony it seemed to me there was something cruelly unjust in slapping all organized labor—for that is what the Smith-Connally bill did—when organized labor as a whole has done such a wonderful job. It did not seem to me to be right that all well-meaning, faithful, honest, patriotic labor should be punished for the sins of one man, John L. Lewis.

I share the general indignation over the conduct of Lewis, but I think how much better it would have been and how much more conducive to the harmony and cooperation that is vitally necessary to win the war, if labor as a whole could have been praised for the part Chairman Nelson says it has done in behalf of the Nation, instead of having this blot and damper put on it by legislative action. The bill that was passed was a punitive, antilabor measure, too sweeping in scope, and it was passed because the pendulum of public sentiment, put in motion by John L. Lewis' misconduct, swung too far. I fear that in the long run the leaders who are responsible for running the war were right in their apprehension that the new law will have a depressing, disuniting, demoralizing effect on the war effort. Production is now falling off; for what reasons I do not know, but I doubt whether the men have the heart in it that they had when they were making such a magnificent record of production.

There were other impelling reasons why I opposed the bill. I did not like its southern sponsorship. Members of Congress from the low-wage section of the South are making every effort to break down the industrial system of the North and to repeal the wage-and-hour law. They want to return to cheap wages, thus giving the South industrial supremacy. I have too much regard for the fine industries of Indianapolis and Indiana and the North, and for the welfare of both our northern employers and our northern wage earners to want to play into their hands.

I might cite just one other objection to the measure which alone, in my opinion, would have justified a vote against it. That is the extent to which it goes toward the centralization of government. I am one of those who think that the Government is already mixing too much in business. I voted against the National Industrial Recovery Administration Act and many other measures which I thought tended to augment bureaucratic authority over business and industry. I think we ought to be recapturing the powers Congress has surrendered instead of augmenting those powers. When this war is over I want this country to be the same country of free enterprise it always has been and which, please God, may it always be.

Yet, no totalitarian ruler of Europe or Asia has more power over industry than this bill confers on the President of the United States. He can take over plants at will and hold them; his executive instrumentality, the War Labor Board, will write labor contracts all over the United States, and, worse still, the legislation denies any appeal to the courts. I do not want Franklin D. Roosevelt or any other President of the United States to have any such power. I will not, as long as I am a Member of the House, vote totalitarianism into the laws of the United States. It is altogether too dangerous.

The looseness with which the bill was put together in its checkered career of amendments and floor controversies, and what not, is shown by the fact that while it purports to prevent strikes it sets up a way whereby strikes may be conducted and thus legalizes strikes.

I would like for you to believe that as the representative of our people and one of the representatives of the Nation as a whole I take my job seriously. I study all angles of these important matters and try to think them out with what God has given me to think with, and I vote the verdict of my judgment and conscience. No doubt I make plenty of mistakes, but they are honest mistakes, and while you may not agree with me in specific instances, I believe you would want your Representative to go into these matters independently with an open mind and try to reach a fair and just conclusion.

Thanking you very much for your letter of inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

REPEAL OF SMITH-CONNALLY ACT DEMANDED

(In the House of Representatives, Friday, May 5, 1944)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, as a friend of both labor and management I rise today to urge Congress to repeal the Smith-Connally Act and to do it immediately before the pernicious effects of that act become more widespread.

The act stands indicted and convicted of two major crimes against public welfare, as follows:

1. It has cast unwarranted reflection on the masses of American labor who have accomplished the greatest war-production record of all time.

2. It is doing incalculable damage to the relations between Government and industry.

I have deep feelings on this score because as a citizen and as a representative of citizens I feel very keenly my obligation to do everything I possibly can to protect civil liberties and free enterprise and no matter what may come I am going to be true to that obligation.

I think it is now pretty clear that the zeal of labor baiters overreached itself when it forced the passage of the Smith-Connally Act.

LABOR'S GREAT PART IN WINNING THE WAR

(In the House of Representatives, Thursday, March 16, 1944)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have received a very significant letter from Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, which gives a graphic description of the part labor has performed in producing the implements that are necessary to win the war.

This letter from the man on whom rests the tremendous responsibility of seeing that the war production program is carried out satisfactorily ought, I think, to bring about two distinct and positive results.

1. It should immediately put an end for all time to the unthinkable, un-American, totalitarian proposal to draft labor in the United States.

2. It should be helpful in bring about the repeal of the Smith-Connally Act and the wholly uncalled for and unwarranted injustice which labor as a whole has had to suffer by the passage of that act. I believe Mr. Nelson's letter demonstrates two facts conclusively—

First. That the proponents of the Austin-Wadsworth universal national conscription bill, otherwise known as the National Service Act and the labor draft, or forced labor, bill do not have a leg to stand on.

Second. That the passage of the Smith-Connally bill was a cruel, stinging insult to honest patriotic labor which has made a record of production beyond all comparison.

I have promptly referred Chairman Nelson's letter to the committees that are considering the Austin-Wadsworth bill and the bills that have been introduced to repeal the Smith-Connally Act and I shall follow up and see that the letter receives the attention its importance merits.

A few days ago I wrote to Chairman Nelson asking him to give me the true picture of labor's performance in producing the implements of war. If it was a bad picture, I wanted to know it and if, on the other hand, it was a pleasing picture, I wanted the facts so that, in justice to labor, I might present the truth to the House and to the country. In his reply Mr. Nelson says it is his firm belief that American labor has done a truly splendid job in war production and that labor has met the heavy responsibilities with real patriotism and determination. Then he proceeds to present statistics of production that are staggering in their immensity.

But I think the amazing story of labor's part in the war effort is best told in Mr. Nelson's own words. His letter to me is as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1944.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Thank you for telling me about your plan to make an address on labor's part in the production of the implements of war. I hope that the following material will be of some use to you:

You ask my opinion as to the part labor has performed in war production. Taking the production program as a whole, and considering all of the difficulties which have been encountered, it is my firm belief that American labor has done a truly splendid job in war production. Labor and management alike have of course been under great pressure during the last 2 years and have had to work at very high tension. Mistakes have been made, naturally, and the strain which is normal at a time like this has from time to time brought about unfortunate misunderstandings and disagreements; yet I do not see how anyone can look at the great volume of production that has been achieved since Pearl Harbor without realizing that labor has met the heavy responsibilities with real patriotism and determination. The important thing is that the job is being done.

The production of arms and munitions since Pearl Harbor has very substantially exceeded even the most optimistic expectations any of us had before this country got into the war. In 1941, for example, when what then appeared to be a very large defense program was under way this country produced munitions valued at less than $8,000,000,000. In 1942 that figure was raised to $31,238,000,000, while in 1943 it stood at more than $57,622,000,000. I do not believe that anyone in the fall of 1941 anticipated that such prodigious increases — properly balanced among the hundreds of different categories—could be achieved so rapidly.

The following figures showing increases made in different categories of production may be of interest to you:

From July 1940 through December 1941 we produced 23,200 military airplanes. In 1942 we produced 47,900. In 1943 we produced 85,900.

From July 1940 through December 1941 we turned out 4,300 tanks. In 1942 we made 23,900. In 1943 we made 29,500.

From July 1940 through December 1941 this country manufactured 126,100 machine guns. In 1942 we made 666,800. In 1943 we made 830,400.

From July 1940 through December 1941 we made 370,500 rifles and carbines. In 1942 we made 1,552,000. In 1943 we made 5,624,000.

In small-arms ammunition 1,200,000,000 rounds were produced from July 1940 through December 1941. In 1942 there were produced 9,800,000,000 rounds. In 1943 production was 19,700,000,000 rounds.

We had produced one piece of self-propelled artillery by the end of 1941. In 1942, 8,300 were produced and in 1943 production was 22,200.

By the end of 1941, 270,000 displacement tons of naval ships had been constructed. In 1942 this figure was raised to 865,000 displacement tons, and the displacement tonnage constructed in 1943 stood at 2,618,000.

I trust that this material will be of some use to you in your speech.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman.

FOR FOOD SUBSIDIES

(In the House of Representatives, Tuesday, November 23, 1943)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in voting on this bill today to put an absolute ban on subsidies I am restricted to a choice between two evils. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. We must vote either for subsidies or for inflation. There is no other choice. If subsidies go out, inflation comes in. There is not a particle of doubt about that. Members who vote to pass this bill to outlaw subsidies may honestly say that they are not in favor of inflation but that is exactly what they will be voting for.

I hate subsidies. No Member who votes today to put a ban on subsidies hates them any more than I do, but there is one thing I hate more than subsidies and that is inflation that would crush the heart out of every person in this country who is on a fixed income and that is precisely the sort of unspeakable disaster we will be inviting if this bill becomes a law.

I believe that under the peculiar circumstances the country is now facing the enactment of this bill would be a major blow to the poor and middle classes and a calamity to the entire Nation for the reason that it would immediately start an upward spiral of prices, the end of which no man can foresee. I would not think of voting for a continuance of limited subsidies if I were not positively certain that by discarding subsidies we shall get something infinitely worse.

The administration has a definite plan to keep prices at the present level, or lower. I am not going to vote to destroy that plan. I am not going to cast a vote that would break down that dam and open the way to galloping, run-away inflation and an orgy of rising prices. Representing a great consuming district I feel that I would be recreant to the trust vested in me if I did not do everything I possibly can to keep the essential items of the cost of living within the means of the masses of the people.

FOR NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION TRAINING PROGRAM

(In the House of Representatives, Monday, June 28, 1943)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in a short time Congress will determine the fate of the National Youth Administration. It will determine whether or not that Administration during the fiscal year 1944 shall train approximately 600,000 youths in industrial pursuits and thus make them effective contributors to our nation's war economy and useful and efficient members of society. I hope that Congress will say to the National Youth Administration: "You may continue your training program. You are doing a good work."

To the extent that I have a voice and influence I am exercising the same in behalf of a continuation of the N. Y. A. training program.

I say this notwithstanding there is no one in Congress, I believe, who has a greater desire than I have to see that economy in government is effected and that in every possible instance duplication and overlapping are eliminated. It has been argued that since there are half a dozen agencies in the field of vocational training the National Youth Administration might well be abolished and the trainees taken over under other agencies, but I find on very thorough investigation that there are two sound arguments against that proposal. One is that the N. Y. A. training program is a going program that is proceeding at full speed in turning out efficient trainees and constantly infiltrating them into plants all over the country where they are vitally needed and to disrupt that program now would slow up the war effort and do much harm. The other argument in favor of continuing the N. Y. A. training program is that there is no other program just like it. It enters into a different field and taps a potential source of timber for skilled manpower and womanpower that is not reached by any other training agency. I find that while it embraces persons of all

races within the scope of its activities it is in many instances the only agency through which Negroes can obtain the technical and vocational training which they desire and to which they are entitled.

If the National Youth Administration training program is to be saved it must be saved now. The situation requires immediate action. The bill is now pending in the Senate and will be voted on soon. I have had several conferences with the junior Senator from New York, in charge of the bill, and he tells me the vote will be very close. I take this occasion to suggest to Members of the House that you do not depend on letters, or even on the telephone, but that you go in person to the other end of the Capitol and see the Senators from your States and urge them to support the bill to continue the National Youth Administration's training program.

FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES

(In the House of Representatives, Wednesday, March 8, 1944)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, child delinquency has reached a peak never before realized nor dreamed of in this country. It has reached the all-time high. In its early stages the rapid growth of child delinquency created amazement and now it has become frightening.

All of us are voting without hesitation and without stint the billions to win the war so as to make civilization safe and secure in the ages to come. While we are doing that I think it is altogether right and proper that we should vote a few millions to cure instead of to kill. We are the guardians of posterity and we have a responsibility to see that the children of America do not suffer spiritual blight and decadence as a result of conditions which it is within our power to remedy.

We will be very derelict in duty if in the face of mounting juvenile crime which already has passed all known bounds we destroy the child-care projects of the community-facilities program by withdrawing the means necessary to enable them to carry them on. We could do no greater disservice to our children who will be our leaders of tomorrow and who need to be strong and reliant to cope with the momentous problems of posterity.

The appropriation of $127,500,000 carried in this bill for community facilities is not as much, in my opinion, as might wisely and judiciously be spent in providing the facilities on which the welfare of the Nation so much depends, but it will cover existing commitments and will provide $18,194,000 of new money to meet contingencies that will arise. The Budget estimate was $150,000,000, and we had definite assurance that if we granted that amount it would close the books and the agency would not return for more money. I voted in committee for the appropriation of the full Budget estimate, which would consume the balance of the authorization of $500,000,000. No one wants to see appropriations cut more than I do, but I do not want to cut them at the expense of our children.

FOR REPEAL OF POLL TAX

Mr. Speaker, by my voice and my votes I have done everything I possibly could to bring about the repeal of the iniquitous poll tax. It is unthinkable to me that our men who are fighting and dying on the battle fronts to preserve our free institutions should be denied the freedom of voting for candidates of their choice to manage those institutions.

FOR BETTER PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

I have consistently voted for better pay for postal employees who were for so long a time the "forgotten men" in our Federal pay scale. I am now heartily supporting H. R. 4501, which proposes to give to postal employees the overtime pay that is so general in defense employment and other branches of the Government.

FOR FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

(In the House of Representatives, Friday, May 26, 1944)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, on the whole, the evidence that has come to me through our committee hearings and from all other directions convinces me that the Fair Employment Practice Committee is doing an outstanding job in promoting national unity, in improving and sustaining the morale of the tenth or more of our people who comprise the minority groups, and in opening up reserves of manpower so much needed to win the war that would otherwise have remained untapped. Sincerely believing, as I do, that the Committee on Fair Employment Practice is a vital war agency, I hope that the amendment striking it down will not be adopted and that it will be implemented with the funds carried in this bill, which are the minimum to enable it to carry on its work.

LABOR'S APPROVAL OF MY WORK IN CONGRESS

Labor, the organ of the 21 railroad brotherhoods, printed the following article on the front page of its issue of March 25, 1944:

Some time ago Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW, Democrat, Indiana, leading member of the House Appropriations Committee, called on Donald M. Nelson, Director of the War Production Board, for a "true picture of labor's performance in producing the implements of war."

Before entering Congress LUDLOW was a Washington newspaper correspondent—and a good one. Carrying his training as a newspaperman over to his law-making duties, when he wants to know about a subject he goes to the fountain-head for his facts.

He addressed his inquiry to Nelson because Nelson is in a position to know more about what labor has done than probably any other official.

"If the labor picture is bad, I want to know it," LUDLOW wrote Nelson. "If, on the other hand, it is a pleasing picture, I want the facts so that, in justice to labor, I may present the truth to the House and to the country."

SPLENDID JOB DONE

Here is what Nelson replied:

"It is my firm belief that American labor has done a truly splendid job in war production. I do not see how anyone can look at the great volume of production that has been achieved since Pearl Harbor without realizing that labor has met its heavy responsibilities with real patriotism and determination. The important thing is that the job is being done.

"The production of arms and munitions since Pearl Harbor has substantially exceeded even the most optimistic expectations any of us had before this country got into war."

Nelson backed this statement with figures showing output of all categories of war materials "that is staggering in its immensity."

In presenting Nelson's letter to the House, LUDLOW declared it "should bring about two distinct and positive results":

AN END TO LABOR DRAFT

"1. It should immediately put an end for all time to the unthinkable, un-American, totalitarian proposal to draft labor in the United States.

"2. It should be helpful in bringing about the repeal of the Smith-Connally Act and the wholly uncalled-for and unwarranted injustice which labor as a whole has had to suffer by the passage of that act."

LUDLOW declared that Nelson has left advocates of the Austin-Wadsworth labor conscription proposal "without a leg to stand on." He added that the passage of the Smith-Connally Act "was a cruel, stinging insult to honest, patriotic labor, which has made a record of production beyond all comparison."

The "amazing story" recited by Nelson, LUDLOW contended, should result in the immediate repeal of the Smith-Connally Act and the refusal of Congress to give any consideration to the Austin-Wadsworth measure.

A Message for Wives and Infants of Men in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, free maternity care for wives of men in military and naval service and free medical and nursing care for their babies is now provided through the Wisconsin State Board of Health as a result of money given to this State by Congress. This Congress appropriated $5,600,000 for that purpose in the spring of 1943 and they appropriated an additional $18,600,000 for the same purpose October 1, 1943.

Under this plan, a wife of a man who is in the lower four ranks of the service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. These lower four ranks include in the Army, private, private first class, corporal, and sergeant; in the Navy it includes men in the seventh to the fourth pay grade.

At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

IMPORTANT TO FOLLOW RULES

Wives of servicemen should acquaint themselves thoroughly with the rules set down for this free medical attention. The rules set down in Wisconsin are clearly stated and must be met in order to receive this care and service. The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service. If the doctor does not have these blanks, write to Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Wisconsin State Board of Health, Madison, Wis., and ask them to rush a blank to you. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2 at once and rush to Madison, Wis., for approval.

APPLY EARLY

It is important that wives apply for this in early pregnancy. The State board of health will not approve payment of the doctor, hospital, or any service before the application is made out. It is

important that the application be made at the first sign of pregnancy. In case of an emergency be sure that the doctor makes application for you within 48 hours after the service is rendered. If the application is not made within 48 hours, no bills for medical or hospital service will be paid. It is most important, therefore, to get the application filled out and sent in at the earliest possible time. See your doctor at the first sign of pregnancy and apply for this free service.

Wives can see their regular family doctor for this. It is not necessary to go to a special or certain doctor to get this aid. It is most important that wives of servicemen remember that no payment for any such service will be made prior to the filing of an application. In other words, no application—no aid. It is tragic to be refused this aid simply because no application was made beforehand.

CHARGES PAID THROUGH STATE BOARD OF HEALTH

The charges for this medical, hospital, and surgical attention are paid through the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Wisconsin State Board of Health, Madison, Wis. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse. No money is given to the wife. No serviceman's wife need worry about proper medical care, infant care, or hospital care in the event of a birth if she acquaints herself with this free service and makes proper application before the event rather than after. Pregnant wives can get prenatal care as well.

WHAT SERVICE WIVES CAN EXPECT

Complete medical service, for maternity patients during the prenatal period, childbirth, and 6 weeks thereafter—including care of complications, operations, postpartum examination—and to the newborn infant.

Health supervision for infants, usually provided in childbirth conferences.

Nursing care, in the home, through the local health department including bedside nursing care as necessary—for the mother, before, during, and after childbirth and for the baby during the first year of life.

Hospital care, in wards or at war rates, for maternity patients and infants. The funds cannot be used in part payment for more expensive hospital accommodations. A minimum stay of 10 days in the hospital after childbirth is arranged if possible. Hospital care may be authorized in any hospitals where the maternity and pediatric services have been approved by the State health agency.

Remember that this service is available only to the wives of the men who are in the four lower ranks of service. It does not apply to the wives of commissioned officers or to the wives of the higher ranking noncommissioned officers.

CONGRESS SET UP THIS SERVICE

The money for this service is available by acts of Congress passed this year, 1943. Your present Congress has appropriated a total of $24,200,000 for this service. I would like to see servicemen's wives learn about this help and make use of it. Should any questions arise ask your doctor or nurse about it and if they do not have the information write your Congressman about it—address your letter: Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Subversive Attempts To Control Elections

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] seemed to be very much irritated because the Dies House Committee on Un-American Activities had caught Sidney Hillman, the Russian-born head of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, reaching across State lines, and laying himself liable to prosecution in the State courts by attempting to control State primaries through corrupt methods.

He has stepped into a trap now. When he reaches across into the State of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Maine, California, or Oregon, to corrupt the electorate in the congressional and senatorial primaries, he subjects himself to prosecution under State laws, and he is likely to find himself inspecting the inside of one of our jails or penitentiaries.

He is trying to build himself up into a dictator—a Hitler or a Mussolini—by shaking down the unprotected laborers in the C. I. O. who cannot help themselves—calling strikes if they do not pay—and using that money to try to get political control of this country. What does he care how many of our boys die for the want of weapons or for the lack of medicines as a result of those strikes, so long as he gets the funds to carry on his subversive campaign?

It is openly charged that he is sending money into Mississippi now, into the district which I represent, to try to control our white primaries, and that a certain Negro organization in New York is doing the same thing. They want to force Negro equality onto the white people of the South.

Already the honest, patriotic, white citizens of the district, whose sons are now fighting the battles of this Nation abroad, to preserve the very institutions Sidney Hillman and his gang would destroy, are watching out for anyone handling these corrupt funds.

Every sheriff, every constable, every marshal, and every law-abiding citizen, as well as the F. B. I., is on the lookout. Anyone caught handling these filthy funds will be dealt with accordingly.

The patriotic people of the district I represent are not for sale; and they are not willing to sell the blood of their sons who are in this war, as they would be doing if they took this filthy money in exchange for their votes or to pay for their aid or support.

What the Disabled Veteran Should Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, if you are discharged or separated from the Army with a disability due to service, you may be entitled to disability benefits, including a pension.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

As you probably know, benefits and pensions for veterans are the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration. It is this Government agency that will handle your claims, will decide the amount of the pension, and will handle all details of this and other benefits to which you and your dependents may be entitled. You should always write to the Veterans' Administration direct and not to the War Department about these matters. Veterans of Wisconsin should do business with Veterans' Administration, Wood, Wis.

FILING YOUR CLAIM

If you are being discharged because of a disability, you will be advised of your right to file a claim for pension and, if you wish, assisted in making application for this benefit before you leave the Army.

The proper form for making application for disability pension is V. A. 526. You can make a claim on this form at any time after discharge or release from active duty. Copies can be obtained at any Army installation, from any Red Cross office, or from any office of the Veterans' Administration. At any of these places you can obtain whatever help you need in filling out the form.

Even though you sign a statement, at the time of your discharge, saying that you do not desire to file application for pension, this will not prevent you from filing a claim at any later date.

Officers released because of disability and not entitled to retirement pay, have the right to file a claim for disability pension and have their rights to this benefit determined by the Veterans' Administration.

HANDLING YOUR CLAIM

It is not necessary to hire a lawyer to secure benefits, and you are advised not to do so. Nevertheless, it is your right to employ legal assistance if you want to. Fees for legal services on pension claims are limited by law.

You may consult your local chapter of Red Cross, the nearest office of the Veterans' Administration, or other organizations approved by the Veterans' Administration for advice and aid in connection with your claim for benefits. This will be furnished to you free.

YOUR "C" NUMBER

The first claim filed by a veteran is assigned a claim number. This is commonly referred to as a "C" number. It never changes. All later claims will come under this "C" number regardless

of when the disability arises. The Veterans' Administration thus maintains a continuous record in one file. Further claims should never be submitted as if they were original proceedings, but all should bear the first "C" number assigned. To save time and trouble in handling your papers, keep a record of your "C" number just as you should do with your Army serial number.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MAKES FINAL DECISION—NOT THE ARMY

Your Army medical board makes a report on your disability, but the final decision as to pension or other benefits rests with the Veterans' Administration. Even though an Army medical board had decided against you, you have the privilege of filing a claim directly with the Veterans' Administration if you disagree and believe that you are entitled to disability benefits.

No soldier needs to be reminded that an undeserving claim wastes the time of officials and delays the rights of other men. But do not hesitate to make application when you believe that your claim is fair and proper.

PENSIONS BASED ON DEGREE OF DISABILITY

Pensions are based upon the percentage of disability and run from 10 percent to 100 percent in multiples of 10. For instance, a veteran with 10 percent disability will receive a monthly sum equal to 10 percent of that granted for total disability. In addition, there are special rates and allowances for specific injuries and more seriously disabling conditions. No additional disability pension is payable for dependents.

PENSIONS BASED ON PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY

Should a veteran of this war become disabled to a degree where he cannot become gainfully employed, he is entitled to a pension although this is not in any way related to his service. This pension amounts to $50 per month.

HOSPITAL TREATMENT, MEDICAL SERVICE, VETERANS' HOMES, AND SO FORTH

If you should ever need further hospital care for a disability incurred in line of duty in the service, it will be provided upon request to the Veterans' Administration. You will be given proper hospitalization and free transportation to the appropriate hospital. Your own ability to pay has no bearing on this service.

If you need medical service or dental care not requiring hospitalization, this too will be provided. This service includes medicine, appliances, bridgework, and so forth, but, of course, the condition must have been caused or aggravated in line of duty by your military service.

Any veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support may apply for admission to one of the numerous Veterans' Homes located throughout the country.

FREE TRAINING FOR A NEW JOB

If your service-connected disability prevents you from working at your old job, you can probably be taught a new occupation in which your disability will not hinder you. This teaching is called vocational training and it is enabling thousands of veterans to overcome physical handicaps, to adjust themselves to civil life, and to regain their earning power. You may even be trained to return to your old job in spite of your disability.

While getting this special training you may receive compensation in addition to your pension and there are added allotments for dependents. Expenses for tuition, books, supplies, and equipment are paid by the Government.

In the various offices of the Veterans' Administration there are advisers who will aid and guide you, who will prepare a program to fit your needs, and make the necessary arrangements for your training. Never hesitate to ask their advice.

PENSIONS FOR DEPENDENTS

Where death occurs, after discharge, from a disability due to service, the widow, children, and dependent parents may make a claim for pension. The Veterans' Administration naturally requires proper proof of relationship with such claims. This again emphasizes the wisdom of keeping your records, including birth and marriage certificates, all together and in a safe place where they can always be found.

PENSIONS ARE SAFEGUARDED

Pension payments to you or to your beneficiaries are not assignable and are exempt from taxation—including income tax—attachment, levy, or seizure, either before or after receipt. These provisions, of course, do not apply to property purchased with these payments.

EMERGENCY RELIEF

Should you need emergency assistance between the time of your discharge and the time when your case can be adjudicated by the Veterans' Administration, it may be obtained through your local chapter of the Red Cross. Assistance may be by grant or by loan, depending upon apparent ability to repay and is made for such needs as shelter, food, clothing, and fuel, and for help with securing benefits to which you or your family may be entitled. Application for such assistance should be made through the local chapter of Red Cross. If there is need for assistance previous to your discharge, you should consult the Red Cross field director at your station.

If veterans have any questions about these aids, see your Red Cross, veterans' service officer, or local American Legion head. If you have any further questions or need any more help, write to Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

VETERAN HAS RIGHT TO APPEAL DISABILITY RATING

In quite a number of cases the first disability rating handed down by the Veterans' Administration is too low. In this case the veteran has the right to appeal the decision, but this appeal must be made within 1 year. This is important. If the appeal is not filed within 1 year, the veteran loses his right to appeal.

If for any reason any veteran has just cause for complaint regarding the disability rating, it is advisable that he appeal at once. In appealing this decision it is wise to get a doctor's statement that he believes that the disability rating given is too low. It is wise also to get a letter from the head of your American Legion and from your Red Cross chairman or county veterans' service officer that the rating is too low.

Send these letters together with your appeal blank filled out completely to Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. I will be very glad to contact the Veterans' Administration and appeal the case for you.

General Somervell Has Done Truly Great Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly great jobs of this war has been done by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell and the Army Service Forces. The Army and Navy Journal has paid fine tribute to General Somervell which I desire to include as an extension of my remarks in order that it may be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress and made part of the permanent RECORD. The article follows:

GENERAL SOMERVELL AND THE ARMY SERVICE FORCES

Back of the combat invasion troops boring their way through Nazi defenses in Europe is the biggest supply job of all history—the task of designing, procurement, manufacture, storage, transportation over land and sea, and distribution of the myriads of weapons and items of supplies to fighting men thousands of miles away when they need it and where they need it.

Heading the Army Service Forces in the planning and performance of this gigantic feat is Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, an Army engineer whose creed can be summed up in one word—"results."

Since his graduation from the United States Military Academy in 1914 General Somervell has been known throughout the service as an officer whose mind and energies are focused in one direction—to get results on the task to which he is assigned. Today, in the direction of this biggest of jobs, he still believes in that single purpose and single aim and cautions all under his command to adhere to it regardless of side issues of expediency or in spite of public or private criticism of their motives, capacity, or even integrity.

This concentration on results has ofttimes brought him criticism, but it also has brought recognition from those who know the whole story. During recent hearings on the gigantic War Department appropriations, Representative STARNES of Alabama, speaking to General Somervell in committee meeting, said: "It was an important date in American history when General Marshall called you to Washington for service. His choice for the highly

important and stupendous task was a happy one for America and for freemen everywhere. When this war is over and we understand the problems with which we have been confronted in the light of history, I think your contribution and that of the Army Service Forces will constitute the greatest saga of World War No. 2."

In his administration of personnel under him, General Somervell gives the widest latitude of authority and expects from them an exercise of initiative and no hesitation about making decisions. He feels that everyone in his command must strive to solve the problems of supply and not to be hide-bound or prejudiced in this approach.

"No one in the A. S. F.," he recently told his personnel, "is going to get hung for taking action; but inaction cannot and will not be tolerated."

The same watchword is his guiding star in his efforts to keep civilian production at top speed. He has spoken out both against management and employers who spend too much time playing golf or planning for post-war civilian production, as well as against labor's production halting strikes. "If we lay down our tools for a single minute," the general says, "it may be too late for victory when we pick them up again."

General Somervell has no patience with anything which does not contribute to the war effort. Addressing the National Association of Manufacturers recently, he discussed post-war planning:

"Until our big job is finished, that other job must remain in second place. Let's not scatter our energies. Let's not devote to millinery the time and energy we should be giving to steel helmets. Let's think of camouflage, not cosmetics. Let's not do too much dreaming about sports roadsters until we have all the jeeps we need."

Further discussing the critical shortage in manpower, General Somervell continued:

"I don't know how we are going to solve this problem. I do know that it must be solved. I do know that manpower still is being employed in beauty shops and perfume factories and poolrooms and bowling alleys. There's been a lot of moaning recently over the fact that some 15,000 night-club entertainers have been thrown out of employment by the operation of a new tax law. Well, there are plenty of jobs for them in your plants or on the railroads and steamships that are carrying the guns and ammunition to our fighting men.

"Let's put these crooners to work at something useful. Our men are dying in Burma and in the jungles of the southwest Pacific. They're dying in Italy and in the air over Germany. There's too much sorrow among the families of our fighting men to waste any tears on a master of ceremonies out of a soft job. If we have to close the night clubs, I say let's lock them up, and the poolrooms and bowling alleys with them, and let's do without perfume and jewelry, if that will help get the war over sooner."

The general carries out the same line of reasoning in his own military organization. He believes thoroughly in the efficiency of the new War Department organization which set up the Army Service Forces along with the Army Ground Forces and the Army Air Forces, but whether or not this is the type of organization which should continue permanently after the war he is not ready to say. Whether the arms and services shall retain their individual identities in the permanent post-war set-up, or whether they shall be amalgamated in a permanent air-ground-supply organization, he has not yet determined. Those are matters for further study; right now his time and energies are being devoted to the problem at hand—win the war.

This singleness of purpose has won results as is now being evidenced on the beaches from Normandy to the Southwest Pacific and China.

The results, too, show sharply in some of the larger accomplishments of the Army Service Forces during 1943:

Procured $23,200,000,000 of supplies and equipment;

Shipped 23,500,000 tons of supplies and equipment to theaters of operations overseas;

Carried overseas 1,870,000 troops and other passengers;

Sent overseas 764,000,000 pieces of mail and 2,200,000 sacks of parcels;

Moved 15,000,000 men within continental United States;

Completed the training of more than 2,000 service units;

Took care of 3,850,000 patients in our hospitals;

Inducted 2,430,000 men into the Army;

Handled 1,800,000 overseas radio messages;

Recruited 61,000 WAC's;

Supplied the troops with $81,000,000 of merchandise through our Army Exchange Service;

Handled 5,000 general courts martial;

Procured 25,000 officers over and above the product of O. C. S.;

Did $2,400,000,000 of construction;

Guarded more than 175,000 prisoners of war and worked tens of thousands of them;

Did $500,000,000 of maintenance and repair work;

Conducted 1,350,000 religious services for the troops;

Had 17,500 pieces of real estate under lease on which we were paying an annual rental of $53,000,000;

Obligated $45,700,000,000 and disbursed $49,900,000,000;

Paid $1,476,000,000 in 3,000,000 family allowance accounts;

Took over and ran the railroads in a period of national peril;

Distributed 1,000,000 textbooks to the armed services and enrolled more than 12,000 students a month in correspondence courses.

Congressional Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement of the total amount which will come directly out of the Treasury in one way or another as a result of the bills that have been passed so far in the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. These figures include, in addition to direct appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, and reappropriation of funds which, without this action, would remain in the Treasury.

The following table shows a breakdown of the amounts made available by bills for each department in the last three sessions of Congress:

Table I

Title	77th Cong., 2d sess.	78th Cong., 1st sess.	78th Cong., 2d sess.
Agriculture	$837,868,110.00	$967,442,616.00	$730,352,070.00
District of Columbia	63,017,368.00	70,301,292.00	75,439,278.00
Independent offices	2,645,053,320.89	3,883,067,316.00	11,402,107,548.00
Interior	196,352,158.60	122,103,376.00	124,252,296.36
Labor-Federal Security	1,071,574,318.00	1,137,167,610.00	1,112,644,464.00
Legislative-Judiciary	25,570,708.00	40,894,478.00	59,701,018.66
Military	42,820,021,846.00	71,507,694,152.00	49,107,801,074.00
Navy	26,002,741,074.00	32,422,759,198.60	32,648,961,701.00
State, Justice, and Commerce	426,281,885.00	226,852,680.00	247,384,980.00
Treasury-Post Office	5,879,403,739.00	8,091,858,177.00	11,204,825,853.00
War Department civil functions	346,312,076.00	97,156,798.00	125,711,580.00
First deficiency	163,780,819.77	6,279,981,739.96	520,762,870.04
Second deficiency	53,721,999.74	260,256,179.72	2,596,551,468.68
National war agencies		2,911,697,224.00	1,033,437,242.00
Lend-Lease, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation and Foreign Economic Administration		6,273,629,000.00	3,920,320,000.00
Farm labor, 1944		26,100,000.00	31,350,200.00
Emergency maternity and infant care, 1944			6,700,000.00
Relief Works Project Administration	282,584,000.00		
Fourth supplemental national deficiency	12,556,672,474.00		
Fifth supplemental national deficiency	32,762,737,900.00		
Sixth supplemental national deficiency	19,146,197,010.18		
Seventh supplemental national deficiency	1,692,574,740.00		
First supplemental national deficiency	1,903,939,210.00		
Maritime insurance	210,000,000.00		
China loan	500,000,000.00		
District of Columbia housing	32,500,000.00		
Education	9,500,000.00		
Navy bill, H. R. 7419, passed July 22, 1942	974,634,000.00		
Urgent deficiency		7,246,700.00	
Urgent deficiency		143,430,591.56	
Total	150,603,038,867.48	138,328,225,323.41	114,949,312,643.78

The expenditures during the fiscal year 1944 will total approximately $93,300,000,000, an increase over last year of approximately $15,000,000,000. The excess of expenditures over receipts this year will be approximately $52,000,000,000, or $4,000,000,000 less than last year. The public debt during the fiscal year will have increased $140,790,000,000 to approximately $195,000,000,000 to $200,000,000,000, depending upon the sales of Government bonds during the balance of the month.

Current expenditures are running at a rate of about $8,500,000,000 a month. The increased taxes during the year are reducing the deficit at the end of the year to a point below the deficit last year. The total appropriations for the year run $114,949,312,643.74. In addition to that there are undoubtedly obligated but unexpended balances for the Army of upward of $50,000,000,000 and for the Navy of upward of $15,000,000,000, so that the total amount available to spend for the

Government without any additional supplemental appropriations will be at least $170,000,000,000. This, of course, cannot all be expended.

Perhaps the expenditures for military purposes in the fiscal year 1945 will run $92,000,000,000 or $93,000,000,000. Perhaps the expenditures for other purposes will run $6,500,000,000, so that the total expenditures for the next fiscal year will run in the neighborhood of $98,000,000,000 or $99,000,000,000.

The revenues will run nearly $50,000,000,000, leaving at least $48,000,000,000 to add to the debt, which will be very close to the $250,000,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1945 unless the end of the war shall earlier stop a considerable portion of our expenditures.

The following is a break-down of the appropriations of this session into regular, permanent, reappropriations, contract authorizations, and special funds for each department of the Government:

Table II

Agriculture:	
Regular	$562,145,918.00
Permanent	125,309,615.00
Reappropriations	32,751,587.00
Trust funds	10,144,950.00
Total	730,352,070.00
District of Columbia:	
Regular	69,111,569.00
Trust funds	6,327,709.00
Total	75,439,278.00
Independent Offices:	
Regular	8,485,099,785.00
Trust funds	1,882,398,262.00
Contract authorization	1,034,609,501.00
Total	11,402,107,548.00
Interior:	
Regular	103,239,796.36
Permanent	21,012,500.00
Total	124,252,296.36
Labor-Federal Security:	
Regular	1,112,644,464.00
Legislative-Judiciary:	
Regular	59,701,018.66
Military:	
Regular	15,434,814,795.00
Reappropriation	33,672,971,000.00
Permanent	15,279.00
Total	49,107,801,074.00
Navy:	
Regular	27,569,798,301.00
Permanent	4,232,000.00
Contract authorization	5,074,931,400.00
Total	32,648,961,701.00
State, Justice and Commerce:	
Regular	241,937,700.00
Trust funds	5,447,280.00
Total	247,384,980.00
Treasury-Post Office:	
Regular	$1,330,846,169.00
Permanent	5,455,255,993.00
Trust fund	4,418,723,691.00
Total	11,204,825,853.00
War—civil functions:	
Regular	92,455,440.00
Permanent	134,256,140.00
Total	126,711,580.00
First deficiency:	
Regular	489,762,870.04
Contract authorization	40,000,000.00
Total	520,762,870.04
Second deficiency:	
Regular	241,368,992.58
Contract authorization	1,855,000,000.00
Reappropriation	500,182,476.10
Total	2,596,551,468.68
National War Agencies:	
Regular	1,030,937,242.00
Contract authorization	2,500,000.00
Total	1,033,437,242.00
Lend-Lease, U. N. R. R. A., and F. E. A., regular	3,920,320,000.00
Farm labor, regular	31,359,200.00

Some question may be raised as to the inclusion of the reappropriations in figuring the total of our appropriations, but if we did not have them, the money would not be spent. Therefore, I can see no escape from the inclusion of these reappropriations to determine the amount that Congress has made available.

The increasing number of Republicans in the House has forced a closer scrutiny of all appropriations and undoubtedly has been responsible for the submission by the Budget of more conservative estimates of the needs of all the agencies of the Government, and has contributed very largely to the courage which has permitted the Appropriations Committee to make some cuts in the appropriations. A further increase in the Republican representation in the House will contribute more in proportion to the salvation of our taxpayers and I am looking forward to the day when we can be of much greater service in cutting down the cost of Government.

Aircraft Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the Ames Laboratory at Moffett Field, Calif., was dedicated.

This marks the culmination of the effort that was made by the Republican Members of the Congress and particularly the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] to provide additional experimental facilities for the development of aircraft.

Back in June 1939 we had no designs of fighting airplanes suitable for construction in the Army, and few in the Navy. Of all the funds provided in the bill that was passed in June 1939 for the construction of airplanes, there were no designs ready to build any.

Republican Members of the House headed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] attempted at that time to add $9,000,000 to the appropriations bill for the experimental development of new and better designs of aircraft so that we might be in a position to build airplanes. This was voted down by the Roosevelt administration supporters, only to have it appear again after England and Germany declared war and it became manifest to the Roosevelt administration that it was necessary to have some designs upon which to build airplanes and so about November 1, 1939, the money became available which the Republicans had tried to make available earlier in the year, but which the Roosevelt forces were able to defeat.

These funds were for aircraft development not only at Moffett Field but at Langley Field, Va. By the failure of the Roosevelt forces to vote the funds for experimentation the development of the Flying Fortress and our fighting planes was delayed by nearly 6 months. It was my privilege to serve upon the Navy Appropriations Subcommittee for 10 years and the Army Appropriations Subcommittee for 4 years and I have served upon the Deficiency Subcommittee for 12 years. During all of that time it has been necessary for the Congress to take the lead for providing for the development of airplanes and other experimental efforts, both in ships and tanks and guns and everything else. The Roosevelt administration has not been forward looking in this connection, but it has always waited for the Congress to take the lead in keeping our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force up to date.

I feel that these facts should be brought out and that we should have them in front of us so that the people may realize whose responsibility it was for our failure to have designs of planes which were up to date and ready to use when the world became engaged in this terrible war.

Benefits to Veterans of World War No. 2 in G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, veterans of this war now can do these things with Government help:

They can buy or repair a home, buy and stock up a farm, start a new business, get a high-school or college education, draw special unemployment benefits if unable to find work, be assured of free and adequate hospitalization.

Benefits extend to men and women of the armed services who have other than dishonorable discharges and who have

served 90 days since September 15, 1940, or less than 90 days if they have service-connected disabilities.

If is important to know exactly what the Government now offers, what the terms, the conditions, the opportunities are in each field.

FIRST, TAKE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR HOME BUYING OR FOR BUYING A FARM

A qualified veteran will be able to get the Veterans' Administration to arrange for a Government-guaranteed loan for buying or building a home or for making repairs, alterations, and improvements on a home. Such loans also may be obtained by a veteran to pay off back taxes or delinquent debts on homes. The Government will guarantee 50 percent of the loan up to $2,000 and will pay the first year's interest on the part of the loan that it guarantees. Thus, a veteran can borrow up to $4,000, with the Government standing behind half of it.

These loans can be made by a bank, loan association, or any other lending agency, including an individual or friend of the veteran. If you are a veteran who obtains such a loan, you would have to satisfy the lender as to collateral on your share. But, in the case of buying a home, the home could be used as collateral. Interest on these loans cannot exceed 4 percent, and they must be repaid in full within 20 years.

In addition, the Government will guarantee fully a secondary loan up to 20 percent of the cost of the property. But the total amount guaranteed by the Government in both loans cannot exceed $2,000. This provision makes it possible for veterans to get cash for original down payments on homes. Interest on such secondary loans can run up to 5 percent. Veterans have until 2 years after the war or 2 years after their discharge—whichever is later—to take advantage of the loan opportunities.

Loans on the same basis are available for veterans who want to buy farms. Money from the loans may be used to purchase land, buildings, livestock, machinery, or other equipment or for making repairs and improvements. But if you are a veteran and want to buy a farm, you must show that you know something about farming and are likely to make a success of the undertaking.

SUPPOSE A VETERAN WANTS TO SET UP HIS OWN BUSINESS

Here the procedure and conditions for getting loans are about the same as those for buying homes or farms. The money may be used to buy an established business or land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, and so forth. Secondary loans also are available for down payments. But if you are getting a loan for this purpose, the Veterans' Administration will want to know something about your background and experience in this business. In other words, you will have to show that there is a reasonable likelihood that you will make a success of it. Even so, it is expected that many veterans will want to start their own business and will be helped.

IF IT IS A MATTER OF EDUCATION OR TRAINING

When a veteran qualifies for a college, school, or training course, the Government will pay up to $500 a year to cover tuition, laboratory fees, cost of books, and so forth. The student also will get $50 a month living allowance, plus $25 a month if he has a wife or other dependents. He may choose his school, but he must keep up with the work or he will be dropped.

If a veteran was under 25 when he entered the service he may return to school even though his education was not interrupted. That is, he may have left school and been working when he entered service. But anyone who was 25 or over when he went into service must show, in order to qualify, that his education was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with. However, any veteran who desires a refresher or retraining course may take such a course for 1 year.

A veteran who qualifies for college or other schooling will be able to remain at Government expense for 1 year. Then, if he qualifies for further education, he can remain for the length of time, up to a total of 4 years, that he served between September 15, 1940, and the end of the war. He has until 2 years after his discharge or after the war ends to return to school. This Government-paid education program stops 7 years after the war ends.

NEXT, AS TO UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Ex-service men and women will be able to claim unemployment benefits of $20 a week for up to 52 weeks if they cannot find jobs. They will be entitled to 4 weeks of unemployment benefits for each month of service, plus additional time allowance for the first 90 days of service. But they are supposed to register with a public employment agency, such as the United States Employment Service, and accept suitable work if offered. Furthermore, they will be disqualified from unemployment benefits if they give up suitable jobs without reason, are fired for misconduct, or, in certain cases, go out on strike. Unemployment benefits will be available to a veteran until 2 years after his discharge or 2 years after the war, whichever is later.

Cash benefits also are provided for self-employed veterans who make less than $100 a month. They can have the Government make up the difference between their net earnings and $100 a month. Like the unemployment payment, this benefit is allowed up to 52 weeks according to length of service.

If veterans have any questions about these aids, see your Red Cross, veteran service officer, or local American Legion head. If you have any further questions or need any more help, write to Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Senate Resolution 114

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under the general leave to extend remarks granted upon the unanimous-consent request made by the majority leader on June 23, I desire to extend my remarks to include a speech in support of Senate Resolution 114, which I delivered in Laramie, Wyo., on August 18, 1943:

I know that it is my purpose in participating with other Members of the Congress of the United States during the summer in a program to present to the people of America the significance of Senate Resolution 114 to limit my discussion to that resolution; the particular significance of its language; the nature of its purposes and the propriety and portent of the resolution in light of the pertinent provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Therefore, it goes without saying that I definitely believe that the future safety and well-being of our country demands our participation with other world powers in an international order with power and authority equivalent to that stated in Senate Resolution 114. I believe that we must extend the juridical order as developed largely out of eighteenth-century philosophy and thinking as the system best calculated to insure individual freedom to man under law, to the world as a whole, in which the component parts of that world shall participate. I believe that the development in thinking which requires the extension of this order over the world is but an inevitable development of the desires of mankind to conquer his own selfishnesses, his own prejudices, and his own hates in order that mankind may occupy the earth in peace and develop its resources intelligently for the benefit of all people who are willing to do a day's work with their hands or their heads, for their share of the good things of the earth. I do not believe that it is the purpose of society to treat the incompetent, the drones, and the lazy equally with the competent, the industrious, the frugal and the prudent, either in this Nation or in any other nations. But I do think it is the duty of society in this Nation and in the world to develop a society of greater equality of opportunity than the world has ever seen to date, in which the competent, the industrious, the frugal, and the people of good will may have an equal opportunity to participate in those material things of the world which the peoples of the various parts of the world deem necessary to their happiness. From this it follows that I do not advocate, nor do I think the American people contemplate, a world W. P. A., nor do I think that that thought is relevant to the issues which are before the American people. As a matter of fact, if the people of the United States, through their elected representatives, are permitted a full opportunity to participate in shaping the peace which is to come and the world order which is to come, it is my conviction that they will support such a peace and such an order which will afford to the peoples of the world the opportunities to develop into competent, industrious, frugal people by their own efforts and consistent with the dignity of man, and that they want nothing else. It is my belief that Senate

Resolution 114 affords this opportunity for the people's representatives to develop such a peace and such a world order, from which I conclude that those who seriously advocate a world W. P. A. are missing the temper of the people, and likewise that those who do not seriously urge such a world order are professing to see the fear of the same in any international world order solely for the purpose of drawing a red herring across the path of an enlightened international development.

It goes without saying that I do not believe it is necessary to further discuss in America the necessity for participation by America in the organization advocated by Senate Resolution 114; and I shall not take my time or yours to advocate the international point of view, or condemn any other, believing as I do, that a substantial majority of the people of the United States recognize the necessity for a new world order and America's participation therein. I do believe, and I have found by my own personal observation that what the people want now is the development of a specific policy as an initial step to the further necessary one of the development of the machinery by which that American policy shall be carried out. But, if there are yet those who believe that after this war America should again attempt a policy of immunizing itself from the rest of the world, then, I point out that now, 25 years after that war, the world is engulfed in another war today; we have not been able and could not avoid being drawn into it. I do not, and I shall not, question the patriotism or the sincerity of those who, during that 25-year interim, in absolute good faith, because they believed that America's best interest lay that way, advocated and supported a policy of immunization. I simply point out that pragmatically we are now in another war, that policy did not prevent our being in another war, from which I would conclude as a person of common sense that a continuation of such a policy, particularly in the light of the newly developed methods of transportation by air which have further shortened the world's distances, that a continuation of that policy will not give us peace; it will not avoid the terrible waste and extravagance and horrors and tragedies of war, from which we must conclude, as thinking people, that we must adopt a specific policy because it is only by developing intelligently an opposite policy that we have any hope of obtaining peace and avoiding war.

Senate Resolution 114, which was presented to the Senate by Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL in March of this year, is designed primarily to declare a foreign policy for the United States based upon the advice of the Senate of the United States which, in my opinion, is entirely consistent with not only the language, but the spirit of the constitutional provisions which declare the duties of the President and of the Senate in the development of an American foreign policy. It is my positive opinion that under the Constitution, the Senate of the United States must not only participate in the formation of an American foreign policy, but that the language of the instrument definitely indicates that it should initiate the policy, or certainly it must participate in the initiation of the policy. In taking this view, I realize that I am taking a position which is opposite to that advanced recently by an officer of our State Department. Nevertheless, the language used in the American Constitution was the development of long and serious debate by scholarly men who, above all things, knew the significance of language. Understanding of this fact gives the background for the reasoning which I am about to advance.

The first clause of the second grammatical paragraph of section 2 of article II of the Constitution, referring to the Executive power and authorities, reads as follows:

"He shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The extremely significant word in this section is the word "advice." Advice is defined as "a recommendation regarding a decision or course of conduct." In other words, when ordinary people use the word "advice" in its ordinary significance, we use it not in the sense of ratifying an accomplished fact, but we use it for the purpose of defining a situation where one person goes to another for the purpose of discussing a course of action or a decesion to be made in the future in order that the person consulted before the fact is accomplished may state his position or his recommendation for the purpose of guiding the person who came to him with reference to the course to be pursued. Or, again, if I am about to make a decision and I go for advice, I contemplate that I will receive the benefit of the thinking of the person whom I consult. It is true that I may disregard the thinking and the conclusions of the person consulted, but having consulted that person, if I choose to disregard his thinking and embark upon a different course, I do so with full knowledge that my decision is contrary to that of the person consulted. Therefore, from the use of the word "advice" in this part of our Constitution, it is clear to me that in the question of the execution of treaties or the entering into of agreements with other nations, our Constitution makers contemplated that the Chief Executive should first consult the Senate of the United States or that the Senate of the United States should first take a position with reference to foreign questions so that its advice and its position would be stated before the Executive and the people of the country prior to the time that agreements with foreign nations were entered into.

From this it follows that, in my opinion, the four Senators who joined in this resolution have evidenced the greatest statesmanship which has been produced by any Members of the United States Senate in my time. I am convinced that it is the purpose of this resolution to avoid the tragic disunity between the Executive and the Senate which followed the last war. I am convinced that it is the purpose of this resolution to obtain a prestatement by the Senate of the United States of America's foreign policy, if and when, the resolution is adopted, for the benefit not only of the President of the United States, not only for the people of the United States, but for the governing bodies of the nations of the world. The resolution sets out the minimum requirements of an intelligent American foreign policy.

And again I state to you, from a deep conviction, that the American people are ready for a discussion of this question. I am convinced that the man in the armed services is desirous of a discussion of this question in order that his sacrifices may be given some purpose and some hope for something better in the future. I think it is the essence of democracy that a full discussion of this policy must be had now; and in that respect I am afraid I differ with those who, lacking confidence in the people, would deviously start upon a policy of indirection, frustrate the desires of a people to form a decision and thereby create disunity which inevitably arises from uncertainty and the lack of forthrightness.

A construction of the word "consent" and an understanding of the implications of the word "treaties" as used in this section of the Constitution lend credence to my construction thereof. However, since I have dealt with that in another speech upon this resolution, I shall not extend this talk any further to repeat that part of my other discussion of this question.

Returning now to Senate Resolution 114, we find that in effect it treats with two classes of international agreements: The first three sections, which I have likewise discussed in another speech upon this subject, treat with the questions which are imminently arising now, during the progress of the war, but questions which also are of necessity of a temporary nature and should not necessarily enter into long-range planning for the future development of a world order.

Sections 4 and 5 of the resolution would have the Senate advise the Executive and the Nation that as a matter of policy, the United Nations and our Government as a member thereof, should form an organization with "specific and limited authorities" to do two things: first, to establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations; second, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation. Of necessity, an organization of the United Nations for such purposes contemplates an organization for permanent purposes. In effect, it is but an extension of the juridical order which has been developed largely by democratic nations for the administration of their national affairs, as the order best calculated to insure peace and order in the world. It is certainly proper also to observe as Waldo Frank has pointed out in his Chart for Rough Waters, as Christopher Dawson has pointed out in his recent contribution to the development of Catholic philosophy, and as Judge Wilkins of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio has pointed out in a relatively recent article in the Notre Dame Lawyer that this concept which we call democracy has its fundamental basis in the philosophy of the Judo-Christian religion.

Now what are the fundamental bases of this order which we have enjoyed as a nation for so many years that we sometimes fail to understand its elements or its functions? Fundamentally it involves a delegation of sovereignty by the people to certain governmental bodies of the right to initiate policies; to others, the right to execute policies; to courts, the right to decide policies; and to a law enforcement agency, the right to enforce the decisions primarily of the courts or also of the Executive under certain specific cases or with the consent and approval of the courts.

When section 4 of the resolution speaks of procedures and machinery for peaceful settlements of disputes, it must have in mind the establishment of courts to settle those disputes. In section five of the resolution, which speaks of a military force of this world juridical order, it speaks of an organization to which the decision of the court can be referred, or to which the findings of a world council that nations are refusing to bring their disputes to the court can be referred for enforcement by an enforcement agency. The theory behind these two provisions is one which requires the people of America to delegate of their sovereignty, certain powers to this court and to this police force for the purpose of extending into world affairs the order under which we have developed as a nation in national affairs.

Before we become unduly frightened by the extension of this sovereignty to a world order, it seems to me that we should again re-examine certain fundamental concepts of sovereignty which lie in all Christian and democratic thinking and which, in turn, are expressed in certain amendments to our Constitution. It is the essence of Christian and Democratic thinking that each individual soul on this earth is more important than any State or society. It is our belief that all

sovereignty is vested originally in the individual; it is out of the individual that governments arise and governments arise purely by the delegation of groups of individuals of certain of their inherent sovereign rights to duly constituted bodies, in order that an orderly society may be created out of the cumulated sovereignties so granted. The thought here presented is not complicated. We live under the effects of this thinking every day of our life in this country, but we have been so accustomed to living under the effects of our philosophy that we have lost sight of the truths which are inherent in it.

Let us begin with the understanding that all sovereignty is in me. This is an immutable truth; it existed prior to the adoption of the ninth and tenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States. These amendments simply declare it in simple and tremendously clear language. The language cannot be improved upon, and therefore should be quoted verbatim. The ninth amendment reads as follows:

"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

The significant language is this: "retained by the people." Now you do not retain what you do not own originally, and all that this amendment, which is part of the Bill of Rights, does is to declare very simply that which I have been attempting to declare in too many words. Sovereignty is in the people and the ninth amendment to the Constitution says that they retain all of it which they do not grant by the written provisions of the Constitution.

Again, amendment ten expresses the same thought in the following language:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectfully, or to the people."

Again, the delegates to our Constitutional Convention who understood this basic philosophy and who insisted that the things which we call the Bill of Rights should be set out in writing, recognized, nevertheless, all through that instrument that sovereignty was vested in the people; that they retained what they did not give; and that they reserved that which they did not give. Let us examine a few examples of the application of this rule.

I shall use the examples of my own State of Indiana, but I believe that they will be found applicable to people of every State in the Union who have adopted a form of government by which they submit to township, county, State, and National Government of sovereignty. Here is what we have done with our sovereignty to date, as a people. First, for the simple necessities of my life, I grant to township officers certain administrative power; to the trustees, certain legislative power; to the advisory board, I grant the power to set up my local school system; I grant to justices of the peace, judicial power; and to their constables, the police power necessary to enforce their orders. I next find that within the area in which I move as an individual normally, there are more complicated problems than those which can be dealt with by my immediate township, so I grant higher power to county officers. They handle the question of county roads; they give me an enlarged school system; they give me courts having jurisdiction over my freedom of action, over my life and over my property of greater value than the jurisdiction which I wish to grant to the justices of the peace. I grant to the sheriffs of those courts the powers to enforce their orders. And again I find that within certain borders, I live in a State; that in order for me to live in an orderly condition in that area, it is necessary for me to give further of my sovereignty to a Governor of that State, to administer and execute the laws of a legislature of that State; and I extend to that legislature, under certain limitations, the right to legislate and create laws under which I shall live, usually to that legislature I give legislative power over the affairs of my township and my county; and I create a supreme court of that State to make decisions between myself and all residents of that State, notwithstanding the fact that they do not live within the township or the county in which I live. Finally, as a result of the courage and the foresight of the citizens of the Thirteen Colonies, there was created an entirely new concept of government—a United States of America. And, I live under that concept of government whereby again I have granted, in the interest of order and of peace and of my greater opportunity for developing and sharing this country, powers to a legislative body known as a Congress; to an Executive, designated as a President, and to a court known as a Supreme Court, and to each of these national divisions of my Government, particularly to the legislative and the judicial, I grant further elements of my sovereignty along with all other citizens of this country in order that I may be governed in that larger sphere of my endeavor.

Now, there are those who will tell you that by the creation of the Constitution of the United States I have limited forever my power to grant any further part of my sovereignty to any other governmental group. The men who say that do not understand the concept of the dignity of the individual nor of the Judeo-Christian philosophy out of which the concept of sovereignty of the individual arises, nor do they understand the implications of amendments 9 and 10 to the Constitution of the United States, which recognized that all sovereignty is in me as an individual and that I have retained all sovereignty which I have not granted and from that which I have retained, I can give further of my individual sovereignty to a now higher degree of government if it is my decision so to do. And there is no limitation upon my power to grant that sovereignty unless it be the limitation which exists in section 2 of article II of the Constitution, which defines the treaty-making power vested in the Executive with the advice and consent of the Senate when two-thirds of the Senators present shall concur. At the most, this section of the Constitution is not a limitation upon my right to delegate further of my sovereignty in conjunction with the rest of the people of this country to a higher degree of government, because amendments 9 and 10 reserve that sovereignty in me and thereby they reserve it to the mass of the American people. I think, however, that it is probably true that under this article of the Constitution to which I subscribe as a citizen, I have delegated to the Executive and to the Senate the power to work out the mechanics, through the instrument of treaties, by which I shall grant any further sovereignty.

With those who advance such a theory I am not prepared to enter into a dispute, but I am positively of the opinion that the people of this country can enter into an organization of United Nations "for the purpose of establishing procedure and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations" and for the purpose of "providing for assembly and maintenance of a United Nations police force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation" without the necessity of any further amendments to our Constitution. I say this because it must be obvious that if amendments 9 and 10 specifically reserve all sovereignty to me which I have not otherwise granted, then the limitation of the control which the Constitution of the United States places over my reserved sovereignty is found only in section 2 of article II which, at best, limits the method and means by which I may further extend my sovereignty. Therefore I say to you that if, in their enlightened desire to participate with the peoples of other countries, the American people determine to establish a new and higher concept of government, having certain limited powers as set out in sections 4 and 5 of Senate Resolution 114, they have it within their power to do so. The individuals of America have it within their power to do so and it is their duty and their obligation to urge the adoption of this resolution immediately in the Senate of the United States so that they may declare, not only to the people of the other nations of the world, but to the President of the United States and the Members of the Senate, that it is their desire to further extend their sovereignty to a higher degree of government as the only means of advancing man's hope to find his destiny on this earth, which is the peaceful pursuit of happiness under the freedom which only exists under laws in a juridical order created by the philosophy of democracy and founded on the revelation of man's destiny which God gave to him through the philosophy of the Judeo-Christian religions.

And finally, one thing more should be said about the question of the power of the people under our Constitution and under their reservation of their sovereignty which I have discussed—to raise their share or proportion of the military police force contemplated by section 5 of the resolution. Clause 12 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution, defining the powers of the Congress of the United States, enumerates, among other powers, the following: "To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years."

The authority given is to raise and support armies. Since amendments 9 and 10 reserve all sovereignty not granted by the Constitution, to the people, then it follows, I think, that the armies which the Congress is to raise and to support are those which the people direct it to support and for the purpose which the people direct under their reservation of sovereignty. Again, since relation with foreign countries under our Constitution, which the people have already created, can only be entered into by treaties, and since a government of the United Nations would be a relationship with other countries, I am of the opinion that section 2 of article 2, which limits the manner in which these treaties can be entered into, must be complied with in setting up the agreements with other nations under which we grant, as a people, our reserved sovereignty to the higher degree of government. But once this decision has been made, then I think it follows that it would be the duty of the Congress of the United States, under its obligation to raise and support armies, to raise and support our proportion of the membership and the cost of maintenance of this United Nations military force, because the provision with reference to the raising and supporting of armies clearly contemplates such armies as we, the people of the United States, exercising our retained and reserved right of sovereignty, shall see fit to authorize, assemble, and maintain.

I realize that the proposal here made has a tremendous impact upon a people who have observed a Europe which, for years has been in constant turmoil; I realize that the bald and bold annunciation of the steps necessary to establish a world juridical order, of necessity, has a shocking effect upon the people who for years, through no fault of their own, have developed their country in security because of geographical advantages and quasi international understandings, of which they had no knowledge; but I am convinced that mankind will destroy himself or reduce himself to the condition of an animal

if he does not devise some method of living together under law with all of the peoples who inhabit the surface of the earth. If there is any purpose in our living as individuals, it is for the purpose of advancing the progress of mankind toward a goal which will permit it to develop the greatest degree of dignity. If we are brought into the world for that purpose, if we have convictions as to the method of affecting that purpose, then we have no right to live unless we have the moral courage to follow as unerringly as it is possible for us to do, the course which we have laid down before us. Our Lord did not engage in an idle gesture when He taught us to pray "Thy kingdom come, on earth as it is in Heaven." The development on earth of a "kingdom as it is in Heaven" cannot be brought about by the miraculous intervention of an all-seeing God who will thrust His wisdom upon man. The fundamental teaching of all Christian religions, whether understood or not, is based upon the theory that man exercises free will; he may follow the course which leads to decency, to honesty, to justice, to charity, and to brotherly love; or, he may reject it as visionary, as foolish, or as against his own temporary selfish interests; but we must remember that on earth man was made not only in the image of God, but man was made to imitate God; that God has no eyes to see with except man's eyes; that He has no voice to speak with except man's voice; that He has no hands to do with except man's hands; and if we understand this and believe it, we, as a people, must take the step which, to us, is opposite to all of our traditions, we must take the step along the road toward which all Christian thinking points. If we fail to do so, let us specifically declare that we do not believe in the brotherhood of man and let us cease to pray, "Thy kingdom come, on earth as it is in Heaven," lest we be eternally damned by our own hypocrisy.

One of Oklahoma's War Heroes Not Getting Square Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JED JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of the House were deeply impressed with the beautiful and fitting remarks just made on the floor of the House by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in connection with the untimely death of one of Alabama's young war heroes, Lt. Leroy Sugg.

Of special interest to those of us who have known Capt. Pervis E. Youree, of Walters, Okla., another war hero, is the fact that Captain Youree was pilot on the same plane with Congressman SPARKMAN's late young friend, who has given his life for liberty's cause, and that the last letter he wrote was in behalf of Captain Youree. Friends of Captain Youree join in offering our sympathy to the bereaved loved ones and friends of this gallant young man who did almost the impossible in helping Captain Youree bring the disabled ship back from enemy territory without the loss of life.

May I say in this connection that all who know Captain Youree are also proud of him and his fine record. Under the leave granted me, I am including herewith his citations, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, EIGHTH AIR FORCE,
May 6, 1943.

GENERAL ORDER NO. 56

[Extract]

* * * * *

IV. Under the provisions of Army Regulations 60—45, August 8, 1932, as amended, and pursuant to authority contained in section I, circular 36, headquarters, E. T. O. U. S. A., April 5, 1943, the Distinguished Flying Cross is awarded to the following-named officers and enlisted men for extraordinary achievement, as set forth in citations in each instance. These individuals have previously earned the Air Medal and Three Oak Leaf Clusters for wear therewith:

Pervis E. Youree, O-442322, captain, Three Hundred and Sixth Bombardment Group (H), Army Air Forces, United States Army. For extraordinary achievement while serving as pilot of a B-17 airplane on a bombing mission over Germany, April 17, 1943. During the bombing run, enemy fighter planes attacked in unusually large numbers, completely disabling two engines and partly disabling a third engine. Displaying outstanding courage and devotion to duty, Captain Youree by skillfully maneuvering his badly damaged airplane successfully bombed the target. On the return journey, when the airplane began to lose altitude, Captain Youree ordered all movable equipment to be thrown out and the crew to take their crash-landing positions. His only thought being the safety of his crew and airplane, Captain Youree kept his plane in flight until a safe landing was made at a base in England. The courage and skill displayed by Captain Youree on this occasion reflect the highest credit upon himself and the armed forces of the United States.

Home address: 301 East Virginia Street, Walters, Okla.

* * * * *

By Command of Major General Eaker:
C. C. CHAUNCEY,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Chief of Staff.

Official:
H. G. CULTON,
Colonel, A. G. D., Adjutant General.

A true copy:
JOHN S. SMITH, Jr.,
First Lieutenant, Air Corps.

I am grieved and chagrined to advise Members of the House that something far worse than death has happened to the co-pilot of the ship referred to by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. That is, it is worse than death if the decision of the Army stands to give Captain Youree a dishonorable discharge and based, I regret to say, on a flimsy charge. The charge is nothing involving moral turpitude, but because Captain Youree flew in close formation with a commercial airliner, while a pilot trainer recently near Ardmore, Okla., for a period of time ranging from 1½ minutes to 3 or 4 minutes. The Army evidently has decided to make an example of the captain, a thing that will disgrace him and his family for life, despite his great combat record.

I have taken this matter up with War Department officials, also with the President of the United States, and under the leave granted me, I am including herewith a letter I wrote to the President on the subject. It follows:

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When I saw you at the White House on Wednesday last, we discussed, you will recall, the case of Capt. Pervis E. Youree, a 24-year-old hero in the Army Air Forces.

You will recall that I told you that I have known Captain Youree and his fine parents all of their lives, that the captain was born and reared in my old home town of Walters, Okla. Immediately after the war started, this young man enlisted, was commissioned on March 16, 1942, served on 25 bombing missions over Germany, received the Distinguished Flying Cross and a cluster, and the Air Medal and three clusters for extraordinary achievement and gallantry. The citation by Major General Eaker said that when under attack by an unusually large number of German planes, Captain Youree's only thought was the safety of his crew and airplane. He managed to fly the B-17 bomber back to England, where he made a safe landing in such a manner as to reflect the highest credit upon himself and the armed forces of the United States.

At Ardmore, Okla., where he is serving as a flight instructor, Captain Youree flew for a short distance in the proximity of a commercial air liner, was subsequently court-martialed and sentenced to a dishonorable discharge. His explanation was—and it was disregarded entirely—that he had executed the left turn to fly parallel to the air liner to avoid a crash, and after a short distance peeled off to the left, thus insuring the safety of the air liner and his own plane. No one was killed, nor injured, no property damaged, and this is the only instance in the entire military record of Captain Youree in which he has received any disciplinary action or criticism.

I realize, of course, as much as anyone the necessity for maintaining safety regulations and discipline in the armed forces. I have a very deep feeling, however, that this is not a fitting reward nor an appropriate conclusion to the career of a man who has such an outstanding record of patriotism and willingness to sacrifice himself, both for his country and the welfare of those he piloted. His whole record is one that cries out for more just treatment than has been accorded through the cold ritualistic processes of military law.

I am firmly of the opinion that this gallant young man should not be sent up as a "burnt offering" to teach a lesson to others who may themselves be far more culpable than is he. It occurs to me also, Mr. President, that a less hardened and a more humane attitude than has been displayed in this instance would do far more to maintain the morale and high fighting spirit of the men of the armed forces.

I recall that another great President under the strain of war found it more humane to revoke the death sentence of a simple sentry who had fallen asleep on his post. Thus he taught the lesson that death itself could never have taught.

Knowing this boy as I do, and having absolute confidence in his sincerity and judgment, I feel that he would shudder far less at a death sentence than one erasing forever the good name and outstanding achievements he has accomplished at so much sacrifice.

Therefore, I earnestly hope that in your great capacity as Commander in Chief of all the armed forces, that you will reward this man's gallantry and self-sacrifice by extending to him the leniency that has been extended by the War Department to others who

have never smelled the smoke and fire of battle, nor risked their own lives in combat over enemy territory. Every action of this man's career, and even the record of the case itself, cries out for a much less cruel and unusual punishment.

Very sincerely yours,

JED JOHNSON.

I feel that Members of Congress will be interested also in reading a copy of a letter to the President written by Wylma Youree Crain, sister of Captain Youree, whose husband is now in England or on the beachhead of France, and who has another brother in action in northern Italy. Her letter follows:

JUNE 5, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write you in regard to my brother, Capt. Pervis E. Youree, of the Army Air Corps, recently court-martialed at Ardmore, Okla., and facing a dishonorable discharge, subject to your decision, as a result of a near collision with a Braniff Airliner in early April.

The details of this matter have been given to you personally by Representative JED JOHNSON, of Oklahoma, and no doubt further information has reached you from Oklahoma State executives and friends of Captain Youree.

Since November 1941 I have been an employee of the National War Agencies here and I know no details of this matter. It is my opinion from what facts I have, however, and the opinion of everyone with whom I have spoken, that the action taken is unjust and entirely too severe. The fact that Captain Youree has been placed before the public eye as an "example" for the entire United States Army is unwarranted. Time magazine termed his court martial an "exception"; this is prejudicial, for many similar cases resulting in the loss of several lives have been practically unnoticed.

This unfortunate incident must not mean the ruination of an experienced flyer who has risked his life many times in active combat with the United States Eighth Air Force in England. He has shown by many meritorious achievements willingness to give his life for our country. This one unintentional and unpremediated incident does not warrant his bearing the stigma of a dishonorable discharge for the rest of his life.

As his sister, I know Captain Youree would not purposely endanger the life of anyone. I have never known him to lie about anything and I firmly believe that his statements at the court martial are true. It is my understanding that he was in formation with the Braniff plane only long enough to veer clear without crashing both planes.

The statements I have made, I believe, reflect not only my personal interest as his sister; I think it is the opinion of the general public from articles appearing in Time magazine, Pathfinder magazine, and newspapers both in our home State of Oklahoma and throughout the country, that the sentence imposed is unjust, especially in view of Captain Youree's splendid combat record during 13 months of active duty overseas.

I know my brother is anxious to remain in the service. His brother in Italy, my husband in England, and the entire family are anxious that he be allowed to do so.

For myself, the family, and friends of Captain Youree I urge you to study his record of achievements carefully and to give a fair and humane decision.

Respectfully,

WYLMA YOUREE CRAIN.

Another letter from President C. M. Conwill, of the Cameron State Agricultural College, where Captain Youree was a student for 2 years, and graduated with honors, speaks for itself:

CAMERON STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
Lawton, Okla., June 10, 1944.

Congressman JED JOHNSON,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JED: Pervis Youree, of Walters, Okla., was a student in Cameron College 2 years, and graduated with above an average grade. He had a good attitude and seemed to be a good citizen. There is nothing against him on his record here.

His sister asked me to write you and tell you about his record in Cameron.

Very truly yours,

C. M. CONWILL,
President.

The following telegrams, including one from his home town of Walters, Okla., speak for themselves:

WALTERS, OKLA., *June 9, 1944.*

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Walters Rotary Club petitions you to exert every effort in behalf of Capt. Pervis Youree, Walters, national air hero, who faces court martial. Convey our petition to the President that he intercede for this young man who has served his country so well in the air over Europe. We consider the punishment recommended by court martial entirely too severe and urge that he be reinstated to his former position, that he may return to combat for the country he loves and the cause to which he is so deeply committed.

W. K. BOYER,
President, Walters Rotary Club.

LAWTON, OKLA., *May 27, 1944.*

Congressman JED JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Any consideration given Capt. Pervis E. Youree, of Walters, Okla., will be appreciated. The general opinion is he has been unjustly sentenced.

Mr. and Mrs. R. W. GROSE.

DUNCAN, OKLA., *June 3, 1944.*

Congressman JED JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Please use your influence for Capt. Pervis E. Youree, Walters, Okla., one who has served his country so heroically. This sentence is unjust.

Mrs. RODNEY S. FRY.

Missing in Action and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving many letters asking questions about the rights of men and women reported as missing. The writers of these letters also want to know what rights the dependents of men and women reported as missing have. For that reason this week I am explaining these rights so that my people will be fully informed. If you have any further questions, feel free to write Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Question. If a serviceman or servicewoman is officially reported to be missing or missing in action, is his or her family notified?

Answer. Yes; the War or Navy Department promptly telegraphs the person whom the serviceman or servicewoman has designated as emergency addressee.

Question. What do the terms "missing" and "missing in action" mean?

Answer. They mean that the person has disappeared. It is not inferred that he is dead. In many cases it is found later that the person is still alive, interned in a neutral country, a prisoner of war, or was isolated in such a way that a prompt reporting of whereabouts was impossible.

Question. When a person in service is in the status of missing or missing in action, does the right to pay stop?

Answer. No. His pay will continue as long as such status is officially continued.

Question. What provision exists for the support of dependents in such cases?

Answer. Family allowances and allotments of pay continue, and if not in effect they may be established.

Question. If the serviceman or servicewoman had not made any allotment of pay previously, how are his or her dependents supported when he or she is declared to be missing, if they are not eligible to receive family allowance?

Answer. Where there is no existing provision adequate for the reasonable support of the dependent or to pay the premiums on the life insurance of the missing person the Secretary of the department concerned may direct suitable allotments of pay for these purposes.

Question. If the dependents of the missing person were eligible for a monthly family allowance but no application had been filed before the person in service entered the missing status, can the dependent obtain a family allowance?

Answer. Yes; by making application therefor.

Question. May a relative who is actually dependent upon a missing serviceman or servicewoman obtain an allotment of pay?

Answer. Yes; if actually dependent and a relative within the recognized degree.

Question. How does the Government make these payments?

Answer. The money is sent to the dependent or insurance company by means of a Government check each month. It is deducted from the missing person's credit which has accumulated.

Question. How much may be allotted to a dependent?

Answer. The Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy determines the amount according to the circumstances in each individual case.

Question. How long do these allotments of pay continue?

Answer. If the dependent remains eligible to receive the allotments of pay, they may continue as long as the serviceman or servicewoman is officially continued in a missing status or is officially transferred to some status entitling him

to a continuation of pay. If such person has been missing for 12 months, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy reviews the record and determines whether such person should be continued in the missing status or should be found to be dead.

Question. If a missing serviceman or servicewoman is later found to be a prisoner of war or interned in a neutral country, does the allotment of pay continue?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Following a finding of death, what benefits begin for the dependent?

Answer. Death gratuities and insurance benefits then become payable to those entitled to them.

Question. What if a missing serviceman or servicewoman returns to the jurisdiction of the American military or naval authorities?

Answer. They again become a part of the Military or Naval Establishment and can adjust their allotments of pay to dependents on the same basis as servicemen or servicewomen who have not been missing.

If there is any need for further information, see your local Red Cross chairman, your county veterans' service officer, or your local American Legion head; and if you need additional information write your Congressman, ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Senate Resolution 114

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under the general leave to extend remarks granted upon the unanimous consent request made by the majority leader on June 23, I wish to include a speech I made in Fort Collins, Colo., on August 20, 1943, in support of the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution, Senate Resolution 114:

I know that it is my purpose in participating with other Members of the Congress of the United States during the summer in a program to present to the people of America the significance of Senate Resolution 114 to limit my discussion to that resolution; the particular significance of its language; the nature of its purposes, and the propriety and portent of the resolution in light of the pertinent provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Therefore, it goes without saying that I definitely believe that the future safety and well-being of our country demands our participation with other world powers in an international order with power and authority equivalent to that stated in Senate Resolution 114. I believe that we must extend the juridical order as developed largely out of eighteenth century philosophy and thinking as the system best calculated to insure individual freedom to man under law, to the world as a whole, in which the component parts of that world shall participate. I believe that the development in thinking which requires the extension of this order over the world is but an inevitable development of the desires of mankind to conquer his own selfishnesses, his own prejudices, and his own hates in order that mankind may occupy the earth in peace and develop its resources intelligently for the benefit of all people who are willing to do a day's work with their hands or their heads, for their share of the good things of the earth. I do not believe that it is the purpose of society to treat the incompetent, the drones and the lazy equally with the competent, the industrious, the frugal and the prudent, either in this Nation or in any other nations. But, I do think it is the duty of society in this Nation and in the world to develop a society of greater equality of opportunity than the world has even seen to date, in which the competent, the industrious, the frugal, and the people of good will may have an equal opportunity to participate in those material things of the world which the peoples of the various parts of the world deem necessary to their happiness. From this it follows that I do not advocate, nor do I think the American people contemplate, a world W. P. A., nor do I think that that thought is relevant to the issues which are before the American people. As a matter of fact, if the people of the United States, through their elected representatives, are permitted a full opportunity to participate in shaping the peace which is to come and the world order which is to come, it is my conviction that they will support such a peace and such an order which will afford to the peoples of the world the opportunities to develop into competent, industrious, frugal people by their own efforts and consistent with the dignity of man, and that they want nothing else. It is my belief that Senate Resolution 114 affords this opportunity for the people's representatives to develop such a peace and such a world order, from which I conclude that those who seriously advocate a world W. P. A. are missing the temper of the people and likewise that those who do not seriously urge such a world order are professing to see the fear of the same in any international world order solely for the purpose of drawing a red herring across the path of an enlightened international development.

It goes without saying that I do not believe it is necessary to further discuss in America the necessity for participation by America in the organization advocated by Senate Resolution 114; and I shall not take my time or yours to advocate the international point of view, or condemn any other, believing as I do that a substantial majority of the people of the United States recognize the necessity for a new world order and America's participation therein. I do believe, and I have found by my own personal observation that what the people want now is the development of a specific policy as an initial step to the further necessary one of the development of the machinery by which that American policy shall be carried out. But if there are yet those who believe that after this war America should again attempt a policy of immunizing itself from the rest of the world, then, I point out that now, 25 years after that war, the world is engulfed in another war today. We have not been able and could not avoid being drawn into it. I do not, and I shall not, question the patriotism or the sincerity of those who, during that 25-year interim, in absolute good faith, because they believed that America's best interest lay that way, advocated and supported a policy of immunization. I simply point out that pragmatically we are now in another war, that policy did not prevent our being in another war, from which I would conclude as a person of common sense that a continuation of such a policy, particularly in the light of the newly developed methods of transportation by air which have further shortened the world's distances, that a continuation of that policy will not give us peace. It will not avoid the terrible waste and extravagance and horrors and tragedies of war, from which we must conclude, as thinking people, that we must adopt a specific policy because it is only by developing intelligently an opposite policy that we have any hope of obtaining peace and avoiding war.

Senate Resolution 114, which was presented to the Senate by Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL in March of this year, is designed primarily to declare a foreign policy for the United States based upon the advice of the Senate of the United States which, in my opinion, is entirely consistent with not only the language but the spirit of the constitutional provisions which declare the duties of the President of the Senate in the development of an American foreign policy. It is my positive opinion that, under the Constitution, the Senate of the United States must not only participate in the formation of an American foreign policy, but that the language of the instrument definitely indicates that it should initiate the policy, or certainly it must participate in the initiation of the policy. In taking this view I realize that I am taking a position which is opposite to that advanced recently by an officer of our State Department. Nevertheless the language used in the American Constitution was the development of long and serious debate by scholarly men who, above all things, knew the significance of language. Understanding of this fact gives the background for the reasoning which I am about to advance.

The first clause of the second grammatical paragraph of section 2 of article II of the Constitution, referring to the executive power and authorities, reads as follows:

"He shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The extremely significant word in this section is the word "advice." Advice is defined as "a recommendation regarding a decision or course of conduct." In other words, when ordinary people use the word "advice" in its ordinary significance, we us it not in the sense of ratifying an accomplished fact, but we use it for the purpose of defining a situation where one person goes to another for the purpose of discussing a course of action or a decision to be made in the future in order that the person consulted before the fact is accomplished may state his position or his recommendation for the purpose of guiding the person who came to him with reference to the course to be pursued. Or, again, if I am about to make a decision and I go for advice, I contemplate that I will receive the benefit of the thinking of the person whom I consult. It is true that I may disregard the thinking and the conclusions of the person consulted, but having consulted that person, if I choose to disregard his thinking and embark upon a different course, I do so with full knowledge that my decision is contrary to that of the person consulted. Therefore, from the use of the word "advice" in this part of our Constitution, it is clear to me that in the question of the execution of treaties or the entering into of agreements with other nations, our Constitution makers contemplated that the Chief Executive should first consult the Senate of the United States or that the Senate of the United States should first take a position with reference to foreign questions so that its advice and its position would be stated before the Executive and the people of the country prior to the time that agreements with foreign nations were entered into.

From this it follows that, in my opinion, the four Senators who joined in this resolution have evidenced the greatest statesmanship which has been produced by any Members of the United States Senate in my time. I am convinced that it is the purpose of

this resolution to avoid the tragic disunity between the Executive and the Senate which followed the last war. I am convinced that it is the purpose of this resolution to obtain a prestatement by the Senate of the United States of America's foreign policy, if and when the resolution is adopted, for the benefit not only of the President of the United States, not only for the people of the United States, but for the governing bodies of the nations of the world. The resolution sets out the minimum requirements of an intelligent American foreign policy.

And again I state to you, from a deep conviction, that the American people are ready for a discussion of this question. I am convinced that the man in the armed services is desirous of a discussion of this question in order that his sacrifices may be given some purpose and some hope for something better in the future. I think it is the essence of democracy that a full discussion of this policy must be had now, and in that respect I am afraid I differ with those who, lacking confidence in the people, would deviously start upon a policy by indirection, frustrate the desires of a people to form a decision and thereby create disunity which inevitably arises from uncertainty and the lack of forthrightness.

I am also convinced that certain other language in the section of the Constitution under discussion sustains my position in this regard. The word "consent" is defined as "voluntary accordance with, or concurrence in what is done or proposed by another." It is true that the word "consent" does not so strongly indicate previous action by the other person, but it does have that meaning not only from its dictionary definition, but from our ordinary use of the word in that we are just as accustomed to thinking of going to a person for his consent in advance of taking action as we are to submit an action for concurrence or approval, and when the word "consent" is used conjunctively with the word "advice," which latter word has in it the contemplation of a previous submission of action, we are inevitably driven to the conclusion that the word "consent" is used in its alternative sense of a previous submission of a proposed action.

Furthermore, Hunter Miller, of the State Department, in his collection and work entitled "Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America," volume 1, part 1, page 9, says this:

"In the sense in which the word is used as treaty in the Constitution, the word 'treaty' comprehends all international agreements submitted for the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States. Further, the descriptive word is 'treaty' suggesting that convention, contract, and protocol are all within the constitutional language."

From this it follows again that despite the fact that some people may attempt to make a case against this resolution requiring action now by the Senate in the declaration of a policy by declaring that in practice certain international engagements have been, and therefore may be, entered into by the executive alone, despite the constitutional language, I need only point out that it is an established principle, not only of law, but of human thinking, that a course of conduct not authorized by authorities cannot, by the repetition of an unauthorized act, override a written, definitely stated grant of power. In other words, it makes no difference to me what course of conduct may have been followed in the past in violation of the Constitution, this irregular conduct cannot serve as a precedent which can, in any way detract from, or deny the right and the obligation of the Senate of the United States, now, at this very time, while the war is on, to adopt a resolution declaring its advice upon the question of foreign policy.

I have devoted some time to developing the constitutional authority, approval, and background of this resolution for the reason that a study of the resolution indicates clearly that an organization of the United Nations is needed now, immediately, to conduct in an orderly fashion the matters set out in the subparagraphs 1, 2, and 3 of the resolution which have to do with, first, the coordination and utilization of the military and economic resources of the United Nations; second, to provide for temporary administration of Axis-controlled areas as they shall be occupied; and, third, to administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in the territories of members of the United Nations and in Axis territory occupied by the United Nations.

Sections four and five of the resolution devote themselves to the formation of an organization for permanent purposes as distinguished from the formation of an organization for three immediate or temporary purposes. And, it is not my purpose or intention to discuss sections four and five here, although I shall do so elsewhere on this tour.

Too much time has been lost by our country not only in failing to adopt this resolution, but in the setting up of an organization as required by the resolution to administer the three urgent and temporary problems with which the resolution deals. We have been on a military offensive, but as United Nations, we have not been on a political offensive. You will note that I say as "United Nations," and I want it distinctly understood that I do not consider that purely American and British cooperation on any of these questions can take the place of a full understanding by the United Nations on those questions, including all of the United Nations, but particularly Russia and China. To me it does not matter that it would be impractical for the Chinese or the Russians to participate in the temporary administration of Tunisia or Sicily and in the temporary administration of Italy; the significant thing is that there is no organization of the United Nations laying down a policy for administering these countries; laying down a policy for rehabilitation of these countries; or laying down a policy by agreement for participation by the United Nations in fully utilizing their military and economic resources of all of the nations for the prosecution of the war and the civilian administration and economic rehabilitation of these countries.

Nor am I satisfied that the so-called agreements reached at the Food Conference take the place of a permanent organization of the United Nations as called for by this resolution. What we need in the world today if democratic processes are to survive, is an abandonment of the policy of emergency commitments, emergency decisions by executive representatives of the United Nations which cannot by any stretch of the imagination take the place of an organization with a written, clearly stated system by which authority is granted to someone or some group to call upon other groups of the United Nations for specific commitments specifically limited by the written agreement itself so that the American people and all of the people of the world may openly understand and know the extent of their obligations and their contributions.

I am definitely of the opinion that the thinking people of America still believe in the principle of orderly, organized government under law and under rule; that they are willing to extend that concept and that principle to the world and to join in an organization based upon definitely stated agreements and obligations accepted by the duly constituted authorities of the members of the organization. But I am also convinced that, except among certain groups found in the large cities of the United States who either do not understand or do not believe in that concept which is essentially American, that the American people are disturbed, that the American people are upset, not by the thought of entering into a completely, fully organized international government with stated principles, but they are upset by the idea that commitments are being made which have not been stated to them, that lack of unity prevails between the United Nations which open discussion could dissolve, and that the elimination of this uncertainty would do more than anything else to unite the people of this country in the prosecution of this war toward a definitely greater goal.

Finally, let me discuss the arguments which are being made today that this is not the time to discuss, either upon the floor of the Senate of the United States or with the other governments of the world, the formation of an organization of the United Nations to carry out the first three purposes of Senate Resolution 114. Consider for a minute the implications involved in such a statement. Consider them in the light of your experiences as people, and, as you consider your personal experiences, remember that nations are nothing more than groupings of humans and that nations pretty generally act in mass as individuals act.

The statement that this is not the time to form an organization of the United Nations implies that the member nations will be split up and disorganized and the war effort injured by such a discussion now. I say to you that the absolute opposite of that statement is true, and I base it upon my observation, which I am sure will concur with your observations, of the conduct of human beings. Daily the men of the United States, of the British Commonwealth, of Soviet Russia, of China, and, to a lesser degree, of France, Holland, Poland, Norway, the Balkans, and Greece, are fighting certain common enemies. The peoples of the first four of these nations, in varying degrees, are converting their material assets for the purpose of conducting that war and thereby insuring their own living standards. They have a goal, which is victory and unconditional surrender of their common enemies. The goal has not been reached; each has a personal interest at this time in attaining that goal. I say to you that if those nations cannot agree at this time, before that goal is attained, they will never agree after it is attained.

Consider for a minute some of the things that I have observed as a lawyer and some of the things which you have also observed as laymen. Recently in my state, four men who had a common interest in certain lands and buildings, but their individual interests were not of equal value, resisted a condemnation suit by the United States government of the property in which they had the common interest. All through the conduct of that litigation, despite the advice and insistence of their lawyers, they refused to sit down and specifically agree upon their separate, individual shares in the common interest. They always said to their lawyers: "We will agree on that; we won't have any trouble about that." The litigation terminated successfully and for 1 year the money was impounded in the Federal Court because these four men could not agree among themselves as to the division of it, and finally when an agreement was made, each one quit speaking to the other. And wherein did they fail? They failed because they refused to agree among themselves while they had a united and common interest in attaining a definite goal and it was inevitable that they would fall out when it was necessary to decide the manner of dividing their gains.

It is not relevant whether the attaining of victory involves the division of any gains among the United Nations, but it is certainly true that the extent of the commitments and

the extent of the contributions and the extent of the controls over the conquered nations and the rehabilitated nations and the resources at their command, if left to a decision after the successful culmination of this war, will inevitably lead to bitterness which, if they do not prevent the establishment of a world order in which there can be any hope for the world, will certainly establish a world order among peoples who have a new bitterness toward new so-called enemies over new grievances arising out of a discussion of what is to be done after this war and a division of power over and access to the resources of the world now held by certain of the United Nations. This result is as inevitable as the rising of the sun because it is inevitably true that while hard bargains make good friends, sloppy thinking and indecisive decision among peoples with a common interest who defer making these decisions until after the goal is obtained inevitably leads to dissension and bitterness. If you cannot discuss the formation of an organization of the United Nations while your men are dying beside the other brave men of the world, while united by the common bond of sympathy, by the common bond of horror at the tragedies of war, then you will not be able to discuss these matters when that sympathy and that horror has been removed.

Finally, if you doubt me, consider what is happening in America today. Every time braver men, by the use of their arms and the sacrifice of their lives attain a temporary victory over our enemies, we, the people of the home front, anticipating sudden ending of our own little inconveniences, a sudden and victorious ending gained by the lives of others, begin to let down our machines; men who are producing the arms betray those who are fighting; people who are being subjected to the relatively infinitesimal inconveniences of a war economy begin to whine and to clamor against the regulations which cause them inconvenience. If there is that division between the people on the home front and the people on the battle front in this country, which arises solely from their failure to have sufficient imagination to comprehend the horrors of war and the sacrifices of the men who are fighting; if there is not a sufficient cementing of American people through blood of the men who are dying, their own flesh and blood, their own kind, on the battlefields of this war; then how can you expect any unity of purpose or unity of sacrifice by the nations of the world when the crucible of war, which to some extent burns out the dross and the meanness and the littleness in us, is chilled by peace, a peace which unfortunately seems to destroy all memory of the good resolves which were blatantly proclaimed during the time of war and releases instead the selfishness and greed and the desire for personal and national gain which, existing in the time of peace, constitutes the soil from which wars spring.

I am convinced that those who cry out against the formation of a positive organization of the United Nations now, on the ground that it would interfere with the war effort, are not only following the course of expediency, but they are also advocating a course of conduct which flies squarely in the face of human nature and all known observed human reactions.

Senate Resolution 114 should be reported to the floor of the Senate now; it should be discussed now, because the people of America are demanding positive information now, and because if our alliances with our allies in the time when our sons, as well as their sons, are dying, are so slender and tenuous that they cannot bind us together under such circumstances, there is little, if any, hope for an intelligent, effective agreement after the war is over.

A Bill of Rights for the American Indian—An Emancipation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 23, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, no racial group in America has given such a high proportion of its sons to fight in this war as the first Americans, the native Indian. And this is a strange thing, Mr. Speaker, because no racial group in the United States has been so limited in its exercise of the traditional rights of citizens and the very rights which we fight to preserve.

It has seemed to me altogether fitting and proper, therefore, that we should now complete the emancipation of the American Indian, to whom citizenship was given in the act of 1924, signed by President Coolidge. Accordingly I am introducing a bill (H. R. 5115) which will provide that hereafter whenever any Indian of lawful age upon his application is found by the Secretary of the Interior to have met any one of the conditions of emancipation set forth in subparagraph (1) of the act he shall be given—

(a) The right to administer his personal property—including money—under the laws of the State of his residence.

(b) The right to receive a patent in fee to any lands allotted to or inherited by him and to administer this or any other real property acquired by him by gift or purchase.

(c) The right to appeal from any Indian court to the State and Federal courts of appropriate jurisdiction.

H. R. 5115 also provides that the exercise of any of these rights shall not deprive the Indian of any rights to which he would otherwise be entitled as a member of any Indian tribe.

Subparagraph (1) states that the conditions precedent to the recognition of an Indian for emancipation by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in the foregoing paragraph shall be the meeting of any one of the following conditions:

(a) An honorable discharge from service in the armed forces of the United States in any war.

(b) Graduation from a standard high school or its equivalent.

(c) Receipt of a certificate of competency to be issued upon the joint recommendation of the tribal council and the superintendent of the Indian reservation for the tribe of which the Indian is a member.

Section 2 provides that the act may be cited as the Indian Emancipation Act.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of such an act will be a matter of simple justice. Today, the restricted Indian must go to an agency office, hat in hand, on certain appointed days and at certain appointed hours, to ask that he be permitted to spend his own money or to administer a portion of his own affairs. The young warrior who has been a part of Uncle Sam's great Army or Navy in this war cannot be asked to go back to that condition. And it is high time that we recognize the progess that has been made in schools and in experience so as to place on their own feet the Indians who have demonstrated their readiness.

Some people would accomplish these ends, Mr. Speaker, by complete abolition of the Indian Office at this time. Personally, I do not think that would meet the situation. A period of transition is needed. Time to work out some matters of school and hospital administration. Time to take care of the older Indians who have had no opportunity to learn to read or speak in the white man's way. But the proposals in my bill of emancipation would permit an Indian upon his own free will to apply on his merits and obtain the rights stated.

I do not maintain this bill is perfect nor that it will meet every Indian problem. Far from that. It does not pretend to solve problems connected with common property. It deals only with the property that belongs to an individual Indian. Other bills can deal with other problems. My purpose in introducing the bill at this time, Mr. Speaker, is to offer an opportunity for the Indians of the several tribes to study it and to express their thoughts as the Special Committee on Investigation of Indian Affairs visits the several reservations this summer.

My colleague, the Honorable KARL MUNDT, of the First Congressional District of South Dakota, author of the investigation resolution and vice chairman of the committee, has consulted with me and arranged the following itinerary for the committee in South Dakota: Tuesday, July 25, Sisseton Agency; Wednesday, July 26, Standing Rock and Cheyenne River; Thursday, July 27, formal hearings at Pierre; Friday, inspection of Crow Creek and Rosebud Reservations; Saturday, July 29, inspection of the Pine Ridge Reservation. I hope that at all these points, and others, the Indians of the many tribes will express themselves to the investigating committee about the proposed Emancipation Act and other matters.

A Message to Dependents of Men and Women in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, any dependent of a man or a woman in our armed forces who is paid $138 a month or less as base pay is eligible to receive a dependent's allowance from the Govern-

ment. I hope all dependents will read this article and keep it for future use. It must be remembered that this act applies only to men and women in service whose base pay is $138 a month or less. Those men and women in service who get more than $138 per month come under another system. The new act passed by Congress, effective November 1, 1943, provides a monthly family allowance as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife may get up to $42 per month if she is named specifically in the court order to receive alimony and she receives the amount named. If this amount is in excess of $42, she cannot receive over $42. The child of a divorcee, where there is no wife receiving family allowance, can get up to $42 per month regardless of the amount given in the court order. If there is a wife receiving family allowance this amount is $30 and if there are other children it is slightly less. Therefore, if the divorce or court order does not name the child to receive support or name the child for less support, this is disregarded and the above amounts are given. Illegitimate children are also considered as class A dependents of the servicemen if they are proven to be his children either by his sworn statement to that effect or by a court order adjudging him to be the father.

Class B dependents: A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent or two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37. Note: Class B dependents, it must be clearly understood, are dependents who are only partially but at least substantially dependent upon service men and women for support. In other words, if the dependents are dependent upon the service man or woman for 50 percent or less of their support, they are classed as B dependents. Those who make application for this family allowance, therefore, should be careful to prove that they are more than 51 percent if they actually need chief support from the man or woman in service, and especially if they have no outside income. Persons who have other means of income unless it is small will as a rule be classed as B dependents. Those who need a great deal of assistance will be classed as B-1 dependents.

Class B-1 dependents: One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; and each additional brother or sister, $11. Two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $79, plus $11 for each additional brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $42, with additional $11 for each additional brother or sister. Note that here again it must be remembered that it is important to prove more than 50-percent dependency where the parents and brothers and sisters actually are greatly dependent. If it is not proven, they are classed as B dependents and receive considerably less money as outlined above.

HOW TO GET FAMILY ALLOWANCE

Wherever possible, as soon as a man or woman enters service they should make application for the allowance to their dependents. They should do this immediately when they are inducted. The allowance payments do not go back but start with the date of application. Therefore, if the man or woman in service waits a month after induction before they file an application, 1 month's family allowance is lost. The longer they wait to file an application, the more money is lost. It is important to file for this the day they enter.

The man or woman in service should submit the application on a form they can get from the commanding officer. In filling out this form it is good to be careful to spell all names correctly and give exact information as to marriage, dates of birth, and so forth. Many of the troubles dependents have in getting their family allowances are due to the fact that the service man or woman is careless in filling out the blank. An extra minute filling out the blank may save several months' time in getting the allowance approved. The application after careful study and filling out should then be handed to the commanding officer.

If the service man or woman for some reason or other fails to make application or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. If there is any question as to where or how to apply, see your local Red Cross chairman or your local county veterans' service officer or local American Legion head, and if you need additional information write to your Congressman, ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

In the case where a class A dependent must apply, the Army provides a blank to be filled out, but the Navy requires only a letter in the handwriting of the dependent stating the facts and giving the serviceman's full name and serial number. Class A family allowance is approved regardless of the serviceman's desire for it. The wife must submit a marriage certificate, and if children their birth certificates, when making application.

If the man or woman in service with class B or B-1 dependents refuses to make an application for them, no other person can apply, and there is no way it can be given to them. They cannot be forced to apply, and it is started or discontinued at the will of the serviceman. If the man or woman is in the Army and his class B or B-1 dependents know that he will approve their application, they may make the application for him providing he is overseas. When the application is received, he is contacted for his approval. If the man or woman is in any other branch of the service, they must make application regardless of whether or not they are out of the country.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FAMILY ALLOWANCE AND ALLOTMENT

It is well for both the serviceman and the dependents to know the difference in these terms. Family allowance is a sum of money partly paid by the service man or woman and partly paid by the Government. No matter how small or how large the family allowance is, $22 is deducted from the service man's or woman's salary where there is one class of dependents, or $27 where there are two classes of dependents, and the balance is paid by the Government. Dependency must be shown for class B or B-1 dependents to receive family allowance.

An allotment is a voluntary deduction from a man's pay to members of his family or dependent relatives and it is not increased by any amount from the Government. These are referred to as class E allotments and no dependency needs be shown to receive it. The service man or woman is the only one who can request that this deduction be made from his pay.

PARENTS AND BROTHERS AND SISTERS CAN RECEIVE ALLOWANCES AT THE SAME TIME AS WIFE AND CHILDREN

It is also important to know that parents and brothers and sisters can get family allowance even if the serviceman's wife and children get one. In other words, if men or women in service have parents and brothers or sisters dependent upon them as well as a wife and children—all of these dependents can receive family allowance. Because a serviceman has a wife and child receiving this allowance, it does not prevent his parents and brothers and sisters from also receiving it. In order to name them, he has to make an additional $5 contribution toward the family allowance. For example, if he has a wife and child or children receiving family allowance, he is having $22 deducted from his wages in part payment of it. If he wishes also to name his parents or brothers or sisters, he has $5 more taken out or a total of $27. The balance in both cases is paid by the Government.

PARENTS CAN GET FAMILY ALLOWANCE FROM MORE THAN ONE SON OR DAUGHTER IN SERVICE

If parents are dependent upon more than one son or daughter or both in service they can get more dependency allowance. They may get either a B rating from both sons or they may get a B-1 rating from one and a B from the other. They may receive family allowance from no more than two sons or daughters in service. This is given where the need is shown to be sufficiently great enough to warrant it.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN CAN HELP YOU IF YOU HAVE ANY TROUBLE

As I have stated above, see your local veterans' service officer, your local Red Cross chairman, or your local American Legion head for assistance. If you need any further help, contact your Congressman. It is a Congressman's duty to help with such matters. He is your Representative in Washington. If you have any trouble at all in this respect, your Congressman is the person to take it up with.

Your Congressman has already helped in more than 15,000 cases. Only 100 of these are now pending. Your Congressman will settle your case for you and get you every cent you have coming. Write to Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

FOR THOSE WHO RECEIVED A CUT IN FAMILY ALLOWANCE

Many people received a cut recently in their family allowance. No explanation is given when the reduced checks arrive so here is the explanation.

To begin with, all those who were cut were reduced to $37 per month. In other words, they were given a class B dependency. No matter how many dependents there are in a family, a class B dependency under the new law gives only $37.

What is a class B dependency? A class B dependency is one where the parents or brothers and sisters are dependent upon the soldier or sailor 50 percent or less.

All dependents some time ago were sent a blank to fill out. On that blank they were asked to list their monthly living expenses for the last 12 months and their average monthly income for the last 12 months. If the difference between monthly expenses and income listed on this blank was $37 or less, they were cut to a class B dependency rating. The dependents' own figures as put on this blank were used as the basis for rating them as B instead of B–1 dependents.

Another thing that reduced many people to $37 per month was the way they filled out the part of the blank which asked how much the soldier or sailor contributed before he joined the armed forces. Many parents put down that they did not know, or put in that the boy contributed nothing to their support or very little before he joined. The more the boy contributed to their support, the better are the chances of the parents to a B–1 rating.

If those who have been cut cannot make ends meet on $37 per month, they should take the matter up with their county veterans' service officer or local American Legion head or local Red Cross chairman; and if any further information or assistance is needed, write me: Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

How To Trace Soldier's Missing Personal Effects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following is a portion of a letter I received from a soldier's mother:

When my son left for overseas 6 months ago he gave into the charge of the officer at the port of embarkation a package containing personal belongings he wanted me to have. To date this has not been received, although I've taken it up with the post office and the express company, but to no avail. What can I do about this?

If you know from which port of embarkation your son left, write to the transportation officer at that port. Otherwise, I suggest you inquire of the transportation officer or the commanding officer of the post, camp, or station to which he was last assigned in this country.

Give full details of what the package contained, describing each article. If these inquiries bring no results, write to the Personal Effects Bureau, Kansas City Quartermaster Depot, Kansas City, Mo., as the package may have been sent there for shipping.

If you get no response or satisfaction after doing the above, write Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and I will get the matter settled for you.

Congress Will Consider Post-War Highway and Airport Construction Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the winning of the war is the paramount objective of the American people. Nothing should be done that will delay victory. It is necessary, however, that Congress consider carefully appropriate and far-reaching plans for post-war projects which are national in scope. Delayed action might conceivably be disastrous to the returning veterans of our armed forces, and to the development and improvement of worth-while construction.

The House Roads Committee, of which I am a member, on June 2 favorably reported H. R. 4915 by Chairman ROBINSON, which authorizes $1,500,000,000 in Federal-aid highway funds to become available at the rate of $500,000,000 for each of the 3 successive post-war fiscal years.

The legislation provides the following:

First, $500,000,000 shall be distributed among the States and become available for contractual obligation within the 30-day period after the passage of the legislation.

Second, $500,000,000 for the second fiscal year shall be distributed among the States and become available for contractual obligations January 1, following the first apportionment.

In the event the bill becomes law within the next few months, as I believe it should, Federal funds will be available by January 1, 1945, in the amount of $1,000,000,000 for the construction of post-war highways. A plan of this sort would enable State highway departments to advance with patterns for specific projects and to present to the State legislatures, meeting next year, plans for matching Federal funds. The measure contains no provision for the date of apportionment or availability of the $500,000,000 for the third fiscal post-war year.

The funds apportionment formula among the States has been changed from the traditional Federal-aid method of one-third population, one-third area, and one-third post-road mileage to a new basis of one-half population, one-fourth area, and one-fourth post-road mileage. This method would allow a greater percentage of Federal moneys to the more populous States for use in relieving traffic congestion in the urban areas.

The measure provides that after making deductions for administration, investigation, and research the funds shall be used as follows:

First, $225,000,000 for the Federal-aid highway system either inside or outside municipalities.

Second, $125,000,000 for principal, secondary, and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads.

Third, $150,000,000 for principal highways in urban areas on the Federal-aid highway system.

Sixty percent Federal funds is the proposed matching basis for the first year, 40 percent State funds with the regular 50–50 matching basis applying thereafter. Provisions are specially provided for States with large areas of publicly owned land.

The bill also provides that the Commissioner of Public Roads has the authority to advance funds to the States where necessary construction work should be expedited. The measure also calls for the creation of a "national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in total extent so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico."

The State highway departments, of each State and the adjoining States, are to make the selection of routes in the interstate highway system in accordance with the regular provisions of the Federal highway aid statutes, and the routes automatically become part of the Federal-aid highway system if not already designated as such.

One and one-half percent of the funds apportioned to any State for any year may be used for surveys, plans, and engineering without matching with State funds.

The legislation provides $25,000,000 for each of the 3 post-war years for forest highways; $12,500,000 annually for forest development, trails and roads; $4,250,000 in each of the 3 years for national park roads, and $5,000,000 in each of the 3 years for access roads to national parks and monuments.

The bill would also authorize the Commissioner of Public Roads to cooperate with the State highway departments in airplane flight strip construction alongside highways.

Our roads committee, in providing for the separation of funds among urban, rural, and secondary roads, proposes the following definitions:

The term "urban area" means an area including and adjacent to a municipality of 10,000 or more, the population of such including municipality to be determined by the latest available Federal census. The

boundaries or urban areas, as defined herein, will be fixed by the State highway department of each State subject to the approval of the Public Roads Administration.

The term "rural areas" means all areas of the State not included in urban areas.

The term "secondary and feeder roads" means roads in rural areas, including farm-to-market roads, rural-mail routes, and school-bus routes, and not on the Federal-aid system.

AIRPORT BILL IS PRESENTED

On June 14, I introduced in the House a Federal-aid airport bill (H. R. 5024) which calls for the expenditure of $1,000,000,000 in Federal funds in 10 years for the development of airports. The administration of the measure would be placed under a newly created director of airports service under the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The bill, following the general plan of Federal aid for highway construction, requires the establishment of "State airport agencies," and funds would be apportioned under a legislative formula among the States. The formula provides that funds should be apportioned among the States in the proportion which their population, area, and number of registered civil aircraft—other than those owned by scheduled air carriers—per civil airport bear to the total population, number of civil aircraft of all the States per civil airport and area.

The measure directs preparation of a national airport plan and authorizes the appropriation of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and $100,000,000 for each of the nine successive fiscal years, in order to bring about the establishment of a Nation-wide system of public airports adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aeronautics. The requirement of States to match Federal contributions on a 50–50 basis, thus making a total program of $2,000,000,000, would be necessary. Special provision is made that not more than 2 percent of any annual appropriation can be expended for the development of any one airport.

States, in order to be eligible for participation in Federal airport aid, must:

First. Enact appropriate enabling legislation.

Second. Set up a State airport agency with adequate powers and suitably equipped to fit the requirements of the Federal-aid airport program.

Third. Enact legislation for the prevention and removal of airport hazards.

Fourth. Refrain from taxing aircraft fuel or aeronautical facilities and operations unless the proceeds are devoted entirely to the development of civil aeronautics.

Fifth. Take adequate steps to assure proper management and maintenance of all public airports.

Sixth. Take adequate steps to assure the availability of State funds for participation in the Federal-aid airport program.

A national plan for the development of public airports adequate to meet the needs of national defense and civil aviation will be prepared and kept current by the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. He is required, in formulating the plan, to take into consideration the recommendations and views of the several States and their political subdivisions. The plan, when developed, will specify the general location and type of airports, and construction priorities will be organized.

Review of Legislation Passed Benefiting World War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the New Mexico Department of the American Legion is opening its twenty-fifth annual convention on this day, June 23. It had been my plan to attend the convention and address the members of the Legion there.

Because of the legislative situation in Washington, where I was serving as a conferee on two of the appropriation bills, I was unable to leave in time to attend the convention, but I prepared and sent to the convention the address which I had written. Because this address carries information which I think should be of interest not only to the veterans of previous wars, but to the men and women now in the armed services of the United States, I desire to insert it into the RECORD. It is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and my friends of the New Mexico Department of the American Legion, first of all I want to congratulate you on the fact that your organization has reached the ripe age of 25 years. When two people have been united in the holy bonds of matrimony for 25 years we celebrate their silver anniversary, and we send them gifts of silver to express our joy at the permanency of their union. In a similar vein I think I might express to the members of the New Mexico Department of the American Legion my gratification at the completion of 25 years of successful association which has tied together into a united and effective group the victors of a great war.

At the same time I can as well express my hope for two additional results: First, that after the veterans of the present struggle return victors from their world-wide conflict, they will find their way into the ranks of the Legion to keep alive and aggressive for the next generation the work which your members have so ably carried forward; and second, that as a result of the combined experience of these two great groups of men who will have fought and won two decisive struggles for freedom and democracy throughout the world, there may come a program which will mean eventual world peace and will insure the sons and daughters of the new generation an opportunity to grow to manhood and womanhood without facing the specter of a third world-wide cataclysm. Surely the accumulated wisdom of these two struggles should help us protect ourselves against a third.

In Washington the program of the serviceman and the care of the veteran has been before us time after time in these last few years, and particularly in recent months. I wish that time would permit me to deal in minute detail with all the measures that have been proposed, and particularly with those which have won final passage. I do think that I would be justified on this occasion in talking at greater length than an ordinary appearance might justify, because I feel that when the soldiers of the present war return to their homes they will naturally come in contact with the members of the American Legion and will seek from you correct information as to their rights and privileges and responsibilities. For that reason I feel that you will pardon what may seem like an extended review of legislation.

You are doubtless aware of the recent measures enacted by the Congress, which President Roosevelt signed on May 27 last. The most important of these were Public Laws 312 and 313. I cannot tell you the number of men and women that these laws will benefit, because it is not possible to make a prediction in connection with the present war which would cover the possibilities involved. However, I can tell you this:

These two laws brought veterans of the present war two very valuable rights, which had been enjoyed by World War No. 1 veterans and dependents for a number of years, but which had not been extended to the younger veterans of the present war until these laws were approved on May 27. They brought non-service-connected disability pensions and non-service-connected death pensions to limited groups of deserving veterans and dependents of the present war.

These non-service-connected disability pensions have been provided for a number of years for veterans of World War No. 1 who are permanently and totally disabled. The rate for total disability is now $60 a month. For those who may remain on the rolls for 10 years, or who attain the age of 65 years, the rate is now $60 a month. These rates now apply to World War No. 2.

Widows and children of veterans of the present war who have a service-connected disability but who die of other causes are now eligible for the first time to pension at the following rates: a widow, $35 a month; a widow with one child, $45 a month, with $5 a month each for each additional child.

As I said, these are new benefits conferred by the acts of May 27 upon veterans, widows, and children on account of service in the present war.

In addition, service-connected disability payments for line-of-duty pension for veterans of the present war were increased by 15 percent. This makes payments for total disability $115 a month, instead of the $100 a month which prevailed before, and proportionate increases have been provided for partial disabilities.

Now as to the veterans and dependents of the First World War. These laws which I have referred to have all provided increases for the veterans, widows, and children of that war.

By this I mean to say that veterans of World War No. 1 with service-connected disability received the 15-percent increase in compensation payments; the permanently and totally disabled veterans of World War No. 1, suffering from nonservice-connected disabilities, had their pension rates increased from $40 a month to the amounts payable in World War No. 2 cases, which are for those on the rolls 10 years—or attaining the age of 65 years—$60 a month; with the others increased to $50 a month.

Also, the widows and orphans rates for nonservice-connected death—these are the Public 484 benefits restricted to those with service-connected disability who die of other causes—these World War No. 1 widows had their pensions increased to $35 a month from $30 a month; a widow with one child from $38 a month to $45 a month, with additional children being increased from $4 to $5 a month.

In addition for one orphan (no widow) the rate was increased from $15 a month to $18 a month; two orphans from $22 to $27 a month; and three orphans from $30 a month

to $36 a month, with additional orphans receiving increases from $3 a month to $4 a month each. These new rates for orphans also apply initially in each instance to like World War No. 2 cases.

Another law which the Congress passed and which President Roosevelt signed on May 11, was Public 309. This law provides that blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation may be provided with seeing-eye or guide dogs for escorts, as well as with mechanical electronic equipment.

In addition, on March 1 President Roosevelt signed a law which increased rates for both veterans and widows of Spanish-American War veterans, and approved a law providing additional benefits for veterans and dependents of the Indian wars.

As you well know, all these new laws, like the old laws, are administered by the Veterans' Administration, which is headed by our good friend Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines.

This great organization, which was conceived by the veterans of World War No. 1 to meet the difficult conditions which existed following the Armistice, was created by Congress as a result of the demand on the part of veterans that one organization be responsible for veterans' care and veterans' benefits.

We were indeed fortunate that your foresight made this great organization possible, because without the head start which was thus provided we would be having great difficulties in caring for the veterans and dependents of the present war.

To give you some idea of the problems which the Veterans' Administration has been meeting successfully in this connection, I have only to say that at the end of May 1943 only 11,000 claims for disability pension growing out of the present war had been allowed by the Veterans' Administration, while at the end of April of the present year, 161,000 claims for disability pension had been allowed, an increase of 150,000 during the past year in pension awards for disability growing out of the present war.

Death awards have been on a smaller scale. They rose from 7,000 in May 1943 to 24,000 in April 1944. National service life insurance awards for death increased from 26,000 in May 1943 to 73,000 in April 1944.

As you are doubtless aware, the so-called G. I. bill of rights, as revised in conference, has passed both the House and the Senate, and was to be signed by the President on Thursday preceding this convention.

I will not endeavor to tell all the particulars of this very constructive measure, which is designed primarily to assist the average veteran upon his discharge from the service. I would call to your attention the fact that the G. I. bill will be in addition to the law we enacted several months ago, providing mustering-out pay of from $100 to $300. This, as you know, goes to all men who have served honorably in the present war.

As to the G. I. bill itself, it proposes a variety of benefits, including continuing education, loans to finance the purchase, repair, or construction of homes, farms, or business properties, with additional provisions for unemployment payments to veterans who may find themselves without jobs.

Under it the Veterans' Administration is declared to be an essential war agency and entitled, second only to the War Department and the Navy Department, to priorities in personnel, equipment, and materials. The sum of $500,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for hospital construction.

No person shall be discharged or released from active duty in the armed forces until his certificate of discharge or release from active duty, and final pay or substantial portion thereof are ready for delivery to him or to his next of kin or legal representative; and no person (with certain exceptions) shall be discharged or released from active service on account of disability until he has executed a claim for compensation, pension, or hospitalization, to be filed with the Veterans' Administration, or has signed a statement that he has had explained to him the right to file such claim. No person in the armed forces shall be required to sign a statement of any nature, referring to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of any disease or injury he may have; and any such statement against his own interest signed at any time shall be null and void and of no force and effect.

Generally speaking, any veteran whose education was interrupted or interfered with or discontinued because of his entry into the military service is entitled to the educational benefits provided in the bill. It is assumed that any veteran who has not reached the age of 25 did have such an interruption. Service of 90 days or more is required to be eligible for educational training. The course must be initiated not later than 2 years after the date of discharge or termination of the present war, whichever is the later. While pursuing such a course the veteran shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $50 a month if without a dependent or dependents, or $75 a month if he has a dependent or dependents. The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution the customary cost of tuition, etc., and other necessary expenses exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel, not exceeding $500 for an ordinary school year.

Loans are provided to veterans for the purpose of acquisition and construction of homes, farms, and business properties. Veterans of all wars are to be provided with the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment. Although this section has to do primarily with veterans of the present war, all war veterans are granted the same employment assistance.

Veterans who have served 90 days shall be entitled, in accordance with regulations issued by the Administrator, to receive a readjustment allowance for each week of unemployment, not to exceed a total of 52 weeks, which occurs not later than 2 years after discharge or release, or termination of the war, whichever is the later date.

Cash benefits provided any veteran under the G. I. bill are to be deducted from any bonus or adjusted compensation, which may be payable after the war.

As you know, hospitalization without service connection for disability and vocational rehabilitation for service-connected disabled veterans who are handicapped were provided by the Congress last year for veterans of the present war

We now have 94 fine veterans' hospitals and homes containing nearly 100,000 beds of all types. These may be sufficient for immediate veterans' requirements, for as you know the armed forces provide initial hospitalization for men in the service, the Army alone having more than a half million beds for this purpose.

After demobilization General Hines expects to receive about 100,000 beds from the Army and Navy for use in veterans' hospitalization. Ultimately the veterans will need another 100,000 beds, but this last hundred thousand will not be required for many years.

In connection with the present veterans' hospital expansion program, the Congress has appropriated more than $40,000,000 for veterans' beds during the past 6 months.

And do not forget this: Our women veterans, that is, the nurses, WAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and Marine Corps girls, have the same rights as the men and are entitled to the same benefits under like conditions.

It took veterans of the First World War many years after the armistice to obtain a number of these benefits I have set forth—benefits which have already been provided for the veterans of the present war.

In conferring these rights resulting from service in the present war before the war is over I think that Congress has only done the fair thing. If these measures have proved beneficial for First World War veterans and dependents, it would seem logical that they would benefit Second World War veterans and dependents as well.

Every citizen of New Mexico takes solemn pride in the record our New Mexico boys have made in the present war.

What could have been more heroic than the gallant stand our boys of the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery made at Bataan and Corregidor? And I say this to you now: The Japs will pay dearly for the inhuman cruelties they have inflicted upon our brave sons, some of whom have survived the unspeakable degradations of the Jap prison camps and will return when the war is ended to become your comrades in the Legion.

Yes; the Japs will pay. They will pay dearly for their treachery and their bestiality.

All of us awaited with mingled emotions, with bated breath, the launching of the gigantic operations against Hitler and his fanatics, which will seal the doom of that madman and his dreams for world conquest. We are now under way and we will not be stopped short of complete victory.

We dread the cost in life and limb, yet we know it must be paid if our America is to be secure in a world where bandits have been striving to loot the possessions of freemen and to subjugate the nations rightfully owning them.

We must be prepared for heavy sacrifices. Fortress Europe is strongly defended, and our enemies are battle-toughened veterans, led by experienced generals.

The operations which we and our allies have launched will be the most gigantic and the most powerful which the history of warfare has ever known.

The battles will be fought to a conclusion—and we will win the final victory. This time we will also win the peace. The bandit nations will be disarmed for all time.

When that day comes again the veterans who comprise the American Legion can meet in their annual conventions and plan for the preservation of peace throughout the world. To that day and that planning, we all must look forward hopefully and with prayer in our hearts, but the day will come. I am confident that my friends in the New Mexico Department of the American Legion will be ready for it.

Service Men and Women—By All Means Keep Up Your Insurance After Discharge

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give a message to service men and women: The chances are that you took out national service life insurance when you joined the Army and that you have been paying for it by having the premiums deducted from your monthly pay. If you possibly can, you should keep this insurance in force when you return to civil life. It is a valuable asset and provides protection for you and your family. If you let it lapse you will not be able to buy similar protection for the same cost.

To keep it in force you must do two things. First, pay the premiums direct.

Second, convert it, within a certain period, as explained below.

PAY PREMIUMS DIRECT TO VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Since premiums can no longer be deducted from your Army pay, you must now pay them direct. Make your check or money order payable to the Treasurer of the United States and mail it to the Collections Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C. Pay the premiums even though a premium notice does not reach you. It is most important to give your full name, birth date, present address, policy number, and your Army serial number.

If you do not want to pay premiums monthly, you can arrange to pay quarterly, semiannually, or annually. However, any change in the method of payment of premiums must be approved by the Veterans' Administration. In other words, you must continue to pay them at the monthly rates until you have arranged with the Veterans' Administration to pay them on a quarterly, semiannual, or annual basis; otherwise, your policy might lapse. If you wish you can have the amount of insurance reduced, as long as the amount continued is in multiples of $500 and not less than $1,000.

CONVERT FORM "TERM" TO "LIFE"

As originally issued to you, your insurance was known as 5-year level premium-term insurance. This policy was good for only 5 years after it was issued. So before the 5 years are up you should convert, or in other words change over, to ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life.

You can do this while the policy is in force and at any time after it has been in force 1 year, by applying to the Veterans' Administration. No medical examination is required. Although the premiums you pay on your new policy will be larger than you now pay, it will be worth your while to convert, for your original policy has no regular cash value. When you get your new policy, however, it will have regular cash value, after the first policy year, against which you can borrow if necessary.

If you become totally disabled before reaching 60 years of age, continue to pay your insurance premiums. After 6 months of such continuous disability, notify the Veterans' Administration. If disability is so established, further premiums will be waived and those you paid during the first 6 months of total disability will be refunded to you.

GETTING YOUR INSURANCE REINSTATED

Ordinarily, the premium for the month of discharge is deducted from your final pay settlement. Make a note of the date when the next premium is due—it is shown on your Form 53—and remember that you are given, for an emergency, a 31-day period beyond that date in which to make payment. If not paid within the 31-day period, your insurance will lapse, but you can have it reinstated within the next 6 months by paying the back premiums and filing a simple statement showing that you are in as good health as at the time of discharge.

Beyond 6 months, you must pass a physical examination before the insurance can be reinstated and this may be obtained free of charge at any Veterans' Administration office.

IN A NUTSHELL

Do not let your insurance lapse. Pay premiums direct. If it does lapse, get all or some of it reinstated if you possibly can. Be sure to keep the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., advised of any change of permanent address. If you have any problems go to the nearest office of the Veterans' Administration.

PRIVATE LIFE INSURANCE

If, when you went into the service, you arranged to have premiums on your private life insurance guaranteed by the Government, remember that payments must be brought up to date within 2 years after your discharge. Your insurance company or the Veterans' Administration will answer any questions.

If you have any questions, write Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

First County in Nation on Fifth War Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, Gregory County, in the Second Congressional District of South Dakota, has the honor and distinction of being the first county in the United States to meet and pass its quota in the Fifth War Loan. The drive opened Saturday, June 3. By 8 o'clock that night, Gregory County was over the top.

That would be a remarkable record for any county—but listen to a word about Gregory County. Ten years ago, it was a disaster county. Drought, grasshoppers, and dust storms plagued it. Strictly a rural county of about 10,000 population with not a town of more than 1,250 people by the last census, it lost heavily in that dry cycle which ran from 1931 to 1940. It lost people, livestock, and money. But the people who could stay did stay. They are the staying kind, hard-working, thrifty, and honest.

Times turned better a few years ago. They have had good crops. Again the population has been depleted by workers going into defense industries and by boys going into the Army and Navy, but those at home have worked all the harder. Only on the 4th of July have they stopped working to turn out in crowds to see Army units that have visited them.

So when L. L. Lillibridge, county War loan chairman, got word of the quota for Gregory County he turned to the young boys and girls in the 4–H Clubs, led by Myron Barber, county agent. They lined up a few prize heifers and pigs to sell at bond auctions the day they opened the drive. Rains and bad roads held down attendance at the sales, but that did not stop these folks. When night came they had reached the goal and beat it.

Gregory County, S. Dak., Mr. Speaker, is a long way from the National Capital. It is a long way from any large city. It is not near any military or governmental center. But the hearts of these people beat with the hearts of the Americans everywhere. They want victory. They have little patience with strikes, work stoppages, or anything else that might delay victory. They want their boys to win the war and return home. And for their own part they are giving every possible effort to produce food and to perform the part of the job assigned to them. I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, and other leaders of the Nation will want to join in congratulating the 4–H Clubs and the people of Gregory County on being first to meet their quota in the Fifth War loan.

Omniscient O'Konski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Polk County Ledger, of Balsam Lake, Wis.:

"THE OMNISCIENT O'KONSKI"

There are quotations around the above heading because it is the title of an article that appeared in News Week, a magazine of more than a million circulation. Just so no one gets the wrong impression, the dictionary says "omniscient" means "a man of universal knowledge."

In an intelligence test given Congressmen by the United Press, a news-gathering organization, Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI rated the highest of all Congressmen.

To a good many people O'KONSKI is a source of wonderment. He puzzles the conservatives and leftists alike. His votes are usually cast in a nonpartisan manner, except that he occasionally matches votes on some extremely ticklish issue. But more often than not his vote is the vote that you or I would cast.

But his letters to the public, published in a large number of newspapers in his district, are unmatched by any Washington newsletter we have ever seen. He usually picks out sensational subjects, writes them with an appeal to the common man who has a bit of grudge toward the wealthy or a grudge and/or contempt for politicians on the whole. He constantly repeats to better emphasize his points. Sometimes is inconsistent in his writings from one week to another. And probably has the greatest percentage of constituents reading his column of any Congressman writing a weekly letter.

He is constantly in touch with folks back home. He gets around 150 letters a day and even answers personally a post card addressed to him. Now he spends a great deal of time working on collection of moneys due servicemen, discharged servicemen, and servicemen's families and dependents. During the last year he has settled over a million and a half dollars' worth in claims.

Few agree with him or everything; a very few heartily dislike him; and many of his

constituents are loyal supporters because he usually votes their way and because he always exerts every effort to give action on any legitimate complaint coming from his district regarding Federal affairs and gets surprising results.

O'KONSKI, we prophesy, will be reelected next fall. He will be elected by Republicans, Democrats, and Progressives, and what-have-you.

It has been many a moon since this congressional district has had a Representative in the limelight as much as O'KONSKI. He's the little man who's always there and always has something to say. He's an orator, partly by profession, and he knows what people want to say and how to tell it to them.

O'KONSKI will remain a "wonderment" to most voters. But they, like he, will throw party lines into the scrap pile, and vote for him again.

Contractors Guide for Termination of Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following publication of the War Department:

CONTRACTORS GUIDE—SUGGESTIONS TO WAR CONTRACTORS AS TO METHODS OF AND PREPARATION FOR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS APPLYING TO FIXED-PRICE SUPPLY CONTRACTS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT

(Issued for war contractors by the War Department)

REQUIRED READING

Procurement Regulation 15, and the Termination Accounting Manual (TM 14–1005), are the official documents used by the War Department in connection with the termination of fixed-price supply contracts dealt with herein.

These documents, as originally published, and current amendments, may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., for a nominal fee.

The appendix of this booklet contains forms recently approved by the War Department for use in submitting the contractor's list of inventory, statement of charges, and settlement proposal.

The latest approved forms may be obtained from the procurement offices of the various War Department services.

Terminations and settlement of War Department contracts are effected by contracting officers of the following procurement services: Army Air Forces, Army Service Forces, Chemical Warfare Service, Corps of Engineers, Medical Department, Ordnance Department, Quartermaster Corps, Signal Corps, Transportation Corps.

MESSAGE TO WAR CONTRACTORS

Winning the war is our primary duty. Yet so long as the fighting lasts, the termination of war contracts is the task next in importance to American industry. This is true because in fluid war many contracts have to be terminated and new ones begun. Only in this fashion can the rapidly changing needs for new and better weapons be met promptly.

Victory depends in considerable degree on how flexible we can keep war production. The quick and efficient termination of contracts and the clearance of war plants for other work therefore has become an inseparable and vital part of the war supply program.

Here lies its immediate significance. There is also a future significance. The orderly and rapid transition tomorrow from war to peacetime economy depends on how well today we solve the mounting problems of contract termination.

Total terminations of all war contracts are inevitable. Nothing is surer. Industry must handle its share of the termination job today or it cannot expect to handle it tomorrow.

There is now a fortunate opportunity to learn how best to do the job before it strikes in full force. The War Department is building its termination organization and procedures in full recognition of this huge task ahead. To protect itself and the national economy, industry must use more of its best brains on the problem. It is a job for first-rate men. Industry can afford to lose no time in assigning these men, and in establishing a framework in which they are to operate.

If this is not done with the utmost dispatch, industrial plants will become clogged with surplus materials and organizations bogged down in a welter of detailed but nevertheless essential work.

This, in some industries, has already happened.

The urgency of the situation is the keynote of this message. The War Department does not settle a terminated contract until the contractor files his claim. In a surprisingly large sector of industry, this elementary task is not being speeded. As this is written, contractors are entitled to claim a half a billion dollars in settlement of contracts already terminated. On many contracts terminated 6 to 12 months ago contractors have still submitted no claims.

There are two factors chiefly responsible for these delays. The first is inexperience in organizing for termination and in training men to do the job. Education will remedy this.

The second factor is not so easily disposed of. Some contractors fail to give sufficiently serious attention to termination. It is still considered, in some quarters, a nebulous problem for some distant tomorrow. Until the termination problem is viewed as an immediate and current task, a pressing and critical part of winning the war, it will not be solved. This situation can only be remedied by a realistic and determined attitude on the part of industry.

This message is a warning that acute economic dislocation and widespread unemployment can result unless the multitude of complex problems inherent in termination are met and solved now. It is also an earnest invitation for full-strength cooperation of war contractors in our mutual task.

Once again, as in stepping up war production to the greatest peak the world has known, the industry-Army team has the opportunity to reach an achievement of which the Nation can justly be proud and upon the success of which the economic welfare of the Nation most assuredly depends.

For speedy settlement you must avoid these obstacles:

1. Failure to provide sufficient personnel in termination unit.
2. Failure to take inventory promptly.
3. Failure to secure and review subcontractors' claims promptly.
4. Failure to present termination claim properly on standard forms.
5. Failure to submit certified invoice or signed voucher after statement is approved.

PART I

I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

It is the policy of the War Department to see that every contractor whose war contract is terminated for the convenience of the Government, is quickly and fairly compensated for the work which he has done under the contract, and that his plant is speedily cleared of materials rendered surplus by the termination, and of Government-owned machinery and equipment no longer needed in war production.

The purpose of this pamphlet is to assist the contractor to do his part in bringing about the fast, fair, and final settlement to which he is entitled. It is not a new set of termination instructions, interpretations, directives, or orders, nor does it supersede in any way the official War Department regulations (PR 15 and the Termination Accounting Manual) governing war-contract terminations and the accompanying disposal of surplus property. This publication explains briefly the A B C's of termination from the contractor's point of view, and suggests steps he may take before termination in relation to the Government, his own organization, and his subcontractors.

This publication is primarily prepared for use by contractors, not lawyers. Accordingly, it is not intended and should not be accepted as an authority on any legal question on which a controversy may arise.

The War Department has gained valuable knowledge from actual experience in terminating many supply contracts. It has been in close touch with leaders of American industry, with a cross-section of war contractors, and with national trade associations. The ideas and suggestions from these sources have been of great assistance in formulating and testing termination policies and procedures. This publication is a way of making this information available to all War Department contractors.

It is written for prime contractors holding fixed-price (sometimes called lump-sum) supply contracts with the War Department procurement services, and for their subcontractors. It is not intended to apply to cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, service contracts, or construction contracts.

II. BASIS OF CONTRACT TERMINATION

The Government's privilege to terminate a war contract in whole or in part in order to meet military requirements is based upon a contractual right universally accepted as a reasonable and necessary method of protecting the Government from paying for work not yet performed and no longer needed because of changes in the military situation. It is not the policy of the Government to commit breaches of contract. It must, therefore, reserve the right in its war contracts to terminate them at any time upon conditions which will fairly compensate a contractor for his performance up to the date of termination. Terminations for the convenience of the Government should not be confused with cancelations due to a contractor's default, or with adjustments in contracts to permit changes in specifications or prices.

The War Department has long reserved the right in its contracts to terminate them for the convenience of the Government, but it was not until January 1944 that a termination article uniform for all Government procuring agencies was adopted. This uniform article was authorized for use in all new prime contracts for the manufacture of war supplies entered into after February 20, 1944. It is not mandatory for contracts of less than $500,000 which are to be completed within 6 months or for contracts of less than $50,000 regardless of the date of completion.

A majority of War Department contracts still contain the old War Department standard termination article in use prior to the adoption of the uniform article. For uniformity it is desirable that existing contracts be amended to insert the new uniform article. Contractors are entitled to such an amend-

ment and may request it from their contracting officer.

III. METHODS OF SETTLEMENT

A comparison of the old War Department standard termination article and the new uniform termination article demonstrates certain advantages of the latter. Broadly speaking, the action required to be taken by contractors under both articles is substantially the same, but in the uniform article the provisions are spelled out in more detail and thus provide a clearer pattern for the contractor's action. The uniform article will be particularly valuable to those contractors who have contracts with more than one procuring agency. Under both of these articles there are two methods of settlement—by negotiation and by formula.

A. By negotiation

The uniform article contains full authority for the contractor and the contracting officer to agree upon an amount to be paid the contractor in either complete or partial settlement of his contract. It is intended that the settlement shall be a lump-sum agreement representing the best judgment of the contractor and the contracting officer of the compensation, including such reasonable profit as will be fair to the contractor under all the circumstances, for the work he has actually performed, including profit on articles or materials not processed by the contractor. The settlement should be arrived at quickly and fairly, and once signed without fraud, by representatives of both parties fully authorized to do so, it is binding in the same manner and extent as a similar agreement between private parties.

The negotiated settlement has definite advantages to the contractor. It is faster and brings about a quicker payment of claims. It is not bound by mandatory restrictions.

B. By formula

If the contractor and the contracting officer fail to agree upon a negotiated settlement of the whole or any part of a claim, the termination article provides a formula for determining the amount of the Government's obligation. While the negotiated settlement and the formula settlement are based upon the same information, a more detailed review and investigation of the records of the contractor will normally be made in the case of a formula settlement. Reasonable approximations or estimates which might be sufficient in a negotiated settlement are no longer appropriate. The burden of proof is on the contractor, and just as in court, he must prove the elements of his claim.

Under the uniform article, this formula provides for payment of the following amounts:

a. The contract price for completed articles delivered and accepted.

b. The cost of all other work.

c. The cost of settling and paying claims of subcontractors and of others against the contractor arising out of the termination of work under subcontracts or orders.

d. Reasonable termination expenses.

e. A profit based on the cost of work done by the contractor and computed in accordance with the percentages inserted in the termination article at the time of its inclusion in the contract. The amount of profit is subject to two limitations—(a) the profit to be allowed on articles or materials not processed by the contractor may not exceed 2 percent of their cost; (b) the total profit may not exceed 6 percent of the total costs incurred in performing the terminated portion of the contract exclusive of costs incurred in settling claims of subcontractors.

The determination of allowable costs must be made in accordance with the Statement of Principles for Determination of Costs Upon Termination of Government Fixed-price Supply Contracts which has been reprinted in PR 15-481 to 486. This statement of costs is expressly made applicable to formula settlements by the uniform termination article.

What Costs Can You Include?

Yes

If found to be reasonably necessary for and properly allocable to the terminated contract, and in accordance with the Statement of Principles for Determination of Costs Upon Termination of Government Fixed-price Supply Contracts approved by the Joint Contract Termination Board, December 31, 1943.

1. Cost of inventory.
2. Subcontractors' claims.
3. Depreciation.
4. Experimental and research expense.
5. Engineering and development and special tooling.
6. Loss on facilities.
7. Special leases.
8. Advertising.
9. Interest on borrowed funds.
10. Settlement expenses.
11. Protection and disposition of property.
12. Initial costs.

No

1. Losses on other contracts.
2. Expense of conversion to other uses.
3. Expenses due to negligence.
4. Costs in excess of those required for the contract.
5. Costs already allowed in renegotiation.

NOTE.—The termination claim plus the amount paid or payable on completed items may not exceed the sum of the total contract price and posttermination expenses.

IV. WHAT TO DO BEFORE TERMINATION

Time to get ready: Terminations are occurring now. They are occurring because of continuous changes in military requirements and in spite of increasing procurement in many lines. While numerous contracts will be completed according to schedule eventually nearly every war contractor will be confronted with the termination problem in one form or another. Today is the time to get ready for that eventuality. How quickly the Government can act in settling termination cases, depends entirely on how quickly the contractor does act, and gets his subcontractors to act.

"It is reported to us that in the past an average of 4 months has been required to get contractors to submit a claim. Only a part of this slowness can be laid to preoccupation with the war or to inadequacies of Government policy. Contractors will have only themselves to blame if they do not get set to handle the problems of termination." (Baruch-Hancock Report on War and Postwar Adjustment Policies, February 15, 1944.)

The Government can act only when the contractor has presented correct and sufficient facts on which mutual action is based. A clear understanding of, and a careful preparation for, termination will materially aid both parties in a prompt and efficient settlement.

Contract terminations and property disposal are based on facts. The success and speed of the job is based on men. Both Government and industry must have the right kind of representatives to act for them. For the contractor, as for the Government, these must be men armed with special knowledge and experience. But also, they must be men of sound judgment, intelligence, and courage who possess an open-minded and judicial attitude.

There follows a series of steps which are recommended to contractors. These steps, of course, are not universally applicable * * * many smaller firms will need to take only a few. Neither are these steps necessarily listed in the chronological order which all companies will find convenient to follow. And quite naturally, every contractor, to suit his special needs, will doubtless find certain steps he must take which are not listed here.

The War Department has established termination organizations in Washington and in its procurement offices in the field. Contractors should not hesitate to consult these regional offices in advance of termination. The contractor will also find it wise to keep in close touch, either personally or through his trade associations, with the actions of Government executive agencies and the Congress.

Steps to Take in Your Own Organization

Read the termination article in your contract thoroughly and understand it fully. This is indispensable.

Select an individual of executive level to head Termination Section, giving him the necessary staff after considering the probable size of your termination problem. See that necessary legal and accounting assistance is arranged for, if it is not already available.

It is evident that contractors generally do not realize the importance and size of the termination job, and do not provide adequate personnel to process their termination claims.

It is estimated that 75 percent of the probable settlement proposals based on terminations still unsettled, have not yet been presented to the War Department. Obviously the contractor cannot be paid, or even have his proposal considered, until he has prepared it in proper form. He should provide a staff adequate for this purpose in his own interest and to assist the Government in making prompt settlements.

Reasonable costs of the termination section actually applied to this work, properly proportioned to the several contracts, may be included in termination charges.

Make a thorough study of the methods by which your subcontracts and purchase orders can be identified with the prime contract to which they apply.

If you are a subcontractor know what Government contracts you are producing for, and the procurement office which has charge of them.

Study backlog of contracts with the Government and your subcontractors and reduce all letters of intent, informal orders or changes, verbal agreements, etc., to formal contracts or amendments to existing contracts.

Study your control system for production control, so that inventories will always be reasonable and termination will find them so. Where feasible, prepare lists of standard costs for parts, sub-assemblies or components. This will speed up the pricing of inventory of work-in-process.

See to it that there is an ample supply of cards, inventory tickets, vouchers, and any other forms needed to record inventory, to compile costs, etc., when termination occurs.

See that raw materials, purchased parts and work-in-process can be properly identified with the contracts or orders to which they apply.

Maintain records to show costs of all jigs, moulds, fixtures, gages, dies, patterns, etc., for which you expect reimbursement. Be prepared to identify them with the contracts to which they apply.

Segregate and protect all Government property and keep an accounting. Be sure it can be identified. Keep stock control records accurate and up to date.

Train personnel to take physical inventories. Experience indicates that the greatest delay, on the part of contractors, has occurred in preparing for and in the actual taking of inventories. Proper training and careful preparation can materially reduce the time required. Study the space requirements for storage of inventories. Investigate other storage facilities if room is not available in the plant.

Consider what types of materials and Government-owned production equipment you

may desire to purchase if they become surplus upon termination of war contracts.

Assign personnel to study markets and potential sales of surplus property.

Become familiar with Government partial-payment and loan provisions and determine what financing, if any, is likely to be needed to pay off subcontractors, to buy raw materials and production equipment, and to take care of your own working-capital requirements.

Study probable effects of any termination on the size and composition of your labor force; develop a policy and program for effecting any adjustment in this force which may be required, giving special attention to the possibility of transferring any employees affected to other work within your establishment; and work out with the United States Employment Service, or other appropriate State or Federal agency, a plan under which any employees who must be released will be released in an orderly fashion and with the best possible provisions for their placement elsewhere.

Steps to Take With the Government

Consult the termination section of the procurement office with which your contract was negotiated about any particular termination problems which you anticipate.

If you have any large contracts which do not contain the uniform termination article, request the procurement office for the amendment of these contracts in order to insert the new article.

Keep currently informed as to the policies of the W. P. B., the O. P. A., the Surplus War Property Administrator, and other Government agencies outside the War Department concerning disposal of surplus property so as to have knowledge of action required when termination occurs.

If the procurement service is not familiar with your accounting practices, prepare a written statement covering your methods of cost keeping, distribution of overhead, and general accounting procedures for submission to the contracting officer. If this is available, it may make a complete audit unnecessary and permit the contractor's statements to be accepted with only spot checks and an office review.

Steps to Take With Subcontractors

Study the rights of subcontractors as outlined in PR 15–325.2.

Set up necessary procedures, prepare instructions and other forms for notifying subcontractors and suppliers when termination occurs. Such termination notices should be prepared and checked for proper legal form in advance. See PR 15–912.2.

Study forms of contracts and agreements with subcontractors and suppliers and as a general practice reduce all verbal and other informal commitments and agreements to proper legal form.

See that your subcontracts provide for termination.

When desirable, hold preliminary conferences with your subcontractors to discuss mutual problems and to urge preparation and education in advance of termination.

Be sure that your subcontractors understand what action they must take when they receive termination instructions from you.

Suggest that your subcontractors maintain inventories at a reasonable level consistent with production programs.

Make sure that your subcontractors understand the costs and charges for which they will be entitled to reimbursement on termination.

See that your subcontractors are prepared to account for, protect and store materials in their plants owned by you and the Government.

Prepare your subcontractors to assist you in the disposal of surplus materials remaining after termination.

Determine in advance, if possible, what financial assistance your subcontractors will need for themselves and for payment of claims made upon them.

See that your subcontractors are prepared with procedures, forms, notices, etc., so that they can take all necessary actions with reference to their subcontractors, and suppliers, suggested herein for you to take with reference to them.

If a Termination Notice Is Received—Take These Steps

Stop work.

Cancel subcontracts.

Notify local office of W. M. C. re surplus labor.

Consult contracting officer re completing work in process.

Cancel special and service contracts.

Notify your subcontractors re completing work in process.

Hold preliminary conference with contracting officer.

Take inventory.

Instruct employees on taking inventory.

Instruct your subcontractors re taking inventory.

Consult contracting officer re purchase or disposal (if loss involved).

Send required copies to contracting officer at once. Required copies to be filed with claim.

Determine values by contracts.

See that inventories are properly protected.

Account for Government property.

Forward list of Government-owned facilities.

Forward list of free issue materials on hand.

Consult contracting officer re purchase or disposal.

Consult contracting officer re removal or storage.

File your claim.

File all claims of subcontractors as directed.

Complete settlement agreement.

If funds are needed, file request for interim payment.

Transfer title to all inventories, etc., to Government.

Advance funds to your subcontractors if necessary.

PART 2

THE CONTRACTING OFFICER

In its contract relations the War Department generally acts through an agent called the contracting officer, who signs agreements and takes final action on behalf of the Government. Every terminated prime contract has a contracting officer designated to represent the Government in settling that contract. Legally the contracting officer is an individual having the authority to bind the Government. As a practical matter, however, the contracting officer has assisting him a team normally including a trained negotiator, lawyer, and accountants, and, where necessary, an engineer and other technical experts needed for the particular settlement. In his dealings with the Government the contractor is protected from arbitrary action on the part of any one individual by the constant participation of this group of trained experts.

Action 1. Pretermination meeting

The first step in a termination, where conditions permit, may be a meeting between representatives of the contractor and of the Government. The status of production and the extent to which it is economically feasible to terminate the contract are considered. Facts and procedures which will be of aid to the contractor and to the Government in carrying out the proposed termination are developed. In many cases, however, sudden changes in the military situation require the Government to act on the termination without the benefit of this pretermination meeting.

Action 2. The notice of termination

1. When to stop work.
2. What work to stop.
3. Stop work of subcontractors.
4. Stop work of suppliers.

The notice of termination is the means by which the Government exercises its contractual right to stop performance under the contract either in whole or in part. It is an official order signed by the contracting officer, either telegraphed or mailed to the contractor. It identifies the terminated contract, states the extent to which it is terminated, and may contain specific instructions as to the stopping of work, the termination of subcontracts, and the preparation of the contractor's statement of charges. Where a telegram is sent, it will generally be followed by a confirming letter containing complete instructions. The contracting officer who issues the notice of termination, may not always be the contracting officer who is to settle the contract; in such cases the notice generally indicates the procurement office designated to accomplish the settlement.

The notice of termination initiates the sequence of steps which the contractor must take to bring about the settlement of the terminated contract. The description of these steps which follows represents in general the chronological sequence of the settlement process. Normally these steps will be initiated by the contractor in the order stated, but efficient settlement methods require that action be taken on most of these steps simultaneously and that action on all of them be continuous and diligent throughout the course of the settlement.

Action 3. Stop work

In your own company: After receipt of the notice of termination the contractor, unless directed otherwise in the notice, should cease as promptly as is reasonably possible all further performance of the terminated portion of the contract. It is important to bear in mind that only a portion of the contract may have been terminated. If for any valid reason, the contractor either cannot cease production precisely as required by the order, or believes it to be contrary to the Government's interest to do so, such as where damage to materials or machinery will result, or where only a small amount of work is needed to convert useless semiprocessed materials into useful finished articles—he should immediately contact the contracting officer, and if some modification of the "cease work" order is agreed to, written confirmation should be obtained from the contracting officer.

With subcontractors: Not only must the contractor stop his own work promptly but he must also take prompt steps to terminate subcontracts and purchase orders affected. He should accomplish this in much the same manner in which the Government terminated the prime contract. It is essential that the Notice of Termination to each subcontractor identify the subcontract or purchase order on which the subcontractor is to stop work and make no further commitments of any kind. It is desirable that the notice also identify by number the Government contract which has been terminated and inform the subcontractor of the name of the procurement office having responsibility for the settlement of the prime contract. Similar notices of termination should in turn be issued without delay by each tier of subcontractors and suppliers having any connection with the terminated contract, so that the termination will reach down throughout all tiers of subcontractors and effectively stop all further work on the terminated contract.

All unused C. M. P. allocations should be returned to the agency or prime contractor from whom the allotment was received, and the regional office of the W. P. B. notified of all unused raw materials (controlled materials) on hand. Release of manpower should be reported to the regional office of the W. M. C.

Action 4. Preliminary conference

As soon as possible after receipt of the notice, a conference between the Government and the contractor will be arranged to discuss procedures and joint action and to determine a time schedule for the settlement of the contract. The importance of this meeting cannot be overemphasized. The contractor should go into this meeting prepared to present a rough estimate of his inventory and of the principal items of his claim. Discussion should commence at once in respect to the disposal of surplus property, the contractor indicating property which he desires to retain for his own use or which he believes can be sold to others, and the material which he believes should be scrapped. The speed with which the ultimate settlement can be reached will be determined to a very considerable extent by the aggressive action taken by contractor and Government personnel at this preliminary meeting. It is important, therefore, that this meeting should not be left to subordinates having no authority or responsibility. It will be desirable at this meeting for the contractor and the contracting officer to exchange lists of personnel who are authorized to act for each party.

Action 5. Partial payments

Neither prime contractors nor subcontractors are required to await final settlement of their claims before obtaining cash payments. Financing may be obtained through V and VT loans prior to termination, and the Government will make partial payments pending settlement as rapidly as a contractor furnishes the necessary information to support such payments.

For all completed articles delivered and accepted, immediate payment at the unit price of the contract will be made.

On the uncompleted portion of the contract, immediate payment on account will be made on the basis of partial claims or estimates of complete claims. Many items of the claim, such as approved subcontractors' claims, direct labor and materials, or termination expenses approved in advance by the contracting officer, can be readily and quickly demonstrated. Contractors desiring partial payments should prepare such portions of their claims immediately and submit them to the contracting officer. If approved, a simple supplementary agreement will be executed and the payment promptly made. Similarly, subcontractors may obtain partial payments from the Government through their prime contractor.

The contracting officer has full authority to make partial payments whenever he is satisfied that the payment is clearly within the entire amount due in connection with the termination. If any partial payment subsequently turns out to be in excess of the total amount due, the partial payment agreement provides that the excess with interest at 6 percent shall be repaid to the Government.

Action 6. Inventories

Clearance of plants: Termination frequently stops performance of the contract in midstream and leaves a considerable amount of surplus materials on hand allocable to the terminated contract. There may be materials in the contractor's plant on which he has done no work, on which he has done some work, or there may be subassemblies, assemblies and parts either partially or completely finished, various tools and equipment, and finally, completed articles.

Since the Government is liable for the cost of surplus property allocable to the terminated contract, its disposal is subject to the directions of the contracting officer. The Government may desire to take title to some of this property because of its strategic value; some of it the contractor will wish to retain; a great deal of it will have to be sold or scrapped.

It is the policy of the War Department that the contractor's plant shall be cleared of surplus property as soon as possible.

It is also the policy of the War Department that settlement and payment of contractors' claims shall not be delayed by reason of failure to dispose of property. Property not disposed of or taken over at the time of the settlement will be removed by the Government or arrangements made for its storage on the contractor's premises.

Limitation on inventories: The War Production Board polices C. M. P. regulations and may impose applicable penalties for deliberate infractions, but it does not look for enforcement of such regulations to the War Department contracting officers charged with settling terminated contracts. Contracting officers, therefore, may reach a decision, in accordance with the principles set forth in Procurement Regulation 15, as to the materials allocable to a contract in process of termination, without deciding whether such materials are in excess of any amount permitted by C. M. P. regulations of the War Production Board.

Before these policies can be made effective in a particular case, the contractor must do his part by preparing a list of the property which he claims is allocable to the contract and for the cost of which he intends to claim reimbursement. This is primarily the contractor's job, but he will have the close cooperation of the Government's representatives.

Divide and List

1. Raw materials, purchased parts, and supplies.
2. Work in process.
3. Production equipment, including tools, jigs, discs, fixtures, etc.

Listing of prime contractor's inventory: All items for which the contractor intends to charge costs to the Government should be first collected or otherwise identified to facilitate listing. Wherever practicable, these segregated materials should be kept under lock and key to avoid loss or inadvertent use for other purposes. In segregating these materials, it will be helpful to have in mind the classification indicated below which is required to be made in listing the inventory.

A descriptive inventory is then compiled of all such materials on the premises. Standard forms for this purpose are included in the appendix (Forms C-1, C-2, and C-3). Listing of the information on these forms will serve the twofold purpose of (a) inventory information necessary for settlement of the claim, and (b) disposition, removal, or storage of the property. This property is to be listed as follows:

a. Raw materials, purchased parts, and supplies;

b. Work in process; and

c. Production equipment, including tools, jigs, dies, fixtures, etc.

Property located in more than one plant should be listed by plants. Property owned by the Government and property owned by the contractor should be listed separately. Rejected or substandard materials should also be separately listed. No claims for rejected or substandard materials will be allowed which apply to articles already invoiced, but such materials when not excessive with respect to the work in process may be considered allocable to the terminated contract.

It is not necessary to complete an entire inventory listing before submitting any part of it. Partial lists will expedite (a) obtaining approval from the contracting officer for the retention of property by the contractor, (b) removal of property for use by the Government or to storage, (c) disposal of property, and (d) obtaining partial payments.

Subcontractors' inventories: Subcontractors should take the same steps with respect to their inventories as the prime contractor takes with his. The same procedures and forms are applicable, and uniformity in this matter will greatly facilitate settlement of subcontractors' claims.

It is the prime contractor's job to instruct subcontractors in the preparation of their inventories and to see that these inventories are submitted to the prime contractor promptly for review by him and by the contracting officer if he requires it. The extent to which the prime contractor should review or check subcontractors' inventory schedules, is dependent on his knowledge of the subcontractor's personnel and business methods. In this situation, he stands in exactly the same position in relation to his subcontractors as the Government stands in relation to him.

Care should be taken in all cases that no materials are inadvertently listed on both the prime and subcontractor's inventory.

NOTE.—Where the contractor's claim is less than $10,000 gross, a combination form (A-2 or A-3—"green") is available, which combines the settlement proposal, the contractor's own charges and the listing of the inventory. For small claims (less than $500 net) a short form (A-4—"pink") is available.

The term "gross" is used to indicate the amount claimed before deducting credits arising from the sale or retention of property. The term "net" is used to indicate the amount remaining after such deduction.

Action 7. Disposal of surpluses

The disposal of surplus materials is a cooperative effort between the contractor and the Government. The contractor's knowledge of industrial and commercial channels of disposition as well as ceiling and market prices are of great value to Government officers in the orderly return of materials to productive uses. Particularly should all inventories applying to claims of less than $10,000 gross be disposed of in place. It is not desired to move into storage any such inventories.

In many cases blanket approval may be obtained in advance from the contracting officer to retain materials at no cost to the Government (i. e., where the cost of such property will be excluded from the claim) or to dispose of all materials at a price not less than a specified percentage of cost.

The contractor is responsible to the Government, while the property is in his possession, for proper storage and protection of all Government materials and of all materials on which he will make a claim against the Government. The contractor may, unless the contract otherwise provides, at any time after notice of termination, remove and store such property at his own risk and expense.

The 60-day policy: Property not disposed of within 60 days after it is first reported on an inventory list will be removed by the Government, upon demand of the prime contractor, or a storage agreement entered into with him. If, after demand of the prime contractor, the property is not removed or a storage agreement executed, the prime contractor may store the property at the expense and risk of the Government. It is essential, however, that he take reasonable precautions for the protection of the property and notify the contracting officer of the action taken. Records should be kept by the contractor to show the costs of protection, removal, and storage for which the Government will be responsible.

The Sequence of Disposal

The disposition of surplus materials will generally be undertaken in the following sequence:

1. Obtain approval from the contracting officer for surplus material the contractor wishes to retain or sell at no cost to the Government, but care must be taken to conform with W. P. B. and other Government agency regulations.

2. Submit contractor's own bid for materials he wants to retain at less than cost, with description, cost, proposed prices and reason for any reduction from market price. It is suggested that the contractor secure quotations from other parties on such items to justify the price he has offered.

3. Return materials to original suppliers if they will give full credit, unless otherwise directed by the contracting officer. If the amount charged to the Government by the contractor is no more than the transportation and packing expenses for shipment to contractor and return to suppliers, it is assumed that full credit has been obtained.

4. Obtain and submit the best quotations from original suppliers, other prospective buyers, or dealers who will buy part of the remaining materials.

5. Report to the contracting officer materials of value only as scrap. After the contracting officer has given written approval for the sale of materials, the contractor should:

6. Complete the transaction with purchaser, as approved.

7. Credit the proceeds of sale against his claim, or transmit proceeds to the Government, when required.

8. If sale as scrap is approved, obtain necessary warranty from the purchaser that the property will in fact be used as scrap.

These procedures should also be followed by subcontractors in the disposal of surplus property resulting from the termination of their contracts. The privilege of prime contractors, however, to store property not removed on demand, at the expense and risk of the Government, has not been extended to subcontractors. Subcontractors having a storage problem should consult, as to the proper procedure, the contractor who placed the particular order or contact.

Action 8. Subcontractor's claims

The settlement of subcontractor's claims should never await the settlement of the prime contract. A contractor in the contractual claim should act promptly in passing on the claim of his subcontractors when presented for approval. He should without delay pass the proposed settlement, if approved by him, up through the contractual chain to the prime contractor regardless of the status of his own claim.

Full cooperation among contractors to speed this process is essential. If any subcontractor finds a lack of cooperation in the contractors above him, he should report this matter directly to the contracting officer.

A prime contractor must review and certify his subcontractors' statements in the same manner and with the same care as he certified their inventories, before presenting them to the contracting officer. He should take into account the efficiency of the subcontractor's cost and inventory methods and general reliability in order to determine the extent to which auditing is required in each case. Claim forms included in the appendix and discussed below in connection with the prime contractor's claims, are suitable for use by subcontractors. Use of these forms will greatly facilitate the swift settlement of their claims. Subcontractors will often require special assistance from the prime contractor in preparing their statements. The War Department does not under existing regulations make direct settlements with subcontractors but will confer with them in cases of particular hardship or difficulty.

You Can Act Now With Your Subs

Under certain conditions the contracting officer may authorize the contractor to make final settlement of any subcontractor's claim of less than $10,000 gross without submitting such settlement for his approval.

It is recognized that subcontracts in many cases may contain termination provisions differing in material respects from the uniform termination article, or may contain no termination provisions whatever. Nevertheless, it is obvious that proposed settlements with subcontractors for amounts not more than would be paid under the uniform termination article, will be acted upon by the contracting officer more promptly than settlements on some other basis.

Action 9. The prime contractor's claims

The two methods: As early as possible in the settlement process the contractor should commence the preparation of the statement of his own charges incurred prior to termination. There are two alternative methods which he may follow: (a) The more usual and distinctly preferable method is the inventory method. Under this method the costs applicable to the uncompleted portion of the contract are determined by pricing the inventory in detail. A profit allowance is then added. (b) In the absence of unit cost information or when the contract is terminated in the early stages of performance, an alternative method known as the total cost method may be used. Under this method the total costs on the contract to the date of termination are computed and a profit allowance added. Deduction is then made for all amounts paid or to be paid for completed articles. No departure from one or the other of these methods should be made without the approval of the contracting officer.

Costs and charges: In preparing his statement of charges the contractor may include all direct and indirect manufacturing, selling, distribution, and administrative costs incurred which were reasonably necessary for the performance of the contract, and properly allocable to it. The contractor should state the amount of profit to which he believes he is entitled on the work done by him under the contract, and the basis of computation of the amount of profit claimed.

The contractor should see that his costs and charges are reasonable and in line with sound accounting practices. Excessive amounts will be rejected in the negotiations and will suggest further investigation, audit, check and review, and thus hold up progress of the case. Detailed instructions as to the inclusion and exclusion of particular items of cost are set forth in PR 15-482 to 486.

The contractor would be well advised where he does not have sufficient trained accountants in his own employ to make use of independent certified public accountants in the preparation of this statement; if approved by the contracting officer, this expense may be charged to the Government. The contractor will also have the assistance of the contracting officer's accounting personnel to instruct him in the manner of presenting the information required.

Proposal for settlement: As soon as all charges are in, including subcontractors' claims and termination expenses, the contractor should prepare his proposal for settlement on Form A-1 (see standard forms included in the Appendix). This form summarizes the settlement of subcontractors' claims, disposal of property and any adjustments agreed to as a result of the preliminary negotiations. The form for presenting the contractor's statement of his own charges is Form B-1, inventory basis; or Form B-2, total cost basis. These are supporting schedules for Form A-1. This statement should be submitted as soon as the contractor (prime or sub) has completed the calculation of his own charges and without waiting for the settlement of subcontractors' claims and the completion of property disposal transactions. Accounting reviews and negotiation of settlements will be greatly facilitated by the use of these standard forms. In exceptional cases, where it is impracticable to use these standard forms, the contractor may request the contracting officer's approval for the use of a special form.

Where the contractor's claim is for less than $10,000 gross, a combination form (A-2 or A-3—"green") may be used which combines in one step and one form (a) submission of the list of inventory, (b) the statement of the contractor's own charges, and (c) his settlement proposal.

In addition a short form (A-4—"pink") is provided and may be used when the contractor's claim is less than $500 net.

Upon submission of the proposal for settlement, the case will be ready for the final meeting between fully authorized representatives of the contractor and of the Government. At this meeting, the final amount of the Government's obligation should be determined.

Action 10. Final settlement

When a lump sum settlement has been agreed to, a settlement agreement will be promptly prepared by the contracting officer. After signature by both parties, the contractor should present to the contracting officer the required certified invoice or signed voucher covering the amount due him, and payment will be made.

If the contractor and the contracting officer are unable to settle the case by negotiation, or if the contractor delays the settlement of the case for an unreasonable length of time, the contracting officer will give the contractor written notice that the case is to be settled by the formula and that the contractor is to submit all evidence bearing on his claim. The contracting officer may conduct further audits and investigations on all issues that were revealed, by negotiation, to be in dispute; if necessary, a hearing may be held at which oral testimony is presented. On the basis of all evidence furnished, the contracting officer will make a determination, supported by appropriate findings of fact, of the amount due the contractor in accordance with the formula.

Questions of fact relating to formula determinations are subject to decision by the contracting officer under the usual disputes article and appeal from his decision may be taken to the War Department Board of Contract Appeals.

Records: The prime contractor and all subcontractors should preserve for a period of at least 3 years after final settlement, all books, records, documents, and other evidence bearing on the costs and expenses of the contractor under the terminated contract, and necessary data (such as bids solicited and received) relating to the disposal of property by the contractor.

CONCLUSION

The cooperative achievements by Government on the one hand and by industry on the other have been outstanding in solving the problem of production. Production will continue to be of prime importance until the war is won.

Delay in reaching prompt settlements of terminated war contracts, and delay in promptly clearing surplus property from war plants, must not be allowed to impede production of needed materials.

It is essential that the same cooperative effort be applied by both Government and industry to this problem of contract settlement and property disposal. It is hoped that this pamphlet will be of some assistance in pointing out various aspects of the problem and in stimulating the thought and energy of all concerned in its solution.

Extension of Emergency Price Control and Stabilization Acts of 1942

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, while I am not quite satisfied with every particular of the bill S. 1764 extending the life of the O. P. A. as it finally emerged from our debates as well as the conference committee, nevertheless I feel that I shall vote for the conference report as I do not see any other way to protect the American consumer.

All of us who are old enough to remember the run-away inflation after the last war feel that the only possible way by which our economy may be preserved is by the continuance of the O. P. A. I am well aware of the fact that the O. P. A. is not a perfect organization; I am well aware of the fact that an organization employing thousands of people may have some who are not up to standard or who are not competent enough to hold such jobs. But, by and large, the O. P. A. has done a fairly good job.

Chester Bowles is as competent an Administrator as can be found anywhere in this country. His staff is conscientious, hard-working, and on the whole intelligently alert to their duties. At any rate, we must have price control, if we want to maintain our economy, and we must have rent control, if we want to prevent a situation which developed after the last war, where in my district alone 40,000 tenants were facing eviction because of the rapacity of their landlords.

We must always bear in mind that economic affairs tend to produce inflation whenever there is a scarcity of consumer goods, and an oversupply of available cash. There is no question that the income of the American people has risen sharply since the war, and that production of some ordinary consumer goods has been steadily diminishing.

We do not wish to impose on the American people any greater restrictions than are necessary for that purpose. We must hold the line, and the purpose of the bill is accomplished, if we are able to maintain a status quo.

We could have made our price-control bill more drastic, we could have imposed more severe penalties for violations but it was the consensus of opinion that the important thing to do would be to continue price control, and give the people an opportunity of going to court if dissatisfied with decisions of the administrative agencies.

The court to which the people may go on appeal from decisions of the various administrative agencies is the Emergency Court of Appeals. It was necessary to provide this type of a court, since otherwise jurisdiction to pass on appeals would be scattered among the 85 district courts of the United States; and how could we expect any uniformity of decisions, if scattered among all these courts? However, the Emergency Court of Appeals is a special court and is an independent court and by no means bound to sustain O. P. A. officials when they are not right.

This emergency court is just as independent as any court of the United States and, I am sure, will correct any abuses or any errors which the O. P. A. may possibly commit.

As I said before, even with the best of intentions and the most efficient staff, it is impossible for the O. P. A. to be always right. Therefore, this court.

The judges of this court will in due course become very proficient technically, and, as orders and regulations of the O. P. A. will be submitted to their adjudication, they will become more and more efficient and will eventually create a fine body of law which will streamline O. P. A. procedures and will make every consumer very well acquainted with what is required of him.

The bill as it finally emerged from the conference committee is necessarily a compromise. I am voting for it in the spirit of compromise and only because I feel that either this bill should pass or we shall not have price control, and a run-away inflation will follow.

Teamwork Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it has been truly said that cooperation is winning the war. We saw it demonstrated in the invasion and subjugation of north Africa. We see it again as we sweep the Pacific on our way to the Philippines and Tokyo. We see it day by day not only in the Pacific and the seven seas but also in the air above them and on every battle line the world around. All honor to these heroes who have left their homes and the lands of their nativities to win their deathless glory.

These, however, are not the only heroes. There are other battlefields where cooperation is helping to win this war, speeding victory, and saving innumerable lives. The transportation front is one of those. Without this, it is not too much to say that victory elsewhere might be doubtful. In our own fair land, as yet untouched by bomb, the railroad corps is winning its battle on the transportation front. Whether on the rails, in yards, shops, depots, or offices, the spirit of cooperation has welded these men of steel into a fighting force unconquerable, daily doing the impossible.

All honor to these railroad men of America as well as to every other fighting man who is winning the war.

From the Washington Star of June 23, 1944, let me read you a thrilling editorial paying tribute to them and to their marvelous record:

A FINE RECORD

Usually the annual E. H. Harriman memorial medals for safety leadership are granted to individual railroads, but it has been decided that this year there will be a special collective award as well. Nothing could be more fitting. With 500,000 fewer freight cars and 22,000 fewer locomotives, the railroads of America have handled 55 percent more freight during this war than during the last; yet, as the American Museum of Safety reports, even though their job thus has been twice as big this time, they have done it with only one-fourth the fatal accident rate. In transporting passengers last year, they traveled 64 percent more miles than in 1942, and 269 percent more than in 1940. Even so, despite this enormous traffic increase, the 1943 fatality record was only 2.97 per billion passenger miles. These statistics speak pretty much for themselves. Wholly apart from their great and spectacular physical contribution directly to the war effort—a contribution without precedent in our history—the railroads have made a superb showing in the field of safety. As an outstanding example of private enterprise carrying out a huge and complex task with remarkable care and efficiency, they can well afford to be proud of themselves, and the Nation as a whole can be proud of them, too.

The G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE WORLEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, this Nation owes a debt to the veterans of this war. It is not possible for this obligation to be measured in dollars and cents but the duty to evidence the Nation's grateful appreciation to the eleven million men and women of the armed forces still exists.

After the last war proper provision was not made for the veterans and their dependents. But this time the story will be different. This time the returning veteran will not have to stand in bread lines nor ask for a dole, nor stand on the street corner with a tin cup.

The Congress of the United States, fully aware of its obligations and responsibilities, has enacted the G. I. bill of rights and I am glad to have had a part in its passage. One can see at a glance that the Government of the United States is liberal with those who are wearing and have worn the uniform of their country; our servicemen are the best paid and the best equipped in the world; our veterans and their dependents receive more adequate care than any others in the world. Because of the different kind of warfare which has developed, the needs will change and many future requirements will have to be met, but our immediate duty is to help them readjust their lives to the new conditions that have been imposed upon them.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

Dependents of all grades of enlisted men and aviation cadets of the Army and Navy are eligible to receive a dependent's allowance from the Government in

addition to the serviceman's allotment. Those men and women serving as officers come under another system. The allowances provided by the Government are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife and one child, $72, and $20 for each additional child. Note: If the divorce or separation order of the court does not call for alimony or separate maintenance, the wife will not receive any allotment, and in case of a court order providing alimony or separate maintenance, she will get no more than the amount fixed by the court.

Class B dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is substantially but not completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37.

Class B–1 dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $50 plus $11 for each brother or sister; two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $68 plus $11 for each brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

It is important that men and women with dependents make application through their commanding officers for allotment and allowance, as these benefits will begin the date application is filed. Allotments are compulsory only for class A dependents. If the service man or woman for some reason or other fails to make application or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out; the Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children and dates of birth. In case a man is reported missing in action, the allotment and allowance continue to be paid for a period of a year, unless in the meantime his status is definitely determined.

Parents and brothers and sisters who can prove dependency can receive an allowance at the same time as wife and children. Parents can get an allowance from more than one son or daughter in the service. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son or daughter in the service, they get $68 per month. Now, if another son or daughter in the service helped support these same parents, they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

The agency for the Navy having jurisdiction over allotments and allowances is: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.; the agency for the Army is: Office of Dependency Benefits, War Department, 213 Washington Street, Newark, N. J. If you experience any difficulty contact your Congressman.

TEMPORARY AID FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Sometimes cases of extreme hardship arise involving dependents of servicemen. Many dependents, and even members of the armed forces themselves, are not fully acquainted with the two emergency agencies set up for the express purpose of helping such persons in need. These two agencies have branches all over the country. They are the Army Emergency Relief Fund, whose functions have recently been assigned to the Red Cross, and the Navy Relief Society, which also can be reached through the Red Cross.

ARMY RELIEF FUND

Any member of the armed forces in the Army can appeal to the Army Relief Fund, represented in all camps, or through the Red Cross if the soldier is not at camp, for needed immediate financial assistance. He will receive courteous and willing assistance at all times. The fund is also open to all dependents of men and women in the Army and anyone needing relief should get in touch at once with this fund through the local Red Cross.

NAVY RELIEF SOCIETY

Any serviceman or servicewoman in our naval forces or his dependents can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. To get immediate action, it is advisable to take the case up through the Red Cross.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

This benefit is payable to all honorably discharged personnel of our services whose rank is below captain in the Army, and lieutenant senior grade in the Navy. Payments are made in the following sums: Personnel with less than 60 days' active service, $100; personnel with 60 days' or more active service, none of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $200; personnel with 60 days' or more active service, any part of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $300. Whenever mustering-out payments amount to more than $100, payments are made in monthly intervals of $100 each. Servicemen who are discharged at their own request are not entitled to mustering-out pay.

FREE MEDICAL AND NURSING CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF MEN IN ARMED FORCES

In most States through cooperation with the Federal Government, a wife of any man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service if it is provided in that State. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2. In the case of emergency, be sure that the doctor makes application for you within 48 hours after service is rendered. If the application is not made within 48 hours, no bills for medical or hospital service will be paid. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse; no money is given to the wife. This service is extended to wives and infants of servicemen in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, but not to any other foreign country.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY PENSIONS

Our honorably discharged veterans of all wars are entitled to a pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by their service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10-percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as a hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month.

The disability claim is filed by the veteran for benefits payable to him as the result of injury or disease resulting from military service. The award of compensation is based on the degree of disability which is determined according to the Veterans' Administration schedule provisions. Any disability, except misconduct, is compensable if it is as much as 10-percent disabling. This application is known as Form 526. It is simple to execute and seldom does one have any trouble answering the questions. Additional evidence is seldom required. This is particularly true on the adjudication of the initial claim. No subsequent formal claim need be filed. If the veteran is dissatisfied with his present rating, he can submit medical evidence to this effect.

However, it should be borne in mind that the doctor's statement must state not only his diagnosis but sufficient findings to warrant it. It is essential that this evidence show, or at least indicate, a higher degree of disability than the present evaluation. Upon receipt of competent medical evidence, the Veterans' Claim Service will authorize an official physical examination for rating purposes, thereby reopening the case for further consideration.

Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred from one Veterans' Administration facility to another, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for settlement, veterans should file claim on proper form which will be supplied them by any Veterans' Administration facility, or the local representative of the American Red Cross. If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

READJUSTMENT TO CIVIL LIFE

One of the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights offers an education to any man who served for a period of 90 days, on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who was

discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition and books, and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if without dependents and $75 if he has dependents. In no event shall the total period of education exceed 4 years. There is also a provision for part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

A veteran also has the right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities, extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Application for education and training should be made to the Director, Servicemen's Education and Training, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

Adequate hospital facilities are provided for the care and treatment of veterans for nonservice disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

The veteran has the right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

A veteran has the right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service, (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (b) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (c) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

Loans provided for the above-mentioned purposes or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000. Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions. The interest rate must not exceed 4 percent. The loan must be practicable and suitable to veterans' circumstances. The loan must be repaid in 20 years. Application must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

A veteran of any war, honorably discharged from any one of the services, has the right to register for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service. He should contact his local United States Employment Office in his home town or county.

There is also a provision for unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed. To be eligible, the person must reside in the United States, be completely unemployed, or, if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week, be registered with and report to a public employment office, be able to work, and available for suitable work.

Any person will be disqualified if he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; if he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work offered; if he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; if he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS AS A RESULT OF LOSS OF SON, DAUGHTER, HUSBAND, OR FATHER

There are four money benefits provided for the dependents of a deceased veteran: 6 months' gratuity payment, monthly insurance payments—if the serviceman applied for insurance—monthly pension, and back pay.

The gratuity is a lump-sum payment equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received at the date of death. In addition, the dependents of any private or seaman who dies in foreign service receive 20 percent of his base pay, and the dependents of any officer who dies in foreign service receive 10 percent of his base pay. If the serviceman was in either the flying service or submarine service, his dependents receive, in addition, 50 percent of his base pay. There is also a longevity provision in addition to the above amounts.

The gratuity is automatically paid to a wife of a deceased veteran, or if there is no wife, it is automatically paid to the surviving child or children. It is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters of an unmarried serviceman. The serviceman should designate someone of this latter class to receive it; however, if he does not, they may apply for it. If two parents survive, the amount is divided between them. A grandparent must show an insurable interest in order to receive it.

Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to Gratuity Pay Branch, Finance Office, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

This insurance is not paid in a lump sum; it is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary—the older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy, if the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is under 30 years of age at the date of death of the insured, payments shall be made in 240 equal monthly installments, at the rate of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance. If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is 30 or more years of age at the date of death of the insured payment shall be made in equal monthly installments for 120 months certain, with such payment in installments continuing during the remaining lifetime of such beneficiary. For instance, under a $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $35.10 monthly, and so forth.

It would be well to have parents and next of kin check with the men and women in service to see that all insurance policies are in order and in the hands of the beneficiaries. An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of half blood. There is nothing to prevent a parent or brother or sister from being the beneficiary of more than one serviceman.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check their insurance policy now. See that everything is in order now. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A little care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen. I would suggest that you send your serviceman this pamphlet so that he may check all matters pertaining to his beneficiaries.

This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, they are not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased serviceman can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month. Two parents, $25 each. Widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child. No widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38; no widow but two children, $38 equally divided, with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100.

The fact that a widow, a child, or parents gets the insurance does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect both insurance and a pension.

When a casualty occurs, that service man or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. All this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to—Finance Officer, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Any person may make application for a headstone for the grave of any veteran of any one of the Army or Navy services whose service was honorable, to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C.

After honorable service, reimbursement for burial may be allowed, not exceeding $100, on burial, funeral, and transportation expenses. Application should be made to Director, Dependent Claims,

Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, his minor children or adult unmarried daughters.

WRITE FOR OTHER INFORMATION

It is practically impossible to cover briefly all the details of benefits available to veterans of this and previous wars. I have tried to outline the benefits relating primarily to World War No. 2 veterans, as many pamphlets are available covering the provisions for veterans of other wars. I offer this digest mainly as a helpful guide to servicemen and their dependents. If anyone has special questions or individual problems not covered in this summary, I shall be glad for you to write to me personally at the following address: Congressman EUGENE WORLEY, House Office Building, Washington, D. C. If you have no particular interest in this pamphlet, please pass it on to a friend.

Wartime Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives has granted a rule making in order the consideration of the bill, H. R. 3442. This is an exceedingly important bill. The issues raised by the minority reports on which the Committee on the Judiciary is so evenly divided, challenge the careful thought of every Member of Congress. Therefore, I invite the study of Report No. 843 and the minority reports. They are as follows:

REPORT NO. 843—AMENDING THE SABOTAGE LAW (WARTIME)

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3442) to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103), having considered the same, report the bill favorably to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that, as amended, the bill do pass.

The committee amendments are as follows:

Page 2, in lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "with reason to believe" and insert in lieu thereof the word "knowing."

Pages 2 and 3, strike out all of section 2 of the bill, from line 18, page 2, down through and including line 16 on page 3.

Page 3, in line 17, after "Sec.", strike out the figure "3" and insert "2."

EXPLANATION

Section 1 of the bill will replace the existing wartime sabotage law (title 50, U. S. C., secs. 101, 102, and 103). It will cover all offenses now covered by those sections and extend the law to certain dangerous acts which are not, or may not be, included in the present law. It does not affect the law concerning sabotage during peacetime.

Existing wartime sabotage law, section 101, defines "war material," "war premises," and "war utilities"; also "United States" and "associate nation." Section 102 fixes a penalty of a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 30 years, or both, for willfully injurying or destroying or attempting to injure or destroy any war material, war premises, or war utilities, with intent to injure, interfere with, or obstruct the United States or any associate nation in preparing for or carrying on war, or with reason to believe that the act may injure, interfere with, or obstruct the United States or any associate nation in preparing for or carrying on war. Section 103 fixes the same penalty for willfully making or causing to be made in a defective manner, or attempting to make or cause to be made in a defective manner, any war material, tool, implement, machine, utensil, or receptacle used or employed in making, producing, manufacturing, or repairing any such war material, with intent to injure, interfere with, or obstruct the United States or any associate nation in preparing for or carrying on war, or with reason to believe that the act may injure, interfere with, or obstruct the United States or any association nation in preparing for or carrying on war.

Section 1 of H. R. 3442, instead of defining the terms "war material," "war premises," and "war utilities," is more comprehensive in that it covers "any property, real or personal, which is being used or which is intended for, adapted to, or suitable for use in the preparation for or carrying on war."

Another substantial change in the law made by section 1 of the bill is the provision for punishment by imprisonment for not more than 30 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both, for a conspiracy to commit any of the prohibited acts. Under present law conspiracies must be tried under the general conspiracy statute (title 18, sec. 88, of the United States Code), which provides a maximum penalty of 2 years' imprisonment or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both.

There has been added to existing law by section 1 of the bill the offenses of damaging, carrying away, concealing, and tampering with property intended for, adapted to, or suitable for use in preparing for or carrying on war.

The existing statute does not cover a situation where a person knowingly sells defective war material to the Government, punishing only persons who are chargeable with making it defectively. A certain amount of the production of war plants is defective and is rejected. Brokers or others may buy up such goods and palm it off on the Government, knowing the material to be defective, without being subject to punishment under the statute. Of course, there may be prosecutions for fraud of persons perpetrating such offenses, but it seems apparent that present law is insufficient in this respect, considering the seriousness of such offenses.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee proposes in section 1 of the bill to change the language "with reason to believe" to "knowing", as it does not favor the use of such language first mentioned in criminal statutes of this character.

The second committee amendment would strike out section 2 of the bill, which is discussed immediately following.

SECTION 2

Section 2 of the bill, proposed to be stricken out by the committee, would apply only to persons who hold contracts or subcontracts for war or national defense material or who have ownership in, or management responsibility for, facilities used for the manufacture of such material. It would make such persons subject to a maximum penalty of death and a fine of $1,000,000 if they should intentionally make or cause to be made or knowingly sell or cause to be sold to the Government or our allies war material which is (1) below the standards or specifications provided therefor, and (2) made so defectively that the maker or seller would have reason to believe that its defectiveness or inferior quality would endanger the life, safety, or health of members of the armed forces of the United States or any associate nation or the success of their military operations.

The burden of proof which would be imposed upon the Government by this section is substantial. The Government would have to show: First, that the material was made or caused to be made below specifications; second, that it was intentionally so made; and third, that the maker had reason to believe that use of the property, on account of its defective condition, would be dangerous to the armed forces or impair the success of military operations. With respect to the sale of defective material, it would have to be established that the seller knew the material was defective and had reason to believe that its use would be dangerous, and intentionally sold it in such condition.

The committee gave consideration to section 2 of the bill and the provisions which were designed to protect manufacturers and businessmen against the possibility of groundless prosecutions involving transactions in which they participated in good faith; however, it concluded, among other considerations, that in some cases there might be a possibility that criminal prosecutions could be successfully maintained, resulting even in capital punishment, in a close case where eminent engineers might disagree as to whether in fact the war material was below the standards or specifications provided therefor, and that they were so defective that the maker or seller would have reason to believe that its use would endanger the life, safety, or health of members of the armed forces or the success of their military operations.

SECTION 3

This section of the bill, as introduced, extends the definition of "associate nation" and "Government of the United States" to include corporations producing property for the United States or Allied Governments or furnishing property thereto. This is necessary in order to bring within the act persons who sell defective war materials to war contractors or to the numerous agencies acting for our allies in this country in the purchase of war materials.

DEPARTMENTAL ENDORSEMENTS

The following letters in support of the bill have been received from the Department of Justice and the War and Navy Departments. The letters were directed to an earlier bill, H. R. 2503.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1943.

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for my views concerning a bill (H. R. 2503) to amend the existing provisions of law relating to sabotage in time of war.

The existing law on this subject, act of April 20, 1918 (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103), defines the terms "war material," "war premises," and "war utilities." It provides that when the United States is at war, whoever, with intent to injure, interfere with, or obstruct the United States or any associate nation in preparing

for or carrying on the war, or whoever, with reason to believe that his act may cause such injury, interference, or obstruction, shall willfully injure or destroy or attempt to do so, any war material, war premises, or war utilities, as heretofore defined, shall be imprisoned for not more than 30 years, or fined not more than $10,000, or both.

It further provides for the punishment by the same penalty of anyone in time of war who with the same intent or reason to believe, willfully makes or causes to be made in a defective manner any war material, or any tool, implement, machine, utensil, or receptacle used in making, producing, manufacturing, or repairing any such war material.

The bill under consideration proposes to amend the existing law by in effect substituting new and broader provisions therefor. The definitions of war material, war premises, and war utilities contained in existing law would be abandoned, and the protection of the statute would be extended to all property, real or personal, which is being used or which is intended for, adapted to, or suitable for use in preparing for or carrying on the war. In addition, it would punish a conspiracy to commit any of the forbidden acts by the same penalties as the substantive offenses.

The absence of a conspiracy provision in the existing statutes relating to wartime sabotage is a grave defect in the existing statutory structure, which must be remedied.

The bill would also fortify the existing provisions of law by punishing the intentional manufacture or sale of defective property intended for use in preparing for or carrying on the war.

Section 2 of the bill which relates to this matter provides the penalty of death or imprisonment for life, or for such term of years as the court may direct, or a fine of not more than $1,000,000, or both. The conspiracy clause is also included in this section.

This legislation would accord an added protection to the Government against sabotage in time of war and would cure some grave defects and omissions in existing law.

I find no objection to the enactment of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 20, 1943.

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SUMNERS: The War Department has no objection to enactment of H. R. 2503, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103), on which you have requested an expression of the views of this Department, if the bill is amended as hereinafter suggested.

The purpose of the bill is to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of April 20, 1918, as amended, to provide (1) for the punishment, during wartime, by imprisonment for not more than 30 years, or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both, of willful injury, damage, destruction, theft, concealment, tampering with, or the making or repairing in a defective manner, or the sale or delivery in a defective or inferior condition to the United States or any associate nation, of any real or personal property used or intended or suitable for use in preparing for or carrying on of war, and attempts or conspiracy to commit any such acts; (2) the punishment of contractors or subcontractors for the production or sale, during wartime, of war material, who intentionally make or cause to be made, or sell, such material which is below the standard or specifications provided therefor, or of defective or inferior quality, or who attempt to or conspire to do so, by death, imprisonment for life, or such term of years as the court may direct, or by fine of not more than $1,000,000, or both; and (3) to define the terms "associate nation," "the Government of the United States," and "United States."

If enacted in its present form, this measure would supersede sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of April 20, 1918, as amended, but would leave sections 4, 5, and 6 of that act intact as they now exist.

Section 4 of the act of April 20, 1918, defines the terms "national defense material," "national defense premises," and "national defense utilities," as used therein. Section 5 provides for the punishment of those who, with the intent to injure, interfere with, or obstruct the national defense, willfully injure, destroy, or attempt to do so, any national defense material, national defense premises, or national defense utilities; and section 6 provides for the punishment of those who, with like intent, shall make or cause to be made in a defective manner, or attempt to do so, any national defense material, as defined in the act, or any tool, implement, machine, utensil, or receptacle used in making, producing, manufacturing, or repairing national defense material, as defined in the act.

The terms "national defense material," "national defense premises," and "national defense utilities" do not appear in sections 1, 2, and 3 of H. R. 2503. Therefore, enactment of that bill without repeal of sections 4, 5, and 6 of the original act, as amended, would render the entire law ambiguous.

Sections 1, 2, and 3 of H. R. 2503 appear to be intended to supersede the entire act of April 20, 1918, as amended, and seem to adequately cover the field of that statute. Accordingly, the suggestion is made that, if enacted, there be added to H. R. 2503 a fourth section providing for the repeal of sections 4, 5, and 6 of the act of April 20, 1918, which were added thereto by the act of November 30, 1940 (54 Stat. 1220). The following language is deemed appropriate to accomplish that result:

"SEC. 4. Sections 4, 5, and 6 of the act of April 20, 1918, as amended (54 Stat. 1220), are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That offenses committed, and penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred, prior to the enactment of this act under any of said sections 4, 5, and 6, may be prosecuted and punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if said sections 4, 5, and 6 had not been hereby repealed."

In order to make section 1 of H. R. 2503 consistent with section 2 thereof, it would appear that the word "the" preceding the word "war" should be stricken from both lines 6 and 14 on page 2.

Amendment of section 3 in the following manner is suggested:

In line 4, page 3, strike out the words "and so defectively or of such inferior quality that its use," and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the words "with reason to believe that its defectiveness or inferior quality."

In line 7, page 3, after the word "shall", insert a comma and the words "with like reason to believe,".

In line 11, page 3, after the word "shall", insert a comma and the words "with like reason to believe,".

Without the amendments suggested in the preceding paragraphs, section 3 would be unnecessarily sweeping, covering even those who made full disclosure of the defective or inferior quality of a product.

Enactment of H. R. 2503 would broaden considerably the scope of the law with respect to acts of sabotage and conspiracy to commit such acts, as well as strengthen the criminal statutes concerning the production for or sale or delivery to the United States or any of its associate nations of defective or inferior property useful for carrying on war in the national defense. This is believed to be desirable.

Accordingly, the War Department recommends enactment of H. R. 2503, if amended as suggested above.

In the opinion of the War Department, the enactment of this measure would not result in the expenditure of additional public funds, since enforcement probably would be no more difficult or expensive than under existing law.

Since the committee has asked that this report be expedited, the Bureau of the Budget has authorized its submission without a determination by the Bureau as to whether enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Acting Secretary of War.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 13, 1943.

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Chairman of the Committee on
the Judiciary, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The bill H. R. 2503 to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103), was referred to the Navy Department by your committee with request for views and recommendation thereon.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," as amended, so as to broaden the law relating to wartime sabotage in order to meet the needs of the present emergency.

The language of the first section of the bill appears to be much broader than present law (50 U. S. C., secs. 101, 102, and 103), and in addition an attempt or conspiracy to commit any of the acts mentioned in both the first and second sections of this bill are made substantive offenses.

Section 2 of the bill is likewise very broad and provides severe penalties for, in effect, intentionally making war material below standard or below specifications so defectively as to endanger the life, safety, or health of members of our armed forces or of the armed forces of associate nations. Section 3 of this bill, among other things, defines "associate nation" and "Government of the United States" very comprehensively.

The Navy Department is of the opinion that the proposed legislation is not the appropriate way to maintain proper standards of quality in the manufacture of war materials. It is further considered that its enactment would tend to reduce the output of the country's war industries.

In view of the foregoing, the Navy Department recommends against enactment of the bill H. R. 2503.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 27, 1943.

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The bill H. R. 2503 to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103), was referred to the Navy Department by your committee with request for the views and recommendation of the Navy Department thereon. Responsive to such request, the Navy Department under date of May 13, 1943, transmitted an unfavorable report on the bill H. R. 2503 to your committee.

By letter of July 2, 1943, the Attorney General requested the Navy Department to give further consideration to the bill. The letter of the Attorney General reads, in part, as follows:

"This Department, which has the responsibility for administering the sabotage laws, is of the opinion that their extension as provided in the bill is necessary at this time. Many cases of intentional defective manufacture of war goods are now under investigation by this Department which cannot be reached under the existing sabotage laws. Some of these cases may be prosecuted as frauds on the Government. But this involves a lesser penalty than sabotage and ignores the gravamen of the offenses as war crimes.

"It is difficult for me to see how this bill would, if enacted, reduce war production. Section 1 applies only to 'willful' conduct, the same state of mind required under existing law. It does not increase the present penalty. Section 2 applies only to persons who intentionally make or sell war materials in such a manner that their use will endanger the life, safety, or health of members of the armed forces. Good faith conduct by producers of war material could never constitute a violation of either section."

The Attorney General referred to a meeting between representatives of the Departments of War and Justice in consequence of which a full accord was reached between those Departments in support of the bill. It is understood that the accord mentioned was reached upon the basis of certain amendments to the bill suggested by the War Department, as set forth in the War Department's letter of April 30, 1943, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, stating that the War Department recommends enactment of the bill if amended as follows:

(1) Amend section 1, by striking out the word "the" preceding the word "war" in line 6, page 2, and in line 14, page 2.

(2) Amend section 2 as follows:

(a) In line 4, page 3, strike out the words "and so defectively or of such inferior quality that its use" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the words "with reason to believe that its defectiveness or inferior quality."

(b) In line 7, page 3, after the word "shall", insert a comma and the words "with like reason to believe,".

(c) In line 11, page 3, after the word "shall", insert a comma and the words "with like reason to believe,".

(3) Add a section, to be numbered section 4, reading as follows:

"SEC. 4. Sections 4, 5, and 6 of the act of April 20, 1918, as amended (54 Stat. 1220), are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That offenses committed, and penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred, prior to the enactment of this act under any of said sections 4, 5, and 6, may be prosecuted and punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if said sections 4, 5, and 6 had not been hereby repealed."

The report of the Navy Department under date of May 13, 1943, referred to the bill as introduced rather than to the bill with the suggested amendments above set forth.

The suggested amendments to section 2 of the bill would materially change its effect by introducing an additional element in the definition of the crime, namely, reason for belief on the part of the person charged that the departure from specifications would endanger life, safety, or health of members of the armed forces. It is believed that the enactment of the bill with such amendments would diminish or eliminate the risk that its enactment would tend to reduce the output of the country's war industries.

The Attorney General advised that many cases of intentional defective manufacture of war goods are now under investigation which cannot be reached under existing sabotage laws. The Navy Department is in full accord with the view that such intentional defective manufacture should be made a criminal offense as a war crime. It is believed that the necessity for such law and the measure of the penalty are matters with which the Department of Justice is primarily concerned.

The Navy Department has also noted the statement of the Attorney General that good-faith conduct by producers of war material could never constitute a violation of the bill if enacted into law. Such interpretation of the bill would seem to eliminate the risk that the output of war industry could be adversely affected by its enactment.

For the foregoing reasons, the Navy Department would have no objection to the enactment of the bill H. R. 2503 if amended as above set forth.

The Navy Department has been informally advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL, *Acting.*

MINORITY REPORT

We, the undersigned members of the Committee on the Judiciary, cannot assent to the committee amendments, and therefore hereby, most respectfully, dissent from the report filed by those members of the Committee on the Judiciary who constitute, in this instances, the majority.

The first committee amendment would strike out of the first section of H. R. 3442 the words "with reason to believe" and insert in lieu thereof the word "knowing."

While the first section of the bill H. R. 3442 proposes to amend the existing law, it did not change the present law insofar as the "reason to believe" clause is concerned.

The change proposed by the first committee amendment is not only not needed but, to the contrary, would dangerously weaken the Government's enforcement efforts by requiring a higher degree of proof than is now necessary.

Under the existing sabotage laws (title 50 U. S. C. secs. 102, 103), the Government can make out a case by showing that the act was willful and was accompanied by either one of the following states of mind:

"(1) Intent to injure, interfere with, or obstruct the United States * * * in preparing for or carrying on the war; or

"(2) With reason to believe that his act may injure, interfere with, or obstruct the United States * * * in preparing for or carrying on the war."

Almost all of the cases brought charge "reason to believe" under No. 2 above. It is almost impossible to prove that a man intended to injure the war effort since he usually has some other primary motive for his act. For example, a man spoils a mass of steel because he is mad at the employer or puts emery dust in the motor because he wants to get the inspector into trouble. In such cases he does not intend to hamper the war effort but certainly has reason to believe that what he does will have that effect.

It is proposed to change the law by requiring the Government to show the following state of mind:

"Knowing that his act may interfere with or obstruct the United States * * * in preparing for or carrying on the war."

This amendment would practically emasculate the sabotage law. It would require the Government to prove that the man actually knew that his act was likely to hurt the war. Proof that any reasonable man in the same circumstances would have known is not enough. The word "knowing" refers to the man's actual knowledge. It is practically impossible for any person to explore the mind of another person sufficiently to prove what the other man knew. The Government should have no greater burden than to establish that in the same circumstances a reasonable man should have known that his act would harm the war effort. Therefore it is vital that the proposed amendment be defeated, and the "reason to believe" standard found in the existing law should be retained.

An example of what the courts will very likely do in interpreting the word "knowing" is found in the case of *State* v. *McBarron* (66 N. J. L. 680 (1901) 51 A. 146), in which the court was called on to interpret a statute punishing anyone who obtained the registration of a voter "knowing that he was not qualified." The court said (p. 682):

"A conviction in this case cannot be sustained solely upon the fact that the plaintiff (in error) procured the name of an unqualified voter to be registered, but it must further appear that he knew when he caused such registration to be made that the person so registered was not entitled to vote at the next election; the significant word of the statute is 'knowing,' which means knowledge of mental assurance, or scienter; it is positive, not negative. Such knowledge must be clearly proved or shown by such circumstances as leave no reasonable doubt in a fair mind; the proof of the knowledge must be clear, not a mere inference that he could have found out by further inquiry; there must have been culpable intent shown, not mere ignorance."

The second committee amendment strikes from the bill section 2.

This section seeks to bring to justice, not the workingman who merely obeys orders; but the higher-ups who give them.

Section 2 was aimed at those who intentionally make or cause to be made war matériel below the standard or specifications provided for the same, with reason to believe that its defectiveness or inferior quality would endanger the life, safety, or health of members of the armed forces of the United States, or of any associate nation, or the success of their military operations; or those who, with like reason to believe, sell, convey, transfer, or cause to be sold, conveyed, or transferred to the Government of the United States, or to the government of any associated nation, any such property or thing knowing it to be below the standard or specifications provided for the same; or those who attempt or conspire to commit any of the above acts.

We respectfully submit that any contractor, subcontractor, or other person having ownership in, or responsibility for, the management of any facilities for the manufacture of war materiel, who intentionally causes the same to be made below the standard or specifications provided therefor and with reason to believe that its defectiveness or inferior quality would endanger the life, safety, or health of members of the armed forces of the United

States, or of any associate nation, or the success of their military operations, should, upon conviction, in the sound discretion of the court, suffer death or life imprisonment, or imprisonment for such term of years as the court may direct, or be fined up to $1,000,000, or both.

The same thing is true of any such person, who, with like reason to believe, should sell, convey, transfer, or cause to be sold, conveyed, or transferred to the Government of the United States or to the government of any associate nation, any such property or thing knowing it to be below the standard or specifications provided therefor.

The same is true of any such person, who attempts or conspires to violate this section.

Under section 2, the punishment prescribed could be as low as imprisonment for 1 day and a fine of 1 cent. The maxima fixed, of course, would be applied only in those few cases of the most heinous, flagrant, and horrible kind.

Section 2 is expressly limited to those cases which occur "when the United States is at war."

If a worker in a war industry, with no authority save to do his work, can be punished under existing law for sabotage committed on the spur of the moment because of anger suddenly engendered and without thought of consequences, how much more should those in management of the concern for which he works, be punished when they intentionally and with reason to believe that the carrying out of their nefarious orders would endanger the lives of our fighting men? And is not the guilt of such higher-ups all the greater when they premeditatedly and deliberately "fix" the testing machines in their plant so as to conceal their iniquity from Government inspectors?

We are convinced that the striking out of section 2 is a profound mistake.

Of course, the third committee amendment, which simply would renumber the sections because of the deletion of section 2, should go out if section 2 is retained, as we fervently hope may be your action.

The Department of Justice has the duty of prosecuting the violators of our sabotage law. They have more than 100 cases of sabotage, clearly established by competent evidence, which the present law does not cover. They desire the passage of this bill, H. R. 3442, without amendment. Neither the War nor Navy Department, nor any other group, objects. Is it not our duty to make all kinds of sabotage illegal and properly punishable? Why should the saboteur be a privileged character when the loyal patriotic citizens are making daily, all-out efforts to win the war? We surely do not wish to encourage obstruction by leaving it lawful.

ZEBULON WEAVER.
MICHAEL FEIGHAN.
SAM M. RUSSELL.
SAM HOBBS.
DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, Jr.
MARTIN GORSKI.
JOHN H. TOLAN.
FADJO CRAVENS.
WILLIAM T. BYRNE.
ESTES KEFAUVER.
JOSEPH R. BRYSON.
HATTON W. SUMNERS.

MINORITY REPORT OF THOMAS J. LANE

While I concur in the minority report generally, I doubt the wisdom of that provision of section 2 of H. R. 3442, which would permit the imposition of the death penalty. I, therefore, reserve the right to offer, or to support an amendment striking from section 2 the death penalty provision, if and when the committee amendments shall have been voted down.

THOMAS J. LANE.

Keynote Address of Gov. Earl Warren, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS ROLPH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by unanimous consent, I extend the address of Gov. Earl Warren, of California, delivered in Chicago, Ill., June 26, 1944, before the Republican National Convention.

We are here to do a job for the American people. And we mean business.

What is our job? Ask any American. Ask the anxious American mother and father. Ask the anxious wives and sweethearts of our fighting men. Ask our fighting men themselves. They will tell you what our job is.

They will give you the keynote for this convention. They will tell you out of their hearts and what they say will be the same—east and west, north and south, it will be the same. For now the same anxieties are on every American heart—the same hour-to-hour concern for what the day may bring forth, the same steadfast courage to sustain them, the same dreams, the same hope that they will have a chance to make their dreams come true.

This is what is in their hearts. This is our job:

To get our boys back home again—victorious and with all speed.

To open the door for all Americans—to open it, not just to jobs, but to opportunity.

To make and guard the peace so wisely and so well that this time will be the last time that American homes are called to give their sons and daughters to the agony and tragedy of war.

Isn't that a plain and homely story? But is there any other story which any American would put in place of it? Is there any other thing which, in his heart, any American wants more than these? Is there any American who would not give everything he has to bring these things to pass?

We know there is only one answer to these questions. We know, also, that that answer makes our job. To get that job done is why we are here. This convention and this election are not time out from the job of winning the war and the peace. This convention and this election are part of that job. We are here to speed the cause—to help America to speed the cause—for which our fighting men are giving their lives. We are here to make the road on which America can march toward victory, toward opportunity, toward peace.

That is the biggest job Americans have ever undertaken together. It is too big a job for little Americans; it is too big a job for a quarreling America. There is room for honest differences among us. There is no room for disunity. We can be of differing minds. But we must be of one heart.

That singleness of heart is not something we can wait for. Our boys in Normandy, in Italy, in India, and China, in the far reaches of the South Pacific—they are not waiting for it. They are of one heart. What a highly courageous, steadfast heart it is.

What they ask of us—what they have the right to expect of us—is singleness of heart here at home. Freedom is in the balances. We dare not be found wanting.

For so great a venture together, we must be together. Here and now, we can begin to get together. That is our purpose. It is the purpose of this convention to put the public welfare above private self-interest; to put the Nation above the party; to put the progress of the whole American community above special privilege for any part of it; to put indispensable principles—once and for all—above indispensable men.

The choice of me as a keynote speaker was not made because of any personal attribute of mine. There were others far abler who could have been chosen.

The only good reason I was chosen was because I come from the great, hopeful, energetic West. Ours is the youngest part of America. My own State of California was a child of 4 years when the Republican Party was born.

Growth and change and adventure are still a part of our daily life.

In the West there is little fear of failure and no fear of trying. That spirit of youth is the spirit of this convention.

Certainly, we are not here to look for a road back to some status quo. There is no status to which we could or should return. The future cannot be overtaken in reverse. Neither are we here to work out some easy-sounding scheme whereby America can stand still. We believe that America wants to get going and keep going. A forward-going America is what we are here for.

In that spirit we can be confident of the future. It will not be easy. We have nothing easy to offer. Dark days lie ahead. We have no tricks to escape them. We expect tough going and we are ready for it. There is no pessimism, no defeatism, no bitterness, no jauntiness among us. Too much that we love and cherish is at stake. And of one thing we are sure: America can come through these trying, desperate times a finer, happier, better-spirited America. It is our purpose to see to it that America does come through that way.

That is what the American people expect the Republican Party to accomplish. They are already turning to us for its accomplishment. That is why, in so many streams of late, they have been changing so many horses. That is why—in city halls, courthouses, and State capitals, where government is closest to the people—the people have returned to Republican government. That is why, in election after election, they are restoring Republican leadership to Congress.

The people did this, not just because they wanted a change. They did it because they wanted a chance. As times became more critical, as their problems became more complex, as strange policies and questionable practices added to their difficulties and increased their confusions, they instinctively returned to the Republican Party.

In Congress, from 16 Republicans in the Senate in 1937 the people have now elected 37; from 88 Republicans in the House of Representatives, the people have now elected 212. From 8 Republican governors in 1938, the people have now elected 26. Three out of every four Americans now live under Republican State administrations. In Washington, where the bureaucrats live, there is still a Democrat in the White House. But out where the people live, the country is predominantly Republican.

In those 26 Republican States, the people have already elected the kind of government which the job ahead of us requires.

They are determined, this year, to have more of that kind of government. They are determined to have more of it in the States. They are determined to have more of it in Congress. They are determined to have more of it—a great deal more of it—in the White House.

In those States where the people have returned to the Republican Party, government is not only for the people, but of, and by the people. That means not some of the

people, but all of the people. Their kind of representative government reaches from ocean to ocean and from border to border. It extends to both sides of the tracks. It includes every citizen. That is why the platform of this convention will be one on which all of us can stand together—not divided by race or creed, not as minorities or majorities, but as fellow Americans.

No party that stands for less than that can unite America. A better world for others must begin with us. That is where, in 26 of our States, it has already begun.

In those States which are already Republican, you will find the record of public administration is progressive, enlightened, and in the public interest. In those States you will find increased emphasis upon the public health, upon free education, upon care for orphaned and neglected children, upon support for the aged, for the victims of industrial accidents, for those handicapped by physical disabilities, and for the victims of economic misfortune.

Those are the States of this Union where labor has achieved its highest dignity; where labor and management have come to their best understanding; where they have learned to work together most effectively; where, together, they are doing the best job.

What is the result of that kind of government? I can tell you. I can tell you in terms that every American with a son fighting overseas will understand. To win the war in the air, those Republican States have been called on to produce more than 81 percent of all our airplanes. To win the war at sea, those States have been called on to produce more than 76 percent of all our ships. To win the war on land, those States have been called on to produce more than 87 percent of all our ordnance—and more than 83 percent of all our other fighting equipment.

The American people were introduced, not long ago, to Dr. Win-the-War. From the record of these States it is clear that Dr. Win-the-War is a Republican.

But this war cannot be fought and won as Republicans or Democrats. This is an all-American war. There is a place for every American in it. There is no place of honor for any American who is not in it.

In or out of office, Republicans and Democrats share the responsibility of winning the war. We want to share it in the same spirit in which the sons of all of us fight from the same fox holes, through the same jungles, across the same beaches, in the same ships at sea and in the air.

The generals who command our armies, the admirals who command our fleets are no more Republican or Democratic than the armies and the fleets which they command. They are not a product of politics. They are products of our nonpolitical Military Establishment. Their concern is not with the party in power—whether it is Republican or Democratic. Their concern is how to get the men and the materials out where the war will be won. They know how to run the war and we will see to it that they have the opportunity to run it without political interference.

Our purpose is to see that the country is responsive to their military leadership, to stand back of them through good days and bad, to see to it that they get the materials needed for victory.

How well that victory can be won; how magnificently it can be won when Government unites all the people to win it is plainly written in the record of those 26 States whose government is now Republican. That is what needs to be done for the Nation as a whole. To that we dedicate ourselves as our first objective, to keep the war out of politics and politics out of the war, to strengthen among us, that spirit of single mindedness, of unity, of self-forgetfulness that will hearten our military leaders, strengthen their hands and speed the day when having bivouacked along the main streets of Germany and Japan, they will lead our boys victoriously home again.

But when the war is won, what then? We will have 11,000,000 men and women out of uniform. We will have millions of war workers whose war work has stopped. We will have tens of thousands of businessmen whose war contracts have been canceled.

What will those millions of Americans want: They will want what is the right of every American to have. They will want jobs. By jobs, they do not mean made jobs—with the Government as employer. That is not what we mean either. They mean money-making jobs in private industry. Those are the kind of jobs we mean.

But these young people will not be satisfied with just jobs. We will not be satisfied either. These young people will want good jobs and a chance to get ahead. Hundreds of thousands of them will want to set up in small businesses for themselves; to be their own boss; to have their own farm; to own their own filling station; to run their own store, or operate their own little factory.

We will see to it that they get that chance. We can see to it, because we know what is is that makes jobs and opportunity. We know that Government does not make them, not the kind of jobs the people want and which we aim to help the people get. Government is nonproducing. It lives off the production of others. Government-made jobs can be a crisis necessity. But such jobs are not good enough for the long pull. For the long pull, the American people want a highway, not a dead-end street.

The belief that we have come to the end of the road, that a dead-end street is all that we have ahead of us—that will not produce jobs and opportunity either. That belief is defeatism. The fruit of defeatism is an economy of scarcity. We know what scarcity produces. It produces scarcity—of jobs, of opportunity, of the good things of life.

We know what it is that makes jobs and opportunity. We know that private production makes them. We know that our productive system going ful' blast can make enough of them. It is the Republican Party that has kept that knowledge alive in America. We have kept it alive against great odds. And now the country knows how important it is that the Republicans kept that knowledge alive. For that confidence in our productive system and the know-how to get that system into full-blast production made the difference, when war came, between life and death. The same knowledge and the same know-how will make the difference when the war is won.

But we Republicans also know that full-blast production—and the jobs and opportunity which it makes—can only come in a climate that is friendly to production. A climate that is friendly to production requires a government that is friendly to production. It requires a government which believes that our economic soil, far from being worn out, is still life giving; a government which believes that those who work honorably and well to make that soil produce, far from being a threat to our well-being, are the hope of it; a government which, far from penalizing production, encourages it; a government which believes in an economy of plenty because its aim for all the people is abundance.

In such a climate, labor and management will not be set off—one against the other. They will realize—government can help them to realize—that they do not represent two different systems; that they are, rather, part of the same system. They will understand that they are partners in that system. If for any reason one partner fails, both will be destroyed. They will understand also that such a partnership system exists for more than profit; that its even more important reason for existence is the increasing security and well-being of all the people.

With such an understanding of their relationship to each other and their responsibility to the community, labor and management can reconcile their day-to-day differences, in order, together, to make full production possible. It is a Republican responsibility to foster that climate and speed that understanding. That we will do.

In such a climate also the farm will no longer be set off against the city, the city against the farm. Farmer and city dweller will come to see that they do not represent two rival economic communities; that, in fact, they are partners in the same community. They will understand that bad times for one mean bad times for the other; that good times for one must include good times for the other. It is a Republican responsibility to speed that understanding and foster a climate in which prosperity is possible for both. That also we will do.

We know that this can be done. We know that the people expect us to do it. They have turned to us because—under the threat of war—they wanted to get going. When the war is won, they want to keep going—toward full, peacetime production that will insure, not jobs alone, but opportunity and a fair and increasing share of life's good things. To that we dedicate ourselves as our second objective.

But to insure such a future, this war must end in something better than an armistice. This war must end in peace. For our homes, our sons, and our daughters, this time must be the last time.

In their hearts the American people know what kind of peace they want. They may differ upon details but they are agreed upon the things that are really important. What is needed is effective leadership, honestly and vigorously to carry into realization the aspirations upon which our people are united.

We want a peace that will be lasting. That means a peace that will be just. That means not only justice for the few and powerful but justice also for the many and less powerful.

We want a peace that is based upon realities and not upon the insecure foundation of mere words or promises. That means a peace which, being mindful of the interest of other nations, does not neglect or sacrifice the interests of our own Nation.

None of these aspirations can be realized under a leadership that plays power politics on a world-wide stage. They cannot be achieved under a leadership which neglects the interests of America. No such leadership can hope to keep the world's respect or to unite America in helping to solve the world's problems. Nor can they ever be achieved by a leadership which holds itself superior to the wisdom of the people.

As Republicans we are united in uncompromising opposition to aggression. We are prepared to take a definite stand against aggression not merely to denounce it but to resist it and restrain it. That calls for effective cooperation with all the peace-loving nations of the world—for the establishment of a tribunal for the settlement of international disputes which otherwise might lead to war. We are agreed, too, that if such a program is to be effective, the friendly cooperation of the war's principal Allied combatants—the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China—is as essential as the keystone of an arch. But beyond that is the task of establishing order, maintaining peace, and extending prosperity. We stand ready to welcome every nation that is prepared in honesty and good will to join with us in the accomplishment of that purpose. And we know that if we are to maintain respect

among the nations of the world, if we are to be able to keep our own commitments and to compel recalcitrants to keep theirs, we must keep America ever strong and self-reliant.

The Republican Party has not waited to declare these principles. At the Mackinac conference we blazed the way for them. The future of America and the happiness of our children depend on their establishment.

Whatever the exact procedures, on these principles the American people in their hearts agree. I do not believe that any sound American political party should say more. I am sure that in good conscience no such political party can say less.

This is the job we are here to do. These are the things about which we mean business—to get the boys victoriously back home; to open the door to jobs and opportunity; to make a peace that this time will be lasting. This is too great an undertaking for petty politics; for name-calling or for hate-making. There is no place among us for malcontents. We are in no mood for torchlight jubilation. Whether we win as a party is of less importance to us than whether we win as a people.

There has been progress in every decade of American history. Progress is an American habit. We do not propose to deny the progress that has been made during the last decade; neither do we aim to repeal it. Whatever its source, if it is good, we will acknowledge it. If it is sound, we will build on it. If it is forward-looking, we will make use of it as we go forward from here.

Neither do we aim to turn the clock back and make an issue of every administration mistake in the past 11 years. We are less concerned about these past errors than about the direction in which for the future we are going.

We believe the New Deal is leading us away from representative government. We believe that its centralization of power in the numerous buraus at Washington will eventually destroy freedcm as Americans have always understood it—freedom in the home, freedom of individual opportunity in business and employment, freedom to govern ourselves locally.

We believe the New Deal is destroying the two-party system. The New Deal is no longer the Democratic Party. It is an incongruous clique within that party. It retains its power by patronizing and holding together incompatible groups. It talks of idealism and seeks its votes from the most corrupt political machines in the country. The leaders of its inner circle are not representatives of the people. They are the personal agents of one man. Their appointments to public office are not made on the basis of efficiency or public approval but on the basis of loyalty to the clique. Under their rule the Constitution has been short-circuited. The Cabinet has ceased to be a voice and has become an echo. Congress, wherever possible, has been circumvented by Executive decree. Both Congress and the judiciary have been intimidated and bludgeoned to make them servile. Over all of this—and over all of us—is the ominous, gargantuan figure of an arrogant, power-intoxicated bureaucracy. Nowhere in its vast domain has it been satisfied with merely one bureaucrat, if by hook or crook desks could be found for two. These bureaucrats of the New Deal tell the farmer what to sow and when to reap—sometimes without regard for either the seeds or the season. They require him to work in the fields all day and keep books for the Government all night. These same bureaucrats tell the worker what union he shall join, what dues he shall pay, and to whom he must pay them. They soon will tell the worker where he can work and where he cannot work. Then the workers of America will be a long way down the road toward that kind of government which our Nation is now resisting with all its power.

These bureaucrats encumber the small businessman with a multiplicity of rules, regulations, orders, and decrees which entangle him, stifle his business and darken his future. They move in—like political commissars—to watch over the shoulders of our industrialists—to say what, where, and how industry can produce.

They have threatened our free press. They have intimidated our free radio. They are using every device and excuse to insinuate themselves into control over the public schools of our States. They have injected a low grade of politics into the administration of relief and social welfare.

They have by-passed the governments of the States in an effort to destroy State effectiveness and compel the people to rely solely upon the New Deal clique at Washington for the solution of all their problems.

For years they have deprived entire regions of representation in the policy-making agencies of the Federal Government.

To perpetuate themselves in power the New Deal clique has always capitalized upon some crisis. It has always had the indispensable man—the same man—for each succeeding crisis. The first time it was the depression. The second time it was the recession. Last time it was to keep us out of war. This time it will be to achieve peace. The next time—who knows what crisis it will be? That there will be one and that the indispensable man will still be indispensable, we can rely upon the New Deal clique to assert. The New Deal came to power with a song on its lips: Happy Days Are Here Again. That song is ended. Even the melody does not linger on. Now we are being conditioned for a new song: Don't Change Horses in the Middle of a Stream. That melody isn't likely to linger either. For 11 long years we have been in the middle of the stream. We are not amphibious. We want to get across. We want to feel dry and solid ground under our feet again.

The life of a nation is a succession of crises. War and peace and economic and social adjustments have always followed each other in endless succession. No party, clique, or individual can rightfully claim priority in government because a crisis occurs during its administration.

The Republican Party was born in a great crisis. The American people turned to it because they wanted to get safely, speedily through that crisis and get on their way again. Then as now, the Republican Party was called by the people to displace a regime of men who had grown tired, complacent, and cynical in the business of government. Then as now, the Republican Party was called upon to replace a party that was torn with dissension and in revolt against itself. Then as now, the Republican Party was called by the people to furnish youth and vigor and vision.

Now as then, the Republican Party will respond to that call. It will represent the Nation, the whole Nation and nothing but the Nation. It will devote itself fervently to the problems of the people and in everything it does the Constitution of the United States of America will be its guiding star. It will function through established law and not through the caprice of bureaucratic regulation. There shall be one law for all men. Its greatest concern will always be for those who have the greatest need. It will conduct government openly where the people can see, discuss, and decide. It will operate less from the Government down and more from the people up. It will make wise and careful use of the people's money. It will keep the public's books in such a way as to allow the people to see how their money is used. It will see that taxes are just, visible, and designed to stimulate rather than punish. It will strengthen our great public-school system, keep it under the control of State and local government, where it is responsive to the people, and prepare it to play a stronger part in the life of the Republic. It will promote peace in industry by stimulating good will between labor and management. It will free the agencies of public information from the domination of government. It will make fully effective the immeasurable strength of the Nation by promoting good will and unity at home. It will not be cocksure in good times or depressed and cynical in bad times. It will direct our combined material and spiritual resources against the enemies of our country. It will make any sacrifice to achieve victory even 1 day sooner so our boys can come home. It will see to it that they are cared for when they do come home. It and we will honor them the rest of our lives.

But we will start building right now, that finer America which during their night vigils they dream of as they look at the stars from their fox holes on land and from their gun turrets at sea and in the air; the America that to them spells happy homes and freedom of opportunity for all; the America that represents unity at home and peace with the countries of the world.

It takes faith to build such an America—a strong faith, the same faith that now sustains our fighting men; a faith that is truly "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen."

With such a faith—which is our faith—we shall march under God toward victory, toward opportunity, toward peace.

A Battle of the War Against Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, please let me call attention to the bill (H. R. 3690) to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases, favorably reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

It is not claimed of this bill that it is a panacea. It is not a complete answer to the problem, with one phase of which it deals. It is an arm to be thrust into a breach in the dike that impounds the bitter waters of crime, pending adequate repair and remodeling.

THE NEED FOR SUCH LEGISLATION

The Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision in the case of *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 332) on March 1, 1943. That decision established, without constitutional or legislative authority, a rule of evidence utterly new and variant from the standard set up by the Constitution of the United States in the Bill of Rights. In that part of the Bill of Rights known as the fifth amendment there is the familiar guaranty that no person shall "be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." Since the Bill of Rights became fully ratified as a part of the Constitution on December 15, 1791, this has been recognized as the supreme law of the land on this subject. Such recognition has been accorded by repeated decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and prior to the McNabb decision it had become well settled that the sole test of admissibility of statements made by persons accused of

crime while in custody was whether they were "made freely, voluntarily, and without compulsion or inducement of any sort"—*Wilson* v. *United States* ((1896) 162 U. S. 613, 623); see also *Lisenba* v. *California* ((1943) 314 U. S. 219, 239).

Whether an individual in custody had or had not been arraigned prior to the obtaining of a confession from him was never before considered a determining factor in considering its admissibility.

For the first time in legal history, in the McNabb case, the Supreme Court used section 595, title 18, of the United States Code as a factor in determining the admissibility of confessions. This section provides that it shall be the duty of the marshal or other officer who may arrest a person charged with any crime or offense "to take the defendant before the United States commissioner or the nearest judicial officer having jurisdiction under existing laws for a hearing, commitment, or take bail for trial." A similar statute is found in Fifth United States Code, section 300a, requiring agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to take arrested persons immediately before a committing officer.

Thus, the Supreme Court has substituted a rule or law of evidence, written and adopted by a majority of the Court, for and instead of the Constitution. The Constitution says that involuntary confessions must not be admitted as evidence in any criminal case. Therefore, by plain implication and on ample authority, voluntary confessions should be admitted as evidence. Yet, in the McNabb case, the Supreme Court says:

> Quite apart from the Constitution, therefore, we are constrained to hold that the evidence elicited from the petitioners in the circumstances disclosed here must be excluded. For in their treatment of the petitioners the arresting officers assumed functions which Congress has explicitly denied them.

The Supreme Court does not say that the confessions of the McNabbs were involuntary, but "quite apart from the Constitution," and although "Congress has not explicitly forbidden the use of evidence so procured," because the arresting officers failed to comply with the requirement that defendants should be promptly arraigned—no matter how voluntary the confessions may have been, no matter that the trial judge, jury and the Supreme Court of Tennessee had held them to be voluntary, no matter that Congress had not forbidden, and no matter what the Constitution provides—the confessions were inadmissible as evidence.

> Mr. Justice Rutledge took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Mr. Justice Reed dissented, as follows:

> I find myself unable to agree with the opinion of the Court in this case. An officer of the United States was killed while in the performance of his duties. From the circumstances detailed in the Court's opinion, there was obvious reason to suspect that the petitioners here were implicated in firing the fatal shot from the dark. The arrests follow. As the guilty parties were known only to the McNabbs who took part in the assault at the burying ground, it was natural and proper that the officers would question them as to their actions.
>
> The cases just cited show that statements made while under interrogation may be used at a trial if it may fairly be said that the information was given voluntarily. A frank and free confession of crime by the culprit affords testimony of the highest credibility and of a character which may be verified easily. Equally frank responses to officers by innocent people arrested under misapprehension give the best basis for prompt discharge from custody. The realization of the convincing quality of a confession tempts officials to press suspects unduly for such statements. To guard accused persons against the danger of being forced to confess, the law admits confession of guilt only when they are voluntarily made. While the connotation of voluntary is indefinite, it affords an understandable label under which can be readily classified the various acts of terrorism, promises, trickery, and threats which have led this and other courts to refuse admission as evidence to confessions. The cases cited in the Court's opinion show the broad coverage of this rule of law. Through it those coerced into confession have found a ready defense from injustice.
>
> Were the Court today saying merely that in its judgment the confessions of the McNabbs were not voluntary, there would be no occasion for this single protest. A notation of dissent would suffice. The opinion, however, does more. Involuntary confessions are not constitutionally admissible because violative of the provision of self-incrimination in the Bill of Rights. Now the Court leaves undecided whether the present confessions are voluntary or involuntary, and declares that the confession must be excluded because in addition to questioning the petitioners, the arresting officers failed promptly to take them before a committing magistrate. The Court finds a basis for the declaration of this new rule of evidence in its supervisory authority over the administration of criminal justice. I question whether this offers to the trial courts and the peace officers a rule of admissibility as clear as the test of the voluntary character of the confession. I am opposed to broadening the possibilities of defendants escaping punishment by these more rigorous technical requirements in the administration of justice. If these confessions are otherwise voluntary, civilized standards, in my opinion, are not advanced by setting aside these judgments because of acts of omission which are not shown to have tended toward coercing the admissions.
>
> Our police officers occasionally overstep legal bounds. This record does not show when the petitioners were taken before a committing magistrate. No point was made of the failure to commit by defendant or counsel. No opportunity was given to the officers to explain. Objection to the introduction of the confession was made only on the ground that they were obtained through coercion. This was determined against the accused both by the Court, when it appraised the fact as to the voluntary character of the confession, preliminarily to determining the legal question of its admissibility, and by the jury. The Court saw and heard wtnesses for the prosecution and the defense. The defendants did not take the stand before the jury. The uncontradicted evidence does not require a different conclusion. The officers of the Alcohol Tax Unit should not be disciplined by overturning this conviction.

It is most interesting to note, in connection with the McNabb decision, that no point was made by the defendants nor by their counsel of any failure on the part of the arresting officers to arraign the defendants promptly. The decision is grounded solely upon the assumption indulged by the court that the petitioners had not been promptly arraigned. The record was silent on this most important point. The petitioners and their counsel did not claim that the petitioners had not been promptly arraigned. The truth is that the petitioners had been promptly arraigned. The prisoners were arrested early Thursday morning on the charge of operating an illicit still. They were properly and promptly arraigned and committed on that charge between 8:30 and 10:30 the same morning. During the raid on the distillery, or shortly thereafter, the murder had been committed in an adjacent cemetery in the darkness of night. No one had been seen, nor apprehended. There was no clue as to the identity of the murderer or murderers. There was a strong suspicion that the McNabbs, who had been operating the illicit distillery, or some of them, were also guilty of the murder. However, there was no evidence sufficient to justify a committing magistrate in binding them over on the murder charge. So there was no arraignment on the murder charge until after three of them had confessed; but every question put to any one of the prisoners was put after they had been promptly arraigned, and committed.

Almost immediately after the decision in the McNabb case was handed down, the administration of justice in criminal courts was thrown into confusion because of the McNabb decision, and in case after case defendants were, solely because of the rule promulgated in the McNabb case, freed by orders of the courts nolle prossing, or reversing, or directing verdicts in pending cases. Many of such cases are cited in the hearings on H. R. 3690, pages 21—cited by the author of the bill—31, 32, 33—cited by the Attorney General—and 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60—cited by members of the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington.

In one of these cases, Mitchell against United States, the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia (138 Fed. 2d 426) reversed convictions and upon certiorari granted by the Supreme Court the decision of the Court of Appeals was reversed by the Supreme Court, April 24, 1944, although the Supreme Court said in part: "We adhere to that decision"—McNabb against United States—"and to the views on which it was based."

The history of the Mitchell case is bad enough, but that of the Wilborn case is infinitely worse. While the convictions of Mitchell were reversed by the court of appeals, yet this reversal has now been reversed by the Supreme Court, so Mitchell may now be punished. In the Wilborn case, however, Judge Pine is quoted as having stated from the bench on the trial that, although his acquittal would constitute a "miscarriage of justice," nevertheless he must be acquitted because of the Supreme Court's decision in the McNabb case. So, Judge Pine directed a verdict of acquittal, and Wilborn walked out of the court a free man. The Constitution prohibits another trial, because a second trial would constitute double jeopardy, so he is as free and clear as anyone could be. What was his self-confessed crime? About 1 a. m. of March 18, 1943, he broke into the apartment occupied by three girls, where he

assaulted one of them, inflicting lacerations requiring 11 stitches, though he did not complete the rape because of the screams of the other girls. He was arrested about 2 a. m. on the same night. About 4 a. m. he confessed. About 5 a. m., in the presence of the arresting officers and his victim, he reenacted the circumstances. About 11:30 of the same day he signed a written confession, and was arraigned about 3 o'clock that afternoon. But the McNabb decision held that no confession could be used as evidence if the self-confessed criminal had not been arraigned promptly, and the judge construed this to mean just that. So, Wilborn, not having been arraigned for several hours after he might have been, was freed by a reluctant jury, because of the courts' direction, made solely because of the McNabb decision! Is this only a "miscarriage of justice" or is it a license to rape?

WHAT H. R. 3690 WOULD DO

It would merely nullify the new rule of the McNabb decision.

It would declare that no such policy as that indicated in the McNabb decision underlies the laws Congress passed requiring prompt arraignment.

It would leave the law exactly as it was before the turmoil and confusion caused by the McNabb decision and wipe out the attempt to bypass and ignore the Bill of Rights, restoring to the full the protective guaranty that no person shall "be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

MERELY A TEMPORARY EMERGENCY MEASURE

The bill H. R. 3690 is not designed to be a complete nor permanent solution of the problems involved in arrest, detention, and interrogation of criminal suspects. These problems are many, varied, and important. They cry for adequate remedies—for full, painstaking study and solution.

All of us favor prompt arraignment. Failure to observe the legal requirement thereof should be punished. The punishment, however, should be inflicted upon the guilty—not the innocent. The arresting officers are the guilty when they fail to see to it that prisoners are promptly arraigned. The public—"We, the people"—are the innocent. Yet under the McNabb decision only the law-abiding, innocent citizens, whose safety is jeopardized by turning self-confessed criminals loose, are punished.

A part of the solution should be the enactment into law of the requirement that all arresting officers be bonded, so that any failure on their part to observe the law would make them not only subject to suit, as they are now, but also able to respond in damages.

THE UNIFORM ARREST ACT

The Uniform Arrest Act, by Hon. Sam B. Warner, is a suggested solution that should have careful study.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUGGESTION

The suggestion given by the Attorney General of the United States—see his testimony in the hearings, pp. 35, 36, and 37—that the arraignment statutes should be made uniform and should have but one requirement as to time, to wit: "Within a reasonable time," also demands full consideration.

ENGLISH RULES

As suggested in the McNabb decision, the English rules for the interrogation of prisoners while in custody prescribed by the judges of the King's Bench should also be studied diligently and constructively with a view to seeing how they may be adapted to the administration of the criminal law in the United States. As so adapted, similar rules should be made by law a part of the solution of this problem.

BRIEF OF AMERICAN BAR COMMITTEE

The bill-of-rights committee of the American Bar Association, under date of May 15, 1944, has furnished the subcommittee that held the hearings on H. R. 3690 with a splendid brief showing clearly and fully the need for protracted and indefatigable study of this whole problem and for the enactment into law of its proper solution. They very kindly offer the services of this committee in collaboration toward these objectives.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, it is manifest that this bill is but an emergency measure, the sole purpose of which is to stop immediately the wrecking of our law-enforcement machinery resulting from the McNabb decision.

The enactment of this bill would do this and give your Committee on the Judiciary time, without the pressure and penalty of suspended law enforcement, within which to study these delicate and difficult problems and for the preparation of such a bill as may be then agreed upon.

Don't Let Careless Talk Cost American Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, some people do not seem to realize the danger that might result to those in the armed forces by carelessly talking concerning the movements of our armed forces. When this is explained to them, however, they realize that the officials of the Army and Navy have adopted a strong policy solely for the purpose of protecting our men and women engaged in carrying the attack to our enemies. One of the most closely guarded secrets is the departure from this country of members of the armed forces for foreign lands. If the enemy knew when a convoy was leaving this country they could advise their submarines by radio. If one of our transports was torpedoed it would be easy to realize the great loss of lives.

Mr. Speaker, I have received from Miss Bertha Bruening, of the Business Letter Co., Inc., of St. Louis, some suggestions that she has placed in print and liberally distributed. Under the permission granted me, I include this as part of my remarks. It follows:

CARELESS TALK COSTS LIVES

America is now in a war of attack.

Our enemies are losing. They are getting desperate.

They're working harder than ever to learn our plans, our weapons, the movements of our forces.

If they succeed, they will use the information to kill our men, throw back our attacks, delay victory.

YOUR HELP IS NEEDED

Civilians as well as fighters must help America win.

We must prevent the Axis from getting vital information. We must guard against careless talk which may be repeated and reach the ears of the enemy.

Little things can often give the enemy the clues he needs to discover important plans.

Seemingly unimportant "bits and pieces" of careless talk about our men, our weapons, and our equipment are gathered and studied by enemy experts.

These are carefully put together to reveal our plans, sink our ships, kill our men.

GUARD WHAT YOU KNOW

Don't tell anyone where a fighter is located outside the United States. Don't tell where he is going, when he is leaving, or anything about his training or equipment.

Never mention where ships are located, what cargoes they carry, when they (or the men on them) expect to sail, or where they are going.

Don't give out any information about the strength of our defenses, our armament, planes, tanks, ships, guns, or other military equipment.

Remember these simple rules for fooling the enemy:

If you hear it from someone, don't repeat it.

If you see it yourself, don't repeat it.

But if you read it in the press or hear it on the radio, it's public property; talk about it as much as you like.

Remember: Careless talk costs lives.

Establishment of a Permanent Nurse Corps in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 5103, Seventy-eighth Congress, "A bill to provide for the establishment of a permanent Nurse Corps in the Veterans' Administration," which is in line with the purposes of the act of June 22, 1944, Public Law No. 346, Seventh-eighth Congress, commonly referred to as the G. I. bill of rights. Title I of that act contains administrative provisions to insure adequate protection to the veterans of World War No. 2 and prior wars, and to assist the Veterans' Administration in the discharge of its functions in the care of the disabled veterans.

NEED FOR A NURSE CORPS IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

In the G. I. bill of rights, the Veterans' Administration is declared to be a war agency and its needs are to be met by priorities second only to the War and Navy Departments. Only in recent months has there been definite action to grant the Veterans' Administration the recognition required to retain necessary personnel and to secure additional workers required to meet the load. This belated action has meant the loss of Veterans' Administration personnel to the War and Navy Departments and other agencies and a definite handicap to the Veterans' Administration in competing with other agencies to secure necessary employees for the hospital functions. This weakness is most pronounced in regard to nurses. The lack of adequate pay, professional status, retirement, and other privileges militates against recruitment of nurses in the Veterans' Administration. Besides losses to other Government departments, civilian hospitals can make better offers than the Veterans' Administration. While aid has been given by commissioning Veterans' Administration doctors in the Army and giving them active duty status in the Veterans' Administration, nothing has been done to meet the nurse problem in similar manner.

There is pronounced need for nurses now, and during the coming year and thereafter, that need will be accelerated. Lack of adequate provision for nurses has burdened the head nurses with the problems resulting from loss of younger and more active nurses and has required them to perform bedside nursing thus neglecting ward supervision and teaching.

The inability of the Veterans' Administration to offer adequate status to student and graduate nurses necessarily reduces the possibility of necessary recruitment.

A CRITICAL SITUATION

The present situation is acute because it is not possible for the Veterans' Administration to give ex-service men and women adequate nursing care unless further inroads into and obstruction of recruitment to the nursing service are prevented. To reveal the critical situation at present, there are now 896 vacancies in nurse positions in the Veterans' Administration.

ADVANTAGES OF A NURSE CORPS

With the establishment of a Nurse Corps in the Veterans' Administration provided in my bill, H. R. 5103, the students now receiving training in Veterans' Administration facilities as senior cadet nurses will be attracted to this service as a permanent career, thus preventing turnover in nurse personnel. Further, the graduate nurses in the service and those contemplating appointment will have and be offered a status in keeping with their profession and more on a parity with the Army and Navy Nurse Corps.

Certainly our disabled veterans should be assured as efficient and adequate nursing service as furnished them prior to their discharge or release from active service. Thousands of our disabled World War No. 2 veterans are being transferred from Army and Navy hospitals directly to Veterans' Administration facilities. The nursing service to which they are sent will be made adequate only by providing a sufficient number of well-qualified nurses in those facilities.

I urge upon the Congress the necessity for recognition of this problem and early enactment of H. R. 5103.

McNutt's July 1 Order Blacks Out Independence Day in 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, July 1, 1944, will be long remembered as a black day in the history of the United States. It is the day when the true liberty of man is to be snuffed out in America by McNutt's national-service edict. On this Fourth of July, the Declaration of Independence will have been repudiated by politicians who talk about freedom while setting up laws that destroy it.

The inalienable right of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" will have been eliminated by Executive order. Instead of our Government achieving unconditional surrender by Hitler and the Japs, we see the administration decreeing unconditional surrender of the liberty of the people of America.

I am familiar with the sugar-coated and honeyed words of explanation which accompany this order.

I am familiar with the smooth and clever language which outlines and makes so simple to understand this decisive step toward slave-labor battalions.

I am familiar with the cry of war necessity and the "essential to the war effort" ballyhoo which is being used to cover up the brutal truth about this referral and placement scheme.

I am familiar with all the booby-trap trickery concealing this slave-labor edict, because it follows so perfectly the pattern used by the dictators of Europe.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that on this Independence Day the fathers, mothers, wives, and sweethearts of our soldiers everywhere will be thinking about this McNutt labor-battalion Executive order. The loved ones of our soldier boys should be thinking about what kind of America their boys will come back to.

Will their boys come back to an America ruined by the same human slavery that those boys were sent thousands of miles to destroy? Have the free workers of America failed? This order says that the workers of America have failed, and must be enslaved. I deny it. It is the administration which has failed the people.

How will this McNutt order work out in practice? Here is an example from the same methods in England. It is the life story of 18-year-old Joseph Henry Wright, of Bursiem, Stoke-on-Trent.

He was killed, at the age of 18, in a pit explosion, on New Year's day, 1942. His father was a miner, too, and when he was injured in a pit he advised his son at all costs to get out of coal mining and seek other work. The youngster did this. In the spring of 1941 his father died, from injuries received down the pit. A few days before the end of 1941 the son was ordered to return to the pit. As he was getting ready for work, on New Year's day, he asked his widowed mother who should let the New Year in, and she said he could do this when he left the house for the pit. So he opened the door to the New Year, and, calling out "A Happy New Year" to his mother, started down the road. He never came back.

Here you have a father trying to rescue his son both from the living death and the actual death of labor in the pit, and the son then taken in the grip of officialdom and forced to return to it, and to his death.

The death of 18-year-old Joseph Wright is sad. That tragedy might pass unnoticed, however, as today many boys are dying because the brass hats have bungled. The fact that strikes terror in the hearts of common people is this—that officials, not responsible to the people, can treat the people like cattle. Truly the lights of liberty are growing very dim when men, like steers in the feedlots, are traded about in the market places and sent to labor and die without right of appeal or hope for the future. This order can end justice, it can end liberty, it can end righteousness in America.

Lincoln said at Gettysburg, "These dead shall not have died in vain." Will our own dead in World War No. 2 have died in vain? The answer is "Yes," if the slave-labor yoke can be fastened on the neck of the common people in full defiance of the Congress representing those people.

Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, Daniel Webster said to the patriots of America:

There are men, in all ages, who mean to exercise power usefully; but they mean to exercise it. They mean to govern well; but they mean to govern. They promise to be kind masters; but they mean to be masters.

Patriots in 1944 should reread the Declaration of Independence and ponder Webster's warning as the McNutt National Service order locks its shackles on the laboring folks of America.

Railroad Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the battle now being waged by Wall Street against Main Street has terrific post-war implications, since it threatens the whole future of railroad service of the United States by destroying the confidence of the investing public in railroad securities. But the winning of this battle for Main Street cannot be postponed until

after the war, because the slaughter of the small bona fide investors is now going on.

Wall Street owns high-priority railroad bonds, bonds secured by mortgages. No one questions the absolute necessity of insuring full payment of these bonds, both principal and interest. The pending bill, H. R. 4960, would not affect such adequate existing insurance. Like Portia, however, this bill insists that Wall Street has a right to demand its pound of flesh, but no blood.

Wall Street is now taking advantage of the "slaughter of the innocents"—Main Street bona fide investors in common stock and junior bonds—by buying bonds whose unearned increment is being built up by wiping out Main Street's junior securities. As usual, however, Wall Street is taking no chances. It is speculating on a certainty. There is no speculation, and will be none, in those classes of so-called securities now held by Main Street. Wall Street knows its game. Its denizens are, as usual, profiting by the killing of "the goose that lays the golden eggs." Since Wall Street wrote the rules by which this game is played, there is no hope for Main Street without amending those rules. National need of adequate railway service requires the protection of the investments of both Wall Street and Main Street in railway securities. The cardinal principle of fair play demands equal justice to both. Hence this bill.

The preservation of railway service will require credit of the kind extended by both Wall Street and Main Street and the restoration of what was supposed to be the true connotation of the word "securities." Security must mean complete assurance for the high priority mortage bond investors and at least reasonable assurance for the investors in common stock and bonds of lower priorities. Otherwise fewer railroads will run; and those that run will operate inadequately. Each of these deplorable results means fewer jobs for railroad men and lowered wages for labor as well as management.

From 30 to 40 percent of the railroad mileage in the United States is in receivership or reorganization. Yet there is no overcapitalization. As required by section 20A of the Interstate Commerce Act, all the "water" has been squeezed out of railroad stocks and junior bonds. Of course there never was any "water" in high priority bonds—Wall Street has always seen to that. Under section 19A of the Interstate Commerce Act, the honest appraised value of the physical properties of all railroads has been carefully made and is kept current by the Interstate Commerce Commission. So, under the law, we know that the stocks and all other securities issued by railroads have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission as fair to the investing public for the last 24 years, and, also, we know the fair market value of rights-of-way, tracks, yards, depots, rolling stock, supplies, and everything else the railroads own, less depreciation and obsolescence. Therefore, there should not be much uncertainty in the calculation of the value of either railroad paper or physical properties. The only serious question grew out of the fact that properly capitalized and equipped railroads vary in earning power. So, in 1935, Congress amended the law so as to require that in addition to all the accurate and dependable information furnished by the Interstate Commerce Commission as to the value of railway paper and equipment, it should, in conjunction with the ascertainment of these values, go further and consider earning power, past, present, and prospective.

In the reorganization of railroads under this amended statute, however, the Interstate Commerce Commission seems to discard two-thirds of the formula fixed by the amendment—to wit, present and prospective earnings—and to pay little or no attention to the value of railroad paper and equipment as fixed by the Commission itself under sections 20A and 19A of the Interstate Commerce Act. The apparent theory being that the war has caused present railroad earnings to be abnormally high and that future earnings are unpredictable, so that the actual earnings of the depression period is the only criterion left for fixing values, no matter what the Commission may have said theretofore. This means that the capital structures now being fixed by the Commission for reorganized railroads are based almost exclusively upon depression earnings. These, of course, were as notoriously low as the war earnings are notoriously high. Neither is a fair criterion. The law required and still requires that—

> The value of any property used in railroad operation shall be determined on a basis which will give due consideration to the earning power of the property, past, present, and prospective, and all other relevant facts.

The purpose of the Bankruptcy Act particularly of section 77 was to relieve debtors of some of their burdens, not of all of their properties.

With these ideas in mind, may I not commend to your careful study the unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary, recommending the passage of H. R. 4960?

AMENDING SECTION 77 OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT (RAILROAD REORGANIZATIONS)

Mr. HOBBS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4960) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, having considered the same, report the bill favorably to the House, with the recommendation that it do pass. This report is unanimous.

The present bill has been substituted for an earlier bill, H. R. 2857, on which hearings were held, and contains changes made as a result of the hearings.

NECESSITY FOR REVISION OF SECTION 77

The purpose of the bill is to correct a very serious situation arising from the interpretation placed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts upon the amendments of section 77 enacted by the Congress August 27, 1935. We believe this situation results from a misapprehension of the intention of Congress with respect to the 1935 amendments. The consequences have been and are so disastrous to railroad investors, and so dangerous to the credit of the railroads in general, that they should be corrected by legislation.

From a legal standpoint, the problem may be stated simply. Section 77 was directed primarily to the relief of financially embarrassed railroad companies through a revision of their capital structures and a reduction of fixed charges. It does not expressly provide for any reduction in the existing total capitalization; but the Interstate Commerce Commission has interpreted paragraph (d) of the section as authorizing it to fix the total capitalization of the reorganized company. In so doing, it has estimated a "capitalizable value of the assets" of the property based almost entirely upon "earning power"—earning power of the property, past, present, and prospective—as these words are used in section 77 (e). Its estimates of prospective earning power are necessarily speculative. Nevertheless, it has used its estimates of earning power to fix capitalizations in all cases very substantially below the existing capitalizations, regardless of the investment in the property and of the valuation previously determined by the Commission under section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act. The Supreme Court in passing upon two major reorganization plans—the Western Pacific and the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific—upheld the Commission in this interpretation of the section, and has further held that the Commission's findings will not be disturbed where there is some evidence to support them. In other words, these administrative findings are beyond judicial review.

The result of this interpretation of the statute by the Commission, and the subsequent refusal of the courts to review the Commission's findings, has caused the destruction of hundreds of millions of dollars of railroad securities representing actual investment in the property made, to some extent at least, in reliance upon the belief that such investments could not be confiscated except by due process of law. In more detail, the legal problem is as follows:

The original section 77, "An act for the relief of debtors," enacted March 3, 1933, contained a provision in paragraph (d) that the Commission after a hearing on a plan of reorganization shall render a report approving a plan which "may be" different from any that had been proposed. As carried forward into the amendments of August 27, 1935, the language was as follows:

"After the filing of such a plan, the Commission, unless such plan shall be considered by it to be prima facie impracticable, shall, after due notice to all stockholders and creditors given in such manner as it shall determine, hold public hearings, at which opportunity shall be given to any interested party to be heard, and following which the Commission shall render a report and order in which it shall approve a plan, which may be different from any which has been proposed, that will in its opinion meet with the requirements of subsections (b) and (e) of this section, and will be compatible with the public interest; or it shall render a report and order in which it shall refuse to approve any plan. In such report the Commission shall state fully for the reasons for its conclusions."

Section 77, as amended, nowhere specifically authorizes the Commission to reduce the existing total capitalization. It does specifically authorize the Commission to reduce the fixed charges. Under subsection (d) as quoted, the Commission has acted upon the assumption that it had the power to reduce the total capitalization, even though that capitalization was well below the investment in the property and below the Commission's physical valuation fixed under section 19a of the act to regulate commerce.

Subsection (e) of the 1935 amendments requires the judge to approve the plan, if

satisfied that it conforms with the provisions of subsection (b) (the principal one of which is the requirement that the plan shall provide for fixed charges of the reorganized company in such an amount that there shall be adequate coverage by the probable earnings available for the payment thereof), but contains no requirement that the court shall satisfy itself of the correctness of the Commission's action under subsection (d). The action of the Commission, therefore, in fixing the total capitalization under subsection (d) is not made specifically dependent upon the approval of the court.

Another of the 1935 amendments involved is the valuation section of paragraph (e). It will be recalled that in the Valuation Act of 1913 (Interstate Commerce Act, sec. 19a), the Commission was directed to determine the value of all the property owned or used by every common carrier, except certain street or suburban railways. It was required to report in detail as to each piece of property, the original cost, cost of reproduction new, the cost of reproduction less depreciation, and all other values and elements of value of the property of such common carrier; also, in detail and separate from improvements, the original cost of all lands and the present value of same. Having completed this work, it was required to serve notice of its tentative valuation upon the carrier, the Attorney General, and the Governors of the various States in which the properties are located. Thereupon, after hearing if a protest was filed, the valuation became final (sec. 19a (h) (i)). The latter section provides:

"All final valuations by the Commission and the classification thereof shall be published and shall be prima facie evidence of the value of the property in all proceedings under the Act to Regulate Commerce as of the date of the fixing thereof, and in all judicial proceedings for the enforcement of the act approved February 4, 1887, commonly known as the Act to Regulate Commerce, and the various acts amendatory thereof, and in all judicial proceedings brought to enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend, in whole or in part, any order of the Interstate Commerce Commission."

The Commission further is required by section 19a to keep these valuations up to date by keeping itself informed of all new construction, improvements, retirements, and other changes in the condition, quantity, use, and classification of all such property. This valuation work has been in progress ever since the passage of the act and the Commission's files contain full information as to all the property of the carriers.

The 1935 amendments of section 77 included the following paragraph as to valuation:

"If it shall be necessary to determine the value of any property for any purpose under this section, the Commission shall determine such value and certify the same to the court in its report on the plan. The value of any property used in railroad operation shall be determined on a basis which will give due consideration to the earning power of the property, past, present, and prospective, and all other relevant facts. In determining such value only such effect shall be given to the present cost of reproduction new and less depreciation and original cost of the property, and the actual investment therein, as may be required under the law of the land, in light of its earning power and all other relevant facts."

This section was proposed to us by the late Joseph B. Eastman, then Federal Coordinator of Transportation. Both Mr. Eastman and his counsel expressed the view that it was desirable, and also that it would not deprive the stockholder affected by any valuation found thereunder from having his day in court for a judicial determination of the value of the property so found.

In proceedings under section 77, the Interstate Commerce Commission has developed what it terms a "capitalizable value" of railway properties, derived from its consideration of earning power under subsection (e); and purporting to act under subsection (d), has limited the capitalization of the reorganized company to the capitalizable value so determined.

At the time these 2 amendments were adopted, some 30 class I railroads, owning an aggregate of 75,000 to 80,000 miles of line, were undergoing reorganization. At this time, only a few of these reorganizations are complete. The first of the reorganization cases to reach the Supreme Court were those of the Western Pacific (*Frederick H. Ecker* v. *Western Pacific R. R. Corp.*, 318 U. S. 448, 87 L. ed. 892), and the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific (*Group of Institutional Investors* v. *Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific R. R. Co.*, 318 U. S. 523, 87 L. ed. 959), both decided March 15, 1943. The Court held in these cases that the findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission as to "capitalizable value" would not be disturbed if they were supported by substantial evidence, and the courts were powerless, under section 77, to grant a judicial review of the findings of the Commission as to valuation determined under section 77 (e), and as to the total capitalization determined under section 77 (d). The result was that the stockholders of both companies were eliminated from participation in the reorganized company, although their stock represented actual investment in the properties, and all security holders of both companies suffered a reduction in the integrity of their holdings and in the probable return on their investments.

In five major companies now undergoing reorganization, the reductions in capitalization aggregate some $600,000,000, meaning that this amount of railroad securities has been eliminated in the reorganization of these five companies alone, although there is no question that the investment in road and equipment and the 19a valuations at the present time are far in excess of the capitalization determined by the Commission. The same is true generally of the other roads involved in reorganization, these five being specifically mentioned, because they are included in one exhibit submitted to this committee by the Interstate Commerce Commission (hearings on H. R. 2857, serial No. 9, p. 199).

That this situation has created an unbearable hardship upon the junior investors in railroad securities and constitutes a real danger to railroad credit may be easily seen from a glance at current railroad earnings. In 1942 the Missouri Pacific earned $32.67 a share on the common stock outstanding under the old capitalization; the Denver & Rio Grande Western, $34.40 a share; Rock Island, $25.11; Frisco, $18.03; St. Louis Southwestern, $27.23. These figures approximately were repeated in 1943, and the high earnings are continuing in 1944. Yet these stocks, which have demonstrated such an earning power, have been absolutely wiped out in reorganization, and the stockholders are without remedy. Moreover, the junior securities of all these roads have been drastically cut in reorganization and the senior securities have been very largely converted into income bonds and preferred and common stock. In one case, the Commission estimated a normal earning power of $11,000,000, and based its capitalization upon that figure; yet in the same year in which the Commission's plan was announced (1941) that road earned more than $18,000,000. In 1942, it earned $36,000,000, and in 1943 $37,000,000. Nevertheless, the Commission still says the old common stock is worthless. The stockholders are without remedy. There is in practical effect no judicial review of the action of the Commission. Although its guess as to future earning power has been demonstrated to be wrong, its findings are final.

It is true that in the last few years earnings due to wartime traffic have surpassed all expectations. It is a fortunate thing for the country that its first line of defense—the transportation system—was able to handle this traffic with such magnificent results. The Commission, in fixing its plans, did not foresee it; likewise, no one can foresee what traffic there will be for the railroads after hostilities have ceased. There will, of course, be a reduction in the wartime traffic, but, unless we are to concede that we are willing to get along with a much less adequate transportation system, and unless we are to admit that our efforts at readjustment after the war will be a failure, then we must insist that the owners of these securities now being confiscated should share in the prosperity which has come as a result of the war and in that which necessarily will follow in rebuilding the Nation's industries.

THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The primary purpose of the bill is to insure that the courts shall make an independent judicial review of each plan and of the evidence upon which the plan is based. Under the existing statute, the Commission is required to certify to the court a transcript of its proceedings; and the court is required to notify all parties and, if objections are filed, to have a hearing. The effect of the proposed amendments is to require the judge to make an independent judicial determination of the facts found by the Commission, and not to hold that the administrative finding of the Commission is beyond judicial review. With this object in mind, the bill provides that the judge shall not only be satisfied that the plan complies with the provisions of subsection (b) as in the present statute, but must also be satisfied that it complies with the provisions of subsection (d), which the Supreme Court held was not within the province of judicial review. This will add nothing to the requirements of the present statute as to the hearing and the scope of the evidence; it will merely direct the courts to exercise the traditional right of review, and to give the parties and the public the benefit thereof.

Second, and as a means of insuring that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be guided by some standard in determining the permissible capitalization of the reorganized company, the bill provides that the existing total capitalization shall not be reduced below the lower of either the investment in the property or the physical valuation as previously determined by the Commission under section 19a. Naturally, if the existing capitalization exceeds the investment, it should be susceptible of reduction, if the Commission finds it is not supported by earning power; or, if the existing capitalization exceeds the physical valuation found by the Commission, it should be susceptible of reduction, unless in that event the Commission deems the earning power sufficient to support it. But where the existing capitalization represents actual investment in the property, or where it is not in excess of the value determined by the Commission under the mandate of law, then it should not be disturbed.

If the transportation system of the country is to be adequately financed, investment in railroad securities must be kept attractive for private investors. It is folly to expect investors to finance new railroads by purchasing stocks or junior securities which may be arbitrarily eliminated. Twenty-four years ago in Congress the question of railroad credit was discussed by Mr. Rayburn, of Texas, who, in advocating the enactment of section 20a of the Transportation Act of 1920, stated (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 66th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 58, pt. 8, p. 8376):

"Of course, the credit of the railroads has been destroyed. But if we write into the law of the land a statute to the effect that before a railroad can issue new securities, before it can put them on the market, it must come before the properly constituted governmental agency, lay the full facts of its financial situation before that body, tell that body what it intends to do with the money derived from the sale of the issue of securities, and after it has received the approval of that regulating body and it goes out and puts those securities on the market, then the Interstate Commerce Commission by this law is empowered at any time to call it to account and have it tell to that regulating body that it expended the money, the proceeds of the sale of securities, for the purposes for which it had made the application. Then we shall have railroad securities that will stand for value in the markets of this country and in the markets of all the world."

It is under this section 20a that the Commission has authorized the issue of some $20,000,000,000 of securities, plus some 20,000,000 shares of capital stock without par value (I. C. C. Activities, 1887–1937, p. 168). Section 20a of the act requires in every case that the Commission certify that the proposed issue of securities is compatible with the public interest. It is ironical that many of the securities which the Commission is now wiping out in reorganizations under its determinations of permissible capitalizations are securities which, directly or indirectly, have been approved by the Commission under section 20a. Many instances have been cited to us which it is not necessary to repeat here.

The important thing is that the Commission in determining total capitalization has no standard to guide it. It must make an estimate of future earning power. In the very nature of things, it cannot foresee with any degree of accuracy what the future earning power will be. As Commissioner Miller said in one case (242 I. C. C. 475), "We are not omniscient and cannot foresee the future."

Another reason why the Commission's estimates of earning power are unsatisfactory as a means of determining value is that the earning power of the carriers generally is within the control of the Commission. Under our scheme of regulation, it is the Commission's duty so to regulate the rate structure that there will be a fair return on the value (as determined under sec. 19a) of the property devoted to public use (act, sec. 15a). It is that provision which justifies an investor in investing his funds in railway capitalization. To say that because the Commission has failed, for whatever reason, to obtain this result, the investor should be destroyed, is certainly not due process of law and cannot conceivably benefit railway credit.

In order to carry out the policy, however, of having fixed interest charges reduced, the bill contains a proviso in section 1 (11) that, if the existing capitalization is in excess of the value of the debtor's property as certified by the Commission under subsection (e)—that is, of what the Commission terms "capitalizable value"—the excess shall be represented by no-par stock issued at the rate of one share for each $100 of such excess. The purpose of this is to afford to the existing stockholders and junior security holders a continued interest in the property. This no-par common stock will still represent actual investment in the property and will still represent a value which the Commission itself has determined under section 19a. It will in no sense be a speculative medium. In bad years, it will pay no dividends; in the good years it should reap the benefit of prosperity at least sufficient to compensate for what the investor has lost in the bad years. As the matter stands now, the investor has suffered through the bad years, and when prosperity has returned the procedure under section 77—originally designed as an act for the relief of debtors—has taken his investment and turned it over to his creditors.

In this connection, the bill contains an additional provision which may be quite helpful. It requires the Commission to name one of its members to confer with the parties in interest and to endeavor to act as a mediator to reconcile their differences. It is thought that this provision will avoid much controversy and consequently shorten the proceedings.

EFFECT ON PENDING REORGANIZATIONS

The bill is made to apply to all reorganization proceedings now pending, except where the property dealt with by the plan has been transferred to a new corporation or retained by the debtor pursuant to the plan, or where the plan has been voted on and accepted by the requisite percentage of creditors of each class prior to the effective date of this amendment.

It is not believed that the provisions of the bill will result in any delay in the pending cases. If it did so result, however, that would not be an objection to correcting a wrong. All of the facts in all of the pending cases are already of record. No long-drawn-out investigation in any case would be necessary to enable the court to pass judicially upon the Commission's determination of earning power. The standards by which the new capitalization is to be measured, that is, the actual investment and the 19a valuations, are readily accessible from the files of the Commission, and in most cases have been introduced into the records already before the courts. While the Commission's valuations under section 19a are by statute made only prima facie evidence (sec. 19a (1)), and may be contested in court when improperly made (*United States* v. *Los Angeles & Salt Lake R. R. Co.*, 273 U. S. 299) 19a valuations do not involve any conflict as to the facts, all of which are matters of record. The controversy would relate only to principles, or the evaluation of evidence.

We conclude, therefore, that the enactment of this portion of the bill would not tend to delay the progress of pending plans. Delay, however, would be preferable to confiscation.

The committee has held protracted hearings on H. R. 2857 for which the present bill is a substitute embodying amendments made as a result of those hearings, and has reached the conclusion that the consummation of the reorganization plans as now framed would be a severe blow to railroad credit and make it well-nigh impossible for any but the richest railroads to obtain new capital on attractive terms. Certainly the present prices of railroad stocks, which are discouragingly low in spite of very high earnings, indicate that no new financing can be done through the medium of common stock until something has been accomplished toward the restoration of railroad credit. Particularly is this true in the case of the reorganized railroads whose preferred and common stocks are being traded in on a when-issued basis at far below par, generally around 35 to 40 for new preferred stocks, and 15 to 20 for new common stocks. This in itself is a commentary on the public regard in which railroad stocks are held. Just emerging from reorganizations after years of careful consideration by the Commission and in a time of rare prosperity, the natural expectation would be that all of the new securities would bring par. As it is now, the only way for the reorganized roads to finance their necessary capital requirements, which we are advised will be heavy after the war, is to issue first-morageg bonds to provide funds, and this will lead back to the evils which section 77 was designed to prevent. The current prices of the new junior securities about to be issued under the Commission's plan indicate that future investment therein has been discouraged by what has happened to the present holders of existing issues. We believe this bill will go far toward curing this situation and, therefore, recommend its passage.

Freedom in America and the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address by Hon. Herbert Hoover before the Republican National Convention in Chicago on June 27, 1944, entitled "Freedom in America and the World":

Delegates and guests of the Republican Convention, we meet at a difficult time for a political convention. Millions of sons of both Republicans and Democrats are fighting and dying side by side for the freedom of mankind. But it is the part of freedom for which they fight that we should carry on at home. Nothing could be a greater shock to freedom than for us to suspend the national election or the soul-searching criticism which will make the more sure that the war will be won and freedom preserved.

Tonight I propose to speak to you upon some larger forces which are contending in this world convulsion. And the direction our country should take if freedom of men is to be preserved.

You will, I am sure, permit me to claim some personal experience with these larger forces which are today dominating mankind.

Like most of you, coming from forebears to whom hard work was the price of existence, I worked with my hands for my daily bread. I have tasted the despair of fruitless search for a job. I have seen the problems of labor both as a workman and as a manager of industry. Long before the First World War professional work took me to many lands under many governments, both of freemen and tyrannies. I dealt with the poverty and squalor of Asia and the frozen class barriers of Europe. I participated on behalf of my country in the First World War. I saw the untold destruction and misery from that war. I dealt with famine among millions. I dealt with violence and revolution. I saw the degeneration and regeneration of nations. I saw intimately the making of the peace treaty at Versailles.

And in all those years of travel to every corner of the earth I landed a hundred times on the shores of my country. Every time it was with deep emotion and gratitude. Emotion, because here was the sanctuary of real freedom. Here was a land of opportunity, a land of wider-spread comfort, a land of greater kindliness, a land of self-reliance and self-respect among men. And gratitude, because I had been born in this land.

During another 12 years I was placed by my countrymen where I had to contend with peace and war and where I had to deal with the hurricanes of social and economic destruction which were its aftermaths. I have had to deal with explosions of Asiatic antagonism to the west. I have seen the rising tide of totalitarianism sweeping over the world.

Why do I recite all of this? Because the experience that has come to me, the honors that have been given to me demand of me that I contribute whatever I can to preserve freedom in America and the world.

THE 170 YEARS OF STRUGGLE AND FREEDOM

Over long periods the deep-rooted forces in the world move slowly. Then from accumulated pressures have come explosive periods with wars, convulsions, violent change, and a train of stupendous problems. And always a part of the complex forces in these gigantic explosions has been the quest of man to be free.

The first of these gigantic explosions which was to shake the modern world began 170 years ago with the American War of Independence and the French Revolution. After those world wars there followed a hundred years of comparative peace in which the will to freedom spread widely over the earth.

Then came the gigantic explosion of the last World War. Again among the forces in that convulsion was the death clash of freemen and dictatorship.

Men inspired by freedom were victorious 25 years ago and freedom spread to additional millions of mankind. But victorious men failed to lay the foundation of lasting peace. And from the destruction of that World War came unemployment and poverty over the whole world. And in its wake also came instability of governments, lowering of morals, frustration of ideals and defeatism. Out of this desperate aftermath despotism rose again in the grim shapes of fascism and communism. By them the freedom of men was defeated over a large part of the earth.

Now we are in the midst of the greatest explosion in all the history of civilization. Again freemen are fighting for the survival of human liberty.

FREEDOM PERMITS NO COMPROMISE IN THIS WAR

By whatever failures of statesmanship the world were brought to this ghastly second world war, the realistic fact is that we are in it. There is only one way out of war—that is, to win it. And victory will come again to our armies and fleets for the sons of America do not quit. By winning the war I mean absolute victory over the enemy armies. Any compromise with Hitler or Tojo will destroy all hope of either freedom or a lasting peace. That is our pledge to these thousands of our men who are dying in the islands of the Pacific and upon the fields of Italy and France.

We are fighting not alone for preservation of freedom, but also for the moral and spiritual foundations of civilization. And it is not alone these foundations under other parts of the world which concerns us today. We have need to look to our American house.

OUR MEN WANT FREEDOM WHEN THEY COME HOME

Recently a canvass was made among youth, both in the armed forces and on the home front, to learn what sort of a world they wanted after this war. I may tell you:

They want a home with a family, a dog, and an automobile. They want the security and self-respect of a job. They want to be free to choose their own jobs and not to be ordered to them by a bureaucrat. They want to prove their own worth and have the rewards of their own efforts. They want to be free to plan their own lives. They want to be free to undertake their own adventures.

They want the pleasure of creative work. They want the joy of championing justice for the weak. They want to tell every evil person where he can go. They want a government that will keep down oppression whether from business or labor. They want a fair chance. They want peace in the world that their children never need go through the agonies and sacrifices they have themselves endured.

They want to be free Americans again. Unexpressed in all this there is deep in their souls a force that reaches back into a thousand generations. That is, the ceaseless yearning of humankind to be free. Its advance is as sure as the movement of the stars in the universe. It is as real as the law of gravitation. It is as everlastihg as the existence of God.

DEGENERATION OF FREEDOM IN THE UNITED STATES

At each of the great rallies of our party in 1936, in 1940, and today in 1944, I have been called to speak upon the encroachments and the dangers to freedom in our country. Each time I knew even before I spoke that our people would not believe that the impairment of freedom could happen here. Yet each subsequent 4 years has shown those warnings to have been too reserved, too cautious.

The reason why these warnings have been accurate is simple. From the beginning the New Deal in a milder form has followed the tactics of European revolutions which have gone before. The direction being set, the destination is not difficult to foresee.

The violent forms of these European revolutions all have certain methods in common. They seek to destroy every safeguard of personal liberty and justice. Their method was to create centralized government and a single political party. Purge was their political weapon. Their economic system is regimentation through coercion by bureaucracy. Their faith is the negation of Christianity—that the end justifies the means. Their strategy is to make public opinion by falsehood and to destroy opposition by assassination of character through smearing.

Now I ask you a question. Do you recognize any similarity between these practices and the 10 years of the New Deal?

Has not every distress, every sorrow, every fear of the people been used to further fasten some part of these totalitarian practices upon us?

With the blessing of the Attorney General, the Communists, and the fellow travelers are spending vast sums to reelect this regime. Would they spend their money to support the freedom of men?

We all recognize that to win this war many liberties must temporarily be suspended at home. We have had to accept much dictatorship of bureaucracy. We must adopt some of the very practices against which we are fighting. In former wars we had no fear of such temporary suspension of liberty. Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson believed in freedom of men.

Long before the war, in an address on January 3, 1936, Mr. Roosevelt recounted how he had built up new instruments of public power which could provide shackles for the liberties of the people in any other hands. Freedom is not promoted by shackles in anybody's hands.

We now know the peacetime shackles they provided for the liberties of the people. They put shackles on our farmers. They put them on honest labor unions, on the freedom of workmen, on honest business enterprise. They have done more. These bureaucrats with these instruments of power fanned bitter hatreds between labor unions which divided the ranks of labor. And they fanned hate between employers and workmen. They built class conflict instead of national unity.

Can a regime which forged shackles on the liberties of the people in peacetime be trusted to return freedom to the people from the shackles of war?

Our present rulers have now issued an abridged edition of the Bill of Rights and the other constitutional guaranties of the citizens from oppression by government. They call the new version the "four freedoms." The original edition, issued and perfected by the fathers, contains 30 freedoms, not 4 only. True freedom abides in the whole 30. They have enriched the soil and the soul of this land for 170 years. Not 1 or 4 but all of them together have brought the greatest advance in civilization in the history of mankind. In this time of crisis to freedom should we amend or abandon any of them?

The Constitution of the United States is a philosophy of government. It is not suspended even by war. But apparently some of these guaranties in our Constitution have not yet been approved by the O. P. A., the W. L. B., the N. L. R. B., the F. E. C., the F. C. C., and some other parts of the alphabet.

If you happen to get into the clutches of these agencies, you will find a lot of the spirit of even the Magna Carta has been forgotten, to say nothing of the Constitution. As an exercise in history you might read again some of those rights, such as trial by jury; the right of appeal to the courts; just compensation for property taken for public use; the provisions against search and seizure; taking of property without due process of law; and others.

These 30 freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution will survive only so long as their safeguards also survive. I need not remind you of the steady invasion of States' rights; the packing of the courts; the dictation to Congress; the constant proof that executive officials arrogate unlawful authority.

Only by a change in administration will our returning soldiers find freedom preserved at home.

REGENERATION OF FREEDOM IN THE UNITED STATES

The price of freedom is not only vigilance as to rights and their safeguards. It also requires vision and action to keep freedom in step with social and economic change that would restrict it.

There is little real freedom for citizens, who, because of forces beyond their control, must go hungry, cold, sick, or ignorant. From the very beginning the faith of America has been that we were our brother's keeper. In earlier time that responsibility was attended to by neighbors, by counties, by municipalities. Many years ago the State governments began to assume a larger part in these responsibilities. In recent years the Federal Government has assumed a part of the burden in education, public health, and by various experiments in old-age pensions and unemployment insurance. But if all these services are to bear the full fruit in freedom, they must be cleared of politics and discrimination. They must be placed upon expanded and firmer foundations.

For the past 70 years the American people have had to engage in battle for freedom on our own economic front. The fertile soil of freedom has grown gigantic business and labor organizations which have immensely increased our comfort and our standards of living.

The vast majority of both business and labor leaders are honest and patriotic. We cannot, however, permit even a small minority of arrogant and irresponsible business leaders to dominate the freedom of men through monopolies, unfair treatment of labor, and manipulation of elections. Neither can we have even a small minority of arrogant and irresponsible labor leaders dominating the freedom of men, dictating who can have jobs and manipulating elections. The truly American concept is that we shall maintain freedom from such abuses by a government of law instead of by the whimsicalities of men or the regimentation of men. We do not need to burn down the house of freedom with the fires of totalitarianism to destroy a few rats.

An imperative problem in freedom is rising before us in the transition from war economy to peace economy. We must convert huge plants and find peacetime jobs in industry for 30,000,000 men and women.

We must begin now to make the blueprints of this transition. But before the blueprints

can even be commenced, the major question for America must be determined. That is, in what economic and social climate, under what sort of conditions is this transition to be made? Already the new dealers have planned a large number of Trojan Horses labeled "liberalism" and "freedom" stuffed with a mixture of totalitarian economics and with doubtful statistics. The easiest task of government is to suppress individuals, subject them to bureaucracy, and subsidize them to lean on governments—or a political party. If a government has enough power, it can always do that. The hard task of government, and the really liberal task, is to build self-reliance, stimulate initiative, and thereby create men and women of energy, of dignity, and of independence. That is the motive power of America.

We will need every atom of this power in the Nation, if we are quickly to convert from guns to plowshares in such fashion as to provide jobs and opportunity for all our people. That can never be had by bureaucratic curbing of initiative, class war, or any other mixture of this totalitarianism with freedom. The decision between these philosophies of government must be made now. For the plans must be established now. We cannot be without a peace program as we were without a preparedness program. We owe it to our fighting men that they find no delays in productive jobs.

Only by a change in administration will these gigantic problems be solved in a climate of freedom.

A WORLD IN WHICH FREEDOM CAN LIVE

We are faced already with the gigantic problems of making a peace where freedom can live. The world cannot go on like this. Science daily creates more dreadful weapons. Chivalry and compassion have gone out of modern war. Women and children are slaughtered and starved with the same ruthlessness as armed men. We cannot fail again in making peace that sticks if civilization is to survive.

Already during this war we are making the mold in which the new world will be cast. Some of these shapes are already beginning to emerge.

1. It is obvious that the hot fires of nationalism are rising out of the emotions of this war just as they do from every war. The Communist internationalism of Russia has been driven out by the nationalist aspiration to free Mother Russia and expand the Empire. Other United Nations are demanding the independent resumption of their possessions. Mr. Churchill has stated that he did not become His Majesty's Prime Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. I am sure that if the Republican Party comes to power it will not be to liquidate either the economic welfare or the independence of the United States.

2. It is obvious from the rise of nationalism that ideas of world super-government, no matter how idealistic, are already dead from these cold blasts of realism. Peace must be based upon cooperation between independent sovereign nations.

3. It is obvious that three great dominant centers of power will emerge from this war—that is, the United States, Great Britain, Russia and possibly China as a fourth. And France will someday return as a major power.

4. It is obvious that there must be some sort of world organization to preserve peace. It is proposed that, like the League of Nations, it shall have a general assembly representing all peaceful nations and a council in which the great centers of power have a permanent part. If the general assembly is not to be a mere debating society, it should be split into three divisions—one for Europe, one for Asia and one for the Western Hemisphere. And each region should be given the primary responsibility for peace in its area before the central council is called upon. Especially should that responsibility be imposed on Europe where the dangers of world wars come from.

5. It is obvious that there must be a long transition period from war to stable peace. Before any organization to preserve peace can succeed, the foundations of political and economic reconstruction of the world must be laid in such a manner as to allay the causes of war. Unless these foundations are securely laid, any temple dedicated to preserving peace will be built upon sand. That was the disaster of the League of Nations. A good league has never cured a bad peace.

6. It is obvious that the great centers of power in Washington, London, and Moscow will dominate these vital political and economic settlements no matter what peace-preserving machinery is set up. Their approach to these settlements must be that of trustees for all nations not their selfish interests. They must not become a disguised military alliance or become the scene for power politics or balance of power. The whole history of the world is punctuated by the collapse of such methods into renewed wars.

7. It should be obvious that there can be no lasting peace unless the productivity of the world be restored. That can come only by exertion from within nations and from political settlements which give them a chance. The United States must furnish food to thousands of starving towns and cities ravaged by the enemy. We should have long since been feeding the undernourished children for compassion is not dead in America. The United States can be helpful to all mankind, but it is certain we cannot finance a world W. P. A.

8. It is obvious the American people have but one purpose in this war. We want to live in peace. We do not want these horrors again. We want no territory except some Pacific island bases that will protect the United States. We want no domination over any nation. We want no indemnities. We want no special privileges.

But we do want the freedom of nations from the domination of others, call it by whatever name we will—liberation of peoples, self-government, or just restored sovereignty. We want it both in the cause of freedom and we want it because we know that there can be no lasting peace if enslaved peoples must ceaselessly strive and fight for freedom.

There are constants in the relations between nations that are more nearly to be found in their history, their surroundings, their ideals, their hearts, than in the declarations of their officials. Foreign relations are not sudden things created by books or speeches or banquets. The history of nations is more important than their oratory.

The ideal of freedom for other peoples lies deep in American history and the American heart. It did not arise from Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points nor from the Atlantic Charter. It was embedded in the hearts of the American people by the suffering and sacrifice with which they won their own independence. It was in response to the cry for liberation and freedom of peoples that we established the Monroe Doctrine, that we fought the Mexican War, the Spanish War, and the First World War. And now, after 20 years, we again sacrifice the sons of America to the call of freedom.

Without this spiritual impulse of freedom for others we would not have engaged in a single one of these wars. Had we not been concerned with the freedom of China, we would not have been attacked at Pearl Harbor. Only because freedom was in jeopardy in all Europe are we making this gigantic effort.

Therefore, the American people are not likely to welcome any settlements which do not include the independence of Poland as well as every other country which desires to be free from alien domination. Americans do not want this war to end in the restriction of freedom among nations. It is obvious that the United States will emerge from this war the strongest military, and thus political, power in the world. Our power to bring freedom to the world must not be frittered away.

SOME ROADS THAT DO NOT LEAD TO FREEDOM

During the past month Forrest Davis has published a circumstantial account of the Teheran Conference. It is said to have been authorized. It has not been denied. It relates to President Roosevelt's new peace method, called by him, "The Great Design." A peace method under this same name, "The Great Design," was proposed by Henry the Fourth, a French monarch, some 350 years ago. It had some similarities to Mr. Roosevelt's idea.

We are told Mr. Roosevelt had this "Great Design" in mind during his recent conference at Teheran.

So far as these published descriptions go this method is power politics and balance of power diplomacy. That is not the diplomacy of freedom. And worse still apparently the United States is to furnish the balance between Britain and Russia. If that be the case you may be sure that we will sooner or later gain the enmity of both of them. The basis of lasting peace for America must be friendship of nations not brokerage of power politics.

There may have been no political commitments at Teheran. But certainly since that conference we have seen a series of independent actions by Russia which seem to be the negative of restored sovereignty to certain peoples. Certainly the Atlantic Charter has been sent to the hospital for major amputations of freedom among nations. The American people deserve a much fuller exposition of this great design.

And the Teheran Conference raises another question. Under our form of government the President cannot speak either for the Congress or the conclusions of American public opinion. The only way for America to succeed in foreign relations is by open declaration of policies. They must first have seasoned consideration and public understanding. These do not come by secret diplomacy. America cannot successfully bluff, intrigue, or play the sordid game of power politics.

Nothing contributed more to the tragedy of Versailles than the suspicion and misunderstandings which arose when the heads of states sought to persuade and beguile each other in secret. Such unchecked bartering results in implications, deductions, and appeasements will rise to plague us.

Direct conferences by heads of state and their military leaders on military questions are useful. But under our institutions and our public opinion negotiation in political matters with our allies should be conducted by secretaries of state. The President of the United States is far more influential delivering considered judgments from the White House. The voice from that pulpit is far more potent than any beguilement in private conversation in some foreign city, or any personal power diplomacy.

President Wilson also had a "great design" most of which was lost by the blandishments and pressures of personal negotiation. Every thinking American views with great apprehension a repetition of 1919. America needs a change in administration to get out of personal power diplomacy.

FREEDOM, THE JOB OF YOUTH

There is a force for freedom as old as life itself which will emerge with new vividness from the complexities of the times. Not only life but freedom itself must find regeneration from youth.

In every generation youth presses forward toward achievement. Each generation has the right to build its own world out of the materials of the past, cemented by the hopes of the future.

Older men declare war. But it is youth that must fight and die. And it is youth who must inherit the tribulation, the sorrow, and the triumphs that are the aftermath of war.

This convention is handing the leadership of the Republican Party to a new generation. And soon to support these younger men there will be an oncoming generation who will differ from all others. Twelve million young men matured far beyond their years under the supreme tests of war will be coming home. To them will be added the other millions of young men and women serving in the shops, on the farms, and in the offices. They also, by the responsibilities they have shared, have had their minds and understanding advanced beyond their age. From the tremendous experience in this war this new generation will have grown in responsibility, in dignity, in initiative, and skills.

And these young men who are offering their lives on the beaches and in the mud, those who are fighting in the air, those who battle on the seas, will return to demand justification for their sacrifices and for the sacrifice of their buddies who have died. They will insist upon a reckoning and they will be stern and hard-faced. They will reject the easy language of politics, the straddlings and compromises, and the senseless phrases of skilled ghost writers. And they will be watchful of political leaders lest they again be led into the giving of the blood and risking the future of their families from failures in international statesmanship. Today, more than any new generation that we have known, youth will demand a voice in its own destiny.

I rejoice that this is to be. Youth can bring the courage, the ideals, and confidence which can erect a new society in America upon the debris of two world wars. We need their courage as never before.

We, the older generation, who have learned something of the great forces in the world, can advise and counsel. The issues are not new, and we can distill principles from the experience of the past. But youth must act and the past can never wholly point the way through the changing future.

And let me say this to the many younger Republicans in this convention. On each election night, I read of able young Republican men and women who are chosen by their countrymen to positions of trust and eminence. I see men whom I have known since they cut their eye teeth in district politics, rise to State and city government, to the Congress, and to the governorship in their State. From that I know that our party is a living institution recruiting from the oncoming generation its brilliant men and women and setting them to work for the good of our country. And it is through this living institution, the Republican Party, that I call upon the younger generations to take up the weapons for American liberty, to fight the good fight in the manner and according to the lights of their own time.

And may I say this to youth: You have a great material heritage. You are receiving millions of farms and homes built by your forebears. There have been prepared for you magnificent cities, great shops, and industries. But you have even a greater heritage. That is a heritage of religious faith of morals and of liberty. There is no problem which confronts the Nation that you cannot solve within this framework.

You in your own manner can lead our people away from the jungle of disorderly, cynical, and bitter ideas, the topsy-turvy confusions, the hopelessness and lack of faith and defeatism that have haunted this Nation over these dozen years. You can lead our Nation back to unity of purpose again.

We of the older generation know that you will carry forward. We wish you to carry the torch bravely and aloft. Carry it with the dauntless assurance of your forebears who faced the chill of the ocean, the dangers of the forest and desert,. the loneliness of the pioneer to build upon this continent a nation dedicated to justice and liberty and the dignity of the individual man. Watch over it. Vigilantly guard it. Protect it from foes, within and without. Make for this a sanctuary and dedicate it to God and all mankind.

Youth of the Republican Party, I, representing the generation of your fathers, greet you and send you forth crusaders for freedom which alone can come under a constitutional republic—a constitutional America.

We who have lived long, turn our eyes upon your generation lovingly with hope, with prayer, and with confidence for our country.

Absentee Voting by Members of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, during the past year the Congress of the United States and the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut have enacted laws providing an opportunity for citizens of Connecticut now serving in our armed forces to cast an absentee ballot in any local, State, or national election.

The Connecticut General Assembly, it seems to me, met its responsibility by passing one of the most comprehensive and liberal absentee ballot laws in the country. The Federal law, however, is more restrictive and cumbersome than seemed to me to be necessary.

During the debate on the servicemen's absentee voting bill I supported the Green-Lucas-Worley bill because that proposal was more simple and direct than the bill finally approved by Congress. I would have liked to see every State make the necessary arrangements to send an absentee ballot to every service man and woman from each respective State. Congress could then have provided for the transportation, via air mail, to and from every camp and battlefront with the State ballot. We could then have provided that whenever a soldier or sailor failed to receive the ballot from his home town he could have then voted the so-called Federal or short-form ballot without any red tape, and without the necessity of swearing that before a certain date that he applied for a State ballot and that by another certain date it had not reached him. The Federal ballot provides only for the election of a President, Vice President, Members of the Senate, and Members of the House of Representatives. That debate is now water over the dam and the immediate task before us is to see that every man and woman serving in the Army, Navy, merchant marine, or the various Army and Navy auxiliaries that I will refer to later have a chance to vote this fall. For the convenience of Connecticut service men and women I submit the following information:

VOTING PROCEDURE UNDER CONNECTICUT LAW

Under the law approved by a special session of the Connecticut General Assembly held in January 1944, members of the armed forces, which include members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or merchant marine, or those serving in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or the United Service Organization attached to and serving with the armed forces:

Members of the above-named organization do not need to be absent from the State in order to vote by absentee ballot but merely be away from their home town. They may apply in person for such a ballot, they may apply through an authorized agent, or by mail. The record shows the voters in every town are authorized under the law to make application on behalf of the serviceman and cause an absentee ballot to be sent to him. Anyone, friend or relative, may make such a request of the registrar of voters who will in turn make application to the town clerk and the ballot will be sent forthwith. This ballot may be sent to the service address or if it is lacking to the best known address in the possession of the registrar, which will probably be his home address and then forwarded. These ballots will be sent 4 months prior to the election which will give ample time for the ballot to be executed and returned to the town clerk. Accompanying the ballot will be complete instructions together with a list of all nominations made by August 15. The ballot provides for the voting of a straight Republican or Democratic ticket, a split ticket, or a complete slate of the names of the voter's own choosing. After the serviceman has made out his ballot, sealed it in an envelope provided for the purpose, appeared before a commissioned officer, and executes the affidavit printed on the envelope, the procedure for obtaining a ballot is simple. The ballot itself is cleared, and there is a minimum of red tape involved as far as the serviceman is concerned.

Another law passed by the general assembly of Connecticut, provides for the making of motors in the field. Any person may ask the town clerk in his town to send the proper forms to any serviceman who is 21 years of age and not a voter or will become 21 years of age on or before election day. The serviceman then fills in these forms, swears to the truth of the statement therein before a commissioned officer, and returns them to the town clerk. Should the serviceman be home on a furlough, he may appear before his town clerk and fill out these forms. This application is then presented to the board of admission of electors at their next meeting or at a special meeting called for the purpose and the qualifications passed upon,

When the application is either accepted or rejected notice of the action is then sent to the serviceman. Any such application sent to a serviceman after July 7 should be accompanied by a ballot. This is done to save time. If the application is accepted and the serviceman's name placed on the voter's list the ballot will be a valid one. If the application is rejected for any reason, the ballot is merely not used and kept in the possession of the town clerk until disposed of at a later date.

Under Connecticut's servicemen's ballot, the serviceman can vote for every office from President right down to the smallest office in his town. Under a Federal ballot he is allowed to vote only for President, Vice President, Senator, and Congressman. Should the serviceman vote both ballots only, the State ballot or complete ballot will be counted, the other simply being set aside.

ABSENTEE VOTING BY SERVICEMEN UNDER THE FEDERAL ACT

Connecticut men and women serving outside of the United States with the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or merchant marine, or in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or the United Service Organizations attached to and serving with the armed forces may vote the Federal ballot, providing they can state under oath that prior to September 1 he applied for a Connecticut ballot but as of October 1 had not received it.

It is the responsibility of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to see that these Federal ballots are made available to every person entitled to use them. Federal ballots may not be used by servicemen stationed in the United States.

Post-card applications for ballots, ballots, and envelopes shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

From the above explanation it will be apparent that it would have been much better to have allowed a serviceman to vote the short Federal ballot if he was satisfied with that ballot without requiring him to apply first for a State ballot.

It is my sincere hope that every Connecticut resident who has a friend or relative serving with the armed forces will take upon themselves the responsibility of making sure that the proper local official sends out an absentee ballot.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it was the most harmonious National Convention in a hundred years, yet 400 policemen were distributed about the scene.

Lincoln's picture was the only one in the giant stadium, well decorated all about.

The Philippine standard was supporting a wreath—never before in our history was there such a spectacle.

JOE MARTIN was a little bigger than his gavel, and he presided with the least ostentation.

It was Hoover's bad luck to draw only one mike when all the others had three.

The reconversion of the Hotel Stevens back to normal, after occupation by the Air Corps, was effective and complete.

During the waiting on the resolutions, Tuesday, no one was allowed to speak, though there were scores present who could have held the attention.

The platforms will both be forgotten. Parties do not run on them anymore. It is the men who sound, not the printed word.

The delegates told the leaders what they wanted. It was not handed down.

A country cousin of a House Member, sitting in his Congressman's seat, yelled down six Senators, standing at one time in front of him.

Griswold's speech from the point of oratory was B flat. No speech could have defeated Dewey.

The hour Dewey spoke the temperature dropped to decency for the first time in 3 days. We need more normalcy.

D-Day: June 6, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it is a misnomer to call our invasion for the liberation of conquerd France the opening of "the second front," but, whether second or seventh, it was fraught with so much hope and doom that its number had lost significance.

We all prayed, and had been praying, but Edna St. Vincent Millay, through her genius, the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., and the vocal cords of Ronald Colman, gave us on this D-day, June 6, 1944, the Poem and Prayer for an Invading Army, worthy of the occasion. With pen dipped in the stream of time, saturated with the sentiment of the momentous history being written in its hours, on that day she wrote this splendid contribution to American thought.

With the kind permisison of the author, it is a real joy to incorporate it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

They must not go alone
Into that burning building!—which today
Is all of Europe!

Say that you go with them, spirit and heart and mind!
Although the body, grown
Too old to fight a young man's war; or wounded
Too deeply under the healed and whitened scars
Of earlier battles, must remain behind.

You, too, may not be with them, save in spirit, you
So greatly needed here, here in the very van
And front of duty,
To fashion tools and engines, and to engineer
Their transport; build the ships and mine the coal
Without which all their efforts would be worse than vain!

You men and women working in the workshops, working on the farms;
Makers of tanks and of tractors, fitters of wings
To metal birds which have not left the nest
As yet, which yet must try their flight;
Sowers of seed in season, planters of little plants
At intervals, on acres newly plowed
And disked and harrowed,
To feed a starving world;

You workers in the shipyards, building ships
Which crowd each other down the ways;
You miners of coal in dark and dangerous corridors,
Who see the sun's total eclipse
Each morning, disappearing as you do under the earth's rim,
Not to emerge into the daylight till the day's
Over, and the light dim;

All you without whose constant effort and whose skill—
Without whose loyal and unfailing aid—
Our men would stand
Stranded upon a foreign and a hostile shore
Without so much as a stout stick to beat away
Death or Pain:
Bullets like angry hornets buzzing 'round the ears and the bewildered brain,
And from the sky again and yet again
The downpour of the heavy, evil, accurate, murderous rain;

You who have stood behind them to this hour,
Move strong behind them now: let still
The weary bones encase the indefatigable will.
But how can men draw near
So fierce a conflagration?—even here,
Across a gray and cold and foggy sea
Its heat is felt!—Why,
Touch your cheek—is it not hot and tight and dry?
And look what light climbs up the eastern sky, and sinks
And climbs again!

Like to the bright Aurora of the North
It floods and flushes, pulses, pales—then glows,
Lighting the entire East majestically;
As if it were the sun that rose.
I wish it were!
Have patience, friend; it yet may be.
Surely our fiber and our sinews, the backbone
And brain of us, are made of some less common stuff
Than clay?—Surely the blood which warms the veins
Of heroes at the front, our brothers and our sons,
Runs also in our own!

And are we not then capable perhaps of something more courageous than we yet have shown?
Surely some talisman, some token of
Our lofty pride in them, our heavy gratitude,
And so much, so much love,
Will find its way to them!
Some messenger, the vicar and the angel
Of what we feel,
Will fly before them where they fly, before them and above,
Like patron goddesses in wars of old,
Cleaving with level lovely brows the hard air
Before the eager prows,
Lighting their way with incandescent wings and winged heel.

This is the hour, this the appointed time.
The sound of the clock falls awful on our ears,
And the sound of the bells, their metal clang
and chime,
Tolling, tolling,
For those about to die.
For we know well they will not all come home,
to lie
In summer on the beaches.

And yet weep not, you mothers of young
men, their wives,
Their sweethearts, all who love them well—
Fear not the tolling of the solemn bell:
It does not prophesy, and it cannot foretell;
It only can record;
And it records today the passing of a most
uncivil age,
Which had its elegance, but lived too well,
And far, oh, far too long;
And which, on history's page,
Will be found guilty of injustice and grave
wrong.

* * * * *

O Thou, Thou Prince of Peace, this is a prayer
for war!
Yet not a war of man against his fellowman.
Say, rather, Lord, we do beseech
Thy guidance and Thy help:
In exorcising from the minds of Man, where
she has made her nest.
A hideous and most fertile beast—
And this to bring about with all dispatch,
for look, where even now
She would lie down again to whelp!

Lord God of Hosts! Thou Lord of Hosts not
only, not alone
Of battling armies Lord and King;
But of the child-like heart as well, which
longs
To put away—oh, not the childish, but the
adult
Circuitous and adroit, antique and violent
thing called war;
And sing the beauties of this late-to-come
by oh-so-lovely Spring!
For see where our young men go forth in
mighty numbers, to set free from tor-
ture and from every jeopardy
Things that are dear to Thee.

Keep in Thy loving care, we pray, those of
our fighting men
Whose happy fortune it may be to come back
home again
After the war is over; and all those who must
perforce remain,
The mourned, the valiant slain.
This we beseech Thee, Lord. And, now
before
We rise from kneeling, one thing more:
Soften our hard and angry hearts; make us
ashamed
Of doing what we do, beneath Thy very eyes,
knowing it does displease Thee.
Make us more humble, Lord, for we are
proud

Without sufficient reason; let our necks be
bowed
More often to Thy will;
For well we know what deeds find favor in
Thy sight; and still
We do not do them.
Oh, Lord, all through the night, all through
the day,
Keep watch over our brave and dear, so far
away.
Make us more worthy of their valor;
And Thy love.

"Let them come home! Oh, let the battle,
Lord, be brief,
And let our boys come home!"
So cries the heart, sick for relief
From its anxiety, and seeking to forestall
A greater grief.

So cries the heart aloud. But the thoughtful
mind
Has something of its own to say:
"On that day—
When they come home—from very far away—
And further than you think—
(For each of them has stood upon the very
brink
Or sat and waited in the anteroom
Of death, expecting every moment to be
called by name).

Now look you to this matter well; that they
Upon returning shall not find
Seated at their own tables—at the head,
Perhaps, of the long festive board prinked
out in prodigal array,
The very monster which they sallied forth to
conquer and to quell;
And left behind for dead."

Let us forget such words, and all they mean,
As hatred, bitterness and rancor, greed,
Intolerance, bigotry; let us renew
Our faith and pledge to man, his right to be
Himself and free.

Say that the victory is ours—then say—
And each man search his heart in true
humility—
"Lord! Father! Who are we,
That we should wield so great a weapon for
the rights
And rehabilitation of Thy creature man?
Lo, from all corners of the earth we ask
All great and noble to come forth—converge
Upon this errand and this task with generous
and gigantic plan:
Hold high this torch, who will.
Lift up this sword, who can!"

Important Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, recently I have received several requests for information about the benefits made available to men and women now serving in our armed forces in the G. I. bill.

For the convenience of those interested, I have prepared a brief summary of not only the G. I. bill but also of other veterans' legislation passed by the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Every one of these measures have had my wholehearted support. I took a very active part in protecting the G. I. bill when it was under consideration in the House.

Experience may indicate some needed changes but in its present form it seems to me that this law will guarantee a well-rounded rehabilitation program for the veterans of World War No. 2.

The provisions of Public Law No. 144, approved July 13, 1943, providing rates of pension for widows, children, and dependent parents of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans based upon death in service or service-connected deaths are frankly inadequate, it seems to me. The widow of a man killed in service or whose death is due to his war service should receive not less than $80 per month. The American taxpayer will gladly contribute toward a generous pension to such widows and orphans. I intend to do everything in my power to see that this comparatively small group are more adequately provided for by the next Congress.

The highlights of veterans' legislation enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress follows:

1. MUSTERING-OUT PAY

The Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, approved February 3, 1944, Public Law No. 225, Seventy-eighth Congress, provides, under certain conditions and limitation, mustering-out payment of $300 for persons who, having performed active service for 60 days or more, have served outside the continental limits of the United States or Alaska; $200 for persons who, having performed active service for 60 days or more, have served no part thereof outside the continental limits of the United States or Alaska; and $100 for persons who have performed active service for less than 60 days.

2. SEEING-EYE DOGS FOR THE BLIND

The act of May 24, 1944, authorized the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide seeing-eye dogs trained for the aid of blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and to provide such veterans with mechanical and electronic equipment for aiding them to overcome their handicap of blindness.

3. SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION INCREASE

The act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, increased by 15 percent the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities; increased the rates for widows and children under Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, which provides compensation to the widow and children where any World War No. 1 veteran dies of non-service-connected cause, but at time of death had a service-connected disability; and included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the said Public Law No. 484, as amended.

4. SPANISH-AMERICAN AND WORLD WAR NO. 1 PENSION INCREASE

Non-service-connected disability: Under Public Law No. 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the rate of pension for permanent and total non-service-connected disability, applicable to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion, the Philippine Insurrection, and World War No. 1, was increased from $40 to $50 per month, with an increase to $60 per month where such veterans have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or reach the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. This act also provides that the above pension for non-service-connected disability shall apply to veterans of both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

5. SERVICE-CONNECTED WIDOWS' PENSION INCREASE

Service-connected death: The rates of compensation or pension for widows,

children, and dependent parents of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans based upon death in service, or service-connected death, are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100)	38
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

The above rates are contained in Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943, and constitute a material liberalization of the prior rates.

6. NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED WIDOWS' PENSION INCREASE

Non-service-connected death: The widow, child, or children of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 are entitled to the following rates of compensation if the veteran at the time of death from a non-service-connected cause had a disability incurred in or aggravated by such war service:

Widow but no child	$35
Widow with 1 child (with $5 for each additional child)	45
No widow but 1 child	18
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	27
No widow but 3 children (equally divided)	36

With $4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

Payments are limited to an aggregate of $64 in any one case.

Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, act of May 27, 1944, increased the rates to the above amounts and also included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans, the law previously having applied only to World War No. 1 veterans.

7. VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved by the President March 24, 1943, provides first that any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war; second, and who was honorably discharged; third, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay; fourth, who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement.

While the disabled veteran is in training his pension, unless it equals or exceeds such amounts, will be increased to $80 per month, if single; $90 per month, if married, with $5 additional for each child, and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required.

8. SPANISH AMERICAN SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION INCREASE

The act of March 1, 1944, Public Law No. 242, Seventy eighth Congress, increased the service pension rate for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, based upon total disability or age 65, from $60 to $75 per month; liberalized the delimiting marriage date governing eligibility of widows of deceased veterans of that group for service-pension purposes by changing the delimiting marriage date from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938; and provided for increased pension to widows of this group by granting $40 per month to a widow when the age of 65 years is attained or $50 per month if the widow or former widow was the wife of the veteran during the period of his service in the war.

9. NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSIONS

The act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, increased the pension payable for non-service-connected disability of permanent and total degree applicable to veterans of World War No. 1 and the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, from $40 to $50 per month, and increased the rate to $60 per month where such veteran shall have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or reached the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. The act also made the benefits above described available to World War No. 2 veterans.

10. THE G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

Generally speaking, to be eligible for the benefits provided, the person must have served in the armed forces for a period of at least 90 days unless sooner discharged for a disability incurred in service in line of duty, and such service must have been during the period beginning September 16, 1940, and ending with the termination of the war. While benefits are provided immediately for those who have been discharged or released from the service under prescribed conditions, the general scheme of the legislation contemplates the affording of readjustment benefits, particularly during the more difficult post-war period. General provision is therefore afforded that the benefits may be claimed and secured within 2 years after discharge or release from the active service or the end of the war, whichever be the later, with an over-all limitation which will permit the serving of one enlistment after the end of the war, and yet permit the person so serving to receive the maximum benefit extended within the prescribed period subsequent to his later discharge.

Subject to the above, the following direct and indirect benefits for veterans of World War No. 2 and certain benefits of similar nature to veterans of prior wars are afforded:

TITLE I. HOSPITALIZATION, CLAIMS, AND PROCEDURES

First. Adequate organization of the Veterans' Administration to administer all veterans' benefits except employment.

Second. Adequate hospital facilities for the care and treatment of veterans for nonservice disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

Third. The right to have explained to him before discharge or release from active service all rights and benefits to which he may be entitled as a veteran and an opportunity, if he so desires, to file a claim therefor.

Fourth. The right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

Fifth. Adequate safeguards as against forced statements against interest.

Sixth. Adequate contact facilities in Army and Navy discharge centers, including those furnished by the services, by the American Red Cross, by national veterans' organizations, and by the Veterans' Administration.

Seventh. Prompt transfer of the essential records of service departments to the Veterans' Administration and prompt adjudication of claims for benefits.

Eighth. The right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service, (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (b) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (c) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

TITLE II. EDUCATION OF VETERANS

First. One year, or the equivalent thereof in continuous part-time study, of education or training (a) at any school or institution of his own choice; (b) in any subject or subjects desired for which he is fitted.

Second. Not to exceed 3 additional years of education and training dependent upon (a) length of service; (b) satisfactory progress in studies or training; (c) the condition that the person was not over 25 years of age at the time of entrance into service, or if over such age, that his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of entrance into service.

Third. Payment of all tuition and other fees, cost of books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses not

to exceed a maximum of $500 per school year.

Fourth. Subsistence allowance while pursuing education or training in the amount of $50 per month if without dependents, or $75 per month with a dependent or dependents.

Fifth. Part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance, but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

Sixth. The right to have released to him books and equipment furnished if he satisfactorily completes his course of education or training.

The right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities is extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

TITLE III. LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

First. Loans for the purposes stated or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000; (a) loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions; (b) the proceeds of the proposed loan must be used for one or more of the purposes specified and the circumstances must meet the specifications prescribed; (c) interest rate must not exceed 4 percent per annum; (d) the loan must be practicable and suitable to the veterans' circumstances; (e) the loan must be repaid within 20 years; (f) the Government must have the right of subrogation to the extent of any guaranty paid; (g) the liability under the guaranty must decrease or increase with the decrease or increase of the amount of unpaid obligation; (h) the agreement must permit the Government to protect itself in case of default through the right to bid on foreclosure proceedings or to refinance.

Second. In the event a principal loan is made or guaranteed or insured by a Federal agency, a loan for all or part of the balance of the purchase price or cost may be guaranteed (a) if it does not exceed $2,000; (b) if it does not exceed 20 percent of the cost or purchase price; (c) if the interest rate does not exceed by more than 1 percent the interest rate on the principal loan; (d) if the conditions otherwise meet those prescribed under (1) above.

Third. Any veteran eligible under title III shall also be eligible for the benefits of the Bankhead-Jones Farm-Tenant Act, as amended, to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant. Eligibility must be determined (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; (b) by the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE IV. EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

First. The right to registration for employment with, and for placement in employment by, the Veterans' Employment Service through (a) the United States Employment Service, (b) any State employment agency cooperating with the United States Employment Service.

Note (a): This right applies to any veteran of any war discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

Note (b): While the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is made responsible for veterans' employment, this is not a function of the Veterans' Administration, but is retained in the United States Employment Service.

TITLE V. READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

1. Unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed, subject to the following conditions:

First. The week of unemployment must have begun (a) after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the effective date of the act; (b) not later than 2 years after discharge or release from active service or the termination of the war, whichever be the later date.

Second. The person is not receiving subsistence allowance for education or training under title II of the act, or increased pension for vocational training under Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Third. To be eligible, the person must (a) reside in the United States; (b) be completely unemployed—or if partially employed, at wages less than $23 per week; (c) be registered with, and reporting to a public employment office; (d) be able to work and available for suitable work.

Fourth. Any person will be disqualified from receiving an allowance if (a) he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause, or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; (b) he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work or to accept suitable work offered; (c) he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; (d) he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage; (e) added penalties apply to successive disqualifying offenses.

Fifth. Within the 52 weeks limit the total eligibility is determined by allowing 8 weeks of allowances for each of the first 3 months of service, and 4 weeks of allowances for each month or major fraction thereof of service thereafter.

Sixth. The allowance of $20 per week will be reduced by any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation—other than pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration—received by the veteran for the same period of time.

2. Any person self-employed for profit in an independent establishment, trade, business, profession, or other vocation is eligible for readjustment allowances (a) if net earnings are less than $100 for the previous calendar month; (b) the amount of allowance to be the difference between the net earnings and $100 per month; (c) the conditions as to eligibility otherwise as provided in title V, except the qualifications and disqualifications.

The Facts About Guayule—Guayule Rubber Project

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday when the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill was before the House and we were considering the item in the conference report to extend the guayule emergency rubber project, certain statements were made in the heat of the debate, largely based; I think, on opinion and exasperation rather than on fact. For instance, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri, said in substance, that practically every dollar we have put into it has been lost or wasted, and that every dollar we will put into it from now on will be wasted.

The hearings before the committees on appropriations, in both the Senate and the House, do not bear out this statement. In the course of my remarks, I intend to call the attention of the Members to the facts in connection with this entire program. If the statement of the gentleman from Missouri is correct, any Member of the House would have been justified in voting against continuing this program. It seems to me that those who voted for the bill should be able not only to justify their vote but also to vindicate their consciences by having available to them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD all the facts in connection with the program, and I shall see that those facts are made available to every Member of the House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I agree with the gentleman that the facts he has presented are correct. Any gentleman who has ever been to California will thoroughly agree with the gentleman's stand.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I will say for the benefit of the gentleman from Oklahoma and other Members that every statement contained in my remarks will be taken directly from the hearings before either the appropriations committees of the House or the Senate or the Poage committee, and they will be entirely factual.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. There is another point that I hope the gentleman will include in his statement concerning the implication made here on the floor of the House that perhaps this particular project is of benefit only to a very small part of the Nation. I hope he will bring

out the beneficial effect of the guayule program not only on that particular part of the country, but on the United States as a whole.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. May I say to the gentleman from California, in whose district this project originated, that it is entirely national in scope, and that our concern should not be for any particular district of the country but for the benefit of the United States. I cannot share the evident optimism of those who think the war will end soon and that we will have all the crude rubber we need in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, when I first addressed the House on the subject of guayule, back in April 1941, 8 months before Pearl Harbor, I made the following statement:

Frankly, I do not see how any of us can look into the future and feel confident of an uninterrupted supply of rubber from the Dutch East Indies or British Malaya, in view of present world conditions.

A year later our supply of crude rubber was in the hands of the Japs.

How then can the gentleman from Missouri justify the statement—page 6288:

We are nearing the closing days of the war. We are going to have all the crude rubber we will need by next year.

That appears to me to be simply wishful thinking. I hope and pray that the gentleman is correct, but in the meantime I do not want to gamble and it is very evident that Congress does not intend to gamble either.

In support of immediate liquidation of the guayule project, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] expressed the opinion—page 6288—that "every dollar beyond liquidation being put into it from now on will be utterly wasted." Perhaps he is unaware that we are now paying not less than 60 cents a pound for crude rubber from South America. This price is in addition to the sums which previously have been invested in the procurement of rubber from that region. Testimony by representatives of the Department of Agriculture before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture on the agriculture appropriation bill for 1945—page 574—indicates that the estimated cost in the future after July 1, 1944, for producing rubber from presently growing guayule over the optimum period of approximately 7 years is 37 cents per pound. Furthermore the Department has estimated that had it been necessary to process all plantations as soon as practicable based on milling irrigated shrub at the age of 2 years and dry-land shrub at the age of 3 years, the estimated cost after fiscal year 1944 for rubber so produced would be approximately 52 cents a pound. Surely it cannot be contended that the production of crude rubber in the United States from now on would, at a smaller cost per pound than we now are paying for crude rubber imports from South America, be a waste of public funds.

In speaking of the expenditures made by the Emergency Rubber Project it is stated by the chairman of the subcommittee that the aggregate expenditures are $45,000,000—page 6368. The testimony shows this to be incorrect. It would appear that had the chairman carefully read the statements presented to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate as printed on page 14 of the Senate committee hearings on the 1945 Agricultural Appropriation bill, he would have known that the estimated total investment as of June 30, 1944, of the Emergency Rubber project is $35,196,245, and of this sum $33,049,331 is estimated as the expenditure for the guayule project. Is not the subcommittee chairman aware that total appropriations for the Emergency Rubber project are approximately $45,000,000; that the funds in amount of $5,420,000 approved by Congress for expenditure in fiscal year 1945 are a part of the $45,000,000 previously appropriated?

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] further states—page 6288—that the most optimistic prediction he has heard by the experts is that for a future expenditure of $5,000,000 annually for 7 years, with good luck, 10,000 tons of rubber could be obtained over the 7-year period. I find nothing of record to support any of these assertions. I refer the gentleman to page 14 of the recent Senate subcommittee hearings. I refer the gentleman to page 14 of the recent Senate subcommittee hearings. I refer to the testimony before the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is chairman in February 1944 in which Mr. Granger, of the Forest Service, stated—page 573:

We figure that counting all expenditures already made and those that will be necessary to be made and giving credit to the residual value or the wrecking value of the permanent improvements and credit to the sale of rubber at 27 cents a pound, we would get the net cost of the rubber—that is, the actual out-of-pocket expense to the Government—down to a little over 50 cents.

He added that the program was based on processing the rubber over a period which would give the Government the greatest amount of rubber at the least possible cost. If it had to be done more quickly, then the cost per pound would be higher.

The program about which Mr. Granger was talking was a 7-year program of closing out the guayule project to produce an estimated 24,000 to 29,000 tons of rubber. The subject is further discussed in the hearings before the Senate subcommittee—page 222. I am at a loss to know the basis used by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] in estimating a total expenditure of $80,000,000 to produce 10,000 tons of rubber at $1.75 per pound. Testimony before the Senate subcommittee does indicate that if the project were liquidated in fiscal year 1945 a potential supply of 10,000 tons of rubber which could have been made available by processing the guayule shrub in 2 years, if the emergency demanded it, would be lost. However, even such an emergency program would not bring the total expenditures to $80,000,000.

It would appear from the statement—page 6288—of the chairman of the subcommittee that Mr. Jeffers, who was then Rubber Director, was of the opinion that the emergency rubber project should be abandoned for the time being, that is, in the winter of 1942–43; that land should be returned to the farmers from whom it had been taken by purchase or lease; that there was no excuse for labor that was being used in the guayule production project and the machinery which was being used being diverted from other uses more essential to the war.

In the winter of 1942–43 Mr. Jeffers, Rubber Director, did indicate that he thought it desirable to reduce budget estimates for fiscal year 1944 below the sum required for maximum possible expansion in that year for which plans were being formulated in response to the impetus provided the guayule project by the September 1942 report of the President's Rubber Survey Committee. This was done to permit further investigation of the rubber situation by the Rubber Director to determine more accurately what part the guayule program should play in the rubber program of the United States. However, to my knowledge the Rubber Director has never indicated that he believed there was no excuse for the labor that was being used on the guayule project and that the machinery being used on the project could be more profitably used in the production of other crops essential to the war effort.

I will draw the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to the hearings of March 1943 of his committee. On page 604 of the record of the hearings there is incorporated a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the President with reference to a downward revision of the financial estimate for the emergency rubber project for fiscal year 1944. In part, that letter reads:

Certain important changes in the Department—

Department of Agriculture—

emergency rubber program for fiscal year 1944 have been suggested by the Rubber Director, as a result of which it is now recommended that a completely new estimate in the amount of $14,271,000 be substituted for the original estimate of $56,000,000 included in the Budget for that year. In considering this revision the Rubber Director has indicated that he believes the new estimate should cover (1) nursery and field operations at about the present level, pending his determination, at a later date, regarding the future scope of the entire project; and (2) continuance at an accelerated rate of research into improved extraction methods, with particular attention to deresinating.

Several months later, on March 19, 1943, the Rubber Director wrote the Secretary of Agriculture, stating:

The present outlook of the rubber situation does not justify the use of manpower for nor the condemnation or use of further lands now needed for the raising of foodstuffs. We trust that this supplies you with my views and that you will carry out the program to secure the maximum yield from such reduced acreage.

The emergency rubber project had under lease for planting at that time some 60,000 acres. As a result of the Rubber Director's request to halt further expansion, all unplanted acreage which would accepted by the farmer-owners was returned to them as promptly as possible, and unplanted acreage

which could not be returned but could be leased for food production was leased for that purpose. Only the remainder, which could not be returned to the farmers or which could not be subleased for food production was planted to guayule.

As a result of further consideration of the rubber program in the United States, in the summer of 1943, the Rubber Director requested that the Department of Agriculture institute a program of guayule production which would produce up to 20,000 tons of guayule rubber per year. The Department of Agriculture subsequently submitted a deficiency estimate to the Congress in the latter part of calendar year of 1943, asking for funds to carry out the request of the Rubber Director. This request for funds was denied by the House, approved by the Senate, but the House conferees refused to yield and the appropriation was lost.

It is perfectly clear to me that at no time has there been evidence that the Rubber Director wished the guayule program to be abandoned or that the guayule operations were not suitable excuse for the employment of labor or machinery.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] states that it is significant that after the guayule program had been virtually abandoned last year, the officials decided to engage in a different sort of activity; that is, the purchase and operation of 200 experimental plots in California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico. This statement would appear to indicate that prior to the late winter of 1942–43, a program of experimental plots had not been instituted in the several States within the range in which it was thought guayule could be successfully grown. The facts of the matter are that such a program was instituted almost immediately upon the initiation of the emergency rubber project in the spring of 1942 and that the establishment of experimental plots throughout the probable guayule range extending from Texas to California, was a regular part of the program from the very inception of the guayule operation, in order that the project might be prepared in the event it were necessary to expand field plantations over a wide geographical area. In the testimony before the committee of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is chairman, in February 1944, it was stated to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] that experimental plots were established in the several States of the Southwest prior to the time that the Rubber Director asked for a curtailment of the expansion of guayule plantings—page 577.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] states—page 6289:

> For every annual capacity production of 350 tons of rubber you will have to provide an additional mill at the cost of $500,000.

This statement is not in accord with the facts. It is true that the construction of one new mill in fiscal year 1945 probably will not in that year produce more than 350 long tons of rubber. The reason for such limited production is twofold. First, the mill can be operated only a portion of the year due to the fact that it must be constructed in that year. Second, the shrub which will be processed in fiscal year 1945 is very young shrub of relatively small rubber content, the youngest shrub it is possible to mill. Two-year-old shrub contains approximately 8 percent rubber. As guayule shrub grows older the rubber content increases rapidly and the output of a mill per unit of time varies with the percentage of rubber contained in the shrub which the mill processes. Utilizing shrub 4 or 5 years old, twice as much rubber can be produced per day in a mill, in comparison with the amount which 2-year-old shrub will produce. The assertion that a new mill is necessary for every 350 tons of annual capacity in terms of rubber, obviously is erroneous. Such would be the case if only 2-year-old shrub were processed. The capacity of a mill unit is approximately 30 tons of shrub per day. The production of rubber per day would vary from about 2½ tons to more than 5 tons depending upon the rubber content of the shrub being processed.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] mentions that the subcommittee on deficiencies, of which he is chairman, has devoted long study to the matter of appropriations for the guayule project over a period of 2 years—page 6288. The subcommittee has held several hearings in Washington. In contrast a study of the guayule project in detail has been made on the ground by an investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture appointed pursuant to a resolution introduced by me last winter. This committee saw the field operations, the research programs, the improvements that have been constructed. It held public hearings at which California farmers, members of the California State Guayule Committee, scientists not connected with the project, and others testified. The members of this bipartisan committee appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Senate and their testimony may be found in the report of the hearings. These gentlemen were favorably impressed with the project, with the accomplishments they observed, with the efficiency of operations, with the progress and application of research. These gentlemen approve continuation of the present guayule program. However, the chairmen of both the Appropriations Committee and of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations disagreed with the findings and opinions of their colleagues from both sides of the House who have investigated and seen the guayule project on the ground.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] says everything that can be learned about making rubber from guayule has been learned. I would refer him to the members of the special investigating committee whom I have just mentioned. These gentlemen know otherwise. They have seen experiments now under way pointing to the possibility of direct sowing of guayule seed in the field, an experiment conducted with a view toward eliminating expensive guayule nurseries. They have seen examples of plant breeding in the process of developing more vigorous and hardy plants, the success of which would greatly increase the climatic range within which guayule might be grown. They have seen experimental production of guayule latex from which a superior grade of guayule rubber can be produced. They know of pollarding experiments from which it may prove possible to mow the tops from guayule shrub one or more times for processing before eventually it becomes necessary to dig the shrub in the final harvest. They have seen experiments to recover by-products of potential commercial value, the recovery of which may prove profitable, and reduce thereby the cost of rubber production. Rather are the possibilities from further guayule research considerable than at an end.

The chairman of the Agricultural Appropriation Subcommittee claims that the farmers of my State of California have not been interested in the program as at present it is carried on. Again I refer the gentleman to the members of the special guayule investigating committee for a more enlightened opinion. Some farmers are not interested. Many other farmers are interested in seeing that the guayule project be carried on to determine whether and under what circumstances guayule may profitably be produced, and California farmers from the guayule areas have expressed themselves as not in favor of eliminating guayule as a source of crude rubber that may aid in meeting the emergency needs of this country. Even those uninterested in guayule as a normal farm crop hold to this view.

I wish to draw also to the attention of the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriation Subcommittee the report of January 14, 1944, of the California State Guayule Committee, a group of farmers appointed by the Governor of that State. Four recommendations were made. They are:

1. That as early as is practical the activities of Government in this project be limited to determining methods for the production and processing of rubber from guayule on a practical and economic basis; and to the conducting of such research and experimental work as is necessary in the present emergency for future emergencies and for aiding in establishing a new peacetime agricultural industry of this nature, if such proves to be economically necessary or feasible.

2. That the Government continue to carry on the present project in as economical and orderly manner as possible and that during such continuation, as rapidly as is practical the growing of shrub be turned over to individual farmers; and the processing be turned over to private or cooperative enterprise.

As it is now estimated that by the fall of 1944 there will be more acreage of matured guayule ready for harvesting than present facilities can process, it is the committee's recommendation that the emergency rubber project immediately establish contact with one or more of the leading rubber users in an endeavor to contract with them for the processing of shrub now being grown. This contract to be entered into with the understanding that such company will use every effort to develop and maintain the domestic production of guayule rubber in the future. Such contract not to be entered into with any corporation not domestically owned and controlled.

3. That since all land leases now held by the Department of Agriculture for the growing of guayule were negotiated under conditions and economic circumstances very different than exist at the present time, or may exist in the future, it is recommended by the committee that owners of such land be given option to renegotiate such leases at the date of harvest of the guayule shrub now growing on land covered by said leases.

4. That in order to obtain more definite and practical information on cultural practices and costs of growing guayule by individual farmers the Congress of the United States appropriate or earmark sufficient funds for the establishment of not less than 15 50-acre farms scattered properly over the guayule-growing area of the State, on which farmers shall be encouraged to grow guayule at a stated, guaranteed payment for their efforts, based on ultimate rubber produced. It is estimated that the amount of rubber produced on these experimental farms, if paid for at the present price being paid by the Government for Mexican guayule rubber delivered at the border, would require a sum of approximately $500,000. The committee desires to point out in this connection that this is not a request for the Government to give the farmers any money, but is primarily a request that funds be earmarked in such a manner as to enable the Government to contract for the purchase of rubber when and if it is produced. The committee feels that if the Government is willing to pay Mexican producers 54 cents per pound, it certainly should be more than willing to purchase rubber from American producers at the same price. The committee believes experience to date has definitely proved that California climatic and soil conditions are extremely favorable to the culture of the guayule shrub.

The report of this committee was approved by the California State Director of Agriculture and by the Governor in March 1944. There are differences of opinion concerning the guayule project among California farmers even as between Members of the Congress. But the assertion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] that California farmers are not interested is an all-inclusive sweeping statement which is not a correct portrayal of the facts.

The entire guayule project is another one of those subjects that needs more light and less heat. Let there be light!

Short Summary of Veterans' Rights and Benefits Under the G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herewith a radio talk made by me over station WHP, Harrisburg, Pa., on June 18, 1944. It describes the important basic legislation just passed by the Congress known as the G. I. bill of rights. I feel confident that it will be most valuable to keep for reference. The speech follows:

The conference report on the G. I. bill of rights passed the House unanimously and is now on the President's desk. It will undoubtedly be signed. Even if not, it will be passed over his veto. I am going to give you a short summary of just what the bill does. Obviously, time does not permit me to go into too great detail; also, rules and regulations to be set forth in the future by the Veterans' Administration as authorized by the act will develop more accurately and more specifically these rights and also the procedure which the veteran must follow. However, I do believe that anyone who reads this closely will know, in general, what benefits accrue to him or her under this bill.

ELIGIBILITY

In order to be eligible the general rule is that a man or woman must have served in the active forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or any of their component parts, during the period beginning September 16, 1940, and lasting up to the end of the present war. Such person must have served for a period of at least 90 days, or have been sooner discharged for disability incurred in line of duty. In addition, he or she must have been released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable. No distinction is made between enlistment and induction.

HOSPITALIZATION AND CLAIMS

1. The Veterans' Administration is declared an essential war agency, and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities on personnel, equipment, supplies, and materials. Priorities for materials are also given to any State institution built or to be built for the care or hospitalization of veterans. These provisions are extremely important. In practical effect they mean that the minute the war ends, at which time the Army and Navy will have no further pressing need for supplies, then the veterans' hospitals will have first call on the goods on hand. Until that time they will have second call.

2. The bill orders the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization to provide additional necessary hospital facilities and authorizes arrangements for the mutual use of hospitals, etc., with the Army and the Navy. For this purpose it authorizes the appropriation of $500,000,000. These hospitals will care for diseases and disabilities nonservice connected as well as those incurred in service.

3. Personnel of the Veterans' Administration may be placed in Army and Navy discharge centers, etc., to adjudicate disability claims and to give advice as to their rights and benefits to all servicemen about to be discharged. It forbids the discharge of servicemen and servicewomen until a substantial part of their pay is ready or, if disabled, until adequate arrangements have been made for filing claims for benefits provided.

These two requirements are extremely helpful. At one time a great deal of needless trouble and grief was caused by hasty releases, leaving the veteran more or less stranded. To some degree this has all been remedied by the cumulative efforts of individual Congressmen, including myself, through the exertion of pressure on the War and Navy Departments, thereby securing this action from those departments of their own accord.

4. A further clause states that recognized veterans' associations shall place representatives at the various discharge centers to aid servicemen about to be released. The American Legion, the V. F. W., the D. A. V., and other similar patriotic organizations are admirably equipped to do this. They are eager and anxious so to do. They have been doing this job. They can now be of even greater help in the future than in the past to the veterans about to leave the service and reenter civilian life.

5. It gives the veteran safeguards in respect to various statements against his own interest, and with respect to review of irregular discharges.

EDUCATION

1. It extends the right of vocational education for service-incurred disabilities to those who served during the period of September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

2. All veterans whose education was interrupted or interfered with by reason of their entrance into the service will be eligible for 1 year's education at any school or institution of his own choice and in any subject or subjects desired for which he or she is fitted. He must start the course not later than 2 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is later.

In order to make these opportunities widely available, it is stipulated that anyone who is under 25 years of age at the time he or she entered the service "shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded or delayed." This means that if the veteran was under 25 when inducted, then the solid presumption will be that this did cut into his education, whether or not he was in fact going to school or to college at the time. If he is over 25 then he or she must show that his education actually was interrupted. However, without such showing any person who served is entitled to a refresher or retraining course not in excess of 1 year.

3. The veteran may select any approved educational institution in any State in the Union whether he resides there or not. An educational or training institution is defined to include all public or private, elementary or secondary schools, business schools and colleges, scientific and technical institutions, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers' colleges, etc., and also technical training-on-the-job schools. It amounts to complete freedom of choice.

Also, an employed veteran may take part-time study under certain rules.

4. The training shall be for a period of not to exceed 1 year, but it may be extended for another 3 years, except in respect to refresher or retraining courses. In brief, the requirement for getting the additional years is that the student fulfill satisfactorily the educational standards of the college or school at which he is studying. However, the greatest length of time which anyone can spend in college will be the length of his or her service after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, excluding the time spent in completed courses in the Army and Navy college and school training programs, as modified by the following paragraph:

Anyone who has spent 90 days in the Army (excluding time spent in completed Army and Navy college training programs) is entitled to 1 year's education. Then at least for all the time over and above this 3 months he is entitled to the equivalent amount of time in Government-provided education. For example, Private John Doe has spent 1 year in the Army. He is entitled to 1 year's education in return for his first 3 months' service. Assuming he has satisfactorily passed his course, then he is entitled to at least 9 months' more training to match the 9 months' service over and above the year secured to him by virtue of the first 90 days' service. In discussing this matter with the Veterans' Administration, I find that it may be that Private John Doe under this illustration may get the full 12 months in addition to the 12 months given him by virtue of his first 90 days' service, or a total of 2 years' education in return for 1 year's service. There is a question of legal construction involved here that has not as yet been decided. If John Doe has spent 3 years in the service, then he can get the maximum amount, i. e., 4 years of education.

5. The Administrator pays the institution the tuition and also the laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and similar fees. The Administrator may pay for books, supplies, and

equipment. However, the total of such payments shall not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

While pursuing a course of education or training the veteran will also be paid a subsistence allowance of $50 per month if without a dependent, or $75 per month if he has a dependent. Any sums paid to the veteran in apprentice schools, etc., for work done will be proportionately deducted.

LOANS

Any eligible veteran within 2 years after separation from the service or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is later, may apply for a guarantee by the Administrator of not to exceed 50 percent of the loan or loans for specified purposes, provided that the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed $2,000. For example, if the veteran borrows $5,000 or $10,000 he will get only $2,000 guaranteed. If he borrows $3,000, then he will have only $1,500 guaranteed (50 percent of $3,000).

Interest on the guaranteed part of the loan for the first year shall be paid by the Veterans' Administration. This gives the veteran more chance to get started. The loans shall run for not more than 20 years at not to exceed 4 percent interest. The loans to be guaranteed may be made by private persons, firms, or corporations, or by governmental agencies and governmental corporations. In connection with governmental loans, there are certain other liberalizing features.

2. The specified purposes for which loans can be made are: (a) The purchase or construction of homes, or repairs to them, or to pay delinquent taxes on a home. (b) The purchase of a farm, farm equipment, livestock, and for repairs on farms. (c) The purchase of a business, business property, business equipment, to be used in a gainful occupation. I hope that this will start many veterans on the road to becoming successful small businessmen and to a revival of small business in this country.

The loans must be approved and the act sets out the broad standards to govern the Veterans' Administrator in his decisions as to whether or not to approve. In general, they are the same that any lending institution would apply: (a) that the proceeds be used for the purpose requested; (b) that the property will be useful and necessary; (c) that the ability and experience of the veteran and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such occupation are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will succeed, and (d) that the price paid does not exceed a reasonable normal value as determined by proper appraisal.

In the case of homes, the amount and terms of the payments must bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses.

EMPLOYMENT

The reemployment provisions are substantially the same as those now in effect. A veterans' employment representative, who shall be a veteran, is attached to the United States Employment Service in each State. He will help to get jobs, give information, etc. This is substantially what Bill Ilgenfritz is now doing so well in Pennsylvania at present. It should be noted that the veteran has other employment rights under the Selective Service Act and other laws passed by the Congress.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

1. Eligible veterans who are unemployed are entitled to receive under certain conditions unemployment compensation at the rate of $20 per week for a maximum of 52 weeks within a 5-year period immediately following the termination of hostilities. The unemployment must begin within 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later. A proportionate amount may be paid to the partially employed who receive less than $20 allowance per week given by the act plus $3—$23.

The allowance for a week will be $20 less that part of the wages payable to the partially unemployed for such week which is in excess of $3 (figured to the nearest highest multiple of $1 where it does not come out even). Thus, if the veteran is earning $10, you subtract $3 from the $10, leaving $7. You then subtract the $7 from the $20, and his weekly payment for readjustment would be $13. Stated conversely, it is $23 per week less the amount earned in partial employment during the week.

2. A claimant will be disqualified if he leaves suitable work voluntarily or is discharged for misconduct; if he fails to accept suitable work when offered to him or refuses to attend an available free training course; and also in certain cases where work stoppages are caused by labor disputes, but only if he is participating therein.

3. Provision is made for self-employed veterans engaged in a trade, business, profession, etc. If his net earnings have been less than $100 in the previous calendar month, he can receive the difference between $100 and his net earnings for such month. This provision is not in our social-security law and, so far as I know, is an innovation in our law. It should enable enterprising veterans to become self-employed.

4. Where a claimant receives other Federal or State benefit, a proportionate adjustment is made in his allowance. Also, veterans who have rights under two or more different sections of this act can only receive the fair and proportionate amount.

PENALTIES

Anyone receiving any money under this title with intent to defraud shall be punished by a fine of $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year or both. The same penalty applies to anyone making a false statement or misrepresentation. Anyone knowingly accepting an allowance to which he is not entitled shall be ineligible to receive any further allowances of any kind under this title. As to other fraudulent claims under this act the general penal statutes will be applicable.

Many veterans, or their families, will want additional information on various parts of this program. The Veterans' Administration is the source of all authoritative rulings on this and similar veterans' laws. If anyone feels that it would be helpful to have me get in touch with the Veterans' Administration in behalf of himself or others, just write your Congressman, JOHN C. KUNKEL, at either 459 Old House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C., or to 20 South River Street, Harrisburg, Pa. If you prefer, telephone me at 4-3356 on the Harrisburg exchange. If I am not there, my secretary, Mrs. Richings, will take your message and forward it on to me or arrange an appointment. She may very probably be able to help you, herself. Both Mrs. Richings in Harrisburg and Miss Garney in Washington have had much experience in this work. All three of us find it a real and great pleasure to do anything possible for the boys and girls in the services and for their loved ones back home.

American League for a Free Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD P. GALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the June 15, 1944, issue of Answer magazine:

AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR A FREE PALESTINE

At its first formal meeting May 24, the sponsoring committee of the American League for a Free Palestine, representing a cross section of influential Americans, established itself as an organization to support the principles and objectives of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation which seeks a seat on the council of the United Nations, an independent army on the battlefield, and the creation of a free Palestine.

Meeting at the home of Maj. and Mrs. Harvey L. Schwamm, 1046 Fifth Avenue, New York City, the American League pledged to mobilize American public opinion behind the liberation movement and to enroll millions of members to support the program of its organization. The newly-formed league, with headquarters at 11 West Forty-second Street, New York City, has a general sponsoring committee of 479 members.

An interim executive committee was elected by the sponsoring committee yesterday. Permanent officers will be chosen at a congress to be convened by the American League in September, the exact date to be set later.

Serving on the executive committee are: Senator James M. Tunnell; Representatives Will Rogers, Jr., and Andrew L. Somers; Assemblyman Robert J. Crews; Konrad Bercovici, Louis Bromfield, Lester Cohen, Frances Gunther, May Lewis, Curt Riess, Russell Gordon Carter, Lion Feuchtwanger, Emil Lengyel, Lawrence Lipton, and Lyon Mearson, authors; Jo Davidson, sculptor; William Auerbach-Levy, painter; Stella Adler, actress; Eric Godal and Arthur Szyk, artists; Sterling North, literary critic; Dr. Manfred Sakel, psychiatrist; Harry Louis Selden, editor; Maj. Harvey L. Schwamm, Nathan George Horwitt, Irving Taitel, Rabbi Baruch Rabinowitz, Betty Keane, Albert A. Bauer, Mrs. Rose Cohen, Alex Wilf, and Frieda Zimmerman.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA ACCLAIMS THE LEAGUE

Reproduced here are some of the messages sent by leading Americans in response to the invitation to attend the meeting of the sponsoring committee:

REPRESENTATIVE WILL ROGERS, JR.

I think that the formation of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation is one of the most wholesome signs that has yet appeared on the horizon of post-war solutions of age-old problems. I believe its claims are just, its philosophy sound. It is the sensible, rational answer both to the Palestine problem and the problem of anti-Semitism.

Peter H. Bergson, with whom I have worked for a long time, is a man of unquestioned integrity, tireless energy, and dynamic leadership. It is men of this type who will, I hope, be leading figures in the post-war world.

The American League for a Free Palestine is formed in the finest traditions of our Nation. I trust millions of Americans of all national descents and creeds will give it their whole-hearted support. Good luck.

Representative WILL ROGERS, Jr.

BEN HECHT

PETER BERGSON,

Hebrew Committee National Liberation:

Zionism as a political force is as dead as the projects of Montezuma. The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation would have been welcomed by Messrs. Herzl and Nordau as an exhuberant step forward. The Jewish cause has been too long under the domination of people by Stephen Wise and his fellow Jewish fossils. What the Jews need most is a high wind to blow these ossified politicos out of their places. They are the dust that has gathered over a lost cause. I hope that out of the storm you raise will

come the young and noble leadership that the Hebrews of Europe deserve. If you are in need of a constituent here is my vote.

BEN HECHT.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD P. GALE

Retel: Regret inability to attend press conference, statement as follows: "After the Balfour Declaration, after years of hope, toil, struggle and irrepressible spirit the Jewish homeland must not be lost in the post-war era. Palestine must flourish under Jewish direction and Jewish control."

RICHARD P. GALE,
Member of Congress.

REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

A free and democratic Jewish commonwealth must be our goal and an accomplished fact when this war is over. The Jewish people have furnished no Quislings or traitors to the cause of the United Nations. Much Jewish blood has been shed all over the world to fight Nazis and tyranny. The democratic cause, the preservation of liberty and freedom requires the reestablishment of the Jews as a nation in their ancient homeland. Palestine should now have representation in the councils of the United Nations and be given the opportunity to form its own division on the battlefields.

GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
Member of Congress.

GEORGE S. GIS

Am heartily in favor of free Palestine as should be a nation and home for Jewish people as I expressed in my article in Jewish Forum late last year. Many war veterans of all societies are heartily in favor of the same.

GEO. S. GIS,
Past National President and Past National Historian Philippine and China Veterans Eighth Army Corps National Association.

MAJ. GEN. GEORGE B. DUNCAN

During recorded history different civilization and creeds have obtained leadership in the world as of Egypt, Persia, Crete, and Rome only to pass into oblivion. Jewish race is the only one to survive in language, history, and religion. Their religion has furnished the background of Christianity and so-called civilization of today. Now the Jews are scattered over the world and are again the subject of persecution. They ask but little from our dominant nations. A free Palestine and opportunity to build again as a nation. The United Nations and Christianity should give them this.

GEORGE B. DUNCAN,
Major General, Retired.

BISHOP F. A. M'ELWAIN

Support aims of league for free Palestine, including representation both in councils of United Nations and on battlefields.

Bishop F. A. MCELWAIN.

RUSSELL GORDON CARTER

Please list me as an enthusiastic supporter of the aims of the American League for a Free Palestine. The Hebrew Council of National Liberation should take its place now as a sovereign nation among the United Nations. Her people deserve the privilege of maintaining an army on the battlefield against the common enemy. We don't want further promises, we want fulfillment.

RUSSELL GORDON CARTER.

LION FEUCHTWANGER

If there is one demand self evident within this scope of the war aims of the United Nations and of the Atlantic Charter, it is a free Palestine and the representation of such a free Palestine in the councils and on the battlefields of the United Nations. Not only would the foundation of such a free Palestine be the obvious solution of the Jewish problem all over the world it would also be a symptom showing that the war aims of the United Nations as far as these have been given shape in the declaration of responsible statesmen are more than words. The foundation of a free Palestine would thus fortify the confidence of the friends of the United Nations in the honesty of their intentions it would disperse the suspicions of the doubters and that shorten the war.

LION FEUCHTWANGER.

ERWIN PISCATOR

Impossible to attend 24th. As I understand it, all United Nations will be made up of free people therefore why should not the free people of Palestine have a free nation. A free Palestine to participate in a post-war council of free nations.

ERWIN PISCATOR.

GRACE MOORE

Deeply regret cannot be present today but I extend every good wish for every success that this league desires for I as an artist who appreciate the contribution to art that has been made through the generations by the Jewish people feel so deeply the need for world wide understanding and appreciation of all your present and future objectives and offer my cooperation in any way needed.

GRACE MOORE.

STERLING NORTH

Am in complete sympathy with your desire to have the Jews of this stricken planet represented both at the peace table and in the battlefield.

STERLING NORTH.

EDDIE DOWLING

I pray the American League for a Free Palestine will be successful and that through its efforts those governments responsible for the present deplorable situation in Palestine will awaken and cease using Palestine as a political football. Of course Palestine should sit with the allied councils and Palestine should be allowed to have its own army and anything else that will help and strengthen a sorely abused people. Sincerely yours.

EDDIE DOWLING.

PEGGY WOOD

In reply to your telegram would say am sure an American league for a free Palestine is close to the heart of many thoughtful people while I feel sure there is good in such a league I myself am not well enough informed to make a public statement for press release on so controversial a question. However you have my best wishes.

PEGGY WOOD.

JULIAN STREET

Whether in present state of world affairs it is feasible or wise to press for free Palestine representation in councils of United Nations and on battlefield, I am not qualified to judge. I do, however, feel strongly that if any people have rightful and ancient claim to any territory whatever, the Jewish people have such claim to Palestine and that this claim should be recognized at earliest practicable moment.

JULIAN STREET.

JAMES KEARNEY, JR.

Proposal for the formation of a free Palestine demands immediate attention to take the greatest advantage of the military and economic contribution towards speeding victory and stabilizing the post-war peace which can be made by the Jews from all the world who have settled in Palestine.

JAMES KEARNEY, Jr.,
The Times Newspapers.

R. J. VIRTUE

Regret not being able to be with you on the 24th but you know I want to do everything possible to further the ends of the league. I think you should be granted representation in council of United Nations and the league should be accorded the privilege of representation on the battlefield. I want you to feel that I want to do everything possible to further the interests of the league in every direction so that its purposes and objectives will be known. If there is any way I can help don't hesitate to call on me.

R. J. VIRTUE,
Publisher, Erie Dispatch-Herald.

FRED A. SEATON

Every reason common decency, fair international dealings, sound statesmanship dictate support of aims of league to gain for Free Palestine representation in councils of United Nations and on battlefield. All Americans regardless of race, color, or creed should back that objective to the limit. Any lack of fairness with the persecuted Jews of the world would be shameful and a practically irredeemable blot on history, and body blow to hopes of fair practical settlement of the peace after the war.

FRED A. SEATON,
Publisher, the Tribune,
Hastings, Nebr.

Medical Care for Wives and Children of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, during 1943 Congress appropriated large sums for grants to the several States to aid those States in using their facilities to carry out the emergency maternity and infant care program known as E. M. I. C. Just recently, in 1944, an additional large sum was provided. This program and these appropriations have had my consistent strong support. I know that this is a service which must be given to the wives and children of the men in our armed forces and that they are entitled to receive it.

In Pennsylvania the administration is under the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Pennsylvania Department of Health, Harrisburg, Pa. I include herein extracts from an article by Dr. Paul Dodds, the director, giving an outline of its operation:

1. WHO IS ELIGIBLE FOR CARE?

Any woman living in this State, regardless of legal residence or financial status, whose husband (living, deceased, or missing in action) at the time of application is an enlisted man of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh pay grades of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. Similarly any sick infant under 1 year of age whose father is an enlisted man as described above.

2. WHAT SERVICES ARE OFFERED?

a. Maternity care by physicians.

b. Hospitalization of maternity patients, if recommended by the physician.

c. Care of sick infants by physicians.

d. Hospitalization of sick infants, if recommended by physicians.

As the program develops, and if funds are available, it is expected that the following additional services can be authorized; consultation, nursing, ambulance, expensive

drugs, major obstetric operations and transfusions.

3. HOW IS APPLICATION MADE?

The wife fills in an application form and takes it to the physician of her choice; the physician completes the form, requesting authorization of services. The patient then mails the form to the Pennsylvania Department of Health, Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Harrisburg.

4. GENERAL INFORMATION

A plan for this program was approved by the United States Children's Bureau, on September 20, 1943, and payment cannot be made for services rendered prior to that date.

The program provides for hospital ward service only and payment made by the Pennsylvania Department of Health may not be used as part payment for semiprivate or private room service.

Hospital insurance may be used, in which case the physician only will receive payment from the Pennsylvania Department of Health.

Initial hospital authorization for a maternity patient is 10 days and for a sick infant it is 21 days. If further hospitalization is necessary, it may be requested.

Martin Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the general executive board of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, expressing regret on the decision of the Honorable MARTIN DIES to decline to run for reelection to Congress.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the intended retirement of the Honorable MARTIN DIES from public life in January next, the House of Representatives and the truly American people will lose their most vigorous crusader for American ideals; and

Whereas thousands of American citizens, regardless of political affiliation, look with admiration upon his indefatigable zeal in hunting down the enemies of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this general executive board with its affiliated States of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, Inc., and the fraternal patriotic Americans consisting of upward of 265,000 members, in thirty-fourth annual session, met and expressed regret at his decision to return to private life; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be, and is hereby, instructed to convey to Congressman MARTIN DIES in behalf of the membership of our various organizations the best wishes for a speedy recovery to health, success in all of his undertakings and an early return to public life; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable MARTIN DIES and be released to the public press.

Benefits for War Veterans Granted Under Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to present a condensed summary of the benefits granted to veterans of World War No. 2 under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Title I of the law authorizes the establishment of adequate hospital facilities for the care and treatment of veterans for nonservice disabilities or diseases, as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in the service.

The rights of veterans are protected by two specific sections of the act, and these read as follows:

No person shall be discharged or released from active duty in the armed forces until his certificate of discharge or release from active duty and final pay, or a substantial portion thereof, are ready for delivery to him or to his next of kin or legal representative; and no person shall be discharged or released from active service on account of disability until and unless he has executed a claim for compensation, pension, or hospitalization, to be filed with the Veterans' Administration, or has signed a statement that he has had explained to him the right to file such claim: *Provided*, That this section shall not preclude immediate transfer to a veterans' facility for necessary hospital care, nor preclude the discharge of any person who refuses to sign such claim or statement: *And provided further*, That refusal or failure to file a claim shall be without prejudice to any right the veteran may subsequently assert.

And—

No person in the armed forces shall be required to sign a statement of any nature relating to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of any disease or injury he may have, and any such statement against his own interest signed at any time shall be null and void and of no force and effect.

Veterans are further protected by the right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service:

First. There may be review by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether a person at the time of committing an offense was insane, in event of which determination benefits to which such person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited.

Second. Except in cases of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of his discharge or dismissal.

Third. Any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine his retirement rights.

Under first and third, above, the application for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal from service or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever is later.

Title II of the act provides for educational benefits; title III, for loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property; title IV, for employment service; and title V for readjustment allowances for veterans who are unemployed.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

In general, to be eligible for the benefits provided under the act:

First. The veteran must have served in the armed forces for at least 90 days, unless sooner discharged for a disability incurred in the line of duty.

Second. His service must have been during the period beginning September 16, 1940, and ending with the termination of the war.

Third. His discharge from active service must have been under conditions other than dishonorable.

While benefits are provided immediately for those who have been discharged from service, the general purpose of the act is to afford readjustment benefits during the post-war period. The benefits provided may be claimed and secured within 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later, with an over-all limitation which will permit one term of enlistment after the termination of the war.

EDUCATION OF VETERANS

Title II, which embraces the educational features of the law, provides for:

First. One year or its equivalent in continuous part-time study of education or training at any school or institution of the veteran's own choice, in any subject or subjects desired for which he is fitted.

Second. Not to exceed 3 additional years of education or training, dependent upon—

(a) Length of service;

(b) Satisfactory progress in study or training; and

(c) The condition that the person was not over 25 years of age at the time of entrance into the service, or, if over that age, his education was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of service.

Third. Payment of all tuition and other fees, cost of books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, not to exceed $500 per school year.

Fourth. Subsistence allowance while pursuing his education or training at the rate of $50 a month if without dependents or $75 a month with dependent or dependents.

Fifth. Part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance, but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

Sixth. The right to retain possession of the books and equipment furnished if he satisfactorily complete his course of education or training.

The right to vocational education for service-connected disabilities is extended to include those who served during the

period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

LOANS TO VETERANS

Title III provides for the guaranty of loans to veterans, such guaranty not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, with a maximum of $2,000. The loans may be made by an individual or by private or public lending agencies and may be made for the following purposes:

First. The purchase or construction of a home;

Second. The making of repairs, alterations, or improvements to a home owned by the veteran;

Third. The purchase of farms and farm equipment; and

Fourth. The purchase of business property.

These loans must conform to the following requirements: The interest rate must not exceed 4 percent; the loan must be practicable and suitable to the veteran's circumstances; the Government must have the right of subrogation to the extent of any guaranty paid; the liability under the guaranty must decrease or increase with the decrease or increase of the amount of the unpaid obligation; and the agreement must permit the Government to protect itself in case of default through the right to bid on foreclosure proceedings or to refinance.

In the event that a principal loan is made or guaranteed or insured by a Federal agency, a loan for all or part of the balance of the purchase price or cost may be guaranteed if it does not exceed $2,000 or 20 percent of the cost or purchase price and other specified conditions are met.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Title IV provides the right to registration for employment with, and for placement in employment by, the Veterans' Employment Service through the United States Employment Service and any State employment agency cooperating with the U. S. E. S. This right applies to any veteran of any war discharged from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

Title V provides unemployment allowances of $20 a week while unemployed, subject to the following conditions:

First. The week of unemployment must have begun after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the effective date of the act and not later than 2 years after discharge from active service or the termination of the war, whichever is later.

Second. The veteran is not receiving subsistence allowance for education or training under title II of the act, or increased pension for vocational education under Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Third. To be eligible, the veteran must reside in the United States; must be completely unemployed, or, if partially employed, has wages under $23 a week; must be registered with, and reporting to, a public employment office; and must be able to work and available for suitable work.

Fourth. Any person will be disqualified from receiving such an allowance if: (a) he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause, or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; or (b) he fails to apply for suitable work or fails to accept suitable work offered; or (c) he, without good cause, fails to attend an available free training course; or (d) he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

Fifth. Within a limitation of 52 weeks, the total eligibility is determined by allowing 8 weeks of allowances for each of the first 3 months of service, and 4 weeks of allowances for each month or major fraction thereof of service thereafter.

Sixth. The allowance of $20 a week will be reduced by any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation—other than pension, compensation or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration—received by the veteran for the same period of time.

Seventh. Any person self-employed for profit in an independent establishment, trade, business, profession, or other vocation, is eligible for readjustment allowance if his net earnings are less than $100 for the previous calendar month, with the amount of allowance being the difference between net earnings and $100 a month.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. John C. Kunkel, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include herewith an address which I made at the seventy-seventh annual Memorial Day services at Harrisburg Cemetery, May 30, 1944, Decoration Day of this year. This was under the auspices of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War whose present commander is Lt. John H. Runkle. It was a great honor to me to join in tribute to these gallant men, so few of whom now remain with us. Today only one survivor remains in the whole of Dauphin County, Henry Maurer, of Wiconisco, now 98 years old. Mr. Maurer served in the first regiment to meet General Lee at Gettysburg, was in the battles of Macon and Cripple Creek, and with Sherman on his march to the sea. To those who have gone before, we pay tribute through him. The address follows:

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

I salute you who by your presence here today reconsecrate this annual Decoration Day so sacred to all of us; you who thus give honor and recognition to those who by their deeds of valor bequeathed to us the freedom, liberty, and union which your own flesh and blood are today fighting with equal courage and bravery to preserve; you who avail yourselves of this day of memory to dedicate yourselves anew to the solemn task that the tribulation and sacrifice by which these departed heroes upheld our integrity and our ideals shall not have been in vain.

By the sword others before them had first won these priceless heritages by great daring; then had molded with certain knowledge and uncanny skill the checks and balances to guard them. Those who rest beneath these small green tents surrounding us here and throughout the land and across the seas have done their utmost to give them to us intact—whole and undivided.

As the great Lincoln said at Gettysburg, "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, and it can never forget what they did here." That is all too true. Yet I believe that the spirits of those great Americans now in the Great Beyond hover over us watchfully in our hour of stress and need, guiding our hands and strengthening our minds and hearts. By associations such as this we will draw an inspiration—something that cannot be seen nor heard—but something that will spur us on to greater efforts in this present tragic era—efforts which will aid each of us to do his extra bit to hasten victory in this world-wide irrepressible conflict now engulfing us.

History tells us that this custom of setting aside May 30 as Memorial Day, or Decoration Day, for the soldiers of the war between the North and the South originated in the South. Below the Mason-Dixon line were most of the battlefields of the war. Near these battlefields were the last resting places of the mortal remains of so many of the brave soldiers of both sides. A young Virginia girl, Cassanda Oliver Moncure, 1 month after the founding of the Grand Army of the Republic, is reputed to have originated the idea in May 1866. Flowers were placed on the graves of the brave men of both armies. Gen. John A. Logan, of the Grand Army of the Republic, witnessed these services of love. It was he who, 2 years later on May 5, 1868, issued an order appointing May 30 of that year as Decoration Day for the Grand Army of the Republic. That day was chosen because it was the date of the discharge of the last Union volunteers of the war. One by one the States have adopted it as a holiday. All the States now observe the day. Although the eight Southern States hold their ceremony on June 3, thereby paying honor also to Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy, upon the anniversary of his birth. There is no national law on the subject, however.

Instituting the great custom of Memorial Day, General Logan said, "It is our purpose to inaugurate this observance in the hope that it will be kept from year to year while a survivor of the war remains to honor the memory of the departed." General Logan's hope will be fulfilled. The thinning ranks of the veterans of the Civil War have ever honored this request and all patriotic Americans have proudly claimed the privilege of joining with them in so doing. And when the last of the old comrades muster out and fall in with the ranks of that vast silent army, when the last bugle call has blown, free Americans throughout the land will continue to place the flowers of spring in tribute and devotion upon these shrines of green. Now, and for many years past we pay homage to those who have passed on "to that bourn from which no traveler returns" after using freely and gladly their strength and their energy to build this Nation into a bulwark of civilization and their blood to cement our Union into a unit indivisable and indestructible. When we do so, we also vow to have and to hold the rights and ideals for which they died.

We know that the youth of today have that high courage, great daring, and steadfast endurance that marked the men of 1861 to 1865. While this day is their day, just as Armistice Day belongs primarily to the veterans of World War No. 1, we would be less than mortal did we not glory in our own. At Bataan, Corregidor, north Africa, Sicily, Salerno, China, Burma, the four corners of the globe, on the earth below, and in the heavens above, and on and underneath the waters, the exploits of your boys and girls have been unequaled in the long annals of recorded history—ours or that of any other nation present or past.

These are your sons, daughters, husbands, relatives, and friends. Ours is not an army or navy drawn from a warrior caste skilled and practiced through the years in the art of war. It is a citizens' army: farm boys, workmen, tradesmen, and others from every walk of life engaged in similar pursuits, earning their living peacefully by the sweat of their brows, living their lives quietly and simply. From thence, overnight as it were, sprang our heroes of today. From the same roots came just as quickly the heroes of those former wars that rocked the Nation.

It is fourscore years since the war when brother fought brother. It is a cheering thought that Father Time has brushed away with soothing hand much of the heartache and sadness caused by the departure of those brave men and women. May Father Time do the same for you and yours. Yet each year adds to their stature and luster. Their place in the hearts of 135,000,000 Americans is secure. To many, that knowledge is a present help. Today throughout the length and breadth of the land there is more heartache and suffering as the casualty lists arrive. This is so close and so immediate that little can be said by way of consolation. Except perhaps this one thought, that no matter how long his or her span of life had been, he or she could never have attained a higher pinnacle of human achievement than this supreme sacrifice for God and country. To no one is ever given the power to do more. No future deed could equal this.

Thomas Gray, the great English poet, in his Elegy in a Country Church Yard said, "The paths of glory lead but to the grave." On Easter and here today we are giving testimony to the inescapable fact that the paths of true glory lead beyond the grave.

This is an appropriate place to pay this tribute. In that time of turmoil troops were moving to and fro to the south and west of here. Many neighboring towns and villages still bear the scars and marks of cannon and gunfire. Just across the river fortifications were being hastily constructed to defend Harrisburg. And across the river and beyond those hills—just 37 miles away—was fought the decisive battle, the battle that made inevitable the final result. The Union preserved—entirely free.

The Americans of the epoch knew by instinct that the Battle of Gettysburg was one of the decisive battles of the world. Historians of other nations agree with them and with us after long study. As time marches on the far-reaching significance of that colossal combat and thence the preservation of this Union have year by year become more crystal clear. The quick and brilliant success of our arms in two later wars prior to this one rested upon that fact. In the precarious, brittle world that confronts us today think what it would mean to us if this country had been divided into groups of smaller states or nations instead of being one powerful and closely welded whole, able to mobilize all its resources with sudden speed, ready to defend its security, safety, and integrity with them and to aid our friends and allies, the United Nations. Think how gigantic this fact looms up to the peoples of the world. We can hold aloft the torch of freedom and liberty much higher as we are today. In union there is strength. We can make the light of liberty burn more brightly amid the storm clouds of a war-torn world. We can insure the world that the torch will be lighted again and quickly in places where the forces of evil and oppression have extinguished it. We could not have fought for freedom if our forefathers had not made all men free.

For if the principle of secession had once been established, it is only logical to assume that it would have been carried further and further and that both a separate North and a separate South would have broken up into yet smaller units by further use of that same principle. This knowledge is shared by our brothers in the South just as much as by those of us in the North.

A Southern Representative in Congress, Mr. COLMER, of Mississippi, expressed this view in a Memorial Day speech sometime ago, when he said: "I shudder to think what might have happened had the South prevailed." Today the North and South are one. There is no North, no South, no East, no West. The ill feeling and bitterness certain to be created by such a war and its emotional aftermath have almost entirely vanished. The common purpose with which all sections of the United States of America joined strictly together to further our ideals in avenging the *Maine* and defeating Spain, when the heroes of 1898 banded together for their spectacular campaigns—San Juan Hill, Manila Bay—when the troops dashed to the Mexican border, and in the World War, provided the melting pots in which were washed away by blood and sacrifice the few antagonisms still existing. The final crucible is this World War.

Never did so many go so far to fight for so so little of material value, as did those boys of 1917 and 1918, who with shining eyes marched forth on that great crusade to make the world safe for democracy and to end all wars and who asked nothing for themselves. Never, until December 7, 1941, were the fruits of their victory and their achievements largely dissipated, but by hands other than their own. Their idealism remains today—as it always will—one of the great moral and regenerative forces of the world. Their work and experience during the past quarter century will be a keystone and a beacon light in avoiding past errors and in building a world order of lasing peace. When we look at the totalitarian governments of today and when we see the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse again riding roughshod over more than one-half of the world, we know that their high objectives were well worth fighting for. If those boys had had their way, the world would have had throughout that peace we still pursue so steadfastly, and countless thousands on whom grinds the tyrant heel would enjoy the blessings of freedom.

Today North, South, East, and West mingle in our armed forces to bring the day of victory quickly and to safeguard and distribute throughout the seven seas to all mankind the opportunity for these same rights and principles which those to whom we pay honor and homage today paid for so willingly but so dearly many years ago.

It was just a little more than four score years after the founding of our Republic until the time the first shot was fired. The critical eras in the history of the United States recur at intervals of approximaely 80 years. Again today we are called upon to make fateful decisions, to expend our blood and sweat to hasten victory and thus save life—the most precious thing on earth. Fortunately victory is clear. But the cost has been great and will be greater. When I speak of cost, I mean cost in human life and suffering. Irreplaceable life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness of a great people are worth defending at any cost.

We have always had these privileges and perhaps had become accustomed to regard them as part of our natural environment, like the trees and the birds and the air and the sun. Perhaps it is not humanly possible to really know the true value of such gifts unless one has had the bitter experience of living without them. We are proud to be citizens of this Nation. We look back on our glorious past and, perhaps, we have a tendency to think that this glorious past insures of itself an equally glorious future. But empires have risen and empires have fallen. Many of these nations also had their periods of amazing success and prosperity. Our own Nation has had its periods of true greatness and it has had periods when it has not been so great. Today we are America. What we do and what we are will determine what this country is and will be. Millions have proven what they can do and will do by making the supreme sacrifice. Well over 35,000 have already died. These whom we honor today have given us most favorable opportunity. The strength of any government is no greater than the composite strength of all its people. It rests upon the aggregate of the aggregate of the persons who form its citizenry. This is truer today in our world narrowed as it is in time and space than ever before.

Americanism is glorious and we should glory in it but is not something inherent—not something which is just here with us of itself because we possess the peculiar good fortune of being American citizens—it is something we must create by our daily lives.

So we must on this solemn occasion keep our eyes fixed on the shining light which glows on the heroes past and present whom we honor today. We must remember them and what they did and what they died for, that their mantle has fallen on us.

"Lord God of Hosts be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the inspiring address delivered as permanent chairman of the Republican National Convention in Chicago by the distinguished minority leader, Mr. MARTIN:

I deeply appreciate the great honor you have bestowed on me by making me the permanent chairman of the 1944 National Convention of the Republican Party.

This convention meets in a solemn moment of our history. As we gather here, our sons are locked in a deadly struggle not merely to crush a cruel foe, but to determine whether or not the ideals upon which our free society is founded may have a decent world in which to continue its growth and progress. Never for a moment do we doubt the issue of this world battle. Seeking no territory to exploit, with no ambition to impose our will upon other peoples, giving the strength and the blood of our brave men and the heroic women who march beside them, pouring out our treasure in such a flood as the world has never known, we ask only that other men may have the right to live in a world where they may enjoy the blessing of that independence which through the favor

of Almighty God we have been permitted to have in such abundance. To such a struggle there can be but one issue. And in a sense this convention is not just a meeting of the members of a political party. It is a meeting of Americans who have a job to do which is only a part of that larger job for which our boys are dying upon so many remote battlefields and in so many distant seas. Here, therefore, in all humility, knowing our limitations, let us offer up in our hearts a prayer for our soldiers and for ourselves to that Allwise Providence who, as Lincoln said, "can go with them, yet remain with us and be everywhere for good." Let us implore Him to speed the day of victory so that they may come home to their mothers, and wives, and sisters, and their young sweethearts, and into our hearts where they will be enshrined forever for the selfless sacrifices they have made.

We will owe these men and women a duty far greater than merely caring for their individual wants when they return. When they went out from these shores they left behind them a form of society dedicated to certain great principles of human freedom and conduct, a society in which every man would have the chance to make his way, to speak his mind and make his own decisions.

They left a Constitution—somewhat battered, perhaps—and those traditions of freedom seriously impaired. But we owe it to them that when they return that Constitution and the heritage of individual freedom which it guarantees shall be restored in all its vigor. I hear it said frequently by our bureaucratic mentors in Washington that we will never go back to the old ways. What old ways are they talking about? We are here to tell them that we shall, as we have always done, forever go forward on all those roads which may lead to a better, safer, and happier life. But there are certain roads we have traveled which we have found to be good. The way of the American Constitution is one of them. And when the Republican Party comes again into control of the Government, the first thing it will do will be to go back to the Constitution.

We are in more than one war. In one of those wars our sons and daughters fight against German and Jap. But there is another war here at home. It is a war between two eternally hostile ideologies. One idea is that of the free society—the society of free men creating their wealth with the instrumentalities of free enterprise under the protection of a representative republic. The other is the conception of the regimented and planned society, living upon vast streams of Government debt and taking its shape and destiny from the directives of a bureaucratic elite under the command of a self-inspired leader. You may call that anything you wish. In Europe they call it fascism. Here we call it the New Deal. And in this war here at home let there be no question where the Republican Party stands. We are for the American system of government. We are for our way. We stand for our ideal of the free society—free enterprise and a free Republic. We are for government under the Constitution by a constitutional President and a Congress acting in the open under law and not by government in secret and without law by an army of irresponsible bureaucrats under a permanent leader.

We will win this internal struggle because the people of America will not tolerate winning the military conflict and then losing at home the precious ideals for which we went to war.

The gravity of conditions both at home and abroad places a heavy responsibility upon the delegates to this convention. We will nominate a man who will lead us in cooperating with other nations to get the world back to a sound, prosperous peacetime basis. We will name a man who will restore to the American people their government, and to all the opportunities for improvement in life which have all but vanished in the last 12 years.

In addition to the selection of capable men for President and Vice President we have the further responsibility of adopting a progressive, forward-looking platform which will meet realistically the problems of today, and which will give to the American people real hope for the future. We will keep any covenant we make with the people.

In this platform we must sound the call for all Americans, regardless of past party affiliations, to rally to the battle to preserve constitutional government, and our American way of life. This must be a government of laws and not a government by men. The courts must not bow meekly to the will of any President.

I know it is difficult to believe that anyone would want to substitute for our American way of life and our American form of government, other forms which have been tried and always found wanting in the past. Yet we cannot be blind to what has been attempted. We cannot ignore the boasts and predictions of men high in the ranks of the New Deal. The signs are very plain. There is a deliberate intention on the part of some to remake America in a way which would destroy opportunity and initiative. They would put an end to private industry. They would regiment all men and all women, and put all our people in shackles of bondage to an autocratic, power-lustful bureaucracy. Those who advocate the rigid permanent regimentation of the American people do not dare to declare openly their purpose. They scheme with stealth, and under the cloak of war activities, to achieve their purpose. They slyly plant the propaganda that the war controls must continue long after the war is over. What they want is permanent control of all industry, and to dominate all phases of our life.

Compare the attitudes and actions of this administration with World War No. 1 Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson. Said Woodrow Wilson: "Liberty has never come from the Government. The history of liberty is a history of resistance. The history of liberty is a history of limitation of Governmental power, not the increase of it."

We Republicans are determined to keep American citizens from being chained like vassals to a New Deal bureaucratic machine.

In the Congress we have fought this battle with the assistance of patriotic Jeffersonian Democrats, who put their country before party, we have been able to hold in check this movement, and we have prevented the consummation of many dangerous objectives. We have now reached a crucial point. We must have reserves in this battle to hold the lines of Constitutional Government. Give us a Republican President, and a Republican Congress, and we can all go to sleep at night secure in the knowledge that we shall continue to enjoy the blessings of the free government and liberty bestowed upon us by the brave, hardy pioneers who blazed the way for our Republic.

The New Deal bureaucrats can be expected in this campaign to picture new and more alluring rainbows. As usual they will be long on glowing promises. But as Lincoln well said, "You can fool all of the people some of the time; some of the peope all of the time, but you can't fool all the people all of the time." The people have lost faith in New Deal promises. Their performances have never measured up to their promises. Now the day of reckoning is at hand.

The people are tired of bungling and fumbling; waste and extravagance; arrogance and bureaucratic dictatorship. They know that unless there is a change from the direction in which we are now traveling national bankruptcy, confiscatory taxes and complete governmental regimentation and control of all our activities is dead ahead. The sure way to avert what would be a major transformation of our political and social ideals is to put a new governmental policy in effect in Washington.

The new dealers assert, when their failures are revealed, that their critics have no policy, no program. That is just as false as are some of the doctrines of the New Deal.

The Republican Party has had, and has now, both a policy and a program. Our policy and our program have been set forth on many occasions; in conferences of Republicans in Congress; and at meetings of the National Committee. At Mackinac we outlined our creed.

Our policy is a positive policy. This policy is to protect, to defend, and to perpetuate our free constitutional form of government, our free-enterprise system of economy, our system of free society. This is a real American policy, and it is broad enough to be embraced by men and women of every party who want to see individual freedom and individual opportunity continued in America. We extend a warm welcome to every American to join us in the historic struggle. We want the participation of everybody in putting our Nation back on a firm foundation.

The Democratic Party which we have known and with which we have honorably struggled on so many fields, but which was a party of Americans who believed in the American system, has lost its power over its own destiny. The Democratic Party has been captured by a minority whose philosophy it despises. It has become a prisoner of the New Deal. Thank God some of its leaders realize this and have had the courage to revolt. This election, curiously, is not merely a fight to put the Republicans into office but, by a strange twist of fate, it is also a fight to emancipate the Democrats.

Back in September 1942 the Republican Members in Congress set forth their policy and their program. These declarations in substance were:

1. The Nation's war effort must continue unabated until complete, decisive victory is achieved for the United States and our allies. We shall continue to demand efficient and unrelenting prosecution of the war on the battle fronts of the world and in the home fields production and delivery of machines, munitions, and supplies and war. We must unfailingly provide our own armed forces and those of our allies with all necessary implements, munitions, and supplies, in ample quantities, in time, where needed. We will uncompromisingly put aside every influence, interest, consideration, and activity which in any way interferes with these objectives.

2. We oppose any attempts to negotiate peace or the consideration of any peace terms until our arms have won such a decisive victory that we, together with our allies, are able to dictate the peace terms. Freedom is at stake. It permits no compromise or appeasement. The Axis dictators must be vanquished.

3. We recognize that the United States has a responsibility to work with other nations, to bring about a world understanding and cooperative spirit which will have for its supreme objective the continued maintenance of peace. In so doing, we must not endanger our own independence, weaken our American way of life, or our system of government.

4. Victory and security transcend all other considerations. We demand full and immediate utilization by the President of the most capable and efficient military and civilian leadership. Mistakes, blunders, and incompetence fall upon all alike. Added tears and unnecessary taxes are the wages of waste and inefficiency. The patriotism and sacrifices of the people must be matched by the selection of the most capable and best-trained leaders in America, regardless of party, group, class,

or section. We pledge as the people's Representatives in Congress a constant vigilance to eliminate waste and inefficiency.

5. Standing unreservedly for every effort to make this Nation strong, vigilant, and vigorous against all its enemies both foreign and domestic, the Republican Party has given and will continue to give to the President loyal, wholehearted, and patriotic support in the war. The gravity of the war situation requires the undivided effort of everyone. The President should not permit himself to be deterred from the responsibility which is his by those forces and influences which persist in continuing so-called social and governmental reforms at the expense of our war effort.

6. National unity depends upon an informed public opinion based upon free speech and free press. The right and duty to criticize and suggest must be fully exercised and discharged. We demand that the people be given all information concerning the war effort consistent with military requirements, but the withholding of information of the failures of the military and civilian officers of the Government cannot be hidden or justified behind the sham of military necessity. There must be no unnecessary censorship. There must be an end to conflicting statements and to an inconsistency of conduct on the part of the Government. There are no privations which our people will not willingly endure, no sacrifices which will not be unflinchingly faced, as long as they are truthfully informed as to the reasons for making such demands upon them. The people grow in strength and determination through truth.

7. There can be no vested interests in this war. No party, class, or section has a corner on patriotism or ability. Whatever our interests, we shall survive or perish together. Our Nation's peril must not be exploited by any individual or group for special gains or advancement. We shall neither support nor uphold any proposal or action on the basis of the interest of any particular group and we shall denounce any others whose action is dictated by such motives. We oppose excessive war profits. We demand the prompt investigation and prosecution of war profiteers. There must be a fair distribution of the war burdens among all the people. War demands a common partnership in both effort and sacrifice.

8. Individual freedom as symbolized and expressed in our American way of life and our Republican form of government with its three independent, coordinated branches must be preserved. This freedom must not be permanently surrendered in the name of the war emergency. There must be a prompt resumption after the war of complete and orderly functioning of constitutional government and free enterprise. Government by consent of the governed is still the best system ever devised for the continued progress of mankind.

9. The Nation faces grave and stupendous financial problems, due in large part to the loose fiscal policies of the last decade. War has added its cost to pre-war extravagance. Grim burdens are being imposed upon all of the people. From the frugality of yesterday and the sweat of today they buy bonds and pay taxes, confronted at all times by the menace of inflation and the threat of repudiation. We shall do all within our power to meet the demand of the people that Government lighten the burden by insisting that nondefense spending be reduced to essentials. Activities by the Government which have lost their emergency characters must be elimnated. Such taxes as are levied upon the people must be based upon the ability to pay and designed to conserve and not destroy.

10. American free enterprise is the last hope of an embattled and bewildered world. It is the last hope of our economic salvation when conflict ends. We stand militantly opposed to any use of the war effort as an excuse for unwarranted encroachments or restrictions upon free enterprise. The economic problems of the Nation must be solved on a basis which is sound and fair to all. National character based on a regard for moral standards and spiritual values must be restored, but this cannot be hoped for unless there is a complete return of intellectual honesty and absolute frankness on the part of those who are charged with the functioning of the Government, both in carrying out their duties and in their relationship with the people of this Nation. The principles which have made America great must not be overthrown by the war. In winning the war, we must not lose the peace.

That is a sound, constructive policy for any party. It is a good platform for any American.

The Republican Representatives in the Congress have never deviated a hair's breadth from those pledges since they were made, and they stand today as the declared policy of the Republicans in Congress. A party which stands for these principles certainly cannot be said to have no policy.

The people of America know that if those policies had been put into effect by the New Deal administration, we would be nearer to the day when we shall welcome back home our boys and girls from their great struggle. There would be a greater unity and a stronger spirit of cooperation, both of which are so vital if we are to win an enduring victory.

The Republican Party is the Bill-of-Rights party. We have witnessed in the recent past attempts by the Administration to set aside, or ignore, the Constitution. It is the contention of the Republican Party that the Constitution is not set aside by the advent of war; it ought not to be ignored because of war. Our system of government is the same; our Constitution is the same; and the importance of observing its provisions and limitations in wartime is the same as when the Supreme Court declared in the famous Milligan case in 1866 that—

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy and despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false, for the Government within the Constitution has all the powers granted to it which are necessary to preserve its existence, as has been happily proved by the result of the great effort to throw off its just authority."

Whenever any criticism, no matter how just or how constructive, is leveled at policies of the New Deal administration, at its contradictions, inconsistencies, broken promises, and mistakes of administration, the Administration's spokesmen always say: "All right, what would you do?" I am going to indicate a few things we will do.

The first thing the Republican Party will do when it comes into power will be to restore to Congress its responsibility and function as the people's special instrument of control over their Government and their public officials.

We will restore responsibility in matters of local concern to the State and local governmental subdivisions. The further Government is removed from the control of the people, the more inefficient and unsatisfactory it becomes.

We will have genuine economy in Government. To achieve that we will eliminate administrative nonessentials. No one can pretend that under the New Deal there will ever be retrenchment in governmental costs. The new dealers just don't believe in it. They preach the doctrine of deficit spending and an unlimited Federal debt.

Our whole taxing system will be made not only as simple as possible, but equitable as well. Taxation must be on a revenue basis and not for punitive purposes. We need a post-war tax policy which will stimulate industry and create jobs for the people. Without genuine tax reform, we will have millions of unemployed.

Under a Republican administration labor will retain all the essential rights and just privileges it has gained. The interests of labor and capital are mutual; working in harmony, each respectful of the rights of others, they can save private enterprise and give prosperity to all our people. When either side is unfair both suffer. Let us through justice to all prevent class warfare between two great groups of our own people. Only through justice to all can we achieve the industrial peace so essential for our full employment and the complete achievement of our fullest measure of prosperity.

Agriculture will be allowed to be self-sustaining and prosperous, which means that it will be assured a commensurate return on investment and labor. It cannot achieve its proper place in our national life when chained and regulated by theorists. A program of plenty is a program of wealth and happiness. The farmer should be given his rightful share of the national prosperity.

Private capital will be permitted and encouraged to venture, in the post-war period, into renewed and expanded production.

Enlarged job opportunities will be assured through a constantly expanding economy. Such an economy can be achieved only by increased production of goods and services at decreased prices, without a reduction in wages, attained through our genius for efficient mass production.

The hobbles of governmental restrictions will be taken off of business and only essential Government regulations retained.

We will continue humane and beneficial economic and social advantages. Old age shall not be a period of anxiety and suffering for the worthy men and women who have contributed to the upbuilding of America. There is no more meritorious appeal than full security for our aged citizens.

We will provide adequate benefits for the men and women of our military services and make certain they are promptly available. And we all know what they must have above everything else when they return is jobs at American wages and unemployment insurance until these jobs are attained.

These are some of our specifications.

The people in November will elect a President. The people know that while the President, under the Constitution, is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, he cannot be the directing genius of our military and naval forces. The people know he must rely on the trained military leadership to conceive and direct the military movements, and all parties should give unhesitatingly their full support to this military leadership. If this were not the case, we would be even more fearful for the safety of the millions of our brave sons and daughters who are in the military service.

We Republicans have constantly acted in that spirit, and we will continue to do so.

In recent weeks we have witnessed unusual and startling innovations in our political life. We have seen the head of the Communist political party in this country, Earl Browder, merge his party with Sidney Hillman's C. I. O. Political Action Committee in a drive for a fourth term for President Roosevelt and the election of a Congress which will be subservient to the will of those organizations. In endorsing Mr. Roosevelt there was no effort by Browder to conceal his objective. "We remain," said Browder, "an organization of Communists who hold the principles of scientific socialism, of Marxism."

Mr. Browder is not being fooled. He knows what he wants and he is taking the road he is sure will bring him to his goal. The American people will not be fooled, either.

This challenge has been insolently and boldly issued to the people of America. It presents a vital issue of this campaign. Do the people want these radical organizations, with their avowed purpose to remake America, to control the Presidency, to secure a rubber-stamp Congress, and to dominate absolutely and completely our Government? Of course they don't.

Since the American people made the decision that this country should be forever dedicated to the cause of free government and free labor, no greater issue has ever been presented.

In this fateful hour the good, sound-thinking people of America will respond to the call to save the country for our American way of life.

Men and women of all political affiliations will join in this fight.

Here is something worth fighting for. Here is an issue which rises above the narrow bonds of partisanship. Here is a real appeal to every red-blooded American, regardless of race, of color, or of creed.

There can be no question as to the decision of the American people. The people of the North, together with the people of the South and West and the East, will join in this call of country to save our liberties. To all of us is presented a glorious opportunity for service. We will not fail to be true to our fighting forces, to the children of today, and posterity of tomorrow.

We will keep faith with the fighting forces over there and their loved ones at home. We will save constitutional government at home and on the firm foundation of freedom and individual opportunity we will build an enduring peace. As a solvent, sound, forward-looking Nation we will be true to our obligations to other nations and we will be equally true to our own people. We will aid other nations to achieve security and rehabilitate themselves. We never shrink from duty, nor do we ever fail to aid afflicted people everywhere in the world. We can and will do it without lowering our own standards of living or sacrificing our own independence.

We go forward to victory, a victory for the American way, a victory for right and justice, a square deal for all people. And upon our efforts let us invoke the blessing of Almighty God.

St. Louis First City of Its Size To Go Over Top in Bond Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, my home city, St. Louis, and St. Louis County, is the first city of its size in the country to subscribe its quota of $180,863,050 in the fifth war loan drive. This is nothing new, as it is not the first time St. Louis and the county has reached its goal in bond drives; not only did they subscribe the quota but with 8 days to go the total exceeded the quota $802,555. Volunteer workers deserve great credit for the success of the drive. The sale of bonds to individuals and corporations will continue even though the goal has been reached.

Services of Vice Admiral Russell R. Waesche, Commandant, United States Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries which has jurisdiction of Coast Guard, is especially proud of the splendid service which has been rendered by that organization under the direction of Admiral Waesche, and the committee is in hearty accord with the views expressed in an editorial on Admiral Waesche and the Coast Guard which appeared in the Washington Post June 14, 1944, and which was placed in the RECORD by Congressman CANFIELD, of New Jersey—see page A3004.

It has always been a pleasure to have Admiral Waesche before the committee because of his clear, comprehensive, and complete statement of all matters of legislation presented by him, and because of the complete confidence which the committee has in Admiral Waesche and his official staff.

My personal acquaintance with Admiral Waesche began at the Yorktown Sesquicentennial Celebration in 1931. At the request of the United States, Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission, the then commandant of the United States Coast Guard designated Commander Russell R. Waesche as harbor master at Yorktown during the celebration and with authority to make the necessary preliminary arrangements for accommodating the large number of vessels which were expected to attend. Thereafter he met the various committees interested in the marine features of the celebration and took active charge of all preliminary arrangements in the harbor and along the water front. Informative bulletins were issued from time to time and distributed to those interested, including steamship companies and yacht owners, as to berths and anchorages, fresh-water supply for vessels attending the celebration, schedules for steamers using the commercial wharf, rules regarding the use of small-boat landings and the transportation of persons by small craft in the harbor, and other pertinent matters. Along with these bulletins were furnished blue prints of wharves and small-boat landings in the harbor and of berthing and anchorage plans.

In the annual report of the United States Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission, the splendid services of Commander Waesche, and of the Coast Guard, were recognized. The Coast Guard vessels engaged in the patrol of the harbor were busily occupied with various duties. Besides being constantly on the alert to guard against any accident to the thousands of persons being transported in the harbor by small boats, each commercial vessel that entered the harbor was met by a patrol boat and conducted to its anchorage; transportation was furnished frequently for the several governors of States and their parties in the harbors; landing forces and liberty parties were carried between the shore and ships in the harbor to assist the ship's boats; thousands of visitors were transported to and from the *Constitution*. During the reception on board the French cruisers, as well as at other official functions in the harbor, the lanes of travel between ships and shore were closely patrolled.

In addition, a Coast Guard officer and detail were placed in charge of the commercial wharf to supervise the docking and unloading of commercial vessels and to safeguard the lives of the thousands of passengers embarking and disembarking at this pier.

The work was performed without accident and with the commendation of all. The services then rendered were but another evidence of the truth of the motto of the Coast Guard that it is "Always Ready." The work done at the Yorktown Sesquicentennial celebration impressed me with the high degree of efficiency of Admiral Waesche and since that time I have been closely in touch with his work. At that time the jurisdiction over the Coast Guard was not in the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, but when the opportunity arose for the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to acquire jurisdiction of the Coast Guard every member of the committee welcomed the opportunity. They have never regretted the change, and every member of the committee feels a personal pride in its magnificent achievements in war and in peace.

I have no hesitancy in saying that Admiral Waesche is one of the most efficient, capable, conscientious, painstaking, informed officials in the United States Government today. I wish for him a long continuance in his present office where he is so efficiently serving.

On June 14, 1944, in the presence of high-ranking Navy and Coast Guard officers, Vice Admiral Russell Randolph Waesche, United States Coast Guard, was sworn in as commandant of the United States Coast Guard for a third term of 4 years by Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal in ceremonies in the Secretary's office.

Vice Admiral Waesche was born January 6, 1886, in Thurmont, Frederick County, Md., and received his early education in the public schools of Maryland and at Purdue University. He was appointed a cadet in the Coast Guard Academy on May 19, 1904, and received a commission as ensign on October 27, 1906. Until 1928 he was a line officer on cutters and destroyers in Alaskan and Arctic waters and the Pacific and Atlantic. He came to Coast Guard Headquarters in 1928 as Chief Ordnance Officer. In 1932, he became liaison officer in the War Plans Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department. With the termination of this duty 4 months later, he became aide to the commandant of the Coast Guard and later, chief of the finance division.

He was appointed commandant of the Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, by the President of the United States on June 14, 1936. Upon termination of this appointment in 1940, he was reappointed for a second 4-year period. In March 1942, he was raised to the rank of vice admiral, and in May 1944, was reappointed commandant for a third 4-year term.

Vice Admiral Waesche originated the Coast Guard Institute and correspondence school for warrant officers and enlisted men; and reorganized Coast Guard field forces in 1931.

During his first term as commandant, the lighthouse service was transferred to and integrated with the Coast Guard and the dual organization of a shore station branch and a seagoing branch was eliminated with one compact organization being set up.

Early in 1942 an Executive order by the President transferred to the Coast Guard certain function of the Bureau of Marine Inspection, United States Department of Commerce. Responsibility for the security of United States ports was also centralized in the Coast Guard.

Under wartime conditions, Vice Admiral Waesche has presided over the greatest expansion of the Service in history. In personnel it has multiplied 15 times, now totalling over 175,000 officers and men. He has organized a merchant marine council to serve as an advisory body on the administration of Coast Guard functions that relate to the merchant marine. He has seen the Coast Guard's peacetime fleet expand roughly three times, and the Service man over 200 Navy vessels.

Vice Admiral Waesche received an honorary degree as Doctor of Engineering in February 1944 from Purdue University. In May 1944, he was elected president of the Society of American Military Engineers.

He has three sons in service: Russell Randolph, Jr., a lieutenant commander in the United States Coast Guard; Harry Lee, a lieutenant colonel in the United States Army Air Forces; and James C., a chief motor machinist's mate in the Coast Guard. Vice Admiral and Mrs. Waesche, the former Agnes R. Cronin, reside at 7005 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

Wartime Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the radio address of Kenneth C. Bradley, national insurance officer, Disabled American Veterans, over Station WINX, Washington, D. C., June 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Life insurance, a subject concerning which most Americans are quite familiar, in time of war assumes entirely different aspects than is the case under normal conditions of life. This is particularly true with respect to the members of our armed forces and their dependents. Private insurance companies, by reason of the greatly increased risks to reserves which participation in the grim tasks of war-making entails, are unable to assume such risks when policyholders enter the armed forces to do battle with the enemy. As a result, most insurance policies contain a so-called "war clause" which, in effect, precludes the payment of death or disability benefits where the death or disability is brought about by the hazards of military service.

To offset this inability on the part of private insurers the United States Government has, from time to time, provided insurance protection to members of its armed forces. At the present time all enlisted and commissioned personnel are permitted to carry from $1,000 to $10,000 of this protection. There are two types, namely: United States Government life insurance and National Service life insurance.

Only those persons who were members of the active military forces prior to October 8, 1940, are eligible, under the law, to the former, whereas all who were in such service on that date or may have since entered such service are, or were eligible to carry the latter provided certain time and health requirements are met. To date, upwards of 12,000,000 policies have been issued by the Veterans' Administration.

All policies provide for payment of benefits to a designated beneficiary in the event of the death of the insured, provided, of course, premiums were timely paid. Premiums may be, and in most instances are, paid by deduction from the pay of the insured while he or she is in the active military service. Upon discharge therefrom, however, other arrangements must be made by the insured either by direct remittance or by deduction from disability pension, compensation or retirement pay, if any. Provisions for payment of benefits, permitted beneficiaries, and types of permitted plans, as between Government life insurance and National service life insurance, differ materially.

Military personnel engaged in the prosecution of World War No. 1 were issued Government life insurance on a yearly renewable term plan, in amounts of from $1,000 to $10,000, payable, in the event of the death of the insured, to his designated beneficiary or beneficiaries. Such beneficiaries were limited to certain specified relatives of the insured. In addition, the policy provided for the payment of monthly benefits to the insured on account of permanent and total disability. Subsequently, provisions were made for the conversion of this term insurance to other plans comparable with the commonly known plans of private insurance agencies. In all policies issued, whatever the plan, there was contained a permanent and total disability clause, together with the provision, on payment of additional premiums, for payment of monthly benefits on account of total disability (not necessarily permanent) which continues for at least 4 consecutive months. Limitations on the class of permitted beneficiaries was practically eliminated.

Until October 8, 1940, on which date the National Service Life Insurance Act became law, eligibility to Government Life Insurance included members of the regular military forces during peacetime. Thereafter the privilege of securing original policies of United States Government Life Insurance was canceled except as to those applications then pending.

The National Service Life Insurance Act, under which the great majority of present members of the armed forces are now covered, falls far short of its predecessor with respect to the benefits it provides. The outstanding difference is the lack of a provision for payment of benefits to the insured on account of permanent and total disability. The nearest approach to this is a provision for waiver of payment of premiums during the continuous total disability of the insured, which commenced subsequent to the effective date of the insurance and which has existed for 6 or more consecutive months. Persons whom the insured may name as beneficiaries are limited to the widow, widower, child, parent, brother, or sister of the insured. The term parent includes those who may have stood in loco parentis to the insured for at least 1 year prior to the insured's entry into active service. All National Service Life Insurance is originally issued under the 5-year level premium term plan, and may be converted after 1 year to ordinary life, 20- or 30-payment life. No other plan is provided.

Time does not permit discussion of the many phases of these insurance plans, but the foregoing outline indicates that there is need for amending legislation to equalize the benefits afforded our fighting men and women.

The Disabled American Veterans in concert with other major veteran organizations has sponsored legislation, now pending before the respective committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, which is designed to correct the manifest inequalities existing between the two types of insurance authorized by existing law. The legislation when adopted would, we believe, provide for the men and women, and their dependents a protection which, by and large, is comparable to that afforded the veteran of World War I and the peacetime soldier, sailor, and marine. Meanwhile, we are continuing our activities designed to assist the service man and woman and their dependents in securing all such benefits to which they may now be lawfully entitled and to advise all who may wish such service through our Nation-wide service department. We have experienced paid representatives in all or most of the regional facilities of the Veterans' Administration, any one of whom is ready and willing, without fee, to assist in this work. The Washington staff is located at room 543 Munsey Building and room 156 Veterans' Administration. Your speaker specializes on the subject of insurance and, like the other members of the staff, will be pleased to assist anyone desiring such aid on insurance problems.

At this time next Monday, Capt. John W. Egense will address you on the subject of veterans' appeals.

Wage and Hour Division Attempts To Extend Its Jurisdiction Over Laundries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 1943, I called to the attention of the Congress a glaring example of bureaucracy rampant. I pointed out in detail the efforts of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor to extend its jurisdiction over

laundries, linen-supply companies, and similar establishments despite a specific exemption provided in the act for service establishments doing a majority of their business within State lines. In connection with my statement, I placed in the RECORD various letters exchanged between Mr. Walling, Administrator of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and myself.

The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in the fall of 1943 vigorously repudiated the efforts of Mr. Walling's division to disregard the clear and unambiguous language which this Congress had written into the statute. Sometime later, the United States Supreme Court refused to disturb that decision.

Despite the clear Congressional mandate in the act and its subsequent affirmation by the judicial branch of the Government, Mr. Walling failed to revise a certain publication—Interpretative Bulletin No. 6—which took the position that laundries doing even a small quantity of wholesale work were to be treated differently than other types of laundries. This bulletin, which is widely circulated, is used by unscrupulous individuals to encourage suits against such laundries.

I called this situation to the attention of Mr. Walling on December 15, 1943, reminding him of his assurance to me in February that this Bulletin No. 6 would immediately be clarified "if the circuit court of appeals sustained the district court." I reminded him that he wrote me on August 12 that he would immediately revise the bulletin if the Supreme Court refused to review the case. Thereafter, despite the decision of the circuit court of appeals and the refusal of the United States Supreme Court to review the case, Mr. Walling failed to revise Interpretative Bulletin No. 6.

Mr. Walling replied evasively on January 7, 1944, and on January 21 I asked him categorically to let me know unequivocally whether the bulletin would be revised to reflect the decision of the Lonas case.

On January 29, Mr. Walling replied stating that he considered a certain press release issued on November 25, 1943 to be "a clear revision of the bulletin." The fact remains, however, that this misleading bulletin is still distributed by the Wage and Hour Division and employees in various parts of the country are still bringing unfounded suits as a result of their lack of knowledge.

The courts have repudiated this interpretation and Mr. Walling himself in his correspondence to me agrees that it no longer represents the interpretation of the Wage and Hour Division. As a consequence, employers in these essential-service industries which today represent a vital bulwark against the spread of disease in their communities are forced by employees' suits to waste time and energy in court which might better be devoted to the continuation of their businesses.

I believe that this correspondence to which I refer should be spread upon the public records as further evidence of the reluctance with which certain agencies confine themselves to the area delimited for them in their congressional grant authority:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION,
Washington, January 29, 1944.

The Honorable FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARTLEY: I am sorry that I was not able to talk with you about the Lonas situation because I was surprised that you had changed your views on the adequacy of what I had done since talking with me on the telephone 2 or 3 weeks ago.

I consider that the statement of our present position on laundries and linen-supply establishments of November 25, 1943, which is attached to every copy of Interpretative Bulletin No. 6 which goes out was a clear revision of the bulletin as you request. I do not see how it is possible to construe it in any other way. Would it make it more clear if a stamped notice was placed in the margin of every copy of the bulletin on page 8 opposite paragraph 25 something to this effect: "But as to laundries and linen-supply establishments see the attached statement dated November 25, 1943"? It would seem to me that no one could possibly misconstrue that we had modified our position on laundries and linen-supply establishments.

As I have already told you, I do not intend to take part in any laundry or linen-supply litigation under the Lonas decision which I am accepting as final in the field which it covered—laundries and linen-supply establishments. I do have to recognize, however, that as to certain other activities which are alleged to be service and which are dealt with in Interpretative Bulletin No. 6 the courts have taken a different view. Insofar as the courts have laid down the law on service establishments it would now appear that our views as expressed in Interpretative Bulletin No. 6, with the exception of laundries and linen-supply establishments, are a correct interpretation of the law. Having changed our policy as to laundries and linen-supply establishments, I cannot see that these industries have any grievance that some other industries which have not been ruled out of coverage of the law by court interpretation but which in some cases have been specifically ruled in, are not ruled out by an administrative interpretation which would be contrary to court decisions.

I am sure that on further reflection you will agree with me in this.

Sincerely yours,
L. METCALFE WALLING,
Administrator.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1944.

Hon. L. METCALFE WALLING,
Wage and Hour Division,
United States Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALLING: This is the first opportunity I have had to reply to your letter of January 7 following our conversation of the previous day, both of which were directed to my letter of December 15. If you will return to my letter once more, you will find that you have failed to answer my principal question: "Will you let me know, at your earliest convenience, unequivocally, whether Interpretive Bulletin No. 6 will be revised to reflect the decision of the Lonas case? If the bulletin is to be revised, when do you expect the revision to be completed?" I appreciate your assurance that your Division will undertake no further enforcement activities contrary to the decision in the Lonas case. However, the laundry industry is disturbed by the continued threat of employee suits which may arise as a result of the language in paragraph 25 of Bulletin No. 6, which states in unqualified language that laundries and linen supply companies serving industrial or business customers are subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act. Despite the fact that your press release of November 25, 1943, now accompanies each copy of Bulletin No. 6, the invitation to litigation is not thereby removed. I am informed that some union organizers are using Bulletin No. 6 to stir up unrest and dissatisfaction among employees of these service establishments and the employers' explanations of the Lonas case are futile in the face of the language of your official bulletin.

In view of your own opinion, expressed to me both orally and in letters on numerous occasions, that you recognize the clear intent of Congress to exempt all types of laundries, is this not the appropriate time to make such a revision? Furthermore, you have given me written assurance on at least three occasions that the bulletin would be revised after the district court decision, after the circuit court of appeals decision, and after the Supreme Court refused to review the case. I am forced to the opinion that some of your staff still nurture the hope that if the bulletin remains in its present form there may some day be further litigation which will once more raise the question before the Supreme Court. I believe it is your duty as administrator of the act, in simple justice to employers in this field to immediately revise the bulletin in accordance with your own opinion and the opinion now of five courts. There is a report that the employer in the Lonas case was forced to spend more than $35,000 in legal fees defending this unjustified case through various steps in litigation. If the next victim of such litigation should be a small laundry as are most plants in the industry, it might be forced to yield its legal rights because it could not afford similar expense.

I understand that complaint has already been presented to the Smith committee outlining the history of this case and the part played in it by your Division. Certainly your failure to make the necessary revision in Bulletin No. 6 required by court decision and your own recognition of congressional intent is the type of administrative action which the Smith committee was directed to investigate. I sincerely hope that you will take immediate steps to eliminate any further protest in this matter.

Awaiting your early reply, I am,
Very sincerely yours,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR AND
PUBLIC CONTRACTS DIVISION,
Washington, January 7, 1944.

The Honorable FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARTLEY: As I explained to you yesterday, I think the misunderstanding on the part of some people in the laundry industry arose out of a statement made by our regional attorney in Boston to a laundry in Vermont, which is doubtless the one Mr. Skinner referred to in his telephone call to you.

Our regional attorney advised the Vermont laundry that up to that time there had been no change in the position of the Division with regard to laundries. This was correct at that time as the Supreme Court action in refusing to review the circuit court's decision in the Lonas case had not been taken and consequently my press release of November 25, which I am enclosing, had not been issued. As you will see from this release, the Divisions are not taking any enforcement action whatsoever with regard to laundries and linen-supply establishments the greater part of whose servicing is in intrastate commerce and will not except in the unlikely eventuality that the Supreme Court might review some other laundry or linen-supply case. The Divisions, of course, will not participate in one in any way.

A copy of this statement which modifies Interpretive Bulletin No. 6 as to laundries is included with every copy of the bulletin

that is sent out so that employees as well as employers who inquire know exactly what our position is.

If the Supreme Court later should decide that the exemption is inapplicable to such establishments, you inquire what my position would be. Of course, any company which has relied upon our press release will not be proceeded against by us and if the Supreme Court made a statement as to the law which is binding on us we would naturally apply it prospectively only in view of our statement that we will not take enforcement action unless the Supreme Court rules in substance in another case that the circuit court holding in the Lonas case was wrong.

As you know, there is always the possibility of employee suits and the Administrator's position is not binding on employees. I should think, however, that the possibility of an employee suit is remote.

Sincerely yours,

L. METCALFE WALLING,
Administrator.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1943.

Hon. L. METCALFE WALLING,
Wage-Hour Division,
United States Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALLING: Several weeks ago Mr. Winslow of your office sent me a copy of a press release which you issued after the Supreme Court refused to review the decision of the circuit court of appeals in the Lonas case. I was somewhat surprised that your statement said nothing about revising interpretative bulletin No. 6. This bulletin remains as a constant invitation to other laundry employees, who can hardly be expected to know about the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, to institute suits against their employers because of your expressed interpretation that wholesale laundry work is covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. I was confident that you intended to fulfill your assurance given me last August that the bulletin would be revised as soon as the Supreme Court disposed of the matter one way or another.

Yesterday, I received a telephone call from Mr. Skinner informing me that a laundryman in one of the New England States recently discussed with your regional attorney, or someone in his office, the present status of wholesale laundry work under the act. Your attorney stated, in substance, that the Wage-Hour Division was not bound by the Lonas case and, in fact, was currently looking for another test case.

Of course, I don't know how accurately the conversation was reported and I presume your attorneys will deny that any such statement was made. Notwithstanding, I am now convinced that there is a deliberate policy on the part of your legal advisers behind the refusal to incorporate in interpretative bulletin No. 6 the congressional intent which you state to me you recognize, agree with, and which five courts have now affirmed.

You wrote me on February 22 that you would immediately clarify the bulletin "if the circuit court of appeals sustains the district court." The circuit court did affirm the district court decision. Thereafter, you wrote me on August 12 that you could not make a public announcement of a reversal of position because of the possibility that the Supreme Court might reverse the circuit court of appeals. Later in August, at a conference in my office, you assured me that you would immediately revise the bulletin if the Supreme Court refused to hear the case. I so advised Mr. Skinner in my letter of September 7, a copy of which I sent to you. You wrote me thereafter confirming the substance of that letter.

Certainly your statement of November 25, which may or may not have appeared in the newspapers throughout the country, does not constitute a revision of interpretative bulletin No. 6. That bulletin continues to be issued from your offices stating unequivocally that wholesale laundry work is not within the exemption of section 13 (a) (2). Your own staff must view the failure to revise the bulletin as an indication that the interpretation is still correct and that your present enforcement policy is merely a temporary marking of time until "the Supreme Court later should decide that the exemption is inapplicable to establishments serving commercial and industrial establishments."

Will you let me know, at your earliest convenience, unequivocally whether interpretative bulletin No. 6 will be revised to reflect the decisions of the Lonas case? If the bulletin is to be revised, when do you expect the revision to be completed? Will you also inform me what action is being taken at present to prevent the bulletin, in its present form, from misleading workers who may secure copies from your offices? Do you intend to attach some statement to these bulletins pointing out that certain sections are in error and that wholesale laundry work is not covered by the wage-and-hour provisions? What is the status of a wholesale laundry which relies upon your press release as indicating that laundry and linen supply companies are within section 13 (a) (2) if "the Supreme Court later should decide that the exemption is inapplicable to such establishments"?

Awaiting your early reply, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.

Loans to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding achievements of this Congress is the G. I. bill of rights, but unless supplemented and implemented it will not do the job that all of us want done for the man returning home from military service.

Let me illustrate by discussing the problem of the returning soldier who wants to acquire and operate a family-size farm. Many of these veterans must start from scratch. Under the G. I. Act the Government will guarantee up to half of a loan for purchase of a farm, livestock, or machinery, provided the guarantee shall not exceed $2,000.

In many parts of the country a family-size farm cannot be acquired without using all a veteran's G. I. credit. In very few sections is the amount sufficient to both buy a farm and equip it. If the veteran uses his G. I. credit for land, he may need a rehabilitation, or operating, loan for equipment and livestock.

You will remember that the G. I. Act makes veterans eligible for loans for the purchase of farms under the Bankhead-Jones Farm-Tenant Act, but it does not provide veterans' preference for rehabilitation loans which many will find necessary. In fact hundreds of men already discharged from military service have known that the Congress had made funds available through the Farm Security Administration for that type of credit.

And many are finding that the available funds are inadequate.

That was why I sought, unsuccessfully, to offer an amendment to the Agriculture appropriation bill when the House conferees reported their recommendations. I wanted to have additional credit provided and earmarked for World War No. 2 veterans. Parliamentary complications prevented consideration of an amendment, however; and I now ask your help in enactment of a measure that will be supplementary to the G. I. Act.

The bill which I have prepared and plan to introduce shortly after the Congress reconvenes following the summer recess is not long. It follows:

A bill to provide for the making of loans to veterans and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of making the loans required by section 505 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to any person eligible to receive the benefits of title III of said act, and similar loans to the family of such person prior to discharge or after his death in service, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to loan to the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, upon the request of either, $15,000,000 upon the terms and conditions specified in the item "Farm tenancy" of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the sums made available hereunder may be distributed among the States, Territories, and counties in such amounts as are necessary to make loans to such eligible persons and their families.

SEC. 2. In order to provide funds for the making of rural rehabilitation or operating loans to any needy person eligible to receive the benefits of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and to the family of such person prior to his discharge or after his death in service, who is unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the area where the loan is proposed to be made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator, upon the request of either, of not to exceed $25,000,000. Such advances shall be made upon the terms and conditions specified in the item "Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation" in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945.

SEC. 3. The amounts herein authorized shall be in addition to any other sums now authorized to be loaned or advanced and the amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect, is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. There is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated $2,500,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture through the War Food Administration to carry into effect the provisions of this act and for necessary expenses, which funds may be expended in accordance with the authorities contained in section 41 (b) (1) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1015), in connection with the making and servicing of loans made hereunder

and collection of money due the United States on account of loans made pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Summarized, this bill will:

First. Provide $15,000,000 for loans to World War No. 2 veterans who choose to buy family-sized farms in accordance with the G. I. Act and the Bankhead-Jones Act. You may ask: Why not use the present Farm Security Administration appropriation? That, you will remember, is $15,000,000 for farm-purchase loans just enough—even if veterans got it all—for an average of one loan per county. Moreover, the general appropriation does not accord veterans' preference.

Second. Provide $25,000,000 for farm-operating loans either to returning veterans of World War No. 2 or to families of men now in uniform or families of those who give their lives in their country's service. Again you may say, Why not use the present Farm Security Administration appropriation for rehabilitation loans? That is $67,500,000, exactly what it was last year when many, many more farm families sought loans than could be accommodated with the reduced appropriation. I understand that the F. S. A. was able to aid 25,000 additional rehabilitation borrowers in the past year. I honestly believe that the coming year will see more than that number of World War No. 2 veterans seeking this type of credit.

Third. Utilize the existing facilities of the Farm Security Administration, including the committees of three of your fellow citizens in every county, for administering this assistance. Thus, the costs will be held to a minimum.

With the additional funds which the bill would give, the Farm Security Administration will be able to aid veterans in acquiring farms, even beyond the G. I. Act's limitations where that is necessary, and will be in position, too, to furnish operating credit not covered by the G. I. Act. The farm-purchase loan of F. S. A. are for 40 years at 3 percent; the rehabilitation, or operating loans, for 5 years at 5 percent. This money, bear in mind, will be loaned, not given, and I submit to you that there is every reason to believe that virtually all will be repaid.

Do you doubt that today there are thousands of men in military service who are expecting to borrow from the F. S. A. when they come home from the war? Fairly typical, I believe, is the attitude of the soldier who wrote the Memphis Commercial Appeal a letter which it published recently, and which I quote:

To the COMMERCIAL APPEAL:

I have only returned from 18 months overseas long enough to find out a few things that have been going on since we left. Spending a few hours in a U. S. O. in Memphis between trains, I chanced to see in your paper an attack on the Farm Security Administration by your Washington correspondent, and an uncomplimentary reference to this agency in the columns of another Memphis newspaper.

I find it hard to understand this. I don't know what F. S. A. has been doing the past 2 years except what my folks, who are farmers in Texas, write me. F. S. A. financing has helped them to raise all kinds of food that they didn't raise in such quantity before the war: beef, pork, eggs, vegetables.

I have saved up almost enough money since the war began to buy the team and tools for a farm of my own and am counting on F. S. A. to help me buy a farm after the war is over.

I am a farm boy and want to go back and settle down in East Texas—the sooner the better.

Staff Sgt. G. S. FOSTER, Jr.
FORT SHERIDAN, ILL.

Here is a communication from Mr. E. M. Stannard, of Columbia, Conn.

Brought up on a farm, I later went to sea and was an officer in the Merchant Marine. When the depression hit that career, I took an opportunity to do newspaper work. While so engaged I bought a run-down, 130-acre farm. As I was about to start small-time farming along with newspaper work, events so shaped up that I felt it my duty to volunteer for naval service. This I did, and was commissioned a lieutenant just prior to Pearl Harbor. I lasted only a short while due to heavy duty and loss of weight. Ordered home, I found I could not do newspaper work. I had the "jitters"—nervous reaction or some such thing. But I found I did have the strength and desire to go ahead with my farm.

The first winter back home I got "calmed down" and made a fair living chopping and selling firewood. But this provided no capital for farm development or improvement.

Then came the very encouraging response of F. S. A. to my inquiry as to aid. Mr. Silas Weeks, then local supervisor, assisted me in every way with his advice and aid in drafting a program and in securing the necessary funds.

Conditions of the market made it seem advisable to alter some of the program Mr. Weeks had suggested, but the general outline was followed.

Our garden last summer gave us all necessary vegetables and my wife canned over 500 quarts of food. I purchased some cows, and from the sale of some small lots of land, was able to modernize and reequip the barn. For a while my entire income, except living necessities, went for additional animals and equipment.

With an improving income, and a developing farm, I feel that in another year I will be fairly independent financially, with a valuable farm plant to provide a living. This will have been achieved in a bit over 2 years.

When I started my farm was only an unworkable white elephant. No bank or private party would finance me. The Federal Land Bank to whom I originally applied for a loan could see no hope in this farm.

But I found F. S. A. treated the problem more generously and, it must be added, more sensibly. My experience shows that, except for F. S. A., I would never have been able to maintain the farm, or bring it to a point where it now is as a going business and a help in the production of needed dairy products.

Mr. Barnard, the present supervisor, has been very helpful in extending my program to adjust to developing needs. I now have 21 head of cattle, other animals, tractor, and much equipment.

No one wants charity, but often financing is needed on a basis no private source will consider. F. S. A. is the only agency of help in such cases. I have only the highest praise for its program and its usefulness, particularly in this wartime.

Do you not agree that this is a testimonial of which the Congress may well be proud—for it was the Congress that appropriated the funds that aided this former Navy man.

The need is growing daily. The Office of War Information has told us that, through February of this year, 1,300,000 men had been discharged from our military services since we entered the war and the current rate of discharge was placed at approximately 55,000 monthly.

For those who are eager to get back on farms in the communities that mean "home" to them, adequate credit should be readily available. To accomplish that is the purpose of my proposal.

Veterans' Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address by Capt. John N. Egense, national appeals officer, Disabled American Veterans, over Station WINX, Washington, D. C., June 19, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When a veteran files a claim on Form 526 with a Veterans' Administration regional office for compensation, pension, or any other benefits to which he believes he is entitled, he should consult a representative of the Disabled American Veterans or a representative of some other recognized service organization. A power of attorney, Form P–22, is used for the purpose to permit the representative to appear in the veterans' behalf when such form is signed by the veteran or claimant.

As long as this power of attorney is in force, no one else may have access to the file. This power of attorney may be revoked by the veteran at any time and another filed with some other veterans' organization if so desired.

When a claim is filed, the Veterans' Administration calls on the War or Navy Departments for the A. G. O. report and all clinical records. When all of these records have been received the case is then considered by the regional board, at which time the veteran may appear himself or he may be represented by the organization holding his power of attorney.

If the board denies the claim the veteran is notified by the Veterans' Administration of such denial and informed of his right to appeal from any adverse decision. He has 1 year from the date of denial in which to file such appeal, and should make this appeal on what is known as Form P–9. This form should be completely filled out by the veteran or claimant, and it should be stated that he is appealing from the decision of the regional office which denied his claim.

If on the appeal form you state that you will submit additional evidence relating to your claim, you will be expected to submit such evidence within 6 months from the date your form P–9 was received in the regional office. In the event you fail to submit such evidence within this 6-month period, your appeal will be considered canceled.

If you state that all evidence obtainable and relating to your claim has been presented to the Veterans' Administration, then the

claim will be certified to the chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

In the course of time the Board of Veterans' Appeals will request that the complete file be forwarded to Washington for consideration by the appellate group. When the file arrives in the central office your representative is notified by the Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals. The file is then called by your representative, who makes a thorough investigative review of the case.

Your representative notes the question at issue on which your appeal was based. If, after his review, he feels that the appeal should be more fully developed, he requests that the file be held in abeyance until he has corresponded with the veteran and asked him to secure, if possible, further evidence or affidavits.

If the representative feels that the appeal should be withdrawn, he so advises the claimant, stating his reason for suggesting withdrawal and requesting the claimant to write a letter to the Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals asking that his appeal be withdrawn and returned to the regional office without any action being taken on the appeal.

Bear in mind that, although you have given power of attorney to any representative organization, your representative is not permitted to withdraw this appeal for you. If, on the other hand, your representative feels that all the evidence is complete, he then calls for a board to hear the case.

When this board is assembled the representative presents the question at issue, stating the facts in the case, submitting all outside evidence, and pointing out why he believes that the claim should be allowed and should have been allowed by the regional office.

It is permissible for the veteran to appear with or without a representative. He may also have his Senator or Congressman appear for him with or without a representative of a service organization, or he may secure the services of a contact representative from the Veterans' Administration.

The Board of Veterans' Appeals has the right to remand the case after the hearing for further medical examination, social service report, or investigation. In this event the case is remanded back to the regional office. After the request of the Board of Veterans' Appeals has been complied with, the regional office reviews the claim again and may then decide that the new evidence warrants the allowal of the claim.

If the regional board holds that the new evidence does not alter the former decision of denial, they must return the claim to the Board of Veterans' Appeals for decision on the original appeal.

If the Board of Veterans' Appeals denies the appeal, both the veteran and his representative are notified. The appeal may not then be reopened unless the veteran or his representative can show that the Board made a clear and unmistakable error, or the claimant may reopen the appeal by submitting new and material evidence.

It takes from 30 to 90 days for a decision to be released by the Board of Veterans' Appeals after a hearing, depending, of course, on whether the appeal load is heavy or light. If light, decision can be expected in a shorter period.

I have tried to give you a clear picture of the proper procedure in filing a claim, and the requirements for filing an appeal in the event of an adverse decision by a local rating agency. There are a number of ways your case can come to Washington; appeal by the veteran, administrative appeal on a dissenting opinion, or the appeal may be merged with the administrative appeal.

The Disabled American Veterans maintain a service officer in nearly every veterans' administration regional office in every State. A full-time staff is located in Room 543, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., and national service officers are also in Room 156, Veterans' Administration Building, Washington. Contact should be made with either of these two places.

Sound Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the greatest need of the world today is a sound, workable, adequate money system. What every nation needs most is a monetary unit stable in value and interchangeable with the money of all other countries—a monetary unit with a value that is independent and separate from the quality of national credit.

This monetary problem was met and solved by the First Congress, when our monetary system was established by simply providing that a given weight of gold of standard fineness and a given weight of standard silver was a dollar, which was made legal tender for all payments. This simple plan provided a money supply that automatically increased to keep pace with growing population and commerce. The Government did not peg the price of either metal; it simply made the dollar the standard of value and the price of all other things adjusted themselves to the value of this monetary unit. The production and minting of gold and silver furnished money in sufficient and ever-increasing quantity to stabilize prices once they became adjusted to the money volume.

This plan made our money independent of the value of Government credit and provided a money media with an international value.

In later years, France, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland, in a monetary convention, perfected the bimetallic monetary system which was similar to the system in use in this country, by standardizing their coinage of both gold and silver on a 15½ to 1 ratio, thereby making their money interchangeable in the countries subscribing to the monetary convention. The plant worked so well that this country was invited to join the convention and standardize our coinage with theirs by reducing our ratio from 16 to 1 to the standard of 15½ to 1. No extra expense was involved. All we had to do was to reduce the contents of our silver dollar from 412½ grains of standard silver to 400 grains. For some unexplained reason, this country refused to join in accepting the plan and thereby this Nation lost the greatest opportunity our Government has ever had to join with the other countries to perfect and give to the world a sound international monetary system—a plan that was wrecked by the avarice of Germany after the war of 1870, and the demonetization of silver and, finally, gold. The time for correcting these monetary mistakes is long overdue.

Experience demonstrates the futility of pegging the price of either gold or silver on a commodity basis. What the world needs is a sound, adequate, workable monetary system, a subject ably presented by Mr. F. H. Brownell in his treatise entitled, "Hard Money," and discussed in some detail with Mr. E. S. Pillsbury in correspondence, which is inserted herewith for the consideration of the Members of Congress:

CENTURY ELECTRIC CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., February 9, 1944.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: Your very interesting letter of January 15 at hand. I have just returned from Florida so hasten to reply.

Thank you for having my letter to the Wall Street Journal published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As a matter of fact, the Wall Street Journal published only about the first half of this letter, but I guess there was no very good reason for blue penciling the rest. Anyway, it is all in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, regular or not.

I am afraid you do not see the monetary problem as I do; otherwise you would not make the statements you make.

For example, you say the true yardstick of value in our country is the dollar. As I see it, we used to have, we ought to have, and perhaps we soon shall have, a true yardstick of value; but to say that our current dollar is, or during the last 30 years has been, a true yardstick of value seems to me nonsense. When we authorized the Federal Reserve Board to expand the currency as trade demands, and to contract it when no longer needed, we substituted money management by a group of officials in lieu of supply-and-demand control of operations through a monetary unit. Of course, we contact supply-and-demand prices in foreign markets where gold is the only money recognized, but for 30 years we have had no money that may be depended upon to generate supply-and-demand prices; and even if we did have such money, there is no reason to consider that our money managers would let it function.

I have been studying the article to which you call attention in the National City Bank's Bulletin of January 1944. The writer of it puts up so conclusive an argument against deficit financing that I am constrained to reproduce here a portion of what he has to say. The fact is that compensatory financing is the kind our Treasury has been doing for 14 years, except that prosperity boomed itself out long ago and deficits only were left for us to deal with. Here is the quotation:

"In this book (Stuart Chase's Where's the Money to Come From?), written in the engaging style for which the author is renowned, Mr. Chase gives full support to the owing-it-to-ourselves argument about internal debt, and plumps unreservedly for the theory of the compensatory economy—that is, where the government takes responsibility for maintaining full employment by spending freely and running into debt in periods of depression, and siphoning off purchasing power and retiring debt by taxes in periods of boom.

"* * * A second, and even more basic, objection to the compensatory budget idea is that it vastly oversimplifies the problem of maintaining economic stability. It would be a fine thing indeed if all that was needed to keep the economic machine hitting on all cylinders at just the right pace would be turning on and off the stream of funds

from the public treasury. But it would be well to pause and think a moment of the full implications of this doctrine.

"What it means, first of all, is applying a single specific—government spending—to all the ills to which the economic system may fall victim. No need to bother about the particular cause of the trouble—whether it be some basic disturbance or unbalance in vital parts of the economy. No need to bother whether exorbitant demands of particular groups are blocking the channels of trade; no matter about international trade barriers, or wrong exchange rates, or bad tax laws, or other shortsighted actions and policies of individuals and governments which, in varying degree, may be responsible for interrupting the even flow of economic activity. For all these, the prescription is the same—more government spending.

"What it means, secondly, is attempting to shift to the government responsibilities that in a democratic society must rest primarily with the people. Putting everything up to the government means weakening the responsibility of the individual. Why should individual groups concern themselves with making adjustments, or place restraints upon their actions? The lid is off for pressure groups, whether they be labor, business, agriculture, or any other, if the government is responsible for keeping everyone employed. Why should anyone worry when the government underwrites everything?

"The fact is that society cannot function under a system that encourages irresponsibility and indiscipline, and which protects everyone from the consequences of making mistakes. This is not to suggest 'putting on the hair shirt' deliberately for the sake of punishment, but simply that necessity is the mother not only of invention but of adjustment. Except as there are incentives and pressures to eliminate sources of disorder, sore spots in the economy tend to get sorer and sorer, until finally the treatment breaks down as after the last war when a maladjusted international situation was masked and propped up by a huge volume of international credits."

Some years ago the farmer wanted subsidies. He got what he wanted and now there is nothing in the world the farmer wants less than subsidies.

At a yet earlier date the banker wanted an abundance of money. Most of them still do. He had been caught short on money from time to time all his life and he wanted enough so he would never be short again. He got what he wanted.

This National City Bank Bulletin contains the first condemnation of the system that has come to the writer's attention from one of the leaders responsible for what we have, although there are plenty long overdue. Now that the ice is broken, we expect these protests to rise to a crescendo that will attract attention in quarters where the farmer has gotten no hearing.

The worker, ever since I can remember, has protested against supply and demand wages in free markets, so we have "collective bargaining." The boss doesn't know how much he ought to pay and the workers know no more about how much they are entitled to receive, so they arrange to put their heads together in some sort of a collective bargaining procedure and zero knowledge times zero knowledge gives 0—a perfect circle. The deed is done. The papers are signed, the bargain is closed. The wage agreed upon constitutes our sacred cow and any man who questions the result is an enemy of mankind in general and labor in particular. However, since our dollar is selling for 80 cents in South America, for 50 cents in Asia, and, according to the latest reports, for 5 cents in China, we may look for development here at home at no distant date. Then even our workers may be ready to let supply and demand play its part in fixing wage rates.

Since you and I do not seem to see the price-building problem eye to eye, I have looked around to see what I have written that sets forth the process as I understand it, and have, therefore, clipped the enclosure from the Voice of Liberty for January 1942. This article contains a knock on silver, but that ought not to spoil it for you. In fact, it ought to help, for I am satisfied that if the silver industry was wisely led, it would work for gold for money to enlarge and stabilize its silver market, if for no other reason.

I am very much concerned that Congress shall not neglect the money question until it is too late to save the dollar. The Economists' Monetary Policies Committee, in their last report, say it sells for a nickel in China. If we don't watch our step, its purchasing power here will be little more before it hits bottom.

I hope there is yet a chance to reinstate supply and demand control in lieu of managed money. If you want to use anything I have written, with or without credit, go ahead; or if I can be of any service by spending a week or two in Washington, don't hesitate to call on me for whatever you think I am good for.

Yours very truly

E. S. PILLSBURY.

FEBRUARY 21, 1944.

MR. E. S. PILLSBURY,
Century Electric Co.,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. PILLSBURY: Ever since receipt of your letter of February 9 which has been uppermost in my correspondence preference file, I have been endeavoring to find the time to study the plans proposed in the data which accompanied your letter, and make an appropriate reply.

It is reassuring to find that thoughtful people—many with wide business experience—are giving their time and attention to the solution of post-war problems. I still adhere to my original idea that what this country needs is a good sound, workable, adequate monetary system and a system of laws, impartially enforced to protect business and enterprise from the restrictions imposed by unfair competition and unfair business practices. I know that the plan I have proposed raises controversial issues, but my chief interest in the money question is in the kind of currency system which I have described. No matter what its characteristics are, if you can convince me that it will embody the principles enumerated, I shall be pleased to join with you in an effort to secure its adoption.

The matter of protecting competition to bring the law of supply and demand into play by fostering free enterprise, and the elimination of unfair business practices and unfair competition will raise no end of controversial questions; but, after all, the provisions of economic law must be brought into play if we are to have a fair and equitable adjustment of the price structure in this country.

In closing, I wish that I might have been able to find the time to go into the several issues presented in your letter and discuss them in more detail.

With best wishes for your personal success and our country's continual advancement, I am

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

CENTURY ELECTRIC CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., May 15, 1944.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing an article entitled "Free Enterprise," answering Mr. Wallace, which I think covers some ground fairly well. I hope you will find time to study it.

A friend sent me copy of a brochure which Francis H. Brownell is sending out entitled "Hard Money." Doubtless you also have received a copy. Mr. Brownell advocates international bimetallism. He reasons as follows:

"When the price of both silver and gold is pegged, as gold formerly was pegged, fluctuations in the market price of both metals become impossible regardless of increases or decreases of their production."

We all know that a very considerable proportion of both silver and gold produced is used in the arts. I don't know what percentage, and Mr. Brownell, who provides many useful statistics, does not tell us. He does state that somewhat less than half of the world's stock of silver is monetary, so we may assume that something like half of the product goes into use in the arts. Let us suppose that lending governments agree that 1 ounce of silver is to constitute a dollar; also that 1 ounce of gold is to constitute $35. Now let us suppose that after getting into operation with these bimetallic coinages, when things have gotten settled down and business has become active, the silver manufacturers are unable to get, at these prices, enough silver from the silver refiners to meet their requirements. What will they do? Will they not start melting silver coin? After they have melted all of the coin they can get their hands on, w]'l they not raise the price? When the price has been raised, say 50 percent, which is conservative considering that silver has sold at from 25 cents to $1.375 per ounce, a ratio of 1 to 5½, since World War No. 1. Will we not be back on the single gold standard with even our fractional silver gone into the melting pot?

Let us suppose, on the other hand, that as time progresses, in lieu of a shortage of silver, a surplus develops, so that governments find a lively demand for gold but are overstocked with silver. Why should the people pay debts with gold, that is scarce, when silver is abundant, and will do the job just as well. All of the experience of the past shows that the more valuable coinage goes into hiding and domestic business, in general, is done in measurements based on the value of the least valuable coinage available.

In another connection, Mr. Brownwell says: "There can be no doubt that it is just as feasible to peg the price of silver as that of gold." To be sure, a government can peg its currency to either silver or gold, but the same government cannot peg its currency to both silver and gold at the same time. If it does, the Gresham law applies and values will be measured in terms of the least valuable coinage or standard. The better one may continue to function in international trade by weight, or it may go into hiding or hoarding, depending upon conditions.

From our former conversations, I feel sure that you will agree with my conclusions relative to this bimetallic money proposition, so I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Brownell. I hope you will also write to him. I feel sure that I am right in my analysis. If I am, it is unfortunate that so good company is not alined up on the right side of this important matter; especially now, when a sound monetary policy was never worse needed.

Yours very truly,

E. S. PILLSBURY.

MAY 23, 1944.

Mr. E. S. PILLSBURY,
Century Electric Co.,
St. Louis, Mo., U. S. A.

DEAR MR. PILLSBURY: I was much interested in your letter of May 15 to Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE, copy of which you were good enough to send me.

If your suggestion, that the arts and silver manufacturers will need so much silver that ultimately they will melt down all the coin and raise the price above anything fixed by the Government should ever eventuate, it is true we would then be back on the single gold standard. So far in the history of the world, the use of silver in the arts has not exceeded one-third of the annual production, on the average. It is conceivable, of course, that the remaining two-thirds would be demanded, but it is so highly improbable as to pass out of the realm of serious consideration.

The same problem can be posed as to gold which, like silver, is used in the arts.

Evidently I failed to get over to you the principle of international bimetallism and pegging the price of both gold and silver. You say, "the same government cannot peg its currency to both silver and gold at the same time." This is exactly what I contend it can and should do. Former bimetallism failed after England pegged—that is, fixed—the price of gold at an unvarying level but did not peg the price of silver, which continued to vary in price and therefore permitted operation of the so-called Gresham law. This drove the world to the single gold standard. The physical quantity of gold having proven to be insufficient and the entire world being off the gold standard at the present time, as well as off the silver standard, it would seem an opportune time to those who believe in hard money to correct the former evils of bimetallism. This can be done by pegging the price of silver as well as the price of gold, just as England stood ready to buy all gold that might be offered at £3 17s. 9d. and to sell all the gold that might be required at the same price plus a little less than 3 cents in United States money.

The price of gold remained between those levels for a period of nearly 100 years.

Similarly, if the United States and Great Britain, or even the United States alone, were to agree to buy all gold offered at $35 and sell all gold required at, say, $35.03 per ounce, and to buy all silver that was offered at, say for example, $1 per ounce and sell all silver desired at not over $1.03 per ounce, there could be no variation in the prices of either gold or silver that would affect their relationship as money.

The object of having a slightly higher selling price is not only to bear the expenses of the transactions, but also to permit the trade demands for both gold and silver to satisfy themselves by paying slightly more than the Government buying price. They would not pay more than the Government selling price, because Government metal would be available at that selling price.

I think if you follow out carefully this thought of pegging the price of both metals, all your fears of operation of the Gresham law and of one metal driving out the other will vanish into thin air.

Yours truly,

F. H. BROWNELL.

Copy for Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE.

CENTURY ELECTRIC CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., June 6, 1944.

Mr. FRANCIS M. BROWNELL,
Chairman of the Board, American Smelting and Refining Co.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BROWNELL: Yours of May 23 at hand. Thank you for your views on the use of more than a single metal as a unit of value. Since you have been so gracious, I will reciprocate as I also appreciate an opportunity to have the problem studied from my viewpoint.

For the purposes of this discussion, we will divide currency into two classes, as follows:

A. A coinage having its value based on the intrinsic worth of its metallic content, and certificates nearly enough duplicative to substitute for said coin.

B. Currency then gets its value from Government connection, promise or management, without definite tie-up to a class A or equivalent coinage.

Those who aline up for "hard money" thereby recognize the inferiority of class B money since there is nothing to justify the large expenditure involved in providing class A money if class B money, costing next to nothing, is just as good.

The next question would seem to be: Will we get class A money by pegging the dollar to two coinages of different metals? The answer is: According to Gresham's law, we will, but not in terms of both metals but in terms of the less valuable. The metal of higher value will promptly disappear from money markets and be traded in in the bullion market in terms of the lower priced metal, or shipped abroad to be traded in by the ounce, which will leave the lower priced metal to become the sole medium of exchange and measure of value for domestic trade.

If there is one fact that has been demonstrated more conclusively than any other, it is that no two commodities can be expected to remain at a fixed ratio of value for any considerable period of time. It follows that whatever ratio government selects for such metals, as silver and gold, they will not stay long at government's figure. It follows that people will not sell government both silver and gold at predetermined prices when in the bullion market one has become worth more than the government price. In your brochure you show that since World War No. 1, an ounce of gold has bought, at some dates, up to five and one-half times as much silver as it has bought on other dates.

Forty-eight years ago this month William J. Bryan got the Presidential nomination as a result of his harangue against "crucifying the world on a cross of gold." Much water has run over the dam since, inclusive of the demonetization of gold by all the nations on earth except a few small South African producer states, and yet gold is still the outstanding unit for measuring values all over the world.

If there is one thing that the experience of these 48 years ought to teach, it would seem to be that money metals get their values from their nature and the uses found for them, and not from government fiat or management.

In your letter you state a proposition as follows:

"If the United States and Great Britain, or even the United States alone, were to agree to buy all gold offered at $35 and sell all gold required at, say, $35.03 per ounce, and to buy all silver that was offered at, say, for example, $1 per ounce, and sell all silver desired at not over $1.03 per ounce, there could be no variation in the prices of either gold or silver that would affect their relationship as money."

Uncle Sam did the equivalent of what you propose for many years, except that the ratio between silver and gold was 16 to 1. However, because silver advanced to, say, 15 to 15½ to 1 relative to gold, the public melted up or got away with nearly all silver coin as fast as it was put into circulation.

A quarter is often called "two bits" in the Midwest. That expression has come down to us for decades when fractional silver was hard to get in sufficient volume to make change, so quarters were cut into halves and each half passed as a "bit."

In the above proposal, if, as the years go by, the value of an ounce of silver should come to be less than the value of one thirty-fifth ounce of gold, silver would soon come to be our sole unit of value. No one would sell an ounce of gold to government for money that represented 35 ounces of silver when he could sell his gold for, say, 40 ounces of silver in the open market. Government would thus get only silver, while gold would be bought and sold in open market in terms of silver, and silver would become our sole unit of value.

It follows that the above scheme is not one to bring about the circulation of two monetary metals but to measure in terms of whichever of two metals, for the time being, happens to be in least demand at the predetermined ratio. This conclusion, of course, presupposes adherence to a free economy. If government pressure is to be exerted, the money becomes clas. B, and most anything can be made to circulate.

It is my opinion that if private enterprise is to be saved from the bureaucrats and a free economy reestablished, we shall have to return to the use of class A money, the only kind capable of generating supply and demand prices, especially of correcting the many wage rates and scales that have been badly muddled during the years since we have depended on debt-based currency.

I am enclosing a brochure entitled "Private Enterprise and the Role of Money," from which you will see that I think we are in danger of a monetary crack-up if we continue indefinitely expanding our currency.

Yours very truly,

E. S. PILLSBURY.

CENTURY ELECTRIC CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., June 7, 1944.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I sent a copy of my May 15 letter to you to Mr. Brownell and received a very gracious reply. (Copy enclosed.) I am also enclosing a copy of my answer to Mr. Brownell. I am doing this because of the importance of this question and because I am gratified to receive so frank a discussion from him and hope he will try to argue this to a conclusion.

Mr. Brownell is a lawyer and may have gotten his leaning toward silver in studying the case from the viewpoint of his clients' direct interest. However that may be, I am of the opinion that large corporations such as the one he heads, as well as all of us, have more to gain by getting the Nation's monetary and financial problems on a sound basis, than by creating an artificial market for a byproduct like silver, for which there is found to be a pretty good market, anyway, after the world's finances are gotten back on a sound basis.

Some one sent me a Senate document entitled, "'Hard Money' Examined," by Herbert M. Bratter, which discusses Mr. Brownell's arguments for hard money at considerable length. I have not studied it enough to comment except to state that the discussion does not seem to me to be on a broad enough line to get very far.

In addition to a copy of my correspondence with Mr. Brownell, we are including copy of my latest leaflet, Private Enterprise and the Role of Money, a copy of which I am mailing to Members of Congress.

Yours very truly,

E. S. PILLSBURY.

AMERICAN SMELTING & REFINING CO.,
New York, June 9, 1944.

Mr. E. S. PILLSBURY,
Century Electric Co.,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. PILLSBURY: In your letter of June 6 you say:

"The next question would seem to be: Will we get class A money by pegging the dollar to two coinages of different metals? The answer is: According to Gresham's law, we will, but not in terms of both metals but in terms of the least valuable. The metal of higher value will promptly disappear from

money markets and be traded in in the bullion market in terms of the lower priced metal, or shipped abroad to be traded in by the ounce, which will leave the lower priced metal to become the sole medium of exchange and measure of value for domestic trade."

My pamphlet, Hard Money, evidently did not express its idea clearly enough. It does not propose pegging the dollar to two coinages of different metals.

What it proposes is that the prices of gold and silver each should be pegged in the way it describes. The dollar would be alternatively so many grains of gold and so many grains of silver. The market price of the number of grains of gold and the market price of the number of grains of silver would then always be identical. As a consequence, I said, at the foot of page 17 of Hard Money:

"When the price of both silver and gold is pegged, as gold formerly was pegged, fluctuations in the market price of both metals become impossible, regardless of increases or decreases in their production, just as happened in the case of gold. Gresham's law would have no chance to operate, for the market price of neither one of the two metals would move out of line either with its mintage ratio or the ratio of each to the other."

I suggest you reread the discussion of this subject on pages 13 to 20 of the pamphlet. Am sorry that I did not state it clearly enough for you to get the idea in the first place.

Yours truly,

FRANCIS H. BROWNELL.

CENTURY ELECTRIC CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., June 20, 1944.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I enclose copy of Mr. Brownell's reply of the 9th to my letter of earlier date, copy of which I sent to you. I am also enclosing my answer to this last letter of Mr. Brownell's.

Thank you for giving these arguments the careful consideration that I know you will.

Yours very truly,

E. S. PILLSBURY.

JUNE 20, 1944.

Mr. F. H. BROWNELL,
American Smelting and Refining Co.,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. BROWNELL: Yours of the 9th instant at hand. I think I have now gotten your viewpoint. You consider that when Government says that either A grains of gold or X times A grains of silver shall constitute a legal dollar, and where Government backs this up by buying and selling these metals at these figures, with no limitation on the quantity, then the people will accept such Government fiat and practice as the equivalent of a market price for the metals involved, and will proceed to mine, refine, and trade in them at the fixed prices, without other consideration.

I spent more time than I would like to admit trying to frame an answer to that, then I looked for what others had done and find the following from Dr. Walter E. Spahr:

"The bimetallic standard offers little prospect of becoming an important contender to replace gold as an international standard. Although bimetallists have contended, and a few still contend, that if all nations would adopt bimetallism then an international bimetallic standard could exist and function effectively, the contention cannot be supported by evidence. The contention rests upon logic, guessing, and wishful thinking—nothing more.

"The world has never had an international system of bimetallism. During the periods when important nations legally had bimetallic monetary standards, these standards actually became either gold or silver, depending upon the relationship between mint and market ratios. Each metal tended to flow to the country where its purchasing power was greatest, and the metal which entered foreign trade tended to be the international standard at that time for the countries involved. Thus both gold and silver were used together and separately in settling international debts, but not at a fixed legal ratio as such a ratio would exist in a country having a bimetallic system.

"In essence, the world's experiences with bimetallism, and especially the Latin Monetary Union's attempt to employ it, reveal that bimetallism has accomplished little if anything more than to delay progress toward international monetary uniformity—a common international monetary standard."

If it were up to me to add anything to support Dr. Spahr's conclusion with reference to the bimetallism theory which you apparently hold, I would say that the theory attributes too much power to government fiat. To be sure, governments often make their notes circulate when they inspire anything but confidence, but that is because no practical alternative is available. In this theory, we have an alternative in the two metals, yet you assume that the people will forget to look around and find out which of these two kinds of money is procurable with the least effort. Well, as Dr. Spahr says, there is nothing in the record to back up any such conclusion.

Dr. Spahr's last proposition appeals to me—"a common international monetary standard." If the world agrees upon a standard, I have no doubt that our Nation will accept such at home as well as for foreign trade, nor that such a metallic standard would be of incalculable value to us in getting our monetary practices and finances on a sounder basis.

There can be no question that silver provides the best token money the world knows anything about. It is no less true that it provides the best real money available to a large percentage of the world's inhabitants. With two fields like those available, the wonder to me is that those especially interested in silver do not proceed to cultivate them intensively in lieu of scouring around in fields where at least one other metal has an edge on silver, from most any viewpoint.

Yours very truly,

E. S. PILLSBURY.

Mr. E. S. PILLSBURY,
Century Electric Co., St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. PILLSBURY: Your letter discussing the money question and copies of your correspondence with Mr. Francis H. Brownell on the subject have been awaiting an opportunity for me to discuss the issue more fully. No better approach to this subject can be made than the statement found in the historic 6-day speech by Senator John Paul Jones, made in the Senate, when he said, "In all the attempts at fundamental discussion, it is necessary first to clear the ground of such obstacles as tradition or ignorance may have placed in the pathway of progress."

The assumption of both yourself and Mr. Brownell as to pegging (fixing) the price of either gold or silver is beside the issue. What we have under consideration is the money function and not the price of any special commodity, a function that in organized society establishes the price of all commodities or, broader still, of all things.

The money problem was met and solved by the framers of our Government when the Nation was first established, when it was found necessary to provide the people with a monetary system. In order to meet the requirements for the three functions of money, (1) a measure of value, (2) a medium of exchange, and (3) a storage of wealth; a simple plan of coining gold and silver, based on the metric system, was adopted and put into operation. Gold and silver were not pegged in price; on the contrary, the Congress decreed that a given weight of gold and a given weight of silver of standard fineness was the unit of money wherever these metals existed. The mints simply put the Government guaranty on the metal as to its quantity and fineness.

"Congress, by 'an act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,' approved April 2, 1792, exercised its constitutional power by establishing a mint and authorizing the coinage of gold, silver, and copper coins, and placed gold and silver on a perfect equality, and gave to each unlimited coinage, and to the coins of each full legal tender in all payments, the gold coins to be eagles, half eagles, and quarter eagles of the declared value of ten, five, and two and one-half dollars, respectively 11 parts pure gold to 1 of alloy; and the silver coin to be dollars or units, half dollars, quarter dollars, dimes, and half dimes, and made them all a full legal tender in payment of any and all sums.

"The weight of the gold in one dollar if coined would have been 27 grains standard and 24.75 pure, and the weight of the silver in the dollar or unit was 416 grains standard and 371¼ grains pure."

This plan gave to this new nation a monetary system which provided for the automatic control and gradual increase of the money volume, a principle of economic law which is indispensable to the stability of the value of money. This control was accomplished by limiting the volume of money to the supply of the precious metals—gold and silver—which is estimated to increase in volume at the rate of 3 percent per year and roughly keeps pace with the growth of population and commerce, which also is estimated to increase 3 percent a year. By this plan of opening the mint to the unlimited coinage of both gold and silver, there was automatically provided the necessary increase in the money volume to supply the needs of the Nation's growing population and commerce.

To anyone with a knowledge of history it is unnecessary to call attention to the progress and expansion of our country when this bimetallic system of money was in use or to enumerate the acquisitions of additional territory—Louisiana, Florida, Texas, California, and the Oregon country—during the period of our Nation's greatest development. This monetary system worked well until the country was overtaken by the disaster of the Civil War. In this emergency national-bank currency was invented and the National Bank Act became law. This new monetary plan gave an advantage to the bankers by the use of their paper money, a plan that gave rise to the agitation which resulted in the demonetization of silver, thereby increasing the need and use of bank-note money.

The history of the long controversy and struggle over the national-monetary policy, with the attendant financial depressions and the legislation that placed the price of silver on a commodity basis which has been followed in recent times by demonetizing gold and pegging the price of that metal on a commodity basis, is too well known to be repeated here.

The fluctuating financial and business conditions in recent years have clearly demonstrated the instability of our currency and the unworkability of our present monetary system. It would be difficult to present a more convincing and positive demonstration of the failure of our national monetary system than that which the people of this country have recently experienced.

Speaking of price—the value of money is established by its purchasing power in obtaining goods and services which will vary with the volume of supply and demand of the

things to be bought. The principles of economic law which control the operation of the money function are as simple as they are controlling.

In order to have prosperous business conditions, the volume of money must be adequate to the needs of business, and the value of money must be stable. To have a stable value, the volume of money must be regulated to increase evenly with growth of population and commerce. The volume of money can be automatically controlled by accepting and minting gold and silver as money as fast as these metals are produced.

The volume of money must be controlled if the value of currency is to be stable. By discarding silver and demonetizing gold this country has substituted a managed currency system for the time-tested automatically controlled coinage system. Under this managed-currency system the money needs of the country are supplied by banks in making loans of Federal Reserve note paper currency. The limitation on bank loans and the obligation to pay interest for the use of bank money is relied upon to limit the control of the volume of money in circulation and with certain limiting safeguards exercised by the Federal Reserve bank is, under normal conditions, an effective deterrent to inflation. But once the business equilibrium is upset by the disturbance of business confidence, the financial machinery provided under a managed-currency system to supply the money function is thrown out of adjustment and thereby cuts off the supply of money and credit when money is most needed to support and stabilize the national economy—a deflationary condition which causes prices to fall and business to stagnate.

History demonstrates that the most dependable, workable plan to supply and control the money function is obtained by the use of the precious metals, gold and silver.

The use of a currency system based on stored gold as security for the issuance of bank credit and currency as the means of providing the Nation with a stable monetary system is a demonstrated failure. This country has no more to gain by deposit of gold on a commodity basis as security for the issuance of bank credit and currency at interest to supply the Nation's money needs, than it would by the deposit of a quantity of spirituous liquor of equal value as security for the issuance of bank credit and currency. The advantage should be on the side of spirituous liquor since it increases in value with age.

In making a choice between the automatic controlled money system, using gold and silver coinage, and a managed paper currency system, if you find that the control of volume of money must be effected by the collection of interest on the money in circulation, and decide on a managed-currency system, then let us have the money issued by the Government and the interest collected by the Government for the good of all the people, instead of this interest yield going to a group of privileged bankers.

In deciding between these money plans, remember that the gold and silver money of our forefathers, without any commodity value being placed on either metal, except the purchasing power of the dollar in the market place, got for us all the broad land and the abundance of natural resources which we have utilized to make the United States of America the greatest Nation on earth.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Bureau of Reclamation Inventory of Western Projects for Post-war Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a statement by Harry W. Bashore, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, United States Department of the Interior, before the subcommittee on Roads and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Post-war Economic Planning and Policy.

The statement was made in connection with an inventory by the Bureau of Reclamation of western irrigation and multiple-purpose projects for post-war construction. I emphasize this presentation because it represents one of the first direct constructive outlines of an economical method of providing speedy employment for returning servicemen on permanent improvements in the 17 Western States.

As a citizen of Nebraska, which is partly in the twilight zone between the humid and arid areas, I recognize the tremendous value of water conservation for assured agricultural production, and I believe that everyone should recognize that water conservation for irrigation and flood control should be one of the first orders of business for the Nation after the war is won.

Commissioner Bashore's statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, the report which I am making to you this morning presents an inventory of irrigation and multiple-purpose projects that are suitable for post-war construction in the 17 Western States.

The construction of many of the projects listed could be scheduled for timely widespread employment of returning servicemen and industrial workers. This work would be at project sites in the West and in the producing centers where the needed equipment and materials are manufactured.

Permanent settlement on new lands would be made possible. Productivity of lands now irrigated with undependable water supplies would be made secure.

The inventory is based upon field investigations and studies that the Bureau of Reclamation has been carrying on under the reclamation law enacted by the Congress in 1902. The national irrigation policy that was adopted in that act has for its purpose the development of the arid and semiarid regions of the country through the conservation of their limited water resources. The Federal reclamation program is the present-day counterpart of the homestead activities of the nineteenth century when the Nation's frontiers were moved westward.

In this area the rainfall is inadequate for agriculture. Water conservation for irrigation is indispensable for the production of crops and for support of a growing population. The people on irrigated farms and the cities and towns that rise on the commerce created by irrigated agriculture, exercise purchasing power that draws the products of the other 31 States in the Middle West, South, and East.

Western markets create national wealth and stimulate employment. It is Reclamation's job to provide the irrigation water that gives stability to western purchasing power. This purchasing power is threatened in many irrigated areas that are faced with water shortages.

Along with irrigation water supplies for new land and existing agricultural areas, Reclamation projects provide hydroelectric energy for industrial expansion, particularly the extraction of western mineral resources and the processing of agricultural products. The projects also provide flood control, stream regulation, municipal water, recreation facilities, and fish and wildlife conservation.

Multiple uses of the project facilities broaden the financial base of the irrigation developments, which must by law repay to the Government their proper share of the construction costs. Power installations increase the revenues that will accrue directly to the United States Treasury and make many projects financially feasible.

The inventory presented today lists by States 236 individual projects and small groups of miscellaneous developments. Thirty-nine of these projects or features of them have been authorized, and limited work on many is going forward under the war-food or war-power programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Construction could be accelerated on the authorized projects, and work could be opened up on some of the potential projects within fairly short notice, if advance funds and authority are provided. Under such a schedule, nearly 150,000 men could be employed at the sites of construction in the West within 9 months. Even a greater number could be engaged in the manufacture of equipment and other materials in industries in sections of the country distant from the project areas.

The completion of all of the projects in the inventory would furnish employment equivalent to one and one-fourth million men working for 1 year. Of this total, nearly 56 percent, or 698,000, would be at work principally in the 31 States of the Mississippi Valley and to the eastward. This work would be in mines, mills, and factories, and in transportation. The remaining 44 percent, or 553,000 men, would be engaged in the actual construction work scattered widely over the western half of the country.

A total of 135,000 irrigated farms would be created for settlement by war veterans and others. Security could be afforded 150,000 additional farms where production is threatened by lack of water. A population of 2,500,000 persons, including the families in cities and towns who service the irrigation farmers, would eventually be directly benefited by the developments. These results, charted in the inventory, would flow from the irrigation of 6,705,000 acres of land now unused and 9,264,000 acres now farmed with inadequate water.

The multiple-purpose projects would provide for 1,765,000 kilowatts of power installations in authorized projects and for 2,579,000 kilowatts of firm power in addition to aid in balancing the agricultural development of the West by industrial expansion.

Annual purchasing power of the West for products of the Midwest, East, and South would be increased $1,250,000,000 at pre-war prices by the full development of these new farms and the communities that they would serve. This figure is based on studies of a typical reclamation project west of the Continental Divide, which shows that a large part of the irrigation farmer's crop dollar goes to the manufacturers and agricultural areas east of the Mississippi River for goods not produced in irrigated regions.

The aggregate costs of the projects are estimated at $2,952,393,000, at 1940 price levels. Of this amount, the actual construction would require $2,670,000,000. The pay rolls at the sites would call for approximately $800,000,000. The expenditures for labor "behind the lines," principally in the 31 States outside the irrigation belt, would, be nearly twice the amount to be spent in the actual construction work, according to an analysis of the distribution by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Most of the remainder would be spent to purchase necessary materials and to defray transportation and other costs.

The difference between the actual construction cost and the over-all expenditures is estimated by the experts of the Bureau of Labor Statistics at $282,393,000. This amount, roughly 9 percent of the over-all figure, would be absorbed by Federal and State taxes, licenses, insurance, and other incidental charges.

The inventory recognizes the projects listed in the initial phase of the comprehensive plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin which is being printed in Senate Document 191. Other projects in the Missouri River Basin are under study and may be used in contemplated revisions of this inventory.

Some projects included in the State lists are parts of comprehensive plans being developed for other river basins including the Colorado in the Pacific Southwest, the Columbia in the Northwest, the Sacramento-San Joaquin in California, and the Rio Grande.

One-fourth of the estimated over-all costs of the projects in the inventory or about $793,000,000 is represented by the construction expenditures which are necessary to complete the developments that the Bureau of Reclamation has been authorized to construct. The greater part of the funds now available for this class of projects will be expended in wartime construction.

Among these authorized projects are such outstanding developments as the Gila in Arizona, the Columbia Basin in Washington to be irrigated from Grand Coulee Dam, the Heart Mountain division of the Shoshone project, and the Riverton project in Wyoming, the Central Valley in California, and the Colorado-Big Thompson in Colorado. In proportion the post-war employment and permanent benefits from the completion of these authorized projects would be as great as is expected from the completion of all developments in the inventory. But the direct employment would not be as widespread through the 17 Western States or in the country at large as from the larger and more comprehensive undertakings that I have outlined.

In my opinion a post-war reclamation program should be an even more substantial step toward the full use of the western water resources for irrigation and multiple purposes than is now possible under the limitations of the authorized projects.

You may ask why irrigation is necessary in this region which represents about one-half of the continental area of the United States.

I point to a map which shows how the United States is divided into two parts by the 20-inch rainfall line which roughly follows the one-hundredth meridian. To the east of this line, running as far as the ninety-seventh meridian, lies what is commonly referred to as the subhumid belt. In this belt rainfall is erratic. Although for many years precipitation was regarded as adequate for crop production, agriculturalists now recognize that frequently insufficient rainfall spells serious losses for those farmers who are not within an irrigation project. To the west of the one-hundredth meridian the rainfall generally is insufficient for crops. In areas where the total annual precipitation might be nearly sufficient, it does not come during the growing season when it is needed.

Except for the high mountains and the strip along the northern Pacific coast, less than 20 inches of rain can be expected in a normal year. The great areas shown on the map as receiving 15 inches or less of rainfall are truly arid. In the Pacific Southwest, including some sections of Arizona and southern California, the rainfall is less than 5 inches annually. These are deserts.

In the 750,000,000 acres of land in the arid and semiarid regions of these States, which are possibly tillable, there is water that can be conserved economically to irrigate about 43,000,000 acres. This latter area is the maximum that could be brought under cultivation and it is about twice the total acreage that is now served by all irrigation systems, both private and Federal.

The development of the 21,000,000 acres now under irrigation has been a gradual process. The transformation of western deserts and sagebrush lands into thriving farms that are now the main support of an area with a population of more than 15,000,000 people began with the settlement of the Mormons in Utah in 1847. As the receding frontier drew the American people westward, they came upon these arid and semiarid regions, trapped the waters for fur, explored the mountains for metals, and cut into the forests, but they passed rapidly over the deserts. They crossed miles upon miles of arid land hoping to find fresh fields. They pressed onward until they realized that it was upon these deserts that the foundation of a permanent civilization in the West must be built. They then began the easy stream diversions and irrigated the valleys and the benches near the smaller rivers. Gradually the irrigation systems became more complicated. Finally, the unregulated flow of the streams became insufficient for the needs of developments relying upon them, and storage works were required.

By the turn of the present century, about 10,000,000 acres of land had been put under irrigation. It was at about this point that the Federal Government became concerned about the need for water conservation in the West and the reclamation law of 1902 was enacted under the sponsorship of the late President Theodore Roosevelt. Its policy was designed to conserve and use the waters of the West for the development of the vast areas of public land to which the Government had title. The increasing population of the West made it necessary to provide for the support of a larger number of people than could be sustained by the meager agricultural resources then existing. These resources rested on the limited irrigation expansion and on the small volume of crops which could be wrested from the dry lands without the artificial application of moisture.

The Federal Government's entry into the field of reclamation stimulated irrigation developments. Since 1900 the total area under irrigation has increased from 10,000,000 to 21,000,000 acres. Since 1930 the irrigation expansion has been almost entirely under the auspices of the Bureau of Reclamation. This is because the complexities of modern water conservation systems are beyond the ability of private capital to finance. These complexities include the necessity for great storage works, as well as the need for multiple-purpose projects to assure maximum use of the water for irrigation, power production, municipal water supplies, and other purposes.

As every storage dam on a western river aids stream regulation, so also does each contribute to flood control. Federal ownership of more than half of the land area of the 11 far Western States, and the interstate characteristics of the water supply of many potential projects are other factors which make water conservation and irrigation in the West subject to legislative action of the Congress.

Bureau of Reclamation projects are now serving more than 4,000,000 acres. Half of this area was carved out of the desert and is now in prosperous farms. The remainder is land that was originally irrigated by private capital but had inadequate water supplies before the Federal systems came to its rescue.

Through the multiple-purpose developments, the Bureau projects have power installations of more than 2,200,000 kilowatts which this year will produce over 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy largely for war industries that are vital to the Nation. These installations will likewise serve peacetime requirements. Hydroelectric power is the principal source of energy in the West and water conservation for this purpose is vital. Water stored in reclamation reservoirs also serves industries and municipalities.

The wartime contributions of irrigated land to the Nation's food supplies have been fully demonstrated. The War Food Administration has recognized the possibilities on reclamation lands for war-food purposes and 24 projects recommended by the War Food Administration have been cleared by the War Production Board for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Federal reclamation projects alone in 1943 produced potatoes for annual rations of 25,000,000 people, beans for 57,000,000, and enough alfalfa and grain for beef and dairy herds to supply 11,000,000 people with meat and dairy products for 1 year.

Many outstanding examples of western developments which have been stimulated by Federal reclamation could be cited. The Salt River Valley in Arizona is outstanding, as are also the Yakima Valley in Washington, the Boise Valley in Idaho, and the North Platte project area in Nebraska and Wyoming. When the projects under construction, as distinguished from those in the entire inventory, are completed, reclamation service will be extended to a total of 12,000,000 acres. The power installations will be increased to more than 4,000,000 kilowatts.

From a population standpoint, the West has outstripped its agricultural production upon which it is dependent. In the first 30 years of the present century, the West grew more rapidly than the remainder of the country. The rate was three times as fast. From 1930 to 1940, the population growth was twice the national rate. The West under the stress of wartime migrations showed an even greater expansion from 1940 to 1943. It was the only one of the four major regions of the country to show an increase in population. It gains was 8.5 percent, while every other major region lost from 3.4 to 5.7 percent. The post-war era will see the impact of this population growth intensified.

From a long-range standpoint the full development of the unused water resources of the West presents human and economic possibilities of great import to the future of the country. It means not only irrigated farms but the expansion of existing cities and towns and the creation of new communities which will provide markets at home for the products of American factories and farms. It is toward this domestic market that the productive capacity of industry should look for expansion.

Studies indicate that the conservation of the remaining water resources would assure an adequate irrigation supply for the 22,000,000 additional acres. About 11,000,000 acres now under private systems with inadequate supplies could be given security through supplemental water.

The net result that could be anticipated from the full development would be about

428,000 new irrigated farms, under present-day systems of farming. These farms would support a total additional population of more than 6,000,000 persons on the irrigated land and in the towns dependent on them.

Property values of $16,000,000,000 at pre-war levels would be created. A domestic market would be built up for American products from factories and farms outside of the irrigation belt that would maintain pay rolls at a distance, keep transportation systems busy and stabilize the business of the entire country.

The inventory that I present to you might be considered a step toward the initial phase of the ultimate development to which our sights should be raised. Further study is required on many of the potential projects, but investigations have proceeded sufficiently to show that many of them could not be authorized under existing reclamation laws and would require special authorization by the Congress. Nevertheless, the contributions that would be made to post-war reconversions and readjustments would justify consideration of a program of this magnitude. The permanency of the improvements that would be built by the men returning from the field of battle and the fleets on the high seas and in the air would add to their stake in the future of the West and in the country as a whole. In effect they would be building irrigated farm homes on which they could settle, raise their families, and live prosperously.

Report of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith submitting a copy of a report made by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee. This is a brief report of the wide and constructive activities of the committee:

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL FOOD STUDY COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE HONORABLE JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, REPUBLICAN LEADER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Food and feed are the most necessary of all commodities and are most essential in the successful prosecution of the war.

Because of the great necessity for food and feed, it was only natural that the New Deal's philosophy of scarcity and its tendency toward bureaucratic control would develop a chaotic condition in the production, processing, and distribution of these most necessary commodities. Confusion and chaos did develop, and the country became thoroughly aroused because of the apparent inability of the New Deal administration to handle the situation properly. The Democratic leadership in Congress closed its eyes to the serious conditions prevailing, and it remained for the Republican leadership to take action. Such action was taken, with the result that the Republican congressional food study committee was set up.

The committee proceeded immediately to its task and divided the work into the following classifications, with subcommittees to give special study to each classification:

1. Production and marketing of field crops.
2. Dairy and poultry products.
3. Livestock and meat products.
4. Distribution and rationing of food.
5. Government food purchases and lend-lease.
6. Farm machinery and farm labor.
7. Fresh and processed fruits and vegetables.
8. Fish and sea foods.

A subcommittee on compilation of reports was also set up.

The full committee consisted of 44 members. The members were selected with the idea in mind of giving fair representatior to the various sections of the country and to the various groups and industries involved.

In order to become thoroughly acquainted with the problems confronting it, the committee at the very outset held public meetings in several sections of the country. To these meetings producers, processors, distributors and consumers of food and feed were invited. The attendance was large, due to the great interest in the subjects involved. The producers presented their problems intelligently and effectively. The processors and distributors appeared through their representatives and gave most interesting and convincing testimony. Consumers were also present in large numbers to present their views. There was universal condemnation of the administration's arrogant and unreasonable enforcement of conflicting and confusing directives and Executive orders in rationing and price ceilings on food, feed, and other commodities.

Meetings were held in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, Princeton, and other places. Several meetings were held in Washington, which were addressed by men of great prominence and men whose knowledge of the food and feed problem was outstanding. Among these were former President Hoover, Frank Gannett, Chester Bowles, and others.

All of the activities of this committee have been carried on without 1 cent of expense to the Federal Government or to the taxpayers.

With pardonable pride we feel free to state that the work of this committee has been constructive from the beginning and has brought to the people and the industries of the country much relief that they would not otherwise have received. We cannot in this report detail all of the activities of the committee and cannot catalogue all the beneficial results obtained through the committee's efforts. We shall, however, recite a few of these results.

ONE MAN CONTROL

One of the distinguishing characteristics of the New Deal is that it seeks to regiment under Federal and bureaucratic control all of the industrial and human activities of the Nation. This technique was more manifest in the handling of food than in probably any other respect. At least 10 separate Government agencies assumed jurisdiction over some phases of the producing, processing, and distribution of food. These various agencies, functioning under widely different and sometimes contradictory directives and executive orders, duplicated their efforts and thereby harassed the public in many ways. The result was confusion and chaos everywhere. It was evident that the only solution for this chaotic condition was a centralization of authority in a single agency, which would then localize responsibility effectively.

From the hearings held by the committee, and from the testimony of many responsible people appearing before it, there was no question but that the American public was demanding that the control of these commodities be placed in the hands of some responsible person with full authority to act. To this end, the committee instructed me, as its chairman, to introduce a bill, known as the Jenkins bill, designated as H. R. 2739. This bill provides in effect that all food activities should be placed under a War Food Administrator within the Department of Agriculture, and that this official should proceed immediately to correlate all food activities. This would inevitably have redounded to the benefit of the consumer as well as the producer, processor, and distributor.

This bill was given great support by the people of the country, and, as proof of its merit, Representative FULMER, of South Carolina, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, introduced a similar bill, H. R. 2837, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. This great committee, which is the highest authority on agricultural and food matters in the Congress, recommended the passage of the Fulmer bill. At that time Chester Davis was occupying a high position in food administration. He was well known as a man of integrity and purpose, who was thoroughly acquainted with the food situation and had the full confidence of Congress. The Republican congressional food study committee would have endorsed his appointment. When it became evident that the Fulmer bill could pass the House, and that Chester Davis would logically be in line for appointment as Food Administrator, the President removed Chester Davis from office.

By his action in removing Chester Davis the President clearly indicated that he resented any efforts by Congress or anyone else to bring order out of the chaos in the food situation, and that he evidently intended that all problems of food and feed should be under the direct control of the White House through the numerous inefficient agencies already set up by him. This is another instance of the President's determination to hold all authority in the White House.

The demand for single agency control of the food problem free of domination has not been lessened throughout the country. The Fulmer bill is still pending before the Rules Committee and should be enacted into law. One of the first tasks of the Republicans, should the Republicans gain control of the House, should be to pass some legislation coordinating all food activities under one responsible head. The producer demands it, the processor demands it, the distributor demands it, and the consumer demands it.

BLACK MARKETS

The first hearing which was held by the committee in Boston developed the unmistakable existence of an extensive black market in poultry. At the time of this hearing the great poultry industry in the New England and Middle Atlantic States was prostrate. The activities of the black market became so bad that the United States Army in several instances was compelled to stop trucks loaded with poultry on the highways and commandeer them. The committee found that the black market is a result of the inability of the consumer to secure necessary commodities because of the Administration's actions destroying the normal channels of distribution and forcing these commodities into illegal channels. This false scarcity of poultry spread all over the country. The old Faneuil Hall Market, which has operated in Boston for more than 125 years, was without a single chicken for sale on a Saturday several months ago, and this was the first time in its existence that it had no chickens to sell. This false scarcity spread into all sections of the country, and hundreds of poultry stores were forced to close their doors and go out of business.

This condition with reference to poultry continued for several months, and all at once

the country was confronted with a huge surplus of poultry. From that time on poultry has supplied the principal meat diet of the Nation.

The story of the black market in beef and pork, and in onions, fish, and other commodities, is equally as sordid as the story of poultry.

The insidious illegal black markets, with their dangerous and unwholesome influence on legitimate business, are the unmistakable result of inefficiency in administration.

These events are conclusive proof that the Administration's failure has created a great dislocation and uncertainty throughout the whole food industry.

FOOD WASTE

In addition to the information adduced at the public hearings above referred to, individual members of the committee have made exhaustive and extensive surveys which produced facts and figures with reference to tremendous spoilage and wastage of great quantities of potatoes, fresh fruits, and vegetables, eggs, milk, butter, and other important food commodities.

RELIEF TO PROCESSORS

The committee as a whole and individually has closely cooperated with food processors and trade organizations, with the result that they have been relieved of many distresses.

CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

As a result of constructive suggestions made by your committee to various Government agencies, many changes in policies and practices have been effected, all of which were for the relief and benefit of the producer, processor, distributor, and consumer.

CHANGES IN PRICE CEILINGS EFFECTED

The committee, through its recommendations, secured the modification of price ceilings on some commodities, with a beneficial result to all parties concerned.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FOODS

The committee learned in its studies that one of the most important problems facing producers and processors of food is the distribution of huge Government surpluses. With a view to avoiding a division of responsibility in this matter, the committee prepared and Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS introduced in the House of Representatives H. R. 4275. This bill seeks to create a central agency to take over the whole problem of Government food surpluses, both those purchased by the Government for war purposes and those purchased direct from producers with the view to stabilizing prices at a parity level. This bill is now pending before the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. It is meritorious and should be enacted.

PRODUCTION PREFERABLE TO SCARCITY

In addition the committee has carried on many other activities related to the administration of the food problem, with a view to stimulating production. We hold that the best antidote to inflation is an adequate production. Surpluses of food and feed, and their adequate distribution, guarantee stability, while scarcity suggests and encourages disaster.

Appended hereto is a more detailed statement of some of the committee's work, which we hope will prove interesting and constructive to the membership of Congress and to the public generally.

Respectfully submitted.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL
FOOD STUDY COMMITTEE,
By THOMAS A. JENKINS, *Chairman*,
HARRIS ELLSWORTH, *Secretary*.

JULY 7, 1944.

The following is a partial statement in more detail of the activities of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee:

ONE MAN CONTROL

Because of the unanimous testimony given at the public hearings held by the committee as to the chaotic conditions being created throughout the food industry by the methods of administration being applied, the committee made an investigation and study of Executive orders and directives creating some of these agencies. This report chronologically traces the history of food administration under the New Deal. It is entitled "Confusion and Chaos." Unfortunately, requests for this report by New Deal agencies of the Government have exhausted our mimeographed supply of this report, but it may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 8, 1943, page 9294, where it is printed at length.

When the war broke out, the administration had full power and authority to effectively set up a Food Administration along the lines so successfully administered by ex-President Hoover, when he was War Food Administrator during World War No. 1. This authority was contained in the act of Congress dated August 29, 1916, which created the Council of National Defense. This, however, would definitely centralize full responsibility and authority in a single agency of Government, which is directly contrary to the desires of President Roosevelt, notwithstanding the will of the people.

A recommendation to this effect was definitely made by the Agricultural Division of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense in July 1940, 10 months after the outbreak of war in Europe. Immediately after this recommendation was made, the Council of National Defense ceased to function as an integrated unit, for the same reason, i. e., that it centralized authority.

Contrary to these recommendations, the problem of food administration was scattered throughout many agencies, with the consequent delays, confusion, and contradictions such a course of action imposed.

The issues inherent in stimulating food production, processing and distribution, involving as they do related factors of manpower availability, labor management relationships, costs and pricing, are so closely allied to each other that a single unit of government must correlate these problems in order to provide their successful solution. The American manufacturer or businessman, who must collaborate with Government through its domination of every phase of our economic life under the present bureaucratic scheme is forced to go to one agency to asecrtain the wages he may be permitted to pay labor; to another agency to fix prices at which he may sell his product; and sometimes to a third agency to ascertain prices which he may pay for his raw materials. He must contact another division of Government to determine the manner in which he may amortize the indebtedness of his business, while still other and different agencies of Government must be contacted and then cajoled, influenced, or flattered to secure decisions on the basis of which he may operate his business.

The consequent delays caused by such pyramiding of one agency upon another, each in turn being given responsibility without authority, inevitably tends to destroy any useful purpose for which these agencies may have been created, and further complicates the whole food and feed problem to the point where detailed regimentation is an administration necessity.

The one solution of this whole problem—the one thing that will expedite administration and eliminate costly and disorganizing delays—is the centralization of the whole administration of food and feed under a single agency in the Department of Agriculture, with authority to act free from White House domination.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

The complaints against the administration of the laws and regulations with reference to the production, processing and distribution of food were so persistent that the committee deemed it advisable to give the public a chance to express itself with reference to the matter.

The first hearing was held in New York City, and was attended by many producers and their representatives, and by distributors through their representatives. The consumers were also represented by various individuals and groups.

The hearings were very informative, and the reports of the hearings, made through the press, carried all over the country and resulted in a great number of demands for hearings in different parts of the country. The representatives of the various food activities took great encouragement from the New York hearing and intensified their efforts towards relieving the situations against which their specific groups complained. The committee offered its assistance, which was gratefully received by several organizations that were vitally interested in the disordered conditions resulting from the unwise administration of the food regulations.

The hearings in Boston were attended by the State secretaries of agriculture of some of the New England States, and also by high State and city officials, who were tremendously interested in the terrible plight into which the food industry had fallen. They also evidenced a great interest and cordiality toward the activities of the committee.

As a result of the Boston hearings, the spotlight of public opinion over the country was pointed toward the plight of the poultry industry, with the result that through the combined efforts of interested parties and this committee the situation was considerably relieved. At the Boston hearing, representatives of the C. I. O. and other consuming groups were heard. These representatives indicated a desire to cooperate and were naturally interested in any program that would prevent extreme rises in the cost of living.

As a result of the Boston hearings, the representatives of wholesale production and distribution intensified their efforts in an attack on the causes of the depression in the various industries, and consequently some modifications were made that were beneficial to the various parties concerned in the production and distribution of food and feed.

A hearing was held in Philadelphia, which was attended by city officials and by a large number of representatives of various food activities. The fishermen from the New Jersey shores were present and presented a pathetic story illustrating the plight of the fishing industry. These representatives showed conclusively that because of inefficient and unwise regulations millions of pounds of fish were held from the market when meats and similar foods were in great demand.

At the Philadelphia hearing persons appeared who outlined and described the effects of unwise administration of ambiguous regulations as applied to grocery-store operators and retailers of meat products. It was authentically reported that during the week previous to this hearing, hundreds of small grocery and food shops had been forced to close their doors.

Representatives of consumer groups were eager to testify and to show conclusively that all classes of people were terrifically discommoded by unnecessary regulations, which were unwisely and arrogantly administered.

A hearing was held in Minneapolis, with the idea of giving to the dairymen and producers of wheat products an opportunity to present their views. This meeting was widely attended by influential men and women and

by organizations with wide connections all through the great food producing areas of the Middle West. The plight in which the hog and cattle producers would find themselves was authentically predicted at that meeting, and likewise the serious corn situation which developed later was accurately prophesied. In spite of the certainty with which these serious dislocations developed, the administration still persisted that there would be no serious dislocations in these respects because the administration claimed they had the situation well in hand. The subsequent experience of the American people shows that the administration failed to heed the unerring signs of the times.

At the Princeton, N. J., hearings, a special effort was made to develop the sentiment with reference to fisheries and with reference to the production from small farms, which produced great quantities of eggs, garden vegetables and dairy products. Representatives of the State Department of Agriculture and of Princeton University indicated a great interest in this meeting, as did representatives of wholesale feed and food producers, and wholesalers of food and groceries of all kinds.

The Princeton meeting demonstrated conclusively that the work of the committee in holding public hearings was greatly appreciated and more than justified. This meeting had the tendency to crystallize sentiment and to sum up the food situation quite generally over the country. The shortage of feed was pathetically illustrated. Facts were produced to show that the wealth of the country had been greatly depleted by reason of the failure properly to administer the food activities of the Nation. It was demonstrated that the regulations were so expansive and so extensive as to include practically every activity of the human family, and that they were written by men who did not understand the problems of the industries involved.

The committee, through its hearings in Washington, which were addressed by the best food experts of the Nation, and by its public hearings, acquainted itself thoroughly with the problems involved and gave the public an opportunity to present their views directly to Members of Congress.

FOOD WASTE

At a time when food is rationed, one of the greatest destroyers of public morale is to find that the Government itself, through poor administration, is wasting huge quantities of food and feed. Every few days the War Food Administration is asking for bids to purchase all manner of "damaged and/or out of condition" commodities in an "as is, where is" condition. One of these invitations to purchase includes "type A enriched wheat flour, rolled oats, canned tomatoes, dried pinto beans, dried black-eyed cow peas, double white runner beans, dried white dutch runner beans," the last three items of which were insect ridden and unfit for human consumption. Another calls for bids to purchase 1,021 damaged cases of canned pears and peaches. Others cover all manner of foods for which the Nation is now rationed.

Congressman GERALD W. LANDIS, chairman of the subcommittee on fresh fruits and vegetables, cooperating with other members of the committee, has continuously carried on a thorough investigation of this growing scandal. On at least a dozen different occasions he has called attention to this situation.

Last year there was a severe shortage of potatoes throughout most of the entire Nation. Suddenly there was an excess of potatoes. The Government bought huge quantities of them and then did not know how to handle them. Thirty-seven carloads of potatoes were permitted to spoil and were dumped at Vincennes, Ind. The New Deal administrators admitted that 1½ carloads were lost. Shortly after issuing a public statement to this effect they finally reported that 22 carloads were lost at Vincennes.

At a time when American housewives were paying as much as 75 cents a peck in some areas for potatoes it was testified before the Banking and Currency Committee that the Government lost 475 carloads of potatoes, while reports were prevalent that an administrative official of the Federal Government privately admitted that more than 25 percent of the 3,200 carloads purchased from the 1943 Virginia and North Carolina crops rotted on the Government's hands.

But potatoes is only one of the many commodities wasted through ineffective and almost tragic administration. In Fresno, Calif., one producer abandoned his 200-acre pea crop and invited the public to help themselves because he could not meet the conditions imposed by the Federal administration. Thousands of cases of canned milk have spoiled in Government warehouses, one radio commentator reporting 17,000,000 cans in a single area. Poor administration was responsible for 1,900,000 pounds of rolled oats becoming infested with insects while standing in railroad cars in New Jersey. It has been reported by the press that 1,400 carloads of eggs have been sold by the Government for $30 a carload, or one-sixth of a cent a dozen, because overcrowded storage facilities made their immediate disposition necessary.

As has already been pointed out, the American farmer and the Victory gardener have both done a tremendously patriotic job, and a benevolent Nature has added to their efforts. In a time like this, however, it is almost criminal to permit such wasteful conditions to exist in a nation at war.

BLACK MARKETS

We have heretofore in our report dealt somewhat extensively with the black market in poultry. It was testified at public hearings that at that time from 75 to 90 percent of all poultry was finding its way into the black market, at prices from 38 to 42 cents a pound, when the ceiling was only 28 cents a pound.

The most flagrant black market activities were those attendant upon the distribution of beef. It is difficult to understand why this condition would prevail in face of the fact that on January 1, 1943, we had 78,000,000 head of cattle, and that on January 1, 1944 we had 82,000,000 head of cattle, which was the largest at any period in our history.

During all that time the stockyards of the nation were overcrowded with hogs and cattle for slaughter. There is no question but that the quantity of beef and pork prepared for the market was in excess of that of any previous year. The amount allocated to the armed services was not begrudged by anyone. It was not a sufficient amount to bring about such disruption as has been experienced in the distribution of beef and pork.

It is to the everlasting credit of the American people that they so patriotically accepted rationing. When they willingly gave up the privilege of purchasing beef in unlimited quantities, as they had been accustomed to do in the past, the Government obligated itself to equalize the distribution of the limited quantities available, so that every American housewife could use the ration stamps in her possession. It was a strange situation that, although the people were supplied with ration stamps which entitled them to purchase beef, there was no beef to be had; and those in charge of its administration apparently did not understand the problem sufficiently to solve it. While they were hesitating, a black market developed, with the result that neither the producer of the livestock, nor the legitimate distributor of meat, nor the consumer was benefited.

It is estimated by competent authority that huge quantities of fish and other sea foods are being diverted to the black market.

Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, publicly admitted that the black market in food amounted to $1,200,000,000 annually.

RELIEF TO PROCESSORS

The committee early found that one of the most difficult problems was caused by the lack of knowledge of those in administrative authority as to trade customs and practices. For example, it has been the custom for food processors, particularly canners, to enter into contracts and agreements with food producers in December and January concerning the price, acreage, and quantity of a given commodity to be purchased by the canners for processing. In many instances the Office of Price Administration failed to reach a conclusion as to the prices that canners would be permitted to pay producers until long after the planting season had started.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee actively collaborated with food processors and Government officials, with the result that in many instances governmental action was expedited to the benefit of the farmers and the canners and consequently to the ultimate consumers.

Likewise a serious problem developed from the failure of food processors to secure adequate labor, because of the low wages allowed in the canning industry. Our committee, through its efforts with Government authorities, was able to relieve that situation greatly to the benefit of labor, the processor, and the public.

The committee played a leading part in crystallizing the Republican attitude in the House of Representatives toward consumer subsidies. Its position has been fully justified by a condition which obtains in the milk industry. Subsidies were paid to milk producers, although they were opposed to subsidies, with the result that in some areas the diversion of milk to those branches of the industry resulted in an oversupply. Due to lack of refrigeration space, thousands of gallons of milk had to be dumped into sewers, while at the same time in the large milk-consuming areas there was a seriously threatening shortage of milk for home consumption.

The very important pancake flour industry was practically destroyed by Government regulations. Through the effective cooperation of this committee with the industry immediate relief was secured and the industry was restored to its normal activity.

Many instances could be cited where the committee collectively and through its individual members has brought relief to many serious situations. One further example will suffice:

Sugar is one of the six most important basic foods of this country, the other five being bread, meat, potatoes, milk, and butter. While there are abundant stocks of sugar available, the New Deal administration continues to carry out its philosophy of scarcity by producing a false scarcity of sugar.

At the outset of the war it was definitely necessary to ration sugar, both to home consumers and to commercial users, and the committee believes that it is advisable to continue rationing of sugar for many reasons. However, there is no longer any sensible purpose in requiring commercial users at this time to curtail their use of sugar to 70 percent or 80 percent of their 1941 consumption. The sugar supplies in 1942 and the first half of 1943 undoubtedly were in such jeopardy that it was necessary to curtail commercial use by bakers, confectioners, beverage manufacturers and bottlers, dairy production processors, canners, flavoring extract manufacturers, and others, to only 70 percent of the 1941 consumption, because of the forced reduction in the shipment of sugar from the Philippines, Hawaii, and the Caribbean area.

The normal carry-over of sugar from one season to another is between 1,500,000 and

2,000,000 tons. On January 1, 1944, there was a stock pile of 3,000,000 tons, and it is estimated that production available to the United States in 1944 will amount to approximately 10,000,000 tons after allowing 1,000,000 tons or its equivalent for the production of industrial alcohol.

Officials of the New Deal administration claimed that ships were not available for the importation of sugar in sufficient quantity to increase allocation to commercial users. The committee made an investigation and it found that ships were available if they were properly routed. Congressman BARTEL J. JONKMAN, chairman of the subcommittee on Government food purchases, presented all of these facts to Congress and pointed out that if only 2 10,000-ton ships out of the more than 2,000 Liberty ships now comprising the American merchant marine were assigned to import sugar from the Caribbean area, it would furnish the 20,000 tons of sugar needed each month to increase the allocation to commercial users from 70 to 80 percent of their 1941 consumption.

It was only after the spotlight of publicity was thrown on the whole matter that the administration not only sent 2 ships but diverted 19 ships to import sugar from the Caribbean area. The committee has been informed that as against the 325,000 tons of sugar imported in the month of March 1944, 400,000 tons were to be imported in April, and 350,000 tons in the month of May. Orders were then issued increasing the allocation of sugar to 80 percent for some commercial users. Since that time the requirements of the industrial alcohol program have been completed without utilizing some 800,000 tons of sugar or its equivalent for that purpose. As a matter of fact, during the month of August, industrial alcohol probably will not be manufactured at all.

The committee has recommended to the War Food Administrator that the allocation of sugar for the third quarter of 1944 to commercial users be increased to 90 percent of their 1941 consumption, and there is no logical reason why they cannot be given a full 100 percent.

The whole administration of the allocation of sugar has been subjected to the whims and fancies of administrative officials who simply appear to be carrying out the policy of regimentation and domination of American industry. As pointed out by Congressman JONKMAN on the floor of the House of Representatives: "It is a sad travesty on democratic administration of Government that, in a land where American industrial ingenuity can convert from a peacetime basis to a wartime basis without destroying the standard of living, as America has done, we cannot have in Government offices that caliber of men who can practically meet the problems our wartime economy creates."

VICTORY GARDENS

The committee strongly endorsed the planting of Victory gardens. The success of Victory gardens during the past year, which were planted in back yards, vacant lots, and public parks throughout the country, was marked. The surveys made indicate that home canning from Victory gardens amounted to an equivalent of 165,000,000 to 200,000,000 cases of canned goods, as compared with an annual average commercial pack of about 225,000,000 cases.

This huge supplemental food supply made rationing of several major canned vegetables unnecessary after December 1943, but the administration did not see fit to remove these items from rationing until June 1, 1944. It was effected then only after strong pleas were made to remove them from rationing. Home canning had so reduced the use of ration coupons for canned vegetables that the warehouses of both packers and distributors were clogged with last year's commercial pack at a time when the 1944 crops were beginning to come in.

Representatives in Washington of food processors and distributors deplore the delay of the New Deal administration in removing these canned vegetables from rationing. They advised the committee that it came too late, and that the canned fruits and vegetables have not been moved from warehouses and store shelves because fresh fruits and vegetables of the 1944 crop had already begun to reach the market.

THE O. P. A. AND THE COST OF LIVING

The Republican Party and the Republicans in Congress have loyally supported rationing and price control, especially since they have been already established. The determination of the commodities to be rationed should have called for the most honest and sincere consideration. The New Deal philosophy of scarcity should have been abandoned contemporaneously with rationing. Curtailment of production and rationing are inconsistent programs.

The Republicans have maintained that with the coming on of the war production should have been encouraged, and rationing should have been adopted only when sufficient production failed.

Threats of inflation are always present during wartime activities. The best antidote to inflation is abundance of production.

Price control is an entirely different matter from price fixing. Price control is flexible and encourages production. Price fixing is rigid and destructive of production. Rationing and price fixing as exercised by the administration has been a leveling-down process and has not been a creative or building-up process. The result is that a penalty has been placed on quality and incentive to produce the best, while a premium has been placed upon the lowering of quality and the leveling to the common grades.

There has been a conflict of opinion among economists with reference to the cost of living. There is no question but that the Government figures on the cost of living have been grossly inaccurate.

The inconvenience which the purchaser of food supplies has suffered in making purchases, and the terrific burdens added to the seller of foods have resulted in hampering the heretofore splendid methods of distribution that had been built up, all of which resulted in inferior quality of goods. This cannot be attributed to the producer, nor to the distributor, but is due absolutely to the unreasonable and unnecessary burdens placed upon the people by Government regulations. Chester Bowles testified before a congressional committee that there were 8,000,000 price regulations.

The Price Administrator and officials of his organization repeatedly have called public attention to the greater increase in prices from 1913 or 1914 to 1918 as compared with 1939 to 1943; and they further call attention to the increase in industrial production during these same periods. Examination of their own charts, graphs, and statistics indicates that the great increase in living costs during World War No. 1 were between the years 1914 and 1917. There was no price control under the Democratic administration then in office. The Price Control Act of 1917, the Lever Act, became effective on August 10, 1917, and was in effect only until the Armistice was signed on November 11, 1918, a period of 15 months. Using the year 1926 as an index base of 100, according to Department of Agriculture statistics, wholesale prices of all commodities of the Nation rose from 124.8 in August 1917 to 136.3 in November 1918, under the able administration of Herbert Hoover, with a mere handful of Government employees to administer the Price Control Act. This was an increase of 9.2 percent during the entire period that the Lever Act was in effect. During the first 15 months of the administration of price control under the present Office of Price Administration, from January 1942 to March 1943, the cost of all commodities rose from 96.0 to 102.5, or an increase of 7.7 percent. If proper consideration would be given to the inferior quality of foods, the increase percentage would be much higher.

In other words, after building a Government bureaucracy of hundreds of thousands of employees, the present administration has been able to affect a savings of only 1.5 percent more than that brought about by Mr. Hoover's administration of the same problems in World War No. 1, according to Government statistics. This saving of 1.5 percent has been completely lost in black market operations, which were nonexistent during World War No. 1. Mr. Bowles publicly estimated that between 3 percent and 4 percent of the average cost of food purchased is in black-market operations. He stated, "That means that housewives today are paying $1,200,000,000 to the black market in food alone."

If our total food bill is about $30,000,000,000 annually, this means that there is an increase of 4 percent in the cast of foodstuffs that is not reflected in the official statistics that the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration furnishes to us. Thus in the first 15 months of price regulations during the present war, the cost of living has actually gone up more than it did during the 15 months that the Lever Act was in effect.

Applying these data to wholesale food prices alone, and using 1926 as the basis of our index, wholesale food prices for the month of August 1917 (when the Lever Act went into effect) was 109.4, while in November 1918 it increased to 128.6 or 17.5 percent. During the first 15 months that the present Office of Price Administration was operating, the index of wholesale food prices rose from 93.7 in January 1942 to 107.4 in March 1943, or a net increase of 14.6 percent. Adding to this the estimated 4-percent increase in the cost of foodstuffs in black-market operations, publicly admitted by Mr. Bowles, the net increase in the cost of food under the administration of the Office of Price Administration during the first 15 months of its operation was 18.6 percent, or 1.1 percent more than under the administration of the Lever Act by Mr. Hoover in World War No. 1. This does not take into account the millions of dollars paid out by the Administration in the form of subsidies.

In other testimony presented by the Price Administrator, he has repeatedly referred to the increase in production of foodstuffs by our agrarian population. Every Member of Congress should point with pride at the patriotism of the American farmer in producing the greatest crops in our history during 1942 and 1943, under the severest kind of handicaps. A benevolent Nature has aided the American farmer in producing ever-increasing crops for the past several years. Military and naval demands took hundreds of thousands of trained farm workers from the fields to serve in our armed forces. But the boys and girls and wives of our agricultural areas put forth their effort, and these stupendous crops were produced. When Mr. Bowles refers to them, to compare them with the period immediately preceding and during World War No. 1, he fails to take into account that in 1916 and 1917 the crop failures in this country were due to unseasonable elements of the atmosphere.

The truth of the matter is that from 1913 to 1918 the estimated harvested acreage of the 52 basic crops increased from 324,000,000 acres to 353,000,000 acres, while from 1938 to 1943 the increase was only from 338,000,000 acres to 347,000,000 acres. Actually, in 1943 there was less acreage under cultivation in the United States than there was in the year 1918. This decrease can only be charged against a philosophy of scarcity which has

dominated this administration from 1933 right down to and including the present time.

Based on the average yield per acre of the principal field crops from 1923 to 1932 as an index figure of 100, the yield in 1917 was 100.8, and in 1918 it was 98.2; in 1942 it was 136, and in 1943 it was 124. This is an average increase for the 2 years, 1942 and 1943, of 30 percent over the yield per acre in 1917 and 1918. This certainly is a gain that cannot be attributed to the administration. It is an advance that has been brought about by the sweat of the brow, hard labor, and patriotism of the American farmer.

The decrease in the yield per acre from 136 in 1942 to 124 in 1943 can be attributed directly to the short-sighted policy to which I have already referred, which brought about a denial of adequate farm machinery and equipment to the farmer. Today the farmer needs more farm machinery and equipment than ever before to replace the trained farm help that has gone into our armed services. Yet the allocation of steel for the manufacture of farm machinery and equipment in 1944 has not yet equaled that which was produced in 1940.

The following is a list of the members of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee: THOMAS A. JENKINS, chairman (Ohio); HARRIS ELLSWORTH, secretary (Oregon); AUGUST H. ANDRESEN (Minnesota); JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS (New Jersey); JOSEPH C. BALDWIN (New York); FRANK A. BARRETT (Wyoming); HOWARD H. BUFFETT (Nebraska); FRED E. BUSBEY (Illinois); GORDON CANFIELD (New Jersey); FRANCIS CASE (South Dakota); J. EDGAR CHENOWETH (Colorado); PAUL CUNNINGHAM (Iowa); DANIEL ELLISON (Maryland); RICHARD P. GALE (Minnesota); CHARLES L. GIFFORD (Massachusetts); FRED C. GILCHRIST (Iowa); P. W. GRIFFITHS (Ohio); ROBERT HALE (Maine); CHRISTIAN A. HERTER (Massachusetts); CLARE E. HOFFMAN (Michigan); HAL HOLMES (Washington); CLIFFORD R. HOPE (Kansas); WALT HORAN (Washington); BARTEL J. JONKMAN (Michigan); GERALD W. LANDIS (Indiana); CHESTER E. MERROW (New Hampshire); WILLIAM J. MILLER (Connecticut); REID F. MURRAY (Wisconsin); FRED NORMAN (Washington); JOSEPH P. O'HARA (Minnesota); JOHN PHILLIPS (California); CHARLES A. PLUMLEY (Vermont); B. CARROLL REECE (Tennessee); EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH (West Virginia); THOMAS ROLPH (California); MAX SCHWABE (Missouri); HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (Pennsylvania); SID SIMPSON (Illinois); RAYMOND S. SPRINGER (Indiana); WINIFRED STANLEY (New York); LOWELL STOCKMAN (Oregon); DEAN P. TAYLOR (New York); WILLIAM I. TROUTMAN (Pennsylvania); EARLE D. WILLEY (Delaware).

Funds for War Activities and Nonwar Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the remarks which I have previously made, found commencing on page 6669 of the RECORD, concerning the amount of appropriations and contract authorizations made at this session of Congress, I desire to present further data with respect to the work of the session on appropriation measures and also data concerning the appropriations made by Congress for the war program commencing in June 1940 and the decrease which has taken place during this period with respect to nonwar funds.

BUDGET ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS

The following tabulation is a comparison of Budget estimates and new direct appropriations made during the past session as portrayed by each of the appropriation bills considered during the session. The net reduction effected by Congress in the recommendations of the Executive during the session is $1,263,776,319.80. This has been accomplished mainly in the amounts for war purposes and has been effected without any impairment of the war program in any of its vital phases.

Comparison of amounts of direct appropriations carried in appropriation bills, 78th Cong., 2d sess., compared with Budget estimates for such bills

Bill	Amount of Budget estimates	Amount of appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriations compared with estimates
REGULAR ANNUAL BILLS, 1945			
Department of Agriculture	$537,741,473.00	$562,145,918.00	+$24,404,445.00
District of Columbia	67,849,959.00	69,111,569.00	+1,261,610.00
Independent offices	8,524,122,309.00	8,485,099,785.00	−39,022,524.00
Interior Department	115,320,395.36	103,239,796.36	−12,080,599.00
Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies:			
Labor, Department of	70,115,200.00	68,119,050.00	−1,996,150.00
Federal Security Agency	688,340,300.00	633,843,885.00	−54,496,415.00
Related agencies	416,476,700.00	410,681,529.00	−5,795,171.00
	1,174,932,200.00	1,112,644,464.00	−62,287,736.00
Legislative and judicial branches:			
Legislative branch	47,182,168.00	46,245,994.66	−936,173.34
Judicial branch	14,451,919.00	13,455,024.00	−996,895.00
	61,634,087.00	59,701,018.66	−1,933,068.34
Military	15,677,869,700.00	15,434,814,795.00	−243,054,905.00
Navy:			
Title I, fiscal year 1945	28,069,819,500.00	26,488,798,301.00	−1,581,021,199.00
Title II, fiscal year 1944	1,081,000,000.00	1,081,000,000.00	
	29,150,819,500.00	27,569,798,301.00	−1,581,021,199.00
State, Justice, and Commerce Departments:			
Department of State	50,371,500.00	47,138,500.00	−3,233,000.00
Department of Justice	117,906,200.00	116,477,200.00	−1,429,000.00
Department of Commerce	79,512,000.00	78,322,000.00	−1,190,000.00
	247,789,700.00	241,937,700.00	−5,852,000.00
Treasury and Post Office Departments:			
Treasury Department	227,454,400.00	220,636,897.00	−6,817,503.00
Post Office Department	1,118,298,990.00	1,110,209,272.00	−8,089,718.00
	1,345,753,390.00	1,330,846,169.00	−14,907,221.00
War Department—Civil functions	86,911,440.00	92,455,440.00	+5,544,000.00
Total, regular annual bills	56,990,744,153.36	55,061,794,956.02	−1,928,949,197.34
SUPPLEMENTAL, DEFICIENCY, AND MISCELLANEOUS BILLS			
Farm labor supply, 1944	(1)	31,359,200.00	+31,359,200.00
First deficiency bill, 1944	593,477,353.47	489,762,870.04	−103,714,483.43
National War Agencies, 1945	1,069,911,425.00	1,030,739,242.00	−38,974,183.00
Defense aid (Lend-Lease) and United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, 1945	3,921,451,000.00	3,920,320,000.00	−1,131,000.00
Second deficiency appropriation bill, 1944 and 1945	261,435,648.61	241,368,992.58	−20,066,656.03
Miscellaneous (estimated and incomplete), 1944	6,700,000.00	6,900,000.00	+200,000.00
Total, supplemental, deficiency, and miscellaneous	5,852,975,427.08	5,720,648,304.62	−132,327,122.46
Grand total, appropriation bills	62,843,719,580.44	60,782,443,260.64	−2,061,276,319.80
Permanent annual appropriations (general and special accounts, excluding trust funds), 1945	6,409,678,867.00	6,407,178,867.00	−2,500,000.00
Grand total, all appropriations exclusive of trust funds	69,253,398,447.44	67,189,622,127.64	−2,063,776,319.80
Deduct amount of contract authorization in naval appropriation bill substituted for direct appropriation estimate			+800,000,000.00
Net reduction in budget estimates			−1,263,776,319.80

[1] Budget estimate in amount of $35,000,000 submitted to first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress and included in total estimates for that session. The bill passed the House at the first session but was not passed by the Senate and finally enacted into law until the second session.

The total of new appropriations made during the session just closed is $67,189,622,127.64. This is the second year of the war and defense-program period in which new war appropriations have shown a decline. The high point was at the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress when a total of $147,071,208,961.89 was appropriated. The total for the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress was $114,564,008,594.62. The comparison of the new appropriations at

this session with those of the first session of the present Congress is as follows:

Total appropriations, 78th Cong., 1st sess	$114,564,008,594.62
Total appropriations, 78th Cong., 2d sess	67,189,622,127.64
Decrease 78th Cong., 2d sess., under 78th Cong., 1st sess	47,374,386,466.98

The amount of new direct appropriations, while representing the amount of new funds voted by Congress, is not indicative of the amounts that will be available in the fiscal year 1945 for the incurring of new obligations and the making of expenditures. Due to the changes in the programs of the War Department, very substantial sums remained unobligated from the fiscal year 1944 and have been reappropriated for the fiscal year 1945 instead of providing new appropriations for these purposes. Therefore, while a total of new direct appropriations of $15,434,814,795 is shown on the foregoing table for military (Army) appropriations there is reappropriated an estimated $33,672,971,000, making the amount to be available for obligation for military purposes in the fiscal year 1945 of $49,107,785,795. Likewise, for lend-lease purposes a total of new appropriations of $3,450,570,000 is granted and in addition there is reappropriated from previous balances and special receipts a total of $3,738,323,000, making a total of $7,188,893,000 available to the President for obligation for this purpose. Other small scattering sums of reappropriated funds make the total of such reappropriations at this session $37,533,524,237. Considering the new direct appropriations and the reappropriations made available at the present session and the new direct appropriations and reappropriations at the last session, the following comparison is shown:

1st sess., 78th Cong.	
New direct appropriations	$114,564,008,594.62
Reappropriations	19,785,560,502.00
Total made available for new obligations by 78th Cong., 1st sess	134,349,569,096.62
2d sess., 78th Cong.	
New direct appropriations	$67,189,622,127.64
Reappropriations	37,533,524,237.00
Total made available for new obligations by 78th Cong., 2d sess	104,723,146,364.64

It will be noted from a comparison of the totals for each session, using both factors of new direct appropriations and reappropriations, that the funds made available for new obligations by the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, are approximately $30,000,000,000 less than those made available at the first session of the same Congress. This is a more accurate comparison of the responsibility of each session of Congress than that of the comparison of the new direct appropriations in that it gives a clearer indication of the obligations that may be incurred for the expenditure of funds from the Treasury in the fiscal period affected.

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

The amount of contract authorizations, which will be subject to future appropriations for their liquidation, is likewise reduced from the total of the first session of this Congress. The amounts are as follows:

Total contract authorizations in addition to appropriations, 78th Cong., 1st sess	$13,446,339,945
Total contract authorizations in addition to appropriations, 78th Cong., 2d sess	8,035,665,901
Decrease	5,410,674,044

WAR ACTIVITY PROGRAM

The national-defense program started in June of 1940 and was greatly accelerated on a war basis immediately after the declaration of war in December 1941. For the period from June 1940 to date, covering 5 fiscal years and six sessions of Congress, a total of $359,202,498,506 has been made available in direct appropriations for war activities and $15,911,739,819 in unliquidated contract authorizations, which will require future appropriations, has likewise been granted. These two sums bring the total amount provided for obligation for the war program from the start up to $375,114,238,325. The following table is a general summary of the distribution of these amounts:

Summary of appropriations and contract authorizations for war activities as of June 30, 1944

Particulars	Army	Navy	U. S. Maritime Commission	Executive Office of the President (including Lend-Lease funds appropriated directly to the President)	Other agencies	Total
Appropriations enacted	$201,292,738,323	$101,171,575,708	$15,900,148,227	$36,152,505,432	$5,153,103,662	$359,670,371,352
Less: Appropriations used to liquidate prior contract authorizations	−169,304,488	−58,087,100	−240,481,258			−467,872,846
Net total available	201,123,433,835	101,113,788,608	15,659,666,696	36,152,505,432	5,153,103,662	359,202,498,506
Unliquidated contract authorizations		[1] 14,136,728,074	1,065,111,745	616,500,000	93,400,000	15,911,739,819
Total war activities	201,123,433,835	115,250,516,682	16,724,778,714	36,769,005,432	5,246,503,662	375,114,238,325

[1] Includes estimated $1,800,000,000 for 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft authorized in Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, subject to direction of the President.

NONWAR EXPENDITURES

Our expense of Government during this war period has been divided into three main categories—war expenditures, nonwar expenditures, and interest on the public debt. These are roughly divided in terms of total Federal outlay of 90 percent, 6 percent, and 4 percent, respectively. Annual expenditures for purposes which have been classified during this period as "war activities" have reached a fairly stabilized level. They were approximately $87,000,000,000 for the fiscal year just closed and will be at that approximate figure for the coming fiscal year, assuming continuance of the war in all theaters during the entire year. Interest on the public debt is on the rise. For the fiscal year just closed it totaled $2,609,000,000 and for the fiscal year just starting the estimate is $3,750,000,000.

A very gratifying reduction has taken place in the items classified as "nonwar" expenditures. I shall append to this statement a tabulation of the trend of these expenditures showing the actual amounts for the fiscal years 1939 to 1944, inclusive, and the estimated amounts for the fiscal year 1945. In this table I am using "expenditures" rather than "appropriations" for the reason that in this particular type of appropriation the expenditure figures can be almost as sharply related to a given fiscal period as the appropriations. The classification of items of appropriation as "nonwar" has prevailed since the beginning of the period of preparation for war and the actual war period. The label "nonwar" is to some extent inaccurate since all Federal activities have to a more or less extent been oriented to the war programs. Nevertheless the category has been followed and includes those items which are not obviously made for war purposes, which are not labeled "national defense" in the law, and also excludes the interest on the public debt. The funds of almost every Federal agency are divided on a "war" or "nonwar" basis as closely as it is possible to make a division of its activity. The Committee on Appropriations also has this table available in chart form of reduced size, a more graphic presentation of the data than can be included in the RECORD:

Federal nonwar expenditures (excluding interest on public debt, Government corporations, and trust accounts) for fiscal years 1939–45

[In millions]

Classification	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945 (estimated)
RELATIVELY FIXED COMMITMENTS							
Tax refunds	$67.9	$91.1	$89.6	$94.4	$79.1	[1] $266.7	[1] $1,506.6
Veterans' pensions and insurance	457.0	449.5	459.3	448.0	488.0	594.4	1,087.2
Social security and highway grants:							
Social security grants	324.8	359.5	418.5	471.2	471.3	487.4	455.4
Highway grants	160.0	153.3	165.9	149.1	86.0	50.2	62.0
Total social security and highway grants	484.8	512.8	584.4	620.3	557.3	537.6	517.4
Other fixed commitments:							
Railroad retirement—payment to trust account	107.1	120.7	124.4	140.8	214.8	262.7	308.8
Government employees' retirement funds—United States share	75.1	87.2	92.7	102.9	107.3	177.3	196.8
Permanent appropriations:							
Expenses of public-debt operations	3.4	3.6	4.5	17.0	55.5	80.0	91.4
Customs earmarked to encourage agricultural consumption and export (sec. 32, act of Aug. 24, 1935)	210.5	73.0	93.8	85.2	55.6	75.0	90.0
Other permanent appropriations	25.5	30.1	38.3	35.5	38.6	45.7	41.8
Miscellaneous grants and contributions	110.2	95.5	106.6	96.5	103.8	100.4	75.6
Total other fixed commitments	531.8	410.1	460.3	477.9	575.6	741.1	804.4
Total relatively fixed commitments	1,541.5	1,463.5	1,593.6	1,640.6	1,700.0	2,139.8	3,915.6
RELATIVELY CONTROLLABLE ITEMS							
Work relief and aids to youth:							
Work relief	2,612.5	1,861.4	1,438.2	937.3	317.4	22.6	17.5
Aids to youth	368.5	377.8	347.3	250.5	17.9	.2	
Total work relief and aids to youth	2,981.0	2,239.2	1,785.5	1,187.8	335.3	22.8	17.5
Aids to agriculture (excluding fixed commitments):							
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	477.9	605.1	465.1	473.7	391.1	369.0	285.0
Parity payments		215.0	183.9	191.0	202.7	165.0	4.0
Other aids to agriculture	252.4	398.7	[2]—84.8	267.5	307.3	77.7	69.8
Total aids to agriculture	730.3	1,218.8	564.2	932.2	901.1	611.7	358.8
General public works (excluding highway grants):							
Rivers and harbor work and flood control	181.7	207.2	210.9	182.3	190.9	174.3	160.6
Tennessee Valley Authority, Bonneville, and Reclamation	90.4	130.1	146.4	239.6	192.9	124.7	102.5
Other public works	85.7	95.5	95.0	78.0	52.7	36.8	64.5
Total general public works	357.8	432.8	452.5	499.9	436.5	335.8	327.6
Establishments and agencies (not included above):							
Legislative establishment	22.0	23.1	24.2	27.3	26.7	29.0	29.0
The Judiciary	9.4	11.0	11.4	11.5	12.0	13.0	13.4
Executive Office of the President	2.4	2.7	2.9	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.6
Independent establishments:							
Veterans' Administration	93.5	101.2	100.0	103.9	111.8	130.0	165.0
Federal Security Agency	63.7	67.2	71.5	79.0	84.9	91.0	97.3
Federal Works Agency	51.4	34.8	25.5	31.8	37.1	65.0	62.7
Other independent establishments	55.6	52.8	52.1	63.8	62.1	62.7	98.7
District of Columbia—United States share	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
Total establishments and agencies	303.0	298.8	293.6	325.6	343.2	399.2	474.7
Cabinet Departments (not included above):							
Department of Agriculture	180.2	176.6	185.5	126.5	119.8	137.7	142.7
Department of Commerce	51.4	69.9	71.5	57.6	61.2	70.8	78.1
Department of the Interior	127.9	82.4	70.3	63.7	54.6	65.3	69.7
Department of Justice	46.9	52.6	56.7	64.0	63.2	71.0	71.5
Department of Labor	6.0	9.9	12.6	11.5	10.8	10.7	10.6
Department of State	16.8	21.8	20.4	26.3	31.8	36.3	46.0
Treasury Department	109.4	108.3	129.2	134.2	165.1	204.2	220.1
War Department—nonmilitary functions	24.1	30.3	33.2	37.8	30.6	12.5	21.4
Post Office Department—general fund expenditures	39.6	42.0	30.1	17.7	8.6	[3]—22.0	
Total, Cabinet Departments	602.3	593.8	609.5	539.3	545.7	586.5	660.1
Total, relatively controllable items	4,974.4	4,783.4	3,705.3	3,484.8	2,561.8	1,956.0	1,838.7
Total, nonwar expenditures	6,515.9	6,246.9	5,298.9	5,125.4	4,261.8	[4] 4,095.8	5,754.3

[1] Includes excess-profits tax refund bonds.
[2] A minus item due to return of $315,000,000 of surplus funds by Government corporations.
[3] A minus item due to return of $29,000,000 of excess advances in prior years to meet anticipated deficiencies.
[4] Actual; distribution estimated.

NOTE.—Revision of tabulation presented by chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. (See Congressional Record of Nov. 4, 1943.)

JULY 7, 1944.

As will be noted from the preceding table, the nonwar expenditures are divided into two main classifications—those for fixed commitments and those for controllable items. The following summary brings out the difference between each of these groups and the grand totals for the fiscal years 1939 and 1945:

	Fiscal year 1939 (actual)	Fiscal year 1945 (estimated)
Relatively fixed commitments	$1,541,500,000	$3,915,600,000
Relatively controllable items	4,974,400,000	1,838,700,000
Total nonwar expenditures	6,515,900,000	5,754,300,000

As this abbreviated table indicates, total "nonwar" expenditures have been cut materially over the period 1939–1945. Relatively fixed commitments have more than doubled, but their increase has been more than offset by sharp reductions in the relatively controllable items.

Until now, annual totals of "nonwar" expenditures have shown a steady decline since the fiscal year 1939. The 1939 total was a peak, exceeded only in 1936, when there were heavy adjusted-compensation payments to war veterans. During the fiscal year 1945, just starting, a sharp increase impends. But this increase is concentrated in the first two fixed commitment classifications discussed below—tax refunds, and veterans' pensions and insurance—both of which are closely related to the war. If we exclude these two classifications, nonwar expenditures show a continued decline to a new low of $3,200,000,000—about half the comparable total of $6,000,000,000 expended in 1939. The total for controllable items continues its rapid downward trend.

RELATIVELY FIXED COMMITMENTS

As the table indicates, reduction in the "nonwar" total has been achieved in spite of a large and growing volume of expenditure for relatively fixed prior commitments. Such fixed items are not subject to substantial reduction through current administrative control or even through congressional action on appropriations because the payments are governed by fixed statutory formulas or contractual arrangements, or their change would otherwise require substantive legislation and revision of moral, if not legal, obligations.

These fixed commitments have risen sharply since 1939, particularly during 1944 and 1945. Whereas in 1939 they made up less than a fourth of all nonwar expenditures, they now comprise two-thirds of a total which itself has been cut drastically.

Tax refunds: Although relatively small heretofore, tax refunds are expected to rise from $67,900,000 in 1939 to above $1,500,000,000 during the fiscal year 1945, including bonds issued now for corporate excess-profits tax refundable after the war. Tax refunds paid from the Treasury are treated as an expenditure item although in measuring over-all trends of Government finance they could perhaps more logically be deducted from revenues. If they were so deducted, total nonwar expenditures in the fiscal year

1945 would be at about the level to which they were cut in 1943.

Veterans' pensions and insurance—excluding administrative costs: At $1,100,000,000 for 1945, fixed commitments for veterans are more than double the average amount for the 3 pre-war fiscal years, 1939–41. Moreover, this estimate for 1945 does not include expenditures which will occur under the newly enacted Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Social-security and highway grants: Of the social-security grants, old-age assistance is the biggest share, with an increase of more than 50 percent above 1939, reflecting increases in the number of beneficiaries and in the average level of payments made by the States. For similar reasons grants for aid to dependent children and for aid to the blind have advanced substantially. These increases are somewhat offset by lower grants for unemployment-compensation administration because of improved employment conditions.

Grants for highways, now much smaller than social-security grants, have declined sharply. During the war such grants are being made only for work necessary to facilitate war transportation.

Other fixed commitments: The rise in the remaining fixed commitments is because of increased appropriations to retirement trust funds and increased expenses of loans.

Two kinds of retirement funds are included—those for railroad employees and those for Government employees. Contributions to the railroad retirement fund have had to be increased steadily and substantially to match growing receipts from special taxes levied for this purpose. This item also might logically be excluded entirely in measuring Government expenditures.

Contributions to the Government employees' retirement fund, on the other hand, are made from general revenues. The recent increase largely represents the gradual payment of a previously accumulated Government obligation to this trust fund, but to some extent it reflects, also, the fact that solely because of the war many employees have continued in service long enough to acquire retirement rights.

Fixed commitments include various permanent appropriations, among which expenses of loans is now the largest. Expenditure under this appropriation for administration and management of the public debt has risen with the amount of borrowing, particularly the wide sale of bonds in small denominations. It is estimated at $91,000,000 in 1945, compared with only $3,000,000 in 1939.

Another permanent appropriation earmarks 30 percent of customs revenue for programs to encourage consumption and exportation of agricultural commodities—programs which during the war emphasize consumption among low-income groups and the leveling off of seasonal or local gluts of the market for various commodities. The amount varies with customs collections.

Other permanent appropriations comprise a variety of items, such as grants to colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts and for vocational education, and various payments to States and counties from public-land revenues.

Also included in fixed commitments are miscellaneous grants and contributions, among which the chief items are payments to sugar producers under the Sugar Act of 1937, payments to reduce interest rates on farm mortgages, and annual contributions of the Federal Public Housing Authority to local housing authorities.

RELATIVELY CONTROLLABLE ITEMS

The distinction between relatively fixed and controllable items brings into clear focus the deep curtailment that has been affected in controllable nonwar expenditures in the past 6 years. In 1939 controllable items amounted to $5,000,000,000. For 1945 they are estimated at $1,800,000,000. They are now at or near bedrock.

Work relief and aids to youth: Reemployment has permitted elemination of work relief and aids to youth, with attendant huge expenditure reductions from just under $3,000,000,000 in 1939 to the small unliquidated obligations of earlier years to be paid in the fiscal year 1945 and estimated at $17,500,000. The estimate for 1945 comprises amounts required to fulfill loan and grant agreements of the Public Works Administration and to make accident compensation payments connected with the former work-relief programs.

Aids to agriculture: Only a few aids to agriculture are included among fixed commitments, most of these aids being shown as controllable items. Such controllable items rose to a peak exceeding $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1940; for the fiscal year 1945 they are cut sharply to an estimated $259,000,000. Parity payments have become unnecessary. Substantial reductions have been made in payments for the conservation and use of agricultural land resources and for miscellaneous aids.

General public works: Expenditures for general public works—other than highway grants already noted—have dropped sharply below their peak of 1942 when the program comprised huge multiple-purpose construction projects at Central Valley, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and in the Tennessee Valley, as well as flood-control works, river and harbor improvements, and reclamation projects in other places.

Many projects which were suspended early in the war to release critical materials had to be resumed later in order to provide additional hydroelectric power, arable land, and navigable waterways. Nevertheless, the estimated expenditure total for fiscal year 1945 is below that of 1944.

Establishments and agencies: Expenditures of the legislative establishment, the judiciary, the Executive Office of the President, and the independent establishments are grouped under the general heading "Establishments and agencies." The independent establishments account for most of the expenditures.

Legislative establishment: The legislative establishment includes the Government Printing Office, Library of Congress, and Architect of the Capitol, as well as the two Houses of the Congress itself. The wartime increase has been mainly in the legislative printing costs of the Government Printing Office. Expenditures of the legislative branch are classified entirely as nonwar items.

Independent establishments: Expenditure increases among the independent establishments are intimately related to the war effort. Thus, the Veterans' Administration expenditures for relatively controllable items, chiefly hospital and administrative costs, are estimated at $71,000,000 more in 1945 than they were in 1939. The Federal Security Agency expenditures in 1945 will be $34,000,000 above 1939, because of wartime demands upon the Public Health Service and increased payments to the States for vocational rehabilitation of disabled civilians. A rise of $11,000,000 in the Federal Works Agency in the same period reflects increased expenditures for operating Government buildings all over the country. For other independent establishments there is a 6-year increase of $43,000,000, concentrated in the following agencies which have important functions of war administration: The General Accounting Office, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and Civil Service Commission.

Cabinet departments: Total nonwar expenditures of Cabinet departments were lower in the fiscal years 1942–1944 than before the war. Exclusive of items classified under other headings in the table, they are rising in 1945 to a total estimated at $58,000,000 above 1939. This difference is more than accounted for by increased Treasury Department expenditures alone, predominantly in the tax collection and fiscal services.

Thus, the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the Treasury Department, is now collecting eight times as much revenue as in 1939 from a great many more individual taxpayers. Its administrative costs are little more than twice as great in spite of the innumerable complications which the war has added to tax administration—for example, special treatment of servicemen. The cost of the fiscal services has more than doubled since 1939, even omitting most of the expeditures of the Bureau of Public Debt because these are covered by a permanent appropriation included among fixed commitments. Foreign funds control, now costing the Treasury Department $4,000,000 a year, is an example of a totally new "nonwar" activity nonexistent 5 years ago.

The major reduction among Cabinet departments is in the Department of the Interior, where "nonwar" expenditures in fiscal year 1945 are about half the comparable expenditures in 1939. The Post Office deficiency has been eliminated; in fact, during the fiscal year 1944 the Department returned to the general fund some advances previously made to cover deficiencies which proved to be smaller than anticipated, thereby establishing a credit against expenditures.

Agriculture Department expenditures, even excluding the sharply reduced agricultural aids, continue well below the level of 1939. The total of War Depart-

ment expenditures for nonmilitary functions, exclusive of general public works, is less than in 1939 despite a rise in expenditures connected with the Panama Canal.

The four remaining Cabinet departments—Justice, State, Commerce, and Labor—have shown in each case some increase in nonwar expenditures exclusive of general public works and fixed commitments. Detailed examination reveals direct connections between the increase of spending and the enlarged needs or new conditions created by the war. In the Justice Department most of the increase was for registration of aliens, detention or surveillance of alien enemies, war-connected law-enforcement activities of the F. B. I., and general provision of legal services for a Government greatly expanded to handle the war effort. In the State Department, some savings from closing diplomatic establishments in Axis and Axis-occupied countries were absorbed by great expansion of activities at other posts, doubling of our establishments in other American republics, and the coordination of extensive foreign economic activities. The Commerce Department increase is more than accounted for by the Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics and the Weather Bureau, which have had their work multiplied by the great wartime increase in air traffic. In the Labor Department, the increase is mainly in the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, although these divisions, now consolidated, and the Department as a whole have reduced their nonwar spending since 1941.

WAR ASPECTS OF NONWAR EXPENDITURES

The preceding sections cover all categories shown in the table. This section elaborates an earlier statement that more than 2.5 billion dollars of the nonwar expenditures for 1945 are for major items closely and obviously related to the war. Corresponding items totaled about $800,000,000 for fiscal year 1944. The largest items are reviewed here.

All expenditures of the Veterans' Administration are considered nonwar; actually, about $180,000,000 in 1944 and $690,000,000 estimated for 1945 are occasioned directly by the present war. These estimates include the large appropriations to the National Service Life Insurance fund, Army and Navy pensions in cases arising out of the present war, war losses under the older system of Government life insurance, and the increase in hospital and administrative costs. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 will further add to the total for 1945.

Wartime developments have added greatly to Treasury Department expenses—chiefly in the form of tax refunds exceeding $1,500,000,000 in 1945, but also in terms of the costs of collecting taxes, administering debt, and other wartime fiscal operations. These administrative costs for fiscal year 1945 are estimated at nearly $200,000,000 above the pre-war level. The General Accounting Office, with its greatly increased auditing load in connection with war expenditures, likewise shows an increase of operating costs to several times the pre-war level.

Payments to the railroad retirement trust fund have almost trebled.

Costs for rental and operation of building space are classified as nonwar, even when incurred on behalf of war agencies. Expenditures of the Public Buildings Administration for these purposes are more than double the pre-war amount.

The items enumerated, with several smaller ones of the same general character, account for one-fifth of so-called nonwar expenditures in the fiscal year 1944 and nearly one-half in 1945.

These increases or new items are for activities clearly related to the war. The totals do not reflect the more numerous instances in which the nonwar expenditures have been cut below pre-war levels and the remaining services redirected wholly or predominantly to the objective of winning the war. For example, War Department nonmilitary expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood control—classified as nonwar general public works—have not only been reduced; they have been to a considerable extent concentrated on waterways of special importance to the war effort. These improved waterways have made it possible for the United States to build on inland lakes and even on dry land some of the vessels for overseas use. Similarly, the expenditures of the nonwar National Park Service have been reduced sharply and the parks are widely used for military convalescents.

The major conclusions to be derived from this analysis are as follows:

First. The Federal dollar of expenditure contains only 6 cents for so-called nonwar purposes. The remainder is made up of 90 cents for war and 4 cents for interest on the public debt.

Second. Nonwar expenditures were cut heavily from $6,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1939 to $4,100,000,000 in the fiscal year 1944 just closed. They will rise to $5,800,000,000 in the fiscal year 1945 because of rapidly increasing fixed commitments, notably tax refunds and veterans' pensions and insurance.

Third. Relatively controllable nonwar items have been steadily slashed from $5,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1939 to a new low of $1,800,000,000 estimated for the fiscal year 1945. They are now at or near bedrock.

Fourth. Relatively fixed commitments cannot be substantially changed without revision of basic legislation. In the fiscal year 1939 they were only 24 percent of nonwar expenditures; during the fiscal year 1945 they will be 68 percent.

Fifth. Controllable items and fixed commitments both contain an increasingly large proportion of expenditures actually for war purposes or occasioned by war activities. Thus, if only the clearest war-related items are excluded from estimated 1945 nonwar expenditures, the total is about cut in half.

Sixth. Activity after activity has been fully reoriented to war.

I feel that every American citizen can take pride in this outstanding record with respect to nonwar expenditures. The percentage reduction which has been made in the controllable items is the largest ever made in the history of the country in any period of time. The increases which have taken place in the fixed commitments are entirely due to the mutations of war. Those activities which had a decidedly nonwar inclination have been converted largely to the performance of war work even though the bulk of their funds are still cataloged as nonwar.

Program Honoring Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following program on the occasion of the unveiling of a portrait of Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, the distinguished and beloved chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, on June 15, 1944:

PROGRAM

Presiding: Representative HERBERT C. BONNER.

Presentation of portrait: Representative EDWARD J. HART.

Introduction of Sandor Klein, artist.

Unveiling of portrait: Mrs. Elsie N. Keefer, clerk of committee.

Address of Vice Admiral Russell R. Waesche, Commandant, United States Coast Guard.

Address of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission.

Address of Representative SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Address of Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, minority leader of the House of Representatives.

Address of Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Acceptance of portrait: Representative RICHARD J. WELCH, ranking minority member of committee; Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK, ranking majority member of committee.

Response: Representative SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND.

(Ceremonies honoring the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, a Representative in Congress since July 2, 1918, from the First District of Virginia, member, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries since April 18, 1921, and chairman since March 14, 1933, were held in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee hearing room, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., on Friday, June 16, 1944, at 10 o'clock a. m., Representative HERBERT C. BONNER presiding.)

Representative BONNER. We are delighted to have so many friends here this morning to join us in paying tribute to a noble son of Virginia and an outstanding American, our chairman.

Primarily our committee deals with the Coast Guard and maritime legislation. We are proud to have on the program Admiral Waesche and Admiral Land. Admiral Waesche

has brought the Coast Guard from a peacetime protective force to one of the Nation's outstanding fighting units. He is recognized as the greatest leader the Coast Guard has ever had.

Admiral Land, through his initiative and dynamic energy, has produced a merchant fleet the like of which has never been gathered together before on the high seas. This fleet has kept life and hope in our allies, and is the first factor of our success to date.

We are also happy and proud to have on this program the Speaker of the House, the minority leader, and the majority leader, certainly men who have led the legislative program of this country through the most trying time we have ever experienced.

I present the Honorable EDWARD J. HART, a member of the committee.

Representative EDWARD J. HART. Mr. Bonner, Mr. Bland and Mrs. Bland, distinguished guests, and my colleagues, this is a singularly happy occasion for all of us. For the humblest as well as the most distinguished in this gathering it is an hour invested with pleasure and with pride. To Mr. BONNER, whose generous mind and heart conceived them, and to all those within and without the House of Representatives who have so generously and so willingly cooperated with him, and to the distinguished artist whose presence here this morning we view with a sense of supreme satisfaction, these ceremonies must be especially gratifying.

It will draw no dissent, I believe, to say that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is one of the highly important committees of the House of Representatives. Upon the establishment and the proper maintenance of a suitable merchant marine no small measure of our country's interest depends, and to be entrusted with the initial and competent consideration of legislation directed toward those ends is a challenge seen that responsibility eagerly assumed and successfully discharged.

In the 10 years during which it has been my privilege to serve on that committee, I have seen that challenge accepted. I have seen that responsibility eagerly assumed and successfully discharged.

I would not willingly permit any note of criticism, however slight, to mar the concord of these proceedings, and I hope I shall not be suspected of offering it when I state that 10 years ago the United States Merchant Marine was in a very sorry state. It was made up, for the most part, of vessels that were old and inadequate, and relatively few. Qualitatively and quantitatively it was utterly unequal, either to the task of carrying anything like its fair share of our foreign commerce, or serving as a useful and helpful adjunct of our Navy. And, while I know that the committee was composed of patriotic, able, and industrious men prior to 10 years ago, it did appear to a newcomer at that time that little effective thought had been given to any plan for the renascence of the merchant marine. I merely state that as an observation and not as a fact, because if I were to enter into a discussion of that matter I would be merely exploiting my own ignorance. But I do know that at that period the merchant marine was truly in the doldrums.

Under the chairmanship of him in whose honor we are gathered here today that deplorable situation was speedily and completely altered. Under the force of his drive this committee became busily intent upon devising remedies to restore the long-neglected health of the merchant marine. It assumed a constant watchfulness; it maintained a lively interest in all things relating to it. Its deliberations became infused with a spirit of inquiry and marked by an intelligent research out of which came rich accomplishments, first in the form of highly valuable legislation and consequent upon that a merchant marine commensurate with the dignity and the requirements of the Republic.

And, while I would not be fair if I did not freely acknowledge that these laudable results could not have been effected harmoniously and so expeditiously without the always generous, able, and devoted cooperation of Mr. WELCH and his colleagues of the minority, I am sure that he will join with me when I say that the mind that guided us and the hand that directed us to desirable ends, beneficial to our country, were the mind and the heart of the brilliant chairman of our committee, Judge BLAND.

We of his committee are intensely proud of Judge BLAND, and we have every right to be. We contemplate with admiration his exhaustive knowledge of all matters coming within the committee's jurisdiction, whether they relate to the merchant marine, the Coast Guard, or the fisheries. We behold with wonderment, and sometimes with grave concern, his measureless industry and his selfless devotion to the work of this committee, a selflessness which at long last nature itself rebelled against but which it could not conquer. For age cannot wither his zeal, nor has time power to dim his enthusiasm for his country's good.

Mr. Chairman, you have been a genuine inspiration to us all. I am permitted today to speak for Democrat and Republican alike. Your tolerance of our impetuousness, your patience with our ignorance, your helpfulness in an infinite variety of circumstances, your innate gentleness, your sincere modesty, all have buried themselves deep within our hearts and generated there an affection for our chairman which shall never be diminished.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, to commemorate his incomparable leadership in a truly great era in the history of this fine committee, and to give visible evidence of the profound regard in which Judge BLAND is held by its membership, we have caused a very excellent likeness to be done by this noted artist, who graces this gathering here today with his presence. It is our desire that it become the property of the committee, that it be hung in the committee room through future time as a stimulus to us and to those who in future days will be permitted to carry on the important work of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and, above all, as an enduring testimony of our chairman's kingship in the empire of our love.

Mr. RAMSPECK and Mr. WELCH, it is my honor and privilege, on behalf of the members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to present to the committee, through you, what I am sure all will agree when they have had the pleasure of seeing it is an admirable portrait of our beloved and distinguished chairman, the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND.

Representative BONNER. It is a pleasure, and we are proud to present the artist, Specialist First Class of United States Coast Guard, Mr. Sandor Klein. Mr. Klein was born in New York and attended the National Academy of Design in New York City. He was winner of the Pulitzer art prize in '31, and also in '31 he was extended a fellowship in the American Academy in Rome, during which year he toured continental Europe and studied. He attended the Julian Beaux Arts School in Paris and was elected a Fellow in the National Academy of Art. He also received the Tiffany Award in New York.

Mr. Klein joined the Coast Guard in 1942 and participated in the invasion of the Marshall Islands and other landings performed by his service. Mr. Klein, it is a pleasure!

I now present the faithful clerk of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mrs. Elsie N. Keefer.

(Mrs. Keefer unveiled the portrait of the Honorable Mr. BLAND.)

Representative BONNER. Mr. Klein, we appreciate your service, and we hope that on our next meeting your rank will be much higher.

It is our pleasure to present Admiral Russell R. Waesche, Commandant, United States Coast Guard.

Vice Admiral RUSSELL R. WAESCHE. Mr. Chairman, Judge BLAND, Mrs. Bland, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen: I am indeed very happy to be here and to participate in these exercises. The Coast Guard has been associated with this committee for many years, and we all love the distinguished chairman.

I, personally, have been closely associated with Judge BLAND since my appointment as Commandant of the Coast Guard and even before that, and we have always found him not only a fair and a just man to deal with, but a lovable man, a man in whom we have faith, a man that we come to with our troubles in the Coast Guard, as well as to get support for legislation.

We are very proud indeed that it was a Coast Guard boy who painted this very fine portrait. I know Judge BLAND would much prefer a man in a bluejacket's uniform to do this work than a man in an officer's uniform or in any distinguished clothing or sphere of activity. He has always been a friend of the underdog. He calls me up many times and writes me many letters, always to find out if there is not something we can do for a seaman. I do not think I have ever had a request from him to do something for an officer or a shipbuilding company or anyone who is well to do.

That is why we have such a deep affection for him. That is why we have faith in him. That is why we will always come to him with our troubles and for sympathy as well as when we want something done.

His interest in the Coast Guard Academy has been outstanding. The last time he went there he probably was too ill to go, but his indomitable will made him go. I only hope that he will remain chairman of this committee as long as I have anything to do with the Coast Guard. I doubt if you can find anyone who would replace him in the hearts of the enlisted men and officers of the Coast Guard, and certainly there is no one who can take his place in the heart of the present Commandant.

I feel that in his activities in this committee and elsewhere, and in his daily life, Judge BLAND owes much credit to his very gracious and lovable wife. Anyone who has met her must realize that there probably lies at least part of the inspiration which has made Judge BLAND such an outstanding, wonderful public servant.

Representative BONNER. It is our pleasure to present Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission.

Rear Admiral EMORY S. LAND. Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Chairman, Lady Mary, members of the committee, distinguished guests: It seems to me that to stand up here and try to say anything is like carrying coals to Newcastle. So much has been said that one might just add "I sign on the dotted line" and let it go at that.

But, as a member of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, I would like to say that we recognize in OTIS BLAND the father of the modern merchant marine; this committee we recognize as our board of directors; we yield to none in our admiration for the fairness and justice of the chairman and the whole committee. It is you legislators who are responsible for the merchant marine that exists today; if there is any credit, it goes back quite a few years, because you put on the books and you have helped us carry through this entire shipbuilding, ship-operating, and ship-manning program.

I come up here so often that I am thinking seriously of running for membership on the committee. But, whether I come up here to be spanked, to be helpful, or to be praised, I am always assured of justice, and that is all any of us are looking for—a square deal.

This committee, I feel, is like Russell Waesche spoke of Lady Mary. It is just like your wife. It is your best friend and your most ardent critic, a fine combination.

Looking around, this has some symbols of a college commencement, and I only wish it were my privilege to confer, as well as admiration for a wonderful portrait, some degrees such as M. D., D. D., and LL. D. on Otis. But if I were to do so, those would be "Mairzie dotes and dozie dotes, and little lansie divie." Sometimes I hope we can give you all three of those in one.

I like to think of OTIS BLAND not only as the chairman but also as a shipmate. It has been the pleasure of my wife and myself to have been shipmates with the judge and his wife. I think of him as a judge not because he is a judge but because he deals out justice, fairness, constructive criticism, courtesy, and leadership, and on behalf of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration it is my great privilege as their representative to say, "Good luck, God bless you, and all honor to a great American."

Representative BONNER. Since the first Congress we have had many distinguished, able leaders in the House of Representatives. We have had many outstanding Speakers. But it can be truthfully said there has never been a Speaker prior to the present incumbent who has the love and the respect of the House of Representatives any stronger, than the present incumbent. He has dealt fairly and justly, and impartially, as he viewed the House with respect to the center aisle. By his conduct in that chair and by his fellowship with the youngest Member and the oldest Member he has ingratiated himself so deeply in the hearts of the membership of the House that no occasion held on Capitol Hill would be fully complete and proper without his presence. It is my delightful pleasure to present the Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

Representative SAM RAYBURN. I just could not let this occasion pass without coming here and saying "Howdy" and greeting the great chairman of this committee.

It has been my privilege to serve in the House of Representatives for a little more than 31 years. In that time I have seen many splendid chairmen come and go, and I think that on the fingers of one hand I could recount the chairmen of great committees who have measured up to the high standard set by OTIS BLAND. He knows his business, and he knows his bills.

This committee, under his leadership, has established such a high and enviable reputation that as a usual thing we do not have to appeal to the Committee on Rules for a rule to make his bills in order. He just gets them up by unanimous consent, and usually without reading. The House has that much faith in him.

I know that for him and his charming wife this is a red letter day. It should be. It is such an honor as comes to few men and to no one more deserving. He has indeed made great, outstanding and lasting contributions as a legislator and as a stateman of the first order, and to you, sir, and to your charming companion, may I say that I hope your years will be long and that throughout the years that are allotted to you your paths may lie through green fields and by still waters. That is the hope and trust of every friend, and they are legion.

Again allow me to congratulate one of the greatest chairmen it has ever been my privilege to know, and say that this tribute today is a just tribute, one that I know is an inspiration to you as it is to us.

Representative BONNER. When I first came to Washington many years ago as an employee on Capitol Hill it was my good fortune and my pleasure to meet early and to learn to love one of the finest characters I have ever known, and so much did I admire him and so much have I continued to admire him that sometimes I have become afraid. He almost persuades me to believe in his faith.

My admiration goes so far that he is the only one of the other party whose picture hangs in my home. It gives me real, sincere pleasure to present the minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN.

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Herbert, Otis, and Mrs. Bland, distinguished guests, and members of the Merchant Marine Committee, it is a privilege for me to come here today. I was delighted when my good friend of 20 years, Herbert, invited me to come. I wanted to come, first that I might pay my personal tribute to a man who has had my personal affection for a good many years. I wanted to come that I might pay tribute to his splendid, patriotic, public service.

It was my privilege to know OTIS BLAND in the early days when I was here. For several years I had an office adjoining his, and I know from that close intimacy with him what high character of public servant he was, always devoted to his work, always on the job, always planning to do something which would promote the welfare of his country.

It is because of these high virtues that, as the Speaker has told you so well, when Otis brings a bill on the floor of the House we have faith in what is included in that bill. We do not ask him quite so many of the searching questions that we might ask some other one who has not endeared himself to us quite as much as Judge BLAND, and so his legislation rolls easily through.

I want to say that I believe that in this trying period he and his committee have done a remarkable job. I had hoped, when I first came into Congress, that I might go on this committee. That was the committee I asked for; but unfortunately they diverted me to other lines of work, so I never came back. But I do know from my predecessor, who was chairman of this committee, what a great value it can be to this country; and I know, too, not only in this war period, but in the period that is to follow the war, how essential the work will be of this committee. I do not know of any committee in these post-war days that will have a greater job to do, a greater responsibility for the prosperity of our country, than this Merchant Marine Committee, and we are fortunate to have men like Judge BLAND, DICK WELCH, and other strong members of the committee.

So I am happy to come here today to pay my tribute to Judge BLAND, to express an appreciation of the fine work he has done for the country. I would fail, also, if I did not say a word of commendation, because I know from my own friendship for Mrs. Bland that she has been an important factor in the stimulating work that he has done. And so, Judge, while we may differ in some of the great political questions, while there may at times be strife, we in the Congress all come to know men as they really are, and we have come to know you as a great legislator, a great American and, as this portrait adorns this room and as the members who have been associated with you continue their membership on the committee, I know we will have faith in the development of the merchant marine and that this committee will be inspired to the highest ideals.

Representative BONNER. New England is rich in many ways. And fortunate is this Nation to have such a State as the Old Bay State to send to the legislative halls two sons who have taken such an outstanding part in national affairs during these trying times.

It gives me pleasure, now, to present the other son of Massachusetts, who has led the majority through these trying times: the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK. Representative BONNER, Judge and Mrs. Bland, members of the committee, friends of the Judge and Mrs. Bland, on an occasion of this kind it is very difficult to adequately and properly express, and I find it so, in words, the thoughts which permeate my mind, and it is difficult to adequately, at least to me, express the deep affection and respect that I have for our distinguished friend.

Real friendship to me is the closest relationship that can exist between two human beings outside of the sacred ties of the family itself. I know no Member of the House of Representatives, in my 16 years of service, that enjoys and possesses the real friendship of his colleagues more than our distinguished friend, whom we not only honor today but who honors us.

In the journey of life there are individuals that we meet who will always remain with us, and SCHUYLER BLAND is one of those rare individuals whose personality, whose noble possessions, whose God-given gifts, developed to the maximum extent possible, impress themselves upon our minds and always remain as a permanent and lasting memory.

The Merchant Marine Committee, as I like to refer to it instead of giving it its long name, is a strong committee. Every member of it is a sincere and conscientious legislator. That is truly due, I think all the members will admit, to the strength and character of the chairman of the committee, to his devotion to duty, to his capacity, and to his tolerance as some of the previous speakers have so ably referred to him.

The Speaker and the minority leader have referred to the confidence that the House has in a bill coming out of this committee. And, while all of the members of the committee are entitled to credit, the real credit rests with the chairman. As a matter of fact, making a little open confession, if Schuyler comes to me and tells me a bill is reported out and asks me about getting a rule, I would say to him, "Schuyler, you are slipping." I cannot remember now when Schuyler ever came to me during the 4 years I have been majority leader and asked about a rule. It is an accepted fact that when a bill comes out of this committee it is going to pass by unanimous consent, and when Schuyler comes to see me, the only question I ask it, "Are the Republican members all right? Have you consulted the Republican members? Have you consulted the Republican leadership?"

He says, "Yes," and I say, "All right, Schuyler."

He says, "Don't you want to read the bill?"

I say, "No. A bill reported out of your committee is one that I know has been well considered, and I do not think it is necessary for me to read or study any bill reported out of your committee." But that is indicative of the confidence we have in him and that we have in the committee under his leadership.

I think the references made to the artist by Representative BONNER are appropriate. This young man has a God-given gift which he has developed. We see here one of the evidences of his great gift which he has developed. It is not only a wonderful portrait but the originality and the conception of the artist are something that impresses me and something that I know impresses each and every one of you.

I was particularly pleased when I heard Representative BONNER say that he hoped that the next time the committee saw this young man that he would hear that the young man had been elevated to a higher

rank. On the occasion of that remark I noticed Admiral Waesche applauding very vigorously, and that is some evidence that the admiral was responding affirmatively to the very hopeful expression of Representative BONNER.

I know you were stirred by the remarks of ED HART. No one is more capable of eloquently expressing his thoughts than Representative HART. The remarks of Representative HART touched each and every one of us. At least they represent my views with reference to SCHUYLER BLAND as completely and as comprehensively as anyone can express them through mere words.

I am pleased to be here. I am honored by being able to be here and to participate in this memorable occasion. I am honored in having known SCHUYLER BLAND. I am honored in possessing his friendship. I am honored in being the beneficiary through the years of his guidance, his example, his inspiration. One influences others more by example than by words, and SCHUYLER BLAND is an example of a gentleman of the highest type humanly possible; an example of devotion to duty; an example of courage; an example of kindness, of understanding, and of respect for the other person's views and the other person's right to entertain whatever views his conscience and his judgment prompt him to entertain.

I have benefited from knowing SCHUYLER BLAND, and this day, Schuyler, I am honored. I know that you feel exceedingly pleased with the presence of your friends here. And, in addition to constituting an honor for you, it is also, and properly so, an honor for Mrs. Bland, to whom some of the previous speakers have so touchingly and properly referred. The arms of a mother or a good wife are around all of us throughout the journey of life. As the poet said, "It is in the arms of a woman that we enter life. It is in the arms of a woman that we gain the courage and strength to bear life. It is in the arms of a woman that we invariably leave life." How vacant the life would be, the span between birth and death, if it were not for her, mother and wife.

The references made to Mrs. Bland are deserved, they are touching but truthful. And so whatever honor comes to you is her honor, and we all join with you and with Mrs. Bland in conveying to you both our feelings on this occasion, that we are honored deeply for knowing you, and we extend to you and Mrs. Bland our congratulations and our very best wishes.

As majority leader, if I might conclude, and if I have the authority or exercise the indiscretion to give you an order, the one order I give you is to work a little less and place more responsibility upon the members of your committee.

Representative BONNER. Now we cross the continent to the Golden Gate, and present the ranking member of this committee, who has a golden heart. There is no man on the committee, not excepting the chairman, who knows more about the work of this committee, the matters before it, and who more diligently applies himself to the work of the committee, than this rugged American, the Honorable RICHARD J. WELCH, of California.

Representative RICHARD J. WELCH. Herbert, Judge, and Mrs. Bland, and our guests, it is indeed a pleasure to join with the committee, my committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in this demonstration of our appreciation and respect for our distinguished chairman, the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, of Virginia.

Judge BLAND, as he is affectively known to us, has worked for years to develop an American merchant marine adequate for national defense and our peacetime economy. He is extremely devoted to the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Academy, and to the fisheries and to the other branches of our Government which come under the jurisdiction of this committee.

It is particularly appropriate that the portrait of this distinguished American be placed in this committee room, where he has labored for many years. It will prove an inspiration to those who have a sincere interest in the American merchant marine.

Representative BONNER. North, West, and South this committee is represented. And I know of no member of the committee who would give more time to the committee and who is more devoted to the chairman of this committee than the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK, ranking majority member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine. Mr. RAMSPECK.

Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK. Mr. BONNER, Judge and Mrs. Bland, our distinguished and honored guests, and friends, men often hesitate to speak in terms of affection for their fellow men, because they seem to think it is sissified. Yet, they do have those feelings, just as others have them, just as men have those feelings toward women and women toward each other.

Those of us who have served with Judge BLAND on this committee do have a sincere and deep affection for him. It goes beyond the usual bounds of friendship. It has been my privilege to serve on this committee under two distinguished chairmen, both of whom are here today, Judge DAVIS, of Tennessee, and Judge BLAND, of Virginia. When I first came to Congress, this committee was what we on the Democratic side called an exclusive committee. Later it was opened to membership without that ban and it was my privilege to become a member of it.

I think perhaps I am the only member on the committee who has no coastline in his district. I live 300 miles from the nearest point where one of these great ships in Admiral Land's fleet can come into port, and, therefore, I have been able to look upon the work of the committee in a somewhat detached manner, not being directly affected by the interests over which it has jurisdiction.

Sitting on the right hand of the chairman, whom we gather here to honor today, it has been my privilege to come to know him most intimately, to understand the devotion with which he approaches the problems facing this committee and to see him work diligently for long hours, tirelessly, in the interest of solving those problems which are so important to this country and to the people whom we represent.

In fact, I think I can speak for the members of the committee when I say that we hope he will follow the advice of the majority leader, because he has oftentimes worked us so hard that we felt he was a little too ambitious and a little bit too hard a taskmaster. Yet we know that every act of his and every meeting he has called have been necessary and in the interest of the welfare of this great Nation.

I think when the history of this great global conflict in which we are engaged is written, notwithstanding the many magnificent achievements in other lines of activity, perhaps the most outstanding, and the one that was certainly as necessary to victory as any other, will be the construction and the putting into operation of the merchant fleet that has been built under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and under the splendid direction of Admiral Land, and the father of this legislation, which made possible the quick construction of this great fleet of merchant vessels, is the gentleman whom we honor here today and whose portrait we have hanging on the wall, painted by this splendid artist from the Coast Guard.

On behalf of the committee, I deem it a great privilege to accept this portrait in gratitude, and with a deep feeling that we have, by hanging it on this wall, recorded for those who come after us our affection and our appreciation of one of the finest personal friends I ever had, one of the most lovable men I have ever known, one of the kindliest souls it has ever been my privilege to be associated with, and one of the greatest American citizens and public servants who has ever served in the halls of Congress.

Representative BONNER. You have probably noticed that I from time to time have been confused as between the minority and the majority. That has been brought about by the fairness of the chairman of this committee. Here there is no distinction. The minority play their part and the majority play their part. We fuss, praise, and enjoy each other.

In my opinion, I have never met a character so strong and yet so gentle; I have never met a man before so able and yet so tolerant of others. It is expressed in this picture: Strength, yet gentleness; sweet, yet strong.

As I look on that picture throughout the years I will remember him and be proud that I had the honor to serve under our chairman, SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND.

Representative SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND. Mr. BONNER, distinguished guests, fellow members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, it is impossible for me adequately to express my present emotions or to convey to you the deep feeling that I have due to the expressions of my friends. One thing that I can say is you have carefully selected my friends to be here today. Possibly you did not invite the others.

I am deeply indebted also to the artist for this splendid work that he has done with possibly a rather poor subject. I do not know; I will leave that to him. I predict for him future honors and greater rewards.

I feel that this is not an honor conferred particularly on me, but that it is conferred on the committee, the men who have served with me and the men with whom I have served, not alone for the last few years but for the past 23 years, I believe it is, that I have been a member of this committee. Through all those years I have never seen more diligent attempts to perform their duties than the efforts of the members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The example I have tried to follow has been the example that has been set by those men who have preceded me. Two of my former chairmen I am gratified to note are here today, my immediate predecessor, Judge DAVIS, and my beloved friend, the Senator from Maine, WALLACE WHITE, who was the chairman of this committee immediately preceding Judge DAVIS, and consequently just the second ahead of me.

Such success as our efforts have attained has been due not so much to the chairman as to the committee members and to the constructive work that has been done by the other chairmen. I refer to the gentleman who, I believe, preceded the minority leader of the House, Judge Green, from Massachusetts, Edmonds, of Pennsylvania, Scott, of Michigan, followed by White of Maine and Davis of Tennessee.

We have had a great work to do here. How well we have performed it let posterity tell and let a kind, generous public say. I pray that the remaining years of our work here together may never cause you to regret this honor. Together, by the efforts of my committee rather than by my own, I feel that we have done something worth while for the coast guard, for the fisheries, for the Panama Canal, for our aids to navigation, for our Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for our American merchant marine, which we have helped to build for the national defense. In that work there has been no semblance of party politics.

There go the bells that call the Members of the House to their duties, and I shall bring

my remarks to a close. How far we have come in our work for the American merchant marine will be reflected by a comparison of conditions which existed in 1935, when we reported the 1936 Merchant Marine Act to the House. Then the total tonnage under construction in the United States consisted of two tankers aggregating 16,800 tons, and the other tonnage consisted of four vessels averaging 418 tons each. The report then filed will show what our condition was.

We must carry our efforts forward. We are in the midst now of considering post-war legislation, the disposal of the ships we now have. It is a trying job, it is a hard nut to crack. What we are going to do I do not know. We have simply got an awful task ahead of us. But we shall do it, conscious that we work not alone for the national defense, for promotion of trade, for stabilization of world conditions, but above all for the maintenance and preservation of peace in the world. God helping us, we shall do all we can to maintain and preserve that peace. The first essential, in my opinion, is an adequate merchant marine.

I thank you all very much.

Crop Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that opportunity has not been afforded to take up in the House before the beginning of the recess the bill (H. R. 4911) to continue Federal crop insurance.

The bill should be considered for amendment and would doubtless be modified in some minor respects before enactment, but it affords a basis for consideration of the vital principle of crop insurance and with the 5 years' experience we have had since the enactment of the first crop-insurance law in 1938, could undoubtedly be perfected to provide a practical and workable law.

The importance of insurance in any industry is too well established to permit debate on the subject. That is just as true in agriculture as in any other modern industry. Security against the hazards attending normal agricultural operations should be assured farmers who take the risks involved in crop production and especially at this critical time in the production of wartime food and fiber essentials.

It is an old problem and one which both governmental and private enterprise have long essayed to solve. But we felt that we had reason to believe we were at last approaching a solution of the problem when we enacted the law of February 16, 1938, now chapter 36 of title 7 of the Revised United States Code.

By the direction of the Committee on Appropriations I reported to the House the first bill providing an appropriation to effectuate the new law. We awaited the outcome of the first year's proceedings with great interest, and it was a matter of disappointment to us when at the end of the first year we found we had a heavy deficit. At the hearings for the appropriation for the next year we discussed that phase of it with the representatives of the Department of Agriculture and explained to them that they must readjust their premiums to meet their indemnities, and they assured us that the loss the first year was due to inexperience and that after the first year they felt certain they could make the proposition self-sustaining. But each year of the 5 years in which it has been in operation they have reported a large deficit—the failure of the premiums to pay the indemnities—in addition to the uncompensated administrative expenses. Each year they have agreed that it is necessary to adjust premiums to make it self-sustaining and each year they have failed to do it. Each year there has been increasing protest from the House against a proposition which should be paying its way and each year it became increasingly difficult to get the appropriation through until this last year when the House in Committee of the Whole, rejected further appropriations for that purpose, by the decisive vote of 123 to 52, due to the fact that it felt the law had not been administered to make it self-sustaining when it might have been so administered.

Along with these regular deficits and a deficit averaging recently $7,000,000 to $8,000,000 a year, the administrative expenses averaged about $8,000,000 a year, so that the loss to the Government is approximately sixteen million a year at present.

Strange to say, along with this deficit there has been a declining interest on the part of the farmers. It is difficult to understand that, because there is unquestionably need for agricultural insurance and certainly the proposition has been more than favorable to the farmers. It has been so favorable, in fact, that the Government has been losing $16,000,000 a year and yet, notwithstanding the inadequate premiums, there has been a steady decline in the use of it.

Due to the fact, advertent or inadvertent, that different bases of computation have been used, there has been some uncertainty about the extent of participation on the part of the farmers. At times it has been based on the number of farms; at other times on the number of farmers; and at still other times it has been based upon acreage. Of course the only sound basis for computing participation is on acreage. Where you count by farms or by operators, it is possible to count the same man twice or not count him at all, but when you base your computation upon acreage there cannot be any mistake or inaccuracy, and based upon acreage there has been a steady decline in participation ever since the proposition became thoroughly established.

In view of the fact that there has been some difference of opinion on this score I will give the official acreage as reported to the Committee on Appropriations by the representatives of the Department.

In 1940 the acreage insured was 12,754,834.

In 1941, 11,734,263 acres were insured.

In 1942 there were 9,631,000 insured.

And the Department, at a hearing before the committee last week, estimated that participation in 1943 would be 9,000,000 acres.

So there has been a steady decline in participation. Farmers who at the beginning took insurance, after trying it for a year or two, dispensed with it.

The committee, in considering this bill, will have to take into consideration the fact that in this instance they are legislating for a great many other crops in addition to wheat and cotton.

Originally we started with the wheat farmers by way of experiment and almost immediately there was a demand from all producers for insurance of other farm crops. We added cotton, and there are now applications from practically every other farm product, so that the committee will now have to take into consideration the fact that in legislating on this bill they are not merely legislating for wheat and cotton but for a service which eventually will include all agricultural products. That is only consistent. You cannot refuse other farmers who are asking the same privilege you accord the wheat and cotton farmers. You cannot say, "We are insuring your neighbor's wheat and cotton but we won't insure your crop." So, eventually, whether we plan it that way or not, if we produce a practical and workable plan of insurance, it must be predicated upon the assumption that eventually, if not in the near future, many other agricultural products will be added.

Now, this bill has never been considered as a relief bill. It has always been presented, and the Committee on Appropriations has presented it to the House, on its merits and as a legitimate business proposition.

Of course, if you consider it a relief measure that is another matter, but it has never been considered on that basis and I am certain that the farmers would never desire it to be considered on that basis, and even if they did, it would be merely a question of time before the House would, as it has in the past, refuse to continue gratuitous appropriations and to provide these large amounts of money as relief measures. In short, our only chance to get crop insurance is to submit it on a purely business basis and consider it solely from a business point of view.

If it is to be considered from a business point of view it must be made self sustaining. There is no alternative. On that I think all members of the committee must agree, because you have had intimate association with it, both in committee and in the House and are fully cognizant of its history on the floor.

The House will not indefinitely make appropriations for any measures, for any group, or any industry, which is not self sustaining except in times of disaster or acute need for relief. In other words, the premiums must pay the indemnities.

It is possible that the House would agree to provide the overhead. At least I would advocate that. My proposition, as embodied in H. R. 3785, is that the United States Treasury meet the administrative expenses; in other words, that the Government be willing every year to

put up the $8,000,000 necessary to administer the measure, but beyond that it is evident that the House will not be willing to go further and we cannot ask them to go further, and if we do ask them to go further, it will be denied. The income must pay the losses; the premiums must pay the indemnities. It must, to that extent, be self-supporting. The farmers themselves ask nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that arrangements can be made to bring the bill up for consideration when the House returns from its recess. Both the Department and the farmers should know at least 6 months in advance in order to plan for participation and administration.

Digest of Federal Legislation Affecting Labor, 1933 to 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to represent the largest industrial district in the world, which is in the heart of the "arsenal of democracy," and the greatest number of war plants in that "arsenal of democracy" are in my congressional district—the Sixteenth Congressional District of Michigan—and hundreds of thousands of patriotic men and women are toiling night and day in those plants, mills, factories, and shipyards.

I was first elected to the Seventy-third Congress and have continuously served during what has been called the decade of achievement under the leadership of our great Commander in Chief, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

During the years that I have served in Congress it has been one of my distinct pleasures to have served continuously as a member of the very important Committee on Labor of the National House of Representatives and, as a member of that committee, it has been my pleasure to assist in formulating and supporting those great measures which have been so beneficial to labor. I am proud of the fact that I have assisted in this program.

During the entire period of the Roosevelt administrations I have been the only Democrat from the State of Michigan who has served as a member of the Committee on Labor.

I have often been asked as to what legislation has been enacted during the Roosevelt administrations that has been beneficial to labor—many of us know about this law and that law but very few realize the great benefits that have been given labor during the past 11 years.

It would take much time to give a digest of all the laws, but I have compiled the following data as to the outstanding legislation that has been enacted from 1933 to 1944.

I have not included the Smith-Connally Act because I bitterly opposed that legislation and when it was approved by the House and Senate of the United States on June 25, 1943, over the objections of President Roosevelt's veto message, I introduced H. R. 3055, Seventy-eighth Congress, to repeal the provisions of that obnoxious piece of legislation.

The following is a digest of Federal legislation affecting labor from 1933 to 1944:

1933: National Industrial Recovery Act—Employment Agencies—Civil Works Administration—Civilian Conservation Corps.

As a direct result of the period of economic depression, the year 1933 saw the Federal Congress, as well as the State legislatures, enacting more legislation affecting employee relations than in any period in the Nation's history. The Federal Government adopted the National Industrial Recovery Act to rehabilitate trade and industry; enacted legislation—Wagner-Peyser Act—establishing a system of free public employment agencies in cooperation with the States; launched a tremendous program of public works, and created the Civil Works Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Congress established in the Wagner-Peyser Act a national system of employment agencies in cooperation with the States, under which the States were required to indicate their acceptance of the act's provisions. The Civil Works Administration was created to provide employment and relief to those unemployed and in need. The President was authorized to create an emergency conservation corps, under which a reforestation corps was created to do work in the forests such as the prevention of forest fires, floods, soil erosion, to construct roads in the national parks and forest reserves, and to protect those areas from the attacks of plant pests and diseases. Under part II of the National Recovery Act, calling for public works and construction projects, special labor provisions authorized a 30-hour week, called for the payment of just and reasonable wages, prohibited the use of convict labor, and outlined preferences in employment.

Other laws passed by Congress in 1933, affecting labor, were the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act, the Emergency Relief Act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and the law authorizing the development of the Tennessee Valley and the operation of the Government properties at Muscle Shoals, Ala.

1934: The Seventy-third Congress met in a second session commencing January 3, 1934.

1935: National Labor Relations Act, Railroad Employees' Retirement Act, Motor Carrier Act, Federal Prison Labor Act, Bituminous Coal Conservation Act, Federal Emergency Relief Act, Social Security Act.

The Seventy-fourth Congress enacted some laws of a temporary nature, designed primarily to meet economic conditions resulting from the depression, and passed amendments to overcome constitutional objections to measures of that type already enacted, as well as laws to take the place of those declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. It also inaugurated a program of permanent legislation, including the Social Security Act and the National Labor Relations Act.

Under the National Labor Relations Act, passed by Congress in 1935, it became the declared policy of the United States Government to encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and to protect the rights of workers to organize for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment. Under this act the National Labor Relations Board, a quasi-judicial body of three members, was created to guarantee the right of collective bargaining, and to make certain that the employer does not engage in unfair labor practices.

Under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 a new railroad retirement system was provided. A pension law for railroad employees had been passed by the Seventy-third Congress, but this law had been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Under the 1935 law, covering employees of any express, sleeping-car, or railroad company subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, it was provided that those employees may retire upon reaching 65 years or, regardless of age, after 30 years of service. The amount of the annuity to be paid to retired employees was determined by the average salary received, but not exceeding $120 per month. In addition to the act creating a retirement system, a companion law was passed, providing for an excise tax on employers of 3½ percent of the pay rolls and a similar tax on the wages of employees.

The Motor Carrier Act, which gave the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by motor carrier, was of particular interest to labor because it gave the Commission the power to make requirements as to qualifications and hours of service of employees and safety of operation and equipment. Section 222 (2) of this act made it a criminal offense, punishable by a fine of not more than $100 for the first offense and not more than $500 for any subsequent offense, for any person knowingly and willfully violating any provision of the act or any rule, regulation, requirement, or order thereunder.

Important from the viewpoint both of labor and industry was the so-called Ashurst-Sumners Act, designed to aid the States in enforcing statutes regulating or prohibiting the sale in the open market of prison-made goods. Under this law no person could transport prison-made goods into a State which forbids the sale of such products in the open market. It also required that all products produced by prison labor and shipped in interstate or foreign commerce must be marked, showing the name and address of the shipper and the consignee, as well as the contents and the name of the penal institution in which the goods were produced. Any violation of this act was punishable by a fine of $1,000 for each offense, the goods transported in violation of the act to be forfeited to the United States.

Familiarly known as the Guffey Act, the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act had as its aim the stabilization of the bituminous coal industry and the creation of better labor relations in that industry. Under its provisions there was established in the Department of the Interior a Bituminous Coal Commission of five members appointed by the President and authorized to formulate a bituminous coal code as a working agreement for the producers accepting its terms. In order to compel coal producers to accept the code as formulated by the Commission, it was provided that an excise tax of 15 percent of the sale price at the mine be imposed upon the sale or other disposal of all bituminous coal produced in the United States. Any coal producer who complied with the provisions of the code was entitled to a rebate of 90 percent of the amount of the tax. In establishing the code the Commission was required to incorporate in it the following provision:

Employees shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and shall be free from interference, restraint, or coercion of employers, or their agents, in the designation of such representatives or in self-organization or in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection; and no employee and no one seeking employment shall be required as a condition of employment to join any company union.

Employees shall have the right of peaceable assemblage for the discussion of the principles of collective bargaining, shall be entitled to select their own check-weighman to inspect the weighing or measuring of coal, and shall not be required as a condition of employment to live in company houses or to trade at the store of the employer.

Congress passed the Federal Emergency Relief Act, which was approved on April 8, 1935, in order to increase employment and to provide relief for the unemployed. The act appropriated $4,000,000,000, together with $880,000,000 from unexpended balances of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Public Works Administration. This money was to be used in the discretion of the President for such projects as highways, grade-crossing elimination, rural rehabilitation and relief, water conservation, reclamation, rural electrification, housing, assistance for educational, professional, and clerical persons, the Civilian Conservation Corps, loans or grants, or both, for projects of States and other political subdivisions, and for self-liquidating projects of public bodies, sanitation, land and flood control, and reforestation.

Special provisions affecting labor were made in the Federal Emergency Relief Act. The President was authorized to fix wages for the various types of work. On permanent construction of Federal buildings the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act relative to payment of the prevailing wage rate were made to apply, the rates to be determined in advance of any bidding. The President was also required to make certain that the payment of such wages on the projects financed by the Government should "not affect adversely or otherwise tend to decrease the going rates of wages paid for work of a similar nature." On all public highways and related projects, employment preferences were to be extended to persons receiving relief, and the hours of work and the rates of wages paid to skilled and unskilled labor on such projects must be predetermined for each State. Workmen's compensation was required to be paid for injuries received by an employee while engaged on any of the projects.

The Federal Social Security Act, approved on August 14, 1935, was of vast importance to labor, as it provided a means for States to create unemployment compensation systems and to eventually assure every worker an income during his old age. Title I of the act provided for grants to States for old-age assistance. Title II provided for the creation of a Federal old-age annuity system. Title III provided for grants to States having approved systems of unemployment compensation. In addition to these methods of providing security for workers, the act provided for assistance to needy dependent children, grants to States for maternal and child-health services, services for crippled children, child-welfare services, vocational rehabilitation of the physically disabled, public-health services, and aid to the blind.

The year 1935 also saw the extension by congressional action of certain provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act, enactment of legislation affecting Federal employees, passage of the old-age pension law of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, and amendment of the Davis-Bacon Act relating to contracts affecting public works.

1936: Although many acts affecting the welfare of workers, either directly or indirectly, were passed by the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress—January 3, 1936, to June 20, 1936—one of the most important was the Public Contracts Act. This was designed to maintain proper standards of hours, wages, and working conditions on Government contracts for the manufacture or the furnishing of materials, and so forth, in the amount of more than $10,000. Under this act certain prescribed labor standards were required to be maintained by the contractor, including an 8-hour day, 40-hour week, prohibition of child labor and the labor of prisoners, and maintenance of the prevailing rate of wages in the locality where the work was to be performed. Administration of the law was placed within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Labor, who promulgates necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the act, which became effective October 1, 1936.

Through the provisions of Public Act No. 776, Congress prohibited the interstate transportation of persons for the purpose of interfering with the right of peaceful picketing during labor controversies. The Judiciary Committee, in reporting the bill to Congress, had declared that the legislation was aimed at those persons and organizations whose regular business was the furnishing, for large fees, of strike breakers to take part in labor controversies. The act provided that—

> Whoever shall knowingly transport or cause to be transported, or aid or abet in transporting, in interstate or foreign commerce, any person with intent to employ such person to obstruct or interfere, in any manner, with the right of peaceful picketing during any labor controversy affecting wages, hours, or conditions of labor, or the right of organization for the purpose of collective bargaining, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 2 years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

During the closing days of the 1936 Congress, legislation was adopted granting to the States jurisdiction and authority to apply their State workmen's compensation laws on all property belonging to the Federal Government. This act was particularly important because before its passage many employees engaged in the construction, and so forth, of public buildings and works of the United States had been deprived of workmen's compensation when injury or death had resulted from an industrial accident.

Through the provisions of Public Act No. 487, the Railway Labor Act was amended in 1936 by bringing within its provisions common carriers by air engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, as well as those carriers engaged in the transportation of the mails, including the employees of such carriers. Employees of air-transportation companies were thus assured of the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

In 1936 several laws governing the employment of labor on vessels were passed. Public Act 808 provided that 75 percent of the crew of every American ship, exclusive of licensed officers, must be citizens of the United States. Licensed officers, coal passers, and sailors were placed on a 3-watch basis, with an 8-hour day at sea. Monthly inspection of crew quarters was required. Under the terms of the Ship Subsidy Act the United States Maritime Commission established by the act was authorized to investigate employment and wage conditions in ocean transportation and to incorporate in subsidy contracts minimum manning and wage standards, and reasonable working standards. Public Act No. 622 created a marine casualty investigation board and provided for stricter and more efficient administration of the steamboat-inspection laws. Three acts were passed to provide for the safety of passengers and employees of vessels while at sea.

1937: Unemployment census; promotion of labor standards for apprentices; railroads; social security; Bituminous Coal Act; United States Housing Act.

During the 229 days of the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress, much time was devoted to consideration of a bill to reorganize the judicial system of the United States. Extensive hearings were held on this and many other bills of interest and importance to labor, including the wages and hours bill which failed of passage.

Public Act No. 409 provided for the first governmental count of the unemployed.

The information to be obtained by that census, including the number of unemployed, statistics on partial employment and job opportunities, was to be determined by the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce, the Works Progress Administrator, the Chairman of the Central Statistical Board, the Chairman of the Social Security Board, the Director of the Census.

In Public Act No. 308 Congress empowered the Department of Labor to formulate and promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices. Such work had been earlier carried on by the National Youth Administration. The new act sought the cooperation of employers and labor in the formulation of apprenticeship programs and was also designed to assist those States engaged in promoting standards of apprenticeship.

Two acts, Public, Nos. 162 and 174, respectively, provided for a railroad employees' retirement and tax system. This legislation was the result of an agreement between representatives of the carriers and the employees following the decision of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, declaring partially unconstitutional the act of 1935. Under the 1937 act employees became eligible to retire voluntarily at 65 years of age or to retire at 60 years of age after completing 30 years' service, with a reduction in the annuity at the rate of one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each month the employee is under 65 years of age. Death benefits were provided for the deceased employee's estate and taxes, ranging from 2¾ to 3¾ percent, on carriers and employees, were levied to pay for the retirement benefits.

In order that the Social Security Board might continue and make available to June 30, 1939, grants to States for old-age assistance, $18,000,000 was appropriated. In another action, Congress appropriated for the States enacting approved unemployment-insurance laws in 1937 a portion of the proceeds from the 1936 employers' tax. Thus all States complying with the Federal act were placed on the same basis with respect to their unemployment-insurance funds.

The National Bituminous Coal Commission was established in the Department of the Interior by Public Act No. 48. While this act, providing for the regulation of interstate commerce in the soft-coal industry, was similar in many respects to the 1935 act, the labor provisions were not included. Congress had, however, declared a policy of employees' rights to collective bargaining, and so forth.

Under the terms of the United States Housing Act, a national housing authority was created in the Department of the Interior. The act authorized loans to public housing agencies to assist in the development, acquisition, or administration of low-rent housing or slum-clearance project by such agencies.

1938: Fair Labor Standards Act, Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, Maritime Labor Board, Work Relief Act of 1938, Workmen's Compensation, National Employment System.

The Federal wage-and-hour law, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, was one of the most important labor measures adopted in recent years, particularly because of the invalidation by the United States Supreme Court of the National Industrial Recovery Act in 1935. The Fair Labor Standards Act provided a minimum wage and maximum straight-time workweek for employees engaged in interstate commerce. Certain industries were specifically exempt. Employment of children under 16 years of age was prohibited, and also employment of children under 18 in hazardous occupations. The Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor was charged with the regulation of the child-labor provisions. To administer the law, a Wage and Hour Division was created in the Department of Labor. Penalties for violation were provided.

The Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act provided a comprehensive system of unemployment insurance for employees of carriers engaged in interstate commerce. Under this act contributions were to be made exclusively by the carriers. The costs of the system, including both the payment of unemployment benefits and the administration of the act, were to be paid from funds into which were to be deposited the taxes collected from employers. Administration of the act was vested in the Railroad Retirement Board.

By an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, approved on June 23, 1938, a Federal Maritime Labor Board was established to aid in the settlement of disputes between maritime employers and employees. The primary function of this board was to encourage all maritime employers, their officers and agents and their employees, to bargain collectively and endeavor to settle disputes amicably.

Public Resolution No. 122, approved on June 21, 1938, provided appropriations for work relief as well as for general relief, and for increasing employment by loans and grants for public-work projects.

A number of changes in the Federal Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act resulted from the enactment of Public Act No. 727. The workmen's compensation law applicable to the District of Columbia was amended by Public Act No. 619. Heretofore, the act had been applicable to all employers. By the amendatory legislation, clerical workers of any Member of Congress became exempt from the terms of the act.

The Wagner-Peyser Act, which established a national employment system, was amended in 1938 so as to permit larger appropriations for the National Employment Service. Previously, 75 percent of the appropriations had been apportioned among the States. The amended act provided that Congress shall designate the amounts to be apportioned by the director.

1939: Social security — Railroads — Maritime workers—Wages and hours—Work relief.

The first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress—January 3 to August 5, 1939—enacted legislation in several fields of interest to labor. A number of amendments to the Social Security Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act were made. Strenuous efforts were made to amend both the Fair Labor Standards Act and the National Labor Relations Act.

The principal changes in the social-security law relating to the tax features of the Federal Social Security Act, the liberalization of the old-age insurance system, and the extension of Federal-State programs of social security. By the enactment of the amendments, monthly old-age insurance benefits became payable in 1940 to qualified workers of 65 or over, instead of 1942. The coverage of the Federal old-age insurance system was extended to nearly a million persons not under the original law. The amendatory legislation also provided benefits for wives and children, and widows and orphans of insured workers, or, in some cases, their dependent fathers and mothers. Financial aid for public health, maternal and child welfare, crippled children, and vocational education was increased. Changes were also made in the tax provisions of the act.

Public Act No. 141 amended the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, with the waiting time changed by requiring a single waiting period of 15 days, in which there are 8 or more days of unemployment, and the special provisions applicable to part-time workers were repealed placing all employees on the same basis.

By Public Act No. 99 seamen were permitted to make allotments of their wages for deposit in a savings bank or a United States postal-savings depository. Public Act No. 188 made effective the provisions of the officers' competency certificates convention, 1936, as ratified September 1, 1938, concerning the minimum requirement of professional capacity for masters and officers on board merchant vessels. Another act—Public Act No. 16—exempted all vessels of the United States of less than 200 tons gross registered tonnage from the provisions of the convention of 1936 as ratified.

Although several amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 were introduced in the House, the only change in that law approved by the Seventy-sixth Congress was the exemption of switchboard operators employed in public telephone exchanges having less than 500 stations.

A number of legislative measures on relief were adopted by the Seventy-sixth Congress. The Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939 provided for work relief to be administered by the Work Projects Administration under the supervision of a Commissioner of Work Projects.

1940: Among the many measures affecting labor enacted by the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress and the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress was a supplemental appropriation for national defense (Public Act No. 781) which provided that notwithstanding the provisions of any law, work in excess of 8 hours shall be permitted, provided compensation for all hours over 8 is not less than 1½ times the basic rate of pay on contracts covered by the 8-

hour law. The act permitted the Secretary of War to waive requirements of payment and performance bond—Heard Act—on contracts for public works for the Military Establishment entered into upon a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis out of funds appropriated for and authorized for the fiscal year 1941.

Public Act No. 831 suspended the 8-hour law on contracts entered into by the United States Maritime Commission for construction, alteration, or repair of vessels provided time and a half is paid for hours in excess of 8 a day and 40 a week. Nothing in this act was to be construed as modifying any contract between management and labor in shipyards which provide for conditions more favorable to labor than provided in this act.

An act designed to expedite housing in connection with national defense provided that laborers and mechanics employed on construction, repair, or demolition work connected with national defense housing projects may work in excess of 3 hours a day provided wages shall be computed on a basic day rate of 8 hours, and work in excess of 8 hours shall be paid at not less than 1½ times the basic rate. The Administrator of the Federal Works Agency was designated to administer the defense-housing program and payment of not less than prevailing wages was required on all projects.

Extension of the 1937 Sugar Act was authorized by Public Act No. 860, with labor provisions on child labor and minimum wage determinations by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Sugar Act, which would have expired December 31, 1940, was extended by 1 additional year.

The first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress extended the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, authorized the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Bureau of Mines or other safety agencies, to make annual or necessary inspections and investigations in coal mines whose products regularly enter or substantially affect interstate commerce, for obtaining information on health, safety, and causes of accidents and occupational diseases in those mines. Such information was to be used as a guide to legislation, as a basis to determine the most effective use of public funds to eradicate nonhealthful and unsafe conditions and as a basis for reports, studies, and statistics. This session also extended the life of the Maritime Labor Board and made the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act applicable in cases of injury or death to employees engaged in any employment at any military, air, or naval base acquired after January 1, 1940, by the United States from any foreign government or any lands occupied or used by the United States for military or naval purposes in any Territory or possession outside of the continental United States, excepting the Canal Zone. Public Law No. 271 changed the title of the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Board to the Board of Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety and directed the Board to make, under appropriate procedure, safety and health rules having the force of law, and to administer the provisions of the act. This act required employers in the District of Columbia to keep places of employment safe and healthful for employees, to keep records and to report on industrial accidents. Section 7 (b) (2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act was amended by Public Law 283 to limit hours on an annual instead of a weekly basis for those employed in pursuance of a collective-bargaining agreement certified by the National Labor Relations Board. The annual limit of hours was raised from 2,000 to 2,080, thus permitting an average workweek of 40 hours instead of approximately 38½ hours.

Public Law No. 380 amended section 7 of the District of Columbia child-labor law to authorize the Board of Education to issue work permits allowing minors 14 years or over, who have completed 8 grades of elementary instruction or its equivalent, to perform in licensed theaters until 11 p. m., instead of 7 p. m., for boys under 16 and girls under 18 as formerly.

The Sugar Act of 1937 was extended and continued up to and including 1944, including the labor provisions.

1942: The second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress amended section 1 (c) of the Walsh-Healey Act to exempt from the overtime provisions employees who are exempt under the Fair Labor Standards Act because they are employed on an annual basis for more than 2,080 hours in pursuance of a bona fide collective bargaining agreement.

Public Law No. 620 prohibited defense contractors from denying employment on account of failure to produce a birth certificate to any person who submits in lieu of such birth certificate an honorable discharge certificate from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, unless the certificate shows on its face that the person may have been an alien at the time of its issuance.

The United States Employees Compensation Act was amended to authorize the Commission to establish a minimum monthly wage base on which death compensation shall be computed in the case or classes of noncitizen employees who sustain injuries outside the United States.

One of the most important enactments of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress was that of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, which authorized the President, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries on the basis of levels existing on September 15, 1942. The act empowered the President to make adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries to the extent that he finds it necessary to aid in prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities. This act prohibited any action with respect to wages and salaries which was inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act or the National Labor Relations Act, or for the purpose of reducing the wages or salaries for any particular work below the highest wages or salaries paid therefor between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942. Under this act employers were forbidden to pay and employees to receive wages or salaries in contravention of regulations promulgated by the President under this act.

1943: The first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress took action on matters of principal concern to labor. In Public Law No. 28 the Secretary of the Navy was authorized to pay transportation costs of civilian employees to and from places of duty in the Naval Establishment outside the continental United States, or in Alaska.

As a rider to the Public Debt Act of 1943, Congress amended the wage stabilization law—Public Law No. 729—to delete the following phrase:

Provided, That the President may, without regard to the limitation contained in clause (2), adjust wages or salaries to the extent that he finds necessary in any case to correct gross inequities and also aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

Public Law No. 45 made an appropriation of $26,100,000 for the calendar year 1943 to be expended by the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution, and the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges for assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war.

The women's-hours law of the District of Columbia was amended to authorize the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board to grant temporary permits to employers to work females more than 8 hours a day and 48 hours a week upon showing that such action is essential to the war effort. Weekly hours were limited to 54 and pay at the rate of time and a half for hours in excess of 8 a day and 48 a week made mandatory.

Section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act was amended in Public Law No. 89 as the War Labor Disputes Act. This provided that the power of the President to take possession of plants extended to any plant, mine or facility where suspension of operation as a result of labor disturbance interferes with the prosecution of the war. It required the return to private operation of any business taken over within 60 days after restoration of productive efficiency and prohibited taking possession after the war ends, and terminated authority to operate any plant taken over 6 months after the war. It also required plants taken over to be operated under the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at time of possession. Under the act, the Government agency operating the plant or a majority of the employees may apply to the War Labor Board for a change in wages or other conditions of employment. The War Labor Board is given statutory authority and the right, whenever a labor dispute may lead to substantial interference with the war, to initiate hearings on a dispute and take jurisdiction over it. In the case of war production, a notice of intention to strike is required and it is unlawful to strike until a strike vote has been conducted by the National Labor Relations Board on the thirtieth day after notice has been filed. Persons who violate this section are liable for damages to any person injured thereby or to the United States.

Public Law No. 113 amended the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920 to extend coverage to all disabled persons instead of only those physically disabled. It set up a new plan for providing vocational rehabilitation to war disabled civilians—those disabled while serving in Aircraft Warning Service, Civil Air Patrol, Citizens' Defense Corps, or as a registered trainee for such services, and officers or members of the crew of a vessel owned or chartered by the Maritime Commission of the War Shipping Administration. It is provided that the entire cost of the program for war disabled civilians shall be paid to the States by the United States Treasury.

The District of Columbia Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have been rather intimately associated with the formulation of the District of Columbia appropriation bills for many years, having served as a member of that committee under the chairmanship of Robert G. Simmons, of Nebraska, one of the ablest members who ever served on the Committee on Appropriations, and now on the supreme bench of his State, and later as chairman myself.

It is a difficult bill. It involves a plethora of detail and its beneficiaries are on our doorstep. But it is one of the most important of all the annual supply bills. The city of Washington is, consciously or unconsciously, taken as a model by other metropolitan areas of the Nation. It is in effect a guinea pig on which are tried out many theories of municipal administration. Other cities send delegations here to study our school system, our police department, our library system, our fire department, our social-welfare set-up, and our methods in administration of innumerable other city facilities and problems. In my opinion we have through constant study in the limelight of congressional scrutiny developed the most effective and efficient system of municipal administration in the Nation or in the world.

It follows that the membership of the committee in charge of this bill must be selected with particular care and I think I gave more thought to the make-up of that committee in the Seventy-eighth Congress than to the personnel of any other subcommittee of the 10 subcommittees in charge of the annual bills. Consequently, it has been a matter of gratification to note the skill with which Chairman COFFEE and his committee have handled the appropriations for 1945, and it is a matter of particular pleasure to observe the reaction of Washington businessmen themselves. I am therefore including as a part of my remarks one of many favorable comments on the subject, in this instance an editorial from the Washington Star, as follows:

A GOOD BILL

The District appropriation bill reported to the House yesterday reflects the work of a sympathetic subcommittee, conscious of local needs, anxious to meet them insofar as revenue and war restrictions permit and impressed by some of the inequitable divisions of cost which have placed a disproportionate burden on the local taxpayer. Chairman COFFEE and his colleagues deserve the warm appreciation of Washingtonians for the fair-minded attitude displayed throughout the hearings and in their report to the House.

Under Chairman COFFEE there is thus promised a continued improvement in relations between Congress and the local community which holds much promise for Washington. Not many years ago the District suffered under a committee dominated by a chairman who sought to make his continued hostility to the District a political platform back home. The voters removed him, as they have others before him. Under the chairmanship of Representative MAHON, of Texas, and now of Mr. COFFEE, the House Subcommittee on District Appropriations has become a constructive force in development of the Capital.

The bill just reported shows the abnormal effects on local finances of the war, which has reduced availability of personnel and has cut construction to a minimum. The silver lining to that cloud has been the opportunity to wipe the slate clean of indebtedness, and to earmark unexpendable revenues for post-war public works. But of even more fundamental importance to the District has been the subcommittee's recognition of such unfair conditions as the maintenance of a National Zoo at local expense; the creation with local revenues of national parks within the District and under Federal control; the development of a water system by the local taxpayer controlled in part by the Army and from which the National Government receives returns, in the form of free water, far in excess of its own investment. As Mr. COFFEE says, the people of the District would be far better off if they had their own water system.

Although the District has suffered in the past by legislative riders on appropriation bills, creating many of the very inequities to which the subcommittee points in its report, the remedy evidently must lie in new legislation, divorced from the appropriation bill. That, at least, is the course recommended by Mr. COFFEE, who suggests to the Commissioners the preparation of legislation on the zoo, the parks, and other matters. With the influential support thus given by the House Appropriations Committee, they no doubt will take full advantage of the recommendations.

The War Congress, 1943–44

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as we are about to take a recess in the closing year of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I deem it appropriate to note the progress of our work to date, as a branch of the Congress and as individual Representatives. It is for us now to give an account of our stewardship for even as we are, by virtue of a 2-year term of office, nearer to the people, we are all the more bound to demonstrate that we are responsive, responsible, and reliable to the satisfaction of the electorate who will shortly sit in judgment upon us all. Rarely has so great a task fallen to any Congress. War is the great test of democratic institutions for power must be centralized to secure the common defense and a centralization of power is ordinarily incompatible with democracy. We did not completely measure up to the test in World War No. 1, for while we won the war we lost the peace and permitted to be planted the seeds of future wars.

Mr. Speaker, the great work of the Nation and the great work of the Seventy-eighth Congress has been that devoted to winning the war. It meant a great task of mobilization. We mobilized our Army, our Navy, and our Air Forces. We mobilized the productive capacity of our farms, forests, fisheries, and mines, our merchant ships and our highways, our accumulated wealth, and our current income. We imposed restraints on our citizens in every field which in peacetime they were accustomed to call fields of liberty. We regulated the supply and price of food, clothing, shelter, the things of the home, the shop, the farm, and the mine. With all of this, we carried on the ordinary affairs of government and we created administrative agencies to see that every citizen contributed his fair share to the common effort and no more.

Mr. Speaker, the duty that fell on the National Government and its legislative branch was not one that could be abdicated or imposed on the people as a whole or on the several States, nor could they justly expect to exercise it. It was a duty that called for centralized power through centralized authority. It called for Nation-wide action planned by Federal legislation and enforced by an administrative arm of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot say that in providing for the administration of wartime regulations and restraints we have satisfied all the people all the time, but we have given as much satisfaction as the nature of the emergency would permit. No one has escaped. No one has been granted a preferred right. No better plan has been suggested. The people realize, like the soldier, that an uncomfortable fox hole is better than no fox hole at all. Today we are spending about $8,000,000,000 per month for all purposes. We have more than doubled production of crops and production of goods. We are maintaining two existences, a wartime existence and a peacetime existence, where before we had only one. We are running in high gear. We have had to find administrators, staff them, survey the territory and the problems, proclaim the regulations and enforce them through the agency of ordinary human beings. We had to act without experience, and through trial and error learn from experience.

The Seventy-eighth Congress has to date appropriated nearly $182,000,000,000, collecting this sum equally from

taxation and the sale of bonds. One hundred and fourteen billions were appropriated in the first session and sixty-seven billions in the second session. Forty billions in appropriations were also carried over from the first year. The actual expenditures, excluding contract allotments, were in the neighborhood of $96,000,000,000 per year of which ninety billions or 95 percent were for war purposes entirely, although considerably more indirectly aided the war effort. The bonded debt is now two hundred billions. The tax burden, while heavy, was lightened by bond sales and justly so, for the succeeding generations will owe a debt to liberty no less than the present generation. We have simplified tax returns and we by-passed one tax year of the income tax by collecting one-fourth more for 1944 to put the taxpayer on a current basis rather than in arrears. This exemption of three-fourths of the 1943 income tax was, unfortunately, of more benefit to those in the higher brackets of income during the war years than to those in the middle and lower brackets.

Due to the insistence of the administration the social progress and gains of the last decade have not been sacrificed or impaired. The National Labor Relations Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Social Security Act and various measures for the benefit of the farmers and for borrowers have been maintained as a part of the liberty we are fighting to preserve.

Mr. Speaker, the work of Congress would have failed were it not for the cooperation of the people in the war effort. The contribution of labor has been magnificent on the part of both men and women in wartime industries. No amount of capital investment, no wealth of natural resources or materials, no plan of war could have succeeded without the wholehearted devotion, industry, and patriotism of our men and women who turned the raw materials into the finished product. The splendid record of industry could not have been made without the cooperation of labor. Under a voluntary pledge against wartime strikes, work has continued at 99.8 percent efficiency, a record unequalled anywhere in the present-day world. We are winning the war with our hands and our hearts rather than with our minds and our money.

The soldier-vote bill, Mr. Speaker, does not offer complete satisfaction to anyone and I do not think it represents that recognition for the servicemen that they could justly expect. Unfortunately some feared the result and therefore desired to limit the vote, while others resisted Federal authority to prescribe voting qualifications in their States because they considered it inimical to their traditions involving racial barriers. The provisions of the Worley bill in the House and of the Green-Lucas bill in the Senate were better, but they were sacrificed rather than expose all legislation to defeat.

Among the many measures enacted by this Congress for the current and postwar relief and benefit of the veterans and servicemen, their dependents, and kin, the G. I. bill of rights stands out as a monument to the studious labor and humanity of the members. It is not alone a strong influence upon morale at home and abroad, but is a material and effective factor making for a healthy postwar recovery in this country and an insurance against deflation and the effects of unemployment.

The strong stand of the President in vetoing the bill designed to outlaw subsidies in aid of price control, and the wise action of the Congress in continuing the Price Control and Price Stabilization Acts without banning subsidies, has resulted in protecting this country from an era of inflation that would have—if the history of the last war is considered—increased the cost of the present war to date by $65,000,000,000 and perhaps discouraged our productive capacity to a comparable extent. Great pressure was brought to bear to throw the economy of the Nation in wartime into the grip of the law of supply and demand. This was done in spite of the fact that a continually increasing supply of cheap money bearing on a continually decreasing supply of goods available for civilian and war purposes, would defeat the operation of any normal relation between a fixed supply of money and a flexible supply of goods. The proposal invited nothing less than inflation constantly spiraling upward and thinning out real wages to be followed by a postwar deflation even without precedent in the disastrous years following World War No. 1. The fight against inflation by keeping price control affected 130,000,000 persons, 35,000,000 families, 3,000,000 business establishments, and 14,000,000 rental quarters. It involved the fixing of 8,000,000 prices and the holding of wartime price increases in the cost of living to 26 percent whereas in the first year of World War No. 1 the increase was 28 percent, in 1919 it was 72 percent, and in 1920 it was 108 percent over the 1914 base. With Government war purchases amounting to 55 percent of total production a subsidy of $450,000,000 would prevent a rise in prices of three and a half billions, thus giving relief to consumer, taxpayer, and producer at the rate of relief of $8 for every $1 distributed in subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, price control with freedom from inflation at a time surplus income can be channeled into the pools of taxation and bond investment is perhaps the greatest blessing of all snatched from the war by a wise Congress inspired by a courageous President. It is a strong base on which to build a firm post-war economy which might otherwise be wrecked on the rocks of inflation.

Much remains to be done, Mr. Speaker, but the war emergency has been met and the domestic economy and finance have received timely attention. We still have a war and a peace to win and we must in good time prepare for the transition. We may look forward to the time when the great powers drained from the people and the States are restored to their proper peacetime owners, but even as mobilization has been a Federal problem, decentralization must be a Federal task. The States cannot demobilize, nor can the people. The Federal Government must liquidate the war, the war contracts, the war supplies, the war industries, and the war obligations. Certainly the States cannot do these things, but they can prepare to resume local government and to put into effect plans to prevent unemployment and plans for deferred construction, improvements, and services held in abeyance for the day of victory. The Nation has responded to the war emergency; Congress as the legislative branch has passed good laws and avoided, on the whole, detrimental enactments. I am proud of the history made here, all of which I saw, much of which I was, and I welcome the judgment of our fellow citizens, which it is their privilege and duty to give at the coming election. The duty to serve rests upon us all. Let us hope we may measure up to the performance of our gallant sons and daughters who are ready to sacrifice—and many of whom have already sacrificed—life itself that our Nation may live.

Profit Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an exchange of letters with the Honorable Chester Bowles, of the Office of Price Administration, relative to a statement on profit control by Dr. Ivan Wright, professor of economics at Brooklyn College, which I inserted in the RECORD of June 13. Mr. Bowles' letter and my reply follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1944.

The Honorable PAUL W. SHAFER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHAFER: I have read with some interest the statement which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 13. This was a statement which you reported had been prepared by Dr. Ivan Wright, professor of economics at Brooklyn College. It related to the subject of profit control and I should like to comment upon the various points made in that statement.

I have no quarrel with Dr. Wright's thesis that profit control would get down to the very mainspring of our economy. I disagree, however, with his allegation that the Office of Price Administration has undertaken to regulate profits per se.

Dr. Wright makes much of the fact that, when profits are taken away from the businessman, his incentive to produce has also been taken away. My experience as a businessman would offer no contradictions to this statement. However, it seems to me that Dr. Wright has lost sight of the realities of the current situation and has not adapted his theory to the current picture. He seems to be arguing that higher profits should be encouraged so that production will also increase. What he fails to see is that we, as a Nation, are and have for some months, been producing at our maximum capacity. We

are using our plants, equipment, manpower, and land resources to the maximum. I fail to see how it would be possible to use them more intensively. Further profits would certainly not create a greater labor force than that now being employed. Almost every report which cites difficulties in reaching production goals, attributes the responsibility to a lack of manpower. Adding several times to current profits could not create any greater labor force, would not yield any greater amount of production. All that it can do is divert production from one field to another and only over a period of time. The Congress in its wisdom early recognized the fact that prices could not be used to control the direction of production during a war period. Through the Second War Powers Act it provided for the establishment of production agencies such as the W. P. B. which could directly allocate materials into lines of production which we wished to encourage. The role of price in this connection would be to see that price impediments do not upset the allocations and production schedules of the production agencies.

I can illustrate this point perhaps by citing a recent order which this Office issued providing for a 7½-percent increase in the ceiling prices on chemical wood-pulp mimeograph paper. Here the War Production Board, recognizing the critical supply situation in the case of pulp for paper, determined that a lighter weight of chemical mimeograph paper should be produced. This would require the use of smaller quantities of pulp and would produce the same number of sheets of paper. However, the production of lighter weight paper involved added costs not experienced by the manufacturer in producing the former heavier weight. This Office coordinated its price program with the production program of W. P. B. As a result, users of mimeograph paper will have the same number of sheets, there will be a conservation of pulp, and consequently, a more efficient use of our resources. Thus we have taken action to assure that price will not be an impediment to production.

Dr. Wright's statement would seem to imply that O. P. A. controls have restricted profits and have hampered production. The facts are these: Industrial and agricultural production figures are at all-time highs. Industrial and agricultural income and profit figures are also at all-time peaks. If, as Dr. Wright charges, O. P. A. has sought to control profits and has thereby hindered production, then certainly we have realized a very major failure to attain our purpose; if that were our purpose. Either we are wholly incompetent as regulators of profit or we have no such intention and have not sought to accomplish this purpose. We have, however, sought to maintain stable prices and it is the stabilization of prices rather than the control of profits which is our purpose. The record speaks for itself. Prices have been stabilized; profits are up and production is up.

Dr. Wright makes much of the fact that businessmen, both large and small, who provide the knowledge and the capital for enterprise, must be able to see and plan ahead. Here, I am in complete agreement with Dr. Wright. I feel that no one thing makes business planning so difficult as a complete inability to estimate what prices will be in the near and somewhat distant future. So long as prices are stable, business plans can be carefully made and soundly executed; when they are fluctuating wildly, as they did during the last war, business planning becomes almost pure guesswork and production is hurt. This is amply borne out by our experience in the last war when prices fluctuated wildly and, during the period from 1914 to 1918, went up almost 80 percent in the case of industrial prices. This 80-percent increase in industrial prices was accompanied by a 25-percent increase in industrial production. During the comparable period in this war, from 1939 through 1943, prices of industrial goods rose only 22 percent but production increased 131 percent, a complete reversal of World War No. 1 experience when prices rose more rapidly than production did. It is interesting in this connection to note that in the last year of World War No. 1 when prices were fluctuating wildly, industrial production actually declined over the previous year. This, I think, answers the point that no one thing contributes so much to sound business planning as a stable price structure.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: I have your letter of June 22 in which you commented upon the statement by Dr. Ivan Wright, professor of economics at Brooklyn College, on the subject of profit control, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 13.

I am glad to note that you do not quarrel with Dr. Wright's thesis that profit control affects "the very mainspring of our economy." It was that thought, as well as Dr. Wright's forthright clear and yet simple exposition of this key problem of the reconversion and post-war periods, that led me to give wider currency to his statement through the RECORD.

I am also happy to learn that your experience as a businessman offered no contradictions to Dr. Wright's statement that, when profits are taken away, a businessman's incentive to produce has also been taken away. It seems to me, however, that you have misread Dr. Wright's statement if you got out of it the view that Dr. Wright has any quarrel with price control and a stable price structure. On the contrary, as I read the statement, he is quite complimentary of the sensible manner in which price control in general has been conducted during the war period. He only asks that the same sensible policy which governed the highly successful conversion from peace to war production be applied in the reconversion back to a peacetime economy. Since he was concerned only with reconversion pricing, what you say about present capacity production for war does not seem to affect the argument at all.

I have found nothing at all in his statement to indicate that he wants higher profits to bring about increases in production at this time. All he asks is that the O. P. A. refrain from issuing directives and orders which prevent producers from making a reasonable profit, or any profit, on civilian goods during reconversion. In this connection, he refers specifically to your MPR 188 as an example of an order regulating profits per se, as you put it. I see nothing in your letter specifically replying to his assertion that this order eliminates profits, and that similar directives of this kind would prevent orderly reconversion.

It seems to me that your letter in no way answers Dr. Wright's charge that MPR 188 and the so-called Vinson directive tend to eliminate the profit motive, and therefore will hamper reconversion. Since you agree with Dr. Wright, as I did, on the broad principle that profit control gets down to the very mainspring of our economy, I do not see why you do not also feel the way he does about specific orders that provide for no profit to producers of particular products.

Thank you for having written me.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL SHAFER.

Army Shoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, following the speech of CALVIN D. JOHNSON, of Illinois, in which he stated army shoes were being ground up for fertilizer, I called upon the commanding general of the Army Service Forces for a report.

Under date of June 17 he wrote me explaining in part the disposition of army shoes unfit for use. He promised me at the time that they would make a further investigation.

Under the permission granted me, I now include as part of my remarks a letter from Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell which follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1944.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: Supplementing my letter of June 7, 1944, I am writing to inform you of the results of an investigation of the reported sale of "good, newly repaired Army shoes" to Smith-Rowland Co., of Granite City, Ill., for conversion to fertilizer.

Investigation fails to confirm this allegation. The shoes, classified as unsuitable for rebuilding for Army use, were bought and paid for by used shoe dealers. On inspection, the dealers determined that the shoes were not worth the cost of transportation. The lots were then shipped, collect, by the purchaser's agent, to Smith-Rowland Co. The specific details of the transaction are set out more fully below.

The Granite City, Ill., plant of Smith-Rowland Co. purchased, in all, five carloads of Army shoes, four in the fall of 1943 and one in June of 1944. An examination of the bills of lading shows that the shipper was Roy Jameson, of Hannibal, Mo.

The four carloads shipped in 1943 were part of a quantity of 4,002,515 pounds of salvage shoes, unfit for further Army use, purchased by the Army Salvage Co., of Chicago, Ill., during the period from March 5, 1943, to May 8, 1944. These carloads were inspected at Hannibal by the principal owner and manager of the Army Salvage Co., who arranged to dump the shoes, because the lots were so poor that they did not justify payment of the freight from Hannibal to Chicago. The shoes were then shipped, freight collect, to Smith-Rowland Co. The Army Salvage Co. paid for the shoes and also paid Jameson the loading charge.

Some indication of the condition of these shoes can be gained from the estimate of the Army Salvage Co., that of a lot of salvage shoes accepted by the company, approximately 10 percent are repaired, 40 percent sold to shoemakers and cobbler shops "as is," and the remaining 50 percent burned. The general manager of the company stated that shoes in wearable condition occasionally were included, but it was hard to locate a pair, and the total of such shoes probably constituted less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the shoes handled.

The carload shipped to Smith-Rowland on June 6, 1944, purchased by the Housman Shoe Co., was inspected at Hannibal by Mr. Housman. Mr. Housman found the shoes "so

badly rotted" that he could not use them. This was confirmed by an inspection of the car while it was still on a railroad siding and before its release to Smith-Rowland Co. The shoes were a very poor lot from overseas—moldy, hard, torn, brittle, manifestly nonrepairable. Housman Shoe Co., like the Army Salvage Co., arranged to dump the shoes in Hannibal. Mr. Housman stated that he had never received shoes that were newly repaired.

In explanation of the statement that "a lot of people who can get them are wearing discarded Army shoes," it was learned that at the time the first shipments were received, Smith-Rowland Co. allowed each of its employees to take a pair of shoes, if a pair could be found. The shoes were in a loose pile in the yard of Smith-Rowland Co.

As stated in my letter of June 7, 1944, the utilization of Army salvage shoes for relief purposes has been under consideration for some time. During the past several months, experimental quantities have been shipped to approximately 20 State prisons and shoe factories, which have been conducting experiments for U. N. R. R. A.

Procurement Division, Treasury Department, has advised this headquarters that a request for two to three carloads per week of such shoes for relief purposes is being acted upon by that agency and that an additional two to three carloads per week will be requested in from 60 to 90 days. This is in addition to the shoes already turned over to that agency for rebuilding.

Sincerely yours,

BREHON SOMERVELL,
Lieutenant General, Commanding.

Thomas Henry Cullen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to record a personal word to the Members of this House upon the life, character, and public service of that distinguished and lovable statesman who came to Congress from Brooklyn in the State of New York and who dedicated his life to the upbuilding and perpetuation of American ideals and institutions—the late illustrious gentleman who preceded me as Representative in Congress of the Fourth Congressional District, Hon. THOMAS H. CULLEN.

The death of my dear friend THOMAS H. CULLEN has been a great loss to this House, to his party, and to the people of his congressional district. He was courageous, honorable, and one of the outstanding men of his State, and of the Nation. His legislative life was marked throughout by his deep devotion to duty and his sense of responsibility of the trust that was his. He possessed in a superlative degree those elements of human sympathy and kindness which made lifelong friends of all who knew him. Of him it can be truly said that if everyone indebted to him for a kindly act should drop a flower on his bier he would slumber beneath a myriad of flowers.

THOMAS H. CULLEN was one of the most picturesque and striking and at the same time one of the most lovable and loyal characters in the public life of our time. He was ever courteous and charitable, and at once an example and an inspiration to all who enjoyed the privilege of his acquaintance and friendship. He resorted to no showy expedients to attract the crowd and attain transient distinction. His life was simple, his aims modest. He sought only to be kind and to be just; and he loved his fellow man.

He was affectionately known as TOM CULLEN by most of his colleagues in the House and by his intimate friends. He was ever ready and willing to extend to others the fruits of his many years of experience, matured judgment, and practical wisdom. He was steadfast in his loyalty to his legislative duties, his family, and his host of friends. His gracious nature and warmth of greeting will always be missed and will long be remembered. Gifted with a keen sense of humor, he had few equals as a social companion. Many a happy social gathering was enlivened with his folk songs and old Irish ballads.

For practically half a century Mr. CULLEN was the able legislative representative of his neighbors in the New York State Legislature in Albany and in the Halls of Congress here in Washington. In his long and illustrious career he lacked but a few days of fulfilling 25 years of faithful service in this House, representing the people of the district in which he was born. He was a product of Brooklyn, and that great borough of the world's largest city can be as proud of him as he was of it.

It can truthfully be said that Mr. CULLEN was a casualty of this war. For some time previous to his passing he was a very sick man, and despite the entreaties of his loved ones and of his colleagues in the House, he refused to relinquish his duties until his health was such that it was physically impossible for him to continue. Just a few weeks prior to his death he attended a series of grueling committee meetings as the ranking majority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and as one of the conferees in connection with the recent revenue bill. It seemed incredible that he could carry on such a difficult task, but he had the determination and courage to complete his last great assignment.

I shall ever recall his many kindnesses during all the years we lived as next-door neighbors in Brooklyn. My children should never forget the kindly and generous Congressman CULLEN. His passing on March 1, 1944, left me with a deep personal feeling of having lost a sincere and true counselor and friend.

To his wife, who was always his constant companion, and to his good family, I extend my sincere sympathy; to his constituency I recall that God has taken unto Himself an able Representative, a devoted friend, a man amongst men. The memory of his faith, his loyalty to the things in which he believed, shall abide with us forever.

None knew him but to love him,
Nor named him but to praise.
May he rest in deserved and eternal peace.

Action on Railroad Retirement Legislation Should Be Hastened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of retired railroad men in the country who for years have been looking forward to congressional action to liberalize the Railroad Retirement Act. Some liberalizing changes have been made during the past few years and in every instance I was happy to support them. Nevertheless, there are many changes that should be made—and made quickly.

Recently, companion bills were introduced in both the House and Senate dealing with this entire subject and at length. In fact they each contain 207 pages. Two days' hearings were held on the House bill by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and then came the recess.

It is admitted by everyone concerned that the problem is complicated because it involves decisions as to who should benefit by the liberalizing features. In other words, "who should get what?"

I strongly feel that this bill is an additional reason why the Congress should be on the job during August, so that the committees will be able to work on this problem and report out some adequate proposal at the earliest possible moment. Legislation on this subject should be enacted this year by the Seventy-eighth Congress. We have waited long enough. We have waited much too long!

Contribution of Vocational Education to the Success of the War Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, when the final history of the World War is written, one of the most interesting and significant chapters will be the chapter on the contribution of vocational education and the school departments of vocational education to the war effort.

For the last couple of decades we have been realizing the importance of training our young people for the business of living and have been slowly developing in our secondary schools courses in vocational education which provided practical training for our boys and girls in the vocations, trades, and professions, as well as the classics and the humanities, and prepared them to take their places in the world as representative citizens equipped to assume the work-a-day responsibilities of life.

No recent educational development has paid higher dividends in the last three critical years. One of the most urgent problems that faced us when we entered the war—a war of production—was the necessity of manning our war plants and factories with skilled craftsmen. Our reservoirs of skilled workmen were sadly depleted and it was only through the mobilization of graduates from high school courses in vocational education and the adaptation of the schools themselves to the training of men and women for war production in factory and field, that we have achieved the miracles of production that have made victory certain.

In none of the vocational courses provided in the average school has this achievement been more marked than in the courses in vocational agriculture. Charged with the responsibility of feeding our armies, the armies of our allies, the hugh concentrations of workers in the industrial centers and the civilian population of two continents, the American farmer has met that challenge with success and efficiency due in no small degree to the armies of trained men and women turned out by every high school in the land. For example, I am just in receipt of a report made by the Department of Vocational Agriculture of the St. Charles Public Schools of St. Charles, Mo. Prof. J. L. Evans, the instructor, who has been in charge of the course for the last several years, says of the work of the department:

No other agency in the county has carried out so extensive a program of agricultural education during the past year.

Our department has made remarkable progress in our fight to increase food production by aiding farmers in machinery repairs, canning of vegetables, the control of livestock diseases, securing adequate feeds, etc.

Our department gave systematic instruction to classes of adult farmers during the past winter. Ten to fifteen meetings were held in each community in sessions of at least 2 hours length. With the exception of Christmas week and Saturday and Sunday nights, I taught adult classes 2 to 3 hours every night from November 1 to March 1.

In a more detailed summary of the character and extent of the work of the department, Professor Evans itemizes and classifies the activities of the department of vocational agriculture of the St. Charles Schools, as follows:

1. Conducted a course in milk and egg production for farmers in the Cottleville area.
2. Conducted a course in farm machinery repair for the farmers in the St. Charles area.
3. Conducted a course in diseases of livestock for the farmers in the O'Fallon area.
4. Conducted a course in farm machinery repair for the farmers in the St. Peters area.
5. Conducted a course in egg production for the farmers in the St. Paul area.
6. Conducted a course in egg production for the farmers in the Portage area.
7. Conducted a course in agricultural economics for the out-of-school farm youth in the St. Charles area.
8. Conducted a course in food production, conservation, and preservation for the people of the St. Charles area.
9. Conducted a canning center for the people of the St. Charles area.
10. Trained a group of city youths for farm labor; aided in placing youths in production.
11. Tested herds for Bang's disease and mastitis for farmers in the county.
12. Tested soils for calcium, nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium needs for farmers in the county.
13. Gave demonstrations on proper procedure in castrating, worming, and vaccinating hogs before farm groups in county.
14. Gave demonstrations in the Harvester community on the proper procedure in docking and castrating lambs.
15. Gave demonstrations on proper procedure in removing retained placentas for farmers in the county.
16. Gave many demonstrations on proper methods of culling and worming poultry for farmers in the county.
17. Tested whole milk, skim milk, and cream for butterfat as a service to dairymen in this area.
18. Gave many demonstrations on proper procedure in operating on hogs with hernia as a free service to farmers in this area.
19. Gave many demonstrations on pruning grapes and fruit trees for area farmers.
20. Drew plans for farm buildings and equipment for area farmers.
21. Gave many demonstrations on proper procedure in castrating and dehorning cattle for farmers in area.
22. Worked out economical, balanced rations for livestock and poultry for county farmers.
23. Treated seed for various diseases for farmers in this area.
24. Constructed a large number of labor-saving devices for farmers in the area.
25. Identified noxious weeds and seeds; diagnosed animal diseases; diagnosed plant diseases; and prepared treatments.

Mr. Speaker, this is typical of the character of service rendered by the 26,000 high schools of the Nation. The vocational schools of both the city and the country have been making an invaluable contribution to their respective communities and to the war program.

But their service is just beginning. The close of the war will precipitate increased and diversified needs which only the schools can adequately supply. There will be new conditions requiring new skills. Training to meet those needs must start first in the secondary schools. Increased emphasis must be placed on their vocational departments and increased support must be provided. It is not too early for school boards, school patrons, and local businessmen who have so much at stake in the postwar period to begin now to plan for the vocational training of the young men and young women who in the years to come are to make this Nation the outstanding nation of the world not only in production but in commercial and spiritual leadership.

Veterans' Rights Under the G. I. Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the war veterans' measure, appropriately called the G. I. bill of rights, has been approved by Congress. General satisfaction has been expressed by the people because it fulfills a general desire and obligation. It is gratifying to the American people who are determined that the rehabilitation of the veterans of this war will reflect the appreciation of the Nation and not reflect its long indifference and indecision as was the case after the First World War. It is especially gratifying to the men and women in the armed forces who will eventually become the veterans of this war. The Congress kept the fundamental interest of our fighting men in mind, and their interest has been safeguarded in the post-war readjustment. I am happy that the word can now go to our forces throughout the world that their bill of rights has been enacted into law. This law means that when our boys return they will find that the provisions of this act provide hospitalization, when needed, assistance in finding jobs, resumption of interrupted education, granting loans to give them a new start in business, buy farms or build a home, and unemployment compensation. These are the principal provisions of the G. I. bill of rights but by no means all of its provisions.

This is news the American people are proud to tell to their sons, brothers, husbands, and fathers. It is the pledge of the Nation to its fighting forces that their country not only supports them now but is ready to assume its obligation when they return to civil life.

This legislation, together with the Mustering-Out Pay Act, will go a long way toward the rehabilitation of our returning soldiers. I am glad that I supported both measures.

Benefits for Servicemen in So-Called G. I. Bill, With Regards to Education, Government Guaranteed Loans, and Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1943, in a radio address President Roosevelt advised the American people that he intended recommending to the Congress the passage of legislation, which in addition to giving mustering-out pay to the men serving in World War No. 2, would also provide opportunity for those who served in this war to secure further education or trade training at Government expense. Also to provide unemployment compensation for the returning veterans and to enable them to negotiate loans guaranteed by the Government for the purpose of purchasing homes, farms, and to finance business undertakings through the purchase of supplies and equipment. These recommendations were accordingly made by the President and in response thereto Congress enacted appropriate

legislation, which was signed by the President on June 22, of this year.

Because I am anxious that the major provisions of this legislation be available in brief and concise form for the servicemen whose homes are in my district, so that they may be aware of the benefits for which they are eligible, providing their discharge was not a dishonorable one, I am listing herewith the objectives of the legislation with respect to education, Government guaranteed loans, and unemployment benefits.

1. EDUCATION

A veteran in the service on or after September 16, 1940, who served more than 90 days—except time spent in an educational course in Army or Navy specialized programs, which was a continuation of his civilian course and which was pursued to completion—or who was discharged or released by reason of actual service-incurred injury or disability, who was under 25 years of age at the time he entered the service, is entitled to a year's course at a college or educational or training institution. Upon the satisfactory completion of that year he is entitled to an additional period or periods of education or training equal to the time he was on active duty after the date stated above and before the termination of the war.

If a veteran's education had been completed when he entered the service, providing he was under 25 years of age at time of entry, he is entitled to a refresher course for a period of 1 year. A veteran who was over 25 years of age at time of entry into the service who can prove that his education was interrupted is also eligible for this training.

The veteran may choose his own college or institution. The cost of tuition, books, and similar incidental charges will be paid by the Government up to $500 per year. The total period of training cannot exceed 4 years. During the period of training the veteran will receive from the Government $50 a month if he has no dependents and $75 a month if he has a dependent or dependents.

The course must be initiated not later than 2 years after discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is later. No education or training shall be afforded beyond 7 years after the termination of the war.

2. LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTIES

For these purposes the Government will guarantee 50 percent of a loan, the amount guaranteed not to exceed $2,000. The money can be borrowed from a bank, individual, company, association, or Government or State agency authorized to make such loans. No security shall be required for the amount guaranteed by the Government. Loans shall be payable in 20 years. Interest shall not exceed 4 percent per annum and the first year's interest will be paid by the Government. Loans will be authorized for the purpose of repairing, altering or improving homes as well as for the purchase or construction of new homes.

A veteran with 90 days or more of active service after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, or who was discharged for service-incurred injury or disability is eligible for these benefits. Application must be made within 2 years after discharge or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is later, but in no event more than 5 years after termination of the war.

3. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

For any actual unemployment occurring 2 years after discharge or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is later—providing that nothing be payable for any period more than 5 years after termination of present war—a veteran who is registered and reports to an unemployment office in accordance with its regulations shall be eligible to an allowance of $20 per week.

A person only able to secure part-time employment, earning less than $20 during the week, is likewise eligible for a portion of these benefits.

A person who is self-employed in an independent establishment, trade, business, or profession whose earnings amount to less than $100 a month shall be eligible to receive benefits for an amount equaling the difference between his net earnings and $100 for such month.

The number of weeks a veteran shall be eligible for this allowance is 4 weeks for every calendar month or major fraction thereof of active service between September 16, 1940, and the termination of the war, not to exceed a total of 52 weeks.

Regarding other provisions of the act, it is suggested that the discharged veteran seek the counsel and advice of the Veterans' Administration facility, which in Philadelphia is located in the Customs House Building at Second and Chestnut Streets, or the service officer of one of the veterans' organizations in his home community.

Why Resurrect the St. Lawrence Seaway at This Stage of the Game?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, all through the year there has been gathering another gigantic push, backed by an enormous lobby, to jam approval of the St. Lawrence seaway through the Congress of the United States. This project continues to rear its ugly head at spaced intervals of time during the past decade. Ever since my election to Congress in 1938, I have actively opposed the St. Lawrence Waterway and I shall continue to do so now.

A careful analysis of the various studies, reports, and documents on the subject have convinced me that it would be a waste of money and economically unsound. The basic objections to the project are so well known and have been discussed so frequently and at such length that it is unnecessary to restate them at this time. They were responsible for its defeat in the Senate in 1934.

After its rejection as being unsound, the seaway emerged again in the 1941–42 era, this time masked as a war project. I expressed my views on this subject in that relationship over Station WHP in April 1942, and also at the same time in an open letter to the Harrisburg Patriot. I pointed out that "what in ordinary peacetime would have been a gross waste of the taxpayers' money, placing the burden on future generations, to the prejudice of the district and the State, in wartime becomes an inexcusable squandering of irreplaceable men and materials for whom and for which there is a known, pressing, and immediate need in our production program. Raw materials, labor, and time sunk in the St. Lawrence cannot be used to create ships, tanks, and munitions we must have at the earliest possible moment for victory."

I also pointed out that it would take anywhere from 4 to 8 years to construct and that at any time during that period there was a strong probability that it would have to be abandoned because of unforeseen shortages of strategic materials. These unexpected shortages did occur in many cases. If that happened, then all materials used to date would have been lost.

The past 2 years have proven that my viewpoint and analysis was correct and farsighted. Subsequent events have borne out my prediction. At many times the boys in the Service who are fighting so valiantly have been short of tanks, planes, guns, ammunition, and other items essential to successful warfare. They would have had far fewer if men and materials had been diverted from the factory and the assembly line to the St. Lawrence sinkhole. They still need all we can give them. We still have many shortages on the civilian home front.

To start this canal now would be as ridiculous as it was then. When we can start to turn our swords into plowshares, we will face a crying need for materials with which to create those many articles required by a starved civilian economy crying for expansion. Returning service men and women, citizens on the home front, all will want and need automobiles, refrigerators, and thousands of other articles. We must use what we have to supply this demand.

Certainly, no one can contend that there has been any trouble with transportation during this war period. And, can anyone point to any real use that the St. Lawrence would have served in the war effort if it had been completely built and in operation even before the war started? It seems to me that it is most embarrassing for those who urged it and testified for it in 1941–42 to come before congressional committees and tell that same story again.

Under the G. I. bill's loan provisions, an opportunity is given for the returning veteran to establish himself in business as a filling-station operator, as a small merchant, or as an automobile accessory salesman, or in many other lines of business. But, if he has nothing to sell, and if automobiles are not available to drive, then from whence will his customers come? How will his business be success-

ful? How will the wheels of commerce keep turning? How will the Government be repaid? The goods that he sells and which the mass of the customers buy, will come in over the railroads and keep railroad employment relatively near its present high figure, and the same is true for trucking and other forms of transportation. But whether for sale or for transportation, the basic necessity is goods.

To debate such a proposal at this time is ridiculous. The war is not over. We hope and pray that it will be ended soon. You will certainly agree that when the war is over, our first major problem is to reconvert industry to peacetime operation and to create jobs and small businesses for the boys and girls who are coming back to civilian life. We do not want to waste the materials that would create those jobs in the "noble experiment" which most engineers say would not work.

EFFECT ON RAILROADS AND RAILROAD MEN WOULD BE DISASTROUS

The basic idea of the St. Lawrence seaway is to take the taxpayers' money and use it to build and maintain a free right-of-way for water-borne traffic, which would compete with the railroads now so adequately serving our community. There are thousands and thousands of railroad men now employed in this district who know full well that the net result of such a program would be to render them jobless. The railroad brotherhoods have always unanimously opposed this whole idea. The railroads themselves would lose traffic. Fewer trains would run. There would be fewer cars to fix in the shops. There would be less freight to move. It would be disastrous.

Its ill effects on the railroads are so obvious that many people at first sight think that the railroads and the railroad men are the only ones affected. But, in our closely knitted, modern industrial State, that cannot be so.

SHIPPERS AND MANUFACTURERS

Shippers and manufacturers in Cumberland, Dauphin, and Lebanon Counties would be placed at a strong disadvantage. They would have to pay freight rates based on compensatory costs to the railroads who build and maintain their own rights-of-way, while freight from the Great Lakes region would be floated—if it could actually be floated—down the St. Lawrence on the back of a Government subsidy, paid in large part by Pennsylvanians, whose tax money would be used to cut the foundation out from under their own businesses and impoverish their own transportation systems. Many factories and firms would not be able to meet such subsidized competition. The result would be widespread unemployment in industry in this area, as well as among many railroad men.

MERCHANTS

Anything prejudicial to the welfare of the railroad man in a district containing as many as does the new Eighteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania obviously would be reflected at once in the sales by the merchants. That effect would be aggravated by what was being caused to industry. You cannot have a healthy community or trade area in which large sections of the citizens are out of work or have to work at greatly reduced wages. So, in the last analysis, the St. Lawrence waterway would have a bad effect on everybody in this whole section, and, for that matter, in the whole State of Pennsylvania. At best, from the national viewpoint, there would be a huge upheaval and dislocation of manpower and factories which only the lapse of a long period of time could heal.

I cannot take the time to go into the technical reasons which engineers, who have carefully studied this project, give for its utter unfeasibility. But let me mention a few. One is that the Great Lakes and certain parts of that area are frozen over from early December until late April in most years, thus rendering the waterway useless during those months. A friend of mine from Buffalo, N. Y., said to me a few days ago, "All you have to do is to look out of one of the skyscraper windows in December or January to see with your own eyes what nonsense the St. Lawrence waterway is." Another is that, prior to the war at least, only 30 percent of the world's tonnage could navigate the seaway and only 5 percent of the United States tonnage could navigate the seaway.

The construction-cost estimates at the lower pre-war prices of 1940–41 were over a billion dollars. Some estimates ran much higher.

There are other objections, particularly technical ones, but these are enough to prove their seriousness. It cannot be shown that it would be of any national benefit. Consumers costs would not be lowered.

Farm Organization and Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VIRGIL CHAPMAN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on farm organization and farm legislation by Hon. James H. Thompson, of Paris, Bourbon County, Ky., formerly speaker of the Kentucky House of Representatives and majority leader of the Kentucky Senate:

FARM ORGANIZATION AND FARM LEGISLATION

(By J. H. Thompson)

Farming is an essential industry. The farmer is the main dependence for food and nourishment of all people everywhere. In the early period of the Nation's history farming was the leading industry; it was the occupation of the majority of the people. In the course of time the population of the country increased, principally by immigration. Among the new citizens were prospectors, investors, and exploiters. Through the influence of this increased population of varied occupations and trades, community centers were established and grew in population, and industry was established here. At the present time those engaged in farming constitute only 25 percent of the Nation's population. Nevertheless the farmer continues at his task of supplying food for all. His job has not been easy or remunerative; his hours of labor have been long; his task laborious.

Many changes may be noted in farm management and farm life in this country during the last quarter of a century. These changes have been brought about by new and improved methods in farm management; also by the use of improved farm machinery and equipment. For many years farmers devoted special attention and time to increasing farm production. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations worked overtime to improve the quality of farm seeds as well as the method of cultivation in order to increase the size and yield of the crops. This practice was continued and as a result large surpluses of farm crops were accumulated. This oversupply naturally depressed prices.

INDIVIDUAL VERSUS ORGANIZED FARMING

The farmer of the past has been generally an individualist. Being more isolated from his neighbors than those in mercantile business, each farmer worked out his own problem to himself, and, in fact, often vied with his neighbors in an effort to produce bigger crops and larger yields than others. In addition, each farmer strived to obtain a better price for his crops than did his neighbor. While this practice of the farmer was in vogue the purchasers of farm crops were combining and cooperating in their efforts to purchase crops and produce at the lowest cost possible. The result was that with only one buyer and a multitude of sellers the market for farm crops was much depressed. In the meantime the farmer continued to increase production, which only aggravated his trouble.

For years farmers devoted their time and efforts mainly to increasing the quality and quantity of their production, giving little thought or attention to the sale of crops. As a result, market conditions became bad and farm income so reduced that farm leaders became alarmed and began to confer about their problems, and to try to find some way to remedy this situation. As a result of these conferences organizations were formed among the farmers to formulate plans for concerted action to secure better prices and to improve living conditions of farmers. Through the efforts of organized farmers a new era was created in the farm life of this country. Today, three great national farm organizations are functioning to promote and protect the interests of farmers.

RESULTS OF ORGANIZATION

The result accomplished by farm organization has demonstrated its worth. Formerly, independent petitions of unorganized farmers were ignored by authorities to whom addressed, while today farm representatives are welcome and counseled with by the highest Government officials. We cannot impress too strongly the importance of organization among farmers. The effective worth of these organizations depends upon the service and devotion of individual members. This fact has been demonstrated by the results accomplished by business organizations including industry, labor, agriculture, which are:

Industry: 85 percent organized; 10 percent population, 21 percent national income; labor: 75 percent organized, 65 percent population, 67 percent national income; agriculture: 30 percent organized, 25 percent population, 12 percent national income.

It will be noted from the above tabulation that the more intensively organized groups receive the greatest percentage of national income. The ratio of income to population of the different groups is as follows: Industry, 210 percent, labor, 102 percent, agriculture, 48 percent.

Organization work is teamwork. It is the combination of forces to accomplish some

definite purpose. It is plainly evident that the greater the force attached to a given load, the easier it is to move, provided it is accompanied with teamwork, that is working together in a common cause and to given end. This means of course merging of forces as contrasted with individual initiative and individual action. In the case of the farmer it means the abandonment of the idea and policy of running each his own business and in his own way. Individualism has proved ineffective in combating other well organized business and forces.

EXPERIENCE SUGGESTS CONTROL

Experience and education have taught the farmer a valuable lesson. While not minimizing the skill and ingenuity of the younger generation which will now carry on, their elders have pioneered in the work and learned by experience much that should be of benefit to future farmers. Take the case of handling and marketing a tobacco crop, the leading money crop of this State. Progressive farmers of this State have been striving for many years through concerted action to make this business more profitable.

The first movement for that purpose was started in 1901. Later, in 1906, the Burley Tobacco Society was organized by the farmers for the purpose of increasing the price of this crop. This organization pooled two crops of tobacco and eliminated a third crop of 1908. Much of the pooled tobacco remained unsold and was sold at auction in 1909. In 1921 the Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperation Association was formed. This organization controlled and marketed six crops of tobacco, namely, 1921 to 1926, inclusive. While each of these movements stimulated the market for tobacco they failed to solve the problem for the farmer, failed to establish a permanent and dependable market plan.

While all efforts failed to control and market tobacco they demonstrated the weakness of such efforts through voluntary control, the basic idea upon which such efforts were founded. Had all the tobacco growers joined together and delivered all of their tobacco to the one sales agency for disposal, then the business could and would have been held under control. With one sales agency for their crops the farmers would have been in a much stronger position than they were as individual salesmen dealing with well-organized buyers. Thus, we have learned by experience that control not only of the marketing but of the production of farm crops is essential to orderly sales and profitable prices.

NATIONAL PROBLEM

Price control of farm commodities can be attained only by control of the production of such crops. This we have learned by previous efforts to secure higher prices simply by the organized sales agencies. While controlling the sale of tobacco within a given territory the production of that crop spread to other and new territory thus not only defeating our efforts but aggravating our problem for future control. The fact that tobacco is grown in several States removes State jurisdiction and regulation by State law, thereby making it a national problem. We have learned by years of experimentation that our efforts, while not entirely unrewarded, have been misdirected. We know now the extent of our problem and the authority to which we may appeal for its solution. The Congress of the United States is the one having authority and jurisdiction over interstate problems. It is apparent therefore that future petitions of farmers for relief or redress will be made to Congress which agency has been most courteous and responsive to appeals of organized farmers.

The facts that farming is Nation-wide and farm problems generally in Kentucky are without the jurisdiction of State authorities make it necessary that farm organization be extended throughout the entire country. Many farm crops as well as farm activities are more or less localized; that is, confined to certain sections of the country. The cotton industry is largely confined to the Southern States while the tobacco industry is in a more widely distributed territory and generally in a different section, though operated in some of the States growing cotton. More widely distributed is the corn as well as the wheat industry. Also the dairy industry and the fruit industry are in different sections and widely different territories. All these farm commodities and farm producers share in a common cause and have common problems, that should be dealt by a national organization.

ORGANIZATION TO MEET ORGANIZATION

Organization is indispensable to the successful conduct and protection of farm business and farm activity. The reason it is necessary for farmers to organize is that all other business is organized. The people with whom the farmers deal are organized, those to whom he sells as well as those from whom he buys. In order successfully to meet such competition it is necessary to use similar methods. A pronounced success in organized marketing has been that of the fruit and vegetable growers, which products are perishable. Purchasers who desire these products are compelled to go to organization rather than individual growers to obtain their supplies. Here the organized purchasers are met by organized growers who fix the price of their products.

Organization is a most effective agency for presenting farm problems to legislative bodies. The representatives of the people who are sent to Congress usually consider and are influenced by the interests and well-being of the majority of their constituents. Particularly are those representatives responsive to the appeals and petitions of organized groups of their districts. This is proper because such groups represent collective sentiment rather than the opinion of one individual. It is not only a courtesy but a favor to the representative of the people that he be informed as to the wishes and interest of those he is elected to represent. Any worthy representative of the people in Congress will not only consider it a duty but a pleasure to serve his constituents and particularly such as are supported by collective actions.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

It sometimes happens that a minority interest in the community dominates public policy. This is not a natural situation and is calculated to create an unwholesome condition. In a democratic country it is presumed that majority sentiment prevails in the operation of the government. When in any case majority rules is thwarted by clique rule or the polution of the ballot, disintegration sets in and corruption is fostered. Such situations have existed in many communities of the country and usually ruling dynasties meet self destruction or die by edict of the public in protest. The same is true of the conduct of the National Government when popular rule is destroyed or when the interests and well-being of the people of the Nation are ignored; then representative government becomes unrepresentative.

For many years prior to 1930 our Government was decidedly capitalistic; its policies were dominated largely by organized industry. During this period great combinations of capital and business were formed which practically dominated all business of the Nation. The power and influence thus created over business was used to influence the selection of high Government officials and representatives in the Congress. As a result of the control of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, first consideration was given the problems of vested interests. Under Government protection huge combinations were formed and fostered through Government favor; the rich grew richer through Government bounty while independent business and farmers paid the bills.

REFORM AND A NEW DEAL

Reform movements, both social and political, are generally preceded by excesses and abuse of power by authorities. The patience and tolerance of the people will bear only so much abuse and when tested beyond endurance they will rebel. The incentive for the radical change in the policy and canduct of national affairs in 1932 was the neglect and indifference of authorities to the appeals of the rank and file of our citizenship, to the demands of the farmers and laboring people for justice and a fair deal. As evidence of prevailing distress in some sections of the country, the people resisted the efforts of authorities to execute foreclosures on homes and farms. In the meantime, authorities and administrators of national affairs made no effort to relieve this distressing situation. The people as a last resort exercised their sovereign right of suffrage and dismissed this unfaithful regime.

The time had come for a new deal or an insurrection among the people of the Nation. Realizing the seriousness of the situation the President, when a candidate, pledged the people of the country a change in policy and in the method of operating the Government; that if given control and authority to do so he would see that the people were given a New Deal; that favoritism would be abolished, and the agencies of Government operated for the benefit and by the direction of the people; that constitutional government would be restored; the rights and well-being of all citizens protected. Besides reaffirming the rights of the people he pledged to provide opportunities for them to live and enjoy the privileges of a free democracy. This program made a strong appeal to the people. It was not only a practical appeal to all properly conducted business but also to the better instincts of people who recognize the obligation of the Government to serve and protect its citizens.

PRINCIPLES AND PROVISIONS ADOPTED

The essential principles and purposes cutlined by the President for enactment include the following: Restore confidence of the people in the safety of our institution; stabilize business, establish banking, on a sound and secure basis; provide security and opportunity to farmers and home owners; creation of farm credit and farm loan agencies; establish parity of farm income by stabilizing farm prices; provide work for the unemployed; food for the hungry; provide for the comfort of the aged and distressed.

Such policies as outlined are essential to the maintenance of order and a well regulated democracy. These have now been enacted into law; the principles and purposes of their enactment remain unchallenged.

The farmers' problems have for a long time been serious. There is no precedent for their solution. The Chief Executive of the Nation, realizing the importance of action on this matter, called an extraordinary session of Congress to deal with it. Previously an effort had been made by Congress to provide relief to the farmers and a measure was enacted for that purpose but was vetoed by President Coolidge. In the present instance President Roosevelt requested the Congress to prepare a farm relief measure and thereby pledged his indorsement of their action. At the time Congress had this problem under consideration the country was oversupplied with farm products; huge surpluses had been accumulated which resulted in starvation prices. The Congress after mature deliberation resolved its problem as a twofold one, namely, first to limit production to public demands, second, to stabilize prices in ac-

cordance with those of other business activities; in other words provided parity of farm income with that of other business income.

RESULTS ACCOMPLISHED

A recent communication from a prominent Member of Congress who has participated actively in support of farm legislation, states, "Unquestionably more has been done in a legislative way for American agriculture during the past 10 years than was accomplished during all of the years of the history of the country up until 1933. A further testimonial of interest and value to farmers is one by Dr. J. B. Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation at Washington, which says, "prices of most major farm products are protected by Government loans or purchase arrangements at 85 or 90 percent parity. The net effect is to give farmers approximately parity prices for these products." He further stated, "The net income of farmers in the United States in 1943 is estimated $12,500,000,000 as compared with $9,500,000,000 in 1942, and a pre-war average of $4,700,000,000." Further Dr. Hutson states, "The control of prices received and prices paid by farmers is assurance against a repetition of the experiences of the other war, when farmers lost their homes or became burdened with debts which they were unable to pay off until recent years of increase in farm income."

Only those of experience can appreciate the difficulties to be encountered in the enactment of a measure in the Congress. First in importance is to procure a worthy sponsor, one who is in sympathy with the purposes to be accomplished. Then, to be successful the sponsor must hold the respect and confidence of his colleagues; this is all important since courtesy is the dominating influence among legislators. Kentucky enjoys the distinction of having the most honored and influencial Member of the National Congress. The services of the senior Senator from this State to the farmers of the Nation will be of permanent and lasting benefit. I may add also that he has the hearty support of other Congressmen from the State. May we say if there is such, farming today is a favored industry and due to the loyal sponsorship and support of Congress and the Chief Executive.

FARM AGENCIES

A number of farm agencies were created and others extended recently by Congress. These are credit and finance institutions and include the Federal Land Bank, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Intermediate Credit Bank. These institutions were designed specially for service to the farmer and landowner. Such agencies have been of great benefit and service to the farmers in furnishing capital for the operation of business and for the relief of banks that were carrying long term and uncollectable loans for farmers. In times of depression banks are unable to furnish capital to cperate business. It was deemed necessary to create "A permanent dependable credit system for farmers" in order to protect their property and to forestall forced liquidations. To serve the people successfully an agency must serve continuously rather than periodically, which is the policy of the Government loan service.

The Commodity Credit Corporation provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act is what the name implies, a credit agent to serve farmers. It not only provides loans to farmers on commodilties but supplies funds for the purchase of farm crops. By authority of this agency the Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative Association purchased and handled twenty-five million pounds of the 1940 Eurley tobacco crop for the farmers and resold it for a creditable advance. This same agency also handled five million pounds of the 1941 burley crop. An additional provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act guarantees parity prices for farm crops. In the case of the 1942 Burley tobacco crop the average price was 41 cents a pound, while the average 1943 crop was 44 cents a pound. The entire output of the 1942 and 1943 crops were sold at prices posted by Government graders under guarantees by the Commodity Credit Corporation. These prices were above a 5-year average, 1935 to 1939, nearly 20 cents per pound.

TIMELY WARNING

The maintenance and support of crop quotas and parity prices depend entirely on the action of farmers and growers. These provisions were inserted in the law at the request and for the protection of farmers. The period of tenure of such quotas is fixed by the farmers themselves. In order for a continuance of the service of the Government the farmers must approve said action. We have previously experienced the results of over-production, which are demoralized markets and starvation prices. We have noted fluctuating prices resulting from uncontrolled production; have learned that nothing can be accomplished by individual effort. We have failed in all efforts to control production by State laws, also in our efforts to obtain living prices by voluntary organizations. We now know from experience and observation that satisfactory prices can be obtained by Government control and supervision of markets. It is therefore up to the farmers to accept this Government service or to open the flood gates of production and drift to old time depression and suffering.

Kentucky farmers are intelligent; they are well informed. They have not forgotten business conditions of 10 years ago when prices of farm products were below cost of production; they recall previous efforts to improve such conditions that were unsuccessful. While today through friendly cooperation by Government agencies farm business and farm life have risen to unprecedented levels, farm income to an all time high. In view of these facts there should be general satisfaction and approval by farmers of the way the Government has assisted them in achieving such results. Any criticism or complaint about the present farm policy would seem unfounded, emanating from sources not concerned about the welfare and success of farmers.

REGIMENTATION

We have heard some talk about the regimentation of business during the present war period; some complaint about the restrictions placed on the conduct of business; of unnecessary drafting of labor in the armed forces causing inconvenience to employers. Some ingenious man has recently coined the expression "free enterprise," which is suggested as a plan for solving our disarranged affairs and business troubles. The inference of this suggestion is that we should be permitted freedom of action during this emergency. This suggestion presupposes that things could and should be run in a normal way while the Nation is waging a desperate struggle requiring the combined effort, and all our manpower as well as resources, to maintain our position in the world—to defend the rights and liberties of the people against an all-powerful combination of forces that would not only conquer but subjugate and enslave our people.

Business must and will go on, and in the best and most practical way possible under the circumstances. We must realize, however, and must concede that our most important business at this time is to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion. To do this will require the mobilization of all the manpower available as well as the resources of the Nation, including a vast army of men and women for the fighting forces, vast amounts of equipment and supplies to maintain such forces in the fields. Then there must be provided food and fiber in the greatest amounts possible in order to nourish and sustain men in the Army.

MOBILIZATION

To conduct a war properly requires mobilization of forces. This includes not only manpower for an Army and Navy but all materials and equipment required to provide manpower with implements used in warfare. Food is as much a necessity as ammunition for servicemen. A soldier without ammunition is helpless; without food he is powerless. In addition, present warfare requires more than any previous conflict in history vast quantities of fuel oils, explosives, as well as rubber supplies, and many other articles of equipment. The quantities of food, fuel, and supplies being consumed in the present world war is almost beyond human comprehension. Problems of transportation alone are so great as to test the capacity of the great railroad and motor transportation systems of the Nation as well as those of the electric and air lines of the country. Only by mobilization can we hope to attain the desired results.

To train an army of millions of men and women for military service is a stupendous task. A review of the immensity of supplies required to equip an army shows what a task it is. In assembling these the Government, by authority of Congress, calls men into the service. Such trainees are subject to the orders of the Government, given by officers of the armed forces. Such orders must be obeyed, even to the giving of their lives in combat with enemy forces. Property and business of civilians are also subject to conscription by authority of Congress to be used for public defense and to provide funds for the prosecution of war. This obligation is being fulfilled voluntarily by all loyal and patriotic Americans, which should be an object lesson to complainers and fault finders. Government regulations are necessary to the prosecution of war and should be cheerfully observed. The greatest obstacle confronted today is the action of some individuals who refuse to do their duty.

American Legion Clears Hon. Hamilton Fish, of New York, of Abuse of Franking Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the National Tribune of May 11, 1944, dealing with the action of the national executive committee of the American Legion in clearing me of any and all charges of violation of the franking privilege, made by the Seventeenth District Americanism Commission of Los Angeles, Calif., without any evidence to support its allegations nor affording any presentation of the facts.

The article follows:

At its first meeting in the Nation's Capital since 1919, called by National Commander Warren H. Atherton because of the needs of its legislative program, the national executive committee of the American Legion closed a 3-day session at the Statler Hotel, May 2, that was high lighted by the adoption of far-reaching programs and addresses by high Army and Navy officials, the Administrator

of Veterans' Affairs, and others, who discussed problems relating principally to existing war conditions and to the care of the Nation's veterans.

* * * * *

In addition to the usual study of matters relating to legislation, employment, national defense, and foreign relations, the committee listened to more than twoscore of national-standing groups and discussed their findings. Perhaps the most outstanding of these in the minds of attendants were the adoption of a skeleton report of the Post-war Planning Commission, which stressed first the winning of the war and then the continuing in America of free enterprise, and by the adoption of another special committee report which freed Representative HAMILTON FISH, of New York, from the taint of misuse of his franking privileges in the promotion of un-American activities.

FISH IS CLEARED

The report of the special committee to deal with charges leveled at Congressman FISH was submitted in a 14-page document by Past National Commander Harry W. Colmery, of Kansas, on behalf of himself, William H. Hargraves, District of Columbia, and National Vice Commander Edward L. Mulrooney, of Delaware. The committee was appointed at Indianapolis last November after Congressman FISH appeared before the executive committee to protest against resolutions adopted at the Kansas City and Omaha conventions of the Legion in which he was accused by misusing his congressional frank by permitting speeches to be sent out, un-American in content, by persons whose patriotism is questioned. FISH has been sorely criticized for granting permission to send out speeches in his envelopes and for encouraging subversive activities.

Colmery quoted the postal laws and regulations relating to the use of the "frank"; submitted as exhibits material used in support of complaints which originated from California; contended that the material in speeches mailed was not germane to the resolution regardless of any possible views or feelings of the Congressman, and concluded that there was no confirmation in the fact of the allegations.

The report went further to state, in effect, that the franking privilege was not to an individual as such but to a representative of the people he serves, and that speeches complained of were explanatory of the right of freedom of speech, that under the Constitution should be exercised without fear of intimidation.

The report suggested strongly that hereafter greater care be given to limiting the scope of convention actions which result "in debates beneath the dignity of the Legion," and further suggested that, where necessary, effort should be directed to a change of laws rather than to personal attacks on individuals. It said that fair criticism without impugning the good faith of honest Americans would redound to the benefit of the Legion.

FISH PRAISES ACTION

After brief debate, the executive committee adopted a resolution to present the complete subcommittee report to the Chicago convention for final acceptance. Colmery later took to task the California Legion district for again attacking the Congressman recently, as a result of which a radio commentator leveled another vicious assault on FISH and the New York newspaper, PM, spread the California action over its pages.

The committee named to investigate the charges against FISH, who is a charter Legion member, was continued to investigate additional complaints on subversive activities.

Congressman FISH, notified of the Legion action, at Goshen, N. Y., issued the following brief statement:

"The action taken by the national executive committee of the American Legion is exactly what I hoped and expected it would be, a simple outspoken act of justice. There is no greater patriotic organization in the country. The Legion is utterly fearless and knows no other interest except what is best for America.

"I am more proud than ever to be a loyal Legionnaire and to have been the chairman of the committee of three that wrote the preamble to the Legion constitution."

Mr. Speaker, I also include the following editorial, which appeared in the same issue of the National Tribune:

THE FISH RESOLUTION

Most veterans will be glad to know that the American Legion has officially relieved Representative HAMILTON FISH, of New York, from any taint in connection with the unfortunate use of his franked envelopes for the purpose of mailing material said to be un-American in character. The special committee of the Legion, headed by Past National Commander Harry W. Colmery, of Kansas, an able and successful lawyer, made a most exhaustive study of the laws and of the allegations contained in the resolution adopted last year by the Legion's Omaha convention. It found no basis in fact for the Legion action and it chastised the organization soundly for directing its efforts to such channels.

Congressman FISH is a loyal American, whose forebears were as thoroughly patriotic as is he. He is one of the founders of the Legion, his eligibility to membership being based on distinguished service in the last war, during which he was decorated for gallantry. He also saw service during the present war; and if he had his own way, he would still be in his country's uniform. He has served his country with distinction in the Congress for a quarter of a century. The unfounded charges of opponents who initiated the Legion resolutions were personally offensive. They were character assassinating and libelous. Had it not been for his regard for the Legion and all of the splendid work it has accomplished, the Congressman would have looked to the courts for relief.

We have not always been in sympathy with Mr. FISH's public utterances. He was an isolationist before Pearl Harbor, and that was his right and privilege. His addresses in behalf of free speech were masterful, if unfortunately violated by his supposed friends. His efforts were honest, if abused. His heart was always right, even though his own close friends have believed his judgment was occasionally warped.

The action of the Legion in sifting the evidence and in making an honest and forthright finding is to be commended. The committee and its chairman did a magnificent job and is to be complimented. That committee has now been continued in service for the purpose of reporting, if necessary, on other actions by alleged subverts that would lead to harm to our country.

The initiators of the original resolutions directed at Representative FISH are to be found in California. We are of the opinion that the resolutions were communistically inspired, perhaps by others than Legionnaires. A so-called legal issue was distorted into an almost successful attempt to brand falsely a loyal citizen and a veteran. We suggest that the continuing committee might well investigate now those who tried so hard to do the branding.

I also include a letter from Mr. Edward K. Inman, vice president and associate editor of the National Tribune, in answer to an inquiry concerning the above editorial, which is self-explanatory:

THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1944.

Mr. JOHN D. LAWALL,
Brockport, N. Y.

DEAR COMRADE LAWALL: I wish to acknowledge your letter of May 20 which relates further to an editorial that appeared recently in the National Tribune.

May I first state to you that we carry no torch for Congressman FISH or for any other individual. We do, however, believe in fairness and in justice. I do not know whether or not you know Mr. FISH personally, or whether you have any detailed knowledge of the resolution that the American Legion adopted at Omaha last year. I know Mr. FISH personally, and I have known him and his family intimately since soon after the last war, in which he served with distinction and in which he received citations for valor above and beyond the call of duty. I am thoroughly familiar with the Omaha resolution, and was present at the time of its adoption. I was present and an interested listener to Mr. FISH's presentation to the national executive committee of the Legion at Indianapolis last November. I was present this year at the May meeting of the Legion committee in Washington, and listened most carefully to the presentation of the FISH question by an unbiased and nonpartisan group. I later read in detail the findings of that committee and the so-called evidence on which the original resolution was based and on which the last Legion action was taken. I am convinced, as were the whole of the executive committee of the Legion, that there was no basis in fact for the charges that were made and I am satisfied that the representatives of a million and a quarter members of the Legion will sustain the executive committee action at the Chicago convention in September. I suggest to you that you be present at that convention and yourself pass judgment on the evidence as it will be submitted.

No one more than I has disagreed at times with pre-Pearl Harbor utterances of the Congressman. I have personally discussed them with him, and I did not see eye to eye with him, but that in no manner whatever prejudiced his right to make them.

The New York Representative is without question a loyal American citizen. His views before Pearl Harbor were apparently not your views. Some of them were not my views. Our Constitution, which we today fight to uphold, gave him the right to express his opinions just as you are given the right to express yours. No finger of prejudice has been pointed to Congressman FISH because of any utterance he has made since we entered the war.

The allegations made in the original resolution adopted at Omaha not only were not sustained by the evidence submitted by its sponsors, but there was also unearthed evidence that persons with communistic leanings were behind the original action taken in California. Subsequently, activities of the same group bear out the suspicions and known facts in this regard. These recent accusations seem to be as ill-founded as the earlier statements against the Congressman, none of which could be substantiated.

This is an analysis of the situation on which was based the editorial I prepared. It was written without personal bias, and without any solicitation whatever. It was prompted solely by the facts as they were presented to the Legion's national executive committee. Any opinions which you may have are your own, and you are fully entitled to them, but nobody has the right to accuse without more than opinion as a basis. I protest strongly any inference on your part that our writings are guided by anything but competent evidence.

Sincerely yours,

E. K. INMAN, *Vice President.*

A Reminder for Servicemen, Servicewomen, and Their Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, a great many service men and women and their relatives and friends do not realize just what their rights and benefits are as a result of the recent legislation passed by the Congress. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am setting forth a short summary of the more important laws on this subject. By reading the title of the law, any service man or woman will then be able to seek further information about his or her rights under it.

I would also like to add if anyone in the new Eighteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania has any difficulties in this respect and they will call at my office, 20 South River Street, telephone 4-3356, Harrisburg, or write me either to Harrisburg or Washington, I will be glad to help get them in touch with the proper authorities and do anything else possible for them.

First. Mustering Out Payment Act: It provides payments for those who have been or are being mustered out of the service after 60 days or more, depending upon the length of service and the place of service.

Second. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to provide seeing-eye dogs trained for the aid of blind veterans entitled to disability compensation. It provides for mechanical and electronical equipment.

Third. Public Law No. 312, providing for payment of pension or compensation to certain persons receiving retired pay by permitting waivers of so much of the retired pay and allowances as is equal in amount to the pension or compensation to which the retired person is entitled. Note: Pension and compensation are exempt from income tax. Retired pay other than that for disability incurred in line of duty is not so exempt. Therefore, the effect of this is to permit exemption from tax of so much of the retired pay as is waived in order to receive compensation or pension.

Fourth. G. I. bill of rights provides for hospitalization, loans, education, employment, and readjustment allowances for veterans of the armed services—a most comprehensive bill.

Fifth. National life insurance: A number of liberalizing amendments have been enacted. Application may be made for not less than $1,000 nor more than $10,000 without physical examination, prior to the expiration of 120 days from entrance into active service. Thereafter, applicants must pass a physical examination. Do not neglect to take out this insurance and do not neglect to keep it in effect after you have taken it out. It is the best insurance policy you will ever be able to get and, after you leave the armed service you can have it converted into most of the regular forms of life insurance and continue it thereafter.

Sixth. Dependency benefits: This act provides for allowances to the dependents of men and women in the service, depending on the type of relationship and the degree of dependency.

Seventh. Casualty payments: Should there be a death casualty in your family, remember that there are four payments due the dependents: first, 6 months' gratuity payment; second, insurance; third, a pension; and fourth, arrears of pay.

Eighth. Maternity care: Under appropriations by the Congress maternity aid to the wives and children of servicemen is granted under State supervision. Consult your own physician for full information.

Ninth. Emergency relief: The Army and the Navy have special funds for emergency relief. The American Red Cross can advise you how to get in touch with the proper authority for advice in this matter.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Dewey stands for democracy; Roosevelt for revolution.

It is evident that Hoover has improved more in his 12 years out than Roosevelt has in his 12 in.

The facts of CLARE BOOTH LUCE and her Chicago speech is another story of a woman who fought for the chance to make good and did.

The serenity of farm people in their short-handed emergency is a comforting and an amazing reality.

From 9 to 9 is the glorious span of the combine day. The dewey morning permits the iron horse to plow corn. There are farm compensations.

The reconversion from continuous rains to a delightful harvest is the order of the week. Growing corn and grasses forget gloom faster than the human.

Some people think it is patriotic not to be interested in politics and yet that is one of the things for which the boys are fighting.

The best answer to the horse in the middle of the stream is that he has gone amphibious, web-footed from time. It just is not a horse.

I have heard Democrats say the unintentional way to get rid of a good political worker is to get him a job and send him to Washington.

The fact that Governor Warren, thinking of his seven children, refused the possibility of sojourning in Washington, is rare and worthy of admiration.

John William Ditter

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN WILLIAM DITTER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, it will be impossible for Members of the House of Representatives who served with him ever to forget J. WILL DITTER—BILL DITTER to all of us. He could wade into any debate and establish a beach head by slashing words here and there until he had found a footing from which he could press a relentless attack.

BILL DITTER scorned defense and apology when he dealt with a subject for which he fought. He was respectful; he was quick to disavow any misinterpretation of an adversary's words; but he believed in carrying the battle to his opponent. And he did so with vigor. He drew on an intensive knowledge of history to supplement his logic. He threw into his remarks the fire that is born of an intense love of country. This combination of knowledge and earnestness gave him an effective eloquence.

We who have seen him take his position in front of the tables will always see him there. He was too vigorous a character to die and be forgotten. He lives.

Silver Propaganda and Money Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, when the American people have so much at stake in the stability of the Government credit and the integrity of our money system it would seem that the newspapers on which most of us must rely for information have a grave responsibility to give their readers the facts in discussing any monetary program established by the Congress and entrusted to the Federal Treasury for execution. So much misleading propaganda has been printed about silver and the use of silver as money that most people have the erroneous idea that the silver-purchase program is a big expense to the Government when in fact it is the only money program on which the Government is making a profit; a profit which could be tremendously increased if the full intent of the law was carried out and all the silver that has been purchased was used for money by the Treasury Department. It is difficult to understand

the motive of the newspapers from one end of the country to the other in persistently misrepresenting the issue and attempting to discredit a money program that has been profitable to the Government and has worked so well in supplying the Nation's money needs. There is inserted herewith an editorial from the Washington Post of June 16 on silver and my reply thereto:

[From the Washington Post of June 16, 1944]

SILVER LOAN

The Treasury has found a new use for its idle silver by agreeing to ship 100,000,000 ounces to India under a lend-lease agreement. It may be remembered that after a prolonged struggle with Congress the Treasury was permitted to sell some silver at inflated prices to domestic industries needing it for war purposes. Prior to that time it had resorted to various lending expedients to circumvent the prohibitions of the Silver Purchase Act. This time it has again found the lending device a handy one for making idle silver hoards useful. The metal lend-leased to India is to be used to increase the coinage supply for the United Nations forces stationed in India and to help keep prices stable.

It may seem curious to suggest that an importation of silver into India provides a means of fighting inflation. But such is the case not only with respect to silver but gold as well. Sales of silver in the open market provide a means of mopping up local purchasing power because silver is selling at highly inflated prices in terms of the local currency. The higher the sale prices the greater, of course, is the anti-inflationary effect of purchases of the metal. The shadow side of this picture is that the authorities have in the past sought to discourage the Indian habit of investing savings in sterile monetary metals instead of putting them productively to work. It is unfortunate that the extraordinary conditions of wartime have made encouragement of the hoarding habit seem desirable as a means of checking inflation. But, given the circumstances, hoarding is at least a lesser evil than accelerated decline of the purchasing power of Indian currency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 26, 1944.

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please refer to the statement made in your editorial of June 16 entitled "Silver Loan" in which you say, "The Treasury has found a new use for its idle silver by agreeing to ship 100,000,000 ounces to India under a lend-lease agreement."

In considering the Government's need for money and the monetary use of the Treasury's stock of idle silver, you might tell your readers why it was necessary to circumvent the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act and keep approximately one-half of the silver bought under the mandatory provisions of this law idle, while the other half was put to use as money at a tremendous saving in interest to the American people and a profit in the form of silver seigniorage amounting to $820,700,000 (p. 85, Treasury Bulletin for May). If the first 1,477,659,945 ounces (Treasury statement, June 15) now in circulation as money can be used at such a large profit, why was it necessary to circumvent the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act by keeping the second 1,253,307,039 ounces idle (Treasury statement, June 15, 1943), when there was full authority in law to use all the silver purchased by the Treasury as money at its coinage value of $1.29 per ounce, which would give the Treasur yan additional profit of $887,000,000 (col. 9, p. 95, Treasury Bulletin for May), to say nothing in the saving in interest to the money users of this country.

Today silver is selling in India for $1.05 per ounce (report, Commerce Department) despite the fact that the British Government for India has demonitized the standard silver rupee and made a 50 percent alloy rupee legal tender. And now our Government is turning over 100,000,000 ounces of our silver to the British Government for India to be coined and put into circulation at full coinage value, all the profits between the difference in the price credited to our Government on the lend-lease books and the coinage value going to the British.

The Treasury is doing this at a time when the Federal Reserve banks are inflating the volume of our unredeemable paper money by the billions, every dollar of which is loaned to the Government or business at interest. The Treasury is doing this while the Government is beating the tocsin to buy bonds and more bonds, and scraping the barrel to find a little more taxation money, while we have the equivalent of $1,750,000,000 in good money metal all bought and paid for—money that is plenty good enough for the British, which our Treasury for some mysterious reason refuses to use.

Why do you tell your readers, "That this time it (the United States Treasury) has found a handy device for making idle silver hoards useful?" And when did silver become a sterile silver hoard in India?"

It would seem that an influential national publication, such as the Washington Post, has a duty to give its readers the facts.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Prices Paid by Farmers Under Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum on the prices paid by farmers under price control.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRICES PAID BY FARMERS UNDER PRICE CONTROL

Farm prices rose during and after World War No. 1 somewhat more than they have risen in this war and in this war they started from a lower level, yet in 1943 farm income was more than $4,000,000,000 higher than in the peak year 1919. Farm operators' net income nearly tripled between 1939 and 1943. Between 1941 and 1943 it nearly doubled.

A very important factor in this increase of farm income to levels never approached in the last war has been the control over prices which farmers pay. In the last war these prices followed farm prices right up the spiral. This happened because there was no effective control of prices. In this war farm prices have risen nearly as much as in the last war, but the prices farmers pay have been very greatly restrained. On the average, prices paid by farmers rose 94 percent between 1914 and 1919. Between 1939 and 1943 they rose only one-third as much, 31 percent. This has resulted under a system of price control that has been geared to restoring and maintaining balance between farm and nonfarm prices.

COMMODITIES USED IN FARM PRODUCTION

In farm operations, costs are increased by rising prices of machinery, of building materials, of fertilizer, of supplies of all sorts. A program which keeps these prices from rising helps keep farm-operating costs down. Following is a summary of what has happened to these prices in comparison to what happened to them during and after the last war.

Farm machinery

Plows, which rose 80 percent in the last war, are up only 11 percent today. Corn planters are up only 21 percent as compared with 89 percent. Grain binders rose by two-thirds last time and by only 15 percent in this war. Cultivators more than doubled in price and in this war have risen by only a sixth.

Building materials

Prices in this group rose from 2 to 10 times as much in the last war as they have since 1935–39. House paint, which more than doubled in price by 1920, has risen only 11 percent this time. Portland cement went from 84 cents a bag in 1910–14 to $1.42 in 1920. Today it is 76 cents, less than half a cent above pre-war levels. Boards and shingles more than doubled in price during the last war, but are up only 50 percent in the present war.

Fertilizer

A typical commercial fertilizer sold for $25.50 a ton before the last war and in 1918 had risen to $42, a rise of over 60 percent. In this war it has risen from $27.50 to $33.50, or 30 percent, just about half as great a rise.

Supplies

The price of milk cans jumped nearly 150 percent by 1920 as against a rise of 35 percent in this war. Kerosene went from 15 cents to 21 cents a gallon. In this war it has been held stable at 13½ cents. Binder twine much more than doubled in the last war, going from 11 to 26 cents. In this war it has risen only from 9 to 14 cents, or slightly more than 50 percent.

FARM LIVING COSTS

These are examples of the differing movements of prices paid by farmers in this war and in the last for commodities used in farm operations. This difference in price movements has made an important contribution to the increase of net farm income since 1939. But this net income itself goes further than it would have gone if the farmer's cost of living had been permitted to rise as it did in the last war.

Clothing

The farmer's wife knows that in this war clothing costs have risen. This has been a very troublesome sector for price control. Yet in the last war these prices rose even more sharply.

Cotton workshirts, which have risen 90 percent, from 70 cents to $1.33, went up 137 percent in the last war, from 61 cents to $1.45. Cotton socks are up 45 percent. Last time they rose 127 percent.

Wool suits sold for $14.00 in 1910–14 and hit $40 in 1919, a rise of 190 percent. Since 1935–39 they have risen from $20 to $29, an increase of less than 50 percent.

Men's work shoes went from $2.20 to $4.90, a jump of nearly 120 percent. In this war they have risen only about 50 percent, from $2.50 to $3.85. Women's shoes before the last war cost $3 a pair, but hit $8.50 by 1920, a rise of nearly 200 percent. In contrast they have risen in this war from $2.45 to $3.35 or slightly over one-third.

Food

The same contrast shows up in foods. Even though the farm prices of these foods have risen substantially, the retail prices

paid by farmers for foods which they do not raise themselves have been markedly restrained.

Flour, which rose 120 percent in the last war, is up less than half as much today—50 percent.

Despite the interruptions to shipping which have made rationing necessary, both coffee and sugar prices have been kept far below their World War No. 1 levels. Today sugar is 7 cents a pound as against 5½ cents before the war. In 1920 it hit 27 cents a pound, four and one-half times as much as in peacetime.

Coffee jumped from 27 to 49 cents a pound last time. Today it is up to 32 cents from 22 cents, about one-half as great a rise.

THE FARMER'S POSITION UNDER PRICE CONTROL

Price control has so effectively restrained the prices the farmer pays that, despite control of the prices he receives, he is better off today then he was in the last war when there was no price control. It must be emphasized that we are operating under a single price-control system, one that reaches to all prices. The system of control cannot be maintained here and let go there. It is all one piece and embraces farm and nonfarm prices together. If the present balance is to be maintained and the farmer's position is to be protected, the system must continue to work in all its parts.

William Howard Wheat

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM HOWARD WHEAT, late a Representative from the State of Illinois

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I want to record my personal affection for WILLIAM H. WHEAT, late Representative from the State of Illinois. We all liked BILL WHEAT for his poise, his friendly smile, his calm confidence in the right as he saw it. An exchange of experiences with him one day revealed that we had many experiences in common as boys from a parsonage home. He knew and others knew that he was not well for months before his death. He said little about it, however, and was cheerful to the end. He believed in his colleagues and in his country. I think it was because he had a fundamental faith that God is in His heaven keeping watch over all.

Address by the Vice President to Iowa Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD the address delivered by Vice President WALLACE before the Democratic State Convention of Iowa at Des Moines, Iowa, on Saturday, July 29, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your choice of me as permanent chairman is deeply appreciated as a token of respect and affection. It is good to be with old friends to plan for victory on November 7 here in Iowa. The prospects for a Roosevelt victory in the Midwest and especially here in Iowa are brighter than they were 4 years ago. At that time we were not in the war. Now we are, and the most reactionary Republican has reason to be concerned as to what might happen to the war effort if we should lose the skilled leadership of the President. Roosevelt will win next fall in Iowa provided you do your part in getting out the full Democratic vote and provided, furthermore, you conduct the campaign on a high plane which does not alienate Republican voters who otherwise would be with you. This plan of campaign will give several Midwestern States to Roosevelt, but it is not enough to win many congressional seats or many State or county tickets.

To do a real job on this front it will be necessary to make the Democratic Party a vital continuously functioning organization through which farmers, workers, and small-town business and professional men can come to agreement and make their wants known. The Republican Party and its organs of publicity have always tried to separate the farmer and the worker. The Democratic Party can succeed only if it brings the farmer and the worker together on a liberal, constructive platform. Those Democrats who fight such a program are Republicans wearing false faces.

It is important to say a word about my southern friends. The farmers of the Middle West owe a lot to the farmers of the South. We would never have gotten satisfactory agricultural legislation if it had not been for men like Marvin Jones, Senator John Bankhead and Senator Alben Barkley. True, there are certain reactionary leaders, but these men are usually financed directly or indirectly from the North. More and more an intelligent, constructive, liberal leadership will arise in the South which will not owe anything directly or indirectly to Wall Street or to outworn prejudices. CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, and Gov. Elliss Arnall, of Georgia, illustrate what I mean. Watch these men. They are young and have a sense of future trends.

One function of a liberal, constructive Democratic Party is to keep the West and the South united. Another function is to keep the farmer and labor united. In carrying out this second function the Democratic Party in Iowa should preach to the farmers every day in every county seat town in Iowa—"your income from hogs, butter, eggs, and cattle goes up and down precisely with the total pay rolls of labor. The moment labor gets into trouble you get into trouble also. You must have a sympathetic understanding of labor's problems if you are to understand your own. You have never been able and never will get satisfactory agricultural legislation without labor's help."

After saying this, ask if it is not true that the Republicans are more interested in balancing the budget than in preventing unemployment. The Republicans were in charge after the Civil War and after World War No. 1, and on both occasions proceeded on the assumption that depression and unemployment were necessary correctives. The world-wide economic whirlwind unleashed sooner or later after the end of this war will be of such a magnitude as to require vigorous action of a type which the Republicans have never been willing to take.

That segment of the press and radio which is controlled by evil monetary interests continually fans every flame of prejudice which will maintain hatred between the farmer and worker. It is easy to state the fudamental Democratic thesis of unity between the farmer and the worker and contrast it with the Republican thesis of hatred between the farmer and worker. The problem is to do something effective about it. It is not enough to make fire-eating speeches for 3 months once every 4 years. The money behind the Republican press and radio subtly spreads its poison every day. To counteract this we must be on the job forming constructive public opinion. We do not have much money and our avenues of press and radio publicity are, therefore, seriously limited. But we do have manpower, womanpower and the enthusiasm of youth on our side. All that is necessary is to formulate a liberal program for constructive democracy which is so compelling in its appeal to farmers and workers in both the North and South that they will be anxious to give personally of their time and money to building a precinct by precinct and county by county organization with channels of publicity to service the members of the organization. In doing such work we must enlist the services of the forward looking men among the lawyers, the school teachers, the doctors, the bankers and all the other professions. You will find help in the most unexpected places provided your program is based on the full use of all manpower, all resources and all technologies for the purpose of equal opportunity and a higher standard of living for all.

The liberal cause has not been defeated and will not be. It merely is in process of being reborn. I ask you to look up—not down; ahead—not backward. When we battle for full production and equal opportunity we battle for the common man. That cause cannot die no matter what may happen temporarily to certain individuals.

And so for the sake of your boys I ask the members of this convention to work with all the fervor that is in them for a Roosevelt victory in the conviction that only by such a victory can the war be terminated promptly and rightly. A Dewey victory, no matter how estimable Mr. Dewey himself may be personally, will inevitably give hope to the wrong elements in Germany and Japan. A Dewey victory, just as was the case with the Harding victory in 1920, would make difficult the building of a world order characterized by abiding peace. The Republicans betrayed the common man of the United States after the Civil War and after World War No. 1. We shall not let them do it again. We will win with Roosevelt.

The Battle for Rubber Is Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 2, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, one of the greatest American newspapers, citing statistics showing an acquisition of 10,000 tons of crude rubber per month with a reserve stock pile of 100,000 tons still on hand. The editorial follows:

THE BATTLE FOR RUBBER IS WON

There haven't been any victory salvos fired in celebration, but the United States has definitely won the battle for rubber. In

2½ years, the rubber scarcity, once the most critical of our raw material shortages, has been turned into what may develop into an oversupply.

Rubber Director Dewey has reported that the production of synthetic rubber in this country now exceeds the volume of crude rubber consumed in the United States in any year prior to 1941. Production is now running at 70,000 tons a month and increasing steadily. The official estimate for 1944 was 869,000 tons, and if the present rate of monthly increase is maintained the final production total will be closer to 1,000,000 tons.

In addition, about 10,000 tons a month of crude rubber is now being imported, and the Nation still has a reserve stock pile of 100,000 tons of crude rubber. Because of this amazing record, materials originally allotted to the synthetic rubber program have been released to make 100-octane gasoline, and this country is now able to export some synthetic rubber to its allies.

With adequate supplies of rubber on hand, civilians find it hard to understand why tires are still rationed for B and C card holders and not available at all for A card motorists. The bottleneck is in manpower and tire cords, with increased military demands for tires as a complicating factor.

However, the situation is much better now than it was a few months ago. Tire tubes are no longer rationed. There is an ample supply of high-grade camelback for recapping, and rationing allotments have been increased. It is now believed that there will be encugh tires to supply A card holders by early next year.

The total output of tires for this year is now estimated at 19,000,000. This figure is 3,000,000 under the planned production, but in 1942 the total output was but 2,500,000. The pre-war average was approximately 50,000,000.

With the battle of production won, the problem which faces the rubber industry is what disposition shall be made of the synthetic-rubber plants after the war. Undoubtedly there will be pressure brought to bear by the natural-rubber-producing nations to regain their pre-war markets in this country.

But regardless of the economic factors involved in that decision, it is apparent that national defense will dictate the retention of at least a part of the synthetic-rubber industry in this country. Moreover, the war has forced industry to learn to use synthetic rubber profitably and many industrial needs are now better served by synthetics made for specific purposes.

If it can be demonstrated, as now seems probable, that synthetic rubber can be made as cheaply as natural rubber can be produced, the synthetic-rubber industry is here to stay.

This editorial and the statistics quoted bear out the contention that further appropriations for the guayule project are unwarranted.

My Record on Measures Relating to Discrimination Against Negroes

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I think I can say with absolute sincerity and truthfulness that Negroes have had no better friend than I have been during my service in Congress. No Member of the national lawmaking body has been more earnest and constant than I have been in seeking to safeguard the constitutional rights of Negroes, to protect them from discrimination, and to see that they secure the recognition that is due them as members of our civil community and as patriotic defenders of the Nation to which both white and Negroes owe a common allegiance.

FOR ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION

Believing that the crime of lynching is the ugliest blot on civilization and the most heinous of all crimes, I have contributed my very best efforts toward stamping it out. I threw the entire weight of my efforts and influence back of the Gavagan antilynching bill, and on June 17, 1936, Representative Joseph A. Gavagan, the author of that bill, wrote to me as follows:

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for your cooperation in procuring the discharge of the Judiciary Committee on my antilynching bill, H. R. 5. Without your signature to this petition it would not have been possible to discharge the committee, and I wish you to know that I am very grateful. No matter what honors may come to you in the future, I am quite certain that you will look backward to your signature on this petition, seeking justice instead of mob rule, as one of your finest contributions to your country.

Assuring you of my appreciation and esteem, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. GAVAGAN,
Member of Congress,
Twenty-first District, New York.

We passed the Gavagan bill through the House but it failed in the Senate. Believing that if the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with its record of crime detection and prevention, could be brought into service in lynching cases it would act as a powerful deterrent, I introduced the following bill in Congress:

A bill to define the crime of lynching, to prescribe punishment therefor, and to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate the facts in connection with lynchings

Be it enacted, etc. That (a) it shall be unlawful for any person to move or travel from one State into another State for the purpose of aiding or abetting the lynching of any person.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to send by telephone, telegraph, or radio, or through the mails, any communication which urges or invites any person to aid or abet the lynching of any person.

(c) As used in this section, the term "States" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

(d) Violations of this section shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 5 years.

SEC. 2. Whenever a lynching occurs in any State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is authorized and directed to investigate the facts in connection with such lynching to determine whether, in connection with or in the course of such lynching, any crime against the United States has been committed.

While antilynching legislation still remains "unfinished business" in Congress I pledge to devote my best efforts in the future, as in the past, to promote legislation which will deal effectively with lynching and get rid of the antisocial conditions which breed such unspeakable crimes. I repeat now what I said on the floor of the House over 8 years ago on June 20, 1936:

Right is not going to be forever on the scaffold, and wrong is not going to be forever on the throne. Sometime the Congress will take this monstrous evil of lynching in hand and suppress it. I will be happy if I may contribute toward that end.

LETTER FROM WALTER WHITE

Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, wrote to me on January 20, 1941, as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: We have received the copies of your antilynching bill and thank you for sending them. Introduction of this bill is further evidence of your magnificent and consistent interest in the difficulties the Negro is encountering.

Ever sincerely,

WALTER WHITE,
Secretary.

AUTHOR OF AMENDMENT TO PREVENT DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NEGROES IN TRAINING

(In the House of Representatives Monday, September 23, 1940. The House having under consideration H. R. 10539, the first supplemental civil functions bill, 1941)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. LUDLOW: On page 10, after line 18, insert a new paragraph as follows:

" 'No trainee under the foregoing appropriations shall be discriminated against because of sex, race, or color, and where separate schools are required by law for separate population groups, to the extent needed for trainees of each such group, equitable provision shall be made for facilities and training of like quality.' "

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose has the support and, in fact, was initiated by the Federal Security Agency, and has approval of the Council of National Defense and of the Budget Bureau. It would provide in respect of the trainees who are to be recruited under these two activities, the Office of Education and the National Youth Administration, the same freedom from discrimination that is contained in the conscription law. If this provision is not inserted in the present law you will have one provision with reference to the draftees under the conscription law and a lack of the same provision in its application to the training under this act.

I think the proposed amendment speaks for itself. As I say, it has the backing of the Federal Security Administration, and it also has the support and approval of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense, which finds it to be in harmony with its labor policy; and of the Budget Bureau, which finds it to be in harmony with the program of the President. It injects no new policies into the administration of our laws but merely makes this act in respect of training conform to the policy already determined upon by Congress in respect to conscriptees under the new Conscription Act. I respectfully ask the committee to adopt the amendment.

I am happy to offer this amendment because it gives to the colored people of our country an assurance that there will be no discrimination against them in training for national defense. In every war in which our country has engaged Negroes have responded to the call of our country and have demonstrated their loyalty and devotion in every way. Now that our beloved country is face to face with another emergency, they are manifesting the

same spirit of patriotism that has guided them in former crises of our national history, and the amendment I have offered would remove racial barriers and guarantee their right to serve. [Applause.]

The amendment was agreed to.

FOR FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

(In the House of Representatives, Friday, May 26, 1944)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, on the whole, the evidence that has come to me through our committee hearings and from all other directions convinces me that the Fair Employment Practice Committee is doing an outstanding job in promoting national unity, in improving and sustaining the morale of the tenth or more of our people who comprise the minority groups, and in opening up reserves of manpower so much needed to win the war that would otherwise have remained untapped. Sincerely believing, as I do, that the Committee on Fair Employment Practice is a vital war agency, I hope that the amendment striking it down will not be adopted and that it will be implemented with the funds carried in this bill, which are the minimum to enable it to carry on its work.

LETTER FROM MALCOLM ROSS, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON
FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1944.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: I cannot tell you how much I appreciate the kind words about F. E. P. C. which you inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I confess to a large degree of institutional pride about F. E. P. C. I know that we intend to fight hard for the principles set down in our Executive order, but not to go beyond the duties laid upon us. With so much careless talk about the Committee's activities, a forthright expression of appreciation such as yours comes like a breath of fresh air, and I want to assure you that it was greatly appreciated.

I hope, when you return to Washington, that you will spare me some time to chat about this whole problem of minority rights in employment, for I know that your attitude toward it and your wisdom in tackling such problems could be of inestimable value to us.

Cordially yours,

MALCOLM ROSS,
Chairman.

FOR NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION TRAINING PROGRAM

(In the House of Representatives, Monday, June 28, 1943)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in a short time Congress will determine the fate of the National Youth Administration. It will determine whether or not that Administration during the fiscal year 1944 shall train approximately 600,000 youths in industrial pursuits and thus make them effective contributors to our national war economy and useful and efficient members of society. I hope that Congress will say to the National Youth Administration: "You may continue your training program. You are doing a good work."

To the extent that I have a voice and influence, I am exercising the same in behalf of a continuation of the N. Y. A. training program.

I say this notwithstanding there is no one in Congress, I believe, who has a greater desire than I have to see that economy in government is effected and that in every possible instance duplication and overlapping are eliminated. It has been argued that since there are half a dozen agencies in the field of vocational training, the National Youth Administration might well be abolished and the trainees taken over under other agencies, but I find on very thorough investigation that there are two sound arguments against that proposal. One is that the N. Y. A. training program is a going program that is proceeding at full speed in turning out efficient trainees and constantly infiltrating them into plants all over the country where they are vitally needed and to disrupt that program now would slow up the war effort and do much harm. The other argument in favor of continuing the N. Y. A. training program is that there is no other program just like it. It enters into a different field and taps a potential source of timber for skilled manpower and womanpower that is not reached by any other training agency. I find that while it embraces persons of all races within the scope of its activities it is in many instances the only agency through which Negroes can obtain the technical and vocational training which they desire and to which they are entitled.

If the National Youth Administration training program is to be saved, it must be saved now. The situation requires immediate action. The bill is now pending in the Senate and will be voted on soon. I have had several conferences with the junior Senator from New York, in charge of the bill, and he tells me the vote will be very close. I take this occasion to suggest to Members of the House that you do not depend on letters, or even on the telephone, but that you go in person to the other end of the Capitol and see the Senators from your States and urge them to support the bill to continue the National Youth Administration's training program.

FOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES

(In the House of Representatives, Wednesday, March 8, 1944)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, child delinquency has reached a peak never before realized nor dreamed of in this country. It has reached the all-time high. In its early stages the rapid growth of child delinquency created amazement and now it has become frightening.

All of us are voting without hesitation and without stint the billions to win the war so as to make civilization safe and secure in the ages to come. While we are doing that I think it is altogether right and proper that we should vote a few millions to cure instead of to kill. We are the guardians of posterity and we have a responsibility to see that the children of America do not suffer spiritual blight and decadence as a result of conditions which it is within our power to remedy.

We will be very derelict in duty if in the face of mounting juvenile crime which already has passed all known bounds we destroy the child-care projects of the community-facilities program by withdrawing the means necessary to enable them to carry them on. We could do no greater disservice to our children who will be our leaders of tomorrow and who need to be strong and reliant to cope with the momentous problems of posterity.

The appropriation of $127,500,000 carried in this bill for community facilities is not as much, in my opinion, as might wisely and judiciously be spent in providing the facilities on which the welfare of the Nation so much depends, but it will cover existing commitments and will provide $18,194,000 of new money to meet contingencies that will arise. The Budget estimate was $150,000,000, and we had definite assurance that if we granted that amount it would close the books and the agency would not return for more money. I voted in committee for the appropriation of the full Budget estimate, which would consume the balance of the authorization of $500,000,000. No one wants to see appropriations cut more than I do, but I do not want to cut them at the expense of our children.

FOR REPEAL OF POLL TAX

Mr. Speaker, by my voice and my votes I have done everything I possibly could to bring about the repeal of the iniquitous poll tax. It is unthinkable to me that our men who are fighting and dying on the battle fronts to preserve our free institutions should be denied the freedom of voting for candidates of their choice to manage those institutions.

LETTER TO REVEREND RICHARDS IN RE POLL TAX

APRIL 15, 1944.

Rev. S. C. RICHARDS,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR REVEREND RICHARDS: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 12 expressing your views in regard to the anti-poll-tax bill.

I have supported from the beginning the bill to repeal the obnoxious poll tax, wherever that tax is imposed. The measure passed the House on May 25, 1943, and was referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. That committee reported it to the Senate on November 12, 1943, and it now is on the Senate calendar.

I supported the bill and voted for it in the House and will continue my efforts until it becomes law. It seems to me a ridiculous travesty and miscarriage of justice when our boys who are offering their lives on the battle fronts for the perpetuation of freedom are denied in many instances one of the most precious of all freedoms—the freedom of casting their ballots for the men of their choice in uncontrolled elections.

I will continue to fight for that freedom as long as I have anything to fight with.

Thanking you for your views, and assuring you of my sympathetic interest,

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

LETTER PROTESTING DISCRIMINATION IN ASSIGNING NEGROES TO COMBAT SERVICE

MARCH 20, 1944.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am receiving inquiries from Negro constituents and from representative Negroes throughout the country indicating a good deal of anxiety over reports that Negroes are not being given a fair show in fighting the battles of our country. It is felt that this is especially to be deplored in view of the fact that Negroes have acquitted themselves with honor and credit in every war in which our country has engaged. Specifically, there is an undercurrent of dissatisfaction based on reports that Negroes are being preponderantly assigned to service the Army and are being deprived of the opportunity which every true soldier covets to engage in combat.

If there is no basis for these reports, I think it would be reassuring if I could so inform our colored people, and whatever the facts may be I think our colored friends, whose patriotism cannot be challenged, are entitled to have the facts.

It is in the hope, therefore, of allaying dissatisfaction, which certainly bodes no good, that I respectfully ask you to advise me on the following points:

1. How many Negroes and how many whites are there in the total military forces?
2. How many Negroes are assigned to service the Army?
3. How many Negroes are assigned to combat duty?
4. How many Negro units are engaged in combat and what are they?
5. How many Negro units are assigned to service duties and what are they?
6. Is it contemplated that additional Negro units are to be placed in combat, and if so, what are the units that are to be so assigned?

7. Finally, from your comprehensive overall knowledge of the military service, what in your opinion are the facts as to whether or not there is discrimination against Negroes in the service, and is it your intention in your position of high responsibility to see that such discrimination is not permitted to exist in the future?

If you can see your way clear to send me a reply covering the above points it will be helpful, I hope, in resolving doubts which must inevitably be injurious to morale.

With kind regards.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Address by Hon. David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts, Seconding the Nomination of Hon. Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky, for Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the speech delivered by me at the Democratic National Convention at Chicago, July 21, 1944, seconding the nomination of Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, as the Democratic candidate for Vice President.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, every delegate to this convention can agree upon the essential qualifications that the Democratic candidate for Vice President should possess. Second only to the Presidency itself, in this time of gravest crisis, this office assumes the utmost importance.

The man who occupies it must stand out from his fellow men in ability, experience, and those qualities of heart and mind that mark the exceptional and successful public leader.

Moreover, the nominee in addition to being liberal, humane, and forward looking, must be courageous enough to stand with conviction and determination for those principles and policies demanded by the times and the advance of our social and economic institutions.

He must be tolerant and just in his viewpoints, sound in his judgments and ever zealous to protect the rights of even the humblest of our citizens against encroachment and discrimination. Above all, he must be rigid and unyielding in his devotion to the American form of Government and the American way of life.

He must be a believer in free enterprise and unfettered opportunities for every group and individual in the Nation, regardless of class, race, creed, or station in life.

That the man whose nomination I proudly advocate is possessed of these basic qualities to a superlative degree no true American can challenge.

But more than that—if I may be permitted to strike a personal note and refer to my long association with him in the United States Senate—he is a man of nobility of purpose, gentility of spirit, and sincerity of conviction.

As the majority leader of our party in the Senate he commands the respect, the esteem, the confidence, and affection of every Senator, regardless of party affiliations.

His amiable personal qualities, his devotion to duty, his burning patriotism, his breadth of vision and tolerance of those who disagree with him have given him a rare position among his colleagues and fellow partisans.

A clear and sound thinker, a gifted speaker, a militant champion of any cause which commands his allegiance, he has never failed to demonstrate and exemplify the highest kind of statesmanship.

If the Democratic Party seeks a nominee for this office who has served his party and his country in the Halls of Congress and on every platform and in every forum in every section of the country and who has furnished sound, inspiring leadership in the party councils for over a quarter of a century, the man I am here to endorse meets that requirement beyond all question or doubt.

If our party seeks a nominee who is of democratic spirit, is approachable to every party worker, who has striven and sacrificed in the advocacy of democratic principles, he is ready to answer your call.

If our party seeks a broad minded, tolerant leader, one who recognizes that in this period when tremendously important and epoch-making decisions must be made, there are bound to be honest and conscientious differences of opinion even in our own party, and who respects the sincerity of those who differ with him, we have one who responds to that acid test of wise effective leadership. Such a man—and I emphasize the importance of these qualities if harmony and wise council are to continue in the Democratic Party—is available.

He has demonstrated these qualities again and again in his brilliant leadership in the Senate where he has maintained a unity of opinion and a spirit of understanding that has made possible the great legislative record, that we as a party have recited from this platform and are now submitting to the American public.

If we seek a candidate who is a tireless and unmatched debater with poise and calmness in the midst of contention, with freedom from sectionalism and with fairness and tolerance toward those who differ with him, one who has won for himself not only the loyalty and esteem of his colleagues but the admiration of all Americans, regardless of party, such leadership we can command.

I do not hesitate to say that his alert and versatile mentality, and his strong devotion to the toilers, the underprivileged, to the unfortunate and to the veterans and the dependents of all wars, have led him to make for himself and his party a legislative record which, for true liberalism and unflinching attachment to Democratic ideals, is unmatched by that of any statesman of our generation.

No man in all America, by reason of his long experience, his study and knowledge of public questions, possesses a surer and sounder grasp of the stupendous problem of this hour. He is, in my opinion, superbly fitted, certainly as abundantly as any other member of our party, for the office of Vice President, yes, for the Presidency itself.

If the estimate I have given you of this great leader appears fulsome and exaggerated, I merely ask that you turn to your United States Senators and Congressmen who know his sterling worth. Those who have labored with him and know him best will bear out every assertion I have made concerning his character, ability and fidelity to his country and party.

Mr. Chairman and delegates, it is my high privilege to urge my fellow Democrats, assembled here in this convention to support as your nominee for Vice President, a tested, experienced and faithful leader, a militant American whose record of 31 years of honorable, useful, and patriotic service has made his party and his country his debtor, and his availability for highest public office within your gift unquestioned and unexcelled. Such a man is Senator BARKLEY of Kentucky whose nomination I am honored to second.

The Thirty-third Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "The Thirty-third Senator," by McNaughton, which appeared in the Pekin Daily Times of Pekin, Ill., on July 27, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THIRTY-THIRD SENATOR

(By McNaughton)

Today's most important job is making sure that World War No. 3 does not happen.

The decision is up to America.

America's decision is up to the United States Senate.

The Senate's decision can be hamstrung by the thirty-third Senator—the one more than a third.

Sixty-three Senators may be for peace, but it takes two-thirds (64) to pass a treaty and if 33 Senators (32 who are a third, and the thirty-third) are against peace, there will be a World War No. 3.

Richard J. Lyons, the Chicago Tribune candidate for United States Senator, might be that thirty-third Senator. He is wishy-washy on peace.

Every Illinoisan knows that Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS is all out, 100 percent, unqualifiedly and unwaveringly for world peace.

Because of this the Times expects to reason with its Republican readers; and in the name of their sons who have died, or of those sons for whom they have present desperate fears, the Times expects to ask Republicans this year to put the fate of the world above politics, and vote this fall for SCOTT W. LUCAS.

Editorials presenting the reasons for this plea will appear in later issues.

Missouri Citizens Object to Enactment of Any Prohibition Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, am

listing, by request, 26 numerously signed petitions against prohibition transmitted to me by Mr. A. J. Immell, of Washington, Mo., which I am filing with the Committee on the Judiciary:

WASHINGTON, MO., *June 20, 1944.*

Mr. CLARENCE CANNON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CANNON: I am enclosing herewith petitions signed by approximately 660 citizens of Franklin, Gasconade, Warren, Osage, and Montgomery Counties protesting against any form of prohibition legislation.

I respectfully request of you that you insert these petitions, or as much of them as is permitted, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,

A. J. IMMELL.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Missouri, by this petition voice our objections to any prohibition legislation; we don't want any more prohibition with all of its attendant evils.

Sponsor: Gosen and Mayer, Rhineland, Mo., March 14, 1944.

Otto Mayel, Rhineland, farmer; Frank Peters, Rhineland, farmer; John Scholten, Rhineland, farmer; A. F. Smith, Rhineland, farmer; Arthur Basman, Rhineland, farmer; M. B. Dowling, McKittrick; R. F. Ploeger, Rhineland, plumber; Ben H. Van Booven, Rhineland, laborer; G. H. Bezold, Rhineland, farmer; Wilbert Hoffman, Rhineland, farmer; C. W. Miller, Hermann, farmer; G. R. Theissen, Rhineland, laborer; R. W. Kruse, Rhineland, laborer; V. Eldringdorff, St. Louis, laborer; Ernest Groteniel, Rhineland, farmer; Wm. Bucker, Rhineland, farmer; Ernest Pottebaum, McKittrick, farmer; Gerhard Bruckerhoff, Rhineland, farmer; Frank B. Pottebaum, Rhineland; H. B. Pottebaum, McKittrick, farmer; Henry J. Pottebaum, McKittrick, laborer; J. H. Lohman, Rhineland; Walter Kolks, Rhineland, trucking; Fred W. Hagedon, Rhineland, fencer; Rudolph T. Winkelmann, Rhineland; Albert Van Booven, Rhineland, farmer; James Van Booven, Rhineland, farmer; George B. Bucker, Rhineland, laborer; Henry Overkamp, Rhineland, farmer; A. J. Fehlings, Rhineland, Mo.; Silvan Heying, Rhineland, farmer; H. J. Bucker, Rhineland, manager; Adolph Eldinghoff, Rhineland, farmer; T. M. Heying, Rhineland, farmer; E. H. Scholten, Rhineland, merchant; Harvey Finders, Bluffton, farmer; Carl Van Booven, Rhineland, farmer; Aloys Elsimaat, Rhineland, farmer; Clem Koenig, Rhineland, blacksmith (beer needed); Geo. Gosen, Rhineland, farmer (beer needed); August Wittman, Rhineland, carpenter; Philip Bruckerhoff, Rhineland, farmer; Aonton Bruckerhoff, Rhineland, railroader; O. A. Vogelsang, Rhineland, commercial fishing; O. W. Peters, Rhineland, laborer.

PETITION

We, the undersigned Missourians, believe that the present persistent efforts of professional prohibitionists to cause Congress to enact prohibition legislation are manifestly unfair because so many of our men are in uniform and overseas in the defense of this Nation of ours and are therefore either unaware of what is being attempted in their absence or are incapable of being heard.

Sponsor: Robert H. Vemmer, New Haven, Mo., March 21, 1944.

Louis G. Harms, Joe F. Taber, M. L. Fertig, Alfred Guick, Paul Hahn, Paul H. Mann, Harry Hostkoetter, Edmund A. Lefmann, New Haven, Mo.; Roscoe W. Hoemann, Berger, Mo.; Chas. F. Muench, Sam Shelton, Clarence Von Behren, Alonzo Kaiser, New Haven, Mo.; Paul W. Meyer, R. F. D. No. 2, Berger, Mo.; R. E. McDonald, J. F. Hamilton, Oscar C. Reck, Harold R. Johnson, Jr., Karl L. Jungs, Elmer Guese, Fred A. Backes, Wm. Willer, Frances Luecke, Ferd Jones, H. W. Blom, John E. Shelton, Lloyd Sweezer, Geo. E. Hale, New Haven, Mo.; Robert L. Reynolds, St. Louis, Mo.; O. O. Thomas, New Haven, Mo.; Virgil Pihle, Berger, Mo.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Missouri, by this petition voice our objections to any prohibition legislation. We don't want any more prohibition with all of its attendant evils.

Sponsor: H. A. Neumann, Herman, March 21, 1944.

W. A. Havelka, Owensville, farmer; G. S. Scharnhorst, Herman, shoe worker; Louis Witte, Bay, farmer; N. E. Smith, Chamois, signalman; Wm. Suppenbach, Chamois, section foreman; Roy Lutz, Berger, watchman; Milton A. Wohlt, Herman, shoe worker; Paline G. Long, W. L. Crawford, Montgomery City; A. C. Loehnig, John Whitman, Herman; Jack Mitchell, Montgomery City; Harry Eberlin, Herman, clerk; Emil Schwenther, Herman, shoe worker; Isidore Winkelmann, Herman, shoe worker; Roy F. Ploeger, Rhineland, plumber.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

Making use of the right of petition secured to us by our Bill of Rights, we earnestly petition you not to favorably consider any type or kind of prohibition legislation that may now be or may hereafter be pending in Congress. Your efforts against any such legislation will in our judgment be a distinct contribution to our country's welfare.

Sponsored by H. A. Neumann, Hermann, March 29, 1944.

Alvin J. Berence, Hermann, shoemaker Wilfred Jerger, Hermann, carpenter; Wayne Dufner, Hermann, cheesemaker; Oliver Klossner, Swiss, miner; George S. Scharnhorst, Hermann, shoe worker; Walter Claus, Hermann, farmer; W. A. Havelka, Owensville, farmer; Louis Witte, Bay, farmer; Milton A. Wohlt, Hermann, shoe worker; Pauline G. Gavey, Montgomery City; W. L. Crawford, Montgomery City; John Whitman, Hermann; A. C. Loehing, Hermann; Jim Mitchel, Montgomery; Harry Eberlin, Hermann, clerk; Emil Schwenther, Hermann, shoe worker; Isidore Winkelmann, Hermann, shoe worker; Roy F. Plorger, Rhineland, plumber; H. F. Schlimeier; F. C. Hant.

PETITION

We the undersigned Missourians believe that the present persistent efforts of professional prohibitionists to cause Congress to enact prohibition legislation are manifestly unfair because so many of our men are in uniform and overseas in the defense of this Nation of ours and are therefore either unaware of what is being attempted in their absence or are incapable of being heard.

Sponsor: Kanstien Holman, Beaufort, March 17, 1944.

L. Kurse, Beaufort, farmer; H. A. Freadrick, Beaufort, farmer; L. H. Kanstrum, Beaufort, merchant; Otto Schomberg, Beaufort, farmer; W. T. Hoeman, Beaufort, merchant; Fritz J. Hoerath, Beaufort, laborer; August Sprick, New Haven, farmer; Otto Schroeder, Leslie, farmer; Herman Wildhabe, Beaufort, farmer; Homer Fink, Beaufort, Route 1, farmer; Charles Riley, Beaufort, farmer, Harry Stromyhoenee, New Haven, farmer; Elmer A. Balte, Beaufort, mechanic.

PETITION

We the undersigned Missourians believe that the present persistent efforts of professional prohibitionists to cause Congress to enact prohibition legislation are manifestly unfair because so many of our men are in uniform and overseas in the defense of this Nation of ours and are therefore either unaware of what is being attempted in their absence or are incapable of being heard.

Sponsor: George Scherer, Leslie, Mo.

George Scherer, Leslie, merchant; Louis Hohenstreet, Leslie, farmer; Henry Julius, Leslie, farmer; William Hohenstreet, Leslie, farmer; D. H. Grob, Leslie, blacksmith; Edward Knihaus, Leslie; Vincent H. Kahn, United States Maritime Service; W. L. Lindemeyer, Leslie, farmer; Elwood E. Grob, Leslie, laborer; Aubrey Roehrs, Leslie, laborer; Louis Fritzmeyer, Jr., Leslie, Martin Scherer, Leslie, factory; William J. Bartels, Union, salesman; Fred Rosendahl, Leslie, farmer; Elmer Knihaus, Leslie, farmer; Calvin Greife, Leslie, farmer; Clarence Bleckman, Leslie, farmer; Thomas A. Atwell, Rolla, salesman; Miles J. Goodwin, Chesterfield; Charles Butler, Leslie; John Shuey; Arthur Creason, Leslie, farmer; Dorothy Creason, Leslie; F. C. Rumbuhl, Leslie, poultry farmer; Roy L. Wade, Leslie, truck driver; Walter Timme, Leslie, farmer; Fred H. Schmidt, Leslie, farmer; Otis Fortner, Leslie, laborer; Carl Claas, Leslie, farmer; Fred Trentman, Leslie, farmer; A. Rumbuhle, Leslie; Theo McWilliams, Leslie; Elmer Ware, Leslie, farmer; Luck Lovel, Union; Mrs. John Wright, Leslie, housewife; S. W. Arnold, Leslie, farmer; Stanley F. Halter; Oscar F. Birkmann, Leslie; Thomas T. Painter, laborer; Otto Heidbrink, Leslie, farmer; Vernon H. Hohenstreet, Leslie, farmer; Mrs. F. A. Rumbehl, Leslie, housewife; Robert Roehr, Leslie; Louis Fritzemeyer, Jr., and Vincent Kehoe.

PETITION

We the undersigned Missourians believe that the present persistent efforts of professional prohibitionists to cause Congress to enact prohibition legislation are manifestly unfair because so many of our men are in uniform and overseas in the defense of this Nation of ours and are therefore either unaware of what is being attempted in their absence or are incapable of being heard.

Sponsor: F. W. Sickendick, Gerald.

J. K. Mills, Bonne Terre, salesman; J. B. Holliday, Rosebud, farmer; C. H. Kohnig, Gerald, banker; Dan Wilson, Gerald; W. H. Vossbrinck, Gerald, box 68; Albert J. Rothemeyer, Owensville; Julius Bucky, Gerald; F. E. Koelling, Sullivan, Route No. 1; Arthur Koelling, Sullivan; Alva Joers, Gerald; Gilbert Hoeppner, Rosebud; Fred Hoeppner, Rosebud; O. H. Meyer, Gerald; Alfred Sickendick, Gerald, farmer; Leo Raaf, Gerald; Jack Rosenthal, Herman Raaf, R. M. Dider, Clifford F. Slingwein, Gerald, Route No. 1; John Slingwein, Gerald, Route No. 1; W. K. Gruenewald, Gerald, Route No. 1; Otto H. Knehaus, Gerald, farmer; Eugene Julius, Gerald, farmer; A. H. Raaf, Gerald; Wm. Vosbirk, Jr., Gerald; Otto Davy, Gerald; B. H. House, Harold H. Rousset, Gerald; Edward H. Bechman, Gerald; Harne F. Farrell, Gerald, shoe worker; L. A. Giebler, Leslie, farmer.

PETITION

We, the undersigned Missourians, believe that the present persistent efforts of professional prohibitionists to cause Congress to enact prohibition legislation are manifestly unfair because so many of our men are in uniform and overseas in the defense of this

Nation of ours and are therefore either unaware of what is being attempted in their absence or are incapable of being heard.

Sponsor: L. J. Immell, Gerald, March 14, 1944.

Kermit Nolting, Gerald, farming; M. R. Shepherd, Sullivan, mining; August Scherelt, Gerald, farming; Raymond Johanning, Leslie, farming; Freddy Vogt, Gerald, farming; David Steineker, Gerald, farming; Melvin Hartman, Owensville, factory; John Shockly, Owensville, factory; Edgar Klemme, Gerald, Navy; Milfen John Ehlers, clerk; Henry Vogt, Gerald, clay mining; Chas. L. Bartel, Jr., Gerald, trucker; Wm. S. Chaferkocter, Owensville; Elmer Fitzwater, Gerald, Rock Island section foreman; John Turley, Gerald, station attendant; Robert Danz, Leslie, farmer; Oscar Holtgrewe, Gerald, farmer; A. W. Ficke, Gerald, carpenter; M. J. Otto, Gerald, farmer; A. L. Myers, Gerald, truck driver; Maynard Farrell, Gerald, farmer; Edgar Mearl Vaughn, Gerald, fitter; Ralph Kleager, Cuba, farmer; Herbert Heidmann, Gerald, farmer; Mrs. Herbert Heidmann, Gerald, housewife; D. D. Haig, St. Louis, salesman; Daryl Chandler, Hermann, clay mining; Oscar Hoemann, Leslie, farmer; Edw. T. Crowder, Rosebud, farmer; S. A. Dickinson, Gerald, farmer; Theodore Steanghaens; Milton D. Blackwell, Gerald, farmer; Alvia A. Grob, Gerald, farmer.

PETITION

We, the undersigned Missourians, believe that the present persistent efforts of professional prohibitionists to cause Congress to enact prohibition legislation are manifestly unfair because so many of our men are in uniform and overseas in the defense of this Nation of ours and are therefore either unaware of what is being attempted in their absence or are incapable of being heard.

Sponsor: Howard B. Garlock, Gerald, Mo., March 9, 1944.

Roma Shepherd, Sullivan, contract hauler; F. W. Fisher, Rosebud, farming; R. G. Nelson, Cuba, farming; Kenneth White, Owensville, factory; Fred H. Wiese, Gerald, retired; A. W. Boston, Gerald, farmer; L. F. Klemegh, Gerald, farmer; L. Fritzmeyer, Leslie, trucker; F. W. Kreft, Gerald; John Wilson, Gerald, farmer; Howard Kreft, Gerald, farmer; Oscar H. Frolker, Owensville, farmer; Robert Frolker, Owensville, farmer; Ed. W. Gerken, Gerald, farmer; Hadley Butler, Leslie, farmer; Otto Brader, Gerald, farmer; Mrs. E. H. Blackwell, Gerald, housewife; John Cowan, Gerald, farmer; Oral Fisher, Gerald, clay labor; Noel Read, Cuba, phono. operator; Ralph Hankins, Cuba, phono. operator; Delmar Graham, Gerald, miner; Ronald Paul Banor, Gerald, student; Marvin Shaw, Gerald, railroader; W. T. Winkle, Gerald, farmer; Joe J. Fisher, Gerald, section labor; Vernon Haynes, Stover, railroad cross tie inspector; E. Meyer, Gerald, merchant; Thomas Schmidt, Gerald, physician; Roy Flottman, Gerald, farmer; John M. Smith, Gerald, farmer.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

Making use of the right of petition secured to us by our Bill of Rights, we earnestly petition you not to favorably consider any type or kind of prohibition legislation that may now or may hereafter be pending in Congress. Your efforts against any such legislation will, in our judgment, be a distinct contribution to our country's welfare.

Sponsored by Howard B. Garlock, Gerald, March 10, 1944.

John G. Troutwein, Gerald, postmaster; Albert Birkmichen, Rosebud, farmer; Flynn E. Story, Gerald, farmer; O. H. Hildebrandt, Gerald, painter; E. Forrest Picke, Gerald, farmer; Leslie Jett, Owensville, leather cutter; Lester Adams, Rosebud, mechanic; Merit Koelling, Leslie, farmer; Gilbert Weiskopf, Gerald, farmer; Dayton Stewart, Gerald, chick sexer; Erwin Blackwell, Gerald, farmer; George Bartel, Sullivan, blacksmith; Junior Bartel, Sullivan, laborer; J. W. Hackman, Gerald, section laborer; J. W. Brandt, Rosebud, farmer; Clinton Brandt, Rosebud, farmer; Raymond Fegeler, Gerald, farmer; Harne R. Farrell, Gerald, shoe worker; Edward H. Backman, Yukon, shoe worker; Alfred Hilkenbaussier, tractor man; W. H. Holt, Gerald, farmer; Grayson Holt, Gerald, farmer; Claude Gardner, Leslie, farmer; Emil Landwehr, Leslie, farmer; Emil Bartel, Gerald, farmer; Alfred F. Brauks, Gerald, farmer; William McNard, Gerald, farmer; Frank Schneideskump, Union, salesman; Arthur Kamper, Gerald, farmer; Hurl Carroll, Owensville, miner; Arthur Cutler, Leslie, dairyman; Benj. H. Knehaus, Leslie, farmer.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

Making use of the right of petition secured to us by our Bill of Rights, we earnestly petition you not to favorably consider any type or kind of prohibition legislation that may now be or may hereafter be pending in Congress. Your efforts against any such legislation will in our judgment be a distinct contribution to our country's welfare.

Sponsored by Harry Henneke, Owensville, Mo., March 9, 1944.

Gerard W. Knehaus, Owensville, clay miner; Edward Wittrock, Owensville; Hufen Enke, Owensville, R. F. D. 3; John Rohifing, Owensville; Ellsworth Terry, Owensville; Raymond Molsheim, Owensville; Ralph Cowan, Owensville; Emery Bronson, Owensville; Walter Schaeffernotter, Owensville; Wm. F. Juedemann, Owensville; John H. Bivens, Cuba, R. 1; Marshall Hibler, Owensville; Peter P. Fisher, Owensville; C. M. Shockley, Owensville; August H. Diestelkamp, Owensville; Walter Buchholz, Owensville; Robert Sebaren, Owensville; Leonard Brown, Owensville; Orel A. Scoutlin, Owensville; Henry Kosff, Owensville; J. A. Teth, Bland; H. Buchholz, Owensville; Clyde Duncan, Owensville; Benjamin H. Kunelmeyer, Owensville; Louis Rushaupir, Bland; Ed. Nolte, Owensville; George Brown, Owensville; J. I. Moore, Owensville; L. G. Bennett, Owensville; Chas. Schoen, Owensville; G. E. Nessen, Owensville.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

Making use of the right of petition secured to us by our Bill of Rights, we earnestly petition you not to favorably consider any type or kind of prohibition legislation that may now be or may hereafter be pending in Congress. Your efforts against any such legislation will in our judgment be a distinct contribution to our country's welfare.

Sponsored by W. A. Landwehr, Owensville, Mo.

Kenneth Decker, Laura Ganer, Carl Roskavaske, W. R. Wanure, James A. Holt, Edwin D. Decker, Geo. Landwehr, Alfred W. Schalk, Owensville, Mo.; N. C. Buchholz, Owensville, Mo., truck driver; Harry W. Lagemann, Jack Hinton, Frank Busen, James K. Morris, Fred E. Pohlmann, Hy W. Ruskaup, Stanley Pialczyk, Edw. Kramme, Wm. H. Uffinan, C. B. Biles, T. G. Rousset, J. T. Moore, C. H. Shactsly, Elmer Benton, Eldo Mitchell, Forrest W. Lichte, Joseph Riefer, Roy Biles, Owensville, Mo.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

The undersigned petitioners of Missouri protest against the consideration of any type of prohibition legislation until the conclusion of the present war and the termination of demobilization. We further respectfully request that this petition be referred to the proper committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sponsored by Clay Wofford, Belle.

R. E. Terrill, Belle, county judge; Roy M. Hart, Vichy, farmer; Paul H. Lehnhoff, Belle, factory; L. O. Seymore, Belle, construction worker; W. F. Schweer, St. Louis, guard; F. F. Hassler, Belle, Route No. 1; Tom West, Belle, carpenter; Ira Smith, Belle, farmer; Steele R. Miller, Belle; Hugh M. Roberts, Rural Free Delivery No. 3, Bland; Charley Crider, Belle, farmer; Thomas C. Kolb, Belle, mechanic; John W. Terrill, attorney at law, Belle; Hy J. Aufder Heide, truck helper, Belle; Herbert Decker, laborer, Belle; Everett Crider, truck driver, Belle; Everett Seymore, laborer, Belle; Emmett Hicks, farmer, Belle; Edward Bollman, truck driver, Belle; W. B. Simpson, farmer, Belle; J. Edgar Jones, farmer and trader; E. L. McKinney, Belle, farmer; W. A. West, Belle, farming; Fred Basham, Belle, factory worker; W. E. Leffler, Belle, tie and timber business; F. A. Miller, St. Louis, locomotive engineer; J. W. Elston, trader, Belle; Ray Dowler; Willie J. Elrod, Belle, laborer; Cellus Berry, Belle, farming.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

Making use of the right of petition secured to us by our Bill of Rights, we earnestly petition you not to favorably consider any type or kind of prohibition legislation that may now be or may hereafter be pending in Congress. Your efforts against any such legislation will in our judgment be a distinct contribution to our country's welfare.

Sponsored by Harry Henneke, Owensville, Mo., March 9, 1944.

Aug. H. Walker, Owensville, farmer; Emmet Estes, Owensville, truck driver; Theodore G. Rousset, Owensville, mining; E. W. Rousset, Owensville, mining; Joe Hauska, Owensville; Milton Williams, Owensville, mechanic; H. F. Langenberg, Owensville, mechanic; Otto F. Henneke, Owensville, farmer; Walter Racherbaumay, Owensville; Albert Haddex, Owensville, farmer; Victor Helling, Owensville, shoelaster; James Biles, Owensville, carpenter; John Wilcheck, Owensville; Virgil Waters, Owensville; H. R. Farrell, Gerald; Oscar Graff, Owensville; Harvey Kohmann, Owensville; George Dittman, Owensville, shoeworker; Sam Rayburn, Owensville; Kenneth Rayburn, Owensville; Sam Reyburn, Jr., Owensville; Raymond White, Owensville; Louis Bronson, Owensville; G. B. Sandy, Owensville; Virgil Stockton, Bland; Raymond Fitzgerald, Bland; Frank Dittman, Bland; Gus Dittman, Bland; B. F. Brandhorst, Owensville; R. A. Aytes, Bland; Edwin Mohesby, Owensville.

PETITION

We the undersigned Missourians believe that the present persistent efforts of professional prohibitionists to cause Congress to enact prohibition legislation are manifestly unfair because so many of our men are in uniform and overseas in the defense of this Nation of ours and are therefore either unaware of what is being attempted in their absence or are incapable of being heard.

Sponsor: Breikmann Bros., Beaufort, March 9, 1944.

Stanley O. Greife, Leslie; Frank W. Wildhaber, William Brueggemans, Beaufort; Ray J. Benemmer, Randolph

Weirich, Louis Fritzmeyer, Leslie; Howard Kreft, Gerald; Frank Klocke, Keith Matthews, Bob Bochert, Harold Meyer, Walter Stuene, Chas. H. Meyer, Willard Puls, Paul Schmitt, Beaufort; Ralph Deppermann, Beaufort, farming; Albert Leach, Charles Lewis, Union; Oliver A. F. Voght, New Haven; Edward Stuesse, David Wildhaber, John Scholz, Beaufort; Elmer Meyer, Leslie; Alvin Koppelmann, Walter Wildhaber, Beaufort; George Neier, Leslie; Chester Dierking, Edward Schmuke, Harold Honold, Albert Tessmer, Hy. C. Mueller, Beaufort; Roy Riley, Beaufort, farming.

PETITION

We, the undersigned Missourians, believe that the present persistent efforts of professional prohibitionists to cause Congress to enact prohibition legislation are manifestly unfair because so many of our men are in uniform and overseas in the defense of this Nation of ours and are therefore either unaware of what is being attempted in their absence or are incapable of being heard.

Sponsor: B. W. Ramann Bros., Beaufort, March 9, 1944.

Emil J. Schmuke, Beaufort, feed manager; Elmer H. Deppenmoor, Beaufort, mine superintendent; F. H. Fechtler, Larry Voss, Beaufort; H. F. Miller, Union, salesman; Wm. Neier, Herman Klocke, Ben C. Freise, Vincent W. Schmick, Robert H. Voss, A. J. Rickmann, Mrs. A. J. Rickmann, Beaufort; A. E. Goldammer, Mrs. A. E. Goldammer, Leslie; Arthur Randolph, Fred Buth, Edw. Mueller, Beaufort; Leonard Horeld, Beaufort, assistant fire chief; F. H. Puls, E. L. Rohlfing, Beaufort; Walter Neier, Joseph H. Neier, Leslie; Hy Fredrick, Louis Fechtter, L. Krouse, Beaufort; Erwin Blackwell, Dayton Stewart, Gerald; Aug. Stuesse, Beaufort; William Wildt, Leslie; Edw. F. Detmer, Beaufort; Carl H. Wildhaber, Leslie.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

Making use of the right of petition secured to us by our Bill of Rights, we earnestly petition you not to favorably consider any type or kind of prohibition legislation that may now be or may hereafter be pending in Congress. Your efforts against any such legislation will in our judgment be a distinct contribution to our country's welfare.

Sponsored by T. O. Benck, Rosebud.

Theo Latall, Rosebud, feeds; John Bollmann, Rosebud, garage; Arthur Jurdemann, Rosebud, shop; Thomas J. Ellwood, Rosebud, farmer; Pearl Austerman, Rosebud, farmer; Geo. Austerman, Rosebud, farmer; Milfred Binkhielter, Owensville, farmer; Harold Bockhorst, Washington, salesman; Louis Eggert, Rosebud, farmer; Leo M. Grue, Rosebud, merchant; Zelpha Grue, Rosebud; R. B. Brandt, Rosebud, hatchery; Viola Brandt, Rosebud, housewife; John Fisher, Rosebud, mining; Victor Eggert, clay prospector; L. A. Robertson, clay prospector; Wilson McDaniel; William Melton, factory, Rosebud; Wilbert Horstmann, Rosebud, farmer; Clarence Aytes, Owensville, factory work; Albert Kosork, Rosebud, farming; A. J. Kosork, Rosebud; Robert Vandgreffe, Owensville, shoe factory; Bob Hihler, shoe worker; H. Norris, Owensville; D. E. Haffman, Owensville, shoe worker; Walter Schaefer, Rosebud, trucker; Mr. G. E. Nessen, foreman; Margaret Nessen, housewife; John A. Wehmeyer, Rosebud, farming and dairying; John Gray, St. Louis, long-distance hauling; Mamie Gray, St. Louis, housewife.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Missouri, by this petition voice our objections to any prohibition legislation; we don't want any more prohibition with all of its attendant evils.

Sponsor: George Kohlbusch, tavern, Hermann.

Mrs. F. C. Haub, Hermann, housewife; Mrs. Walter Kast, Hermann, shoe worker; Walter Kast, Hermann, shoe worker; Glen Oetterer, Hermann, shoe worker; Ervin Koch, Hermann, shoe worker; Otto Weissenback, Hermann; Harvey H. Spearman, Hermann; Felix Murdwellen, Hermann, sales manager; O. W. Streck, butcher; Chris Schrieber, Hermann; Herman Berend, shoemaker; Carlie Luppold, Hermann, monument worker; Ray Barnhart, Union, carpenter and ironworker; Louis H. Koch, Hermann, contractor; E. R. Ruediger, Hermann; Simon Pycatt, Hermann; Virgil V. Fleisch, Hermann, shoe worker; Joe Knebler, Hermann; Christ F. Fleisch, Hermann, shoe worker; Orgie Brethorst, Berger; Victor V. Kunz, Hermann, merchant seaman; Otto Sicht; Carl Richter, Hermann, shoe worker; Walter J. Behrmann, Hermann, clerical worker; H. E. Ochsner, Hermann, county collector; L. E. Huxol, Hermann, truck driver; Alf. F. Badi, Berger, farmer; Armin C. Loehnig, Hermann, United States Engineer Department; J. E. Mitchell, Hermann, butcher; Virgil C. Paretz, Hermann, shoe worker; Albert Krueger, Hermann, shoe worker.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

Making use of the right of petition secured to us by our Bill of Rights, we earnestly petition you not to favorably consider any type or kind of prohibition legislation that may now be or may hereafter be pending in Congress. Your efforts against any such legislation will in our judgment be a distinct contribution to our country's welfare.

Sponsored by Hugo S. Elsemath, Rhineland, March 7, 1943.

Ben Van Boaren, August Winkelman, Rhineland, farmers; Leon Kemp, McKittrick, laborer; Frank Gillette, McKittrick, laborer; M. E. Aubuchon, Rhineland, farmer; Arthur Whiteside, McKittrick, laborer; Fannie Whiteside, McKittrick, housewife; Vernon Finders, Harvey Finders, S. B. Heyung, Fred Nagedom, Hugo Allgeyer, Rhineland, farmers; Clarence Ellis, McKittrick, farmer; Geo. Gosen, Rhineland, farmer; Ben H. Eikel, Frank J. Eikel, Bluffton, farmers; M. E. Rickhoff, New Florence, sailman; W. G. Eikel, Tony Moseley, Americus, laborerers; Leo Strattman, Clarence Strattman, Rhineland, farmers; Bill Drullinger, Rhineland, laborer; Steve Van Beck, Richard Van Beck, Rhineland, farmers; Wm. Stiers, Rhineland, garageman; George Bruckerhoff, Rhineland, dairyman; Sib Heying, Rhineland, farmer; Everett Schlatt, Sid Thomas, Americus, laborers; Frank Struttman, Rhineland, farmer; Clifford Gregory, Bluffton, farm hand; Walter Greis, Rhineland, farmer.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Missouri, by this petition voice our objections to any prohibition legislation; we don't want any more prohibition with all of its attendant evils.

Sponsor: Strokel's Tavern, Berger, March 7, 1944.

Rudolph George Schowe, Berger, Army; Edward D. Boles, Berger, farming; Curtis Voks, Berger, trucking; F. Herrell, Berger, agent M. P.; A. R. Kipp, New Haven, farming; George Zellmann, Berger, railroad; William V. Garbs, Berger, railroad; George Berend, Berger, railroad; Elmer Hug, Berger, railroad; August Kropps, Berger, farmer; Elmer Meyer, Berger, railroad; John D. Stock, Berger, blacksmith; Irvin J. Diederich, Berger, railroad M. P.; Marsh Hiatte, Berger, railroad; John H. Witthaus, Berger, farmer; Gustav Z. Poetting, Berger, retired shop worker; William Blackwell, Hermann, farmer; Ralph W. Schmidt, Berger, farmer; Ernest J. Blumer, Berger, trucking and clerking; Leon Meyer, Berger, farming; Henry L. Meyer, Berger, farmer; Marrin Kemper, Berger, farm laborer; B. W. P. Madden, Berger, farmer; Herman Bloomer, Berger, undertaker; George Pfautsch, Berger, railroader, M. P.; Carl N. Smith, Berger, railroader; Gus W. Strobel.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

Making use of the right of petition secured to us by our bill of rights, we earnestly petition you not to favorably consider any type or kind of prohibition legislation that may now be or may hereafter be pending in Congress. Your efforts against any such legislation will in our judgment be a distinct contribution to our country's welfare.

Sponsored by F. V. Klossney, Swiss, March 7, 1944.

Earnest Boesch, Hermann, clay miner; George Mueller, Hermann, farming; Charles W. Mochel, Hermann, farmer; Jacob Michel, Hermann, farmer; Mrs. Charles Wettling, Swiss; William Brink, Swiss, laborer.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Missouri, by this petition voice our objections to any prohibition legislation; we don't want any more prohibition with all of its attendant evils.

Sponsor: George Stolte, Stony Hill.

Edwin Von Behren, Stony Hill, clay miner; Vernon H. Kohlbusch, Stony Hill, truck driver; Alfred A. Gumper, Stony Hill, mechanic; Elton H. Gumper, Stony Hill, soldier; LeRoy J. Kohlbusch, New Haven, farmer; Gus T. Haeffner, New Haven, farmer; Henry C. Vehburald, Hermann, farmer; Henry Schoeing, Hermann, farmer; Clarence Albersmith, Hermann, farmer; A. C. Maupin, Owensville, farmer; E. G. Benz, Hermann, Route 1, farmer and county surveyor; G. J. Traub, Owensville, Route 1, farming; Herman Tovel, Owensville, Route 1, farming; Christ Humburg, New Haven, Route 1, farmer; Charles J. Oberg, Stony Hill, farmer; Howard H. Zoeller, Hermann, Route 1, farmer; Sam Wiegand, Hermann, laborer; Alwin Fredrick, Hermann, farming; Lawrence H. Kreuger, New Haven, bulk oil dealer; Charles Monney, Hermann, Route 1, farming; Elmer T. Rousset, New Haven, Route 1, farmer; Paul Holtgrewe, Gerald, farmer; Albert W. Fleer, Owensville, carpenter; Hilbert Horstmann, Berger, farming, Arnold Heinlein, Hermann, farming; Edward Ablemann, Hermann, laborer; Herman D. Gumper, Owensville, Route 1, farmer and blacksmith; Albert E. Horstmann, New Haven, laborer; Harvey A. Horstmann, New Haven, laborer; Erwin F. Schmidt, Gerald, farmer; Emil Fischer, Hermann, laborer.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

We, the undersigned, all voters in the State of Missouri, vigorously protest against the

passage of any type of prohibition legislation by Congress. Whether that legislation be designed to effect Army camp neighborhoods or whether it be national in character would in our judgment serve only to impede the efforts of this country to win the war and would bring back the racketeering and the bootlegging common in this country during prohibition.

Sponsor: F. W. Klossner, Swiss, March 7, 1944.

Carrie Klossner; Paul von Behren, Swiss, garage man; Hilda von Behren, Beatrice Klossner, Swiss; Gurt von Behren, Hermann, farmer; Raymond von Behren, Hermann, farmer; Adolph Bieber, Herman, farmer; R. Ernst Krull, Hermann, Rural Route 1, farmer; Robert C. Schneider, Hermann, Route 1; Wm. Kahll, Hermann, farmer; Joe G. Bieber, Hermann, clay miner; Albert Michel, Hermann, clay contractor; Jake Lautenschlaeger, Hermann, clay miner; William W. Bieber, Hermann; John Hahn, Swiss, farming; Otto Fluetsch, Hermann, farmer; Harlan Kessler, Hermann, clay miner; Ben Metzger, Hermann, farmer; Carl Bock, Hermann, Route 1; Mrs. Joe Bieber, Hermann; E. B. Schermann, Hermann; Fred Moeckli, Hermann; Otto Kohlbusch, New Haven, clay miner; Ed Hammelman, Hermann, clay miner; Arthur Scherman, Hermann, clay miner; Victor Bohl, Hermann, farmer; Ben Schoering, Hermann, farmer; Theodore Michel, Hermann, farmer; Mrs. Alma Hargrane, Swiss; Louis Schoening, Hermann, farmer; S. C. Roberts, Hermann, miner; Milton Lange, Hermann, tractor driver.

PETITION AGAINST PROHIBITION

We, the undersigned, all voters in the State of Missouri, vigorously protest against the passage of any type of prohibition legislation by Congress. Whether that legislation be designed to affect Army camp neighborhoods or whether it be national in character would in our judgment serve only to impede the efforts of this country to win the war and would bring back the racketeering and the bootlegging common in this country during prohibition.

Sponsor: George Kahlbusch, Hermann.

Erwin H. Gaertner, Hermann, bread salesman; Albert Paeschel, Hermann, laborer; Ervin C. Williams, Hermann, laborer; Milford Oberg, Hermann, farm laborer; Aug. Wehmeyer, Hermann, shoefactors; Otto H. Voelkerding, Hermann, machinist; E. B. Ward, Hermann, retired; Geo. Kohlbusch, Hermann, tavern keeper; Melvin Schindler, Army; Raymond C. Oetterer, Hermann, farm laborer; Omer Zumsteeg, farmer; T. J. Koebler, Hermann, farmer; Albert E. Hug, Hermann, farmer; Sam Ulrich, Hermann, shoeworker; Otto V. Kunz, Sr., Hermann, shoeworker; W. F. Humerfeld, McKittrick, blacksmith; M. F. Kappelmann, Hermann, hatchery owner; O. H. Hagedorn, Hermann, dry cleaning; Milton A. Wohlf, Hermann; Oscar Hoffmann, Hermann, machinist; Charles Fricke, Hermann, laborer; Gus J. Schoenhoff Hermann, meat cutter; W. F. Klink, Hermann, machinist; Frank J. Augustine, Hermann; H. W. Knaly, Hermann, farmer; Ralph N. Eipermann, Hermann, shoe worker; Willard A. Fleeman, Hermann, shoe worker; H. E. Fogerson, Hermann, warehouse manager; Wm. F. Hoffmann, Hermann, shoemaker; Henry Rohlfing, produce and trucker, Hermann; F. C. Haub, agent, Missouri Pacific; C. N. Tannemeyer, Hermann, painter.

Address by the Vice President Seconding the Nomination of President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD the address delivered by the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, seconding the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, on July 20, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As chairman of the Iowa delegation I am deeply honored to second the nomination of the greatest living American—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The strength of the Democratic Party has always been the people—plain people like so many of those here in this convention—ordinary folks, farmers, workers, and businessmen along Main Street. Jefferson, Jackson, and Woodrow Wilson know the power of the plain people. All three laid down the thesis that the Democratic Party can win only if and when it is the liberal party.

Now, we have come to the most extraordinary election in the history of our country. Three times the Democratic Party has been led to victory by the greatest liberal in the history of the United States. The name Roosevelt is revered in the remotest corners in this earth. The name Roosevelt is cursed only by Germans, Japs, and certain American troglodytes.

The first issue which transcends all others is that complete victory be won quickly. Roosevelt, in a world sense, is the most experienced military strategist who has ever been President of the United States. Roosevelt is the only person in the United States who can meet on even terms the other great leaders in discussions of war and peace. The voice of our New World liberalism must carry on.

It is appropriate that Roosevelt should run on the basis of his record as a war leader. He is successfully conducting a war bigger than all the rest of our wars put together. We must finish this job before the Nation can breathe in safety. The boys at the front know this better than anyone else.

The future belongs to those who go down the line unswervingly for the liberal principles of both political democracy and economic democracy regardless of race, color, or religion. In a political, educational, and economic sense there must be no inferior races. The poll tax must go. Equal educational opportunities must come. The future must bring equal wages for equal work regardless of sex or race.

Roosevelt stands for all this. That is why certain people hate him so. That, also, is one of the outstanding reasons why Roosevelt will be elected for a fourth time.

President Roosevelt has long known that the Democratic Party in order to survive, must serve men first and dollars second. That does not mean that the Democratic Party is against business—quite the contrary. But if we want more small businessmen, as the Democratic Party undoubtedly does, we must modify our taxation system to encourage risk capital to invest in all rapidly growing small business. We want both a taxation system and a railroad rate structure which will encourage new business and the development of the newer industrial regions of the South and the West. Rate discrimination must go.

The Democratic Party in convention assembled is about to demonstrate that it is not only a free party but a liberal party. The Democratic Party cannot long survive as a conservative party. The Republican Party has a monopoly on the conservative brains and the conservative dollars. Democrats who try to play the Republican game inside the Democratic Party always find that it just can't work on a national scale.

In like manner Republicans who try to play the Democratic game inside the Republican Party find that while it may work on a State basis, it can never work nationally. I know because my own father tried it. Perhaps Wendell Willkie may have learned in 1944 a little of that which my own father learned in 1924. The old elephant never changes and never forgives.

By nominating Franklin Roosevelt the Democratic Party is again declaring its faith in liberalism. Roosevelt is a greater liberal today than he has ever been. His soul is pure. The high quality of Roosevelt liberalism will become more apparent as the war emergency passes. The only question ever in Roosevelt's mind is how best to serve the cause of liberalism in the long run. He thinks big. He sees far.

There is no question about the renomination of President Roosevelt by this convention. The only question is whether the convention and the party workers believe wholeheartedly in the liberal policies for which Roosevelt has always stood. Our problem is not to sell Roosevelt to the Democratic convention but to sell the Democratic Party and the Democratic convention to the people of the United States.

The world is peculiarly fortunate that in times like these the United States should be blessed with a leader of the caliber of Roosevelt. With the spirit of Woodrow Wilson but avoiding the pitfalls which beset that great statesman, Roosevelt can and will lead the United States in cooperation with the rest of the world toward that type of peace which will prevent World War No. 3. It is this peace for which the mothers and fathers of America hope and work.

Issues that will be with us for a generation—perhaps even for a hundred years, will take form at this convention and at the November election. The Democratic Party and the independent voters will give Roosevelt their wholehearted support because of his record in peace and war.

As head of the Iowa delegation, in the cause of liberalism, and with a prayer for prompt victory in this war, permanent peace, and full employment, I give you Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Independence Day Address of Hon. Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio ad-

dress delivered by me at Worcester, Mass., on July 4, 1944:

On this birthday of our country's independence I am constrained not to discuss political questions. Because I believe that this year, above all in our long history, on this memorable American holiday so full of deep meaning not only to the American people, but to all the liberty-loving people of the world, it is urgent that we should pause and consider the true significance of the Fourth of July.

Since that great hour when the American colonists, battling against the armed might of one of the greatest empires in history, threw off the shackles of tyranny and oppression and instituted a free government in this Nation, America has enjoyed a measure of freedom and happiness never given to the rank and file of the people of any other nation. Personal liberty has been so firmly enthroned here that succeeding generations have taken it for granted.

Through crisis after crisis, through struggle after struggle, through war after war, American liberty has been preserved from tyrants and dictators. Independence as a nation and independence as individuals have been the very soul of our beloved country where men are born free, live free so long as they obey the law, and transmit this freedom to their posterity.

The nation that does not possess independence is a slave nation. The individual that does not possess independence is himself a slave. The nation that is governed by another is a subject nation. The man whose will is controlled by another is a puppet and a minion. Yes, indeed; independence is the very soul of America, one of the most precious attributes of our Nation and individual character which from time immemorial our people have valued more than life. So we should thank God for this great and glorious Independence Day that made our people free.

Now we are facing the greatest crisis of all, which will determine whether we will continue to live as freemen and citizens or as slaves and subjects; whether we are to retain our matchless form of government and American way of life, or surrender them to domination by alien groups. Ruthless tyrannical enemies beset us on far-flung battlefields, on the sea, and in the air, and our noble sons are waging courageous warfare against them with an indomitable spirit and gallantry that makes victory certain.

While we are so engaged, and while the minds of our people are resolutely fixed upon winning this great and terrible world conflict, dangerous internal enemies are subtly attacking our liberties and security here at home.

Through stealth, subterfuge, deceit, and infiltration, these forces of revolution and subversion, cleverly organized, ably led, financed with a mysterious yet most abundant means deriving encouragement and support from the seats of the mighty are at work in almost every community of our land.

Their aim is the destruction of freedom, the suppression of the individual, the death of democracy. And they are well on their way toward the accomplishment of their dastardly purpose to nullify the American Constitution, stultify the immortal Declaration of Independence and fasten the tyranny of an alien radical bureaucratic dictatorship modeled on the principles of Karl Marx, upon the rank and file of the American people.

As Americans our duty is not only clear but sacred. Our boys are not failing us. They are willingly giving their all to save our country from the cruel fate of oppression. We cannot fail them, nor can we fail the immortal principles of liberty, equality, and justice upon which our Nation is based, and for which the brave, heroic boys so valiantly fight.

The aroused colonists of 1776 hailed the glorious Fourth—their Independence Day—as the day of deliverance—a day of deliverance from political tyranny. Let us, too, who have enjoyed the great heritage of freedom forged by the greatest statesmen the world has ever known, enunciated on the First Fourth, and immortalized by the suffering, sacrifices, and bloodshed of millions of our countrymen, let us, too, I repeat, be aroused to the gravest of dangers that surround our Nation in this present hour.

Let us awaken to the perils which threaten freedom, let us renounce, repudiate and smash, so they will never rise again in this country, the radical termites who seek the destruction of our priceless American institutions. Let us in our own day and age, true to the courageous traditions of the American founders, deliver our country from the curse of totalitarian tyranny which hangs over all the world today as a menace to ourselves and to all mankind. Not only eternal vigilance but determined action is the price of liberty. We can no longer take it for granted.

Let us, therefore, catch the spirit of those who have fought, bled, and died to perpetuate America. On this sacred birthday of our country, fully awakened and ready to act, let us pledge our efforts, our allegiance and like the patriots of old, our lives and our fortunes, if need be, to the destruction of tyranny, the preservation of freedom and the protection of our exalted and beloved American Independence for the Nation and for the free men and women who live under the shelter of our matchless Constitution. Let us say with the noble Thomas Jefferson, the author of the immortal Declaration of Independence we so solemnly commemorate today, "I have sworn eternal enmity toward every form of tyranny over the mind of man." Let us wage undying battle against the commissars of 1944 who like the mercenaries of the Revolution, seek to oppress us under a form of tyranny more cruel than death itself.

From this hour forward, let us strive, work and fight for speedy victory, the prompt return of our boys, and the effective extermination of the radical termites who would enslave America and destroy our hard-won freedom.

Thank you and good evening.

Sacrifices by Parents Incident to the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in the Iowa Legionnaire of June 18 there appears one of the best-written and most moving articles or editorials on the matter of the sacrifices parents are making that I have ever read. It is entitled "Father's Day," and was written by Maj. Frank Miles. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FATHER'S DAY

(By Maj. Frank Miles)

Father's Day, Sunday, June 18, will be sad for thousands of American fathers, as it will be for mothers and others who loved boys who have made the supreme sacrifice in the war.

It will be a day of compassion for fathers of those who are suffering from wounds inflicted by enemy weapons.

It will be a day of fear for the thousands of fathers whose sons are in action in the battle areas in Europe, the Pacific, and elsewhere.

It will be a day of concern for the fathers whose sons are in German and Japanese prisons.

It will be a day of worry for the fathers of those in uniform who are training for combat.

It will be a day of uneasiness for fathers of youths who must shortly don the uniform.

It will be a day of misgivings for all fathers who realize how difficult the future during the war and long after victory will be for all children.

Fathers may be incapable of loving sons and daughters as deeply as mothers do, but the good father loves a child to the very depths of his soul—and the loss of that loved one breaks his heart.

The true father strives to be brave when his son has been slain, maimed, or imprisoned, or is in or soon to be in grave danger. He will try to keep himself braced, with his chin up, and carry on because he knows that's the way his boy would want him to act. Only a coward unfit to have a courageous son will use artificial things to sustain himself.

When a loving father receives the tragic news, "Killed in action," he is stunned as if he had been struck a terrific blow at the base of his brain. Blackness envelops him. He gasps and mumbles. His head whirls. He is sick inside. He has never known such pain unless he has had like word about another child. He tries to make himself think there's a mistake.

Friends come to him. They are kind—so very kind. They may feel nothing they can say or do will help, but their earnest voices and handclasps do help immeasurably.

If the mother lives, the father goes to her in their home and takes her in his arms. They weep together.

Dear neighbors sit with them for a while. Conversation is hushed. Possibilities which might warrant reason for doubt are discussed.

Messengers deliver telegrams, each mail brings letters, the telephone rings often.

Darkness the first nights is depressing. Fitful sleep is broken with sobs.

If they are Christians, they pray—for it is comforting.

Gradually consciousness of the sympathy and prayers of friends, sweet and beautiful memories of the departed, and the knowledge that he knew what he was fighting for and fell valorously in a glorious cause lifts the awful chills. After a time, the father and mother can smile and laugh over incidents of the son's babyhood, childhood, boyhood, and young manhood. His pranks, his problems, his joys and griefs, his tender deeds—all pass before them in fond recollection. They read his "I'm okay, don't worry, see you soon" letters. They look at his pictures, snapshot and posed, which reflect his life from the cradle until a few weeks before he crossed the mortal divide, and somehow they feel that in spirit he is right there with them. Moreover, they grow more and more sure that sometime there will be a happy reunion.

How much better that a boy die in honor than live in disgrace.

How much better that he give his life for his country than that he lose it in crime or a drunken joy ride.

How much better that he sleep in a hero's grave than that he live behind prison walls.

How much better that he is at rest than that he live for years hopelessly and helplessly insane, perhaps realizing his plight at intervals.

How much better that he is out there in that great company of American noblemen who gave their all for human freedom than that he live despised as a slacker.

Robert Alexander, of Davenport, the second Hawkeye Boys State Governor, was killed in air conflict with the Japanese.

"It's not how long you live but how," was in a frame on a wall of his room at home.

Many a boy who will not come back did far more to glorify God and country than millions of men who have lived and will live past three score and ten.

Some of the youths gone left young widows and babies they bade affectionate, hopeful farewells.

Some left wives who will give birth to babes they will never see on earth.

"I thank God I shall be the mother of my precious husband's child," many a one smiles through her tears.

Fathers worthy of sons who have given their young lives that America may live will do their utmost to be the kind of dads they died for.

On Father's Day, may all fathers of sons living—in uniform and out—figuratively unite in determination to inspire them by lofty patriotic conduct.

May the fathers of the dead join hands and reverently pledge:

"Here's to you, sons—under God we shall not let you down."

May all Americans—fathers and all others—on that day reconsecrate and rededicate themselves to the greatest possible service in the ideals for which the sons of America are struggling, bleeding, and dying.

And here's a salute to all good fathers gone.

Statement by Hon. Esequiel Padilla, Secretary of Foreign Relations of the Republic of Mexico, Before the Inter-American Defense Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by the Honorable Esequiel Padilla, Secretary of Foreign Relations of the Republic of Mexico, before the Inter-American Defense Board on July 11, 1944.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, gentlemen, once more I enjoy the deep satisfaction of being in the midst of this representative body of the armed forces of our American republics.

It was indeed a fortunate inspiration of the third meeting of ministers of foreign affairs at Rio de Janeiro to create the Inter-American Defense Board. To integrate a united continent it was indispensable to think of common defense. For aggressions of ambition America represents one of the greatest temptations in history. Its wealth, its opportunities of abundant life, its hospitable and fertile territory, and its institutions of progressive liberty and harmony were for a long time defended by distances and wide oceans. But now only a concerted unity of action and a compact civil and military solidarity can be an invulnerable shield for its destinies. A world organization for the maintenance of a permanent peace shall offer a constructive answer to the global clamor to abolish war. But America has the duty, in the meantime, of creating not a machine of aggression but a defense system, coordinated by cooperation, by judgment, by techniques, and by the common devotion to an ideal shared by all.

I believe that from the somber years we have lived, so full of dangers and of threats ready to break loose at any one of the dramatic moments of the totalitarian aggression, one of the conclusions we can draw is that in this continent of liberty and international fraternity it is imperative to maintain an invulnerable defense.

It is of transcendental importance to state that this Inter-American Defense Board, studying the defense of the continent, is indeed a source of confidence. Because of the existence of this institution, no armed preparation can take place in the silence of the isolation of any of our republics. It is to the interest of all to guarantee that no egotism shall prevail. This center of military cooperation is an active laboratory of the sentiments of brotherhood of the peoples of the Americas. Nothing brings human hearts closer together than to be on guard, from the same watchtower, against the dangers that may come from all routes in the horizon; and that due to a felicitous continental doctrine, no matter where they threaten any of our republics, they are, in fact, threatening the whole hemisphere.

It is of no consequence that the military participation of our peoples should be so unequal. This is an institute of equality. The amount of the contribution offers contrasting differences; but the spirit with which it is extended is the same in each and every case: that of devotion due to the cause of the Americas. The undaunted valor of the peoples and the sum total of the patriotism of all, forge one single American patriotism. This institute, therefore, represents, and must continue to represent, the valor of the continent, never for aggression but always resolute to defend the spiritual treasure and the grandeur of the Americas.

The Slaughter of the Little Pigs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1933 as well as the following years a great deal was said and printed concerning the slaughter of little pigs. It was a desirable subject for some during the campaign of 1934, as well as 1936, and even in 1940.

Strange as it may seem, it was not until 11 years later that the true story was told. Why those who urged the slaughter remained quiet all those years I do not know, for it remained for Lowell Mellett, the columnist, to break the story. I have failed to see where anyone involved challenged his statement or even commented on it.

Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me I include as part of my remarks an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on the subject as well as Mr. Mellett's article. They follow:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

LITTLE PIGS AND MASTER MINDS

There is a certain type of incident in public affairs which is made to order for the enemies of everyone who had any connection with it. Of such an order was leaf-raking, which furnished political capital to the foes of W. P. A. right up to the finish. Of the same order was the celebrated cause of the little pigs and their slaughter in the summer of 1933.

Regardless of its merits or demerits, the incident of the piglets possessed just those qualities of incongruity that could be used with damning effect against a man. And it could be used just as well by those who had favored the measure as by those who had condemned it even as a desperate device for keeping farmers from bankruptcy in a year when there was not enough corn to bring the pig crop to maturity.

Whenever blame has been leveled for this proceeding, it has been laid upon the shoulders of one man—HENRY WALLACE, then Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. WALLACE has been ridiculed, he has been represented as an apostle of scarcity, he has been attacked both fairly and unfairly—and mostly the latter—as the man who killed the little pigs.

It is unusually interesting therefore, to read Lowell Mellett's report, 11 years afterward, that the program was devised at a conference of corn-hog farmers from 10 Midwestern States and approved by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Farmers' Union, the Corn Belt Meat Producers and the Central Cooperative Exchange.

All these other gentlemen have sat back in dignified silence and let Mr. WALLACE take all the panning, all these years, and Mr. WALLACE has taken it like a man, accepting responsibility fully, and leaving others to accept theirs or not, just as their dispositions might lead them.

It is not a very flattering commentary on the others, but it is another testimony to the courage and unshakable decency of HENRY WALLACE.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

ON THE OTHER HAND

SLAUGHTER OF THOSE LITTLE PIGS IN 1933 PROVIDED FOOD FOR HUNGRY, SAYS WRITER

(By Lowell Mellett)

During this campaign you will be hearing again the horror tale about the little pigs. You may also be interested in hearing the truth, which I've never yet seen in print. This is it:

In the summer of 1933 the farmers in what are known as the corn-hog States were faced with a desperate problem. The price of hogs was ruinously low. Corn to feed the hogs was growing scarce; the Northwestern corn belt was suffering from drought. The foreign market had largely disappeared because of retaliatory tariffs and other restrictions.

Unaware of this prospect and not believing much in birth control anyhow, the hogs in the spring had blessed the farmers with an unusually large crop of pigs. The farmers, as a result, had millions of hungry little mouths to feed, a dwindling supply of corn, and the prospect of selling the porkers at a heavy loss if they were held off the market until they reached the age at which pigs usually are killed.

Name committee to act

On July 18, 1933, representatives of corn and hog farmers from Nebraska, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio met in Des Moines, Iowa. The 76 delegates present named a committee of 25 to act, with Earl Smith, president of the Illinois Agri-

cultural Association (now vice president of the American Farm Bureau Federation), as its chairman, and Ralph H. Moyer, Iowa farmer, secretary. The committee met in the Union League Club of Chicago, July 24 and 25, and there unanimously agreed on a plan to raise the price of hogs and relieve the pig situation. This called for asking the Agriculture Department to contract with the packers to purchase and process pigs weighing from 50 to 110 pounds, the product to be disposed of to the Red Cross or other relief agencies.

A subcommittee—Ed O'Neal; Earl Smith; Mr. Moyer; Clifford Gregory, Illinois farmer and publisher; and Roswell Garst, Iowa farmer—was named to meet with the Agriculture Department. The meeting occurred in Washington on August 7 and the proposals of the farmers were fully discussed. On August 10 a conference was held at the Willard Hotel, attended by corn and hog producers, farm-organization executives, packers, and others. Those present included Mr. O'Neal; Mr. McCloskey, who spoke for Mr. Taber, master of the National Grange; and Mr. Kennedy, who spoke for Mr. Simpson, president of the National Farmers' Union; Mr. Sykes, of the Corn Belt Meat Producers; and Mr. Crandall, of the Central Co-operative Exchange. All strongly endorsed the program.

Following the conference the details of the program were worked out and it was put into operation.

Food for hungry

The result was that 6,000,000 surplus little pigs were turned into 100,000,000 pounds of pork and the pork was distributed by the Government to feed the hungry—of which, you remember, there were millions that summer. Some very small pigs that could not be handled as meat by the packers were turned into grease and tankage for fertilizer and eventually "plowed under."

If these pigs had been held until the usual marketing age, they would have eaten about 75,000,000 bushels of corn. That would have produced a bad situation the following year, since the 1934 corn crop, due to the drought, was about a billion bushels short.

The squeals of the little pigs, born to die that humans might live, were heard briefly that summer of 1933 and then were heard no more. The squeals of certain humans, including some, no doubt, who helped eat the little pigs, still echo on occasion.

I've often wondered why HENRY WALLACE, who, for aiding this effort to save the farmers on the one hand and feed the city folks on the other, has been labeled the exponent of an "economy of scarcity," hasn't spent a little time in explaining the facts to the people of America. I've wondered even more why farm leaders like Ed O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau Federation, and Albert Goss, of the National Grange, and Jim Patton, of the Farmers' Union, have been so silent on the subject.

Excerpts From Addresses Made on the Floor of Congress by Hon. J. Harry McGregor, of Ohio

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of Congress, I have earnestly endeavored to voice on the floor of the House of Representatives the opinions of the people whom I have the honor to represent. In accordance with these opinions I have advocated a strong defense program, and since the declaration of war an all-out effort for the winning of the war.

I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include the following summary excerpts of a few speeches I have made on the floor of Congress in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

(January 16, 1941, 10 months before Pearl Harbor)

I believe American citizens who must do the fighting, the dying and the paying for any war we get into, still have a right to differ as to our methods of defense, as to how far we ought to get into this war, and as to what our course for the future ought to be. As for myself, I want to say to you that I believe the Nation ought to turn, with the same energy it would if Washington were being bombed, to produce a national defense. We ought to be able to produce that national defense and at the same time vastly aid Britain with munitions of war. We have the productive capacity to do that. Therefore, in conclusion, I want to say that for my own part I think we must strain every fiber of our being to produce a national defense, and that we will have to see this thing through as a united people wholeheartedly devoted to the cause of winning the war, and protecting ourselves against any and all dictators.

(February 4, 1941, 9 months before Pearl Harbor)

We, of Congress, are those individuals who should have the information that will give us the understanding of the international affairs that we might give to the people back home true representative government. I call upon the leaders of this administration, and of this Congress, to submit to this body that information and quit forever the secret chamber meetings of a select few. I learned from my people that they want three things: First, peace; second, a strong defense program; and, third, a decentralization of power. We can and we must extend full aid to those who are fighting aggression if only for our own defense, but we cannot, we must not, abandon our own free government in the process.

NONDEFENSE EXPENDITURE

(April 1, 1941, 8 months before Pearl Harbor)

The people of my district are heartily in accord with an adequate defense program and are willing to pay for it, but they insist that this vast unnecessary expenditure for departments other than national defense must be immediately stopped. I again call on the leaders of this administration with this statement: "We are willing at all times to spend and pay for a defense program, but please quit calling on Congress to appropriate money for every conceivable department, labelling it under the guise of national defense."

NATIONAL DEFENSE

(June 17, 1941, 6 months before Pearl Harbor)

If there are specific things the President deemed necessary to have further authority to achieve, he should say what these things are; remove all obstacles which are hindering our defense program.

WHEAT QUOTA

(July 15, 1941)

Many farmers in my district need this excess wheat which the Government wants to penalize them for raising. They need it to feed their own livestock and poultry. With this thought in mind and wanting to assist the American farmer, I introduced yesterday a bill, known as H. R. 5303, which would allow the farmer to feed the wheat which he raises above his quota, and in that way bring him a small semblance of aid.

GAG RULE—TAX BILL

(July 30, 1941)

I say to the Members of the House—each of us is entitled to submit to the entire membership such suggestion and changes as he thinks would make the bill more equitable, more workable, more feasible. If this is a good bill, it should stand on its merits, and if we have amendments and suggestions we should be allowed to present them and let them be adopted or defeated upon their own merits. The statement has been made—vote a "gag rule" to protect ourselves and keep the Members from "going out on a limb." We are all 21 years old, have faced many issues. Let us face the real issue of taxation and remove some of the irregularities of this bill. Vote down the gag rule. Give us a chance to amend the bill. Let our people know we will do our best to represent them and say to the world we will not be a rubber stamp.

UNNECESSARY EXPENDITURES

(March 13, 1942)

I think I am speaking for my people when I ask the President to insist that the heads of departments, bureaus, and independent establishments, as an act of patriotism take an active part in this program to curtail unnecessary activities and personnel. The excess of Government personnel in Washington is plainly evident. Those in the Government service admit that practically every Government agency could get along as well, if not better, with less personnel.

UNITY NECESSARY TO WIN WAR

(May 4, 1942)

The American people should have but one aim at this time—the swift defeat of Axis Powers. To blame the interventionists or the anti-interventionists, or isolationists, is to play the enemies' game and to cause them to shout with joy. Those who continue these arguments or stir up racial group prejudice are interfering with our real aim—the winning of the war. The idea that a man cannot be 100 percent behind a war President and at the same time criticize and suggest where improvements can be made is pure dictator thinking.

REDUCTION IN NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL SPENDING

(March 30, 1943)

If we contemplate taking nearly a third of the national income in taxation, it is most important that our tax program be studied carefully to make sure that (1) it is directed to cut down excessive spending power where it exists and (2) that it does not cut so deeply into the spending power of any group as to endanger health and wartime efficiency. An ideal program would be to cut out all the excessive spending, reduce all Federal personnel about one-half, which would include a reduction of our Federal bureaus, and then submit a pay-as-you-go tax program that treats the rich and poor alike.

THE FARMER, HIS TROUBLES AND HIS NEEDS

(April 15, 1943)

The necessary food required to feed our people cannot be produced until the Government reduces the red tape and rescinds a large percent of its rules and regulations which are now being enforced and which are causing the American farmer to become discouraged. They have been pushed from pillar to post. Who is to be blamed for this bungling? Is it Congress? Is it the farmer? Is it the bureaucrat, who is not at all familiar with farm conditions, and yet issues rules and regulations under which the farmer must operate? Most assuredly it is not Congress, nor the farmer. In my opinion, the farmers' needs can be analyzed under these three points: (1) Labor, (2) machinery, and

(3) the right to produce without Government interference. The farmers have been asked to produce even more food than last year, but little consideration has been given to making these increased goals possible. The farmers have been stripped of their skilled workers until farm employment is at the lowest point in history.

O. P. A.

(July 2, 1943)

Failure of the O. P. A. in its meat-control program, as well as numerous other programs, is caused by confusion, red tape, and at times contradictory O. P. A. regulations, all of which are the result of too many attempted practices of theorists, rather than the operations of practical, experienced personnel. What we need in O. P. A. are men who will issue regulations based on good common sense. We cannot afford to experiment any longer, especially when such experimentation is being done at the expense and is a direct threat to the livelihood of every American. We, here in Congress, want to put a stop to this bungling and confusion and I hope we can do it now.

DESIRES OF MY PEOPLE

(October 1943)

My people—

1. Want to make every necessary sacrifice to win the war, but they are opposed to any unnecessary sacrifices.

2. Want Congress to retain its rights and be a legislative body, and not yield its control to any individual or group. They don't want a rubber-stamp Congress.

3. Want politics, jealousy, selfishness, greed, and profiteering taken out of our war program.

4. Want to know the truth about our war production, war policy, our gains and losses on the battle fronts. They want the news to come from our Government. They don't want to be dependent upon some of our allies for this information.

5. Want immediate dismissal of all on the Federal pay roll who are not needed and who are not giving performance comparable to their pay. Those not needed should be placed in armed service, on essential production lines, or on the farms.

6. Want the Federal Government to recognize State and local rights and the right of private and individual initiative.

7. Want policy-forming departments to be headed by individuals with practical experience, not theorists.

8. Want the right to work and the right to produce without unnecessary governmental red tape and interference.

9. Want Congress to establish a definite post-war policy, guaranteeing to the boys and girls when they return home, employment and a lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am in complete accord with the above wants of my people, and I believe them to be the desires of the majority of the people of our Nation. I, therefore, respectfully urge and request that the leadership, as well as my colleagues in Congress, cooperate with me in every possible way in order that these wishes be fulfilled, all of which I am certain will be determining factors in bringing this war to an early and successful conclusion.

LET'S INVESTIGATE BEFORE WE TAX

(October 28, 1943)

Let's investigate our Federal bureaus, find out which are needed and which are not needed, how many people can be removed from the Federal pay roll without hindering our war effort, determine how much money is absolutely needed before we burden the people with additional taxes and pour more money into the Federal Treasury. Experience has proved to me if you give Federal bureaus and departments the money they will spend it. So, let us see if they actually need any more money; and if so, how much.

It is not my desire to prevent the necessary departments from having everything they need to carry on the war, but inefficiency and waste has never yet won a war. There definitely is a tremendous amount of waste and unnecessary expenditure, and the production and purchase of unnecessary goods, and the hiring of thousands of totally unnecessary people in our Government agencies. Why is it that the United States is spending more money on this war than all of our allies combined? Why this swarm of Federal employees, these unnecessary rules and expenditures which are increasing our taxes, while we preach economy and sacrifice?

We are ready to spend any amount of money actually needed to save a single life or shorten the war 1 minute, but we want these expenditures to be based upon actual needs, and not upon mere unfounded recommendations. Let us again reflect the thrift and common sense of our forefathers who founded this country. Let us all be champions of economy and good judgment and enemies of extravagance and waste.

VOTE FOR ARMED FORCES

(December 8, 1943)

Give to the men and women of our fighting units the right to vote, as well as legislation that will give a cash payment at the time of their discharge. The legislation relative to voting should allow them the franchise with a minimum of red tape and trouble. Since they are fighting to save our country, they want to vote to save our country. Thousands of men are being discharged practically penniless. Let's give them immediate financial assistance to help them get readjusted to civilian life. These are obligations that we cannot conscientiously postpone any longer.

MC GREGOR OBJECTS TO ADJOURNMENT

(December 20, 1943)

I want to go home—so do the boys and girls of our military units. But they cannot go, and we should not go. Let us all remain on the job every day, fight and work as one unit and in this way bring victory at an early date.

VOTE FOR ARMED FORCES

(February 2, 1944)

I am glad to take the floor and fight for the right of those who are wearing the uniform of our country. I will say unequivocally that I want our armed forces to vote, but I don't want them to be penalized or discriminated against because they are wearing the uniform. They certainly are entitled to the same ballot you and I have. They are American citizens giving their lives that you and I might live and vote for all those we want in public office. Let's give them that same privilege.

MC GREGOR SPEAKS IN BEHALF OF VETERANS

(March 28, 1944)

It is our duty as a Congress to develop a program to assure just and equal benefits for those of our armed forces.

Being a veteran of World War No. 1, I fully realize the difficulties encountered when we attempt to rehabilitate ourselves to civilian life after service in the armed forces.

The records will show that I have consistently supported all equitable legislation providing just and reasonable benefits for our fighting men and women of all wars, as well as for their dependents, and I hope that when the committee has hearings on these two bills—S. 1767 and H. R. 4357—relative to veterans of World War No. 2, the committee will also give some consideration to the needs of veterans and their dependents of World War No. 1. Let us give immediate aid for these groups of patriotic citizens.

MC GREGOR OPPOSES BUREAUCRATIC CONTROL

(May 25, 1944)

Mr. Speaker, we find that we now have scores of agencies set up by Executive directive, and, to a great extent, government by bureaucratic decree instead of government by legislation. Under this management, Government bureaus have the power of life and death over practically every individual and private business enterprise in the country.

The people are aroused, Congress should be aroused, and at once put a stop to the power of these Government bureaus which are practically destroying private business through the imposition of penalties. These bureaus have a control over industry, business and civilian life, and by directives make our laws and then serve as prosecutor, judge, and jury.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, while we are fighting the greatest war in history, to preserve our freedom, we don't want to lose our own constitutional form of government. If we continue to allow bureaucratic control and government by Executive decrees, it will not be long until the legislative branch will be so stripped of authority and the executive department so entrenched that any attempt to recover constitutional government will be doomed for defeat.

So again I say, Mr. Speaker, we, as Members of Congress, can and must stop bureaucratic control or government by Executive directives. We represent the people and we stand between government by representation on one hand and government by bureaucracy and dictatorship on the other. We must lead the fight for the survival of our American institutions, our American people, and our American form of government.

The President's Speech at Boston, October 30, 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of keeping the record straight and preventing any confusion as to what the facts are with respect to the President's Boston speech, made on October 30, 1940, I include herein an editorial contained in the Washington Times-Herald of Wednesday, July 26, 1944, which I believe gives the facts as they occurred:

P. S.—YOU CAN TAKE IT OFF YOUR INCOME TAX

When Mr. Roosevelt made his "again and again and again" speech at Boston on October 30, 1940, he spoke as follows:

"And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

"They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. The purpose of our defense is defense."

Since calling attention to this statement by Mr. Roosevelt, which is what clinched the defeat of Wendell Willkie that year, we have had a great deal of mail declaring that we did not give the full quotation.

The letter writers—on the Roosevelt side, of course—generally assert that the President added the words:

"Unless we are attacked."

We reiterate that the quotation given above is the full quotation, and that nowhere in the record of that speech, nor in the recording of his voice on that occasion, do the words "unless we are attacked" appear.

As an evidence of our sincerity we will bet—no, pardon us, we are not supposed to bet on elections—we will offer to an organized charity the sum of $5,000, provided any party who questions the actuality of Mr. Roosevelt's words can prove we are wrong. This is on the understanding that the challenger will put up $5,000 if he is wrong, the charity to be designated by the winner.

"PUT NOT YOUR TRUST IN PRINCES"

While we are on the subject we might spring a few more direct quotes from Mr. Roosevelt, taken from more talks made just prior to the last election. On November 2, in Cleveland, he said, among other things:

"There is a great storm raging. It makes things harder for the world. And that storm, which did not start in this land of ours, is the true reason why I would like to stick by these people of ours until we reach the clear, sure footing ahead.

"We will make it—make it before the next term is over. We will make it and the world, we hope, will make it, too.

"When that term is over there will be another President, and many more Presidents in years to come."

Two days later, on November 4, while going up the Hudson Valley to Hyde Park, Mr. Roosevelt stopped to address some "old neighbors" on what he described as his sixth visit on the day before election.

"It is the last time, very obviously," he said, "that I will do that as a candidate for office, but you can be sure that in the years to come my heart will be in Dutchess County, where it always has been."

HERE WE LOSE QUOTATION MARKS

On November 8, 1940, Mr. Roosevelt held his first press conference after his reelection. We are not privileged to present direct quotations, because he long ago established a rule that reporters must beat around the bush and avoid the President's words within quotation marks.

So we can only give the gist of what passed at the press conference, although it is reasonably accurate, as all those who reported the occasion agree on it.

The room was crowded, and Mr. Roosevelt was in a victorious mood. One of the reporters, seizing the first chance, asked him whether he would he would stand by his assurances that he would not seek another term.

Mr. Roosevelt, possibly tired out by the campaign that was just over, turned snappish, and even angry.

The reporter, he said, had better return to grade school and learn the English language; the statement the President had issued before the election had been perfectly clear to the President and to everyone else as well.

At this point the assembled press laughed. The reporter blushed and started to ask another question. Mr. Roosevelt cut in again and said he was not there to teach the reporter English; the statement had been in English, perfectly clear English, and the reporter had better read it again.

The conference then passed on to other matters.

The moral of all this seems to be contained in Psalms cxvi: 3:

"Put not your trust in princes."

Acceptance Speech by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the acceptance speech delivered by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, to the Republican National Convention at Chicago on June 28, 1944.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am profoundly moved by the trust you have placed in me. I deeply feel the responsibility which goes with your nomination for President of the United States at this grave hour of our Nation's history.

That I have not sought this responsibility, all of you know. I told the people of my State, 2 years ago, that it was my intention to devote my full term as Governor exclusively to their service. You have decided otherwise. In accordance with the principles of our republican form of government you have laid upon me the highest duty to which an American can be called. No one has a right to refuse that call. With the help of God. I shall try to be worthy of the trust. I accept the nomination.

I am happy and proud to be associated in this effort with my good friend the distinguished Governor of Ohio—John W. Bricker.

For many months John Bricker has gone from State to State telling people what the real issues are and telling them the need for better government and what great good will come with election of Republicans.

MADE NO PLEDGES

Never before in the history of our party has any man displayed such fine sportsmanship as he did this morning, and I am proud to be associated with him.

I come to this great task a freeman. I have made no pledges, promises, or commitments, expressed or implied, to any man or woman. I shall make none, except to the American people.

These pledges I do make:

To men and women of the Republican Party everywhere I pledge my utmost efforts in the months ahead. In return, I ask for your support. Without it, I cannot discharge the heavy obligation you lay upon me.

To Americans of every party I pledge that on January 20 next year our Government will again have a Cabinet of the ablest men and women to be found in America. Its members will expect and will receive full delegation of the powers of their office. They will be capable of administering those powers. They will each be experienced in the task to be done and young enough to do it. This election will bring an end to one-man government in America.

To Americans of every party I pledge a campaign dedicated to one end above all others—that this Nation under God may continue in the years ahead a free nation of freemen.

At this moment on battlegrounds around the world Americans are dying for the freedom of our country. Their comrades are pressing on in the face of hardship and suffering. They are pressing on for total victory and for the liberties of all of us.

Everything we say or do today and in the future must be devoted to the single purpose of that victory. Then, when victory is won, we must devote ourselves with equal unity of purpose to rewinning at home the freedom they have won at such desperate cost abroad.

To our allies let us send from this convention one message from our hearts: The American people are united with you to the limit of our resources and our manpower, devoted to the single task of victory and the establishment of a firm and lasting peace.

To every member of the Axis powers let us send this message: By this political campaign, which you are unable to understand, our will to victory will be strengthened, and with every day you further delay surrender the consequences to you will be more severe.

NO DOUBT OF VICTORY

That we shall win this war none of us and few of our enemies can now have any doubt. But how we win this war is of major importance for the years ahead. We won the last war, but it did not stay won. This time we must also win the purposes for which we are fighting. Germany must never again nourish the delusion that she could have won. We must carry to Japan a defeat so crushing and complete that every last man among them knows that he has been beaten. We must not merely defeat the armies and navies of our enemies. We must defeat, once and for all, their will to make war. In their hearts as well as with their lips let them be taught to say: "Never again."

The military conduct of the war is outside this campaign. It is and must remain completely out of politics. General Marshall and Admiral King are doing a superb job. Thank God for both of them. Let me make it crystal clear that a change of administration next January cannot and will not involve any change in the military conduct of the war. If there is not now any civilian interference with the military and naval commands, a change in administration will not alter that status. If there is civilian interference, the new administration will put a stop to it forthwith.

But the war is being fought on the home front as well as abroad. While all of us are deeply proud of the military conduct of the war, can we honestly say that the home front could not bear improvement? The present administration in Washington has been in office for more than 11 years. Today it is at war with Congress and at war with itself. Squabbles between Cabinet members, feuds between rival bureaucrats, and bitterness between the President and his own party members, in and out of Congress, have become the order of the day. In the vital matters of taxation, price control, rationing, labor relations, manpower, we have become familiar with the spectacle of wrangling, bungling, and confusion.

Does anyone suggest that the present national administration is giving either efficient or competent government? We have not heard that claim made, even by its most fanatical supporters. No, all they tell us is that in its young days it did some good things. That we freely grant. But now it has grown old in office. It has become tired and quarrelsome. It seems that the great men who founded this Nation really knew what they were talking about when they said that three terms were too many.

PEACE MUST BE BUILT

When we have won the war, we shall still have to win the peace. We are agreed, all of us, that America will participate with other sovereign nations in a cooperative effort to prevent future wars. Let us face up boldly to the magnitude of that task. We shall not make secure the peace of the world by mere words. We cannot do it simply by drawing up a fine-sounding treaty. It cannot be the

work of one man or of a little group of rulers who meet together in private conferences. The structure of peace must be built. It must be the work of many men. We must have as our representatives in this task the ablest men and women America can produce, and the structure they join in building must rest upon the solid rock of a united American public opinion.

I am not one of those who despair of achieving that end. I am utterly confident we can do it. For years, we have had men in Washington who were notoriously weak in certain branches of arithmetic but who specialized in division. They have played up minor differences of opinion among our people until the people of other countries might have thought that America was cleft in two.

But all the while there was a large, growing area of agreement. Recently the overwhelming majority of that broad area of agreement has become obvious. The Republican Party can take pride in helping to define it and broaden it. There are only a few, a very few, who really believe that America should try to remain aloof from the world. There are only a relatively few who believe it would be practical for America or her allies to renounce all sovereignty and join a superstate. I certainly would not deny those two extremes the right to their opinions; but I stand firmly with the overwhelming majority of my fellow citizens in that great wide area of agreement. That agreement was clearly expressed by the Republican Mackinac declaration and was adopted in the foreign policy plank of this convention.

No organization for peace will last if it is slipped through by stealth or trickery or the momentary hypnotism of high-sounding phrases. We shall have to work and pray and be patient and make sacrifices to achieve a really lasting peace. That is not too much to ask in the name of those who have died for the future of our country. This is no task for men who specialize in dividing our people. It is no task to be entrusted to stubborn men, grown old and tired and quarrelsome in office. We learned that in 1919.

The building of the peace is more than a matter of international cooperation. God has endowed America with such blessings as to fit her for a great role in the world. We can only play that role if we are strong and healthy and vigorous as Nature has equipped us to be. It would be a tragedy after this war if Americans returned from our armed forces and failed to find the freedom and opportunity for which they fought. This must be a land where every man and woman has a fair chance to work and get ahead. Never again must free Americans face the specter of long-continued, mass unemployment. We Republicans are agreed that full employment shall be a first objective of national policy. By full employment I mean a real chance for every man and woman to earn a decent living at a decent wage.

NEW DEAL FAILED UNEMPLOYED

What hope does the present administration offer here? In 1940, the year before this country entered the war, there were still 10,000,000 unemployed. After 7 years of unequaled power and unparalleled spending, the New Deal had failed utterly to solve that problem. It never solved that problem. It was left to be solved by war. Do we have to have a war in order to get jobs?

What are we now offered? Only the dreary prospect of a continued war economy after the war, with interference piled on interference and petty tyrannies rivaling the very regimentation against which we are now at war.

The present administration has never solved this fundamental problem of jobs and opportunity. It never can solve this problem. It has never even understood what makes a job. It has never been for full production. It has lived in chattering fear of abundance. It has specialized in curtailment and restriction. It has been consistently hostile to and abusive of American business and American industry, although it is in business and industry that most of us make our living.

In all the record of the past 11 years is there anything that suggests the present administration can bring about high-level employment after this year? Is there any reason to believe that those who have so signally failed in the past can succeed in the future? The problem of jobs will not be easily solved; but it will never be solved at all unless we get a new, progressive administration in Washington—and that means a Republican administration.

For 150 years America was the hope of the world. Here on this great broad continent we had brought into being something for which men had longed throughout all history. Here all men were held to be free and equal. Here government derived its just powers from the consent of the governed. Here men believed passionately in freedom, independence—the God-given right of the individual to be his own master. Yet, with all of this freedom—I insist, because of this freedom—ours was a land of plenty. In a fashion unequaled anywhere else in the world, America grew and strengthened; our standard of living became the envy of the world. In all lands, men and women looked toward America as the pattern of what they themselves desired. And because we were what we were, goodwill flowed toward us from all corners of the earth. An American was welcomed everywhere and looked upon with admiration and regard.

FORWARD WITH VIGOR

At times we had our troubles, made our share of mistakes, but we faltered only to go forward with renewed vigor. It remained for this past 11 years, under the present national administration, for continuing unemployment to be accepted with resignation as the inevitable condition of a nation past its prime.

It is the New Deal which tells us that America has lost its capacity to grow. We shall never build a better world by listening to those counsels of defeat. Is America old and worn out? Look to the beaches of Normandy for the answer. Look to the reaches of the wide Pacific—to the corners of the world where American men are fighting. Look to the marvels of production in the war plants in your own towns. I say to you: Our country is just fighting its way through to new horizons. The future of America has no limit.

True, we now pass through dark and troubled times. Scarcely a home escapes the touch of dread anxiety and grief; yet in this hour the American spirit rises, faith returns—faith in our God, faith in our fellowman, faith in the land our fathers died to win, faith in the future, limitless, and bright of this, our country.

In the name of that faith we shall carry our cause in the coming months to the American people.

Kill the Japs!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. H. CARSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by James Francis Thierry, of Canton, Ohio:

KILL THE JAPS!

(By James Francis Thierry)

On an afternoon one Sunday
Came the news upon the air:
"Japs have knifed us at Pearl Harbor
From their Asiatic lair"—
Kill the Jap rats! Kill the Japs!

Many a month of war has seared us,
And another story comes
Of the fiendish crimes committed
By those bloody little bums—
Kill the Jap rats! Kill the Japs!

They have killed and tortured thousands
In the death traps of the east—
And we'll wreak a fearful vengeance
For their brutal vulture feast—
Kill the Jap rats! Kill the Japs!

We must blast and beat and batter
Every rotten little Jap!
We must smash their savage empire—
We must wipe them off the map.
Kill the Jap rats! Kill the Japs!

Cries of vengeance ride the storm-wings
Of a nation's bitter wrath.
Through Japan's corrupted cities
Bombs will blast a blazing path.
Kill the Jap rats! Kill the Japs!

By our martyrs at Manila,
Bataan and Corregidor.
We'll avenge our fallen heroes
When we win this fearful war.
Kill the Jap rats! Kill the Japs!

In New Guinea stands MacArthur
In the sunset's golden gleam—
Sworn to wield the Sword of Vengeance,
And the Philippines redeem.
Kill the Jap rats! Kill the Japs!

Send our bombers over Tokio—
Speeded by our cold disgust.
Wipe it out like ancient Carthage,
Smashed completely into dust.
Kill the Jap rats! Kill the Japs!

O'er Balboa's mighty ocean
Swim the rats of black Japan.
To the brute Mikado's rat-tail
Uncle Sam will tie a can.
Kill the Jap rats! Kill the Japs!

Death to that unclean Mikado,
And to all his evil crew.
While the Eagle screams defiance
O'er the heaven's vault of blue:
Kill the Jap rats! Kill the Japs!

Franco, Farrell, and De Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Station WOR, July 12, 1944:

Two devastating wars within 25 years have taught us at least one lesson. Freedom cannot be maintained in any one country without regard to what happens to freedom in other countries. As was wisely stated by Mr. Joseph M. Jones in Fortune magazine, we have paid a horrifying toll "to learn that unless the democratic principle is maintained in a vigorous, living, and growing state, pro-

tected and extended in the world, it will either wither away and die or be destroyed in its citadel." The United States not only have the greatest stake in protecting and extending the democratic principle, but as world leader, symbol of freedom in the world, is the only country that is in a position to take the lead in that great task.

To that end America must nurture and encourage the spread of that democracy with its free elections, freedom of speech, religion, and press, and protection of rights of the individual with equality before the law and freedom from arbitrary search and arrest.

Concomitantly any force that traduces that democracy must be destroyed, whether it be fascism in Italy, Falangism in Spain or Argentina, nazi-ism in the Reich, or Japanism in Asia and the Pacific.

Therefore, the democracy of a French Committee of National Liberation under a De Gaulle must be encouraged, while the despotism of Franco in Spain must be eliminated and the fascism of a Farrell in Argentina must be discouraged.

You cannot confine or isolate fascism any more than you can confine a stink in a closet. It seeps through and befouls the air. Our own freedom is correspondingly contaminated with Franco flourishing to our east and Farrell to our south.

The world cannot exist half free and half Fascist, half liberated, half coerced and cowed.

What shall be our policy, for instance, toward Franco after we shall have beaten Hitler? Certainly we cannot accept this tyrant in the family of respectable nations. Franco and his Falange crushed democracy in Spain because the United States, England, and France (at England's bidding) failed to aid the Republicans. Our tragic nonintervention helped sustain this foe of democracy.

Shall we aid him again as we did another Fascist monster—Mussolini—and offer him money to make his trains run on time?

Shall we continue to recognize Franco? No. Shall we, in common parlance, give the "hot foot" to the Fascist Farrell regime in Argentina? Yes.

Why? Because it is the only way we can use our great powers and influence to restore the conditions of freedom in these benighted lands; otherwise another Schickelgruber on horseback or a howling dervish on a cannon top will again so entrench himself as to require a third world war to dislodge him.

Franco has rightfully been called "appeasement's child." If it were left to me, I might say "brat." Since the end of the Spanish civil war, the history of Allied Nations' negotiation with Spain reveals one appeasement after another, and the tragedy of it all was that the one-way concessions by England and the United States yielded naught. They merely served to increase Franco's already voracious appetite. He has never taken the trouble to disguise his community of interest and purpose with Hitler and Mussolini.

With utter spinelessness, we accorded Franco a credit of $13,350,000 through our Export-Import Bank to supply him with much-needed cotton.

Our objective, of course, was good will. But our gifts proved as useless as water going down a drain. We did not even wait for Franco to ask for favors. We coddled him. We actually sought him out and bestowed our largesse upon him. We delivered to him at bargain prices two 12,600-ton ships. In return, our embassy at Madrid was stoned by Falangists from the University of Madrid with the open connivance of the Government.

We gave Franco half a million dollars' worth of flour, dried and condensed milk, and medicines, paid for out of a congressional appropriation, to the Red Cross for the relief of the war stricken. The American food remained in Spain all right, but equivalent amounts were exported to Hitler. It was not generally advertised among the Spanish people that the American Government had been so generous to them.

Regardless, he sent his evil-reeking Blue Division of Fascist Spaniards to fight against Russia, our ally, on the eastern front. Then adding insult to injury, he sent a congratulatory message to José Laurel, puppet Quisling of the Japan-sponsored government of the Philippines. At this moment Franco continues to ship wolfram, so valuable and strategic a metal in airplane manufacture, to Hitler.

He continues to permit Spain to be a happy hunting ground for Axis spies. Many an American merchant ship and transport has been sunk by Axis subs because Madrid was a veritable pipe line of intelligence as to ship movements passing Gibraltar and Tangier, Spanish Morocco.

If we so desire we certainly have the power to bend El Caudillo to our will. He must depend upon us for gasoline, raw materials, and machinery. He must depend upon England for coal and for the navicerts to forward much-needed corn, wheat, and meat from the Argentine.

He no longer presents a military danger to us. He cannot now imperil our supply lines. Even Gibraltar is no longer menaced by Franco. The Rock is safe, with the Allies in complete control of north Africa and the Mediterranean. The Azores, too, are in Allied possession. Portugal's threat has been immunized. D-day has come and is now a date in history.

At best, Franco can only thrust a paper sword at us. All is not well with him at this juncture in Spain. Uneasy lies his head with its thorny crown. Despite the fact that thousands of Republican militiamen are still held without bail in Franco's jails, many patriots and loyalists are ready to band together to fight Franco.

More than 100,000 Spanish Republicans—refugees in South and Central America—are being organized for the liberation of Spain from Generalissimo Francisco Franco's fascism.

Let's get rid of him fast. We should oust the Spanish Ambassador from Washington and recall permanently our Ambassador, the Francophile Carlton Hayes, at once, and then sever diplomatic relations.

Finally we must employ all possible economic sanctions with complete encirclement and blockade of Spain. That would bring El Caudillo cringing to his knees immediately. It would break the pseudo backbone of Spanish fascism at once.

There is another Fascist nation that needs quarantining and that is Argentina. It is proving a cat's paw for Hitler and apes his techniques. Its President, Gen. Edelmiro Farrell, its Col. Juan Domingo Peron recently made the Vice President, need money for rearmament. They confiscate Jewish bank accounts. Newspapers brave enough to speak the truth are taken over and their editors jailed. All political parties have been dissolved. This means the complete collapse of the machinery through which democracy can function. Charters have been taken away from all religious minority groups, thus effectively stamping out freedom of religion. Liberals, radicals, and labor leaders have been placed in internment camps.

Peron delivered an unparalleled jingoistic speech on June 10. He said an Axis or Allied victory would make no difference to Argentina. He boasted that a totalitarian state is the only solution to Argentine needs. A war economy and a warlike life are utterly essential for his country.

Secretary Hull has wisely and none too soon recalled Norman Armour, our Ambassador. This has thrown Farrell and Peron and their cabinet into a state of agitation. Newspapers were ordered to make no mention of Armour's recall. Britain too has recalled her envoy. The simultaneous departure of the Ministers of Peru, Paraguay, and Chile was a severe jolt to the militarists.

Strongest economic sanctions should follow and Farrell and Peron must be brought to book.

We have at long last realized that the military clique that rules Argentina represents a complete triumph for Hitler and Franco in that there has been set up a pure Fascist state in the Western Hemisphere.

Ecuador is threatened with reprisals unless it goes Fascist. Farrell refuses to allow Ecuador to ship quinine to the United States. On Paraguay's border, Argentine Fascist troops threaten to prevent Paraguay's Government from following a firm inter-American Good-neighbor policy. Peron and Farrell place burdensome restrictions against Uruguayan travel and commerce unless Uruguay steps in line. The threat to little Uruguay became so serious that we had to send a squadron down to Montevideo and Admiral Ingram announced that the United States would defend its friend Uruguay against Farrell's totalitarianism.

Farrell knows that aggression is essential to Fascist success. He lost no time in training his guns on Bolivia as well and overthrew the existing government and set up a Fascist regime.

Buenos Aires is a rendezvous of Axis spies.

Argentine presents a most dangerous threat to the future of democracy in South America. Argentine has been flooded with posters and placards denouncing the damned Yankees. Farrell is using Argentine's belated and spurious break with the Axis as an excuse for suppressing all the constitutional rights of the people.

We should blockade the ports of Argentina, embargo essential gasoline, and terminate a most lucrative export trade of hides, corn, meat, and wheat. The Farrell-Peron militarist-Fascist government would then collapse.

While we successfully fight gangsterism, nazi-ism and fascism abroad we cannot let it flourish in our own hemisphere's back yard.

De Gaulle is truly representative of France and the French people. The world hails him as the one general in the entire French Cabinet who absolutely refused to surrender. Now all America has welcomed and cheered him.

In my humble opinion, the President errs in withholding complete recognition from De Gaulle and the French Committee as the provisional government of France. This organization, with De Gaulle at its head, is the spontaneous creation of French patriotism, French resistance, and French democracy.

General De Gaulle has no competitor. This gallant soldier has been received at the White House with full diplomatic pomp and ceremony. Apparently he has been accorded every honor save the one he most covets—that of full recognition for his committee and for himself as chief of metropolitan and Empire France. Yet, in France's darkest hour, he refused obeisance to Vichy. It was De Gaulle who escaped to snatch up the flag of France and bid her people rise from paralyzing defeat—and utter despair. He rallied the weary, war-torn French with his cry, "France has lost a battle—but France has not lost the war!" He spat upon Laval and his collection of French Quislings. His bravery caused the most staunch hearts of France to gather around him, to organize the famous underground, the Maquisards, popularly known as the Maquis, and to supervise their resistance so that today, despite Nazi threats and actual reprisals, they control much of France and menace to a great extent Hitler's lines of supply.

As we penetrate deeper into the parts of Normandy liberated by Allied arms, it will be De Gaulle's provisional government that will restore civil authority. Until such time

as the free French people, under the Constitution of the Third Republic, shall be enabled to reconstitute their government, this provisional committee is the guardian of all French rights and the trustee of the power and sovereignty of the French people. De Gaulle is their democratic choice. He should not be fed recognition with an eye-dropper.

I hope that the culmination of De Gaulle's visit will be a full understanding between President Roosevelt and the provisional government of the French Republic, ending finally in complete recognition. De Gaulle represents 50,000,000 Frenchmen of metropolitan and colonial France, with an army, navy, and an air force operating in Africa, Italy, Russia, Great Britain, Normandy, and the Pacific Ocean.

It is difficult to understand our continued recognition of the worthless, hollow Fascist regimes of Franco and Farrell and Peron and our resistance to complete recognition of the democratic free France under De Gaulle. The contradiction does not make any sense to me.

A Poem of a Father to His Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a poem written by Mr. E. B. Wallace, of Bisbee, Ariz., to his son, relative to his oath of loyalty to the United States. At the time the verse was written the boy was attending a secret radio activities school somewhere in these United States.

FOR MY SON BILLY, SEAMAN FIRST CLASS, UNITED STATES NAVY

I pledge allegiance to my flag,
May God my witness be;
No tyrant foe can ever drag
Its furls on land or sea.

My heart will thrill with joy and pride
As thy stars and stripes unfold,
Exalted reverence from inside,
Its glories yet untold.

May I be mindful of my trust;
Dear God, direct my way
To know at all times that I must
Look up to Thee and pray.

Oh, my America, I am proud
To be one of thy sons;
To serve thee well, if I'm allowed
To man thy ships and guns.

I swear by all that I hold dear,
By all I do or say;
My sacred trust, be ever near
My heart, my U. S. A.

No reservations will I hold,
My pledge, my oath, to thee;
My strength, my all, till I am old,
My land of Liberty.

From Dad,

E. B. WALLACE.

BISBEE, ARIZ.

Republican Platform, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Republican platform of 1944, adopted by the Republican National Convention on June 27, 1944, in Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM 1944

The tragedy of the war is upon our country as we meet to consider the problems of government and our people. We take this opportunity to render homage and enduring gratitude to those brave members of our armed forces who have already made the supreme sacrifice, and to those who stand ready to make the same sacrifice that the American course of life may be secure.

Mindful of this solemn hour and humbly conscious of our heavy responsibilities, the Republican Party in convention assembled presents herewith its principles and makes these covenants with the people of our Nation.

THE WAR AND THE PEACE

We pledge prosecution of the war to total victory against our enemies in full cooperation with the United Nations and all-out support of our Armies and the maintenance of our Navy under the competent and trained direction of our General Staff and Office of Naval Operations without civilian interference and with every civilian resource. At the earliest possible time after the cessation of hostilities we will bring home all members of our armed forces who do not have unexpired enlistments and who do not volunteer for further overseas duty.

We declare our relentless aim to win the war against all our enemies: (1) For our own American security and welfare; (2) to make and keep the Axis powers impotent to renew tyranny and attack; (3) for the attainment of peace and freedom based on justice and security.

We shall seek to achieve such aims through organized international cooperation and not by joining a world state.

We favor responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

Such organization should develop effective cooperative means to direct peace forces to prevent or repel military aggression. Pending this, we pledge continuing collaboration with the United Nations to assure these ultimate objectives.

We believe, however, that peace and security do not depend upon the sanction of force alone, but should prevail by virtue of reciprocal interests and spiritual values recognized in these security agreements. The treaties of peace should be just; the nations which are the victims of aggression should be restored to sovereignty and self-government; and the organized cooperation of the nations should concern itself with basic causes of world disorder. It should promote a world opinion to influence the nations to right conduct, develop international law and maintain an international tribunal to deal with justiciable disputes.

We shall seek, in our relations with other nations, conditions calculated to promote world-wide economic stability, not only for the sake of the world, but also to the end that our own people may enjoy a high level of employment in an increasingly prosperous world.

We shall keep the American people informed concerning all agreements with foreign nations. In all of these undertakings we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority in behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight. We shall sustain the Constitution of the United States in the attainment of our international aims; and pursuant to the Constitution of the United States any treaty or agreement to attain such aims made on behalf of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

We shall at all times protect the essential interests and resources of the United States.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE RELATIONS

We shall develop pan-American solidarity. The citizens of our neighboring nations in the Western Hemisphere are, like ourselves, Americans. Cooperation with them shall be achieved through mutual agreement and without interference in the internal affairs of any nation. Our policy should be a genuine good-neighbor policy commanding their respect, and not one based on the reckless squandering of American funds by overlapping agencies.

POST-WAR PREPAREDNESS

We favor the maintenance of post-war military forces and establishments of ample strength for the successful defense and the safety of the United States, its possessions, and outposts, for the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine, and for meeting any military commitments determined by Congress. We favor the peacetime maintenance and strengthening of the National Guards under State control with Federal training and equipment as now provided in the National Defense Act.

DOMESTIC POLICY

We shall devote ourselves to re-establishing liberty at home.

We shall adopt a program to put men to work in peace industry as promptly as possible and with special attention to those who have made sacrifice by serving in the armed forces. We shall take Government out of competition with private industry and terminate rationing, price-fixing, and all other emergency powers. We shall promote the fullest stable employment through private enterprise.

The measures we propose shall avoid federalization of Government activities, to the end that our States, schools, and cities shall be free; shall avoid delegation of legislative and judicial power to administrative agencies, to the end that the people's representatives in Congress shall be independent and in full control of legislative policy; and shall avoid, subject to war necessities, detailed regulation of farmers, workers, businessmen, and consumers, to the end that the individual shall be free. The remedies we propose shall be based on intelligent cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and local government, and the initiative of civic groups—not on the panacea of Federal cash.

Four years more of New Deal policy would centralize all power in the President, and would daily subject every act of every citizen to regulation by his henchmen; and this country could remain a republic only in name. No problem exists which cannot be

solved by American methods. We have no need of either the communistic or the fascist technique.

SECURITY

Our goal is to prevent hardship and poverty in America. That goal is attainable by reason of the productive ability of free American labor, industry, and agriculture, if supplemented by a system of social security on sound principles.

We pledge our support of the following:

1. Extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered.

2. The return of the public employment-office system to the States at the earliest possible time, financed as before Pearl Harbor.

3. A careful study of Federal-State programs for maternal and child health, dependent children, and assistance to the blind, with a view to strengthening these programs.

4. The continuation of these and other programs relating to health, and the stimulation by Federal aid of State plans to make medical and hospital service available to those in need without disturbing doctor-patient relationships or socializing medicine.

5. The stimulation of State and local plans to provide decent low-cost housing properly financed by the Federal Housing Administration, or otherwise, when such housing cannot be supplied or financed by private sources.

LABOR

The Republican Party is the historical champion of free labor. Under Republican administrations American manufacturing developed, and American workers attained the most progressive standards of living of any workers in the world. Now the Nation owes those workers a debt of gratitude for their magnificent productive effort in support of the war.

Regardless of the professed friendship of the New Deal for the workingman, the fact remains that under the New Deal American economic life is being destroyed.

The New Deal has usurped selfish and partisan control over the functions of Government agencies where labor relationships are concerned. The continued perversion of the Wagner Act by the New Deal menaces the purposes of the law and threatens to destroy collective bargaining completely and permanently.

The long series of Executive orders and bureaucratic decrees reveal a deliberate purpose to substitute for contractual agreements of employers and employees the political edicts of a New Deal bureaucracy. Labor would thus remain organized only for the convenience of the New Deal in enforcing its orders and inflicting its whims upon labor and industry.

We condemn the conversion of administrative boards, ostensibly set up to settle industrial disputes, into instruments for putting into effect the financial and economic theories of the New Deal.

We condemn the freezing of wage rates at arbitrary levels and the binding of men to their jobs as destructive to the advancement of a free people. We condemn the repeal by Executive order of the laws secured by the Republican Party to abolish "contract labor" and peonage. We condemn the gradual but effective creation of a labor front as but one of the New Deal's steps toward a totalitarian state.

We pledge an end to political trickery in the administration of labor laws and the handling of labor disputes; and equal benefits on the basis of equality to all labor in the administration of labor controls and laws, regardless of political affiliation.

The Department of Labor has been emasculated by the New Deal. Labor bureaus, agencies, and committees are scattered far and wide, in Washington and throughout the country, and have no semblance of systematic or responsible organization. All governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor. Such labor bureaus as are not performing a substantial and definite service in the interest of labor must be abolished.

The Secretary of Labor should be a representative of labor. The office of the Secretary of Labor was created under a Republican President, William Howard Taft. It was intended that a representative of labor should occupy this Cabinet office. The present administration is the first to disregard this intention.

The Republican Party accepts the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, the Wages and Hours Act, the Social Security Act, and all other Federal statutes designed to promote and protect the welfare of American working men and women, and we promise a fair and just administration of these laws.

American well-being is indivisible. Any national program which injures the national economy inevitably injures the wage earner. The American labor movement and the Republican Party, while continuously striving for the betterment of labor's status, reject the communistic and New Deal concept that a single group can benefit while the general economy suffers.

AGRICULTURE

We commend the American farmers, their wives and families, for their magnificent job of wartime production and their contribution to the war effort, without which victory could not be assured. They have accomplished this in spite of labor shortages, a bungled and inexcusable machinery program, and confused, unreliable, impractical price and production administration.

Abundant production is the best security against inflation. Governmental policies in war and in peace must be practical and efficient with freedom from regimentation by an impractical Washington breaucracy in order to assure independence of operation and bountiful production, fair and equitable market prices for farm products, and a sound program for conservation and use of our soil and natural resources. Educational progress and the social and economic stability and well-being of the farm family must be a prime national purpose.

For the establishment of such a program we propose the following:

1. A Department of Agriculture under practical and experienced administration free from regimentation and confusing Government manipulation and control of farm programs.

2. An American market price to the American farmer and the protection of such price by means of support prices, commodity loans, or a combination thereof, together with such other economic means as will assure an income to agriculture that is fair and equitable in comparison with labor, business, and industry. We oppose subsidies as a substitute for fair markets.

3. Disposition of surplus war commodities in an orderly manner without destroying markets or continued production and without benefit to speculative profiteers.

4. The control and disposition of future surpluses by means of (a) new uses developed through constant research, (b) vigorous development of foreign markets, (c) efficient domestic distribution to meet all domestic requirements, and (d) arrangements which will enable farmers to make necessary adjustments in production of any given basic crop only if domestic surpluses should become abnormal and exceed manageable proportions.

5. Intensified research to discover new crops, and new and profitable uses for existing crops.

6. Support of the principle of bona fide farmer-owned and farmer-operated cooperatives.

7. Consolidation of all Government farm credit under a nonpartisan board.

8. To make life more attractive on the family-type farm through development of rural roads, sound extension of rural electrification service to the farm, and elimination of basic evils of tenancy wherever they exist.

9. Serious study of and search for a sound program of crop insurance with emphasis upon establishing a self-supporting program.

10. A comprehensive program of soil, forest, water, and wildlife conservation and development, and sound irrigation projects, administered as far as possible at State and regional levels.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

We give assurance now to restore peacetime industry at the earliest possible time, using every care to avoid discrimination between different sections of the country, (a) by prompt settlement of war contracts with early payment of Government obligations and disposal of surplus inventories, and (b) by disposal of surplus Government plants, equipment and supplies, with due consideration to small buyers and with care to prevent monopoly and injury to existing agriculture and industry.

Small business is the basis of American enterprise. It must be preserved. If protected against discrimination and afforded equality of opportunity throughout the Nation, it will become the most potent factor in providing employment. It must also be aided by changes in taxation, by eliminating excessive and repressive regulation and Government competition, by the enforcement of laws against monopoly and unfair competition, and by providing simpler and cheaper methods for obtaining venture capital necessary for growth and expansion.

For the protection of the public, and for the security of millions of holders of policies of insurance in mutual and private companies, we insist upon strict and exclusive regulation and supervision of the business of insurance by the several States where local conditions are best known and where local needs can best be met.

We favor the reestablishment and maintenance, as early as military considerations will permit, of a sound and adequate American merchant marine under private ownership and management.

The Republican Party pledges itself to foster the development of such strong privately owned air-transportation systems and communications systems as will best serve the interests of the American people.

The Federal Government should plan a program for flood control, inland waterways and other economically justifiable public works, and prepare the necessary plans in advance so that construction may proceed rapidly in emergency and in times of reduced employment. We urge that States and local governments pursue the same policy with reference to highways and other public works within their jurisdiction.

TAXATION AND FINANCE

As soon as the war ends the present rates of taxation on individual incomes, on corporations, and on consumption should be reduced as far as is consistent with the payment of the normal expenditures of government in the postwar period. We reject the theory of restoring prosperity through government spending and deficit financing.

We shall eliminate from the budget all wasteful and unnecessary expenditures and exercise the most rigid economy.

It is essential that Federal and State tax structures be more effectively coordinated to the end that State tax sources be not unduly impaired.

We shall maintain the value of the American dollar and regard the payment of government debt as an obligation of honor which prohibits any policy leading to the depreciation of the currency. We shall reduce that debt as soon as economic conditions make such reduction possible.

Control of the currency must be restored to Congress by repeal of existing legislation which gives the President unnecessary and dangerous powers over our currency.

FOREIGN TRADE

We assure American farmers, livestock producers, workers and industry that we will establish and maintain a fair protective tariff on competitive products so that the standards of living of our people shall not be impaired through the importation of commodities produced abroad by labor or producers functioning upon lower standards than our own.

If the post-war world is to be properly organized, a great extension of world trade will be necessary to repair the wastes of war and build an enduring peace. The Republican Party, always remembering that its primary obligation, which must be fulfilled, is to our own workers, our own farmers and our own industry, pledges that it will join with others in leadership in every cooperative effort to remove unnecessary and destructive barriers to international trade. We will always bear in mind that the domestic market is America's greatest market and that tariffs which protect it against foreign competition should be modified only by reciprocal bilateral trade agreements approved by Congress.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

We favor the prompt extension of relief and emergency assistance to the peoples of the liberated countries without duplication and conflict between Government agencies.

We favor immediate feeding of the starving children of our allies and friends in the Nazi-dominated countries and we condemn the New Deal administration for its failure, in the face of humanitarian demands, to make any effort to do this.

We favor assistance by direct credits in reasonable amounts to liberated countries to enable them to buy from this country the goods necessary to revive their economic systems.

BUREAUCRACY

The national administration has become a sprawling, overlapping bureaucracy. It is undermined by executive abuse of power, confused lines of authority, duplication of effort, inadequate fiscal controls, loose personnel practices and an attitude of arrogance previously unknown in our history.

The times cry out for the restoration of harmony in Government, for a balance of legislative and executive responsibility, for efficiency and economy, for pruning and abolishing unnecessary agencies and personnel, for effective fiscal and personnel controls, and for an entirely new spirit in our Federal Government.

We pledge an administration wherein the President, acting in harmony with Congress, will effect these necessary reforms and raise the Federal service to a high level of efficiency and competence.

We insist that limitations must be placed upon spending by Government corporations of vast sums never appropriated by Congress but made available by directives, and that their accounts should be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office.

TWO-TERM LIMIT FOR PRESIDENT

We favor an amendment to the Constitution providing that no person shall be President of the United States for more than two terms of 4 years each.

EQUAL RIGHTS

We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women. We favor job opportunities in the post-war world open to men and women alike without discrimination in rate of pay because of sex.

VETERANS

The Republican Party has always supported suitable measures to reflect the Nation's gratitude and to discharge its duty toward the veterans of all wars.

We approve, have supported and have aided in the enactment of laws which provide for reemployment of veterans of this war in their old positions, for mustering-out pay, for pensions for widows and orphans of such veterans killed or disabled, for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, for temporary unemployment benefits, for education and vocational training, and for assisting veterans in acquiring homes and farms and in establishing themselves in business.

We shall be diligent in remedying defects in veterans legislation and shall insist upon efficient administration of all measures for the veteran's benefit.

RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

We unreservedly condemn the injection into American life of appeals to racial or religious prejudice.

We pledge an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes who are in our armed forces are impairing morale and efficiency, and the adoption of corrective legislation.

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

ANTI-POLL TAX

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

ANTILYNCHING

We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

INDIANS

We pledge an immediate, just, and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation. We will take politics out of the administration of Indian affairs.

PROBLEMS OF THE WEST

We favor a comprehensive program of reclamation projects for our arid and semiarid States, with recognition and full protection of the rights and interests of those States in the use and control of water for present and future irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses.

We favor (a) exclusion from this country of livestock and fresh and chilled meat from countries harboring foot-and-mouth disease or Rinderpest; (b) full protection of our fisheries, whether by domestic regulation or treaties; (c) consistent with military needs, the prompt return to private ownership of lands acquired for war purposes; (d) withdrawal or acquisition of lands for establishment of national parks, monuments, and wildlife refuges, only after due regard to local problems and under closer controls to be established by the Congress; (e) restoration of the long-established public-land policy which provides opportunity of ownership by citizens to promote the highest land use; (f) full development of our forests on the basis of cropping and sustained yield; cooperation with private owners for conservation and fire protection; (g) the prompt reopening of mines which can be operated by miners and workers not subject to military service and which have been closed by bureaucratic denial of labor or material; (h) adequate stock piling of war minerals and metals for possible future emergencies; (i) continuance, for tax purposes, of adequate depletion allowances on oil, gas, and minerals; (j) administration of laws relating to oil and gas on the public domain to encourage exploratory operations to meet the public need; (k) continuance of present Federal laws on mining claims on the public domain, good-faith administration thereof, and we state our opposition to the plans of the Secretary of the Interior to substitute a leasing system; and (l) larger representation in the Federal Government of men and women especially familiar with western problems.

HAWAII

Hawaii, which shares the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood; and to equality with the several States in the rights of her citizens and in the application of all our national laws.

ALASKA

Alaska is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood.

PUERTO RICO

Statehood is a logical aspiration of the people of Puerto Rico who were made citizens of the United States by Congress in 1917; legislation affecting Puerto Rico, insofar as feasible, should be in harmony with the realization of that aspiration.

PALESTINE

In order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jewish men, women, and children driven from their homes by tyranny, we call for the opening of Palestine to their unrestricted immigration and land ownership, so that in accordance with the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the resolution of a Republican Congress in 1922, Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth. We condemn the failure of the President to insist that the mandatory of Palestine carry out the provision of the Balfour Declaration and of the Mandate while he pretends to support them.

FREE PRESS AND RADIO

In times like these, when whole peoples have found themselves shackled by governments which denied the truth, or, worse, dealt in half-truths or withheld the facts from the public, it is imperative to the maintenance of a free America that the press and radio be free and that full and complete information be available to Americans. There must be no censorship except to the extent required by war necessity.

We insistently condemn any tendency to regard the press or the radio as instruments of the administration and the use of Government publicity agencies for partisan ends. We need a new radio law which will define, in clear and unmistakable language, the role of the Federal Communications Commission.

All channels of news must be kept open with equality of access to information at the source. If agreement can be achieved with foreign nations to establish the same principles, it will be a valuable contribution to future peace.

Vital facts must not be withheld.

We want no more Pearl Harbor reports.

GOOD FAITH

The acceptance of the nominations made by this convention carries with it, as a matter of private honor and public faith, an undertaking by each candidate to be true to the principles and program herein set forth.

CONCLUSION

The essential question at trial in this Nation is whether men can organize together in a highly industrialized society, succeed, and still be free. That is the essential question at trial throughout the world today.

In this time of confusion and strife, when moral values are being crushed on every side, we pledge ourselves to uphold with all our strength the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and the law of the land. We so pledge ourselves that the American tradition may stand forever as the beacon light of civilization.

Benefits of Veterans and Their Dependents and Their Rights Under Existing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, there is no subject of more widespread interest throughout the Nation than the benefits of veterans and their dependents under existing law. There is scarcely a family in this Nation that does not have some member in the armed forces of the United States and, for the purpose of enabling the dependents of veterans and returning veterans when they return from the wars to obtain quickly information as to their rights and benefits provided by existing law, I wish to herewith submit the following brief digest of existing statutes passed in their behalf.

G. I. BILL

The act of June 22, 1944, known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, provides:

TITLE I. HOSPITALIZATION, CLAIMS, AND PROCEDURES

First. Adequate organization of the Veterans' Administration to administer all veterans' benefits except employment.

Second. Adequate hospital facilities for the care and treatment of veterans for non-service-connected disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

Third. The right to have explained to him, before discharge or release from active service, all rights and benefits to which the veteran may be entitled, and an opportunity, if he so desires, to file a claim therefor.

Fourth. The right to adequate prosthetic appliances—artificial limbs, eyes, and teeth—and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

Fifth. Adequate safeguards—as against forced statements against the interests of the veteran.

Sixth. Adequate contact facilities in Army and Navy discharge centers, including those furnished by the services of the American Red Cross, by national veterans organizations and by the Veterans' Administration.

Seventh. Prompt transfer of the essential records of service departments to the Veterans' Administration and prompt adjudication of claims for benefits.

Eighth. The right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service—

(a) By the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to determine whether the person, at time of committing the offense, was insane, in event of which determination benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited;

(b) Except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal;

(c) Any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may, likewise, have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever is later.

TITLE II. EDUCATION OF VETERANS

First. One year, or the equivalent thereof, in continuous or part-time study, of education or training—

(a) At any school or institution of the veteran's choice.

(b) In any subject or subjects desired for which he is fitted.

Second. Not to exceed 3 additional years of education and training, depending upon—

(a) Length of service.

(b) Satisfactory progress in studies or training.

(c) The condition that the person was not over 25 years of age at the time of entrance into service, or, if over such age, that his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of entrance into service.

Third. Payment of all tuition and other fees, cost of books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, not to exceed a maximum of $500 per school year.

Fourth. Subsistence allowance while pursuing education or training in the amount of $50 per month if the veteran is without dependents, or $75 per month if he has a dependent or dependents.

Fifth. Part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but the payment of tuition and other expenses.

Sixth. The right to have released to him books and equipment furnished if he satisfactorily completes his course of education or training.

Seventh. The right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities is extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

TITLE III. LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

First. Loans for the purposes stated or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan. The total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding the aggregate of $2,000.

(a) Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions;

(b) The proceeds of the proposed loan must be used for one or more of the purposes specified and the circumstances must meet the specifications prescribed;

(c) Interest rate must not exceed 4 percent per annum;

(d) The loan must be practicable and suitable to the veteran's circumstances;

(e) The loan must be repaid within 20 years;

(f) The Government must have the right of subrogation to the extent of any guarantee paid;

(g) The liability under the guarantee must decrease or increase with the decrease or increase of the amount of unpaid obligation;

(h) The agreement must permit the Government to protect itself in case of default through the right to bid on foreclosure proceedings or to refinance.

Second. In the event a principal loan is made or guaranteed or insured by a Federal agency, a loan for all or part of the balance or the purchase price or cost may be guaranteed—

(a) If it does not exceed $2,000;

(b) If it does not exceed 20 percent of the cost or purchase price;

(c) If the interest rate does not exceed by more than 1 percent the interest rate on the principal loan;

(d) If the conditions otherwise meet those prescribed under 1 above.

Third. Any veteran eligible under title III shall also be eligible for the benefits of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant. Eligibility must be determined—

(a) By Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

(b) By the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE IV. EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

First. The right to registration for employment with or for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service through—

(a) The United States Employment Service,

(b) Any State employment agency cooperating with the United States Employment Service.

It should be noted also that this right applies to any veteran of any war, discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable discharge; and it should also be noted that, while the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is made responsible for veterans' employment, that is not a function of the Veterans' Administration but is retained in the United States Employment Service.

TITLE IV. READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

First. Unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed, subject to the following conditions:

1. The week of unemployment must have begun—

(a) After the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the effective date of the act;

(b) Not later than 2 years after discharge or release from active service, or the termination of the war, whichever be the later date.

2. That the veteran shall not receive subsistence allowance for education or training under title II of the act or increased pension for vocational training

under Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress.

3. To be eligible, the person must—

(a) Reside in the United States;

(b) Be completely unemployed—or if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week;

(c) Be registered with and reporting to a public employment office;

(d) Be able to work and available for suitable work.

4. Any person will be disqualified from receiving an allowance if—

(a) He leaves suitable work voluntarily, without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct;

(b) He, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work or to accept suitable work offered;

(c) He fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course;

(d) He is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage;

(e) Added penalties apply to successive disqualifying offenses.

5. Within the 52 weeks limit the total eligibility is determined by allowing 8 weeks of allowances for each of the first 3 months of service and 4 weeks of allowances for each month or major fraction thereof of service thereafter.

6. The allowance of $20 per week will be reduced by any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation other than pension, compensation or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration, received by the veteran for the same period of time.

Second. Any person self-employed for profit in an independent establishment, trade, business, profession, or other vocation is eligible for readjustment allowances—

(a) If net earnings are less than $100 for the previous calendar month.

(b) The amount of allowance to be the difference between the net earnings and $100 per month.

(c) The conditions as to eligibility otherwise as provided in title V, except the qualifications and disqualifications.

Third. Severe penalties are provided for fraud and misrepresentation in connection with claims for readjustment allowances.

Fourth. Readjustment allowance claims are to be serviced by State agencies or, as to railway employees, by the Railroad Retirement Board.

Fifth. Right of appeal from any such agency to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is preserved.

TITLE VI. GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND PENAL PROVISIONS

First. By definition "veterans" include those who reside within the continental United States, the several States, territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

Second. A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable is made a prerequisite to entitlement to benefits under Public Law No. 2, as amended, as well as this act. This will apply to—

(a) Pensions.

(b) Compensation.

(c) Hospitalization.

(d) Domiciliary care.

(e) Vocational training;

(f) Benefits provided by this act.

Declaration is made that benefits received under this act shall be deducted from any benefit afforded by subsequent legislation, if any, in the nature of adjusted pay or compensation for service.

VETERANS' BENEFITS UNDER OTHER LAWS—ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES ADMINISTERED BY THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

The following amounts are paid for the support of soldiers' dependents:

A wife only, $50.

Wife and one child, $80.

Wife and two children, $100.

For each additional child, an additional $20.

One child but no wife, $42.

For each additional child, an additional $20.

If the parents are dependent upon the soldier:

One parent will receive $50.

Two parents, $68.

One parent and one dependent brother or sister, $68.

Two parents and one dependent brother or sister, $79.

One brother or sister but no parent, $42.

For each additional dependent brother or sister, an additional $11.

DOMICILIARY CARE

The United States Soldiers' Home, under jurisdiction of the War Department, or Naval Home, under jurisdiction of the Navy Department. This is in addition to that provided by the Veterans' Administration.

EMPLOYMENT

Return to his job after discharge under jurisdiction of Selective Service; placing in other jobs, War Manpower Commission; veterans' preference, administered by United States Civil Service Commission and various departments and agencies; job training, rehabilitation (nonservice disability), administered by the Federal Security Agency.

INSURANCE

Old-age and survivors insurance administered by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency.

RETIREMENT PAY

Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard administered for officers and enlisted personnel of the regularly established and reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

TAXES

Bureau of Internal Revenue: All veteran benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration are exempt from all taxation.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Act of February 3, 1944, Public Law No. 225, Seventy-eighth Congress: Mustering-out pay of $300 for persons who have performed active service for sixty days or more, have served outside the continental limits of the United States or Alaska; $200 for persons who have performed active service for sixty days or more and have served no part thereof outside the continental limits of the United States or Alaska; $100 for persons who have performed active service for less than sixty days.

PENSIONS FOR SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR, BOXER REBELLION, AND PHILIPPINE INSURRECTION VETERANS

Act of March 1, 1944, Public Law No. 242, Seventy-eighth Congress: Pensions were increased for these veterans, based upon total disability or age 65, from $60 to $75 per month. Previous law was liberalized with respect to the limiting of marriage and governing eligibility of widows of deceased veterans for service pension purposes by changing the limiting date of marriage from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938; and provided for increased pension to widows of this group by granting $40 per month to a widow when the age of 65 years is attained, or $50 per month if the widow or former widow was the wife of a veteran during the period of his service in the war.

VETERANS OF INDIAN WARS

Act of March 3, 1944, Public Law No. 245, Seventy-eighth Congress: Increased the rate for total disability or age 65 to $60 per month; and authorized the rate of $100 per month where the veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance of another person. The act also liberalized the marriage date previously limited to March 3, 1917, by including additional widows married after that date if 60 years of age and if married to the veteran 10 or more years prior to his death, with the requirement of continuous cohabitation with the veteran from date of marriage to date of death; and increased the service pension from $30 to $40 per month upon the attainment by the widow of age 70 years and $50 per month if the widow was the wife of the veteran during the period of his service in the Indian wars.

NATIONAL GUARD AND SELECTIVE SERVICE MEN'S PENSION BENEFITS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Act of May 11, 1944, Public Law 300, Seventy-eighth Congress: Provided for volunteers, National Guard men, and selectees pension benefits based upon disability resulting from injury or disease incurred in the line of duty while reporting under orders of the local draft board and prior to acceptance or rejection from service. This act provides benefits similar to those which were provided for World War No. 1 cases.

SEEING-EYE DOGS, ETC., FOR BLIND VETERANS

Act of May 24, 1944, authorized the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide seeing-eye dogs trained for the aid of blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to provide such veterans with mechanical and electronic equipment for aiding them to overcome their handicap of blindness.

INCREASED PENSION RATES

Act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress: Increased by 15 percent the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to the veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities; increased the rates for widows and children under

Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, which provides compensation to the widow and children where any World War No. 1 veteran dies of non-service-connected cause but at the time of death had a service-connected disability and included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the said Public Law No. 484, as amended.

PENSION BASED UPON NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

Act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 313, Seventy-eighth Congress: Increased the pension payable for non-service-connected disability of permanent and total degree applicable to veterans of World War No. 1 and the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, from $40 to $50 per month, and increased the rate to $60 per month where such veterans shall have been rated permanently and totally disabled and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or reached the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. The act also made the benefits above described available to World War No. 2 veterans.

RETIRED PAY

Act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 314, Seventy-eighth Congress: Provides for the payment of pension or compensation to certain persons receiving retired pay by permitting a waiver of so much of the retired pay and allowances as is equal in amount to the pension or compensation to which the retired person is otherwise entitled. Inasmuch as pensions and compensation are exempt from income tax and retired pay other than that for disability incurred in line of duty, is not so exempt. The effect of this act is to permit exemption of so much of the retired pay as is waived in order to receive pension or compensation.

COMPENSATION AND PENSION FOR DISABILITY OR DEATH

Service-connected disability: Under the Veterans' Regulations promulgated by the act of March 20, 1933, as amended, honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 are entitled to compensation or pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by such service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10-percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as hand, foot, or eye, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month. While the World War No. 2 veterans were entitled to these rates following the act of December 19, 1941, they were placed on complete parallel under the Veterans' Regulations promulgated under the act of July 13, 1943, Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, with reference to the requirements governing proof of service connection of disability. The later act also liberalized the regulation concerning the presumption of soundness upon entry into service. Under Public Law 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 include veterans entitled to wartime rates based upon service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including special awards and allowances fixed by law, were increased by 15 percent.

In lieu of such pension or compensation, Reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States meeting the requirements of the Army regulations pertaining to the retirement of officers of the Regular Establishment, are retired by the War Department, certified to the Veterans' Administration, and their retired pay, equal to 75 percent of their base pay, is paid by the Veterans' Administration out of the pension appropriation.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

Public Law No. 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944: The rate of pension for permanent and total non-service-connected disability applicable to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion, the Philippine Insurrection, and World War No. 1, was increased to $60 per month where such veterans have been rated permanent and total, in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reached the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. This act also provides that the above pension for non-service-connected disability shall apply to both veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH

The rates of compensation or pension for widows, children, and dependent parents of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans, based upon death in service or service-connected death are as follows:

Widow, no child, $50.

Widow, one child—with $13 for each additional child—$65.

No widow, but one child, $25.

No widow, but two children—with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100—$38.

Dependent father and mother, each $25; or one only, $45.

The above rates are contained in Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943, and constitutes a material liberalization of the prior rates.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH

The widow, children, or child of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 are entitled to the following rates of compensation if the veteran at the time of death from a non-service-connected cause had a disability incurred in or aggravated by such war service:

Widow, but no child, $35.

Widow, with one child—with $5 for each additional child—$45.

No widow, but one child, $18.

No widow, but two children—equally divided—$27.

No widow, but three children—equally divided—$36, with $4 for each additional child—the total amount to be equally divided.

Payments are limited to an aggregate in any one case.

The same law, Public Law 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, May 27, 1944, also included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans—previously the provision had applied only to World War No. 1 veterans.

CLAIMS AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF AWARDS

Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred to a veterans' facility, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims with essential service and medical records are forwarded to area offices for adjudication, the applicant shall file claim on proper form which will be supplied upon inquiry addressed to any Veterans' Administration facility or regional office or to the local representative of the local Red Cross or veterans' service organization.

HOSPITALIZATION OF DISCHARGED PERSONNEL

Under interagency agreement, when a person who is to be discharged from military or naval service is in need of further hospital care, prior arrangements are made by the commanding officer to afford him opportunity to file all necessary claims, supply necessary clinical and service data, and send the veteran to the Veterans' Administration facility designed to receive him—C. AR 615–360, change No. 4, April 16, 1943. If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will fill all necessary claims for him.

DEATH IN THE SERVICE

Upon death in the service, the service department notifies the Veterans' Administration and claims forms are sent immediately to all known dependents.

GROUPS POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE FOR PENSIONS

All members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the Public Health Service or of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, when ordered to active service with the Army or Navy or as to United States Public Health Service while service outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, and as to Coast and Geodetic Survey when assigned during present war to duty on business of War or Navy Departments in areas outside continental United States or in Alaska or coastal areas of the United States as determined by the War and Navy Departments to be of immediate military hazard, are potentially eligible for pensions.

THE WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was not in the active service and while the several Women's Reserve Corps of the Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard originally were in the active service, they were by statute precluded from pension eligibility; in lieu thereof, being subject to laws pertaining to employees compensation. Legislation was subsequently enacted making the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard components eligible potentially for pension benefits (Public Law 110, 78th Cong., approved July 1, 1943; Public Law 183, 78th Cong., approved November 8, 1943; and Public Law 214, approved December 23, 1943).

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE, PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES AND DOMICILIARY CARE

Eligibility is extended to any veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 honorably discharged, having a service-connected disability requiring such care, treatment, or appliance, or one who was discharged for disability and not dishonorably; also one not dishonorably discharged who is unable to defray his expenses, has tuberculosis or a neuropsychiatric ailment or disability which requires hospital care.

Dependent upon availability of facilities, eligibility includes any veteran of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, and who is in need of such care and is unable to defray the expenses therefor—regardless of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service.

The service groups included are all components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, the respective Women's Reserve thereof, and United States Public Health Service and Coast and Geodetic Survey under the conditions stated for pension purposes.

The Veterans' Administration maintains at present 94 facilities and has contract facilities with a total of 92,019 beds, distributed as follows—as of March 23, 1944:

Tuberculosis	6,212
Neuropsychiatric	39,417
General medical and surgical	25,658
Domiciliary	16,117
Contract—other governmental	4,227
State and private	388
Total	92,019

LOCATION OF DIAGNOSTIC CENTERS

Diagnostic centers with expert specialists available are maintained at Hines, Chicago, Ill.; San Francisco, Calif.; and Mt. Alto, Washington, D. C. Cancer clinics: Bronx, N. Y.; Hines, Chicago, Ill.; Mt. Alto, Washington, D. C.; Atlanta, Ga.; Portland, Oreg.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

The present building program will raise this total to more than 100,000 beds. The Veterans' Administration anticipates an eventual need of 300,000 beds to enable veterans of World War No. 2 and of prior wars to receive hospital and domiciliary care to the same extent as is now provided. However, this estimated maximum should not be needed until a considerable period of time after the war, or require eventual additional construction of more than 100,000 beds since there will be, under present plans, 100,000 beds in Veterans' Administration facilities and it is anticipated that it should be possible to obtain the same number from the Army and Navy shortly after the termination of the war.

CLAIMS

Any person who is to be discharged from active service and who is in need of and entitled to hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration shall transfer directly to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. Claim for all benefits and necessary clinical and service data accompany him or are filed by the manager if the veteran is insane or incompetent.

All others should file claim for treatment or hospitalization directly with the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office. (One or more are in each State in the Union except Delaware.)

While domiciliary care cannot be said to be a part of the rehabilitation process, it is a valuable benefit for those who have reached a permanent state of disability and have no other means of support.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 24, 1943: This law provides: First, that any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war; second, and who was honorably discharged; third, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay; four, who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement. There are 53 such facilities which, generally speaking, are bounded by State boundary lines. The course of training prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit the veteran for employment may not exceed 4 years and may not extend beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

PURPOSE OF REHABILITATION

The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by reason of a handicap due to service-incurred disability. In performing the functions imposed upon the Administration by Public Law 16, it will be the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to utilize educational institutions and establishments of recognized standing in the training of these disabled veterans into employment and to train each person as near his home as may be possible. Employment of veterans has been accomplished to a considerable extent through the United States Employment Service. It will be the purpose to correlate all Federal and State facilities to the end that those vocationally trained will be graduated into employment opportunities.

While the disabled veteran is in training his pension, unless it equals or exceeds such amount, will be increased to $80 per month if single; $90 per month if married; with $5 additional for each child and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required.

CLAIMS

Those persons discharged from the service directly to the Veterans' Administration facilities for hospitalization will have their claims filed and processed and the question of need for and entitlement to vocational rehabilitation may be given consideration as soon as the individuals' physical and mental condition make training feasible. Any other person honorably discharged from the service may make claims for vocational rehabilitation in the claim for pension which may be filed at the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office.

INSURANCE

National service life insurance was provided under the act of October 8, 1940, Public Law 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, and liberalizing amendments thereto were enacted during the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses. A number of other liberalizing proposals are pending in the present Congress and the Veterans' Administration has submitted certain proposed changes found to be justified by studies conducted.

Application may be made for not less than $1,000 nor more than $10,000 without physical examination prior to the expiration of 120 days from entrance into active service. Thereafter, any such person in the active military or naval service may apply if the application be accompanied by acceptable evidence of good health.

APPLICATIONS

Application forms are supplied the service departments, and may be obtained from the commanding officer or designated insurance officer. The applicant may elect to pay premiums in cash or by allotment of pay. Policies are not issued during the war, but insurance certificate is mailed to the address designated by applicant.

The insurance is against death only, but includes waiver of premiums during total disability existing for more than 6 months, and commencing prior to the insured's sixtieth birthday. The policy is a 5-year level premium term policy with rate based upon the American experience table of mortality and 3 percent interest—the Government assuming the extra hazard of the military and naval service and the administrative expense. The insurance is payable only to a widow—widower; child—including a stepchild or illegitimate child, if designated as beneficiary by the insured; parent—including person in loco parentis; brother, and sister of the insured, and is payable only in monthly installments. The insured may change the beneficiary designation at any time.

After the policy has been in effect for at least 1 year, while in force it may be converted to an ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policy upon application to the Veterans' Administration, without medical examination.

In cases where the person in service died or became totally disabled or was captured or isolated by the enemy prior to April 20, 1942, and had less than $5,000 insurance in effect, the law provides that gratuitous insurance to an aggregate of $5,000 shall be deemed in effect. Claims for such gratuitous insurance should be filed as soon as possible, because of limitations. In most of these death cases only a widow, child, or dependent parent can claim such insurance.

The insurance is payable in the event of the death of the insured while the policy is in force to a beneficiary or beneficiaries, which may be designated

by the insured, only within the relationship of widow or widower, child, parent, brother, or sister. The proceeds of the policy are payable as an annuity in 240 equal monthly installments of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance to any beneficiary who is under 30 years of age at the time of the death of the insured; otherwise, in continuous monthly installments throughout the lifetime of the beneficiary, with a guarantee of the payment of 120 monthly installments to the surviving relatives of the insured who are within the permitted class of beneficiaries. The amount of the monthly installment under the latter mode of payment is dependent upon the age of the beneficiary at date of death of insured. For example, if the beneficiary is then 40 years old, the monthly installment is $4.50 for each $1,000 of insurance; if 50, $5.39; if 60, $6.81; if 70, $8.51.

The beneficiary would receive under a policy of $5,000 or $10,000, for example: Monthly payments, beginning at the stated ages, in the following amounts: $27.55, $55.10; $22.50, $45; $26.95, $53.90; $34.05, $68.10; and $42.55, $85.10.

CLAIMS

All claims for insurance benefits should be addressed to the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., but necessary forms may be secured from the nearest Veterans' Administration Facility.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LIFE CONVERTED INSURANCE

Life converted insurance can be applied for only by those who served in World War No. 1.

No one may have more than $10,000 National Service Life Insurance and Government Converted Insurance combined. Insurance premiums are guaranteed by the Government under Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended. Any person in the active service having a commercial life policy or policies meeting the requirements of said law, article IV, may, upon application to the Veterans' Administration on forms supplied the Army and Navy, secure guarantee of premiums, on amount of insurance not in excess of $10,000, while he is in the service during the present war. The insurance premiums so guaranteed by the Government constitute a lien against the policy and must be paid by the company out of any settlement thereof. In the event of the insured's discharge from service, he has a period of 2 years within which to pay the premiums with interest so guaranteed, or otherwise such indebtedness constitutes a loan on the policy with interest, and if the amount of such indebtedness exceeds the cash surrender value, the policy is automatically canceled and the Government pays the insurer the difference between such cash surrender value and the indebtedness. Forms for making application for such insurance protection are supplied to the War and Navy Departments, and may be secured in person or from his commanding officer or other designated official by any person entitled thereto.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

Public Law No. 359—Seventy-eighth Congress—approved June 27, 1944, known as the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, provides that certain preferences be given to veterans for employment in governmental agencies, either temporary or permanent, and in—

(a) the classified civil service;

(b) the unclassified civil service;

(c) any temporary or emergency establishment; and

(d) the civil service of the District of Columbia.

The veterans who are to be thus preferred are designated as—

(1) those ex-servicemen who have served on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States and have been honorably discharged and who have established the present existence of a service-connected disability, or who are receiving compensation, disability retirement benefits, or pension by reason of public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the War Department, or the Navy Department;

(2) the wives of such service-connected disabled ex-servicemen as have themselves been unable to qualify for any civil-service appointment;

(3) the unmarried widows of deceased ex-servicemen who served on active duty in any branch of the armed services of the United States during any war or in any campaign or expedition for which a campaign badge has been authorized and who were honorably discharged; and

(4) those ex-service men and women who have served on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war or in any campaign or expedition for which a campaign badge has been authorized and have been honorably discharged.

In all civil-service examinations for entrance into the service 10 points shall be added to the earned ratings of veterans suffering a service-connected disability and their wives and the unmarried widows, and 5 points shall be added to the earned ratings of all other ex-service men and women; provided that examinations for the positions of guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians competition shall be restricted to persons entitled to preference under this act as long as such are available and during the present war and for a period of 5 years thereafter. Also providing for the waiver of certain qualifications and restrictions on civil-service appointments and providing for certain other preferences for veterans.

LIST OF LAWS WHICH PROVIDE BENEFITS OR ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS OR THEIR FAMILIES

Public Law No. 10, March 17, 1943: Amends Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits in certain World War No. 2 cases.

Public Law No. 13, March 23, 1943: Amends section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium-term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 16, March 24, 1943: Amends title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the veterans regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 17, March 24, 1943: To amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 23, April 8, 1943: Relates to the selective-service deferment on occupational grounds of persons employed by the Federal Government.

Public Law No. 36, April 12, 1943: Amends section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended by section 10 of Public Law No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 20, 1941.

Public Law No. 38, April 16, 1943: Provides for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

Public Law No. 49: May 7, 1943: Provides for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 73, June 15, 1943: Abolishes certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 74, June 15, 1943: Provides for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 87, June 23, 1943: Provides reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 89, June 25, 1943: Relates to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 90, June 26, 1943: Making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 99, June 29, 1943: Amends an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war."

Public Law No. 101, June 29, 1943: Equalizes certain disability benefits for Army officers.

Public Law No. 113, July 6, 1943: Amends the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return in civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 115, July 7, 1943: Provides for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government.

Public Law No. 126, July 9, 1943: Amends the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year.

Public Law No. 144, July 13, 1943: Provides more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 165, October 21, 1943: Amends section 11, Naval Aviation Cadet Act, 1942, uniform allowance for ensigns and second lieutenants.

Public Law No. 169, October 25, 1943: Amends section 12, Naval Aviation Cadet Act, 1942—designation of beneficiary.

Public Law No. 170, October 25, 1943: Transportation in Government-owned motor vehicles—employees of Veterans' Administration at field stations—absence of adequate transportation.

Public Law No. 171, October 25, 1943: Amends Naval Reserve Act, 1938—allowance for uniforms.

Public Law No. 174, October 26, 1943: Amendment to Allotment and Allowance Act of 1942.

Public Law No. 183, November 8, 1943: Amends act providing for Women's Reserve of Navy and Marine Corps so as to grant same benefits as are granted male members and amends act providing female physicians so as to restrict members of Naval Reserve to shore duty in continental United States.

Public Law No. 194, November 11, 1943: Public Health Service Act of 1943. Grants same benefits as granted to members of armed forces under certain conditions.

Public Law No. 187, November 22, 1943: Provides for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

Public Law No. 197, December 5, 1943: Amends the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended—induction of fathers.

Public Law No. 213, December 23, 1943: Limits private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

Public Law No. 202, December 17, 1943: Increases amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States.

Public Law No. 214, December 23, 1943: Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act, 1941—SPARS—amendments to.

Public Law No. 221, January 20, 1944: Amends Nationality Act of 1940.

Public Law No. 225, February 3, 1944: Mustering-out Payment Act of 1944.

Public Law No. 242, March 1, 1944: Amends Spanish War laws to increase pension for veterans and widows at age 65. Extends marriage date to January 1, 1938.

Public Law No. 245, March 3, 1944: Increases pensions to Indian War veterans and their dependents.

Public Law No. 248, March 4, 1944: Amends Public, No. 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, so as to provide for full participation of institutions of the United States in training-of-nurses program.

Public Law No. 268, March 29, 1944: Amends section 4, Public, No. 612, Seventy-sixth Congress, reappointment of officers.

Public Law No. 269, March 29, 1944: Amends provision of act authorizing 6 months' death gratuity.

Public Law No. 275, March 31, 1944: Amends act of March 3, 1895, re surety bonds.

Public Law No. 279, April 1, 1944: Deficiency appropriation, 1944.

Public Law No. 289, April 1, 1944: Authorizes pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children.

Public Law No. 265, April 4, 1944: Clarifies the application of section 1 (b) of Public, 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

Public Law No. 300, May 11, 1944: Amends part II of Veterans Regulation No. (a).

Public Law No. 308, May 23, 1944: Regulates furnishing of artificial limbs to retired officers and enlisted men and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment.

Public Law No. 309, May 24, 1944: Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans.

Public Law No. 312, May 27, 1944: Increases rates of compensation and pensions to veterans for service-connected disability, and to widows and children under Public, 484, Seventy-third Congress.

Public Law No. 313, May 27, 1944: Increases the rates of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month; to $60 per month in certain specified cases.

Public Law No. 314, May 27, 1944: Provides for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay.

Public Law No. 359, approved June 27, 1944 (78th Congress), provides for certain veteran preferences and waivers in employment in governmental agencies.

Report by Fred S. McCargar on the Salinas, Calif., Guayule-Rubber Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1, 1944

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid report on the guayule-rubber project at Salinas, Calif., prepared by Fred S. McCargar, secretary of the Salinas Chamber of Commerce, in cooperation with Lt. W. A. Borkhuis, special service officer of the Salinas Army Air Base.

I wish to call attention to a statement contained in the latter part of the report, reading as follows:

No; the Salinas Valley is not the best place to grow guayule. They seem to get about twice the production around Bakersfield, Calif., and the experimental plots in Texas indicate that the results there are far better than in California.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOUR OF THE GUAYULE RUBBER PROJECT—SUB-DEPOT CONFERENCE OF MATERIAL OFFICERS AT THE SALINAS ARMY AIR BASE, JULY 13, 1944

(Statement prepared by Fred S. McCargar, secretary Salina Chamber of Commerce, in cooperation with Lt. W. A. Borkhuis, special service officer of the Salinas Army Air Base.)

The emergency rubber project under the United States Department of Agriculture is being handled by three departments—the Forest Service, the Bureau of Plant Industry, and the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry. The Forest Service with J. C. Campbell as director has charge of the growing of the rubber plant. B. P. I. with Dr. A. C. Hildreth as director has charge of the research work on the development of new plants. B. A. I. C. with Mr. Francis McDonald in charge has to do with the development of new and better methods of plant milling.

The project when it was started anticipated growing 200,000 acres and they developed nurseries and produced seed for that acreage but recent curtailment of finances has cut the project down to 30,000 acres, discontinuing all further expansion and abandonment of the nurseries; but continuing the actual growing and harvesting the 30,000 acres planted, as well as continuing the research work, both by the B. P. I. and the B. A. I. C. It, of course, is unfair and illogical to charge to the amount of rubber that has been produced (about a million and a half pounds) or to the amount of rubber that will be produced on the 30,000 acres (about 30,000 tons) now growing, of which about 10,000 are in the Salinas valley, 10,000 around Bakersfield, and the other 10,000 are near Los Banos, Woodland, Patterson, all in California, the entire cost of the project which was planned and developed with much of the machinery bought for 200,000 acres. However, it is not all wasted, because there is approximately 400,000 pounds of seed on hand, which in comparison to the 20,000 pounds on hand at the time the Government took the project over, would mean that if again put into full operation would speed up the project at least 1 year.

You will first visit the industrial area, where you will go to the seed house, which is under the direction of Carl Taylor, who has developed various new methods of treating the seed. Because of the coating on the seed husks, it was necessary to wash the seed in a chlorine solution and to pre-sprout the seed for 4 or 5 days in a pre-sprouting room. Mr. Taylor first developed the process of eliminating the pre-sprouting method and now has developed a method of thrashing the seed out of the husks, eliminating all of this very expensive and very technical process, thereby making it possible for a farmer to harvest, thrash, and prepare his own seed for the next crop.

From there you will go to the Bureau of Plant Industry, under the direction of Dr. A. C. Hildreth, where you will first be shown the methods of laboratory extracting the exact amount of rubber in each sample after grinding up carefully a weighed amount of the shrub. Acetone is dripped through it to dissolve out the resin, after which benzine is dripped through it to dissolve the rubber, which is then evaporated, leaving the amount of rubber on the bottom of the glass. The percent of rubber runs all the way from 3 percent in very young shrubs up to 18 or 20 percent of pure rubber in the more mature shrub.

You will then go through the greenhouses, where Dr. Robbins will explain to you his crossing of various members of the same plant family to which guayule belongs. One particular plant, mariola, is very hardy, and it appears that the successful crosses will have an equal amount of rubber or more, and it can probably be grown much further north in the United States. He is crossing it with one of the related plants that grows from 15 to 16 feet high. You will also see the laboratories, where the study is made of how the rubber is formed in the plant.

From there you will go to the B. A. I. C. Laboratories, which are under the general direction of Mr. McDonald, first going through the laboratory where the testing of vulcanized rubber is under the direction of Dr. Place, and visiting the laboratory where Dr. Jones is working on the process of extracting the rubber as a milk latex, the same as rubber is extracted from trees. This is done by first grinding the plant up under water and diffusing the rubber into the water and then taking it out of the water by centrifugal force, the same as cream is separated from milk in a cream separator.

Then you will go to the Pilot Mill under the direction of Mr. James M. Cummings where you will see various new methods being perfected and improvements being made on the old milling methods of first drying the rubber plant and then grinding it up under water after which small particles of rubber float to the surface and the wood silt sinks.

From there you will go to the nursery where you will see the seed beds 4 feet wide by 400 feet long, each growing enough seedlings to be transplanted to from 2½ to 3 acres. Until the abandonment of the expansion program, they had 40,000 seed beds. The seed is first laid on the ground in 2-inch-wide strips, then covered with sand and watered by an overhead sprinkling system. At the end of 5 or 6 months, they are ready for transplanting to the fields. Dr. Hildreth's department has developed a method of planting the seed directly in the fields which gives promise of being a much cheaper and better method of growing the guayule plant. It has been stated that this will cut the over-all cost of production of guayule rubber at least 22 percent.

You will then visit fields of guayule rubber 1 and 2 years old, noting the difference in growth between guayule grown on irrigated land and nonirrigated land, there being considerable difference of opinion as to which will be the ultimate, most economical way of growing rubber. Under irrigation it shows at least four times as much rubber in the same length of time, but of course the land values are much greater and the cost of irrigation added probably will more than offset the increased amount of production, but of course as a war effort that cannot be taken into consideration.

From there you will visit the 5-year-old plots (and some experimental plots even as old as 13 years) which is believed to be the most economical period in which is harvested guayule rubber on nonirrigated land. If time permits we will visit the fields where the seed is planted direct in the field, eliminating the necessity of nurseries. This promises to be a very satisfactory way for the individual farmer to produce rubber and even this method of growing the seedlings for transplanting may be further developed at a much lesser cost than the overhead watering nursery bed system.

You will next visit the mill where you will first see the storage room where the bales of shrubs come in after which it is chopped, then goes through the drier, then through three sets of rollers (some of the new methods developed indicate that very fine choppers will be used instead of rollers in future construction). Then you will see the battery of four tubular mills where the shrub is ground under water by small rocks the size of a fist rolling against each other. Then it goes into the first settling tank where the rubber, together with some cork, floats to the top and the wood silt sinks; then it goes into piler tanks where under 550 pounds of pressure water is forced into the air cells of cork so that in the next settling tank the cork sinks. (NOTE.—Mr. Cummings at the B. A. I. C. has recently developed a method of giving the shrub a 2,000 pound pressure for about 10 seconds instead of the 90 minutes in the piler tanks and getting the same results, making it a much quicker, easier, and cheaper process.) The rubber is then placed in trays and dried in vacuum driers after which it is pressed in 100 pound cakes and boxed ready for shipment. Dr. D. Spence, probably the best versed man in guayule rubber, some years ago developed a process of retting the rubber shrub before milling, which is the same process that corn goes through in a silo and which tends to lessen the resin in the rubber and the B. A. I. C. is developing new methods along this line.

If time permits, we will visit the Jordan pilot mill which is a modification of the paper-making machine process, and which according to some has great promise as the proper milling method. Instead of grinding the shrub under water for 90 minutes or more, it is run through this shredding paper-mill process for about 10 minutes, securing say its proponents a greater percentage of rubber than the other process.

You ask, "What's the future of guayule?" Only time will tell. If you would like to get a pro and con view of it, get ahold of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 20 and read pages 6284 to 6290, inclusive. You can get this at any library, newspaper office, chamber of commerce, etc.

The difficulty with guayule has been that because of the high resin content, about 20 percent, and because the resin also picked up about 10 percent additional dirt, 100 pounds of guayule rubber only had about 60 pounds of pure rubber in it; but for certain usages such as in the sticky part of the cord manufacturing process of tires, it was equal or more valuable than the purer Hevea rubber and, hence, little was done during the past 30 years trying to purify it. Now with the new methods, particularly Dr. Jones' latex method, the tensile strength is even better than Hevea; so that particular hurdle seems to be already surmounted. Then the question of whether it can be raised in competition with tree rubber from the Orient or in competition with synthetic rubbers produced here. From the best information we can get, tree rubber will never again be imported into this country on an average of less than 14 cents a pound and those best informed on guayule believe that guayule can be produced for less than 10 cents a pound under private enterprise. Whether it can compete with synthetics, of course, depends upon how cheaply synthetics can be produced. Some believe that synthetics will be produced as low as 12 or 14 cents a pound, but all agree that, at present, synthetics require some pure rubber to mix with it to make it 100 percent usable for heavy-duty tires and guayule appears to be the best pure rubber to mix with it. No, the Salinas Valley is not the best place to grow guayule. They seem to get about twice the production around Bakersfield, Calif., and the experimental plots in Texas indicate that the results there are far better than in California.

As Army men, I suggest that you get hold of General Eisenhower's report made on guayule in 1931, in which he advocated the planting of several hundred thousand acres of guayule rubber as an insurance against our getting into the difficulties that we did and certainly if we had followed his advice we wouldn't have been caught with our rubber pants down.

As many Congressmen are misinformed on the guayule project, your cooperation will be appreciated in disseminating the true picture.

What Every Disabled Veteran Should Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, if a veteran is discharged or separated from the service with a disability due to service, he may be entitled to disability benefits, including a pension.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

As you probably know, benefits and pensions for veterans are the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration. It is this Government agency that will handle your claims, will decide the amount of the pensions, and will handle all details of this and other benefits to which you and your dependents may be entitled. You should always write to the Veterans' Administration direct about these matters.

FILING YOUR CLAIM

If you are being discharged because of a disability, you will be advised of your right to file a claim for pension and, if you wish, assisted in making application for this benefit before you leave the service.

The proper form for making application for disability pension is V. A. 526. You can make a claim on this form at any time after discharge or release from active duty. Copies can be obtained at any service installation, from any Red Cross office, or from any office of the Veterans' Administration. At any of these places you can obtain whatever help you need in filling out the form.

Even though you sign a statement, at the time of your discharge, saying that you do not desire to file application for pension, this will not prevent you from filing a claim at any later date.

Officers released because of disability and not entitled to retirement pay have the right to file a claim for disability pension and have their rights to this benefit determined by the Veterans' Administration.

HANDLING YOUR CLAIM

It is not necessary to hire a lawyer to secure benefits. Nevertheless, it is your right to employ legal assistance if you want to. Fees for legal services on pension claims are limited by law.

You may consult your local chapter of Red Cross, the nearest office of the Veterans' Administration, or other organizations approved by the Veterans' Administration, for advice and aid in connection with your claim for benefits. This will be furnished to you free.

YOUR C NUMBER

The first claim filed by a veteran is assigned a claim number. This is commonly referred to as a C number. It never changes. All later claims will come under this C number regardless of when the disability arises. The Veterans' Administration thus maintains a continuous record in one file. Further claims should never be submitted as if they were original proceedings, but all should bear the first C number assigned. To save time and trouble in handling your papers, keep a record of your C number just as you should do with your serial number.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MAKES FINAL DECISION—NOT THE ARMY

Your medical board makes a report on your disability, but the final decision as to pension or other benefits rests with the Veterans' Administration. Even though a medical board had decided against you, you have the privilege of filing a claim directly with the Veterans' Administration if you disagree and believe that you are entitled to disability benefits. Do not hesitate to make application when you believe that your claim is fair and proper.

PENSIONS BASED ON DEGREE OF DISABILITY

Pensions are based upon the percentage of disability and run from 10 percent to 100 percent in multiples of 10. For instance, a veteran with 10-percent disability will receive a monthly sum equal to 10 percent of that granted for total disability. In addition, there are special rates and allowances for specific injuries and more serious disabling conditions. No additional disability pension is payable for dependents.

PENSIONS BASED ON PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY

Should a veteran of this war become disabled to a degree where he cannot become gainfully employed he is entitled to a pension, although this is not in any way related to his service. This pension amounts to $50 per month.

HOSPITAL TREATMENT, MEDICAL SERVICE, VETERANS' HOMES, ETC.

If you should ever need further hospital care for a disability incurred in line of duty in the service it will be provided upon request to the Veterans' Administration. You will be given proper hospitalization and free transportation to the appropriate hospital. Your own ability to pay has no bearing on this service.

If you need medical service or dental care not requiring hospitalization this, too, will be provided. This service includes medicine, appliances, bridgework, and so forth; but, of course, the condition must have been caused or aggravated in line of duty by your military service.

Any veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may apply for admission to one of the numerous veterans' homes located throughout the country.

FREE TRAINING FOR A NEW JOB

If your disability prevents you from working at your old job, you can be taught a new occupation in which your disability will not hinder you. This teaching is called vocational training. It is enabling thousands of veterans to overcome physical handicaps, to adjust themselves to civil life, and to regain their earning power. You may even be trained to return to your old job in spite of your disability.

While getting this special training you may receive compensation in addition to your pension; and there are added allotments for dependents. Expenses for tuition, books, supplies, and equipment are paid by the Government.

In the various offices of the Veterans' Administration there are advisers who will aid and guide you, who will prepare a program to fit your needs, and make the necessary arrangements for your training. Never hesitate to ask their advice.

PENSIONS FOR DEPENDENTS

Where death occurs after discharge, from a disability due to service, the widow, children, and dependent parents may make a claim for pension. The Veterans' Administration naturally requires proper proof of relationship with such claims. This again emphasizes the wisdom of keeping your records, including birth and marriage certificates, all together, and in a safe place where they can always be found.

PENSIONS ARE SAFEGUARDED

Pension payments to you or to your beneficiaries are not assignable and are exempt from taxation—including income tax—attachment, levy, or seizure, either before or after receipt. These provisions, of course, do not apply to property purchased with these payments.

EMERGENCY RELIEF

Should you need emergency assistance between the time of your discharge and the time when your case can be adjudicated by the Veterans' Administration, it may be obtained through the Red Cross. Assistance may be by grant or by loan, depending upon apparent ability to repay, and is made for such needs as shelter, food, clothing, and fuel, and for help with securing benefits to which you or your family may be entitled. Application for such assistance should be made through the local chapter of Red Cross. If there is need for assistance previous to your discharge, you should consult the Red Cross field director at your station.

If veterans have any questions about these aids, see your Red Cross or veterans' service officer. If you have any further questions or need any more help, write to your Congressman, WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

VETERAN HAS RIGHT TO APPEAL DISABILITY RATING

In quite a number of cases the first disability rating handed down by the Veterans' Administration is too low. In this case the veteran has the right to appeal the decision, but this appeal must be made within 1 year. This is important. If the appeal is not filed within 1 year, the veteran loses his right to appeal.

If for any reason any veteran has just cause for complaint regarding the disability rating, it is advisable that he appeal at once. In appealing this decision it is wise to get a doctor's statement that he believes that the disability rating given is too low. It is wise also to get a letter from your Red Cross chairman or county veterans' service officer that the rating is too low.

Send these letters together with your appeal blank filled out completely to Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. I will be very glad to contact the Veterans' Administration and appeal the case for you.

The Democratic National Platform, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL D. JACKSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the platform of the National Democratic Party adopted at its 1944 convention held in Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Democratic Party stands on its record in peace and in war.

To speed victory, establish and maintain peace, guarantee full employment and provide prosperity—this is its platform.

We do not here detail scores of planks. We cite action.

II

Beginning March 1933, the Democratic Administration took a series of actions which saved our system of free enterprise.

It brought that system out of collapse and thereafter eliminated abuses which had imperiled it.

It used the powers of government to provide employment in industry and to save agriculture.

It wrote a new Magna Carta for labor.

It provided social security, including old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, security for crippled and dependent children and the blind. It established employment offices. It provided Federal bank-deposit insurance, flood prevention, soil conservation, and prevented abuses in the security markets. It saved farms and homes from foreclosure and secured profitable prices for farm products.

It adopted an effective program of reclamation, hydroelectric power, and mineral development.

It found the road to prosperity through production and employment.

We pledge the continuance and improvement of these programs.

III

Before war came, the Democratic administration awakened the Nation in time to the dangers that threatened its very existence.

It succeeded in building, in time, the best trained and equipped army in the world, the most powerful navy in the world, the greatest air force in the world, and the largest merchant marine in the world.

It gained for our country, and it saved for our country, powerful allies.

When war came, it succeeded in working out with those Allies an effective grand strategy against the enemy.

It set that strategy in motion, and the tide of battle was turned.

It held the line against wartime inflation.

It insured a fair share-and-share alike distribution of food and other essentials.

It is leading our country to certain victory.

The primary and imperative duty of the United States is to wage the war with every resource available to final triumph over our enemies and we pledge that we will continue to fight side by side with the United Nations until this supreme objective shall have been attained and thereafter to secure a just and lasting peace.

IV

That the world may not again be drenched in blood by international outlaws and criminals, we pledge:

To join with the other United Nations in the establishment of an international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the prevention of aggression and the maintenance of international peace and security.

To make all necessary and effective agreements and arrangements through which the nations would maintain adequate forces to meet the needs of preventing war and of making impossible the preparation for war and which would have such forces available for joint action when necessary.

Such organization must be endowed with power to employ armed forces when necessary to prevent aggression and preserve peace.

We favor the maintenance of an international court of justice of which the United States shall be a member and the employment of diplomacy, conciliation, arbitration, and other like methods where appropriate in the settlement of international disputes.

World peace is of transcendent importance. Our gallant sons are dying on land, on sea, and in the air. They do not die as Republicans. They do not die as Democrats. They die as Americans. We pledge that their blood shall not have been shed in vain. America has the opportunity to lead the world in this great service to mankind. The United States must meet the challenge. Under divine providence, she must move forward to her high destiny.

V

We pledge our support to the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" and the application of the principles enunciated therein to the United Nations and other peace-loving nations, large and small.

We shall uphold the good-neighbor policy and extend the trade policies initiated by the present administration.

We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

We favor legislation assuring equal pay for equal work regardless of sex.

We recommend to Congress the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women.

We favor Federal aid to education administered by the States without interference by the Federal Government.

We favor Federal legislation to assure stability of products, employment, distribution, and prices in the bituminous-coal industry to create a proper balance between consumer, producer, and mine worker.

We endorse the President's statement recognizing the importance of the use of water in arid-land States for domestic and irrigation purposes.

We favor nondiscriminatory transportation charges and declare for the early correction of inequalities in such charges.

We favor enactment of legislation granting the fullest measure of self-government for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and eventual statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

We favor the extension of the right of suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia.

VI

We offer these post-war programs:

A continuation of our policy of full benefits for ex-service men and women with special consideration for the disabled. We make it our first duty to assure employment and economic security to all who have served in the defense of our country.

Price guaranties and crop insurance to farmers with all practical steps:

To keep agriculture on a parity with industry and labor.

To foster the success of the small independent farmer.

To aid the home ownership of family sized farms.

To extend rural electrification and develop broader domestic and foreign markests for agricultural products.

Adequate compensation for workers during demobilization.

The enactment of such additional humanitarian, labor, social, and farm legislation as time and experience may require, including the amendment or repeal of any law enacted in recent years which has failed to accomplish its purpose.

Promotion of the success of small business.

Earliest possible release of wartime controls.

Adaptation of tax laws to an expanding peacetime economy, with simplified structure and wartime taxes reduced or repealed as soon as possible.

Encouragement of risk capital, new enterprise, development of natural resources in the West and other parts of the country, and the immediate reopening of the gold and silver mines of the West as soon as manpower is available.

We reassert our faith in competitive private enterprise free from control by monopolies, cartels, or any arbitrary private or public authority.

VII

We assert that mankind believes in the "four freedoms."

We believe that the country which has the greatest measure of social justice is capable of the greatest achievements.

We believe that racial and religious minorities have the right to live, develop, and vote equally with all citizens and share the rights that are guaranteed by our Constitution. Congress should exert its full constitutional powers to protect those rights.

We believe that without loss of sovereignty, world development, and lasting peace are within humanity's grasp. They will come with the greater enjoyment of those freedoms by the peoples of the world, and with the freer flow among them of ideas and goods.

We believe in the world right of all men to write, send, and publish news at uniform communication rates and without interference by governmental or private monopoly, and that right should be protected by treaty.

To these beliefs the Democratic Party subscribes.

These principles the Democratic Party pledges itself in solemn sincerity to maintain.

Finally this convention sends its affectionate greetings to our beloved and matchless leader and President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He stands before the Nation and the world the champion of human liberty and dignity. He has rescued our people from the ravages of economic disaster. His rare foresight and magnificent courage have saved our Nation from the assault of international brigands and dictators. Fulfilling the ardent hope of his life, he has already laid the foundation of enduring peace for a troubled world and the well-being for our Nation. All mankind is his debtor. His life and service have been a great blessing to humanity.

That God may keep him strong in body and in spirit to carry on his yet unfinished work is our hope and prayer.

Nomination of General Stilwell To Be a Four-Star General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch entitled "President Nominates Stilwell To Be Four-Star General; Will Hold Rank With Marshall, MacArthur, Eisenhower, Arnold."

General Stilwell is a son of my native State of Florida. His home is in Palatka, Fla. He graduated from West Point in 1904. His record in China and wherever he has been assigned to duty has been an inspiration to the youth of our Nation, and to all those who compose the great Army and Navy of our country. Florida takes great pride in the fact that one of her native sons has made good.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT NOMINATES STILWELL TO BE FOUR-STAR GENERAL—WILL HOLD RANK WITH MARSHALL, MACARTHUR, EISENHOWER, ARNOLD

President Roosevelt today nominated Lt. Gen. Joseph Warren Stilwell, American commander of Chinese forces in Burma, to be a full general in the Army of the United States.

The proposed promotion, raising General Stilwell to a rank held by Gen. George C. Marshall, Gen. H. H. Arnold, Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, suggested the probability of new and more important work for General Stilwell in the Burma-China area.

In the American military organization, he holds the assignment of commanding general of the United States Army Forces in the Burma-China theater. He also holds a top-flight position under Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek of China and has certain staff duties under the Allied commander in chief in Southeast Asia, Lord Louis Mountbatten.

Authorities here foresaw in the nomination an intensification of Allied war effort in the Southeast Asia area, particularly by strengthening the organization of Chinese armies. The problems in this connection are twofold: Initially, the job is to keep a maximum amount of supplies flowing into China by air while clearing a land route through Burma which must serve until such time as the naval forces driving across the Pacific from Guam and New Guinea can open a China seaport on the Asiatic mainland.

Secondly, it is to bring about the full training, and, so as far as necessary, the reorganization of Chinese military forces into a powerful combat team.

One of the main concerns of the Allied war leaders here has been how to use China's vast manpower resources in finally crushing the Japanese.

OTHERS PROMOTED

In recognition of outstanding leadership and courage on the field of battle, the President also sent to the Senate nominations of nine other Army officers for temporary promotion, two to major general and 7 to brigadier general.

To be major generals, temporary—Brig. Gen. Robert T. Frederick, San Francisco, and Brig. Gen. Jens A. Doe, Chicago.

To be brigadier generals, temporary: Col. Gerald J. Higgins, Infantry, Burl, Idaho; Col. Maurice W. Daniel, Field Artillery, New Albany, Ind.; Col. James A. Van Fleet, Infantry, Coytesville, N. J.; Col. George A. Taylor, Infantry, Portland, Oreg.; Col. Charles D. W. Canham, Infantry, Kolo, Miss.; Col. Hugh F. T. Hoffman, Cavalry, Fort Smith, Ark., and Col. John H. Church, Infantry, Frederick, Md.

The officers are engaged in current operations in the China-Burma-India, the Southwest Pacific, the Mediterranean and the European theaters.

WISE IN ORIENTAL WAR LORE

Wise in jungle and mountain fighting and versed in the language and customs of the Far East, Gen. Stilwell has lived up to a prophecy made by a Chinese Army organ in 1942 that his appointment as chief of staff to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek was equivalent to adding 100,000 troops to China's fighting forces.

The general never forgot for a minute the "hell of a beating" which he admitted he and his men took from the Japs in Burma in the spring of 1942, nor the bitter lessons they learned on the 140-mile retreat on foot to India through the wild Burmese jungles.

At the end of the retreat he declared Burma could be retaken and immediately set out to prove his words.

The lanky American, whose troops knew him as "Uncle Joe," became a familiar figure at jungle outposts, where his outnumbered and outgunned troops were being conditioned for the long road back.

SPEAKS CHINESE FLUENTLY

Shirt-sleeved, chewing gum and puffing a cigarette in a long holder, he discussed tactics in fluent Chinese with unit commanders within range of enemy machine guns, helped to organize withdrawals, to plan feints, or to throw troops into combat at strategic points.

With other Allied leaders General Stilwell attended conferences in Washington in the spring of 1943 between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. He said then that it would be a hard job to defeat the Japanese.

"We have a savage enemy and there's plenty of him," he said. "There'll be a lot of hard fighting, but we are thoroughly determined to get after him."

In January of 1943 General Stilwell received the Distinguished Service Cross at a surprise ceremony in Chungking where his son, Lt. Col. Joseph W. Stilwell, Jr., pinned the decoration on his breast.

General Stilwell held the temporary rank of major when he went to France in December 1917 with the American Expeditionary Forces of the World War.

He participated in the engagements at La Fere, Verdun, and Toul, and in the St. Mihiel offensive, and received the Distinguished Service Medal.

He was with the American Army of Occupation in Germany, returning to the United States in the summer of 1919.

Born at Palatka, Fla., March 19, 1883, General Stilwell graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1904. While there he was an all-around athlete and helped to install basketball as a sport.

He married Winifred Alison, and to this union were born five children—Joseph W., Jr.; Nancy, Winifred, Alison, and Benjamin.

Benefits for Veterans Under G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, veterans of this war can do these things with Government help:

First, they can buy or repair a home; second, buy and stock up a farm; third, start a new business; fourth, get a high-school or college education; fifth, draw special unemployment benefits if unable to find work; sixth, be assured of free and adequate hospitalization.

Benefits extend to men and women of the armed services who have other than dishonorable discharges and who have served 90 days since September 15, 1940; or less than 90 days, if they have service-connected disabilities.

It is important to know exactly what the Government now offers, and what the terms, the conditions, the opportunities are in each field.

First, take the opportunity for home buying or for buying a farm. A qualified veteran will be able to get the Veterans' Administration to arrange for a Government-guaranteed loan for buying or building a home or for making repairs, alterations, and improvements on a home. Such loans also may be obtained by a veteran to pay off back taxes or delinquent debts on homes. The Government will guarantee 50 percent of the loan up to $2,000 and will pay the first year's interest on the part of the loan that it guaranties. Thus, a veteran can borrow up to $4,000, with the Government standing behind half of it.

These loans can be made by a bank, loan association, or any other lending agency, including an individual or friend of the veteran. If you are a veteran who obtains such a loan, you would have to satisfy the lender as to collateral on your share. But, in the case of buying a home, the home could be used as collateral. Interest on these loans cannot exceed 4 percent, and they must be repaid in full within 20 years.

In addition, the Government will guarantee fully a secondary loan up to 20 percent of the cost of the property. But the total amount guaranteed by the Government in both loans cannot exceed $2,000. This provision makes it possible for veterans to get cash for original down payments on homes. Veterans have until 2 years after the war or 2 years after their discharge, whichever is later, to take advantage of the loan opportunities.

Loans on the same basis are available for veterans who want to buy farms. Money from the loans may be used to purchase land, buildings, livestock, machinery, or other equipment or for making repairs and improvements. But if you are a veteran and want to buy a farm, you must show that you know something about farming and are likely to make a success of the undertaking.

Suppose a veteran wants to set up his own business: Here the procedure and conditions for getting loans are about the same as those for buying homes or farms. The money may be used to buy an established business or land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, and so forth. Secondary loans also are available for down payments. But if you are getting a loan for this purpose, the Veterans' Administration will want to know something about your background and experience in this business. In other words, you will have to show that there is a reasonable likelihood that you will make a success of it. Even so, it is expected that many veterans will want to start their own business and will be helped.

If it is a matter of education or training: When a veteran qualifies for a college, school, or training course, the Government will pay up to $500 a year to cover tuition, laboratory fees, cost of books, and so forth. The veteran also will get $50 a month living allowance, plus $25 a month if he has a wife or other dependents. He may choose his school.

If a veteran was under 25 when he entered the service he may return to school even though his education was not interrupted. That is, he may have left school and been working when he entered service. But anyone who was 25 or over when he went into service must show, in order to qualify, that his education was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with. However, any veteran who desires a refresher or retraining course may take such a course for 1 year.

A veteran who qualifies for college or other schooling will be able to remain at Government expense for 1 year. Then, if he qualifies for further education, he can remain for the length of time, up to a total of 4 years, that he served between September 15, 1940, and the end of the war. He has until 2 years after his discharge or after the war ends to return to school. This Government-paid education program stops 7 years after the war ends.

Next, as to unemployment benefits: Ex-service men and women will be able to claim unemployment benefits of $20 a week for up to 52 weeks if they cannot find jobs. They will be entitled to 4 weeks of unemployment benefits for each month of service, plus additional time allowance for the first 90 days of service. But they are supposed to register with a public employment agency, such as the United States Employment Service, and accept suitable work if offered. Unemployment benefits will be available to a veteran until 2 years after his discharge or 2 years after the war, whichever is later.

Cash benefits also are provided for self-employed veterans who make less than $100 a month. They can have the Gov-

ernment make up the difference between their net earnings and $100 a month. Like the unemployment payments, these benefits are allowed up to 52 weeks according to length of service.

If a veteran has any questions about these aids, see your Red Cross, veteran-service officer, or any officer of your local American Legion or Veterans of Foreign Wars post; or see the veterans' representative of the War Manpower Commission of the United States Employment Service. If you have any further questions or need any more help, write to your Congressman, WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The Baltimore Sun Editorial on a Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Fourth Term," appearing in this morning's Baltimore Sun.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO FOURTH TERM

Mr. Roosevelt's decision to run for a fourth term makes it necessary for the Sun to oppose him in order to do what it can to forestall the evils which such a decision brings into view. Fortunately, the Republicans have nominated an able candidate in Governor Dewey. Good Democrats and good citizens generally can support Mr. Dewey with few reservations and no misgivings.

There was no good reason, even with reference to the war, why Mr. Roosevelt should have chosen to do violence to the profound beliefs of his party and the most cherished tradition of the country by seeking to hold on to his office. The American people know, deep in their hearts, that long tenure of office corrupts the soul of the officeholder and breeds therein contempt of the people and their institutions. Such disintegration has been in evidence in the Roosevelt administration for a long time. It reached its distasteful climax at the Chicago convention, when Mr. Roosevelt, with sententious doubletalk, tossed his most devoted follower, Mr. WALLACE, into the discard. Today, in its organization, the Democratic Party is little more than a shaky alliance between the President's personal followers and official dependents, the disgruntled South and the unsavory big city bosses, all for the purpose of holding on to power and the perquisites of power for 4 years longer. No good for the country can come out of such a combination of forces.

It is possible to say that a change in administrations can be made without reference to the war for several definite and unassailable reasons. Mr. Roosevelt's record, both in the pre-war period and during the great national effort, is spotty, to say the least.

The claim made that only Mr. Roosevelt can guide the country into an effective international organization is not borne out by the facts. It is true that, as President, Mr. Roosevelt has moved in important respects toward future collaboration. But it is also true that in so moving, Mr. Roosevelt has received the almost unanimous applause of spokesmen of both parties. So close have we come to unanimity in our belief in international organization as essential for maintaining peace, that he would be a hair splitter indeed who could point out a major difference between the platforms of the two parties on this issue. The debate on such a subject could be prolonged, but the essential fact is that which we have stated. And we need no deep student of history to remind us that the convictions of a President on foreign policy are no guaranty that the country will follow him.

The most promising international effort to avoid world disintegration was that of the London Economic Conference of 1933. Mr. Roosevelt, in person, wrecked that conference. So little did he understand the forces at work that, with debonair indifference to the tragic results of his attitude, he committed this country to a course which signified extreme economic isolationism.

The indomitable spirit of Mr. Hull, his wise Secretary of State, fortunately was not crushed by this irresponsible manifestation of muddled thinking, and the United States did not lose wholly its reputation for disinterested international action. The reciprocal trade program was allowed to proceed, but Mr. Roosevelt confirmed his lack of understanding by agreeing to and even praising the so-called Neutrality Act (1935) which made it difficult for us to aid our proven friends and almost obligatory for us to help our potential enemies. The effective criticism of this foolish law came not from Mr. Roosevelt, but from Representative WADSWORTH, a Republican.

That is not the record of a farseeing statesman; it is the record of an adroit politician seeking to follow the profitable way. Even as late as 1940, Mr. Roosevelt, still misjudging the course of events, was telling the country that we could keep out of war. It was not he, but the same Mr. WADSWORTH who initiated the Selective Service Act.

Finally, thanks chiefly to the efforts of private citizens, the people of the country came to understand our stake in the war and the dangers to us of an Axis victory. Only then did Mr. Roosevelt seek to catch up with the current. He deserves all credit for the amendments to the Neutrality Act, for the destroyer-bases deal with Great Britain, and for the inauguration of the lend-lease system. He took good advice, also, in the preparation and enforcement of the various acts imposing economic controls, though, as we all know, some of his own decisions, particularly in the matter of wages, have made it extremely difficult to hold the line against inflation. But it is worthy of note that in the very girding for war which is implied in such undertakings, another of his weaknesses caught up with him.

So little did he comprehend the workings of the American economic machine that he set up the futile Office of Production Management, presided over by the synthetic dual personality he called Mr. Knudsen-Hillman. The administrative ignorance implied in this arrangement had its humorous aspects, but it delayed the meshing of our productive machine and brought confusion into the industrial world at the very time precision and order were essential.

Ultimately, we worked ourselves out of the difficulties thus thrown in our way by Mr. Roosevelt's muddled improvisations. But we did not and could not work ourselves out of the difficulties thrown in our way by a still more fundamental gap in his understanding. This weakness had been displayed all through his long battle (never truly won) with the depression. It expressed itself in his notion that a primary function of the Federal Government is to distribute money. From this, it is only a small step to the belief that the beneficiaries of such largesse are the proper components of a political machine. If Mr. Roosevelt himself has not overtly subscribed to this belief, his henchmen have acted on it. The Federal Government, thanks to Mr. Roosevelt's theory of its function, has become a partisan in the economic struggle rather than an umpire.

We all know how this strange attitude of Mr. Roosevelt's worked out finally in the court-pack plan, beaten with the greatest difficulty. We know what it has done to the concept of law as interpreted by the new Supreme Court. We know how it has made a mockery of the enforcement of some of our laws. We know, too, how it has emboldened the less responsible labor leaders to make grotesque demands and how the machinery of the Federal Government has been manipulated so that those demands could be gratified.

The theory of government thus evolved is destructive. An administration which uses its power and the substance of the people to win over the labor vote or the vote of any organized pressure group is a corrupting administration. Its moral basis is as bad as that of an administration which bids for the support of monopolists or any other vested interest.

Such a government is especially obnoxious in time of war. For its practices mean that production is kept going in many of our factories only with the greatest difficulty and in the face of constant strikes and threats of strikes. Favoritism in government tends to destroy national unity at the very time national unity is our greatest asset. That we have done as well as we have with war production is a tribute not to Mr. Roosevelt's policy but to the inherent strength and patriotism of the American people in all ranks. The industrialists and the workers have shown that this is not Mr. Roosevelt's war but a war of the American people.

If all goes well, the war will come to an end in the next 2 years, no matter who is elected in November. In the opinion of qualified observers, Germany will be defeated in an even shorter time. With Hitler's downfall, the problems of returning to peacetime ways will crowd upon us. The strains put upon our economy during the first 8 or 9 years of Mr. Roosevelt's tenure have not been dissipated but intensified by the new strains of warfare. We should not deceive ourselves by failing to recognize this fact.

Our fiscal difficulties were severe enough before December 7, 1941. Since then we have multiplied our debt manyfold and we have not begun even to think about repayment. Our tax structure is such that almost no provision is made for massing those aggregations of capital without which industrial reconversion and industrial development after the war will be impossible. We shall have many millions of men and women under the necessity of shifting to new jobs if they can find them. We shall have other millions of service men and women who will have to be absorbed into our social structure.

Therefore, in considering the election of next November, we have to bear in mind not only the conduct of the war effort, but also the return of the country to its new peace basis. Even if it were correct to say that Mr. Roosevelt has been a good war leader, we should still have to ask ourselves what sort of a leader he would make in the early post-war years.

There is nothing in the record to show that Mr. Roosevelt comprehends the nature

of the difficulties we shall face. There is nothing in the platform on which he is running which shows more than a verbal concern for those difficulties. The one reconversion program which has been laid before him—that of Mr. Baruch—has been all but ignored.

Nor is it any answer to say that Mr. Roosevelt has been too absorbed in his duties as Commander in Chief to have time for such matters. Even in wartime the Commander in Chief is still President and as such responsible for the civil affairs of the country.

The alternative to Mr. Roosevelt is Mr. Dewey. To say that Mr. Dewey should be elected is not to insist that the choice is between black and white. The Governor of New York despite the orators at the convention which nominated him, is no white-plumed knight. He is, on the contrary, a practical, level-headed man with a mind more like that of a scientist than that of a warrior on horseback. His passion is for orderly procedure. His hatred is for negligence and disorder. His inspiration is not intuition but reason. He does not orate, he discusses. He would hardly make an exciting President but he would certainly make a competent one.

The question of his liberalism or his conservatism can hardly arise, save in the minds of special interests seeking Government favors. A monopolist, finding him unapproachable, might well call his distastefully liberal. A labor leader, applying in vain the sort of pressure which the C. I. O. applies so fruitfully to Mr. Roosevelt, might call him a reactionary. Most people, not seeking favors and judging him solely on the basis of his public acts, would describe him as an aloof, understanding administrator and not worry their heads about meaningless labels.

He has another quality, akin to that we have been discussing, which Mr. Roosevelt notoriously lacks. He chooses his advisers and subordinates not on the basis of personal predilection but on the basis of their capacity. Whimsy played no part in the selection of the men who have helped him give New York State the best government it has had in years. His experts have not been political manipulators or one-idea economists. They have been clear-eyed, cool-headed administrators, like himself.

It is quite obvious from this description, which we believe to be accurate, that Mr. Dewey will never raise the national temperature to the boiling point. There will be few brilliant improvisations, few inspired pronunciamentos. Those seeking a leader with a capital L had best not vote for him. On the other hand, those who feel that 12 years of government by ear are enough, and want a return to stability, will find in him something almost unique in the way of vigor, conscientiousness, understanding, and clarity of thought.

In thus comparing the relative merits of the two men who are now appealing to the American people for their votes in November and in making its own choice of Governor Dewey known, the Sun is conscious that it has not said here all that needs to be said. Nearly every assertion herein about both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Dewey needs to be amplified and documented. That will be our task as the campaign progresses. Moreover, there are differences in the platforms on which the two candidates are running. In some matters the Democratic platform is superior to the Republican. In some the Republican is superior. In both there is much muddled thinking and writing. The candidates and their spokesmen, we may assume, will endeavor to clarify and interpret these confusing passages. The Sun will be obligated to face these differences frankly and make a judgment between them.

But the primary issue will remain. Three terms for a President are one too many. In a fourth term, with the unifying ties of wartime emotion removed, the evil forces of disintegration which we all know exist would be free to do their worst. The national safety would be compromised. Mr. Roosevelt's record could be much better than it is and Mr. Dewey's much worse and still the public interest would demand a change.

Suppose Governor Dewey Had Been Our President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Suppose Governor Dewey Had Been Our President?" published in the Philadelphia Record of July 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPOSE GOVERNOR DEWEY HAD BEEN OUR PRESIDENT?

In his acceptance speech, Governor Dewey denounced President Roosevelt for "wrangling, bungling, and confusion." His constant implication was that he and the Republican Party would have done a much better job.

The Roosevelt record is so bad, insists Dewey, that our President is not to be entrusted with the task of securing peace after victory is won.

That is quite an indictment and quite a claim. Fortunately, we can check up.

We have Mr. Dewey's record for those years. We have the Republican Party's record of those years.

So let us go back only 4 years. Let us suppose that on January 1, 1940, Thomas E. Dewey was sitting in the White House and the G. O. P. had a majority in Congress.

What kind of a job would have been done?

1. Great Britain would not have received the 50 over-age destroyers when U-boats almost cut her lifeline to America.

2. Russia probably would not be an ally today.

3. There would have been no lend-lease program.

4. We would have been caught on December 7, 1941, with almost the tiniest army in the world.

5. We would have had almost no air force.

6. We would have been committed to a policy of isolation.

All this is on the record. Here it is:

ISOLATION?

On March 30, 1940, Dewey declared, "We must elect a Republican administration which will keep * * * completely out of European affairs."

DESTROYERS FOR BRITAIN?

Even after France had fallen, and 2 days before Winston Churchill's famous "blood, sweat, and tears" speech, Dewey opposed any further aid to Britain because it "might lead to involvement."

RUSSIA?

It was in January 1940 that Dewey called recognition of Russia by the United States "a conspicuous and unfortunate departure" from our foreign policy, and Russia itself "a perversion of government abhorrent to the conscience of mankind."

LEND-LEASE?

As late as January 15, 1941, after Britain had barely survived the blitz, Dewey said the lend-lease bill would "bring an end to free government in the United States," and added that it would permit the President to "give away the whole Navy."

PREPAREDNESS?

If the Republican Party had been in control, the bill to build an army through the Selective Service Act would have been beaten. The Republicans in the House voted more than 2 to 1 against it. The count was 112 against, 52 for.

OUR AIR FORCE?

When the President, in 1940, called for an air force of 50,000 planes and an annual production of 50,000 planes, Dewey said in a speech at Dallas, Tex., May 27, 1940:

"What is the good of talking about 50,000 planes unless we know what we are talking about? To produce 50,000 planes a year it will take a plant four and a half times as large as our present plant, including all plant capacity under construction. Experts estimate it would take 4 years to accomplish this."

Within 3 years, it turned out, America was producing 100,000 planes a year.

With this record, anyone can see where this Nation would have been on December 7, 1941, had Dewey and the G. O. P. been in power.

It is highly probable that our mainland would have been attacked.

True, Dewey later changed his mind on all these points—after the President proved their rightness. He changed his mind on lend-lease. He says he has changed his mind on isolation. He changed his mind on aid to Britain, on conscription, on air power.

But anybody can be a second guesser.

The Presidency demands a man who can be right the first time.

Yet today Dewey by implication denounces the vision and courage of Franklin Roosevelt, who recognized the danger and had to fight Dewey's own party in order to prepare the country to meet that danger.

That "tired old man" was wide awake when Thomas E. Dewey was fast asleep.

Keynote Address by Governor Kerr at the Democratic National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the keynote address delivered by Hon. Robert S. Kerr, Governor of the State of Oklahoma, before the Democratic National Convention held in Chicago, on July 19, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Democrats of this great convention and my fellow Americans, in this solemn hour, as representatives of the common people of every State and Territory in this Nation we meet again to reaffirm our faith in Democratic principles and to give an accounting of our stewardship. But in this greatest crisis in history, America and the world have a right

to ask more of us. They are entitled to know where we stand and what our aims and purposes as a great political party are. We are here to answer.

Our aim is complete and speedy victory.

Our goal is a just and abiding peace.

Our promise to a world at peace is responsibility and cooperation.

Our pledge to America at peace is a government responsive to the needs and hopes of every citizen, even the humblest, a government which will not shirk or fail, but will fulfill, with gratitude and fidelity, our sacred obligation to our returning service men and women.

The keynote of this convention and of America's heart and mind is not being sounded here tonight. It is being thundered by our fighting men around the world, by those at home who provide the food for them and us, by the workers who provide the munitions of war, by the rank and file of our citizens who, through taxes and bond purchases, provide the money required to pay our part of the cost of this global war. This keynote is being sounded loud and clear by the roaring, swirling thousands of our fighter planes—our slashing bombers and our mighty superfortresses of the air. It comes from the deadly throats of the many, many guns on the battle units of our powerful fleets—all seven of them. It comes from the blazing firepower set and kept in motion by our men who fight on the ground, the Infantry—yes, and the invincible marines. May God bless them and keep them—all of them, our fighting men and women—and give them the sustaining strength to match their glorious spirit. It is they who, since Pearl Harbor, have been and now are sounding the keynote of America's unyielding purpose, of democracy's aims and hopes.

AN ALL-AMERICAN ANSWER

Let us be in tune with the spirit of that keynote.

Hitler, in his blind ignorance and fury, called us a "decadent, soft democracy." Our fighting men have given him his answer—the greatest all-American team of all times—the team of all Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, has given him his answer. The farmers, the workers, the rank and file of our citizens, the armed forces of our Nation, democratic but not decadent, are marching, tramping, and climbing with our Commander in Chief to victory.

There is no easy way to win this greatest of all wars either at home or abroad. As our fighting men battle and slash their way closer and closer to Berlin and Tokyo, they will meet harder and sterner tasks. The same is true where we fight.

Our sacrifices will be harder and sterner. We know that in the long shadows we yet must travel there will be, in the words of the mighty Churchill, "Blood, toil, tears, and sweat." That is our portion—that we can and will endure—but wouldn't it really be terrible if in addition to all of these we should be compelled to suffer the affliction and disaster of another Hoover administration?

In this hall last month the Republicans nominated as their candidate for President the man selected for them 4 years ago by Herbert Hoover. As America looked on she saw the mantle of Herbert Hoover not falling upon but being placed upon the shoulders of his cherished disciple, Thomas E. Dewey. What she did not see, but what will become more and more apparent, is that the mantle has become the shroud.

When that same convention snubbed and sidetracked Wendell Willkie the last vestige of liberal leadership of the Republican Party was buried under an avalanche of reactionary sentiment from which it cannot soon emerge.

SHALL WE INVITE DISASTER?

Talleyrand said: "The Bourbons were incapable either of learning anything or of forgetting anything." To give these modern Bourbons, these Republican leaders, control of the Nation for the next 4 years would bring about the certain return of 1932. It would be to invite disaster without even the chance of "coming in on a wing and a prayer."

The old guard is again in the saddle in the G. O. P., hoping to run rampant over liberalism in America in November as they did over their own ranks here 3 short weeks ago.

In their blindness the Republicans have charted a course America will not follow.

In their hatred they have matched a fight they cannot win.

The forces of Democracy will accept their challenge and defeat them—either on the issue of what they did not do and cannot do, or on the issue of what we have done and will do.

Do you remember the 12 long years from 1920 through 1932, when America hardened under Harding, cooled under Coolidge, and hungered under Hoover? The Republican Party had no program to prevent economic disaster then. It had no program in the dangerous years preceding Pearl Harbor to prevent war or to meet it if it came. Most of the Republican Members of the National Congress fought every constructive move designed to prepare our country in case of war.

They fought and voted against the naval-expansion bill in 1938.

In March 1939 they voted against a bill to increase our air force to a total of 6,000 planes.

In June 1939, in the House, they voted 144 to 8 to reduce the appropriation for the Army Air Corps.

In September 1939, after war started in Europe, they voted 6 to 1 against the repeal of the arms embargo.

In September 1940, after France had fallen and the blitzkreig against England had begun, the Republicans in the House voted 112 to 52 against the Selective Service Act.

In February 1941 the Republicans in the House voted 135 to 24 against lend-lease.

In August 1941, 4 months before Pearl Harbor, the Republicans in the House voted 133 to 21 to disband that part of the armed forces built from selective-service personnel.

They fought every person who came forward with courage to declare the danger that threatened the world and us, and every person who sought to prepare this Nation to meet the conflict that loomed across the world's horizon.

THE REPUBLICAN ROLE

The Republican Party has no program today except to oppose. Let us limit them to that role.

They have played partisan politics with one of the most deadly dangers confronting our Nation—the danger of inflation. They have offered no program to prevent it. Yet with reckless abandon they sought to destroy the one adopted.

Our Republican opponents are not even united among themselves. Millions of them favored Willkie and deeply resent his being driven from the party.

Confidentially, my fellow Democrats, real battles are being fought among the tall timbers of the Republican Party. I have never seen a group more keenly suspicious of each other, nor have I ever seen suspicions better founded.

Most Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, agree that our President has done a great job as a war leader. Our opponents attack him and seek to defeat him on domestic issues.

I take it that none here is too young to remember the tragic years of 1929 through 1932. The awful depression and Republican unemployment of those 4 years, brought on by the unsound policies of Coolidge's administration and intensified by Hoover's inadequacy and insufficiencies, created more suffering in this Nation, destroyed more wealth, caused more poverty, and left our Nation in the most weakened and hopeless condition ever known.

THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD

What American is not grateful for the gains our people have made since those dark days? A prosperous Nation now demonstrates its mighty power as its factories, mills, and farms, year after year, set new records of production. They are the wonders of the world. I share your pride in the unparalleled peacetime advances won under the matchless leadership of our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

If you truly favor private enterprise and equal opportunity to all, can you support the Republican Party, under which these suffered most and came the nearest to destruction?

Do you remember when the president of the National Chamber of Commerce publicly urged that the President revive and restore the crushed and broken structure of private enterprise?

Do you remember when the captains of industry throughout the land, struggling to free themselves from the quicksand in which they were sinking, pled for the National Government to save them? How often must they be saved from the flames of depression and bankruptcy brought on by the short-sighted policy of the Republican Party when in power before they will seek to avoid the cause of their trouble with as much vigor as they strive to be relieved of its consequences? How many whirlwinds must they reap before they learn the folly of sowing the wind? If we truly favor private enterprise how can we fail to support the Democratic President, under whom the greatest advance in material prosperity by the largest percentage of our people in all of the Nation's history has been achieved?

I know a few whose prosperity is exceeded by their pessimism. Their howls are louder in the midst of the most prosperous times they have ever known than their groans were in the bottom of Hoover's black depression. And this when so many are suffering and sacrificing so heroically and without complaint!

WHICH WOULD YOU CHOOSE?

If Americans truly favor prosperity for our farmers, can they support the Republican Party, under which the farmers suffered the most, or oppose the present Democratic administration, under which they have prospered the best?

If Americans truly favor labor, can they support the Republican Party, under which labor fared the worst, or oppose the present administration, under which it has enjoyed the greatest progress?

If you truly favor old-age assistance to give our honored aged citizens freedom from want and starvation, can you support the Republican Party, under which this security was never known, or can you oppose the present administration, which originated it in spite of the Republicans' bitter opposition?

THE REPUBLICANS WERE "AGIN' IT"

If America truly favors a social security program giving American workers security from starvation when conditions beyond their control temporarily prevent their employment, can we restore the party to power that fought the legislation providing it? Or can we afford to remove the party from power that erected this great milestone of progress?

If we in America truly favor a sound banking system providing profit to its owners and safety to its depositors, could we restore the party to power, under which in 12 years more banks failed than in all the rest of our Nation's history with the greatest loss to depositors ever known, or could we remove from power the Democratic administration,

under which the depositors have suffered the smallest loss and the stockholders received the fairest percentage of profit ever had during any similar period?

If we favor economic conditions permitting small business to prosper, could we vote to restore the Republican Party to power, under which in 1932 alone 32,000 small businesses failed, or could we vote to remove from power the Democratic administration, under which small business has enjoyed its most profitable years?

If we in America truly favor the opportunity for the average family to own its home, can we vote to restore to power the party under which more homes and farms were lost and more mortgages foreclosed than during any other similar period, or could we vote to remove the Democratic Party from power when more millions of American homes, both on the farms and in the cities and towns, were saved, than during any other time?

THE DEMOCRATS DID IT

If we in America truly favor conservation of our greatest natural resource, the soil; the reclamation of badly eroded or abandoned lands; the provision for irrigation of millions of acres, can we vote to remove from power the administration under which the most progress ever made has been brought about, or could we vote to return to power the Republican administration under which these matters were either forgotten or ignored?

If we favor winning an abiding peace after our magnificent fighting men and women have defeated our enemies—if we do not want to compel each succeeding generation of America's sons to leave their homes and firesides and families to go yonder where the ravages of war maim and disable and kill, can we vote to restore to power the political party whose leadership, after World War No. 1, willfully and wickedly sabotaged every effective vehicle for keeping the peace?

Shall we restore to power the party whose national leadership under the domination of isolationists scrapped and sank more of our fleet than was destroyed by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor? Or can we fail to support the Democratic administration under which America has become the greatest naval power on earth?

WHAT KIND OF POST-WAR?

If we in America truly love these sons and daughters of ours who today fight for us and who tomorrow will achieve the victory for which they fight today, and if it is our resolve that they shall have the opportunity for profitable peacetime employment when they return from the wars to take their place as the most respected and best loved among us, can we vote to return to power the political party whose national leaders were so indifferent to the welfare of the veterans of World War No. 1? You saw those veterans compelled to sell apples and pencils on the streets of our cities because no jobs were available anywhere in the land. You saw them go to Washington to petition their Government, for which they had fought—at Chateau-Thierry, at Belleau Wood, in the Meuse-Argonne, and on a dozen other battlefields. You saw that same Republican administration turn a deaf ear to their petition, and order its military forces to drive those veterans from the streets of the Capital of the Nation they and their battle-killed comrades had saved. You saw the military armament—machine guns, rifles, and tanks—of the Government for which they had offered their lives turned on them by the unwilling hands of their own comrades because of the stupid and brutal orders of a Republican President. You saw some of them killed; you saw their pitiful personal belongings, evidences of their poverty, taken from them and burned.

If you oppose this kind of bitter ingratitude, and I know you do, can you oppose the Democratic administration which has already recommended and helped to bring about legislation providing lasting and constructive benefits to the returning service men and women of this war? Can you fail to support this Democratic administration that has declared so unequivocally its purpose of providing the opportunity for profitable peacetime employment to our returning service men and women?

The American fighting man aims to win this war and then come home to Mom and Dad and to Mary and the kids, and he wants a job—the opportunity for honorable and profitable employment. Where is the American who would deny him this blessed privilege? Where is the American who would give him less? The Republican administration gave him much less after the other war.

The Republicans made some vague promises to our fighting men here in this hall last month about what they will do for them after the war. That's pretty good from a bunch that wouldn't even give them the opportunity to vote during the war. I've seen the Constitution used for a lot of fine purposes, but that is the first time I ever saw it misused as a cudgel to drive millions of fighting Americans away from their own ballot boxes.

Many Republican leaders, sounding the real keynote and purpose of the Republican Party in this fateful year, say: "There has not been a single constructive accomplishment brought about by the Roosevelt administration." Reactionary Republicans have resisted every progressive measure of this administration and bitterly oppose them now. They remind me of the cantankerous old grumbler who on his ninety-second birthday was asked, "Uncle, you have lived to the ripe old age of 92—you must have seen a lot of changes in your time, haven't you?" Replied the uncle, "Yes; and I am agin' every one of them."

I read a graphic, if not elegant, poem the other day describing the Republican opposition. It read as follows:

"TWELVE LONG YEARS

"The Republicans for 12 long years
Have shed their coats and skins and tears
To tell their comrades how they feel
Regarding Roosevelt's New Deal.

"For 12 long years they've pled for votes
But never mention 9-cent oats.
They say 'This New Deal stuff is rotten.'
But never speak of 4-cent cotton.

"For 12 long years they've wept aloud
And cussed this money-spending crowd.
They say, 'Of liberty we are shorn,'
But not a breath of 12-cent corn.

"For 12 long years they've been at sea,
And now they come to you and me
And offer us as bait for votes
More 3-cent steers and 9-cent oats.

"For 12 long years they fume and fret,
Hammer and slander the 'New Deal set.'
They say to all, 'What a cheat!'
But forget to talk of two-bit wheat!

"They offer as in days of old
A crown of thorns, a cross of gold,
More gilded promises—can you beat 'em?
Well, one thing sure, you can't eat 'em!"

My friends, the Democratic Party has proved its worthiness of the people's continued confidence.

Time and again we have seen the results of our President's leadership. Time and again our opponents have sought to fill the minds of the people with doubt and confusion, and time and again successes have dispelled the doubts, confounded the confusers and confused the doubters.

The people have not been—they will not be—misled. They are doing a magnificent job. Men and women, boys and girls of all political parties, of every race and color and religious faith are proving themselves to be America's greatest generation.

AMERICA IS STRONG

Our enemies, dazed and bewildered, cannot understand the striking power, producing and building power, of our military and our civilian soldiers.

Our heroic and patriotic farmers have made greater production records each year in spite of increasing war shortages of manpower and farm machinery and regardless of periodic gloomy prophecies of national starvation by many, including Herbert Hoover.

All of these and thousands of other things have been accomplished by America's civilian armies, with American women doing their proud part and more. They march side by side with the men in the armed forces. Their strong and faithful hands never stop working, in the homes, on the farms, in the factories, and at every job that will speed the day of victory. They long for, work for, and pray for peace. The kind of peace worked for, fought for, and died for by the immortal Woodrow Wilson. The kind of peace worked for and fought for now by President Roosevelt.

WE MUST WIN THE PEACE

America and her allies are winning this war because they have planned their work and are now working their plan. They can and must win an abiding peace. International peace, as we of this generation have had to learn twice, is of vital concern to every American. It cannot be achieved by burying our heads in the sand and leaving white tail feathers waving in the breeze.

Through tragic experience we have learned that it is just as necessary to prepare for peace while waging war as it is to prepare against war while enjoying peace. We must realize that the unsolved problems of peace are the causes of war.

Some of the greatest victories won in this war have been in the field of diplomacy. No military victory can mean more to America and her allies than the diplomatic advances made in the Atlantic Charter, and in the conferences held at Casablanca, Moscow, Teheran, and Cairo. These and many other such advances have been wisely conceived by our President, so ably aided by that grand American statesman, the greatest Secretary of State in a hundred years, Cordell Hull.

TRIED—OR UNTRIED?

The President, during the next 4 years, must represent our country in many more such conferences. I ask all Americans everywhere: Who can best represent our Nation in the future councils of war with our allies and in the conferences around the peace table? I know America will not regard this question lightly, nor decide it wrongly. Shall it be Thomas E. Dewey or Franklin D. Roosevelt?

Who will represent England at the peace table? An untried man—or her greatest and wisest—Winston Churchill?

Who will represent China? Some man without experience—or Chiang Kai-shek?

Who will represent Russia? One who for the first time will participate in such a meeting and who, no matter how honorable he might be or how able he might sometime become, would thus be greatly handicapped—or will she be represented by her most experienced and strongest—Joseph Stalin?

Each of our allies will be represented by the one who has demonstrated the greatest ability for the task.

Who will represent the United States of America? An untried leader who has not even told his own people what his views are? Or the man who has from the start declared his position in clear and certain words, and who has the respect and esteem of all the United Nations as no other living American?

Will it be Dewey—or Roosevelt?

THE MYTH OF YEARS

Just suppose for a moment, but no longer, that it were Dewey. What would Churchill

and Stalin and the Generalissimo and the other Allied leaders think and do when they learned that he looked on them as just a group of "tired old men"?

When England faced her darkest hour, with her military forces unorganized and poorly armed, in whose leadership did she place her trust? Her least tried or most proved? Can England, can we, can the civilized world ever discharge the debt of gratitude due Winston Churchill?

When he was just about as old as Mr. Dewey is now he permitted an impetuous urge to lead him into the tragedy of Gallipoli. But how different he acted at 65. After Dunkerque he stood before the House of Commons. Listen—are these the words of a "tired old man"? "We shall not flag nor fail. We shall fight in France and on the seas and oceans. We shall defend our island whatever the cost may be. We shall fight on the beaches, landing grounds, in the fields, in streets, and on the hills. We shall never surrender."

Look at Stalingrad. Whose figure looms amid the defenders? Whose spirit sustains them in the most heroic and awful hour in Russia's history? Who stopped and defeated and now drives Hitler's once mighty armies, once dreaded air force, back and back and back? Mr. Dewey would have discarded him nearly 3 years ago when he was 62 as a "tired old man." But Russia is smarter than that. She marches irresistibly today under the leadership of her much revered, world respected, 65-year-old Joseph Stalin.

ARE THE ADMIRALS AND GENERALS TOO OLD?

Let us examine the record.

Shall we discard as a "tired old man" 59-year-old Admiral Nimitz?

Shall we discard as a "tired old man" the lion of the Pacific, 62-year-old Admiral Halsey?

Shall we stop his onward sweep to redeem the Philippine Islands and discard as a "tired old man" 64-year-old Gen. Douglas MacArthur?

Should we discard as a "tired old man" the chief of all our naval forces, 66-year-old Admiral King?

Shall we discard as a "tired old man" the greatest military leader of our Nation, 64-year-old Gen. George C. Marshall?

No, Mr. Dewey; we know we are winning this war with these "tired old men," including the 62-year-old Roosevelt as their Commander in Chief. What diplomatic or military experience have you had that justifies you or us in believing that you can handle the most difficult and important responsibilities and duties ever placed upon the shoulders of any American?

When the life and liberty of every American hang in the balance; when the safety and welfare of unborn generations in this fair land are at stake, what assurance do you have for yourself and your own loved ones or can you give our 130,000,000 Americans that you and we may know that you can do this tremendous job? Suppose we broke up this team that every American knows is a winning one, which you have openly approved and in an effort to gain votes promised to keep, that is, all but the Commander in Chief, which position you seem to regard as a minor detail; and suppose we named you Commander in Chief? What assurance could our fighting men, their mothers and fathers, sons and daughters, have that we could thereby win the war one day sooner, or as soon, and with as few casualties, as we can under our present leadership? What experience have you had or what deeds have you performed to indicate that you could do as well, to say nothing of doing better?

Imagine, if you can, what we would have suffered and where we would be if Dewey had succeeded in his efforts to defeat lend-lease when it was proposed by President Roosevelt, who was neither too old to originate that great program nor too tired to put it in operation.

Roosevelt was not too old to see the terrible danger to America from Germany and Japan nor too tired to move with speed and courage to get munitions of war to the democracies who were fighting them and thus keeping them away from our shores.

Lend-lease, in spite of Dewey's opposition, in spite of opposition from the vast majority of Republican leaders in Congress, went into effect 9 months before Pearl Harbor. Now, 3 years and 4 months later, all Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, can thank God for it and for Roosevelt who did so much to accomplish it.

DEWEY'S POSIES

In his efforts now to appear something other than the isolationist that he is, Thomas E. Dewey has gathered a few posies from the declared foreign policy of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull, until he has most of the form of a Willkie bouquet without any of the substance.

The forces of isolationism crucified the great-hearted Woodrow Wilson. The same forces now strive with equal fury and frenzy to inflict the same fate on Roosevelt. But where they succeeded then, they will fail now.

The people—patriotic Democrats and Republicans alike—will not again be misled and betrayed by the same false doctrine and propaganda, no matter how disguised or camouflaged it may be.

In 1920 Mr. Harding and the Republican Party promised to lead America back to normalcy.

Mr. Hoover reiterated that thought from this platform last month when he said, "And may I say this to the youth [and the youth in Albany was listening to every word] * * * you can lead our Nation back to unity of purpose again."

Our answer to that is: "This Nation is not going back again."

WE ARE NOT GOING BACK

When this war is won a grateful Nation will not go back on the farmers of America who have produced so heroically and so abundantly in our great war effort—nor will this Nation go back to a Republican administration that did go back on American farmers.

When this war is won a grateful Nation will not go back on labor—the workers who have produced the munitions and equipment of war so patriotically in this great struggle—nor will this Nation go back to a Republican administration that did go back on the workers of America.

When this war is won a grateful Nation will not go back on the home owners, businessmen, and the great masses of our people who have served so faithfully in this war effort—nor will this Nation go back to a Republican administration that did go back on these, our citizens.

When this war is won a grateful Nation will not forget, nor go back on its returning service men and women—nor will this Nation go back to a Republican administration that did go back on the returning servicemen of World War No. 1.

Our President has already made comprehensive plans for America to go forward now, and in the post-war period. He has submitted them to the Congress. Part of them are now law. Others soon will be. It is his proposal and our program that wartime America can and will become a prosperous peacetime America with opportunity for profitable employment for all.

I say to you, to the Democrats of America, to our fighting forces around the globe, and to all men and women of this Nation who have dreamed of a better world, and who are willing to work and sacrifice to realize that dream, victory is within our grasp. We have stormed the beaches of poverty and discouragement and fear and seen the hearts of the people filled with new life, lifted with new hope, and buoyant with superb confidence. We have overrun the ramparts of special privilege and reaction and planted the banner of Democratic liberalism high on the hill of human progress.

Let our opponents—who have grown fat in a prosperity they could not build for themselves—do their worst. Under our great Commander in Chief we will not now retreat. We will not falter in midpassage. We will win.

Address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce, Member of Congress from Connecticut, to the Republican National Convention at Chicago, June 27, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 23, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the privilege given to me, I include the address of Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Member of Congress from Connecticut, to the Republican National Convention at Chicago, on June 27, 1944. The address is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the convention, we have been called together in a time of historic crisis to choose the next President of the United States.

Plainly the honor of speaking to you in this hour so fraught with consequence has come to me because I am a woman. Through one woman's voice our party seeks to honor the millions of American women in war industries, in Red Cross work, in civil service, in hospital and canteen, and volunteer work. Our party honors the women in the armed services and our truly noble Army and Navy nurses. Their courage has written a new chapter for American history books. Above all we honor the wives and sisters and sweethearts and mothers of our fighting men. The morale of the home front has been largely in their keeping. They have kept it to the height of the morale on the battle front.

And yet, I know and you know, that American women do not wish their praises sung as women, any more than they wish political pleas made to them as women. They feel no differently from men about doing their patriotic jobs. They feel no differently from men about the ever-growing threats to good government. They feel no differently about inefficiency, abusiveness, evasion, self-seeking and personal whim in the management of the Nation's business. They feel no differently about the processes which have little by little distorted our democracy into a dictatorial bumbledom. And certainly they feel no differently about pressing this war to the enemy's innermost gates, or creating from the sick havocs of war itself, a fair and healthy peace.

But there is one thing that women feel, not differently, but more deeply about than men.

In this crowded convention hall, many women are wearing the little red and white pin whose blue star shows that somewhere on land, in the air, at sea, there is a man in uniform who is dearer to her than all else in the world. Shall I speak of what is closest to the mind and heart of every American woman today? Then I shall speak of the man who is known from Key West to Kiska, from San Diego to Harlem, as G. I. Joe.

American women want these minutes and, yes, every minute of our thought and concern to turn on this fighting man. Uppermost in their minds are his hopes, his aspirations, his dangerous present, and his still uncertain future.

Now, G. I. Joe's last name is Legion, because there are about 12,000,000 of him. What his immediate needs are today his generals and his admirals know best. To the filling of these needs, all Americans are pledged to the limit of their capacity.

But this convention is gathered together to consider not so much G. I. Joe's immediate wants as to clarify what his wants are likely to be in the next 4 years, and to plan to meet those wants.

Before this convention is done it will have clearly interpreted Joe's long-term wants in keynote and in platform, and to the honoring of them our candidate will pledge himself with vigor and with truthfulness.

The great Scandinavian, Ibsen, said, "I hold that man most in the right who is most closely in league with the future."

Here the Republican Party will choose the man most closely in league with G. I. Joe's future as he and his family see it. And so the man we choose shall prove to be most in the right in November.

Now, if you asked G. I. Joe today what he wants most of the future, he would probably say, "I want to go home, of course. But I want to go home by way of Berlin and Tokyo."

And this tremendous and heroic want of Joe's to sail into the roadsteads of Yokohama, and march by the waters of the Rhine—this alone is a greater guaranty of the future security of our Nation than any guaranty any political party can offer.

This is Joe's gift, beyond price, to America.

But wait—if today you asked Joe, in the heat of battle, why he wanted to go home by way of Berlin and Tokyo, you might get a very unexpected and sobering answer. He'd say that the biggest reason was that he wanted to vindicate and avenge G. I. Jim. And because G. I. Jim is the biggest reason today that Joe is fighting like a man possessed of devils and guarded by angels, we had better talk of him in the time that remains to us.

Who is G. I. Jim? Ask rather, who was G. I. Jim? He was Joe's pal, his buddy, his brother. Jim was the fellow who lived next door to you. But, "He shall return no more to his house, neither shall his place know him any more." Jim was, you see, immobilized by enemy gunfire, immobilized for all eternity.

But Jim's last name was not Legion. You read the casualty lists. You have seen Jim's last name there: Smith, Martof, Johnston, Chang, Novak, LeBlanc, Gonstantakis, Yamada, O'Toole, Svendsen, Sanchez, Potavin, Goldberg, Rossi, Nordal, Wroblewski, McGregor, Schneider, Jones. You see, Jim was the grandson and great-grandson of many nations. But he was the son of the United States of America. He was the defender of the Republic, and the lover of liberty, and he died to make a more perfect Union, "that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Today a white cross marks his narrow grave on some Pacific island. His dust dulls the crimson of the roses that bloom in the ruins of an Italian village. The deserts of Africa, the jungles of Burma, the rice fields of China, the cold depths of the seven seas, the very snows of the Arctic, are the richer for mingling with the mortal part of him. Today his blood flecks the foam of the waves that fall on the Normandy beachheads. And again and again he falls on the tragic soil of France. Yes; even as it was in 1918. Or tantalizing and inscrutable phrase, Jim is just—missing in action. Then all that marks him anywhere is a gold star in the window and the tears that are silently shed for him.

There are many gold stars on the women sitting in these halls. To all who loved Jim, even more than to those who love Joe, everything we do and say here must be helpful and inspiring.

We are come together here to nominate a President who will make sure that Jim's sacrifice shall not prove useless in the years that lie ahead.

For a fighting man dies for the future as well as the past; to keep all that was fine of his country's yesterday, and to give it a chance for a finer tomorrow.

Do we here in this convention dare ask if Jim's heroic death in battle was historically inevitable? If this whole World War might not have been averted? We know that this war was in the making everywhere in the world after 1918. In the making here, too. Might not skillful and determined American statesmanship have helped to unmake it all through the thirties? Or, when it was clear to our Government that it was too late to avert war, might not truthful and fearless leadership have prepared us better for it in matériel and in morale, in arms and in aims? These are bitter questions. And the answers to bitter questions belong to time's perspective. Being human, we Republicans are partisan. But being partisan, we risk being unjust if we try to answer these questions in days so fateful. But this, even as partisans, we dare say: The last 12 years have not been Republican years. Maybe during the twenties Republican Presidents were overconfident that sanity would prevail abroad. But who dealt with the visibly rising menaces of Hitler and Mussolini and Hirohito? It was not a Republican President. Who promised young Jim's mother and father and neighbors economic security and peace from '33 to '39? Yes, peace? It was not a Republican President. Who promised the mothers and fathers of America again and again and again that their sons were not going to be sent to fight in any foreign wars—when he knew, when he knew, even as he spoke, that the security of America demanded that these sons should shortly fight on foreign soil? It was not a Republican President. Who gave these promises again and again and again to our ears, but broke them to our hearts? It was not a Republican President. This terrible truth cannot be denied; these promises, given by a Government that was elected again and again and again because it made them, lie quite as dead as young Jim lies now. Jim was the heroic heir of an unheroic decade; a decade of confusion and conflict that ended in war—the Roosevelt decade.

But Jim did not complain too much about his Government. Sure, mistakes, awful mistakes, had been made by his Government. But Jim figured that anybody can make mistakes. Maybe Jim's friends and neighbors had made them, too. How could his friends and neighbors tell that they had been going for some promises that should not have been made because they could not be kept? How could they tell that some of these promises were never spoken to be kept? Maybe Jim's neighbors would have acted differently, voted differently, if they'd known all the facts. But maybe they wouldn't. Anyway, Jim has taken the rap for everyone's mistakes, from the man in the White House down to the man in the house around the corner. And it was O. K. with Jim. He was ready to pay with his life for his countrymen's mistakes, anytime, if it gave the home folks and good old Joe a fresh start on life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in a world wiped clean of the Nazi marauders and Japanese spoilers.

If Jim could stand here and talk to you he might say, "Listen, folks, the past wasn't perfect. But skip it. Get on with the business of making this old world better. You've got the land, the tools, the know-how, and big bunches of people who want to pull together. No country ever had more. And you've got great and friendly nations who want to pitch in with you, like they pitched in even before Joe and I did, to fight the Japs and Germans. Take your hats off to the past, but take your coats off to the future. I didn't look back when I struck the beaches. Is it tougher at home for you fellows?"

This is what Jim might say if he could stand here and talk to you. Well, I suspect Jim is at this convention—although he is no longer, you understand, a Republican or a Democrat. But a man who dies to keep America America, and to give G. I. Joe a break, just might like to stay on a bit to see whether or not he's really succeeded. So, if Jim were here, it might be the most natural thing in the other world. Maybe he was brought here by some friend who knows his way around American Presidential conventions. Yes, maybe he was brought here by Gen. George Washington. All Americans know that the General's spirit has watched over every gathering where Presidents have been picked for 147 years. And if that is the case, then Jim has learned a lot he never knew before about American Presidents. For example, Jim always knew from the history books that the General was a soldier without blemish. But now he knows that Washington was a President who, if he erred, as all Presidents do, erred with integrity. He knows that General Washington might have become America's king, and that President Washington might have stayed in power all his days; the early days of our weak and infant Republic, which were days of terrible crises and stupendous emergencies. Wild disorders of frontier life, political confusion worse than any we know, marked Washington's last years in office. And there were great social and economic injustices still to be corrected. Then every man said that George Washington was the indispensable man. Who understood better and could better save the new liberty he had given a new nation? But Washington so loved his country and the institutions that he helped to author, that he refused more than two terms. That was a tradition Washington's spirit never saw broken at any President-making gathering for a century until it was broken by the man who promised in this very city 12 years ago that "Happy days are here again." It was never broken until it was broken by the man who promised peace—yes, peace—to Jim's mother and father. But Jim knows now why, even so, Washington's spirit is calm. Why? Well, Washington knows even better today than he knew a century and a half ago, that no one man can destroy our Nation's institutions. And no one man can save them. He knows that the people alone can destroy, or save, their country's institutions. For freemen always have another chance to redeem the mistakes of the past, and to shape anew their own history. In peace or in war, freemen can always choose and change their President.

Oh, yes, Jim and his friend, the Father of his Country, want us to choose well, as well as we know how here. They want us to choose a man who would rather tell the truth than be President; to choose a man who loves his country and its institutions more than he loves power. They do not want us to pretend that any one Republican, more than any one Democrat, is indispensable. They want us to think as Americans. And as Americans, they want us to raise here a "standard to which the wise and honest can repair." They know that the event, today as yesterday, is in the hands of God.

And this we will do here, for Jim's sake. And then Jim can exultantly say:

"I am the Risen Soldier, I have come
From a thousand towns, the city blocks
The factories, the fields of this fair land.

"Many am I, yet truly one, the son of many streams
That poured their wealth into the common cup
The wide and golden cup of liberty.
"I am the Risen Soldier; though I die
I shall live on and, living, still achieve
My country's mission—Liberty in truth.
"Lord, it is sweet to die—as it were good
To live, to strive for these United States,
Which, in your wisdom, you have willed should be
A beacon to the world, a living shrine
Of liberty and charity and peace."

It is as Americans that we are gathered here. We come to choose a President who will redeem the mistakes of the past, not try to apologize for them. Who will justify G. I. Jim's death, not try to explain it.

Apology and explanation must suffice for the Democrats when they meet in this city—not to choose a President but to take Mr. Roosevelt and like it.

Let that convention which meets here point to Joe's homecoming with forboding. Let the Democratic Party call Joe, who has saved us, "The terrible problem of the returned veteran." Another candidate, not ours, can hold Joe's return as an economic club over the heads of the people. We are Americans. We say, "Hurry home, Joe, by way of Berlin and Tokyo. We need you."

Yes, we Republicans, men and women, are here to build a greater and freer America, not only for, but with the millions of young, triumphant G. I. Joes, who are fighting their way home to us.

Missing in Action and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving many letters asking questions about the rights of men and women reported as missing. The writers of these letters also want to know what rights the dependents of men and women reported as missing have. For that reason, I am explaining these rights so that my people will be fully informed. If you have any further questions, feel free to write me, Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Question. If a service man or service woman is officially reported to be missing or missing in action, is his or her family notified?

Answer. Yes; the War or Navy Department promptly telegraphs the person whom the service man or service woman has designated as emergency addressee.

Question. What do the terms "missing" and "missing in action" mean?

Answer. They mean that the person has disappeared. It is not inferred that he is dead. In many cases it is found later that the person is alive, interned in a neutral country, a prisoner of war, or was isolated in such a way that a prompt reporting of whereabouts was impossible.

Question. When a person in service is in the status of missing or missing in action, does his right to pay stop?

Answer. No. His pay will continue as long as such status is officially continued.

Question. What provision exists for the support of dependents in such cases?

Answer. Family allowances and allotments of pay continue; and if not in effect, they may be established.

Question. If the serviceman or servicewoman had not made any allotment of pay previously, how are his or her dependents supported when he or she is declared to be missing, if they are not eligible to receive family allowance?

Answer. Where there is no existing provision adequate for the reasonable support of the dependent or to pay the premiums on the life insurance of the missing person, the secretary of the department concerned may direct suitable allotments of pay for these purposes.

Question. If the dependents of the missing person were eligible for a monthly family allowance but no application had been filed before the person in service entered the missing status, can the dependent obtain a family allowance?

Answer. Yes; by making application therefor.

Question. May a relative who is actually dependent upon a missing serviceman or servicewoman obtain an allotment of pay?

Answer. Yes; if actually dependent and a relative within the recognized degree.

Question. How does the Government make these payments?

Answer. The money is sent to the dependent or insurance company by means of a Government check each month. It is deducted from the missing veteran's credit which has accumulated.

Question. How much may be allotted to a dependent?

Answer. The Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy determines the amount according to the circumstances in each individual case.

Question. How long do these allotments of pay continue?

Answer. If the dependent remains eligible to receive the allotments of pay, they may continue as long as the serviceman or servicewoman is officially continued in a missing status or is officially transferred to some status entitling him to a continuation of pay. If such veteran has been missing for 12 months, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy reviews the record and determines whether such person should be continued in the missing status.

Question. If a missing serviceman or servicewoman is later found to be a prisoner of war or interned in a neutral country, does the allotment of pay continue?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Following a finding of death, what benefits begin for the dependent?

Answer. Death gratuities and insurance benefits then become payable to those entitled to them.

Question. What if a missing serviceman or servicewoman returns to the jurisdiction of the American military or naval authorities?

Answer. They again become a part of the Military or Naval Establishment and can adjust their allotments of pay to dependents on the same basis as servicemen or servicewomen who have not been missing.

If there is any need for further information, see your local Red Cross chairman or your county veterans' service officer, and if you need additional information, write your Congressman, WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Henry S. Hooker to the Men's League of Marble Collegiate Church on the evening of June 13, 1944:

The answer to the question of the fourth term is found, I believe, in considering and evaluating the things that happened in the summer of 1940. This country was in mortal danger at that time. If it ever had a rendezvous with destiny it had it then—and the month was May. The British Army by great bravery had just escaped annihilation and reached England from Dunkirk. Their weapons for further defense were gone. In the whole of England there were no adequate weapons. There was a great body of American opinion in favor of concentrating on the defense of this continent and allowing England to go under. America had to make a decision. If it had made the wrong decision you would not be here tonight. It had to decide whether it would permit England to go to the wall and lose her fleet, or whether it would stand by England. If our country had allowed England to go to the wall, it is quite apparent that it would not have stood a chance against the Axis Powers in the year 1940.

At that moment Churchill telephoned to the President and the President made the decision. The President issued orders to the War Department to collect every available piece of surplus artillery and ordnance and ship it to Raritan, N. J., where vessels for England were ordered to assemble. Within a week freight trains from the far west and every part of America were steaming east to Raritan with this material.

At this point the lawyers entered the scene and advanced technical objections. The lawyers told the Government that it would be a breach of neutrality to sell these arms to England, but they could be sold to an American corporation who in turn could sell them to England and this was accordingly done. Title was passed to the U. S. Steel Export Corporation and from it to the British Government. When the word was flashed that the lawyers were satisfied the stevedores loaded the munitions on the ships and shortly thereafter the British Army had something with which to fight and the worst of the crisis was over.

The next thing that happened that summer was a miracle. A Selective Service Act

was for the first time in American history passed in time of peace and in an election year through the determination and insistence of the President. Let us tell you a little of the history of that act.

Nearly 30 years ago a group of men foreseeing war and knowing our unpreparedness gathered in New York and organized the Military Training Camps Association. With the help and leadership of Gen. Leonard Wood they established voluntary training camps to prepare officers. There were many difficulties, but they carried on and when war broke out they furnished the nucleus of the officers of the American Army who fought in France. If this had not been done it is a question whether the American Army would have arrived in time to save Europe. I know because I went over with my division in May 1918, and there was not much time to spare. After the World War this association which became known as the Plattsburg Group carried on with the object of having something like the Swiss system of universal service introduced into America so that we should not be caught again weak and impotent and see our men needlessly slaughtered. One of the leaders of this Group was James Wadsworth, a Republican and a very fine man. He appeared before the Senate Military Committee at the end of the First World War with our bill for universal service, and he was told by that committee that it was not necessary to consider this bill because there would never again be another World War.

In the spring of 1940 the old Plattsburg Group met often at the bar association here in New York and sat around a long table and prepared what later became the Selective Service Act. Many men now in the Government had a hand in this—among others, Colonel Stimson, now Secretary of War, and Judge Patterson, now the Under Secretary. As a result, the Selective Service Act was drawn and sent to Washington and introduced into Congress by Congressman WADSWORTH and Senator Burke, and it became known as the Burke-Wadsworth bill. At that point nothing further happened because the politicians thought it was dynamite and wouldn't touch it.

One night in June 1 happened to be staying at the White House and dined alone with the President, and I told him of the bill. He had never seen the bill. It had not been brought to his attention. He studied the bill that night and the next day threw the whole power of the administration behind it, and the miracle of its passage was assured.

Later in September, acting under Executive authority, the President turned over 50 of our old destroyers to the British in exchange for military bases stretching from Newfoundland to the Caribbean, and the things these ships did forms one of the most glorious pages in naval history.

For instance, about 18 months later one of them, the old U. S. S. *Buchanan*, rechristened the H. M. S. *Campbelltown*, steamed into the harbor of St. Nazaire, passed under point-blank range of the German guns, and rammed itself into the great lock gate of Germany's principal submarine and battleship base on the Atlantic. There it stuck with 5 tons of high explosive in its hold which was timed shortly to blow up and there it was visited by the high German officers of the town and there it suddenly blew up, destroying all the Germans and wrecking the base.

Other things happened in the summer of 1940 with lightning rapidity. I have not time to enumerate them now. No leading Republican applauded them except Wendell Willkie and he has been discarded by his party. Even he objected to delivering the destroyers to England without the permission of Congress, and as you all know the delay in getting this permission would have been fatal when things had to be done fast.

This was the summer of our rendezvous with destiny and these events mark the manner in which we kept that rendezvous. These events mark one of the greatest decisions in the history of any country or in the life of any man. Out of this decision came our lend-lease aid to Russia, to China, and to others, and out of it came the spiritual coalition of the United Nations and the pattern of ultimate victory.

The following months and the following year saw the introduction into Congress of many measures to implement the decision that had been taken, and every one of these measures was opposed, generally speaking, by the Republicans, in both the House and the Senate.

In the summer of 1941 the Selective Service Act under which our Army was being trained was to expire. If it had been allowed to expire men in training would have gone home and our preparedness would have come to an end. The Republican isolationists did their best to kill the Selective Service Act that summer. A vote was taken and the bill missed death by one vote.

Today it is crystal-clear that the Republicans were not wrong in matters merely of slight importance. They were wrong on the fundamental issue of our continued national existence. One does not return to a doctor whose advice if followed would have brought death, no matter how good that doctor's intentions might have been.

The desperate crisis is past, but the danger is not over and the future is difficult. If we think again of the summer of 1940, and carefully evaluate what happened then and since, we find our answer to this question of a fourth term.

An Honor Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, taking advantage of unanimous consent heretofore obtained, I am inserting the address I delivered upon the occasion of the dedication of the honor roll at White River Junction, Hartford, Vt., on Sunday, July 30, 1944.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen men and planes and squadrons of planes darken the sky and shake the earth with the thunder of their motors and their bombs.

We've seen battleships and fleets of battleships, cruisers, destroyers, carriers whipping the sea in a welter of white paper, drowning all sound with the roar of their guns.

We've heard the endless surf beat of attacks that roll in and smash at a beachhead again and again and then over-run islands and shoals of islands with tidal waves of landing craft, tanks, and trucks, and men.

We have seen men by the million go out from among us exemplifying the might of America to fight for that freedom which only those have a right to enjoy who are willing to die if necessary to maintain and defend it.

And we have seen some of them brought home to the land they loved to sleep in its bosom forever, having paid a man's price for a peace that is only bought by those who love to be free.

So today we dedicate ourselves and this emblem to their memory and to the determination to carry on to the end that they shall have not died in vain, that the hopes of all of us may be realized, for an America where there will always be work to do, a greater future, unlimited opportunities for every man and woman to dream, to build, and to grow, as we shall keep America free from all pirates and aggressors who might hope again to loot the world.

There are those short-sighted people who have held that we could not longer accommodate the growth of science, technology, and mechanical power to the Bill of Rights and our form of government.

In a thousand factories and plants scattered across this continent engaged in defense work we have proved the foolishness of that fallacy.

Men's inventions cannot be of more value than men themselves. A man is always bigger and better than any machine he makes.

Those who would have you and me think that an irreconcilable conflict is created by our so-called machine age in which liberty must be sacrificed should not forget that we have fought for liberty. The dynamic forces which sustain economic security and progress in human comfort lie deep below the surface. They reach to those human impulses which are watered alone by freedom.

The initiative of men, their enterprise, the inspiration of thought, the determination to be free, flower in full only in the security of those rights established fundamentally by our fathers.

Liberty comes alone and lives alone where the hard-won rights of men are held unalienable. Where governments themselves may not infringe. Where governments are indeed but the mechanisms to protect and sustain these principles. Liberty comes to those who will fight for it. It is for this concept of a government of and for and by the people for which you are giving your all and your best. It is for this concept that America's sons and daughters have died and for which they stand ready to die today.

Those rights that made our fathers free men are in question. If they be not now the more carefully preserved, said John Eliot, they will render us to posterity less free, less worthy than our fathers.

We must recognize the fact that a world conspiracy of all the basest, foulest, most wicked criminals in history, saturated with a crazy determination to crush our civilization, threatens to stop all human progress, to destroy the work of centuries, to establish their new order over our dead bodies.

Against the aggressor hordes that affront and confront us we have—

"* * * set up our banners. We are not
Ashamed to show the cause for which we fight.

* * * * *

"We are full slow to rouse; and deaf and blind
To danger till the day is almost lost;
Then, as one man, welded in heart and mind,
We fight to victory, and scorn the cost;
There is no foe we have not dared to meet,
And none we will not face—except defeat."

We proclaim our determination to emancipate ourselves, to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, to preserve and conserve all of those guaranteed liberties and freedoms for which it stands and shall forever stand; to save, safeguard, and transmit to posterity the democratic form of government that is ours, its principles of justice, freedom, and equality. To this end we dedicate ourselves, the undivided genius of our people, all we hold dear

and sacred, with one duty, one desire, and an unbeatable determination to win this war.

The defense of the ideals of the founders of this Republic, and the maintenance of them constitute the only pure patriotism to which an American can lay claim or in defense of which lay down his life.

To the memory and in honor of those who have gone forth from this area to do or to die in order that liberty may live, we dedicate this honor roll.

No man knows what lies ahead of us as a nation or as individuals. We are pledged by all that is good, and honorable, and holy, to maintain the ideals of democracy. We are committed to something more than keeping possible invaders from our shores.

National defense means something more than helping friendly nations to keep our liberty.

We are bound by our love of life, and are on our sacred honor to keep alive in this Nation those ideals which have made America great. We should dedicate ourselves anew to an unending determination to make this country one in which all men shall have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We should consecrate ourselves to the end that this Government of ours shall continue to establish justice and make secure the blessings of liberty. We should highly resolve that this Government of ours shall not perish from the earth.

It is not to be overlooked, however, that even in victory the end for which the war is being fought could easily be lost because of the incompetency of leadership and unpreparedness for the peace to come. After all, what is the end for which the war is being fought? Let me answer the question by referring to a letter from a soldier overseas, which tells the story better than I could were I to try. He said: "We're headed straight for the open doors of hell, and when we get inside they'll slam 'em shut and lock 'em. Maybe I'll come out alive, and maybe I won't.

"I'll take that chance. I'll take it because I know now what I'm playing for over here. And it isn't marbles.

"I'm not fighting for the right to wait in line for my daily bread.

"I'm not using a bayonet and a knife to carve myself a hole where I'll hide in fear for the rest of my days.

"I'm not betting my life out here so anyone back there can tell me where and what and how to worship.

"I'm not outguessing madmen with machine guns in their hands for the privilege of being told what to say and when to say it.

"I'm fighting for freedom.

"I'm fighting for the things that made America the greatest place in the world to live in * * * that are going to keep America the greatest place in this world to live in.

"So don't anybody tell me I'll find America changed.

"Don't anybody tell me there's no future any more in America. Don't anybody tell me there's a ceiling on my opportunity to make a million or be President.

"Don't anybody tell me there's a bridle and bit waiting for me with my name on it!

"That's what took the humanity out of the men I'm up against now. And I don't want any part of it!

"I want to come back to the same America I left behind me * * * where our way of living has always brought us new and better things * * * and always will * * * the America where there's clean, hard work to do * * * where there's freedom, and justice, and opportunity for all * * * where, if you can think and plan and act on your own, there are no limits on how high you can rise, how far you can go.

"That's what I'm fighting for.

"That's America to me.

"Keep it that way until I come back!"

That is the burden of our responsibility on the home front.

All of us are rightly concerned as to what the world of tomorrow shall be. Certainly one has only to lift his eyes from the ground to see that the path which the Government should follow lies open before it and away from the roads which led us into this World War No. 2.

Every person knows today, whatever he thought yesterday, that the foreign policy of the United States has been based on isolationism, or was till our hands were forced by Japan.

That such policy has failed utterly and miserably is a foregone conclusion, and as Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, declared the other day, had we been willing to play our part in keeping the peace of the world since World War No. 1, the cost to us in life and treasure would have been an infinitesimal part of the cost required of us today.

We should have learned and are paying a terrible price to be educated to know that we cannot run away from our destiny.

Selfishness, fear, and ignorance wrote the Treaty of Versailles, kept us out of the League of Nations, prevented the founding of the World Court, prevented a lasting peace, and are responsible for the holocaust of today. It must not happen again.

To some people it seems that the League of Nations is the natural point of beginning for that reorganization and readjustment which experience has shown to be essential to make it the center of some form of that federal union which most certainly will have to be set up.

While others are opposed to the League on the ground that it is and would be at best a league of governments and not of peoples, such people favor an international confederation of nations to be regulated by international law enforced by an international police force.

All of us are resolved to win the war and to achieve a genuine and enduring peace. In order to establish a free world after the victory at arms is accomplished is a question which deserves the best thought of the most profound thinkers of the age, yet it can only be established and maintained by, and most largely will depend on the leadership and the policy of the United States. We cannot dodge our responsibility.

Most of the plans for peace start with the idea that the problem is one of power. This is a sound assumption. How to apply the power is the problem. Some believe that the maintenance of peace depends on some form of economic action—international cooperation—removal of economic restrictions on world trade, and equal access to raw materials. Others emphasize social justice and social security. Another group stresses the importance of psychological and spiritual forces, education, creation of world opinion, development of international morality, revival of religion. Still others pin their faith chiefly to institutions of democracy, the growth of law, and respect for it, or wider recourse to arbitration and conciliation. Many think that peace can be assured by special measures applied to Germany as the most dangerous actual or potential breeding place of wars. As the old fellow used to say at the Dog River Valley Fair, "You pays your money, you takes your choice," for there are over a dozen tentative plans which have been promulgated and 26 different groups working on post-war planning. What we must bear in mind, as I see it, is that we must not be diverted from our objective, which is to win the war at the earliest possible moment and at whatever the cost.

As for me, if you are interested to know what I personally believe, I shall support the program to establish some international organization which can by force if necessary keep the peace.

Our fundamental national interest after victory at arms is the establishment of our national security to safeguard and promote the political, economic, social, and spiritual or moral (call it as you like it) well-being of this Nation and of all the nations.

We must establish some system of organized international cooperation for the maintenance of peace based upon the willingness of the cooperating nations to use force if necessary to keep the peace. There must be no question that adequate and appropriate means are provided and are always available and will be used if and when any aggressor nation starts a fight. We must be unitedly strong enough to do it and uniformly determined that there shall be an end put to war. Whatever it may cost us as a price to preserve the peace.

We must insist upon the preservation of our old freedom, keep our standard of living, and our American way of life to the fullest possible extent. Then bend every effort to lead or to cooperate to create a law-abiding, war-free, just society. This is the mission which America has in the world, and we should and shall fulfill it in God's good time.

It is no time for a blueprint. As the Negro preacher said, "We may arguefy and spectify to our hearts' content, but we cannot specify," until we know, for example, what Russia's peace terms will be, or what plans China has for its own development—or until, in fact, our partners have had a chance to examine and to approve the specifications and the articles of association on the basis of which the partnership is to be established. But seeing the world in shambles, business destroyed, homes broken by the millions, millions sick in body and mind, and other millions whose careers have been interrupted, everywhere the peacetime pursuits of more than a billion people transformed into war effort, while the total war bill rolls on and up and will reach close to half a trillion dollars, the American people will not undertake to stop historical evolution, avoid, evade, or to escape their destiny or to shirk the responsibility of their mission.

Saving the best we have and can, we will go ahead to build a new and a better social, political, and economic society, nearer to our heart's desire, based on American leadership, maintained by American power, and dedicated to freedom.

But do not be too optimistic. This is a fight to the finish that we are in. We are surrounded right here at home by clamorous political experimenters, social uplifters, and vigorous radicals who have little respect for the past, and whose chief concern for the future is to make it as different as possible from the present. Their aim is to tear up everything by the roots, to destroy all that has been done, and to begin all over again.

Such a program as they advocate both openly and insidiously is as un-American, unintelligent, and as unpractical as it is dangerous.

If we let the world be turned over to them, it will for an indefinite period be a regimented and government-controlled world, ruled by force, either economic or military, or both. The choice of today will determine the character of the world tomorrow.

Our responsibility will not be lightened "Till the lights go on again all over the world."

Rights of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to set forth further answers to questions about the rights of service men and women and their dependents, so that my people will be fully informed as to these matters.

Question. Are officers, Army nurses, warrant officers, or cadets, U. S. M. A., entitled to a family allowance for their relatives or dependents?

Answer. No. The benefits of this act are limited to enlisted men and women, and aviation cadets.

Question. Are enlisted members of the Women's Army Corps eligible?

Answer. Yes; they may apply for a family allowance for dependent children, dependent husbands, and also for dependent parents, brothers, and sisters.

Question. May a man or woman who is eligible for a family allowance also authorize a class E allotment of pay?

Answer. Yes; and many do authorize such an allotment of pay on behalf of dependents, in addition to the family allowance, in order to provide added security.

Question. If a dependent is in a hospital or institution may payment of the family allowance be made to some other person or to the institution, for the credit of that dependent?

Answer. Yes; if the applicant desires that payment be made to a person other than the entitled relative or dependent, or to an institution, for the credit of that dependent, the name and address of such person or institution will be entered on the application in the proper location. The Office of Dependency Benefits will determine whether or not the payee designated is the proper person to receive payment.

Question. Will photostatic copies of documentary evidence be accepted?

Answer. Yes, if properly certified.

Question. What happens to a family allowance in effect when a man is reported missing, missing in action, beleaguered, besieged, captured, or interned?

Answer. It is continued, subject to right of the serviceman to terminate it if dependents receiving it are other than wife, child, or former wife divorced. They may be in a position to exercise this right if interned or captured, and able to establish contact with the O. D. B. If dependents are not receiving a family allowance at the time, and are eligible, they may apply for this benefit on the official form, W. D., AGO Form No. 625.

NOTE.—In cases of extreme need, dependents may apply for dependency allotments of pay under Public Law 490 in addition to the family allowance. For information about dependency allotments of pay, write to your Congressman, WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Question. When a dependent dies, what should be done with a check or checks sent to the deceased dependent after death, or uncashed at time of death?

Answer. Such check or checks should be returned to the Office of Dependency Benefits, Newark 2, N. J. A new check—covering all amounts of a family allowance uncollected at the time of dependent's death—will be written to an appropriate payee as determined by the O. D. B.

Question. If payments for two or more dependents are included in one check and one such dependent dies before the check is cashed, should survivors try to cash this check?

Answer. No. Such a check should be returned to the O. D. B. A new check will be drawn covering the amounts due surviving payees. Amounts due deceased payee will be paid to an appropriate payee designated by the O. D. B.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to write your Congressman, WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Unheralded Feat of Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Morning Call, of Paterson, N. J.:

UNHERALDED FEAT OF OUR MERCHANT MARINE

Congressman CANFIELD'S daring trip to England as a crewman incognito of a merchant-marine tanker, to view first hand the activities of the United States merchant marine, has focused long belated public attention on the heroic role those mighty lifeliners of the sea have played on the road to victory.

Mr. CANFIELD, before leaving on his adventurous investigating mission as a member of the important Congressional Committee on Merchant Marine, had expressed the belief that this vital and dauntless arm of our Nation's armed services, so essential in keeping our Atlantic and Pacific lifelines moving to our boys at the front, had not been fittingly recognized by the Government. So as a practical idealist he decided to see for himself, which he did in one of the most unique ways of congressional history.

While his report to Congress will not be ready for some time, the Morning Call is confident, that what he saw was more than sufficient to confirm his belief, and prove our unwavering faith in the rugged patriotism of the United States merchant marines based upon our personal knowledge of a number of these grizzled veterans of the deep, officers and seamen alike.

Well earned and fully merited then is the war risk bonus recently obtained for merchant seamen, representing financial compensation for the performance of extraordinary duty. How perilous have been their tours of duty through submarine and mine-infested waters momentarily beckoning death, which monetary reward, however, can little repay, the long casualty lists offer mute but glowing testimony. Yes, long before Pearl Harbor our merchant marines were in the thick of the fight.

Now thanks to our regenerated Navy, the hazards of this seafaring arm of our military might, though still constant, are on the wane. With a reported loss up to the end of May of 5,727 merchant seamen, we can be thankful for the present definite improvement now confirmed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill in their joint report on the antisubmarine campaign for the month of June, showing that merchant vessel losses for last month were below their most hopeful calculations.

In an analysis of this loss of life among our merchant marines, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., referring to the offensive and defensive allied activities which have progressively improved the situation, says:

"There was the constant patrolling of the sea lanes by the Allied navies on the hunt for Axis submarines. On the defensive side, there has been the most effective use of naval escorts * * * and the creation of new and advanced bases for reconnaissance." The civilian mind cannot fathom the amount of vigilance, effort, and sacrifice which has gone into "sub-busting" or evaluate the military dividends derived. Our merchant service has been a vital factor in this regard, being directly responsible for preventing many an enemy-inspired disaster at sea.

As a result of this admirable teamwork between our merchant marines and the Navy, the enemy sea raiders have lost their deadly punch of the past 2 years and thousands of lives have been saved from a watery grave not only of seamen, but also of soldiers on their way across the sea to come to grips with the Axis demons of hate and destruction who would enslave the world. The United States merchant marine has played a noble role, but now that our maritime strength is approximating its peak and new ships are coming off the ways, the need for new crews to man this now greatest of all fleets is one of the pressing war problems of today, and it must be promptly met to keep our ocean life lines running full speed ahead to our invading armies of liberation.

So we urge our Government to take immediate action to further encourage and stimulate new enlistments in the United States merchant marine whose war record of this war marks one of the proudest achievements in maritime history.

Rights of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to set forth further answers to questions regarding the rights of men and women in the service and their dependents, so that my people will be fully informed as to these matters.

Question. May a wife apply for a family allowance if her husband has made no arrangements for it?

Answer. Yes; if he is an enlisted man or an aviation cadet. She should fill out W. D., AGO Form No. 625, and attach required evidence. The application may be approved with or without his consent.

There is one exception. If she is the wife of an enlisted man in one of the first three grades and her husband already has made a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters in effect—either for herself or other dependents—which he wishes to continue instead of the family allowance, she will receive no family allowance.

Question. If the class A dependents of a serviceman make application for a family allowance, and he thinks they should not be granted an allowance because of special circumstances, can he appeal for relief from the requirement of providing a family allowanee for them?

Answer. There is no way in which the serviceman may control an application made by or on behalf of an eligible class A dependent. Section 104 of Public Law 625, Seventy-seventh Congress, states:

A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States to the class A dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man upon written application to the department concerned made by such enlisted man or made by or on behalf of such dependent or dependents.

Question. If a serviceman with a wife and children is divorced by his wife while he is in the Army, and she is decreed alimony, will the family allowance be reduced?

Answer. Family allowance for former wife divorced will be reduced from $50 a month to a sum up to $42. Payments for divorced wife and children will be governed by divorce decree.

Question. If a serviceman remarries, will his second wife receive a family allowance?

Answer. Yes; she will receive the full monthly payment for a lawful wife, $50. The amount of her family allowance is not affected by the fact that the former wife receives a family allowance. Nor will former wife's family allowance or that of her children be affected by his remarriage.

Question. If a serviceman has several children living in his own household and/or in the household of a former wife divorced—or a separated wife—will each child receive monthly payments?

Answer. Yes. Under joint Army and Navy regulations governing administration of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, total sum of family allowance payments for all children of a soldier will be divided equally among them.

Question. If a woman has entered into a common-law marriage in a State where such marriages are recognized, and is at present receiving a family allowance, would she be eligible for this allowance if she moved to a State where common-law marriages are not recognized?

Answer. Yes. Eligibility for family allowance payments is not affected by such a change of residence.

Question. Are all enlisted men in the first three grades—staff sergeant, technical sergeant, first sergeant, and master sergeant—required to contribute to a family allowance for their wives and other class A dependents?

Answer. Yes. A family allowance for class A dependents of a soldier in any one of the three higher grades is compulsory if such dependents request it and if the enlisted man has made no monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents—in effect on or applied for before November 1, 1943—on behalf of his wife, children, and/or other dependents. If he has made such monetary allowance, he may elect to continue it instead of applying for a family allowance, or to discontinue it in favor of a family allowance. He may not have both. Nor may any soldier request a monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents after November 1, 1943. The family allowance is the only benefit for dependents for which enlisted men are eligible after that date, except as stated above.

If you have any further questions, please write your Congressman, WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. I will be glad to help you.

Let Us Have More Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed editorial from the Louisiana Farm Bureau News of July 1944 should be of interest to the whole Nation. With rural electrification, better housing, and better roads farm life is much more attractive than urban life and so much more wholesome. It is our job to see that the farmers of these United States get these farm improvements; also that the farmer gets a decent wage for his toil in the form of better marketing conditions and better prices. We must encourage diversification, better balanced farms which will produce much of the necessities of life for the farm family with a surplus to sell to the industrial and urban families, providing the money to buy the things that industry and commerce have to sell. Then and only then will we have a balanced and self-sufficient economy. Yes, indeed, give us more farmers but make farm life both attractive, convenient, and profitable.

LET'S HAVE MORE FARMERS

Any post-war planning which does not provide for the quick return of several millions of returning service men to the farm will be a colossal mistake. Regardless of the fact that no civilian goods have been manufactured for nearly 4 years, and that there will be an enormous demand for the things which we have had to do without, it will be practically impossible for industry to adjust itself to pre-war conditions and absorb more than one-third or one-half of the men and women who will be looking for jobs when the war finally comes to an end.

The farm is the greatest and most important of all industries. The farm is the food factory of the world. If the farm were to close down, hunger would stalk the Nation. We could get along without radios, refrigerators, washing machines and automobiles, but we cannot get along without food. Food is grown on the farm—there is no other place for large scale operations in the production of something for people to eat.

But, first, the farm and farm life must be made more attractive than it has ever been before. Drudgery must be taken out of farm life if we ever hope to get any large number of our returning soldiers back to our food, feed and fiber factories.

Our cities are filled with men and women who would willingly swap city life for farm life if they could have some of the conveniences city life affords. They are not going back to coal oil lamps, bored wells, washing tubs and washboards.

They want and are entitled to all the electrically operated labor-saving devices which go to take drudgery out of farm work. They want radios, refrigerators, washing machines, electric irons, water systems, milking machines, chicken brooders, feed grinders, wood saws, shop tools, ice-cream freezers, stoves, percolators, toasters, etc., and they are entitled to all these things. They are not only entitled to them but they must be supplied before any number of our people can be induced to seriously consider taking up farming as a permanent vocation.

More rural electric lines and cheap power is the one best way to check disintegration of the farm home and farm life. No man with a mental picture of his old mother scrubbing clothes and drawing water from a deep well looks with favor upon going back to such conditions.

Put city conveniences in the rural home; give a man a car or a truck to get his produce to the city market; keep the country from being considered a thing apart from the city, and, with surroundings most people love, the country home will beckon as it never has before.

Freedom of action in growing crops and animals, and the joy of carrying out a plan of its own is worth a lot to any family. Cash income is important, and the farmer can always have it, but it is by no means the only measure of living.

Plenty of fresh vegetables, fruits, eggs, milk, home-cured meat, fried chicken at will, with an ice box to keep things cold and good, certainly tops off any city dweller's prospects.

Who would trade the joys a well-ordered country home offers for a hemmed-in home in a crowded, bustling city, where the rule is "every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost"?

New Roads to Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, James Patrick McGovern, a former captain in the A. E. F. during the First World War, and a member of Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105 of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, has composed a poem which reflects such a basic spiritual force as mankind must cherish if civilization is to survive—let alone to advance. He has titled it "New Roads to Rome," and is dedicating it to the national welfare. Pursuant to unanimous consent granted by the House, I now present the verses

for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

NEW ROADS TO ROME

Kaleidoscope of law, religion, art,
And every mortal trial of state and man,
Rome, great theme for every human heart,
Now owes high promise to the American.
Columbus, Genoese, sailed the broad West,
Our arms today crusade by Eastern sands—
Strange wheel of fortune: In true freedom's quest
We turn back Goths and Huns, new heathen bands.
Brave as our legions, be our councils wise
To lay the cornerstone of stable peace
On such foundations as in Rome still rise
Of Christianity's undying lease.
War would ever be a fugitive
If only Christ among us all might live.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Another Big, Big Blunder, Governor Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in Governor Dewey's acceptance speech at Chicago he belittled the memory of that great soul, Woodrow Wilson. He said in that speech:

No organization for peace will last if it is slipped through by stealth, trickery, or the momentary hypnotism of high-sounding phrases. * * * That is too much to ask in the name of those who have died for the future of our country; this is no task for men who specialize in dividing our people; it is no task to be entrusted to stubborn men, grown old and tired and quarrelsome in office. We learned that in 1919.

Too bad that a candidate for Presidency of the United States would make such a remark—he can never live it down—and I here quote David Lawrence's answer to Mr. Dewey's slur on Woodrow Wilson, taken from July 7 issue of the United States News:

This is a gratuitous slur at the memory of Woodrow Wilson. It is inaccurate and is an evidence of superficiality. It is to be hoped that Governor Dewey will read the real history of 1919 and not be swayed by the Republican isolationists who would like now to blame President Wilson for the destructive job which the Republicans in the Senate under Senator Lodge in 1919 did in wrecking the noble efforts made by an American President to set up the foundations of world peace.

AN OPPORTUNITY TO WIN VOTES OF INDEPENDENTS

The boys who are dying in France today would not have been asked to make that supreme sacrifice if the Government of the United States—under Republican administrations between 1920 and 1933—had unequivocally supported the League of Nations and had shown by example to the craven politicians of Britain and France that the United States would use force if necessary to keep the peace and avoid a second world war.

Zionist Organization of America Receives Highest Treasury Award in War Bond Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following addresses delivered by Dr. Israel Goldstein and the Honorable William C. Fitzgibbon at the presentation of the United States Treasury Department's highest citation, on July 31, 1944, to the Zionist Organization of America for its accomplishments in the recent War bond drive:

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. FITZGIBBON, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY, UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Sixty-five million fighting Zionist dollars have gone to war. Under the generalship of President Rabbi Israel Goldstein, the Zionist Organization of America mobilized for a campaign to sell $25,000,000 worth of War bonds during the month of June. Edmund I. Kaufman acted as national chairman of the drive, and Ernest E. Barbarash was his chief lieutenant in charge of operations.

If you had attained your objective, $25,000,000, that would have been an outstanding success. Had you doubled your quota and raised $50,000,000, that would have been a superb accomplishment. But you didn't stop at $25,000,000 or at $50,000,000, you pressed on and on until your sales of War bonds reached better than $65,000,000. What a record! Emblazon it upon your scroll; point to it with patriotic pride, and challenge any other organization of like size to top that achievement.

Little wonder it is that the United States Treasury Department wishes to honor you with its official citation for distinguished services rendered in behalf of the War Financing program. How befitting those words are to the Zionist Organization of America: Distinguished—superior in ability, achievement and character; service—work done for another. The investments you made in War Savings bonds were not for yourselves alone; they were a service to the men and women in our armed forces; to your fellow citizens at home, and to all liberty-loving peoples throughout the world. You served humanity by helping to provide the means by which to save civilization from destruction. Distinguished services rendered. Inside that word rendered, we find the spirit of democracy, for rendered means to give in return—to pay for something owed or due. We in America are blessed with freedom, independence and prosperity because our people fought at Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, Gettysburg and Chateau-Thierry, that we might enjoy liberty. For this priceless heritage, we are indebted to our forebearers, and the only way we can hallow their memory is to give of ourselves in service to the cause for which they gave their lives. Thus do we deserve to be cited for distinguished services rendered. This, the Zionist Organization of America, its officers and members have done summa cum laude.

As on the field of battle, so on the home front citations are awarded in recognition of heroic deeds. Such citations do not retire their recipients from active duty, but rather inspire them to greater patriotic service. Likewise, Mr. President, this official Treasury citation awarded to the Zionist Organization of America, and so richly deserved, will, I am confident, be cherished as a memento commemorating a most successful war effort, and also, as a commission for even greater patriotic service.

ADDRESS BY DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN, PRESIDENT OF THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA

It is with humble gratitude that I accept on behalf of the Zionist Organization of America this citation from the Treasury Department of the United States. When the Zionist Organization of America undertook a War-bond quota of $25,000,000 for the month of June we made a conservative estimate on the basis of last year's precedent. Our actual achievement, however, is nearly three times the quota we took, being in excess of $65,000,000. This is the largest amount raised in any single Jewish organization in the United States. It is proper that the Zionist Organization of America should take the lead seeing that its membership of 120,000 makes it the largest Jewish membership organization.

Our members, like all Americans, have been stimulated by the success of our armed forces overseas, in the Pacific as well as in Italy and France. Close to 500,000 Jewish boys are fighting in the American forces. Many thousands of whom are among the dead and wounded. The least that we their kin back home can do is to provide the tools for victory. Thus we have endeavored to do and shall continue to do by our War-bond purchases.

We cherish the hope that it will not be long before the Nazi yoke will be broken in Europe and soon thereafter, the Japanese stranglehold upon the Far East. When Europe will be liberated the full story of the Jewish part in the victory will be revealed, the 600,000 Jews in the armies of Soviet Russia, the 100,000 in the armed forces of Great Britain and the countless thousands in the guerilla forces and underground group of Poland, France, Yugoslavia, and other occupied lands. With special pride we point to the war record of the Jewish community in Palestine. Without conscription but by voluntary enlistment more than 30,000 men, representing 25 percent of its male population of military age, are serving in the armed forces, Palestine Jewish soldiers have led in military assignments in Lybia, Syria, and Crete, which involved the greatest peril and called for the greatest daring and ingenuity. Behind them is the Jewish home front in Palestine contributing through hard working agriculture and industry much needed supplies of food, clothing, machine parts, and repair facilities.

No people has made a heavier contribution to the victory of the United Nations, in proportion to its membership, and no people has suffered so heavy a toll. More than half of the Jews of occupied Europe have been exterminated. No other people has suffered civilian casualties in such degree.

The victory of the United Nations will come too late to bring the dead back to life, but it is not too late to rescue many thousands now in Hungary and in other satellite countries who, under the shadow of defeat, may be persuaded to release great numbers of Jews. It is now up to the United Nations to persuade surrounding neutral countries to provide temporary asylum, guaranteeing the cost of temporary maintenance and also guaranteeing permanent resettlement after the war. Now that the International Red Cross has informed us that the only obstacle is the availability of visas, the duty incumbent upon the United Nations is obvious. The United Nations will also have to persuade Turkey to permit large numbers of Jews to

transit for Palestine. Most of all, it is up to England to open the doors of Palestine for as many as can get there.

Looking to the permanent solution of the problem of Jewish homelessness in Europe, Palestine is the only place which will be fit economically, psychologically, socially, and culturally to absorb a large immigration. In order to provide for both the spiritual and physical needs of the Jewish people, Palestine must become a Jewish commonwealth. Only the Jewish people can make Palestine big enough to serve the needs of the Jewish people, without dislocating any of its Arab inhabitants. The establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth is post-war aim No. 1 of the Jewish people. No matter how great the military victory of the United Nations may be, the war will not have been won on the moral side unless this measure of justice will have been achieved.

That American public opinion understands and appreciates and favorably regards this aim is abundantly attested by the Palestine plank which both the Republican and the Democratic Parties have recently included in their platforms.

American Zionists pledge their lives and the lives of their children, their substance, and their sacred honor to the speeding of the victory which will bring liberation to all the oppressed of earth.

The success of our War bond campaign is due to the able direction of its chairman, Mr. Edmund I. Kaufmann, the results of whose efforts have reemphasized the readiness of our people to give practical and tangible expression to their patriotism; and, above all, to the regional and district leaders, war effort committee chairmen, and key workers who carried on the drive. The response of our members and their friends has surpassed all expectations.

Free Doctor and Hospital Care for Wives and Infants of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, free maternity care for wives of men in military and naval service, and free medical and nursing care for their babies is now provided through the Wisconsin State Board of Health as a result of money given to this State by Congress.

Under this plan, a wife of a man who is in the lower four ranks of the service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. These lower four ranks include in the Army: Private, private first class, corporal, and sergeant; in the Navy it includes men in the seventh to the fourth pay grade.

At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

IMPORTANT TO FOLLOW RULES

Wives of servicemen should acquaint themselves thoroughly with the rules set down for this free medical attention. The rules set down in Wisconsin are clearly stated and must be met in order to receive this care and service. The wife should see her doctor for an application form to apply for this free service. If the doctor does not have these blanks, write to Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Wisconsin State Board of Health, Madison, Wis., and ask them to rush a blank to you. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2 at once and rush to Madison for approval.

APPLY EARLY

It is important that wives apply for this early. The State board of health will not approve payment of the doctor, hospital, or any service before the application is made out. In case of an emergency be sure that the doctor makes application for you within 48 hours after the service is rendered. If the application is not made no bills for medical or hospital service will be paid. It is most important, therefore, to get the application filled out and sent in at the earliest possible time. See your doctor and apply for this free service.

Wives can see their regular family doctor for this. It is not necessary to go to a special or certain doctor to get this aid. It is most important that wives of servicemen remember that no payment for any such service will be made prior to the filing of an application. In other words, no application—no aid. It is tragic to be refused this aid simply because no application was made beforehand.

CHARGES PAID THROUGH STATE BOARD OF HEALTH

The charges for this medical, hospital, and surgical attention are paid through the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Wisconsin State Board of Health, Madison, Wis. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse. No serviceman's wife need worry about proper medical care, infant care, or hospital care if she acquaints herself with this free service and makes proper application before the event rather than after.

WHAT WIVES CAN EXPECT

First. Complete medical service for maternity patients during the prenatal period, for childbirth and 6 weeks thereafter—including care for the newborn infant.

Second. Health supervision for infants.

Third. Nursing care, in the home, through the local health department, including bedside nursing care necessary for the mother—before, during, and after childbirth, and for the baby during the first year of life.

Fourth. Hospital care, in wards, or at ward rates, for maternity patients and infants. These funds cannot be used in part payment for more expensive hospital accommodations. A minimum stay of 10 days in the hospital after childbirth is arranged if possible. Hospital care may be authorized in any hospitals where the maternity and pediatric services have been approved by the State health agency.

Remember that this service is available only to the wives of the men who are in the four lower ranks of service. It does not apply to the wives of commissioned officers or to the wives of the higher-ranking noncommissioned officers.

CONGRESS SET UP THIS SERVICE

I want servicemen's wives to know about this help that Congress has provided for them. Should any questions arise, ask your doctor or nurse about it; and if they do not have the information, write your Congressman, WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Farmers Come Through Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, over the Mutual Network, Wednesday, August 2, 1944, at 10:15 p. m., entitled "Farmers Come Through Again." Judge Jones gave an inspiring message in his address last night, when he told how one of the greatest production achievements of our entire war effort has been made by the Nation's farmers and ranchers. Every American has reason to be proud of the splendid accomplishments listed in his speech.

I have recently returned from a trip out through the great farm areas of the United States. What I saw out there is of such importance to everyone of us in this whole country—and even to much of the rest of the world today—that I want to report to the public on what I saw and what it means.

This war is a production war. We have known from the beginning that victory would depend on production—and the almost unbelievable production records that we have made, the goals that have been reached and exceeded, are proof enough that victory will be ours. We have produced planes and tanks and guns and munitions of every kind beyond anything that was thought possible before the war. But one of the most outstanding production feats of all these, one of the greatest production achievements of our entire war effort, has been made by the Nation's farmers and ranchers. It is inspiring to see the tanks and planes rolling off the assembly lines of our arsenal of democracy, but it is equally inspiring to see what I saw on my trip, the equally amazing production now under way on our farms.

I wish that our 11,000,000 soldiers and sailors could see what I have seen, so that they would know that they will continue to be

the best fed army in the world. I wish that every man, woman, and child in the United States could see the record-breaking crops and harvest which the long hours and skill and the hard work of our farmers and their families have produced again this year. And finally, I wish that the misguided war lords of Germany and Japan could see this tremendous harvest and production, so that they would realize now the total hopelessness of their attack against a nation of such resources and a people of such determination as ours. If they could see what I have just now seen, they would give up and stop more quickly this unhappy war, knowing that their defeat is inevitable.

Down in the southern portions of the Great Plains where the wheat harvest was then in full swing, they were gathering the greatest wheat crop ever produced in this or any other country in all history. Last fall much of that country was dry and it looked as though wheat yields would be low. It was wise to play safe, and all our efforts were to guard carefully our food and feed supply and get the last full pound of results from every pound of feed we had. But nature was kind, and the combination of favorable weather and the hard work and skill of the farmers and their families brought record yields and a tremendous harvest. They tell me that our wheat production this year will be not only a record, but more than a hundred million bushels greater than we have ever produced before.

But the big crop itself was not all that I saw. I saw the tremendous job of handling it, which is a challenge to the genius of America, and an impressive spectacle in itself. Farmers and their families, old and young, men and women, boys and girls, people from the cities and towns were working early and late to get in the crop. I saw one 10-year-old boy operating a tractor and combine. I saw one farm woman in Kentucky who has worked her tractor day and night, not only taking care of her own crops but plowing and cultivating for her neighbors. Boys and girls in their early teens and hundreds of thousands of women are doing man-sized jobs with their hands and with machines. Many soldiers were helping with the harvest on short periods of leave.

We have read with amazement and with pride of the tremendous marshaling of mechanized equipment on the embattled beaches of Normandy and we are justly proud of the organization that mobilized these machines of war and drove them on. But this year, in our own country, a great battalion of large combines was shipped down from the North, mobilized and equipped—and on the D-day of harvest they began their long march through the wheat fields of the Southwest to follow the harvest northward across the country to the Canadian border on their own mechanized march to victory.

The big crop has added to the wartime burdens of the railroads. More freight cars have been needed to move the grain to terminal storage elevators, and more and more men have been needed to unload them. It is customary in the Southwest to pile some wheat on the ground temporarily at harvest time. But this year it has been heaped in the fields and along the railroad sidings and stored in temporary bins—and in one small town I saw a paved street roped off and piled high with wheat. But our record-breaking wheat crop will, I am sure, be moved and stored in ample time to prevent loss.

I mention these incidents as illustrations of the initiative and the hard work and the problems that are a part of our victory on the home front. All these, along with the uncertainties of weather, are a part of the business of producing food, which we too often take for granted.

Now what does this wheat crop mean? It means one more assurance of plenty for our armed forces and for all of us on the home front. It means greater assurance, too, for our fighting allies and for the people of occupied countries who will look to us for a part of their food needs when they have been liberated. The fact that the wheat crop is so much larger than was expected a few months ago means that more wheat will be available for feed for livestock than had been anticipated. The most important feed grain is corn, of course, and the size of this year's corn crop will largely determine the amount of milk and meat and eggs that we can have this year and the next. The prospects now are for another corn crop near the 3,000,000,000-bushel mark, although it is still too early in the season to count on it for sure.

The wheat and corn prospects are not by any means the only bright spots in the agricultural production picture this year. We have another big hay crop this year and that's important to our livestock industry. The prospects now are for another big soybean crop from which we get feed for livestock as well as a large part of the vegetable oil for human consumption and industrial uses. The prospects now are for another big potato crop—bigger than the production of most recent years although not quite as large as last year. Commercial vegetable acreage gives promise of turning out a larger volume than last year. Livestock numbers, especially cattle, are very large. Our farms and ranches are teeming with cattle in much larger numbers than ever before. The number of cattle now on farms is 15,000,000 greater than the 1935–39 average and nearly 8,000,000 greater than the high point of the previous cattle cycle in 1934.

These are some of the things that one sees out in the great ranch-and-farm areas of our country today. They cause us who are concerned with the Nation's food supply to give serious and sober thought to what it means.

It means one thing which I never tire of repeating. That is that the craftsmanship and the skill and the patriotism and the hard work of the American farmer and his family can be depended upon to meet the challenge of production, given normal growing conditions and prices which will enable him to carry on. The more I see our farmers and their families at work, the more I marvel at their remarkable job of conversion to war production.

It was fortunate that we had these first two ingredients of food production—namely, good weather and the kind of farmer that we have. It was equally fortunate that we had for them a system of support prices and that we had these long enough ahead of planting and breeding time, so that the skill of our farmers and the bounties of nature could proceed to extend for 1 more year the long stretch of 7 years of record-breaking production.

There are two reasons why price supports have been important to everyone in America. First, they have given farmers the assurance they must have to plan for and to produce so far beyond their normal output. When goals were established for production of guns and planes and tanks and the thousands of other items of equipment needed to fight a global war, the Government made contracts with manufacturers on a price basis. When war needs demanded a third more food than peacetime production the Government said in effect to farmers, "Increase your production to meet these war needs and on every commodity for which an increase is asked, the Government will guarantee that you get a reasonable price." Price supports are the farmers' counterpart of the manufacturer's war contract.

The second reason why price supports are important to everyone is that by helping to get abundant production they help to make workable the wartime program to control prices and prevent inflation. A black market cannot be maintained in a commodity that is plentiful.

During the last war, some foods sold for extremely high prices—eggs, for example. Some people have wondered why eggs didn't sell at very low prices at times when supplies have been very large during this war. But the reason why eggs have been so plentiful at times is that there are price supports on eggs for farmers. These price supports which have assured more abundant production have made it possible for consumers to buy eggs at more reasonable prices on the average throughout the year. Those of you who remember the price of eggs during the last war will remember that eggs have been more reasonable and more plentiful during this war. But for the plentiful supply of eggs it might have been very difficult to prevent black market operations and dollar-a-dozen eggs in the black market.

In wartime when the demand is so great for so many farm commodities, farmers couldn't be expected to continue producing eggs abundantly if they had to take a loss on abundant production. And so the price support and price stabilization programs work hand in hand to protect consumers against extremely high prices and protect farmers against extremely low prices. And, at the same time, they have helped farmers to produce the abundance we all are enjoying now.

In the case of some foods there will occasionally be some temporary oversupplies. In order to be sure to have enough we must sometimes expect to have too much. But I am sure that no one would be optimistic enough to hope that such a tremendous production effort could be so well geared and so delicately controlled that every goal could be exactly reached in spite of all the hazards of war and the uncertainties of weather. I am sure too, that if criticism comes, farmers would rather it would be for having too much rather than for having too little.

We do have abundant supplies of food. And having built up our wartime stocks of food during years when production was being increased to its present high level, there is no reason to suppose now that farmers will not be able to continue to supply us abundantly, barring unfavorable weather.

America owes the farmers of this country a debt of gratitude for the way they have come through on their job of producing food to win the war. Many farmers too are indebted to city people who have helped them in critical periods to harvest the crops. The work of our Victory gardeners and home canners has made a big difference in our fight for food.

In our war years we have seen a vast demonstration of the kind of accomplishment we can expect when everyone is doing his part. Our food situation is good and if we work at it in the future as we have in the past we can keep it that way.

Rights of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to set forth further answers to questions regarding the rights of men and women in the service and their dependents so that my people will be fully informed as to these matters.

Question. Should the wife of a man overseas write to him concerning reinstatement of her family allowance if he has become eligible again?

Answer. No. She should write a letter to the O. D. B. stating, first, serviceman's name, present rank, and serial number; second, family allowance application number, if known; third, period of time during which she received family allowance; fourth, reason for discontinuance; fifth, request for reinstatement.

Question. Should wife requesting reinstatement send in documentary evidence again?

Answer. Not if she has submitted all required evidence. It will be a matter of permanent record at the O. D. B.

Question. Should a soldier in one of the first three grades who wishes to have a family allowance reinstated for his dependents file a second application for them?

Answer. No. He should write his commanding officer, stating facts of case.

Question. Is it compulsory for a serviceman to apply for a family allowance for his class B–1 or class B dependents?

Answer. A family allowance for eligible class B–1 or class B dependents is entirely optional with the serviceman and may be stopped at any time at his request.

Question. Are the dependent parents of a man in the Air Force eligible for a family allowance?

Answer. If the man is an enlisted man or an aviation cadet; yes. If he is a commissioned officer; no. An officer may, however, authorize a voluntary class E allotment of pay on their behalf, if he wishes to do so. The Air Force is a part of the Army.

Question. May a mother who worked in order to support her son prior to his entry in the Army—and is still working—receive a family allowance from him?

Answer. Such a case would have to be judged on its merits. She must prove that she is dependent upon her son in order to be eligible.

Question. May a mother with two sons in the service have a family allowance from each son?

Answer. Yes; provided she is dependent upon both of them at least to a substantial degree, and provided that each son desires to apply for a family allowance on her behalf. She may be dependent upon one son—and only one—for chief support and upon a second son for a substantial portion of her support. Or she may be dependent upon each son for a substantial portion of her support.

Question. What steps should she take to get this benefit from both sons?

Answer. She should request each son to apply on her behalf, as the family allowance will be payable only at his request or with his consent. She might supply each son with a dependency certificate, W. D., AGO Form, No. 620, properly filled out and signed by herself and by one witness to her signature. If the two sons desire to apply on her behalf, they may then attach these forms to their applications.

Question. A mother has sons and a daughter in the service, and a husband who is retired on a small income. May she receive a family allowance from any one of her children in the service?

Answer. Yes; provided she can prove dependency upon any one of them, and provided the child concerned consents to the authorization of this benefit.

Question. Under what authority does the O. D. B. change the rate of payment or discontinue a family allowance?

Answer. Under authority of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended. This amendment provides increased payments for certain class A dependents, also for those parents, brothers, or sisters who rely upon the serviceman for their chief support, establishing these in a new class—class B–1. Under the law as amended, payments to those remaining in class B are fixed at a flat monthly rate of $37.

Question. If a dependent's family allowance payments have been reduced and the dependent is actually relying upon the serviceman for chief support, will the Office of Dependency Benefits reconsider the case upon request?

Answer. Yes. The dependent should write the O. D. B., Newark, N. J., giving full facts to establish claims of dependency. State amount of each item of living expenses such as rent, fuel, food, clothes, and medical bills—per month. Also, state monthly income from sources other than the family allowance. The O. D. B. is set up to authorize family allowances for those who are entitled to them and will review and redetermine any case wherein dependents had not originally supplied the O. D. B. with sufficient facts to support claims of dependency.

Question. If a dependent who has been in class B becomes dependent upon the serviceman for chief support, may she have payments increased? How?

Answer. Yes; payments may be increased. Dependent should write the O. D. B. for reconsideration of her case, giving an itemized statement of income and expenses.

Question. If a dependent's payments have been discontinued because of failure to return the dependency certificate to the O. D. B., will the case he reopened if this certificate is sent in now?

Answer. Yes. The O. D. B. will reconsider the case upon receipt of sufficient evidence to support claims of dependency, together with a letter requesting reconsideration.

The foregoing articles are of especial importance to the members of our armed forces, their parents, wives, and children, and to their dependents in general.

Be sure to keep these articles for future use and guidance. You will find them of inestimable value for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that all the benefits for servicemen, their wives, mothers, children, and other relatives outlined in these articles and in the previous articles that I have set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, were made possible by legislation passed by the Congress of the United States; and I am very glad to report to my people that as their representative in Congress, I worked for and voted for all the legislation passed by the Congress which made possible the benefits for our men and women in the armed service, their wives, mothers, and their children.

In the 4 years I have been in Congress, I am glad to report that more than 40,000 of my constituents have written to me for help and guidance in Federal matters.

I am happy to report further that I have worked to meet and fulfill every request. All these requests have received my personal attention. It has been the rule of my office to answer every letter or post card received by me within 24 hours after its receipt.

Your Congressman is your agent in Washington. If for any reason you have any problem with the Federal Government, you should write your Congressman. I invite the people in my district to write me and to call on me if and when you have any problem which relates to the Federal Government. Write your Congressman, WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Free Ports for Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Free Ports for Refugees," delivered by me over radio Station WMCA, July 5, 1944:

Every day as we move on to liberate the countries which the Nazis control, the enemy is enslaving and murdering thousands upon thousands of noncombatants. It started in Poland. I need not repeat to you the reports of the damage which the Germans inflicted there. Nor need I repeat to you how the Germans applied their science of destruction to the other countries of Europe—Norway and Denmark, to Holland, Belgium, and France, to Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Latest victims of the German drive are their late collaborationists—the Bulgarians and the Hungarians. The Germans are now treating those Bulgarians and Hungarians precisely as they treated the Poles as long as there was a Poland to destroy.

For, according to Nazi principles, all who are not Nazis must become underlings; all who are not Germans must become subhumans; all who are useless to the Nazis must be killed. If Nazis cannot use you as a slave, either because you are too weak in muscle or too strong in character, they destroy you. Before they kill you they take away ever bit of our clothing. They strip you naked—children, women, and men. For the clothes of the dead are good enough, they say, for their slaves in factories and on farms.

Some of these victims of the Nazis managed to escape. Others will manage before we can get to Europe and stop this dreadful destruction of humanity. The refugees managed to get to Sweden, to Switzerland, to Spain and Portugal, to Turkey, and some reached the haven of even the fighting United Nations—Russia, England, and a very few, the United States.

This problem calls for a solution, but any solution offered at this time can be only a

temporary one. It was with this idea in mind, that I introduced House Resolution 154, which I still believe would have been the most adequate answer to the problem. Some opposition developed, however, and I, therefore, introduced another resolution known as H. Res. 576. This resolution offers a temporary solution by way of so-called free ports.

The President of the United States created a War Refugee Board to afford relief to these victims, not only in this country but in other countries as well.

An American journalist, Samuel Grafton, who writes for the New York Post, the Washington Star, and many other great newspapers, suggests that we establish free ports in which to harbor such refugees temporarily—until the War Refugee Board and similar agencies get them permanent places to live.

These free ports for refugees would be exactly like the free ports for international merchandise. Goods come to our seaports. There they are put into bond in warehouses until they are re-exported. They do not enter our domestic commerce. They do not compete with the products from our farms and factories. They merely rest on a shelf, as it were. We supply the shelf, that is, the warehouse, that is, the free port—as an international convenience which costs us nothing.

Why not establish similar free ports for refugees. They would remain interned and segregated in such free ports, in such temporary havens, for the duration of the war. At the end of the period, they would be returned to the countries of their origin, or to those countries which would invite them—just as soon as we bring peace and order to Europe.

Remember that these human beings would be in transit, precisely like a batch of merchandise kept in customs bond on the free port of Staten Island.

Remember, too, that we have more than 200,000 Nazi prisoners of war in this country right now. They, too, are transients. As soon as the war ends we shall return them to central Europe where they were born. Every camp for prisoners of war in this country is a free port in the sense that I am advocating. The prisoners are treated well. But they may not leave their camp. Neither would the refugees be allowed to leave. But, this is the most important thing in the world today, the Nazis here are imprisoned, the refugees would be sheltered. Jail and asylum are diametrically opposite in spirit.

The milk of human kindness that flows through all our hearts makes it imperative that we do something definite for those European refugees, and do it with the greatest dispatch.

Quick and widespread was the response to this proposal of temporary shelters for refugees. Newspapers, magazines, national organizations, national leaders, throughout the land quickly applauded, quickly approved, quickly memorialized President Roosevelt to establish such havens forthwith.

The New York Times said editorially: "The plan has nothing to do with restricted or unrestricted immigration. It is simply a proposal to save the lives of innocent people."

The New York Herald Tribune said editorially: "The appeal represents one more expression of American anxiety that nothing be left undone in the effort to save as many innocent people as possible from the unspeakable brutality of the Nazis."

The Chicago Sun said: "We can hope that the Government can and will adopt the project."

The Asheville (N. C.) Citizen Times said: "Prisoners of war will not reside here after the war. It could be the same, if charity follows the counsel of wisdom, for the war refugees."

That leading Catholic weekly, the Commonwealth, urged: "Suppose we put our influence, whatever determination to help the refugees we have left, back of the plan."

And that liberal weekly, the New Republic, had this to comment: "The United States Government talks a lot about helping refugees from Hitler-occupied Europe; but thus far we have done almost nothing about it—build a few concentration camps along the eastern seaboard. Put the refugees into them with the understanding that they are to see no more of America than this, and will be sent somewhere else when the war is over. At least, they would not starve in Europe or use up precious cargo space for food on ships going to north Africa. If we refuse as a nation to do any more than this, then in the name of human decency, let us do no less."

Speaking for the National Farmers' Union of whom he is president, James G. Patton, pleaded with President Roosevelt: "I am confident, Mr. President, that if the American people were acquainted with the true facts of Nazi persecution, they would cry out with one voice asking that this country point the way in this proposed humanitarian task of providing temporary havens for European refugees."

President William Green of the American Federation of Labor also pleaded: "I urge you, Mr. President, in my own name, and in the name of the American Federation of Labor, to cause the creation of free ports in this country for refugees who are victims of this cruel war now, before it is too late. Such action on your part will, I believe, clear the way for similar action in other parts of the allied and neutral world."

And president Philip Murray, speaking for the C. I. O., cried out: "In behalf of the C. I. O. I endorse the plan and hope to see it implemented without delay."

And Mr. Justice Frank Murphy, speaking as chairman of the National Committee Against Persecution of the Jews: "Surely we have not become so calloused to human suffering, so inured to brutality and bestiality that we can stand idly by and refuse to initiate this simple plan which will save thousands of human lives and in the bargain cost the taxpayers of our country not a cent."

There are also hundreds of others, Poles and Czechs, Scandinavians and Netherlanders, Belgians and French, Serbs, Croats, Albanians, and Greeks, who are also trying to escape the Nazi debasement. There are Catholics, Lutherans, and Eastern Orthodox as well as Jews. They represent all types of religions, all types of political and social creeds which the Nazi despises and fears.

It is for all these refugees that Jewish organizations—the American Jewish Congress, the American Council for Judaism, the American Ort, the Hebrew Sheltering Society—have joined the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., the Farmers Union, and Mr. Justice Murphy's National Committee Against Persecution of the Jews—in pleading to President Roosevelt to establish such temporary havens for refugees in this country.

The President of the United States has ordered the admission of 1,000 refugees and I am endeavoring to persuade the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, of which I am chairman, to pass a resolution to establish more free ports, and to urge other nations to do likewise.

On establishing these free ports, we shall be able to congratulate ourselves on having saved that many human lives from death and destruction. Each human life saved means that a victim of Hitler's fury has been rescued. It means that Hitler's plan of extermination of the people of Europe was not successful. It means that both we and other liberty-loving nations have definitely done a humanitarian act and only then will we be able to point out proudly to the consistent record of our Nation's history, that we are an asylum for the oppressed.

Commendation of Thirty-sixth Infantry Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM CONNALLY
OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Dallas (Tex.) News relating to the Thirty-sixth Infantry Division, the members of which came from my State, and to Maj. Gen. Fred L. Walker, former commander of the Thirty-sixth Division, during its operations in Italy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALOROUS DEEDS OF TEXAS THIRTY-SIXTH WIN GENERAL'S HIGH PRAISE

FORT BENNING, GA., July 25.—Back among familiar surroundings Tuesday was Maj. Gen. Fred L. Walker, former commander of the Thirty-Sixth (Texas) Division, which gained fame for its fighting in Italy.

General Walker, nearly two decades ago, was a student at the Fort Benning Infantry School. He assumed the duties of commandant of the school after a conference at post headquarters with Brig. Gen. William A. Hobson, post commander.

"I have observed our soldiers in battle on the Italian front over a period of 10 months and I am convinced that our soldiers are better than the Germans," General Walker said.

In a report to Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, United States of America, Commanding General Army Ground Forces, in Washington, General Walker said our soldiers are "more cheerful, more confident, better marksmen. After having seen our men going through the hardships of last winter during which they were subjected to almost continual rains, mud, cold rations, and continual artillery and mortar fire, maintaining a cheerfulness far superior to the enemy, I feel confident that they are capable of being made into the best soldiers in the world."

The Thirty-sixth Infantry Division, which General Walker commanded, has seen some of the bitterest fighting of the war. This division made one of the toughest amphibious landings of the war—under fire of the enemy's guns at Salerno. They were in the fighting at Altavilla, made one of the hardest crossings of the river in the war—the crossing of the Rapido—and fought at Cassino. They were one of the divisions in on the capture of Rome.

"The Thirty-sixth Infantry Division is a great outfit and I hated to leave it," General Walker said. "The public knows the deeds of some of its more publicized heroes such as Sgt. Charles (Commando) Kelly and Sgt. James Logan and Pvt. William J. Crawford, who won the Medal of Honor, and Sgt. Manuel Gonzales, who won the Distinguished Service Cross. But the division has hundreds of other heroes, real infantrymen who have proved that they're the kind of men you like to soldier with."

Although an Ohioan himself, General Walker's face lit up with pride when he talked about the Thirty-sixth, which was the Texas National Guard before it was inducted into Federal service in 1940. He assumed command September 13, 1941.

Although Selective Service trainees who filled out the division to combat strength and

replacements from all over the Nation have given it an All-American flavor, General Walker says the citizens of Texas still regard it as their own.

He was notified before he left Italy that Texas Highway 36 has been renamed Thirty-sixth Division Highway and that plans are going forward to erect a monument to the division on that highway near Temple, Tex.

General Walker was not an eyewitness to Sergeant Kelly's feats which won for him the Medal of Honor, but he visited the Mayor's house in Altavilla—the scene of Kelly's exploit—after the Germans had been pushed out of the city.

"The third-story window from which Kelly dropped mortar shells as grenades on the advancing Germans was about 70 feet above the ground with a deep ravine below that," he said. "From there it was easy to make the shells fall on the point so that they would detonate.

"The Thirty-sixth Infantry Division has suffered heavy casualties several times," he continued, "but our men have had what it took to come back and give it back to the Germans in kind. Although we've seen less days of action than some of the other divisions, we've seen the toughest kind of action of all, storming a well-fortified beach and rivers."

General Walker is proud of a letter received, just before he left Rome, from Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark, United States Army, in which the Fifth Army commander said in part:

"My heartiest congratulations on your new appointment, I am delighted that the Infantry School will have such a skilled commandant.

"The Fifth Army regrets the loss of one of its veteran commanders but realizes the importance of the role you are to play in the training of infantry for future battles.

"At this time I wish to express my very best wishes for every success as commandant of the Infantry School as well as to extend my congratulations for the superior job which you performed as commander of the Thirty-sixth."

General Walker was honored with a dinner at Rome just before leaving there, when a new song, singing the glory of the division, was introduced by one of the band members, Sgt. John Forte, 7331 Reed Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Sergeant Forte also composed Via Roma, a song which the general said had become very popular in Italy.

Just before the big push started in May, General Walker told the members of his division that they were being held in reserve, "But when you are committed, the eyes of the world will be upon you."

Sergeant Forte borrowed the expression to name his song, The Eyes of the World Are Upon You, Thirty-sixth, which ended with:

"Cheers to the men of the Thirty-sixth,
Theirs is the spirit that's never been licked.
To the men who led her
From Salerno to Rome,
Maj. Gen. Fred L. Walker."

General Walker was graduated from Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, in 1911 with a degree in engineering. Having been a member of B Troop, Ohio Cavalry, for 4 years, he took an examination for an Army commission in the fall of 1910. He was accepted in February 1911 and entered the Army in April as a second lieutenant of infantry, doing special work to gain his college degree later.

In 1932 he attended the Army War College, Washington, D. C. For the following 4 years he served on the War College faculty. He won the Distinguished Service Cross and Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster in the World War.

His wife formerly made her home in Columbus, Ohio, but moved to Fort Benning with him. Their two sons are infantry officers.

Editorial Comments on Retirement of James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three excellent editorials, one from the New York Times of June 10, one from the Brooklyn Citizen of June 15, and one from the New York Enquirer of July 17, commenting upon the retirement of the Honorable James A. Farley as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 10, 1944]

MR. FARLEY LEAVES THE CHAIR

Mr. Farley has been a chairman for 26 years. He began in 1918 with the Rockland County Democratic Committee. In 1930 he took the chair of the New York State Democratic Committee, which he has just resigned. For 8 years he was chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He has done an immense amount of drudgery. He has managed effectively a great Government department. Now, in a letter full of characteristic kindness for his fellow-workers, he becomes free at last to earn the competence which his great ability, exclusively exerted, would have won him long ago.

A political chairman usually becomes something of a mythological figure. To his opponents his words and his works are evil. Mr. Farley didn't entirely escape the demonologists, but the sinister myth couldn't stick long to a personage to incorrigibly honest, friendly and straightforward. Even the straightest-laced objectors to his code of sticking to his party through thick and thin had to make him an exception. Both politicians and the public have been impressed by his character.

Born with the gift to like and be liked, his tact and power to please are natural, not acquired. He must know by sight no small part of the voting population of the United States. Enlarging a Jeffersonian trait, he has written letters to most of the rest of the population. He comes down to us in a stream of green ink. He never talks too much and never bores us. Brought up in a Republican county, he has never had the bitterness that might have been expected. He has been moderate and reasonable. If he has had disappointments he keeps them to himself. He is a good fellow with no sacrifices of dignity. He is a good man, though he doesn't know it and won't believe it if he is told. As a public man he is A–1 The best of luck to him as a private man. As he gives up the chair we recall this recipe from his book of reminiscences. He "still believes that the only way to get ahead in public life is to understand people and sympathize with their viewpoint."

[From the Brooklyn Citizen of June 15, 1944]

MR. FARLEY'S FAREWELL

Whatever else may be said about the resignation of James A. Farley as chairman of the Democratic State committee, there is no doubt that it marks the end of an era. With this realization there also comes a feeling of sadness, for it almost seems as if politics were progressing too swiftly nowadays and too many events were happening too rapidly. When the old order changes and gives place to the new, it is natural for there to be considerable reluctance at parting with the good from the past.

However, it was, perhaps, inevitable to anticipate Mr. Farley's action. As he himself pointed out, his "business duties and obligations" preclude his devoting what he considers the amount of time necessary to perform the work of the State chairmanship in a conscientious manner. Since no one has ever been able to accuse him of lacking a sense of duty, or being deficient in the conscientious fulfillment of his responsibilities, it is understandable that Mr. Farley should have declined to concentrate on one assignment to the neglect of another.

In conjunction with his fidelity to a trust imposed in him, he has also manifested an unfailing sense of modesty in claiming credit for the tasks which he has accomplished. His formal statement of resignation displays this quality in his declaration that, "Whatever success I may have had in the performance of my duties as chairman of the State committee has been due entirely to the assistance I have had from the leaders and the precinct workers—men and women—down through the years."

What Mr. Farley apparently fails to grasp, with true self-effacement, is the fact that it was his own industrious and inspiring example which evoked this willing aid and cooperation from his admiring assistants. Yet he disclaims even this modicum of justified pride when he says, gratefully and humbly, that "I doubt if any man in my position has ever enjoyed the friendship of the leaders and the party workers as I have during these 16 years."

The truth of the matter is that few other men in public or private life have Mr. Farley's capacity for making friends and, as Shakespeare says, "grappling them to the soul with hooks of steel." If the Democratic politician benefited by an acquaintance which was wide and varied, it was because it was founded on the sincerity of Farley, the man. The Brooklyn Citizen joins with that host of friends in wishing him well as an executive and as a Democrat.

[From the New York Enquirer of July 17, 1944]

JIM FARLEY—AMERICAN

In the fierce conflict that is American politics there is no room for weaklings. Men who for themselves or for others seek power for an idealistic or worldly reason, have no easy path.

There is no governing class in America. The boy from the wrong side of the tracks has as much right to seek the highest office in the land as does the son of the wealthiest family. Therefore, he who enters the political arena knows that he must deal with all the people, some zealous in behalf of his plans, others bitterly opposed.

On his way he may sometimes compromise, sometimes veer slightly, but always before him he must keep his goal and his general direction must ever be toward it.

He must place the interest of his country first and as he is loyal to it, so must he be loyal to his party and his friends.

Above all else, he must be honest. The public is his judge and while the public is often slow to understand and sometimes temporarily deceived, in the long run it makes a true assay of a man's real worth. Successful politicians themselves place the highest value on personal honesty and even the bitterest opponents, worthy of each other's steel, will invariably grant full trust in each other's word.

Obviously, a man successful in politics must possess great ability, singleness of purpose, courage, loyalty, and high moral integrity.

Such a man is James A. Farley. And in saying this we know that we only echo the thoughts that are in the minds and hearts of millions of Jim's fellow Americans.

It is not necessary to restate here Jim Farley's record. It is known the length and breadth of the land. Thousands can testify to his political ability and his genius for organization. But more thousands will rate Farley eminent not so much for these attributes, for others have them, but because through the years, despite hard blows, despite disappointments, despite temptations, he has held fast to the virtues of patriotism, loyalty, honesty, and has demonstrated moral integrity and spiritual qualities of the highest order.

Jim Farley has resigned as chairman of the Democratic State committee and is stepping out of public life. But we know that millions of Americans expect him to keep up his interest and to watch closely the political scene. America will always need men like him and such is our faith in Jim Farley's love of country, we know that if the enemies of America seem to be waxing too strong and the people summon him back to the political arena, Jim Farley, patriotic American, will respond.

Federalization of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and on his behalf I ask unanimous consent that there may be included in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Doctors," by Frank C. Waldrop, appearing in the Washington Times Herald of July 31, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOCTORS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

There is pending in Congress a bill 90 pages long, and containing roughly 17,000 words, that makes the doctors of America shiver. This bill proposes that the Federal Government spend $3,000,000,000 more per year than it does now for medical care and hospitalization of the people in general.

Uncle Sam is already the heaviest spending patient in history—what with the Army and Navy hospital systems, veterans' care, and the various public-health services operated under direction of the United States Surgeon General.

This additional $3,000,000,000, also to be administered primarily under control of the Surgeon General, is looked on by the doctors as the absolutely last ton of bricks to flatten them into machine parts of a Government-run medical bureaucracy.

The 17,000 words, all highly technical and full of complicated legal meaning, were put together by New York's Senator WAGNER and Senator MURRAY of Montana, as an amendment to the already existing Federal social-security laws.

In its preamble, it reads like a gilt-edged bond against all the ills that human flesh is heir to, for it proposes "to provide for the general welfare; to alleviate the economic hazards of old age, premature death, disability, sickness, unemployment, and dependency: * * *" etc., etc.

Just how a law of Congress can provide against "premature death" or alleviate the "economic hazards" thereof is not so clear. But the American Medical Association looks on the bill as a provision for the premature death of the sort of medicine that has brought to the United States of America the highest health standards in the history of man.

And, of course, the $3,000,000,000 worth of medical work to be done each year under the terms of this bill won't be free at all. Who escapes taxes, except by "premature death"?

But, at any rate, here is how the project is supposed to work: The Surgeon General is authorized to select on his sole say-so hospitals in which patients may stay at the taxpayers' expense for from 30 to 90 days.

He is also the final say-so as to the organizing of panels of general physicians and specialists—he alone will say who is a specialist—to do tax-paid preventive and curative medicine the country over.

Doctors will serve according to his instruction and appointment—or else.

In brief, the entire basic system of medical practice in America will be governed by the head of one Federal bureau in Washington—if the bill goes through.

And some astonishingly clever maneuvers have been started to blast it through at the psychologic moment.

For instance, have you had trouble getting a doctor lately? America is so short on civilian physicians that the house of delegates of the American Medical Association warns an epidemic of influenza or similar disease would sweep the country in devastating fashion. The doctors just can't get around to their patients now, and in a few years things will be worse, according to the A. M. A.

Britain, Canada, and Russia, looking ahead to the troubles of post-war readjustment, are enlarging their systems of medical training now, war or no war.

But Mr. Roosevelt, in his infinite wisdom, is working in exactly the opposite direction. The overworked older doctors of America are dying at the rate of 4,000 a year. They are being replaced at the rate of only 1,500 a year—because F. D. R. has decreed that no premedical students shall be deferred from the draft. By 1948, end of term IV, if any, the effect of this policy would leave the United States with 10,000 fewer doctors than it has today.

The house of delegates of the A. M. A. has begged Mr. Roosevelt to think twice about this, and warned that the result will be a critical loss for the private practice of medicine in the post-war era when care for the veterans will in itself be a gigantic assignment and world demand for American medical skill will hit us.

There just won't be enough young doctors to fill the ranks as the older men die, they show by simple mathematics. But there will be a crisis and an emergency. And then the political geniuses can spring the Wagner-Murray bear trap at the moment the country's desperation for medical attention will be at its peak.

The doctors are up against some of the ablest political propagandizers who ever lived. If F. D. R. gets his fourth term, he will socialize them for sure, if he can.

The doctors can beat him at his game only by tossing all their crooks and quacks out of their medical societies, by showing they care more for their patients' welfare than for their elaborate "ethical" protection of doctors who have double-dealt with the public.

They have a heavy policing job to do in their own ranks if they expect the public to stand with them against the Wagner-Murray juggernaut, and without the public on their side it will crush them for sure.

Public Health Service Drive on Tuberculosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following article from the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, August 3.

It is interesting to note that the newly created Tuberculosis Control Division of the Public Health Service reports that Washington is eighty-fourth on the list of 92 cities reported. I hope that the members of the District Committee, who recently held an investigation, will find time to read this report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH SERVICE PLANS NEW DRIVE ON TUBERCULOSIS—DISTRICT LISTED AMONG 92 CITIES TO RECEIVE AID

The United States Public Health Service today announced it is shaping up plans for a new national tuberbulosis control program in 92 cities with a population of more than 100,000, including the District of Columbia.

Dr. A. Barklie Coulter, head of the Tuberculosis Bureau of the District Health Department, when informed of the announcement, said he fully expected the national assistance to be extended to Washington will be in the form of a grant of money. Legislation authorizing a fund of $10,000,000 for the Public Health Service has been enacted, but the money has not yet been appropriated.

The Public Health Service made public a comprehensive set of statistical tables disclosing the relative death rates of the 92 cities, based on deaths during the 3 years of 1939, 1940, and 1941. The average yearly death rate in the big cities was shown to be 55.4 per 100,000 population, compared with 43.5 in communities of 2,500 to 100,000 population and 31.1 in rural areas.

DEATH RATES VARY

Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe, chief of the newly created Tuberculosis Control Division of the Public Health Service, recently authorized by Congress, said that death rates in the large cities vary extremely, and studies were being made to find out why. For example, he pointed out the death rate in cities of overwhelmingly white population varies from 15.6 deaths per 100,000 population in Grand Rapids, Mich., to 151.7 in San Antonio, Tex.

Washington's standing among the 92 cities was listed in several ways—its relative position based on deaths among all races, deaths among whites only, among nonwhites, among cities of its own size and by geography.

The cities with the lowest death rate among all races, which stood at the top of the list, were Grand Rapids, Mich., 15.6; Salt Lake City, 19.3; Minneapolis, 20.9.

D. C. IS IN EIGHTY-FOURTH PLACE

Washington was listed in eighty-fourth place, with a rate of 82.7 deaths per 100,000 population of all races. Cities with a higher tuberculosis death rate among all races than Washington were: San Antonio, 151.7; Chattanooga, Tenn., 113.7; Sacramento, Calif., 97.5; Jacksonville, Fla., 89.4; Memphis, Tenn., 89.1; Atlanta, Ga., 86.5; Birmingham, Ala., 83.7.

In the list given, the death rate for the white race only, however, Washington stood next to the top among cities of its own relative size from 500,000 to 1,000,000 population, with a death rate of only 38.3 per 10,000 population. The only city which had a better rate than Washington was St. Louis, Mo., with a death rate of 37 per 100,000 white population.

Dr. Coulter, pointing to this good showing of the District, said this was the fairest comparison of any of the tables listed by the Public Health Service. He emphasized, however, that cities should not be considered to be in competition with each other in a tuberculosis death rate. Instead, he said, a more practical consideration would be to show how rapidly the death rate was going up or down in each city.

He stressed his recent report that since the establishment of the Bureau of Tuberculosis in the Health Department here in 1935, the death rate generally had dropped from 102.2 to 66.4 per 100,000 population, according to his figures here.

OTHER CITIES LISTED

After St. Louis and Washington in the Public Health Service list of death rates among white populations were Pittsburgh, 38.9; Milwaukee, 39.3; Cleveland, 42.1; Baltimore, 46.8; Buffalo, 48; Boston, 55; and San Francisco, 61.

Among cities of its own size, Washington stood in fourth place for the death rate among nonwhites, as follows: St. Louis, 176, per 100,000 population; Pittsburgh, 182.6; San Francisco, 188.5; Washington, 194.3; Boston, 215.7; Baltimore, 299.2; and Cleveland, 235.1.

The nonwhite situation among 39 cities of the country listed showed Washington in twenty-eighth place with the figure of 194.3. The highest nonwhite tuberculosis rates were in Newark, 275.5; Chicago, 250.1; Chattanooga, 244.4; Cincinnati, 243.3; Cleveland, 235.1; Tulsa, Okla., 234.1; Baltimore, 229.2; Boston, 215.7; New York, 213; Philadelphia, 203.5; Jacksonville, Fla., 198.4; Washington, 194.3, and Detroit, 189.2.

Among such cities the ones with the lowest nonwhite death rate were Fort Worth, 102.7; Charlotte, N. C., 107.2; Kansas City, Kans., 109.2; Dallas, 116.9; Houston, 134.4, and Richmond, Va., 135.3.

A Soldier at the Peace Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in today's Washington Times-Herald, entitled "A Soldier at the Peace Table." I make this request for the reason that I believe the editorial to be timely, reasonable, and correct.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOLDIER AT THE PEACE TABLE

SOLDIERS KNOW AND HATE WAR MOST

Miss Marcia Winn, writing in the Chicago Tribune last week, came up with a suggestion that we believe merits a lot of consideration. She suggested that a soldier, or some soldiers, be invited to sit at the peace table, since they are the ones who actually know about war and hate it most. And she told how her suggestion came about.

Miss Winn said she had a letter from a man who had been in the Spanish-American War, whose son had been in the last war, and whose grandson was in the current war. Her correspondent said he had come out of his own experience hating war, and felt that his son and grandson would duplicate his feelings.

"The soldiers who come home," he wrote, "are the world's best missionaries for peace."

The man later called on Miss Winn in person and elaborated on his idea.

"Women can do a lot for peace," he told her, "but in the long run it's up to the men. The only way we will ever stop war is through the men who have fought in a war."

His great idea was to have a soldier at the peace table.

As Miss Winn remarked, the notion is full of holes. How to pick the soldier? What powers to give him? In fact, the question of questions, How to do the thing at all? Actually, it's just a dream, but even so, it's worth thinking about.

Peace tables are usually surrounded by politicians who are dickering with one eye on the people back home and by diplomats who almost always outsmart themselves by being too diplomatic. Sitting in, usually, are generals and admirals, who believe they are entitled to have some say about allotting the rewards of the victory they have just won.

BATTERIES OF EXPERTS BEHIND NEGOTIATORS

Sitting behind the actual negotiators are batteries of secretaries and bales of papers. The secretaries are experts on this and that, and the papers are full of studies about where the new boundaries should be and who pays whom for what. The boundaries are jiggled back and forth according to the claims of minority pressure groups, associations of fiery patriots and, occasionally, the word of some one who really knows something about it. The claims are adjusted not only in terms of those who lost a cow when the armies battled across their pasture, but by the representations of those engaged in international commerce, impatient to grab the trade formerly held by the losers.

And underneath everything else is the insistent undertone of politics.

But by the time things reach the negotiation stage, the war itself has been pushed into the background, to become a set of casualty statistics in the almanac, where they will be looked up by coming generations of editorial writers seeking a comparison for the figures in the new war.

The men who have fought the war have ceased to be soldiers, because they are dead, or because they have been demobilized.

The politicians at the peace table may occasionally remember the men who were soldiers, because those who got out of the war alive are voters; they can be tossed a bonus. The diplomats don't have much time for soldiers except considered as a point which may be used effectively in an argument. The generals and admirals, who are often shown decorating a soldier or a sailor, are accustomed to considering their men in numbers and firepower, too, and not as people.

What we are getting at is this. None of those people around the peace table ever has had that intimate contact with war that the ordinary soldier has had. Cerainly a general or an admiral gets killed once in a while, but if he does, it's a mistake. And a politician or a diplomat may get assassinated, but not, usually, in a fox hole or on a beachhead. They know war only in the broad and impersonal sense.

We think that, even though it's just a dream and insanely impossible, there might be a way to plant a couple of soldiers on the peace table. Probably not what we called an ordinary soldier, the tough inarticulate fighter, but there must be among the ranks somewhere a couple of sensitive, intelligent men who could put across to the other participants in the debate the notion that a soldier does not like war and could convey to the experts a suggestion as to what the men who fought the war would like to do about the peace.

Of course, it's just a dream.

Control of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of June 18, entitled "F. C. C. Probe Bares Plan to Control Press," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

F. C. C. PROBE BARES PLAN TO CONTROL PRESS—GAGGING OF CRITICS IS FIRST OBJECTIVE

(By Willard Edwards)

A New Deal pattern for intimidation of the American press, leading to eventual control through a permanent Government propaganda set-up, has been brought to light in hearings just concluded by the special House committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission.

Patching together bits of testimony wrung from numerous Government witnesses over a period of weeks, committee members said there has become evident a well-planned program for bureaucratic domination of radio, the press, and freedom of speech.

SUPPRESSION OF CRITICISM

Suppression of newspaper criticism of the Government is the first objective of the planners, the evidence indicated. An attempt to accomplish this would be made by the publication of surveys presenting a comparison of Axis radio broadcasts with selected excerpts from a few prominent newspapers which have aroused the wrath of President Roosevelt by opposition to New Deal policies.

As a basis for making such a comparison, the Federal Broadcast Intelligence Service of the F. C. C., the testimony revealed, has prepared a digest of enemy broadcasts, divided into 14 themes, illustrative of the Nazi and Japanese propaganda.

This chart is inclusive, members noted, of practically all possible criticism of the United States and its allies, so that hardly an American newspaper worthy of the name would be exempt from a charge of having followed, in some manner, at some time, the enemy propaganda line.

BRANDED AS PRO-NAZI

A newspaper could be branded as pro-Nazi on a basis of comparison with these 14 themes, if it had ever intimated that "political and economic injustice" existed in the United States or Great Britain or criticized the foreign policies of Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Churchill.

Similarly, an editorial or news story suggesting that President Roosevelt was under the influence of Communists would be condemned as following the German propaganda line.

As a crowning absurdity, statements that Germany and Japan were powerful and might win the war could be assailed as fomenting enemy propaganda. The highest-ranking officers of our Army and Navy might qualify as enemy propagandists on this basis, members noted.

WHIPPED INTO LINE

The publication of such comparative surveys, however, they remarked, might damage the prestige of the first newspapers selected as targets to such an extent that many other newspapers would be whipped into line.

Following is a summary of the 14 themes of enemy propagranda, drafted by the propaganda analysis section of the F. C. C., which would form a basis for denunciation of any newspaper found to have published criticism similar to them in any respect:

"Political and economic injustice exist in the United States and Great Britain, and internal corruption, war profiteering, Communists and spiritual decay. The foreign policies of the United States and Great Britain are morally unjustifiable. Either President Roosevelt or Prime Minister Churchill or both is a war monger, unscrupulous, the pawn of Communists.

FEAR OF EDITOR CITED

"Germany and Japan are powerful and possess the manpower, armaments, materials, and morale essential to victory. The United States and Great Britain are weak. The United Nations are disunited, and distrust, deceive, envy, and suspect each other. The United States and the world are menaced by Communists and plutocrats."

Variations of some of these themes can be found in many newspapers, committee members noted, and one remarked ironically:

"An editor might fear to render a tribute to a dish of pigs knuckles and sauerkraut lest he be labeled pro-Nazi because a Germany broadcaster had expressed a liking for similar fare."

It was reported that last Monday's 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision in the Hartzell espionage case, affirming the right of an American citizen both in war and peace to criticize the Government and the President in the strongest terms, even to "immoderate and vicious invective," if he so desires, may have caused a temporary halt to plans for publishing the surveys.

FRANKFURTER DISSENTS

It was observed, however, that the ruling prevailed by the narrow margin of one vote and the present court has been known to reverse itself. Justice Frankfurter, one of the dissenters, was revealed during the committee hearings to have requested a daily copy of the F. C. C.'s digests of Axis broadcasts.

Evidence concerning the 14 themes was brought out during the questioning of Dr. Robert D. Leigh, former president of Bennington College, Bennington, Vt., who is director of the F. C. C.'s Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. He was questioned by Committee Counsel Harry S. Barger about the activities of Dr. Harold D. Lasswell, now engaged in research on war communications at the Library of Congress.

Leigh said Lasswell was working in an atmosphere of great secrecy" and was "in touch with a great many important people around town" in the preparation of surveys based upon Axis broadcast material supplied him by the F. C. C. Leigh was asked how comparisons of Axis propaganda would be made with American newspapers.

MAKE COMPARISON

"You identify cliches of Axis propaganda, the people it attacks, then you compare it with what are called the Nazi lines and get your identification," he testified. "If you want to compare an American newspaper with the German propaganda, you would study the quantity and emphasis and consent of the newspaper and make the comparison."

"Do you not feel," asked Barger, "that if such principles as the ones we have been discussing became firmly established, we may be laying the foundation for a real Gestapo to operate against freedom of speech and freedom of the press?"

"It seems rubbish," Leigh replied. "All we are doing is a war job having to do with Axis propaganda to the United States. My division has no interest in the prosecution of anybody."

In November 1942, according to the testimony, the F. C. C. contracted to furnish its Axis broadcast digests to the Office of War Information for delivery by it, through wire services, to newspapers and radio. This marked the formal entrance of the Government into competition with existing war services in the gathering and distribution of news.

SHOULD CONTINUE WORK

Moreover, Dr. Leigh conceded, the material is edited by both his division and the O. W. I. before it reaches the public which gets only that part of it which the two Government agencies wish it to have.

He added, with emphasis, that he thought propaganda work and the monitoring of foreign broadcasts should be continued after the war "for the information of our Government, especially the State Department."

The Farm Surplus Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask the unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial printed recently in Printer's Ink, a New York City magazine, commenting favorably on S. 2041, a bill recently reintroduced by Senator SHIPSTEAD and myself and now pending before the Senate Committee on Agriculture. I am glad to say the measure is attracting a great deal of attention among farmers throughout the Midwest.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE REVIVES BILL TO PROVIDE PERMANENT FARM SURPLUS SOLUTION

When the Senate returns next month from its furlough, high up on its calendar will be S. 2041 introduced 3 years ago by Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, and Senator SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota, offering a new economic principle by means of which, it is declared, the farm surplus problem can be permanently solved. In a word, the bill specifies that our yearly surplus of farm products, up to a billion dollars, shall be exported and that the purchasers be allowed to pay for them in merchandise rather than gold. By means of prorate import quotas, the merchandise thus imported would be only 2½ percent of the United States yearly output in any one classification. The effect on each manufacturer would be negligible, and, in any event, he would gain added profit through the increased prosperity of the farmer. Three years ago the bill stirred up but little interest. It was regarded as just another of those things. But now Senators and Representatives are taking it seriously, and some heavy support has developed for it. You are going to hear plenty about this bill before long.

The Philadelphia Transit Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following editorial from this morning's Philadelphia Record, relating to the recent strike in Philadelphia and its causes.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE DIDN'T SLIP; WE WAS PUSHED

When an elderly gentleman slips on a banana peel, the polite attitude is to look the other way—while he picks himself out of the gutter and wipes off the filth.

Now that the Army has our transit system again in operation and Philadelphia is picking itself out of the gutter, the Record has been advised that we should not add to our city's embarrassment by too caustic comment or criticism; that we should literally look the other way while Billy Penn wipes off the filth. Most important, we are not to inquire who planted the banana peel.

Here and now, the Record serves notice that it is not going to look the other way.

Here and now, the Record serves notice that it will devote all the abilities and resources which it can command to discovering and bringing to justice the perpetrators of this vile conspiracy against our country.

We use the word "conspiracy" advisedly. This was not a strike. Of that the Record is convinced. The transit tie-up was a deliberate plot. It will go down in history as the most shameful work stoppage during World War No. 2.

Until the plotters are discovered and punished, the whole city must share this shame. Until it is proven that this sudden repudiation of patriotic obligation and American principle was not spontaneous but manufactured, Philadelphia must remain a marked city "where it can happen again."

The Record knows that banana peels don't fall from the skies in Philadelphia.

The Record knows this particular banana peel was planted.

To discover by whom and why, The Record will seek answers to the following questions:

Who called the meeting of 50 P. T. C. employees at the Paradise Cafe on Ridge Avenue at 8 p. m. last Monday evening? That is where the work stoppage was finally planned. Who passed the word to meet there? Frank P. Carney, president of the company union, which is still in existence to represent office employees, was prominent at that meeting, but we have no proof that he called it. If he did, the trail would be very clear. In any case, the grand jury should subpena everyone present at that 8 o'clock meeting.

From their testimony it should not be hard to find out who really started the fireworks—or, to stick to our simile, who planted the banana peel. Those 50 men recruited some 150 more. The 200 divided into groups who put over the walk-out at the various car barns, bus garages, subway, and transit terminals. That's how easy it is for a city to fall, once it starts to slip on a banana peel.

But there are two other lines of inquiry of equal importance which we propose to pursue.

Why were Transport Workers Union officials completely in the dark about this "spontaneous" decision of their members to tie up the Philadelphia transit system? Three months ago a majority of the P. T. C. employes had voted for T. W. U. to represent them as their bargaining agent with management. Immediately after that balloting negotiations for a new wage contract were instituted. The very adroit representatives of T. W. U. succeeded in obtaining a very favorable contract for their members, with wage increases of about $3,000,000 a year. After long delay, because of technicalities, this contract was to have been signed last Friday.

While no election of officers of the new local union had been held, shop stewards had been appointed and were functioning. Why was none of these T. W. U. shop stewards included in the original 50 who met at the Paradise Cafe to plan the sabotage? Why did no one of the 50 suggest that T. W. U. officials be notified and represented at their meeting?

Did the 50 men at the Paradise Cafe represent the 8,000 transit employees? Three months ago the employees had repudiated the company union.

What caused them to completely reverse their attitude, accept company-union leadership, and repudiate T. W. U. leadership to which they had given their endorsement a few months ago?

On the face of it, doesn't it look as though a disgruntled minority pulled a "quicky" on the representatives of the majority, who had gone to sleep after concluding a favorable contract for their new members?

But there is another line of inquiry which is even more significant.

Where was management when the cars stopped?

What did management do to meet this emergency?

So far as we can discover the answer is "absolutely nothing."

Dr. A. A. Mitten, chairman of the industrial relations committee of P. T. C., was the official charged with the responsibility of meeting this situation. He admits that he knew about it Monday night. He went out to the car barns early Tuesday morning. He decided not to say anything to the men assembled there because they were "too sullen." He issued no appeal to the men to return to work. By the way:

No appeal to employees to return to work was issued by any official of P. T. C.

Why?

Why was no meeting called of the executive committee of P. T. C. on Tuesday morning? Certainly with the system completely frozen and the city tied up, there was sufficient reason for a meeting of the executive committee if not of the full board of directors. It happens that Mayor Samuel is an ex-officio member of the board of directors, together with three councilmen, who represent the city's interest in the maintenance of its transit system.

Did they demand a meeting of the directors?

We happen to know that in this emergency there was no meeting of the board of directors or of the executive committee until Friday morning, when the executive committee met to accept the usual contract which the Army offers when it takes over.

We want to know why management took so little interest in the strike.

There are answers to all these questions—and when they are properly answered certain pillars of society will be called to account and a great city will be cleared of its shame.

Control of London Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of July 16 under the title "British Ruling Class Controls London Press."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH RULING CLASS CONTROLS LONDON PRESS—CENSORSHIP IN ENGLAND WEAKENING NEWSPAPERS AND DISTORTING WAR NEWS

(By J. Loy Maloney)

(Mr. Maloney left the United States for London on May 17 and returned July 4. He tells here of some of the observations he made of the British press during his 6 weeks' stay.)

The belief that the British have tremendous capacity for the absorption of punishment is nowhere more exemplified than in the case of British newspapers.

A casual reading of the London press for 6 weeks forces the conclusion that the British ruling class—names of nobility and wealth such as Beaverbrook, Rothermere, Kemsley, and Astor run through the lists of British newspaper proprietors and controlling shareholders—gives British newspaper readers just what the ruling class thinks they should have and little else. And what is even more shocking is the fact that newspaper readers there "queue up" in long lines to buy what is offered. They appear to like what is handed them.

Although time appears to have relaxed somewhat the British censorship—it is still bad enough—the British press remains weak and lacks all constructive criticism. As if in return for accepting slavishly its news presentation which the British ruling class thinks newspaper readers there should have the latter are treated to good news, strongly played up, whether there is any or not.

Bad news is played down, and good news painted in its most glowing colors. The publishers say it is best to keep the readers—who have suffered the pangs of war for 5 years—as happy as possible. Failures are explained away, sometimes painfully.

The circumstances which most shock the American newspaperman in London is the interlarding of the news with the opinions of the newspaper editor and his reporters.

This mixing of opinion and fact has been practiced so long that the reporters and editors are past masters of the art.

When this phenomenon is pointed out to British newspaper readers, they have the greatest difficulty in recognizing the difference between the two. They have fed on the mixture so long that they can't tell one from the other.

Even an American sojourning in London for a few months soon gets used to it.

The editorial opinion injected into the news stories soon acts as a drug on the reader and the first thing he knows he is swallowing it and if he isn't careful—like the British newspaper readers themselves—is learning to like it or, at least, ceases to object to it. Soon he is sound asleep so far as independent thinking is concerned.

The necessity to compress stories into small space has aided this practice. Stories which "classify" from all over the world are rewritten and localized.

The date lines which give authenticity to reports in American newspapers are forgotten. This makes it easy for the editors and rewrite men to inject their opinions in the news with impunity.

Often the only way a British newspaper reader could tell an editorial from a news story is the fact that it appears on the editorial not the news page.

As to the Pacific war, British newspaper readers know little about it. A story worth a column or a column and a half in Chicago on the exploits of MacArthur and Nimitz will get two or three paragraphs on the back page of a London daily or no mention at all.

European news is well mapped, but maps on the Pacific battles, land and naval, are almost unknown. It is a European war to the British newspaper publishers and readers.

It is difficult to see why the British ruling class, controlling the press as it does, underplays the war on Japan, in view of Prime Minister Churchill's repeated statements that once Hitler is beaten the British will turn their efforts to the Pacific. British newspaper readers certainly have been ill prepared for any such event.

The statements of the Germans on their many radios get more prominence in the British press than the Nimitz-MacArthur battles to whip Japan.

British newspapers often take the Axis radio statements at their face value, giving them prominence and presenting them to British readers as unqualified facts.

American civilians sojourning in London were for a time unable to reach much of the activities of Americans battling in Italy or flying bombers over the Continent.

When it was the British in action, the reader was specifically told so. When it was the Americans, they were referred to as "allies."

British bombers were called British bombers, but when the American day bombers were over Berlin they were often referred to merely as Flying Fortresses and Liberators, and the reader was permitted to draw his own conclusions as to the nationality of the pilots, navigators, and gunners.

This tendency, however, was knocked into a cocked hat after the invasion of France. The activities of the American troops on the Cherbourg Peninsula were so newsworthy that the British newspapers were forced to give the facts frankly.

This they did with the result that the superior press given the American troops was

the subject of much comment in London and the demand was immediately made by the British and their American newspaper spokesmen that more correspondents, especially American, be sent to cover the fighting on the British sector of the invasion area.

There is still censorship, backed by law, in Great Britain.

Of late it has been somewhat liberalized and, of course, does not force the British newspapers to serve continually glowing reports to the effect that everything is going well, whether it is or not, when the bold facts would be more interesting and be more conductive to an efficient war production and a vigorous conduct of the war.

It is possible under the British law to punish violations of the censorship by fines and jail sentences. The British government did for a time suppress the Daily Worker, although it is now publishing again.

The British still refuse to accredit Daily Worker reporters as foreign correspondents, however.

"Stops"—the newspaperman's term for definite rules against certain stories or phases of stories—are numerous in Britain.

In the case of the flying bomb, for instance, these "stops" for a time covered three and a half single-spaced typewritten pages.

As the war has progressed and British censorship has tended outwardly at least toward liberalization there have been fewer efforts to prosecute newspapers as having printed facts dangerous to the war effort. Prosecution of the London Daily Telegraph was dropped when it became apparent that the Government could not prove statements made in that paper interfered with the progress of the war.

The principal stumbling block to news publication at the present time is the fact that British censors are "advised" by the British Foreign Office and by air, army, and admiralty "advisors."

The censor does not have to take this "advice" but in practice it amounts to law.

The British have canceled the old edict issued in 1942 which empowered the ministry of information to ban news stories tending to create dissension among the Allies. However, reporters are "advised" by the censor when such news comes up that it should not be written or transmitted.

This "advise" had best be taken because the reporter, if he disregards it, is courting trouble with his credentials and may find himself in England when he and his office want him on the fighting front.

One "stop" remaining in British censorship is a ban on the discussion of diplomatic relations. This is on the ground that it would tip off the enemy on what is planned.

There are also "stops" on stories indicating this is an imperialistic war and there is another on stories which indicate there are large numbers of reluctant soldiers in the French army.

In general, American reporters prefer to submit their stories to British censorship rather than American. The latter are often inexperienced and, so reporters say, often stop stories that the British will pass.

It is unnecessary for the British newspapers to submit to censorship of British home news—news developed in England.

The newspapers may print it at their peril, and in doing so may run afoul of the general British censorship law.

Thus, British newspapers often print stories which the British censors stop when an American tries to send them to the United States.

In that case the American reporter must take to the British censor the British newspaper story as printed. Then the ban is removed at once and the story can be sent—perhaps as much as 12 to 24 hours after the British press has printed it.

Dewey's Labor Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of changes in labor legislation which have long been advocated by me, some labor politicians and some labor racketeers have frequently charged me with being antilabor. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Many times, actions of the National Labor Relations Board have been condemned by me and amendments to the Wagner Act have been offered to remedy the things criticized. But never was my criticism of the Labor Board more pointed than that made on various occasions by William Green, president of the A. F. of L.; Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O.; and John Lewis, leader of the United Mine Workers.

My contention, embodied in a proposed amendment, that employers should be given the right to petition for an election, was finally adopted by the N. L. R. B. Long after I advocated it, the A. F. of L. insisted that the board limit its election precincts to localities or industries. More recently, both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. conceded by their actions that my contention that servicemen should not lose their seniority by enlistment is sound, although some labor politicians and a few labor papers bitterly condemned me for proposed legislation to that effect. The over-all labor program advocated by me would have done much to eliminate labor strife.

At the recent conference of Candidate Dewey and the 25 Governors in St. Louis, a labor program was adopted, which now advocates much of the legislation offered by me—some of it 2 years ago—and legislation now proposed by Dewey and the 25 Governors would aid collective bargaining, preserve the rights of employees, tend to promote industrial peace.

While my proposed amendments were bitterly opposed, they will ultimately be adopted, for, as stated in the report of the 25 Governors and Candidate Dewey, the administration "of existing labor statutes has been inefficient and arbitrary and has tended to promote, rather than to allay, industrial strife."

The foregoing is written, not in the spirit of "I told you so," but simply to show that, in spite of the present condemnation of strikes which hinder war production, there is no disposition to in any way curtail employees' rights or benefits because a few misguided so-called leaders act unreasonably or in disregard of their duty to support the war effort.

We can, and beyond question the new Congress will, adopt new legislation and that legislation will preserve labor's gains, while, at the same time, protecting the unorganized workers and employers.

Is Federal Supervision Over Federal Expenditures Interfering With States' Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from the press reports of the conference of Republican governors held in St. Louis recently that States' rights will be advanced by Candidates Dewey and Bricker in the coming campaign. Few subjects have been more thoroughly debated.

That the Federal Government has assumed certain controls in connection with the allocation of Federal funds for various State programs no one can deny. If by any chance, Mr. Dewey is elected President, is he willing to say now that he will urge Congress to amend existing law to permit Federal contributions to continue and at the same time eliminate Federal supervision and control of the expenditure of Federal grants by the States. As a governor he might favor this as it would enable the States, including his own, to accept Federal grants and spend the money in any way they please but as a President, who is directly responsible to the people of all the States, his obligation would be to see that Federal grants to the States are applied to the purposes for which they have been provided. New York, Mr. Dewey's State, has gratefully accepted well over a billion dollars from the Federal Government. Is Mr. Dewey willing to say now that he will urge Congress to discontinue making future contributions to the States?

I have just received from the Bureau of the Budget a statement of expenditures for grants to States. The 1945 contributions to date, while below that of 1944 are still around a billion dollars. This figure, however, is infinitesimal in comparison with the amount that will be authorized by the Congress to stimulate employment after the war.

The Conference of Governors objects to Federal supervision and interference, but at the same time criticizes, not Congress as a whole, because that would include Republicans, but the Democratic administration for not having adopted a plan for the post-war era. "National disaster will result if employment is not provided for returning veterans and defense-plant workers," say the Republican governors headed by Governor Dewey and his running mate, Governor Bricker.

The governors advocated public-works projects, aid to the States by the Federal Government for road construction, and so forth. Governor Dewey said the joint statement will end the quarreling and bickering in Washington with the election of a Republican administration; that it will end conflicts between Federal and local authorities, which have been

shockingly wastful and injurious to effective government.

Would it not be well for Governor Dewey to be more specific and cite just what caused the conflicts?

Another suggestion was for Congress to adopt a post-war program. Of course, Congress should have a post-war program set up ready to put into operation immediately to prevent widespread unemployment and another depression when the war terminates. I predict these Republican governors will demand the Federal Government provide the major share of the cost of the program. When they make that demand let them remember the critical statements they made in St. Louis relative to Federal interference with the rights of the States. Surely they must admit the Federal Government has some rights. Will the governors demand their representatives in Congress carry out their suggestions that the money is to be handed to the States, to be disposed of as the States desire without any check by the Government to see that it is used for the purpose for which it was allocated? Of course, the Congress will insist upon some check which in the language of the governors is Federal interference with States' rights.

An editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 1, 1944, refers to this question. It follows:

MR. DEWEY'S POW-WOW

The conference between Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and the 25 other Republican governors, which opens in St. Louis today, is primarily, of course, a move to strengthen the organization of the party's 1944 Presidential campaign.

The meeting will dramatize the fact that Republican governors now hold office in 26 of the 48 States. It will give the G. O. P. candidate an opportunity to meet his fellow executives, to map a campaign with their aid, and to inspire them to active support of his cause.

The 15-point program outlined for the conference boils down to the question of the relations between the States and the Federal Government. Even though the conference approaches the problem from a purely political point of view, there are possibilities for general enlightenment from its discussions and its decisions.

There will be difficulties, however, in reaching a decision on how to present the States' rights issue in the campaign, for this question has baffled Americans for generations back. The problem has become particularly acute in the last few decades, when the increasing centralization of government and the increase in Federal spending among the other units of government have given a new aspect to the issue.

Sincere opponents of Federal interference in State affairs have found themselves facing a dilemma. The growing complexity of government has compelled Washington to take a greater hand than ever before in matters which were formerly the exclusive province of the States. The needs of the depression era placed a greater relief burden upon the States than they could bear without assistance, and the Government was obliged to help with the job, for the sake of rescuing human beings from hunger and distress.

Federal funds have been sent into the States, often on a share-and-share basis, for many other purposes: to build highways, to control floods, to save farms from foreclosure, to aid in education, to teach farming methods, to assist with old-age pensions, to provide school lunches for needy children.

This spending of millions in the States has necessarily exercised a control over their policies and laws. As is often said, he who pays the fiddler calls the tune. Yet, it has in many cases provided benefits, in addition to the cash, by causing the States to install merit systems in order to meet Federal requirements.

William Allen White, one of the keenest of the Republican Party's advisers for many years, sailed into this problem with his characteristic bluntness in an Emporia Gazette editorial only a few months before his death. Mr. White wrote of a governors' conference at Columbus, Ohio, which had taken a stand against Federal interference:

"Of course Federal interference in State affairs is bad, and of course it is one of the vitiating things of the Americans politics of this fourth decade of the twentieth century, and of course sooner or later it will and must be checked.

"But it will not be stopped by a bunch of governors who, when they are at home, keep their milk pans out day and night to catch whatever benevolent dew falls from the heaven of the New Deal in the way of State subsidies.

"For 6 long years, the Gazette has preached against letting the Federal Government write the laws for Kansas. And so long as the Federal Government hands out the Federal aid, it will be fashionable to denounce the New Deal and take all that is coming from it."

The Republican platform and Mr. Dewey's statements recognize this inescapable dilemma. The platform acknowledges the need for Federal public works, and the candidate's call for the conference put the subject on the agenda. The platform calls for "intelligent cooperation" between the Government and the States and local groups—a plank that does give the governors a chance to take a stand on the Federal spending issue without going so far as to repudiate Government funds, for certainly the process of cooperation could be improved.

Mr. Dewey's conference in St. Louis isn't going to affect the fundamentals of the States' right issue. Republican, as well as Democratic governors will continue to catch the dew with their milk pans.

I also include an article by Mr. Marquis Childs on this subject. It follows:

GOVERNORS AND STATE'S RIGHTS

ST. LOUIS.—With the broad objective of the Republican governors' conference that has just been concluded here no one could disagree.

The picture of power-hungry bureaucrats working zealously to centralize authority in Washington is largely a figment of the imagination. The bureaucrat is an effect, not a cause. The fact is that the average bureaucrat struggles, and too often in vain, to keep up with the deep underlying causes that have resulted in the transference of power away from the States and localities to the Federal Government.

Any realistic effort to check the long trend toward centralization is all to the good. But it must touch basic reality to mean anything.

Take, as an example, the governors' plank on public works. It's a reasonable recommendation for planning in advance by Federal, State, and local units. Included, however, is the following:

"When and if in case of national necessity there are public works which may properly be the province of both Federal and State or local governments, then grants-in-aid should be made by the Federal Government to States or, through them, to their local governments, without conditions which invade the authority of the State or local government."

If that means what it seems to mean, then it says that the Federal Government shall dish out the money but shall have nothing to say as to how it shall be spent. The State could flagrantly misuse the money, and yet, presumably, the Federal Government could do nothing about it.

Here in Missouri, a year or so ago, an incident occurred that illustrates this conflict.

Under a Federal grant-in-aid, the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor advanced money to the State for family assistance, the Federal law specifying, that the State officers who dispensed the money should meet certain civil-service standards.

The Children's Bureau learned that the jobs were being handed out to deserving politicos with little or no special training. After an investigation and hearings, and in spite of political pressure, the Federal money was stopped until the conditions were met.

What if no conditions had been laid down in the law? The way would have been opened to a patronage grab, and other State administrations might have found it advantageous to follow the example of Missouri.

Here, of course, you get down to an interesting contradiction. One of the chief reasons for lining up the governors behind the Dewey campaign, as one of the principal Dewey people told me privately, was because of the great patronage that most of them wield through their appointive power.

State job-holders who want to hold their jobs are going to be told to get out and work for the national ticket. This is politics on the practical side. But it hardly accords with the lofty language of the governors' 14 points.

There is however, a deeper contradiction in the fact that an important bloc of governors was not present at this meeting at all. The Democratic governors of the Southern States would have had some interesting things to say to the St. Louis conference.

South of Mason and Dixon's line, a revolt against discriminatory freight rates is brewing. Many southerners who are grounded in "States' rights" have come to feel that these rates are a kind of interstate tariff to protect the industrial East from the competition of the South and the Middle West.

The Eastern States want to keep the present lopsided rate structure, Governor Dewey went before the Interstate Commerce Commission 2 years ago to say that the differential was necessary for New York.

Even among the 26 Republican governors regional differences found expression. Montana wanted one kind of treatment from the Federal Government on highway aid, and New Jersey wanted another kind.

Mr. Speaker, Federal interference with States rights was born when Congress passed laws granting Federal aid to the States. The more aid the more interference. Eliminate the aid—destroy the interference.

The following list of expenditures for grants to the States was furnished me by the Bureau of the Budget:

EXPLANATION TO ACCOMPANY "STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES FOR GRANTS TO STATES: 1941–45"

A "grant" as the term is used in the accompanying statement is in essence a Federal expenditure made to, or on behalf of, State or local governments, as contrasted to such an expenditure made to an individual or group of individuals within the States or local communities. The statement, therefore, indicates the entire flow of Federal funds in the form of grants or donations to State or local governments. It includes payments to defray a portion of the cost of specified services ordinarily performed by those governments for their constituents, and, under emergency conditions such as for

unemployment relief or natural defense and war, it includes the entire cost of specified services performed by them or under their supervision. Included also are expenditures of Federal agencies to supply State or local governments with facilities for conducting the usual public services or to supply those services.

The statement includes these types of Federal payments:

a. Grants to States or local authorities for an activity which is conducted by both a governmental and a nongovernmental agency, but for which it is impracticable to distribute the expenditure to show separately the cost for the governmental portion. Examples: Training for nurses, a portion of which is paid to private individuals; emergency maternity and infant care, a portion of which is paid to private institutions or individuals; school lunch and milk program, a portion of which is paid to private schools or child-care centers.

b. Grants to local units of government. Examples: Annual contributions to local housing authorities; payments to counties under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act.

c. Federal agency expenditures made on behalf of State or local governments. Examples: W. P. A. State and local projects; F. W. A. community facilities and war public works.

d. Federal revenues shared with States or their subdivisions. Examples: Payments to States under Mineral Leasing Act; payments to counties under the submarginal land program.

e. Federal payments in lieu of taxes. Examples: Operation, maintenance, etc., national defense housing, N. H. A., F. P. H. A.; T. V. A., payments to States and counties.

Statement of expenditures for grants to States, fiscal years 1945 and 1944 (estimated), and 1943, 1942, and 1941 (actual)

Agency and type of grant	Estimated		Actual		
	1945	1944	1943	1942	1941
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Water Power Act	$30,000	$50,000	$43	$28,695	$20,219
War Shipping Administration: State Marine Schools	[1] 250,000	[1] 250,000	[1] 260,417	121,864	104,743
Veterans' Administration: Federal aid to States and Territories, soldiers' homes [1]	1,305,600	1,254,000	1,175,520	1,375,000	1,431,840
Federal Security Agency:					
American Printing House for the Blind	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
Office of Education:					
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000
Colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts—permanent appropriation	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000
Vocational education:					
Further development of vocational education in States and Territories	14,000,000	14,000,000	13,694,220	13,416,649	12,987,978
Promotion of vocational education in Hawaii	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Promotion of vocational education in Puerto Rico	105,000	105,000	91,443	96,044	96,727
Education and training, defense workers (national defense)	72,000,000	100,000,000	131,240,629	111,282,165	60,301,326
Promotion of vocational education, permanent appropriation	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,095,109	6,832,858	6,952,965
Loans to students (national defense) [1]		1,958,000	2,994,236		
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Vocational rehabilitation of disabled civilians [1]		6,705,000	2,782,065	2,679,206	2,216,373
Public Health Service:					
Division of Venereal Diseases, expenses, grants [1]	10,000,000	9,708,020	9,325,058	7,644,699	
Public health work, Social Security Act	11,000,000	11,400,000	10,572,672	11,472,995	10,772,531
Training for nurses (national defense) [1]	71,197,000	51,745,000	4,473,269	573,954	
Social Security Board:					
Old-age assistance	339,000,000	325,000,000	319,175,802	299,054,496	259,780,984
Aid to dependent children	54,900,000	62,000,000	67,927,263	69,406,313	62,990,837
Aid to blind	9,500,000	8,800,000	8,522,688	7,954,052	7,073,151
Unemployment compensation administration	31,000,000	34,000,000	54,415,683	70,256,050	63,011,153
U. S. Employment Service, payments to States				1,600,222	3,187,597
Federal Works Agency:					
Public Roads Administration:					
Federal-aid highway system	[1] 49,830,000	[1] 48,237,274	[1] 61,620,194	107,109,869	118,615,219
Secondary or feeder roads	[1] 4,406,000	[1] 5,628,964	[1] 6,603,792	16,048,720	17,359,206
Elimination of grade crossings	[1] 7,010,000	[1] 8,389,175	[1] 13,630,249	26,040,776	29,924,578
Public lands highways	[1] 69,500	[1] 252,954	[1] 70,341	811,590	1,421,955
Strategic highway network (national defense) [1]	[1] 14,540,000	19,831,819	12,065,541		
Surveys and plans (national defense) [1]		7,065,386	2,672,114		
Work Projects Administration: State and local projects [2]			159,844,415	811,134,227	1,161,539,897
Community facilities, defense public works (national defense) [2]	115,000,000	98,326,466	93,387,336	130,515,769	
Public Works Administration—Emergency relief and public works acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938, net [1]		265,076	14,413,565		221,105
National Housing Agency:					
Federal Public Housing Administration:					
Annual contributions to local housing authorities	10,900,000	11,200,000	9,882,882	9,925,891	4,747,170
Operation, maintenance, etc., National Defense Housing, payments in lieu of taxes [1]	19,403,100	14,251,800	3,091,441	1,599,332	
Department of Agriculture:					
Office of Experiment Stations: Agricultural experiment stations	6,937,500	6,972,500	6,921,703	6,924,832	6,861,423
Extension Service:					
Agricultural extension work, in States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	13,943,950	14,198,950	14,078,984	14,141,804	13,775,918
Cooperative agricultural extension work	4,704,710	4,704,710	4,704,710	4,704,710	4,701,165
Forest Service:					
Payments to States and Territories from National forests fund	2,475,000	2,475,000	1,668,717	1,539,291	1,440,325
Payments to Arizona and New Mexico school funds, from National forests fund	26,000	26,000	22,832	22,787	23,392
Forest fire cooperation [1]	5,900,000	6,008,943	3,666,352	2,353,725	2,235,757
Forest fire control (emergency)			1,201,601	520,457	
Soil Conservation Service: Payments to counties from submarginal land program, Farm Tenant Act, permanent appropriation	112,000	75,000	59,474	44,604	32,193
Food Distribution Administration: Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities: [2]					
Purchase of agricultural commodities for distribution through State welfare agencies	10,000,000	12,000,000	6,643,884	51,747,088	100,091,903
Maintenance and operation of school milk and lunch program	50,000,000	50,000,000	15,340,134		
Department of the Interior:					
Payments to States from receipts under Grazing Act, permanent appropriation	550,000	392,000	547,912	561,598	385,082
General Land Office:					
Payments to States of 5 percent of proceeds from sales of public lands	3,000	3,000	4,660	481	9,364
Payment to Oklahoma from royalties, oil and gas, south half, Red River	3,000	6,500		10,498	
Payment to counties, Oregon and California land-grant fund, permanent appropriation	700,000	950,400	718,510	667,052	558,606
Payments to Coos and Douglas Counties Oreg., in lieu of taxes, on Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, permanent appropriation	26,000	26,000		27,781	36,380
Payments to States from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, permanent appropriation	2,775,000	2,689,500	2,563,029	2,165,347	1,948,444
Payments to States from potash deposits, royalties and rentals, permanent appropriation	165,000	338,500		80,254	142,152
Fish and Wildlife Service:					
Federal aid, wildlife restoration [1]	911,800	1,679,387	1,264,205	1,713,339	1,189,470
Payments to counties under Migratory Bird Conservation Act, permanent appropriation	45,000	45,000	25,095	24,554	16,751
Department of Labor, Children's Bureau:					
Grants to States under Social Security Act:					
Maternal and child-health services	6,220,000	6,500,000	5,707,930	5,926,966	5,471,285
Services for crippled children	4,170,000	4,100,000	3,848,163	3,996,637	3,928,281
Child welfare services	1,588,000	1,970,000	1,582,774	1,573,391	1,531,770
Emergency maternity and infant care (national defense)	20,000,000	23,000,000	942,253		
War Department, Corps of Engineers: Payments to States, Flood Control Act of 1938 [1]	37,000	81,062	15,200		
Tennessee Valley Authority: Payments to States and counties, in lieu of taxes [1]	3,415,000	3,665,000	3,473,591	1,859,438	1,499,394
Total grants to States	982,328,860	994,496,386	1,091,204,701	1,812,773,676	1,975,872,852

[1] Figures represent obligations on the basis of object classification rather than expenditures. (See explanatory statement.)
[2] Figures represent obligations on the basis of project or function classification rather than expenditures. (See explanatory statement.)

Mr. Speaker, it might be well for the governors, including Governor Dewey and Governor Bricker, to inform the Congress, either individually or collectively, just which of these grants they are in favor of repealing and at the some time advise their Representatives and Senators whether or not, if the laws are repealed, the States will assume full financial responsibility and continue the programs now in effect.

Unfair Rough Rice Ceiling Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter which I have addressed to Hon. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and to Hon. Marvin Jones, Administrator of the Office of War Food Administration, following up the protest of the Representatives and Senators from the rice-producing States, in respect to the unfairness and unreasonableness of the order MP-518, of date March 7, 1944, placing a ceiling price on rough rice, and all of which we further protested as being unnecessary and that the prices established are below the cost of production at this time. Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that it was never the intention of the Congress to give the power to these governmental agencies to fix the price on any product below the cost of production, and I sincerely trust that the officials charged with this responsibility will give prompt and favorable consideration to this matter, which affects my State and other States in the production of this most important food crop. Immediate action is required as the crop is now being harvested.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 7, 1944.

Hon. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator, Washington, D. C.

Re: MP-518, dated March 7, 1944, Ceiling price on rough rice.

GENTLEMEN: Under date of March 28, 1944, I addressed a letter to you which was signed jointly by the Senators and Representatives from the rice-producing States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Texas, and California, advising you that we had consistently opposed the placing of a ceiling price on rough rice, and demanding that the order be abrogated or rescinded, and outlining the reasons for such request.

I offered an amendment to the Price Control Act in the House of Representatives when this legislation was being considered for extension, to the effect that rough rice be excluded from the provisions of the act, but as you know the amendment was not adopted.

My colleagues and I have not changed our opinions, and still maintain that it is unfair, unreasonable, and unnecessary to place a ceiling price on rough rice, and that the maximum prices established for rough rice are below the levels of the year 1942, and violate the 1942 Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, and that these prices are below the cost of production as proven by the testimony of representatives of the Department of Agriculture of the States of Louisiana and Arkansas, and others. You will recall that this testimony outlined that under the ceiling prices imposed on rough rice production would be largely curtailed, and in addition, our farmers and the rice industry generally would suffer financially.

For your information, I am enclosing a newspaper article from the Lake Charles American Press, recopied by the Crowley Signal, wherein you will note that as a result of a survey made by the Lake Charles Journal, all that we have contended has come to pass, and our farmers will lose money at present prices.

The purpose of this letter is to request that your department make a review and further study of the ceiling prices on rough rice, and that an amendment be issued increasing the ceiling prices on this product in keeping with the cost of production.

Please let me hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.

Memorial for H. Koenemann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleagues for giving me unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following tribute by Clifford Powell, Red Oak, Iowa, to an American soldier who has given his all.

I place this wonderful tribute in the RECORD praying that all who read it who have lost a loved one in the service of his country might feel at least a slight loosening of their heartstrings in the great loss they have sustained.

[From the Red Oak (Iowa) Sun of June 22, 1944]

MEMORIAL FOR H. KOENEMANN—RED OAK SOLDIER, PVT. (1ST CL.) HOWARD KOENEMANN, HONORED—TRIBUTES GIVEN BY FRIENDS AND PASTOR

POWELL'S TRIBUTE

A memorial service was held on Sunday at the Congregational Church for Private (1st cl.) Howard Koenemann, Red Oak young man and member of Company M, who was killed in action in Italy on December 3, 1943. Rev. H. C. Bradshaw gave the memorial address and tributes were given by Robert Johnson of the American Legion and Clifford Powell speaking for the members of the Congregational Church of which Howard was a member.

Music was by a choir composed of members of the Congregational and Baptist Churches, Howard having previously attended the Baptist Sunday school.

Following is the text of Mr. Powell's address. It bespeaks the feeling of members of this community not only for Private (1st cl.) Koenemann but for all the young men who go out into battle in the present conflict that the American way of life may be preserved.

THE TRIBUTE

About a quarter of a century ago, and during the darkest days of another great war, an inspired American boy wrote:

"I have a rendezvous with death
At some disputed barricade
When spring comes 'round with rustling shade
And apple blossoms fill the air.

"At midnight in some flaming town
When spring trips north again this year,
And to my pledged word and true
I shall not fail that rendezvous."

Today we meet to pay tribute to one of our own boys, who, like Alan Seeger, did not fail that rendezvous. Howard Koenemann closed his young life with an act of gallantry that shines as a meteor across a darkened sky, and in doing so, brought honor and glory to himself, his parents, his community, and to his Nation.

All of us join extending to his parents, honored and beloved citizens of this community, our deepest sympathy. We are powerless to lessen their grief and sense of loss. But we can, I think, comfort them with the thought that Howard has made a great contribution to the cause of right and world progress. They have that greater and inner satisfaction of knowing that they have helped in the great struggle of man from darkness to light. And so we clasp their hands and say:

"Keep up the song of faith
And let your heart be strong
For God delights when faith can praise
Though dark the night and long."

It is a great personal honor to be asked to pay a tribute to our young friend. It was my privilege to know him intimately for many years and to observe his development into manhood. During his boyhood he regularly attended this church, but because of attendance at another Sunday school, he would arrive here a few minutes late. He would shyly grin as we ushered him to the family pew, well to the front of the church. His interest was in the athletics of our local schools, and in those activities which all youth love. He enjoyed the companionship of boys particularly, and it was only natural that he enlisted with the local National Guard company. He enjoyed the rigors of military training, and in his quiet way would wisecrack over the difficulties encountered. He never complained. He never faltered. He faced life with a quiet smile.

When M Company left in 1941 for training in the South he rode away with a wave of his hand, and entered into the drudgery and toil of preparing for war. He was typical of those thousands of lads, who left all their plans and hopes, their friends and relatives, and adventured forth—not for their own sakes alone—but going in your place and in mine—bearing the hardship and dangers that threaten each and every one of us. We gather here under a debt of eternal gratitude to these typical American boys—these modern knights—who are acting as our shield, and as our sword. Would that every person in this community, and in this Nation, fully realized our indebtedness to them. Howard Koenemann gave everything he had so that we could live peacefully and happily here in this quiet town.

A year's training in the South was followed by a year in Ireland and Scotland. The training was severe and strenuous; and then our community was electrified by the news of the landing in Africa. Montgomery County paid a fearful price in gaining that objective—but it was won by boys like Howard. And this was quickly followed by the grim and costly battles in Italy. Stubbornly, mile by mile, yard by yard, the determined and sobered Allies moved forward, and in this great struggle, Howard played his gallant part:

"And how can man die better
Than facing fearful odds
For the ashes of his fathers
And the temples of his Gods."

And so we gather this afternoon to show in a measure our deep sympathy to his parents. And we also meet and pay tribute to a gallant son, and to a man who did not fear to cast his lot for decent living and for a better world. And we also meet to renew in ourselves a sense of individual obligation to carry on to its glorious conclusion, the task on which the hundreds of young men and women from this community are now engaged.

To his parents we can say, in the words of Willis Sutton:

"No contribution you shall ever make to the history of the world will in any way be comparable to having given it a great boy."

His memory will be measured not in length of years but in his accomplishments.

"The shortest life is the longest, if 'tis best.
It is ours to work, but to God belongs the rest.
Our lives are measured by the deeds we do
The thoughts we think, the objects we pursue."

Howard was a modest lad. Public adulation was to him a thing to be avoided. He wanted only to be with his friends, to comment quietly on the passing show and to do his duty. He possessed a quiet sense of humor, and his letters from Ireland, with their semiserious comments on the natives, were a pleasure to receive and read. He liked the Irish but he feared to call twice on the same girls, as they all seemed imbued with matrimonial intent. He also liked the Italians. As all soldiers call them, he found the "Dagoes" good scouts. They would carry his pack for him and he greatly appreciated this courtesy. Never a word in his letters that the going was tough or that he feared the approaching battles. Just a typical American boy—just the kid next door.

Many of us do not appreciate the real American boy. He does not wear his heart on his sleeve. He does not want to show sentiment. He scoffs at sob stories. But from several years intimate living with them, I have discovered that there is no grander thing under heaven than the average American boy. He is true. He is a sentimentalist. He can take anything the world can give and come up with a grin. He will share his last ration with a hungry child, and he will risk everything to save a life—either of his comrades or of a dumb animal.

Hundreds of thousands of these boys are scattered over the face of the earth today—facing every danger and discomfort known to man—and shielding you and me. Very few can express why they are fighting. They are not given to oratory. But deep in their hearts they know that they are there to preserve the good things which for 5,000 years civilized man has laboriously built up.

A few weeks ago in the New York Times, Berton Braley expressed their thoughts in these words:

"What is it we are fighting for?
For all we hold as just
For tolerance and dignity
And simple, human trust.
For faith and hope, and honors,
We are fighting one and all.
For old and homely axioms
We learned when we were small.
The mottoes of the copy books
The simple sentiments
Of honesty and charity
And simple common sense.
We fight with our united might,
With body, soul, and brain
To save the 'moldy platitudes'
The copybooks contain.
We're fighting for the copybooks
Those adages and saws
Which fools deride,
But which abide as fundamental laws
Which are the key to decency,
Those rusty rules that give
To age and youth the guiding truth
By which all free men live."

Deep in the hearts of these boys they are determined that this Nation shall not perish, that it shall eventually, and by God's will, be "a government of the people, by the people, for the people."

And yet my friends, in this very community are some who cannot realize or value the sacrifices boys like Howard are making. We have in our midst those who complain of the little inconveniences to which they are being subjected; who resent the necessities of rationing; who blindly use the war to play partisan politics, and those who ignorantly urge the elimination of various races and minority groups. In the name of Howard Koenemann, I indict all such as un-American, lacking in patriotism and Christianity.

These American boys are seeing life through an enlarged vision. They are already demanding that those of us here clean the political stables of soft living. They may come home worse Congregationalists, worse Methodists, and worse Lutherans, but friends, they will come home better Christians. They will be better Americans, more understanding of world conditions, and with an outlook that reaches around the entire globe. They are entitled to an accounting from those who have not been real patriots. We here must pledge each to himself.

"Here—on this soil
Began the kingdom, not of kings, but men
Began the making of the world again.
Where equal rights and equal bonds were set
Where all the people equal franchised met
Where doom was writ of privilege and crown
Where human breath blew all the idols down
Where crests were naught, where culture flags were furled,
And common men began to rule the world."

Let us remember then, that in that awful hour, when his machine gun squad was held up, and Howard went forward alone to free his mates—that in that glorious act be unconsciously displayed all that America fights for. He expected no glory, but he won immortal fame. He sought no praise, but a grateful government cities and decorates him. He probably realized the danger, but

"When duty calmly said, 'thou must,'
The youth replied, 'I can'."

He did not go forward to insure the continuance of special privilege, of a grumbling citizenry, or cowardly discontents. He proved that greater love hath no man than that he lay down his life for his friends; that freedom, justice, and democracy are greater than life; and that when supreme occasions arise the common man can meet them with pure courage and simplicity.

Howard probably would not desire these words of tribute. Had he expressed a wish, it probably would have been:

"And may there be no sadness of farewell
When I embark."

But we owe it to ourselves and to our community to recall a glorious life well spent. We owe it as a duty to his parents. And we must seize such moments as inspiration to greater deeds. This memory must be and will be kept fresh in our hearts. To all of us, Howard Koenemann calls:

"Ye that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife
And know that out of death and night shall rise
The dawn of ampler life,

"Rejoice, whatever anguish rends the heart,
That God has given you the priceless dower
To live in these great times and have your part
In freedom's crowning hour,

"That you may tell your sons, who see the light
High in the heavens—their heritage to take—
I saw the powers of darkness take their flight;
I saw the morning break."

Statement of R. S. Reynolds Before Truman Investigating Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. R. S. Reynolds, president of the Reynolds Metals Co. before the Truman Investigating Committee on June 19, 1944. Mr. Reynolds appeared before the committee at its request. I also ask consent to have printed immediately following the statement an article by Mr. I. F. Stone on Mr. Reynolds' statement entitled "This Is Really Enterprise."

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF R. S. REYNOLDS, PRESIDENT OF REYNOLDS METALS CO., BEFORE TRUMAN INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE AT ITS REQUEST, JUNE 19, 1944

Gentlemen, I am pleased to be called before this committee. It is high time that we get together and find post-war jobs for those heroes who will come back from the battlefields and for the thirty-odd million men who will be thrown out of battle plants. If we start now closing plants, we are laying up trouble for tomorrow.

I feel that we can find a use for all the aluminum production today; for example, in ships, landing boats, tanks, armor plate, and many items of essential consumers' goods. Indeed, shipments of aluminum products to consumers in March of this year were 232,000,000 pounds—almost as much in one month as the total aluminum production before the war. If we will sanely distribute the Government plants, I am positive we will find ample business to keep all aluminum plants busy when peace comes.

I have listed some suggestions which I would like to read and leave with you for your further consideration.

1. If aluminum should return to the hands of one producer, I prophesy that the sole producer would not be able to keep even its privately owned plants in full production. I cannot conceive of the steel industry, the automobile industry, the railroad industry, the housing industry, or the great consumer-goods industry adopting and becoming dependent upon a metal controlled by one company. If two independent companies could be placed in a strong competitive position, it would be only a question of time until new aluminum plants would have to be built to take care of the increased demand for this magic metal.

2. In my opinion, aluminum will not reduce the production of steel and other metals. On the contrary, I am certain it will increase such production. If steel refuses to make use of aluminum, I prophesy that the steel industry will find it difficult to maintain its present production in the world of

tomorrow. If, on the other hand, it takes advantage of the insulating quality of aluminum which reflects 96½ percent of all radiant heat, of its resistance to corrosion, and of the reduction in weight which aluminum affords, I prophesy that the steel industry, as great as it now is, would yet have to double and redouble its production.

3. Aluminum will soon make use of soft woods of the forest which are now suitable only for fuel. It will give to the soft woods freedom from moisture, fire, and termites, and will give them the quality of insulation which will bring to the homes of the world freedom from excess heat in the summer and excess cold in the winter.

4. Aluminum will not replace steel in the railroad industry but as a cladding for steel will bring to the industry reduction in weight and consequent saving in fuel and power plus the supreme insulating value of aluminum together with its noncorrosive qualities.

5. Aluminum will provide farmers a superior protection in preserving fresh fruits, vegetables, and frozen foods, enabling the farmers to market their products throughout the year instead of forfeiting their profits in glutted markets at harvest time.

6. Aluminum in combination with magnesium will be used in huge quantities in all transportation by air, by land and by sea.

7. In the distribution of wholly owned Government plants due consideration should be given to the fact that Aluminum Co. of America and Reynolds Metals Co., on their own resources and at their own risk, multiplied by three the pre-war production of aluminum. Both expansions were ready when Pearl Harbor came. The Government-owned plants did not come into production until a year and a half thereafter. In addition to this contribution Aluminum Co. of America and Reynolds Metals Co. reduced the price of aluminum to the Government 25 percent at the time when all other metals were advancing in price.

8. The value of these Government plants is dependent upon their ability to compete with privately owned plants, particularly the large plants constructed in Canada and owned and operated by Aluminum Co. of Canada with large advances by our Government, firm orders and other protective provisions, all of which are familiar to your committee. Therefore, in fixing the prices and terms for these plants on the basis of a competitive position for world markets, it will be necessary for you to give due consideration to the net cost to Aluminum Co. of Canada of its plants and power developments, so built in this emergency, upon completion of its contracts with our Government. If the prices as thus determined should be considered too low then the Government might retain title to these plants, leasing them on the basis of an appropriate division of profits with the proviso that if after 3 years the plants are not in operation, the Government shall have the right to make other disposition of them.

[From New York PM of July 27, 1944]

A THING OR TWO—THIS IS REALLY ENTERPRISE

WASHINGTON.—While everybody is making after dinner speeches about free enterprise, there is very little of it around and what there is gets treated as a stepchild.

I give you the case of R. S. Reynolds, of Reynolds Metals, the first man in a generation to compete with Alcoa in the making of aluminum. This shrewd burly little man is one of those rare creatures, a genuine capitalist, a fellow with ideas and the nerve to risk his money on them.

When France fell Reynolds began preaching the need for more aluminum. And while the big fellows got their war plants from Jesse Jones on a silver platter, Reynolds had to mortgage everything he owned to qualify for an R. F. C. loan to make the light metal.

Reynolds came here several weeks ago to testify before the Truman committee, but no one paid any attention to his testimony. Everybody talks full employment in the large, where it will remain pie-in-the-sky. Nobody's interested in getting down to the job of achieving it, industry by industry.

The bogey of the sit-tight boys is that aluminum can only expand at the expense of steel and other materials, so what's the use? Reynolds provided some facts and figures on what aluminum could do, not only on its own, but in combination with other materials.

He showed how aluminum as an alloy could expand the market for steel by giving the heavier metal the benefit of its insulating qualities, its resistance to corrosion, and its weight reduction. He disclosed that used with soft woods, now suitable only for fuel, aluminum could provide a housing material free from moisture, fire, and termites.

He opened the door on new possibilities in agriculture by telling of his experiments in using aluminum foil to keep fruits and vegetables fresh for year-round marketing. Reynolds said he had wrapped oranges in aluminum foil "and 9 months after the oranges have lost practically no moisture and are full-sized."

But Reynolds, who learned about free enterprise the hard way, had one commonsense warning. "If aluminum should return to the hands of one producer," he told the Truman committee, "I prophesy that that sole producer would not be able to keep even its own privately owned plants in full operation. I cannot conceive of the steel industry, the automobile industry, the railroad industry, the housing industry, and the great consumer-goods industry adopting and becoming dependent on a metal controlled by one company."

Reynolds has a really big idea. He proposes that in disposing of war plants the Government sell aluminum facilities not only to Reynolds Metals but to a third company, an aluminum company which would be cooperatively owned by a group of big potential users—automobile and railroad equipment companies, for example.

Such a plant wouldn't be anywhere near enough to take care of their needs, but it would be enough to assure them that they could safely shift over to aluminum without being caught in a price squeeze. These potential users represent a market that would dwarf present aluminum capacity.

I challenge Eric Johnston, of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and Paul Hoffman, of the Committee for Economic Development, to be a little less fervent about free enterprise in the abstract and give this Reynolds down-to-brass-tacks program the boost it deserves.

I. F. STONE.

Our Heroes and Their Loved Ones Deserve the Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this Nation owes a great debt to the brave veterans of this war. After the last war proper provisions were not made for them and their dependents. This Congress of which I am proud to be a member was determined that this should not happen again. I am proud that I, as a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress, worked, supported, and voted for the G. I. bill which is now law.

The Congress of the United States, fully aware of its obligations and responsibilities, has enacted the G. I. bill of rights and I am glad to have had a part in its passage. One can see at a glance that the Government of the United States is liberal with those who are wearing and have worn the uniform of their country; our servicemen are the best paid and the best equipped in the world; our veterans and their dependents receive more adequate care than any others in the world. Because of the different kind of warfare which has developed, the needs will change and many future requirements will have to be met, but our immediate duty is to help them readjust their lives to the new conditions that have been imposed upon them.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

Dependents of all grades of enlisted men and aviation cadets of the Army and Navy are eligible to receive a dependent's allowance from the Government in addition to the serviceman's allotment. Those men and women serving as officers come under another system. The allowances provided by the Government are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife and one child, $72; and $20 for each additional child. Note: If the divorce or separation order of the court does not call for alimony or separate maintenance, the wife will not receive any allotment, and in case of a court order providing alimony or separate maintenance, she will get no more than the amount fixed by the court.

Class B dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is substantially but not completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37.

Class B–1 dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $50 plus $11 for each brother or sister; two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $68, plus $11 for each brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

It is important that men and women with dependents make application through their commanding officers for allotment and allowance, as these benefits will begin the date application is filed. Allotments are compulsory only for class A dependents. If the serviceman or woman for some reason or other fails to make application or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out; the Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children and dates of birth. In case a man is reported missing in action, the allotment

and allowance continue to be paid for a period of a year, unless in the meantime his status is definitely determined.

Parents and brothers and sisters who can prove dependency can receive an allowance at the same time as wife and children. Parents can get an allowance from more than one son or daughter in the service. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son or daughter in the service, they get $68 per month. Now, if another son or daughter in the service helped support these same parents, they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

The agency for the Navy having jurisdiction over allotments and allowances is: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.; the agency for the Army is: Office of Dependency Benefits, War Department, 213 Washington Street, Newark, N. J. If you experience any difficulty contact your Congressman.

TEMPORARY AID FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Sometimes cases of extreme hardship arise involving dependents of servicemen. Many dependents, and even members of the armed forces themselves, are not fully acquainted with the two emergency agencies set up for the express purpose of helping such persons in need. These two agencies have branches all over the country. They are the Army Emergency Relief Fund, whose functions have recently been assigned to the Red Cross, and the Navy Relief Society, which also can be reached through the Red Cross.

ARMY RELIEF FUND

Any member of the armed forces in the Army can appeal to the Army Relief Fund, represented in all camps, or through the Red Cross if the soldier is not at camp, for needed immediate financial assistance. He will receive courteous and willing assistance at all times. The fund is also open to all dependents of men and women in the Army and anyone needing relief should get in touch at once with this fund through the local Red Cross.

NAVY RELIEF SOCIETY

Any serviceman or servicewoman in our naval forces or his dependents can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. To get immediate action, it is advisable to take the case up through the Red Cross.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

This benefit is payable to all honorably discharged personnel of our services whose rank is below captain in the Army and lieutenant, senior grade, in the Navy. Payments are made in the following sums: Personnel with less than 60 days' active service, $100; personnel with 60 days' or more active service, no part of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $200; personnel with 60 day's or more active service, any part of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $300. Whenever mustering-out payments amount to more than $100, payments are made in monthly intervals of $100 each. Servicemen who are discharged at their own request are not entitled to mustering-out pay.

FREE MEDICAL AND NURSING CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF MEN IN ARMED FORCES

In most States through cooperation with the Federal Government, a wife of any man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service if it is provided in that State. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2. In the case of emergency, be sure that the doctor makes application for you within 48 hours after service is rendered. If the application is not made within 48 hours, no bills for medical or hospital service will be paid. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse; no money is given to the wife. This service is extended to wives and infants of servicemen in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, but not to any other foreign country.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY PENSIONS

Our honorably discharged veterans of all wars are entitled to a pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by their service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10-percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month.

The disability claim is filed by the veteran for benefits payable to him as the result of injury or disease resulting from military service. The award of compensation is based on the degree of disability, which is determined according to the Veterans' Administration schedule provisions. Any disability, except misconduct, is compensable if it is as much as 10 percent disabling. This application is known as form 526. It is simple to execute and seldom does one have any trouble answering the questions. Additional evidence is seldom required. This is particularly true on the adjudication of the initial claim. No subsequent formal claim need be filed. If the veteran is dissatisfied with his present rating, he can submit medical evidence to this effect.

However, it should be borne in mind that the doctor's statement must state not only his diagnosis but sufficient findings to warrant it. It is essential that this evidence show, or at least indicate, a higher degree of disability than the present evaluation. Upon receipt of competent medical evidence, the Veterans' Claim Service will authorize an official examination for rating purposes, thereby reopening the case for further consideration.

Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred from one Veterans' Administration facility to another, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged, for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for settlement, veterans should file claim on proper form which will be supplied them by any Veterans' Administration facility or the local representative of the American Red Cross. If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

READJUSTMENT TO CIVIL LIFE

Education: One of the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights offers an education to any man who has served for a period of 90 days, on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice, up to $500 per year for tuition and books, and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if without dependents and $75 if he has dependents. In no event shall the total period of education exceed 4 years. There is also a provision for part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

A veteran also has the right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities, extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Application for education and training should be made to the Director, Servicemen's Education and Training, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

Hospitalization and prosthetic appliances: Adequate hospital facilities are provided for the care and treatment of veterans for nonservice disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

The veteran has the right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

Right of medical review of irregular discharge or release from active service: A veteran has the right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service, (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at the time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination, benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (b) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (c) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15

years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

Loans for the purchase or construction of houses, farms, and business property: Loans provided for the above-mentioned purposes or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000. Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions. The interest rate must not exceed 4 percent. The loan must be practicable and suitable to veterans' circumstances. The loan must be repaid in 20 years. Application must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

Employment of veterans: A veteran of any war, honorably discharged from any one of the services, has the right to register for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service. He should contact his local United States Employment Office in his home town or county.

Unemployment compensation: There is also a provision for unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed. To be eligible, the person must reside in the United States, be completely unemployed, or, if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week, be registered with and report to a public employment office, be able to work, and available for suitable work.

Any person will be disqualified if he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; if he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work offered; if he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; if he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS AS A RESULT OF LOSS OF SON, DAUGHTER, HUSBAND, OR FATHER

There are four money benefits provided for the dependents of a deceased veteran: 6 months' gratuity payment, monthly insurance payments—if the servicemen applied for insurance—monthly pension, and back pay.

Gratuity: The gratuity is a lump-sum payment equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received at the date of death. In addition, the dependents of any private or seaman who dies in foreign service receive 20 percent of his base pay, and the dependents of any officer who dies in foreign service receive 10 percent of his base pay. If the serviceman was in either the flying service or submarine service, his dependents receive, in addition, 50 percent of his base pay. There is also a longevity provision in addition to the above amounts.

The gratuity is automatically paid to a wife of a deceased veteran, or, if there is no wife, it is automatically paid to the surviving child or children. It is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters of an unmarried serviceman. The serviceman should designate someone of this latter class to receive it; however, if he does not, they may apply for it. If two parents survive, the amount is divided between them. A grandparent must show an insurable interest in order to receive it.

Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to Gratuity Pay Branch, Finance Office, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington, D. C., by the surviving relative of a seaman to Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Monthly insurance payments: This insurance is not paid in a lump sum; it is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary—the older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy, if the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is under 30 years of age at the date of death of the insured, payments shall be made in 240 equal monthly installments, at the rate of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance. If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is 30 or more years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in equal monthly installments for 120 months certain, with such payment in installments continuing during the remaining lifetime of such beneficiary. For instance, under a $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

It would be well to have parents and next of kin check with the men and women in service to see that all insurance policies are in order and in the hands of the beneficiaries. An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of half blood. There is nothing to prevent a parent or brother or sister from being the beneficiary of more than one serviceman.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check their insurance policy now. See that everything is in order now. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A ittle care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen.

Monthly pension: This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, he or she is not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased serviceman can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month; two parents, $25 each; widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child; no widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38 equally divided, with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100.

The fact that a widow, a child, or parents get the insurance does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect both insurance and a pension.

Back pay due the serviceman: When a casualty occurs, that service man or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. All this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to Finance Officer, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Headstone for grave: Any person may make application for a headstone for the grave of any veteran of any one of the Army or Navy services whose service was honorable, to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Burial allowance for any war veteran: After honorable service, reimbursement for burial may be allowed, not exceeding $100, on burial, funeral, and transportation expenses. Application should be made to Director, Dependent Claims Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, his minor children or adult unmarried daughters.

WRITE FOR OTHER INFORMATION

It is practically impossible to cover briefly all the details of benefits available to veterans of this and previous wars. I have tried to outline the benefits relating primarily to World War No. 2 veterans. If anyone has special questions or individual problems not covered in this summary, I shall be glad for you to write to me personally.

Address by Hon. Samuel D. Jackson, of Indiana, Before the Connecticut Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 1), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] at the Democratic State convention on Friday last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of this convention and fellow Americans, I feel singularly honored to be invited to address the Democratic convention of the State of Connecticut—the State of the former Govs. Wilbur L. Cross, Robert A. Hurley, and of ex-Senator Augustine Lonergan. I am honored to have

been presented to you by one of your most distinguished sons, a noted national chairman of our party and Attorney General of the United States, Homer Cummings. It is gratifying to have an opportunity to speak to the friends and neighbors of one of the most distinguished Members of the United States Senate, a loyal friend of the President and the people, my colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY.

The 1944 Democratic National Convention is now history. In many respects it is one of the most significant meetings of this generation. It submitted the future of this Nation, and perhaps the future of civilization itself to the jury of the American electorate. It closed the issues for this unprecedented wartime campaign and election.

It wrote a platform which was short, understandable, and unambiguous. It presented the candidacy of the man who will guide our destinies for another 4 years, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Among other things, this convention proved that Democrats can air their difficulties, debate their sectional differences, discuss their delicate problems, and select their candidates for office out in the open—in the presence of 20,000 spectators, with 10,000,000 loudspeakers tuned in, and with all the world listening. There was nothing that needed to be hidden, nothing to be ashamed of, no group to be trammeled, and no one to be throttled.

By the instrumentality of that convention, millions of American voters of divers views, differing opinions, conflicting desires, and antagonistic purposes, openly solved their problems, arrived at a single message, and nominated a ticket satisfactory to all.

During the proceedings, each burst of applause and each noisy demonstration seemed to voice its own throaty utterance, like a mighty wave beating upon the rocks, but the sum total result was a steady thunder of Democratic enthusiasm like the noise of the surf—the sound that forecasts an acclaiming verdict of approval when election day rolls around in November.

The feature of that convention was, of course, the substitution of HARRY S. TRUMAN for HENRY A. WALLACE as a candidate for Vice President. There is no use blinking the fact that articulate groups called for one, or the other of these two outstanding American statesmen. This is a most natural and a truly American habit and course of action. But nobody was licked in the Democratic Convention at Chicago. To be licked implies a just punishment for unworthy conduct.

If those of labor were for MR. WALLACE, they were within their rights in every reasonable and honorable effort to advance his cause. There is room in the Democratic Party for labor in all its patriotically organized forms.

The workers still prefer, and shall continue to prefer, that party which, for the first time in history, guarded them against the exactions of conscienceless exploitation. They will be found in this campaign in the Democratic Party. The doors of the Republican house have been shut against them, and there is not a flickering candlelight of welcome for them there.

HENRY A. WALLACE is a great liberal and a great Democrat. He has taken a noble stand in what, to a man of lesser stature, would be a personal disappointment. He is not lost to the cause of liberalism. He, more than few men can, understands that his cause transcends men, elections, and political parties. HENRY A. WALLACE, honest and altruistic, is for Franklin D. Roosevelt and HARRY S. TRUMAN.

On the other hand, Senator TRUMAN is a just, kind, humble, industrious, and patriotic American. He is an able statesman. By his activities through the special committee of the Senate to investigate the national defense program, he has saved his country hundreds of millions of dollars. He has insured the greater safety of the armed forces of this Republic. He has greatly enhanced the quality and extent of the preparation of our armies and navies for the bloody combats awaiting them in every quarter of the globe.

For the dollars saved, the American taxpayer is everlastingly grateful. For the greater safety with which he has clothed and surrounded the last American boy, he deserves the unfailing prayers of the fathers and mothers of our men and women in uniform. For bringing a victorious end to this war just one day nearer, he deserves the blessings of Heaven.

The advances and achievements wrought in liberal legislation will be secure, and further gains will have ample opportunity for development within the common sense, acceptably progressive influence of HARRY S. TRUMAN as he presides over the Senate. He will make the United States of America a great Vice President for the next 4 years.

We are in the midst of the fiercest, most devastating war mankind has ever known.

We have said that America cannot afford to take a chance—that our people will not gamble with the lives of their sons, your sons and mine.

The opposition would have us believe that we and our noble allies already have our enemie: vanquished; their morale shattered, and their power destroyed. We wish we could believe that.

But our military authorities tell us that is not true. These authorities say that tremendous battles loom large between us and the ultimate surrender of enemy arms, or even the destruction of enemy morale.

America will win this war finally and completely, no matter who is elected President of the United States next November.

Yet, under the most favorable conditions, an administrative change, we know from experience, would mean change all the way down the official line. Change means interruption. Interruption means delay.

Every day of delay means the sacrifice of more American lives.

The American electorate will not vote for change, interruption, and delay.

We pray this war may end soon. The sooner the better—tomorrow—tonight—would not be too early. But our servicemen who have been away from home longer, and who have been farther away from home, than ever before in our history, realize, and so do their parents, that the Presidency which begins January 1945 will be a wartime Presidency, and not a peacetime Presidency.

What we contend is that a change of administration now might well prove to be the tragedy of this generation.

In terms of statesmanship, a comparison of the apparent dimensions of the G. O. P. aspirant with a man of the stature of the President rules out of the field of rational consideration this proposed substitution for the party of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We do not condemn our adversaries' selection of a candidate so young, but we do expose the hypocrisy in their claim that the Presidency now needs a man of just his age.

What the Presidency demands now is not so much a bright young man as a man of wisdom and experience, with depth and breadth of vision.

The Old Guard would substitute themselves for an administration whose foresight led us from depths of poverty in 1932 to the high ground of 1940—converted a pacific nation of 1940 into the strongest military power on earth in 1944—and achieved more in war preparedness in 3½ years than the combined accomplishments of the Jap in a half century and the Nazi in a decade.

According to press reports, the G. O. P. candidate for the Presidency states that the country cannot face another period like the Roosevelt depression for some 8 years after 1933.

If that expression, "Roosevelt depression," makes sense, then logic has fled the campaign and inductive reasoning has lost its power.

That watchword that only Republicans are capable of dealing with the domestic problems of Federal administration—that watchword is a tired old man of many campaigns.

We know from bitter experience where their expertness in the field of domestic administration led us. After three uninterrupted terms in charge of the Government that expertness led us into the depths of depression.

President Hoover had no slide rule with which to find his way out of that disastrous quagmire. The country turned from the great engineer to a Democrat. The country will not turn back from that Democrat to a pupil of the great engineer.

Our adversaries scorn our claim that we should not change administrations now on account of the war.

At the end of the Spanish American War, in the summer of 1898, the people of this country looked forward to the work of a peace commission. That commission was to crystalize the gains made by our victory over Spain. That had been a war which, without overstating the case, was neither as furious nor as widespread as World War No. 2. We faced the off-year election of November 1898. But the war was over. The enemy had surrendered. The peace negotiations were just in the offing when the campaign came on. But we were clearly the victor, and the vanquished could but yield to our terms.

Certainly those were circumstances under which a plea for uninterrupted continuation of the administration of the party then in power would have less potency than now. There is certainly a thousand times the weight in the argument today that the present war administration should continue uninterruptedly than was true under the comparatively easy circumstances of 1898.

But even so, the Republican campaign of 1898 was pitched upon the plane that we should not change the complexion of Congress on account of the tendency of that step to weaken the hands of the peace commissioners.

In that campaign, Albert J. Beveridge, of Indiana, prominent Republican leader and spokesman, in a campaign speech in his own home State, in September, said:

"If the administration is defeated at the polls, will England believe we have accepted the results of the war? Will Germany be discouraged from interfering with our settlement of the war * * *? Will Russia * * * regard us as a steadfast people? * * * The world is observing us today. * * * Think of England abandoning its ministry at the moment it was securing the fruits of a successful war. Think of Germany rebuking Bismarck at the moment he was dictating terms of peace to France. What would America say of them if they should do such a deed of mingled insanity, perfidy, and folly? What would the world say of America if * * * the American people should rebuke the administration * * * and place a hostile House and Senate in Washington? God forbid! When a people show such inconstancy, such childlike fickleness as that their career as a power among nations is a memory."

In the same campaign Theodore Roosevelt, in an address in New York on October 5, said:

"I should ask the people of this country to support the administration of President McKinley, if for no other reason than because, say what you will, the victory at the polls of the men who are opposing and denouncing his administration in this election will be interpreted abroad as meaning, on the

part of America, a repudiation of the war from which we have just emerged triumphant. * * * It will result in partial undoing what our Army and Navy have accomplished."

Ex-President Benjamin Harrison, in a letter appearing in the press just a few days before election day in that year, said:

"Our election results should not give, or even seem to give encouragement to those who would find in our discords and divided counsels their advantage."

President McKinley, in a campaign tour through the Middle West, at Clinton, Iowa, October 11, 1898, uttered the following:

"The Army and Navy of the United States have won not only our praise, but the admiration of the world. Our achievements on land and sea are without parallel in the world's history. * * * We want no differences at home until we have settled our differences abroad."

In the light of such illustrious precept and example from such unfailing authority, what Republican in 1944 can deny that it is the bounden duty of the Democratic Party to point out to America that although we will win this war in any event, still, change now might well prove to be the tragedy of this generation.

I believe the vast majority of Americans in both political parties want peace—and perpetual peace—based upon common international action supported by effective implementation to guarantee to the 10,000,000 returning veterans that their sons will be spared a recurrent war.

But it is folly to assume that because a majority of each party desires that end that, therefore, there is no reasonable difference between the two parties as to which gives the greater hope for that permanent peace.

When the President was striving to lead the Nation in preparation for our defense, the Republican leadership, seeking to damage his prestige, was demanding a foreign policy which would have played directly into the hands of the Axis war lords.

They called the recognition of Russia a fuzzy-minded departure from sound policy. They attacked lease-lend, the salvation of the lives of millions of our own boys, as threatening an end of free government in the United States.

Then they leaped from nonparticipation pillar to world cooperation post. Then they began to speak of "durable cohesion" and "solid relations" among the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China.

And now, while mankind the world around is still engulfed in tragedy, the G. O. P. proposes to our suffering people that we hold the world together by that verbal hybrid of the new Republican lexicon "peace force," the paternity of which no one admits and which nobody understands and nobody will explain.

Compare that with the clear, courageous, and unmistakable language of the Democratic platform adopted at our convention in Chicago.

What about the writing of the peace? At the peace table Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek will be grasping each for his own post-war advantage, and justifiably so. The people want our representative to have an equal chance—to be big enough to hold his own.

Is a man of 42 to sit down at the table for us with Chiang Kai-shek who is 58, Churchill who is 69, and Stalin who is 64?

In Franklin D. Roosevelt is to be found a combination of knowledge and fervor rising to the heights of the growing soul of America, and matching the sublimity of the people's prayers for a just and durable peace. He knows the men with whom we shall have to deal. He knows the forces which will be brought into play. He has an enthusiasm for the field. The best is none too good for the United States of America.

Less than 60 days ago the greatest military expedition of all time crossed the choppy waters of the English Channel and landed on the beaches of Normandy.

There was launched the genius, the sacrifice, and 3½ years of the toil of our people.

That flotilla of 4,000 ships and 11,000 aircraft carried the best trained and best equipped soldiers we have ever sent to war.

They are neither Republicans nor Democrats. They are not interested in politics. But they want to see the Stars and Stripes above Berlin (and Tokyo, too, for that matter). Then they want to get home. And then they want to be assured that we have put an end to this succession of murderous conflicts.

They want another thing. They want economic post-war security. This administration has laid down early outlines for post-war reconstruction according to the Baruch report. Part of that plan has already been turned into law for the cancelation of war contracts, settlements, and plant clearance. This highly industrial state will seen be reassured by further legislation fostered by this administration looking toward the disposal of surplus commodities and the careful readjustment of millions of industrial workers. Human demobilization, plant demobilization, and surplus property legislation is now under active consideration and will be before the Senate next week. The G. I. bill, already law, takes care of the rehabilitation and readjustment of the returning veteran.

And right here let me make the observation that the Republican Party has sought to create the impression that because of the war Congress and the administration have deliberately undertaken to fasten upon the people by grants of extraordinary power to the Executive, certain controls, unlimited and indefinite as to time.

Not only is this not true, but on the contrary by the very language of these acts themselves the exercise of any perpetual or protracted unusual controls is specifically prohibited.

Every grant of extraordinary power carries with it its own limitation as to time, as witness lend-lease, stabilization, and war-power legislation.

All such extraordinary powers expire by lapse of time unless renewed by the act of Congress. Congress also has retained the right to terminate these powers at its own will by concurrent resolution of the two bodies, not requiring the approval of the President.

This administration demonstrated by a program of economic relief and social reform, both long and broad, that it has the knowledge, vision, and courage to achieve a sound reconstruction. Industry, on its own efforts, will do much to absorb the 10,000,000 men when they return and to reconvert to peacetime production, transportation, and assimilation of goods. But industry and organized labor, great as their achievements may honestly and wisely be expected to become, will sorely need to be complemented by the hands of a sound and experienced governmental administrator.

So, while we await the outcome of our soldiers' long, hard march to Berlin, now in the midst of their rendezvous with destiny, let this convention resolve to guarantee to them their best hope for an early victory, a permanent peace, and a secure post-war economy.

Let us leave this convention touched with the livid fire of conviction that Franklin D. Roosevelt is the most valuable public servant in the world today and that to retain his party in power until the job is done is a noble cause, and our best opportunity to serve the great State of Connecticut, and the names of all her illustrious sons and daughters, living and dead.

Japan's Soldiers Victims of the Opium Habit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks an editorial from the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of Wednesday, June 28, 1944. It follows:

HIMSELF DUG THE PIT

Perfectly poetic justice works through the news that thousands of China's own invaders are falling victims to the opium habit. Tokyo's semiofficial Domei warns Japan's soldiers against the vice—and there would be no such public warning if there weren't a definite public peril.

Many months ago, United States Commissioner of Narcotics Harry J. Anslinger told how Nipponese conquerors set up and operated opium concessions as almost their first act after formal occupation of any seized district. It was a thoroughly established and carefully planned maneuver, with the intent of rendering the conquered people incapable of revolt.

What the Japanese overlooked is the rule that the drug traffickers are themselves dangerously open to those insidious temptations which they spread. Shakespeare said it:

"For 'tis the sport to have the enginer
Hoist with his own petar."

Higgins Exposes Labor Black Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1944

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on August 1 the House Military Affairs Committee made public an important report. This report, which was prominently displayed on the front pages of the Nation, condemned the vicious black market practice of hoarding and trafficking in skilled aircraft manufacturing labor by "engineering service" firms.

The committee's report, while otherwise to be commended, was noticeable for one serious omission. It failed to give proper credit to a man and to an aircraft company in my congressional district who have played a leading role in the exposure of this labor-hoarding at a profit. I refer to Andrew J. Higgins and Higgins Aircraft, Inc., of New Orleans.

The House committee report of August 1 related how Higgins Aircraft, Inc., had paid out $1,303,608.42 to three so-called engineering service subcontractors, but omitted to tell why Higgins Aircraft was forced to pay out this sum or how Higgins had over a period of months exerted

every effort to have the Government end this monopolistic and costly practice.

Mr. Higgins already is known the world over for his invention and manufacture of the famous landing boat which bears his name, of PT boats of the type which spearheaded the invasion of Europe, nad of many other products. His immense war contributions have been praised by President Roosevelt, General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and Admiral King. Only 2 weeks ago, he delivered his ten-thousandth landing boat to the United States Navy. He takes justifiable pride in the fact that he is able to build things faster and better and cheaper than anyone else.

By its omissions and its failure to clearly lay the foundation of events in this matter, the committee's report has done a grave injustice to an organization which should merit he highest praise for its courage and zeal in taking the lead in exposing practices which it abhorred.

This injustice to Mr. Higgins is all the more striking in view of the fact that this is the second black market in the war production program which Mr. Higgins and his associates have brought to light. Some of you may recall that in the summer of 1942 during congressional hearings into the causes for cancelation of the Higgins Liberty ship contract at Micheaud, La., Mr. Higgins and his sons exposed a black market in steel. As a matter of fact, they first made the public conscious of the term "black market" as it existed in the United States.

I have taken the trouble to check the records and the documents in this case. The facts show conclusively that Mr. Higgins and his associates last winter started the ball rolling against this labor-hoarding racket; they called it to the attention of Government agencies and investigating committees; they protested and complained and crusaded. They were directly responsible for the first publicity which shed the light of day on these practices. Over a 7-month period they have waged a continuing campaign. Yet, the House committee report did not cover any of this early background.

It is my purpose here to show, by a simple recitation of the facts that Andrew Higgins and associates are due official praise and citation for exposing a nefarious practice which they abhorred but which was considered a usual thing by other airplane manufacturers. Higgins led the way in condemning this brokerage of skilled labor, and others followed in his wake.

Construction of Higgins Aircraft, Inc., was begun January 13, 1943, when the Army Air Forces awarded the company a contract for 1,200 plywood cargo airplanes. That plant, covering 48 acres, the largest in the country for building transport planes, was built in 8 months—far ahead of schedule. At its dedication October 24, 1943, the fact was brought out that it was one of the few cost-plus plants in the country completed within its cost estimate and ahead of scheduled time.

On August 3, 1943, the Army Air Forces shifted the contract from plywood to metal planes. For the next several months, the plant had to be untooled and retooled for metal construction. Then, as the plant became ready for tool-up production, the recruiting of personnel got underway. That was when Mr. Higgins and his men first became aware of this vicious racket operated by labor brokers disguising themselves as "engineers subcontractors' services."

The officials of the new aircraft company discovered that labor brokers in the guise of engineering concerns had obtained a corner on the market supply of certain types of scarce and highly skilled technicians. These companies, operating mainly in the vicinity of Detroit and Chicago, had set themselves up in business as suppliers to the aircraft industry of tool designers, machinists, loftsmen, and other specialized technicians. Their services were sold to the manufacturers at excessive and exorbitant rates of pay, higher than the rates which Higgins Aircraft, Inc., were permitted to pay in New Orleans under the wage stabilization program.

Mr. Higgins and his associates found themselves in the position of being compelled to subcontract for the services of these men. Aircraft had never before been manufactured in New Orleans and there was no local supply of skilled labor for the tooling up of this plant. Accordingly, Higgins Aircraft, by necessity and not by choice, entered into subcontracts with three of these concerns at rates of pay set by the engineering service companies, with the idea of utilizing these services only until the company could hire its own specialized personnel.

Almost immediately Mr. Higgins and Higgins Aircraft, Inc., began their compaign to end this evil practice. This campaign took the form of registering vigorous protests with the proper Government agencies in Washington and at the same time requesting of the War Manpower Commission the right to recruit its own personnel in other States in order to replace the employees of the so-called engineering services.

On February 11, 1944, Mr. Frank O. Higgins, vice president of Higgins Aircraft, sent a letter of protest to the Truman committee. This was addressed to Mr. Hugh Fulton, chief counsel for the committee. This letter is extremely significant because to our knowledge it was the first protest that anyone registered against this labor brokerage scheme. I am going to quote it here in full, and in so doing let me call attention to the fact that it was written 6 months before the House Military Affairs Committee report was made public. Following is the text of Mr. Higgins' important and detailed letter to the Truman committee:

FEBRUARY 11, 1944.

MR. HUGH FULTON,
Chief Counsel, Special Committee Investigating the National-Defense Program, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: The purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention, and to protest against, a deplorable condition which is seriously retarding our operations and increasing production costs, and as it is prevalent throughout the aircraft industry, must be similarly affecting other aircraft manufacturers.

Listed below are the classifications of craftsmen that it is necessary for us to employ in the performance of our contract to build C-46A airplanes, together with the maximum hourly rates that we are permitted to pay under the schedule approved by the Wage Stabilization Unit of the United States Treasury Department:

Tool designer	$1.75
Loftsman	1.50
Production planner	1.45
Jig builder	1.45
Tool and die maker	1.45
Template maker	1.30

From the moment that our first airplane contract was announced, we were prematurely besieged with offers from countless engineering service companies throughout the country to supply engineering talent to us at rates ranging up to $4.50 per man-hour, which we consistently declined, naively believing that we could avoid this exorbitant expense by direct employment. However, after months of determined but unsuccessful efforts to build up our own technical personnel, we came to the realization that the numerous engineering concerns had a monopoly on the services of men of this caliber, and in order to complete our processing, planning, tool designing, and lofting in time to meet our schedule, we were forced to negotiate with some of these firms to supply the men vitally needed, on a contract basis.

It is impossible for us to compete for the services of these men because, for some unknown reason, engineering service firms are seemingly exempt from the limitations of the Wage Stabilization Unit and hire them at rates as high as $2.50 per hour, plus a maintenance allowance of $48 a week. Notwithstanding the fact that we are prohibited from paying wages that would induce these engineers to work directly for us, an agreement to pay these labor hoarders as high as $4.50 per man-hour for straight time is recognized as an allowable, reimbursable item of cost by the Contract Section of the United States Army Air Forces.

The injustices of such a situation is obvious and its disastrous effects upon the progress and harmony of our organization are numerous and far reaching. Due to the freedom of action that these firms evidently enjoy, they pursue their operations in a manner characteristic of racketeers, even to the point of brazenly proselyting labor right in our own territory and even in this plant. We refer to instances where men we had hired were approached by spokesmen of these operators upon their arrival in New Orleans and lured onto their pay rolls at higher wages before they reported to us, and then loaned to us at their outrageous fee. Their recommendations as to the capabilities of the men they furnish cannot be depended upon, as they have no scruples against sending men who have had no previous experience and of questionable reputation, and our constant vigilance is required to detect and weed out such characters. The apparent immunity from regulations under which these manipulators thrive seems to contagiously encourage among their employees an attiude of irresponsibility and disregard of ethics, as they frequently violate our company rules and commit acts of personal misconduct for which we have to demand their recall. Our own men in these categories, working side by side with these subcontracted men, doing the same work at considerably lower pay, are disgruntled and are constantly attempting to obtain their release so that they can sign up with the engineering service companies. Of course, we can deny their release, but when workmen are forced to stay on the job, in such a frame of mind and under such inequitable conditions, the quality, efficiency, and volume of their work is lowered, resulting in an undermining of our entire organization. The additional expense to which we are subjected as a result of this arrangement is appalling. At the present time we have

over 400 engineering service men working for us at an average weekly cost of $105,000, whereas if this same number of men were on our own pay roll their aggregate wages would amount to approximately $35,000 weekly.

Although at the present time we have agreements with only three of these firms—Michigan Designing & Engineering Co., Detroit, Mich.; Affiliated Engineering Co., Detroit, Mich., and Carney Engineering Co., New York, N. Y.—we are still being endlessly solicited by others who profess to have considerable quantities of available man-hours to place at our disposal. It is difficult to understand, in these times, how parasitical enterprises with no contracts of their own can maintain a monopoly of hoarded engineering talent at extravagant remuneration and subsist by victimizing aircraft companies with contracts vital to the war effort, who are at their mercy because of the critical shortage of technical personnel.

We can suggest one of two methods of remedying this paralyzing state of affairs. First, subcontracts for engineering services could be outlawed—disallowed as a reimbursable item of expense—in the performance of all Army and Navy aircraft contracts throughout the country, as well as all other Government contracts using this type of assistance. Obviously, this would necessitate the engineering service companies' recalling all their men working in the Nation's various aircraft factories and finally releasing them to seek individual connections at existing wage levels. Such a directive would have to be absolute in scope to be effective, but would result in a tremendous saving to the Government. The other solution would be to boost the rates approved for craftsmen in these classifications to a point that would permit aircraft companies to compete with the engineering services in the hiring of such personnel. While this procedure would not be so economical as the first suggestion it would bring relief to the aircraft industry by placing it in an equitable position to not only raise the morale of the men now in their employ but to break up these labor pools and eliminate the excessive profits now going into the coffers of these scavengers.

We earnestly recommend this matter to your committee for immediate investigation and correction because the taxpayers who must bear the burden of the exorbitant costs, and the armed forces who are deprived of maximum production as a result of this intolerable condition, are the ultimate sufferers.

The attached list shows the names and addresses of engineering concerns who have approached us both by letter and representative's personal vists, and we will be glad to supply any additional information in our possession that you may request.

Yours very truly,

HIGGINS AIRCRAFT, INC.,
FRANK O. HIGGINS,
Vice President.

Attached to this letter was a list containing the names of 40 engineering service companies which had solicited Higgins Aircraft, Inc., with offers to furnish technical personnel.

Acknowledging receipt of this letter and its attachment, Mr. Fulton, on February 16, wrote Mr. Higgins as follows:

Thank you for your letter of February 11. The committee is checking into the matter.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH FULTON,
Chief Counsel.

Mr. Higgins sent copies of his February 11 Truman committee letter to high officers of the Army Air Forces Material Command with a note to each officer which said "Anything that you can do to assist in alleviating conditions described will be greatly appreciated." Army Air Forces officers who received this correspondence were: Brig. Gen. O. R. Cook, Chief, Administrative Staff, Production Division, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio; Brig. Gen. Raymond G. Harris, District Supervisor, Midwestern Procurement Division, Wichita, Kans.; Col. W. M. Morgan, Production Engineering Section, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio; Lt. G. H. Moriarity, Chief, Industrial Service Branch, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio; Lt. Col. Walter Winston, Administration Assistant, C–46 Production Committee, Buffalo, N. Y.

Acknowledging receipt of Mr. Higgins' letter and enclosure, Lieutenant Colonel Winston wrote Mr. Higgins February 25, as follows:

1. This office is in receipt of your letter dated February 16, 1944, subject as above, enclosing a copy of your letter dated February 11, 1944, to Mr. Hugh Fulton, chief counsel of the Truman investigating committee, on this subject.

2. The particular situation to which you refer has been a matter of great concern to this office and has been repeatedly commented upon by representatives of this office and other Army Air Forces personnel concerned.

3. Copies of your letter are being forwarded to the Material Command at Wright Field with the request that all assistance possible be rendered you in the solution of your problem.

4. Copies of your letter are also being furnished all executive members of the C–46 Production Committee for their information and further action if desired.

Mr. Frank O. Higgins also sent copies of his Truman committee letter to Chairman Donald M. Nelson of the War Production Board, and Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Executive Vice Chairman of the Board. In his letter to Mr. Wilson dated February 17, Mr. Higgins complained of "these practices which are seriously hampering our own progress here and undoubtedly asserting a similar effect on the aircraft industry as a whole."

Following is the reply of Mr. Wilson, dated February 22:

DEAR MR. HIGGINS: This will acknowledge with appreciation copy of letter written by you to Mr. Hugh Fulton, regarding engineering service companies. I am of the opinion that there is a great deal to what you present.

I appreciate your kind invitation to visit your plant, and I assure you that when possible, I will do so.

On March 11, 1944, Chairman Nelson acknowledged receipt of Mr. Higgins' letter as follows:

Thank you for your letter of February 26, and the copy of your letter dated February 11 to Mr. Hugh Fulton, chief counsel, Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, United States Senate, concerning the engineering service companies who have solicited your organization with offers to furnish technical personnel.

I have brought this matter to the attention of Mr. T. P. Wright, Director of the Aircraft Resources Control Office, who informs me that this practice of numerous engineering concerns circularizing the aircraft industry for engineering contracts was brought up in a recent meeting of the Aircraft Production Board, and steps are being taken to effect a solution as soon as possible.

From the Truman committee letter by Mr. Higgins we have seen how the vice president of Higgins Aircraft, Inc., on February 11 condemned and requested governmental action against the gouging black market in skilled aircraft labor. Now, let us trace the next steps which Higgins took in his efforts to end or remedy this condition.

In early March Andrew Higgins sent to Washington as his personal representative Col. John H. Jouett, executive vice president of Higgins Aircraft, Inc. In conferences with high officials of Government departments Colonel Jouett personally called this racket to their attention. As Mr. Higgins' representative he pointed out that these so-called engineering service companies were operating as brokers supplying technical labor at excessive fees to his company. He showed that such costs increased the cost of production at the Higgins Aircraft plant—a cost borne by the taxpayers of the United States. Colonel Jouett further pointed out that the presence of these over-paid employees tended to cause labor unrest among the men and women of Higgins Aircraft, Inc. Moreover, it was stressed by Colonel Jouett that such a condition violated the letter and the spirit of the stabilization and the manpower control programs.

In these conferences Colonel Jouett made clear that Mr. Higgins had accepted his cost-plus contract to build cargo airplanes at the lowest percentage of profit ever asked by any contractor. Mr. Higgins is not a war profiteer and was particularly upset that others were being allowed to profiteer excessively upon his own contracts.

On March 2 and 3 Colonel Jouett conferred with the Vice Chairman of the War Labor Board, with officials of the Aircraft Production Division of W. P. B., and with officers of the Army Air Forces.

Gen. Oliver P. Echols of the Army Air Forces appeared gravely concerned and quite surprised at the extent to which this activity had gone. He asked Colonel Jouett to supply him with complete information. Upon being given a copy of Frank O. Higgins' letter to the Truman committee, General Echols and his staff took the matter up with the War Manpower Commission.

Colonel Jouett also saw Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren and his chief legal adviser. They, too, had no conception of what was going on in this racket and did not see how their office was concerned therewith. They took the position that the Comptroller General's office must approve payment for any services or costs which are made in good faith and are approved by the contracting officer if in line with costs or prices which have to be paid.

Writing from Washington on March 9, Colonel Jouett advised Mr. Higgins in New Orleans:

Our action has spread like wildfire throughout Government circles and the aircraft industry. The Glenn L. Martin Co. has filed a letter of protest against the engineering firms, and one or two others have officially expressed themselves also. They all abhorred the racket but none of them did anything about it. It was like Mark Twain and the weather.

At the present moment Higgins Aircraft is hailed as a constructive force.

Colonel Jouett concluded:

Since dictating the above, I have talked to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Executive Vice Chairman of the W. P. B., and he is a thousand percent in favor of the action we are taking. He said that if the racket is not busted up, it will become a national scandal, and he is happy that Higgins is taking the lead.

The Baltimore Sun, supplied with information by Mr. Higgins and associates, published the first complete account of this manpower racket in its issue of March 26. The page 1 article, under a Washington date line, was headlined "Labor black-market operations described." Following are the lead paragraphs:

WASHINGTON, March 26.—Predicting that the War Labor Board very shortly will take action to abolish the racket, Government officials today confirmed the existence of a widespread black market in skilled labor that is smashing wage ceilings and disrupting industrial relations.

To illustrate its cost to the taxpayers, they cited the case of one war contractor who reported he had been compelled to hire—at the Government's expense—over 400 men "at an average weekly cost of $105,000," or about $260 per man.

The contractor added in a complaint to the Truman committee that, had he been able to avoid the black market and hire the same men at the ceiling wage rates fixed by the Government, the cost to the taxpayers would have been only $35,000 a week, or about $85 per man.

The operations of the black market are a combination of labor hoarding and circumvention of wartime wage ceilings, according to officials who—as representatives of the W. L. B., War Manpower Commission, and Army and Navy procurement agencies—have seeking, in a series of conferences here, ways to break it up.

This, they say, is the way the racketeers operate:

They form, or take over, a so-called engineering service company.

In that guise, they corral and attach to their pay rolls as many skilled machinists as they can pirate away from manufacturers with guarantees of higher wages than the latter are allowed to pay such men under wartime ceilings.

Aided by the scarcity of skilled labor produced by their hoarding activities, they compel manufacturers to contract with them for workers, who are provided as though part of a legitimate engineering service.

The workers involved are given fictitious semi-professional job classifications to take them out from under the wage ceilings fixed for the work they actually perform and are paid, instead as high as $6.50 an hour plus $6 a day for subsistence.

The racketeer, who collects from the manufacturer and pays the men, charges as high as $12.50 an hour for their time and pockets the difference as his fee.

The W. M. C.'s region No. 5 management-labor committee at Cleveland has provided an example of the profits accruing to the racketeers.

It is hardly necessary to identify the contractor in the second paragraph as Mr. Higgins.

Further down in the story the Sun credits Higgins with initiating action with the Truman committee, as follows:

PUT ON TRAIL BY HIGGINS

The Truman committee was put on the trial of the labor black market by Frank O. Higgins, vice president of Higgins Aircraft, Inc., New Orleans. Mr. Higgins appended a lengthy February 11 letter to the committee a list of 40 "engineering service companies who have solicited Higgins Aircraft, Inc., with offers to furnish technical personnel."

The Sun article concluded by quoting a number of paragraphs from Frank Higgins' letter.

In the first week of March, Bill Cunningham, syndicated columnist of the Boston Herald and other newspapers, visited New Orleans, and the Higgins plants. During the course of his stay, Mr. Higgins gave Cunningham information about the racket with the idea that additional publicity might bring official attention and possibly correction.

In his column of April 4, 1944, published in about 25 newspapers, Cunningham, without naming the plant, reported on details of the racket, as it existed at Higgins Aircraft. Here are the opening paragraphs of that article:

During that recent swing of the map, this reporter stumbled across a by-product of the labor situation that seems to cry to the stars in the Star-Spangled Banner for a congressional investigation and a neckbreaking crackdown. If it's what it seems to be, it's as deliberate a steal from the taxpayer's pocket as any profiteering vulture ever managed to operate.

It seems to be a straight case of extortion in war plants—the old badger game without benefit of badger. War plants in aircraft manufacturing are the principal victims. Plants in Detroit, St. Louis, and New Orleans have paid through the nose. The polite name covering the steal is Engineering Service.

The gist of it is that these engineering services form pools of skilled labor and then hire them to war contractors desperately in need of such men at extortionist prices, pocketing the difference, and it's a very rich difference, indeed. This is strictly a black market in skilled labor—a complete bypassing of the Wage Stabilization Act.

After pointing out that "the Government is doing nothing about these hoarders," Cunningham concluded his article as follows:

As it is, the ultimate sufferers are the taxpayers, who must support these cost-plus parasites, and the armed forces, deprived of maximum production and maximum war plant morale unless a broker's price is met, and even after it has been met.

It seems more than ridiculous, took at a time when talk of a labor draft, a IV–F draft, and all the rest keeps filling the air. These pools broken up and the labor placed in normal circulation would straighten out at least part of the picture. There's no secret about these firms. Their names and addresses can be had easily. They solicit openly, and it's more than possible they're perfectly legal as the laws are now drawn. But legal right and moral right can be two different things. This is wrong. It's absurd. It's theft. Congress should get busy.

After all of this ground work had been laid by Higgins Aircraft, Inc., five Government agencies on April 12 condemned the labor-hoarding racket in O. W. I. press release No. B 1933. Following is the lead paragraph of this release:

A program for combating on several fronts the so-called engineering service companies which purport to provide engineering service to war contractors but actually operate as brokers supplying skilled labor at exorbitant rates was jointly announced today by the National War Labor Board, War Manpower Commission, War and Navy Departments, and Maritime Commission as a result of conferences between representatives of these agencies who have for some time been studying the practices of some of these companies.

The release goes on to say that individual plans of action have been drafted by these various agencies which are concerned with the so-called engineering service companies which render little, if any, engineering service, but really serve as a labor broker supplying skilled workers for excessive fees.

The plans call for establishing stabilized rates that can be paid to workers.

Meantime, the "engineering service" companies continued to pursue their trade.

One Chicago firm, March 21, solicited Higgins Aircraft, Inc., attaching letters of reference and recommendation from officials of the Army Air Forces, United States Maritime Commission, and the office of the Secretary of the Navy.

On June 5 the Department of Justice announced that a Federal grand jury in Detroit had handed down an indictment charging four persons with defrauding the Government in the handling of subcontracts for machine tools used in construction of B–24 bombers at the Ford plants.

One of those indicted was Andrew Kalman, one of the proprietors of the Affiliated Engineering Co. This company, according to the Associated Press report of the indictment, made exorbitant profits through padding pay rolls, using fictitious time sheets, charging for the work of nonexistent persons and charging for the time of designers who actually worked elsewhere.

This is one of the three companies Higgins Aircraft had been crusading against.

The officials of Higgins Aircraft, Inc., have said that the employees of these labor pools were a disturbing element in their plant. They violated company and Army regulations, boasted to the Higgins employees of their superhigh wages and in some cases even tried to pirate Higgins' own men away from him. Let me cite an actual case. On February 8 an employee of Higgins Aircraft, in charge of a scheduling section in the plant, who had been on the job for 10 months, tended his resignation. Questioned as to why he was leaving he told a company executive that he had learned he could increase his income from the rate of $1.75 per hour to $2.50 an hour by accepting a position with a contract engineering firm. That these men were disturbing influences was admitted by the Michigan Designing & Engineering Co. in a memorandum issued March 21, 1944, "To all supervisors, leaders, and personnel of Michigan Designing & Engineering Co." This memo went on to say that men violating the time card punching regulations were committing fraud and subject to prosecution under Federal laws. The memo added:

There has been a tendency of some men in the past to come in when they felt like it, also coming in late and working just as their mood fitted the occasion—going home early and in plan old American talk, doing as they

damned please. This practice must and will cease.

During the spring and early summer Higgins Aircraft, Inc., proceeded to replace the subcontracted engineering service employees with their own personnel as rapidly as competent engineering help became available in its allowable wage scale or could be trained. The employees of one of these companies was reduced from 258 men in early 1944 to less than 50 as of May 20. Meanwhile, Higgins officials had gone to the War Manpower Commission and repeatedly requested permission to recruit skilled and technical personnel in the States of Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and others in order to procure its own production planners, loftsmen, and process men from such areas and thereby release labor brokers' employees. Clearance for this recruiting was finally granted May 1 and men are being brought in as rapidly as they can be hired. Meantime, the rates of these labor racketeers had been increased.

Michigan Designing & Engineering Co. advised Higgins Aircraft, May 20, 1944, that the new rate effective June 26, for overtime would be $5.50 per hour worked in excess of 8 hours in any one calendar day and in excess of 40 hours in any one week.

On June 5 Higgins Aircraft sent to Mr. H. Ralph Burton, general counsel for the House Military Affairs Committee, complete information as to its contracts with the Michigan Designing & Engineering Co., Affiliated Engineering Co., and Carney Engineering Co.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that these facts speak for themselves. When the House committee's report was released a few days ago Mr. Higgins issued the following statement:

I brought this engineering racket to the attention of the country when I revealed it to the Truman committee back in February.

On February 11 my son, Frank Higgins, general manager of Higgins Aircraft Corporation, wrote to the Truman committee asking them to investigate the racket of which we had been made victims, and asked that a stop be put to it. The committee held some preliminary inquiries, which were reported in considerable detail by the Baltimore Sun and some of the eastern papers early in March.

Our part in the matter was gratefully acknowledged by Hugh Fulton, counsel for the Truman committee.

Months later the House committee took it up and we supplied them with full data. Their failure to credit us with the exposure puts us at a disadvantage. Certainly it puts the committee in a questionable light. The record speaks, and eloquently, if they would permit it. I do not understand it.

At the same time I issued this statement:

Andrew J. Higgins should be given credit for the exposure of the engineering racket. He brought it to the attention of the Truman committee, the War Manpower Commission, and to others, including myself, back in February. He is given full credit for the exposure in the War Manpower Commission and in other Government bureaus where the facts are known. I do not understand why the committee failed to show this. It has done one of our great producers a grave injustice by letting it appear that he was a party to the practice. I intend to see that this wrong is righted.

The above facts shows conclusively that Mr. Higgins and other officers of Higgins Aircraft, Inc., by leading a fight against a practice which had been tolerated by other aircraft manufacturers, and for their efforts in first calling it to official and public attention, deserve credit and commendation for their interest in this matter.

In conclusion, I am offering for the RECORD, two editorials from New Orleans newspapers. Following is the lead editorial of the New Orleans States of August 2:

TAXPAYERS GYPPED

Revelations anent the operation of a species of labor racket by so-called engineering service firms that have been and are mulcting the American taxpayers out of many millions of dollars, would shock the people if they are not already immunized against shock by a long succession of weird devices of labor and management to raise the cost of war goods by enough to allow lavish and unwarranted rakeoffs to self-injected intermediaries.

This latest racket was brought to the attention of the Senate's Truman committee by Andrew J. Higgins, of New Orleans. Mr. Higgins' enterprises here are among the victims. Other victims are such well-known concerns as United Aircraft, Chrysler Corporation, and Brewster Aeronautic.

The method used, as described in this newspaper yesterday, was to recruit all the available engineering skill and labor for the so-called engineering service outfits. These outfits were in some instances merely a partnership of two or three relatively unknown individuals. In one case, a man and his wife operated an engineering service. The labor and skill thus engaged by these concerns at 50 cents to $3 an hour in one locality were then farmed out to the makers of war goods at $4.50 to $7.50 an hour. The difference between the two wage scales seemed to be the gross profit of the engineering service enterprise, which apparently was nothing more than a labor-renting agency. The profits were plenty lush, running from 100 to 500 percent, according to the details published.

The Higgins firm was the first to call this suspected gyp to the attention of Congress. A complaint was filed as far back as last February 11 by Frank Higgins, son of the head of the firm. This was addressed to Hugh Fulton, chief counsel of the Senate's Truman committee. The mere filing of such a complaint should have stirred the Truman investigators into prompt and vigorous action. Whatever activity followed appears to have been belated, reluctant, and half-hearted. The elder Higgins now complains that a House committee which finally did start an investigation, published only a portion of the actual or potential findings.

Under these contracts with the labor-renters posing as "engineering service" concerns, the Higgins enterprises have been compelled to pay wages and salaries totaling $2,112,583.30 over a period of time, whereas if these identical workers had been recruited locally with no fee going to the interlopers, the sum would have been $729,974.88. This means a loss to the taxpayers, who foot the entire bill, of $1,383,608.42 at the Higgins firm alone. Similar losses at all the other plants where the gouge was practiced might have brought the aggregate up to $5,000,000 or perhaps ten to twenty millions. Perhaps the probing Members of Congress considered such sums too trifling to bother about saving. As for the principle of the thing, a policy of gouge and gyp and graft and cut-in has prevailed so universally in the business of supplying war goods and tools that a sense of futility about attempting to fight it anywhere may have gripped the congressional committees.

In every war there have been slick profiteers and get-rich-quick contractors, and there are plenty of them in this war. Waging war is a terribly wasteful process, anyway. There is bound to be stupendous loss. Most of it is simply unavoidable at the time. Sometimes a part of the loss can be recovered later.

In the Higgins case the labor-renting contracts had the approval of the Army officers charged with the procurement of supplies. And these officers were undoubtedly actuated by a necessity of getting the goods needed as soon as possible, and never mind the cost.

Mr. Higgins deserves the country's congratulations for pointing a finger at this deplorable gouge. No other enterpriser seems to have bothered about making a complaint to Congress, which seems to indicate that all others were complacent about business practices victimizing their country and the taxpayers.

Members of Congress, newspaper editors, and others have been prompt and vigorous in exposing certain practices and policies of labor unions that stalled or retarded war production or increased the cost of it. This time the evils are on the side of management. They should be exposed just as vigorously and denounced as fearlessly.

Following is the lead editorial of the Times-Picayune of August 3:

WHAT'S THE LOOPHOLE?

Since the vicious practice by which Higgins and other aircraft manufacturers have been overcharged for engineering talent seems to be out, or on the way out, protesting about it now is much like closing the stable door after the horse has gone. The Government will hardly recover the millions of dollars the so-called hoarders of technical labor have made out of their contracts to supply workers to the aircraft plants at approximately triple the wages the companies would have been permitted to pay had they been able to do their hiring direct. The Higgins plant announces that it presently has no contracts with the engineering companies and the report of the House military committee states that the practice has been greatly curtailed.

In the report released Tuesday, the committee brought out that Higgins, Chrysler, United Aircraft, and Brewster had been paying engineering companies up to $4.50 per man-hour straight time and $5.70 overtime for the services of such skilled craftsmen as tool designers, jig builders, and die makers. The Higgins company revealed that the Treasury's wage stabilization unit had fixed the wage ceilings on such workers, if hired direct, at $1.30 to $1.75 an hour in this area. Finding itself unable to obtain directly the talent it needed, the Higgins Co. began last September to do business with some of the 40 organizations operating as engineering companies which overwhelmed it with offers to supply the talent. In February, Frank O. Higgins, vice president of Higgins Aircraft, wrote the chief counsel of the Senate investigating committee protesting the deplorable condition which he said was retarding the plant's operations and raising production cost. So far as we know the Higgins Co. deserves credit for being the first to come out in the open to fight the scheme.

While millions already have been given up to the engineering companies, it isn't too late to inquire by what defect in the stabilization law or Treasury ruling such overcharges have been tolerated. Although the Treasury long has been aware of the wage ceiling evasion, we have never seen an explanation of why it was allowed to continue. Surely the public is entitled to something more than just a House committee's report condemning the practice as reprehensible.

Exploits of Marines on Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8, 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, many New Mexico boys have been and are contributing mightily to the war effort. I wish it were possible that I could include in the RECORD the many statements and articles which have been printed concerning the sons of New Mexico who are engaged in the war. It is impossible to do so at this time. Later I hope it may be done. But today I have in my hand an article appearing in the New York Times of July 30. It relates graphically the experiences of a New Mexico boy, and it happens, Mr. President, that that boy is the son of one of our own colleagues the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. I ask that this article be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMAND POST HAS WILD GUAM DAWN—25 MARINES LED BY SENATOR CHAVEZ' SON KILL 68 JAPANESE INTRUDERS

(By Robert Trumbull)

WITH THE FIRST PROVISIONAL MARINE BRIGADE, ON GUAM, July 24.—An audacious Japanese who walked boldly into an American command post near Agat and picked up a box of grenades touched off a dawn battle in which 25 Americans, commanded by Lt. Dennis Chavez, Jr., son of the New Mexico Senator, slew 68 Japanese.

The story is all the more remarkable because Lt. Chavez's outfit is part of a headquarters and supply company, which is not ordinarily expected to engage in rough-and-tumble combat, although it happens—in fact, Chavez's platoon sergeant, John Green, big, rugged West Virginian, was commended for a similar mix-up on Eniwetok in February.

The headquarters and supply company, commanded by Capt. Elliot Lima, of Fallon, Nev., the night of D-day dug in on a level stretch between two rugged knolls north of Agat. During the day they captured a Japanese Hotchkiss machine gun. Toward dawn a dark figure strode boldly past the sentry. Challenged, he said, "Watcha say, mate?" laid hold of a box of grenades and started to walk off toward the Hotchkiss.

A JAPANESE IS BLOWN UP

A marine noticed that the newcomer was a Japanese and fired. The bullet struck and detonated the grenades in the box, obliterating the Japanese. Captain Lima said a Japanese flag was found the next morning torn to small bits and ribbons and the Japanese's notebook was strewn like confetti over a 15-yard circle.

Shortly afterward, as the sky began to lighten, the marines relaxed, thinking they soon could get out of the wet fox holes. A group of men approached bearing boxes of ammunition. When they were almost inside the line guarding the command post of Col. Merlin F. Schneider someone spotted Japanese leggings on these men and opened fire.

Immediately the Japanese dropped into tall grass and deployed for an attack.

"Our position was good," Lieutenant Chavez said. "We were in fox holes, the Japanese in an open field of fire. But we had only two light machine guns and a few automatic rifles, while they sounded like a full machine-gun company."

"LAST REEL OF HORSE OPERA"

The Japanese suddenly rose and charged, some swinging swords and bayonets. One officer ran toward Pvt. (1st cl.) William Hurst yelling, "Marine, you die."

Hurst replied "The hell I will," and cut him down with an automatic rifle.

Another officer, "a story-book Jap with buck teeth," rushed at Lieutenant Chavez.

"He grinned kinda toothily just as I shot him," Chavez said, "and I kinda hated to do it."

"The end of it was like the last reel of a horse opera," Captain Lima said. "Two wounded marines crawled to me and said Lieutenant Chavez' outfit was running out of ammunition, lobbing grenades from fox holes and shooting like wild men. Meantime I had sent in another platoon under Lt. Reginald Fincke, of New York, to back 'em up. By sunup there were 68 dead Japs against 1 marine killed and 5 wounded."

Lieutenant Chavez, who is 31 but looks 25, discussed the engagement modestly and kept switching the conversation to New Mexico politics. It was some time before the writer wormed from him the reluctant admission that he had personally killed at least five Japanese with a tommy-gun.

Polish-Soviet Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8, 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, yesterday I was permitted to insert in the body of the RECORD and likewise in the Appendix of the RECORD articles which I had clipped from the press relating to the situation in Poland today. I have now before me an article by Mr. Constantine Brown, published in the Washington Evening Star of several days ago, in which he mentions the Moscow-sponsored and controlled Polish Government. I have also another article by Mr. Constantine Brown dealing with the same subject published in the Washington Evening Star of July 26, 1944.

I wish to read one paragraph from the editorial published in the Star. The editorial is entitled "Polish Puppets." I read as follows:

The Soviet Government, in announcing its intention to enter into an agreement with the new Polish Committee of National Liberation for the civil administration of liberated Polish territory, serves unmistakable notice on the rest of the world—

Which includes us—

that it proposes to settle Eastern Europe's problems in its own way.

There does not appear to be anything that the other United Nations, especially Great Britain and this country, can do about it. It is the Red Army that is driving the Germans from Poland. The Soviets, to be sure, have had very substantial support from the United States and Britain, but there is no escaping the fact that it is the Russian Army which is liberating Eastern Europe and tearing the Wehrmacht to shreds. As a result, the word of Marshal Stalin becomes the law of the east. He can make whatever decisions he pleases, and the necessities of war prevent us from opposing them.

There being no objection, the editorial and the two articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 26, 1944]

POLISH PUPPETS

The Soviet Government, in announcing its intention to enter into an agreement with the new Polish Committee of National Liberation for the civil administration of liberated Polish territory, serves unmistakable notice on the rest of the world that it proposes to settle eastern Europe's problems in its own way.

There does not appear to be anything that the other United Nations, especially Great Britain and this country, can do about it. It is the Red Army that is driving the Germans from Poland. The Soviets, to be sure, have had very substantial support from the United States and Britain, but there is no escaping the fact that it is the Russian Army which is liberating eastern Europe and tearing the Wehrmacht to shreds. As a result, the word of Marshal Stalin becomes the law of the east. He can make whatever decisions he pleases, and the necessities of war prevent us from opposing them.

There is small likelihood that this state of affairs will have an adverse effect on the prosecution of the war. Germany remains to be finally beaten, and the necessity for full military co-operation continues undisturbed by unfortunate political developments. But it is not a good omen for the peace.

What Russia has done here, in effect, is to recognize a puppet Polish Government. It refuses to deal with the Polish Government in London, which is the only Polish Government recognized by the United States and Britain. The Soviet Government, so far as can be ascertained, has come to terms with the puppet regime without consulting the United States or Britain, and apparently has bluntly rebuffed President Roosevelt's efforts to effect some reconciliation with the legal Polish Government. And Stalin has done this at the same time that he expects and receives a fully representative voice in the decisions affecting Italy and western Europe.

It also should be noted that the Soviet Government in recognizing the new Polish committee, apparently considers that the dispute as to territory east of the so-called Curzon Line has been automatically settled in its favor. The official statement on the decision to treat with the puppet group emphasizes that Russia has no designs on "Polish territory." But this plainly refers to the Polish territory that remains after the area in dispute has been incorporated in the U. S. S. R., and for all practical purposes this is a "settlement" imposed by force of arms on Poland.

We may hope that the future will produce a softening of this picture as it appears today. But there is nothing to be gained from self-deception. Russia apparently has embarked on a course which does nothing to encourage hope for a peace based upon mutual trust and real international co-operation. She has also committed herself to policies which the United States, while probably obliged to accept them, cannot possibly indorse in good conscience.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 26, 1944]

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

Polish soldiers under the command of Gen. Wladislav Anders are fighting in Italy for the common cause of the United Nations. Other trained Polish soldiers in England may join the Americans and British in France. Besides these ground troops, there are about 12,500 Polish aviators in the Allied Air Forces,

participating in the air attack over Germany and western Europe.

In Italy the Polish divisions have done well. In the the bloody assault on Monastery Hill above Cassino 3,000 Poles were reported killed. Only last week the Anders forces occupied the important city of Ancona. Polish flyers have been fighting the German Luftwaffe ever since 1940.

Such facts are being recalled now in Washington at a time when Premier Stalin has decided to give liberated Poland a government "ready made" in Moscow, composed principally of members of the Union of Polish Patriots. This organization is regarded as a creation of the Kremlin, claiming the right to rule Poland because it is backed by Moscow's political influence and the bayonets of Red soldiers.

The Russian victories are thrilling the American people. The Germans appear unable to withstand the Red onslaught in any section of the front. The Nazi armies, which at one time made their foe pay dearly for every inch of reconquered ground, are now melting away.

If military victories alone could bring about a real peace the Russian victories would be cheered even more loudly in Washington diplomatic quarters.

But, unfortunately, in a global war, peace is not obtained only by military victories. The governments of the victorious nations must piece together, in a manner acceptable to all the United Nations, the debris caused by the Axis aggression. Only frank cooperation by all can achieve such an objective.

Poland is a dramatic example. This war started because the great western democracies would not stand for the arbitrary dismembering of a nation of 35,000,000 persons. The Poles caved in a few weeks after the war started because they were attacked simultaneously by two nations totaling 260,000,000 persons.

The Poles continued, however, to fight outside their own homeland. At first a handful of aviators who managed to get away joined their British colleagues in the desperate battle against the Luftwaffe. Later, soldiers and officers who escaped or were freed by Russia formed contingents which now are fighting on our side. A government composed of good, bad, or indifferent Polish politicians was formed in London. Regardless of its composition, the Allies—including Russia—recognized that government as the sole representative of Poland until such time as the liberated country could freely choose the new men to govern it.

This principle was embodied in the now apparently moribund Atlantic charter which was solemnly signed in Washington in January 1942, by all members of the United Nations including, of course, the U. S. S. R.

The break in diplomatic relations between the Polish government in exile and Moscow over what appears to be a trivial incident, in the light of the great principles for which we are fighting, has thrown a monkey wrench in the relations among the United Nations. Soon after the break, Moscow created a puppet organization composed of Poles completely in sympathy with the Russian objectives of incorporating the border states into the U. S. S. R. The moving spirit of this Soviet-created organization is Wanda Wasilewska, the wife of Alexander Kornejczuk, a former Assistant Secretary of State of the Soviet foreign commissariat and a now foreign commissar of the nominally autonomous Ukraine republic.

It is this organization consisting of Poles completely subservient to the Kremlin which has been entrusted by Premier Stalin with the Government of new Poland.

The question of the future boundaries of Poland is of only relative importance as far as the United States is concerned. Boundaries in Europe always have and always will continue to be elastic. We are interested in the sovereignty of a Polish Government, elected freely by the Polish people. The Polish Government in exile may not represent the present view of the Polish people, but its existence is in accordance with the Constitution of Poland which has never been rejected by the Poles.

The Polish Government in exile was not created by the Allies. The new Government has actually been created by a foreign power. As such it is less representative of the Polish people than the Government in London.

During the official visit of Polish Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk in Washington last June, President Roosevelt recognized the sound basis of the Polish Government in London. He endeavored, somewhat timidly, it is true, to bring about an understanding between the Polish Premier and Premier Stalin. He urged the Russian leader to receive Mikolajczyk at the Kremlin and talk matters over.

Out of this conversation Mr. Roosevelt hoped that some sort of an arrangement might be reached for a skeleton independence of Poland and at the same time satisfy Stalin's objection for security on the Soviet's western borders. The Russian Premier's final answer to the President's friendly intervention was his creation Monday of a Polish puppet government.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The fate of the "Dumbarton" conference, a parley among the Big Four for the postwar organization of the world, depends to a large extent on the result of talks held in Moscow this week between Premier Stalin and Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Premier of the Polish government in exile.

Warsaw is expected to be liberated by the Russian forces this week.

The Russian Government created a Moscow-sponsored Polish Government with a heterogenous list of subservient men and women as soon as it became convinced that the defeat of the Germans in Poland was only a question of days.

The British and American Governments realized that the creation of a 100 percent Moscow-sponsored administration was a definite challenge to everything we are fighting for. Prime Minister Churchill decided to take the matter in his own hands and has had several direct communications with Premier Stalin since last Sunday. He insisted that Stalin receive the Polish Premier and discuss with him the question of forming a new government in Poland composed partly of members of the Government in exile and partly of members of the new Moscow creation. Mr. Churchill won his point and last Wednesday the Kremlin informed London that Premier Mikolajczyk would be received in Moscow.

The Polish premier lost no time and boarded a plane for Moscow in an endeavor to save whatever he could of Poland's sovereignty.

According to reliable information available in Washington, Mr. Mikolajczyk hopes to strike a bargain whereby the face of the Polish Government in exile might be saved. The basis of the arrangement he hopes to reach in Moscow is that Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, the President of the Polish Republic, dismiss the cabinet and appoint another which would include some members of the present administration such as Mikolajcyzk, who is said to be persona grata with Stalin, and several others who are acceptable to the Kremlin. The rest of the Government would be composed of some leaders of the Polish underground and some Poles who belong to the Moscow-sponsored organization.

The American and British Governments feel it is vitally important that there be at least an outward appearance of legality in the formation of the Government of the first eastern liberated country. If Stalin accepts the compromise that the President of Poland shall dismiss the present cabinet and order the formation of another, even if all its members are carefully selected by Moscow, such a government would be constitutional and its acts, including a drastic boundary revision of Poland's eastern borders, would be legal.

Unless such a compromise is accepted by the Kremlin, the picture at the forthcoming international conference in Washington is going to be very gloomy. Mr. Churchill is said to have stressed this point to Stalin and the fact that the Russian premier has agreed at the eleventh hour to receive the Polish leader and his advisers has given renewed hope to Washington and London that a compromise is possible.

Following Mr. Churchill's advice, Premier Mikolajczyk will avoid discussing the question of Poland's future borders. This, it has been agreed by all concerned, will be a matter for the peace conference to decide at the end of the war. The only real problems which exist today between Moscow and the Polish Government in exile are the question of personalities in the new government, the legality of such a government from the international point of view and the administration of the liberated territories once they cease to be a war zone. Whether Stalin is disposed to make these concessions to the Polish Government in exile and to his two major allies is a matter of conjecture.

High officials in the State Department are optimistic about the prospects of the discussions between the two premiers. They point out that unless Stalin has decided to make some concession he would have persisted in his refusal to receive Mikolajczyk. All previous American and British attempts to arrange a heart-to-heart talk between them had failed. It is probable that the Russian Premier may have mellowed, on the surface at least, toward the government in exile with which he abruptly broke relations 18 months ago.

Mikolajczyk himself is a realist. He understands fully that unless he goes a long way in meeting Russia's terms he will be abandoned by the United States and Great Britain. But while he is reported to be willing to yield to almost everything asked of him in Moscow he is stubborn enough to refuse to sign any agreement which would make his country a mere dependency of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. He is aware that the future of Poland will be closely linked to Russia, but he is endeavoring to obtain at least a nominal recognition of Poland's sovereignty.

Inadequacy of State Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8, 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "State Jobless Pay Called Inadequate," published in the Washington Post of today, and containing an interview with Arthur J. Altmeyer, chairman of the Social Security Board.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE JOBLESS PAY CALLED INADEQUATE—SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD'S CHAIRMAN SEES PLANS FALLING SHORT OF RECONVERSION NEED

Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, has filed a report with War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes, indicating that State unemployment compensation systems will be unable to protect the Nation against widespread reconversion unemployment.

This report has assumed considerable significance in view of congressional consideration of proposals to supplement State unemployment benefits with Federal funds.

One high administration official who asked that his name be withheld emphasized yesterday that adequate provision must be made for unemployment compensation if workers are to be kept on war jobs until the war ends. At present officials are moving cautiously with reconversion planning to avoid stimulating a flight of workers from war jobs.

DEFECTS ARE CITED

Defects in State insurance systems listed by Altmeyer included—

Limited duration of benefits—28 States provided maximum benefits of 16 weeks or less, as of January this year.

Low maximum weekly benefit amounts—22 States limit the maximum weekly benefit to $15.

Limited coverage—only 13 States cover employers of 1 or more employees. Others exempt small employers. About 2,000,000 workers in Government arsenals, depots, and navy yards, and merchant seamen are not covered.

Unduly restrictive disqualifications.

"SPREAD" TOO NARROW

Failure to distribute the excessive financial burdens of reconversion unemployment over the entire country. Some States will exhaust their reserve to get by the reconversion period, while two to three and five-tenths billion dollars of other reserves may be untouched in the hands of other States.

"The most serious inadequacy of State unemployment compensation laws," Altmeyer said, "is the limited period during which benefits can be drawn.

"In some States, an unemployed person can draw only 2 or 3 weeks of benefits. Even in the rather good year 1941, for the country as a whole, one-half of all claimants were still unemployed when they had exhausted their benefit rights.

"In 36 States, over 40 percent of the beneficiaries used up all their benefits; in 3 States, over 60 percent exhausted all rights. Many workers remained unemployed for long periods after exhausting their benefits."

One proposal before Congress is to provide Federal aid to extend emergency benefits up to $35 a week until 2 years after the end of the war.

"The average weekly benefits of about $12.60 for 1942 and $13.80 for 1943 was only about one-third of the average weekly wage," Altmeyer said. "Thirty-two States pay higher rate for accident compensation than for unemployment compensation."

Benefits are often inadequate in States which have accumulated large reserves, Altmeyer said.

Oregon's reserve fund at the end of 1943 was large enough to pay benefits to 85 percent of employed workers, he said. North Carolina's reserve is large enough to pay benefits to 88 percent of employed workers, yet the average weekly benefit in 1943 was only $7.10—lowest for any State.

Present reserves total $5,000,000,000, enough to provide $20 a week for 20 weeks to 12,500,000 workers if they were in a national pool, Altmeyer indicated. Divided as they are among the States a pattern of poverty and plenty is presented.

7 PERCENT COVERAGE

He cited research indicating that only 7 percent of the actual wage loss through unemployment in 1940 was covered by benefits. It was estimated that the States, under present regulations, would be unable to underwrite more than 10 percent of the anticipated reconversion unemployment loss.

"It does not seem possible that in the remaining time before the war ends, most State unemployment compensation laws will be sufficiently extended and improved to intensify sufficiently the degree of protection against widespread unemployment," Altmeyer said. "The search for a solution to the problem must, therefore, proceed in other directions."

Article by David Lawrence on Misuse of Statements Made by President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8, 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "Political Tricks Seen as Spur to Isolationism," published in yesterday evening's Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL TRICK SEEN AS SPUR TO ISOLATIONISM—WRITER WARNS OF HALF-QUOTES FROM ROOSEVELT SPEECHES

(By David Lawrence)

Sometimes arguments made in the midst of a political campaign have an effect long after the election, and the danger today is that isolationism in America may be stimulated in the post-war years because of misrepresentation concerning the facts leading up to America's entry into this war.

Already it is apparent that even Republicans who are international minded are making the mistake of thinking they can get votes for Governor Dewey by citing President Roosevelt's promises made in 1940 to keep the United States out of the war.

Reference is being made frequently to speeches of Mr. Roosevelt, but in selecting quotations the stump speakers of the Republican Party ignore the fact that the President's main point always was that he would not send American boys abroad "except in case of attack," or that he would not favor American participation in any war that was a "foreign war" and hence did not concern directly the interests of the United States.

It is well known that Mr. Roosevelt in 1940 hoped that Hitler would not be so stupid as to provoke the United States, and that America by supplying airplanes and munitions of war, and taking all steps "short of war" could keep the European war from reaching the United States and becoming an American war instead of a "foreign war."

OFFICIAL TEXT OF STATEMENTS

The European war ceased to be a foreign war when the territory of the United States was attacked by Japan on December 7, 1941, and when Italy and Germany thereupon declared war on the United States. In the interests of fairness all the quotations from the President's campaign speeches in 1940 that bear in any way on the subject are given here as taken from the official text:

"WASHINGTON, September 11, 1940.—I hate war, now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all that I can to keep war away from these shores for all time. I stand, with my party, and outside of my party as President of all the people, on the platform, the wording that was adopted in Chicago less than two months ago. It said: 'We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.'"

DAYTON, Ohio, October 12, 1940.—When we speak of defending this Western Hemisphere, we are speaking not only of North, Central, and South America and the immediately adjacent islands. We include the right to the peaceful use of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. That has been our traditional policy. • • •

"We are building a total defense on land and sea and in the air, sufficient to repel total attack from any part of the world. Forewarned by the deliberate attacks of the dictators upon free peoples, the United States, for the first time in its history, has undertaken the mustering of its men in peacetime. Unprecedented dangers have caused the United States to undertake the building of a navy and an air force sufficient to defend all the coasts of the Americas from any combination of hostile powers."

"PHILADELPHIA, October 23, 1940.—To Republicans and Democrats, to every man, woman and child in the Nation I say—your President and your great Secretary of State are following the road to peace.

"PLATFORM OF OUR PARTY

"We are arming ouselves not for any foreign war. We are arming ourselves not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: 'We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands cutside of the Americas, except in case of attack.'"

"BOSTON, October 30, 1940.—I give you one more assurance, I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores. The purpose of our defense is defense."

"HARTFORD, October 30, 1940.—The result of that effort is to make the United States strong enough in order to defend itself from attack from the outside. And you know, too, that we aim to defend only against an attack from the outside."

"BROOKLYN, November 1, 1940.—I am fighting to keep this Nation prosperous and at peace. I am fighting to keep our people out of foreign wars and to keep foreign conceptions of government out of our United States."

Italy's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8, 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an inspiring and very worth-while poem entitled "Italy's Independence Day," written by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITALY'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

The identical banner that happened to fly
In the front of the Capitol Dome
Was the one that was flown, on the Fourth of July,
In Nineteen Forty-four, over Rome.
This was her Independence Day, as it was ours
Back when we threw off bondage's yoke,
And stood forth, fortified by our God-given pow'rs,
That grew stronger with every wise stroke.

Underneath this same flag that flew from near the base
Of our National Capitol's Dome,
When our Congress declared, with distress in her face,
War on Tokyo, Berlin, and Rome,
The surrendered Italians triumphantly sang
Forth the praise of the Stripes and the Stars,
From the balcony where Mussolini's words rang
Once "with war and with rumors of wars."

Freedom's flag is the ensign of peace, not of war—
And will fly after war-flags collapse—
Yet, Americans have an inspired hatred for
The unmerciful Germans and Japs,
And will never again let their leaders wage wars,
And lay waste peaceful nations' domains,
And endanger the land of the Stripes and the Stars,
Over which still the Prince of Peace reigns.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

The American Ideal: The Common Denominator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address on the subject The American Ideal—The Common Denominator, which I delivered in Milwaukee on Sunday, August 6, 1944, before a group of Americans of Slovakian descent.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, in Wisconsin, and in many sections of our land, Americans of Slovak origin constitute an important, highly respected, and very patriotic element of our citizenship.

At the outset of these remarks, permit me to extend my sincere respects to this group—and to other Americans of Slovak descent—or Americans from any other blood stream—for their deep loyalty to the Government of the United States.

Certainly the national Slovak groups have always had an abiding faith in the American cause, and throughout the war have done everything possible to further the war effort.

In the roll calls of our fighting men—in Normandy or on Saipan, or wherever we fight—there are many names whose origin was in the northern counties of Hungary or from lower Austria or from Moravia or from the Jablunka Mountains or from Silesia or from Galicia or from the Little Russia's boundary.

In this war—and in the history of our land—many Americans of Slovak descent have written glowing pages of outstanding achievement.

The Americans who came from the lands of the Slovaks—or whose fathers came from the lands of the Slovaks—as a natural heritage have an inbred understanding of the value of freedom.

For many years the Slovak nationality was suppressed in the lands of your forefathers. There was a time when the Slovaks of Europe in one area at least were denied the right to use their language in church and school, and the result of that was a large emigration to America.

With this background of suppression, we can readily understand why the American of Slovak descent cherishes our American ideals so fervently.

Despite a European background of many troubled years, the Slovaks are fundamentally a peaceful race, a race of people fond of music and song.

Early in this great war, many Slovak groups sent resolutions to Washington consecrating every effort as a part of the united war effort.

Early in this war Slovak groups pledged wholehearted and unconditional support to protect the American ideals of right and humanity.

In September of 1942 a number of Slovak groups met in Pittsburgh, and in their resolutions they referred to the rulers of Slovakia which was separated from the Republic of Czechoslovakia in March of 1939 after the Pact of Munich. The resolutions referred to the alliance of the rulers of Slovakia to Nazi Germany.

Our Americans of Slovak ancestry pointed out that the people of Slovakia, as lovers of democracy by inheritance, could not be in accord with the unholy alliance of their rulers and Nazi Germany.

In the dark and turbulent hours of this alliance, the people of Slovakia were shackled by Nazi might and terror. But Americans of Slovak descent continued to believe that any nationality "no matter how small, has a right to its own nationhood." And consequently, Americans of Slovak descent felt in voicing their own patriotic convictions that they were also voicing the convictions of their Hitler-enslaved Slovak brethren across the Atlantic.

Americans of Slovak descent have condemned the betrayers and the murderers of the Slovak people who declared war on the United States of America—a liberty-consecrated land which gave asylum to all Slovaks who for the last half century have desired to escape European oppression, the oppression of almost a thousand years.

Fellow Americans—we know that the Hitler horde by ruthless tactics of treachery, rape, and robbery have reduced many peoples to serfdom. In this land Americans of many bloodstreams have watched closely the oppression and the slavery visited on the lands of their fathers.

All of these Americans know that liberty and freedom are a priceless heritage which must be defended at any cost.

Americans of Slovak descent realize also that their forefathers came from an area where there were many related but divided nationalities. That is one reason why Americans of Slovak descent are so keenly conscious of the priceless value of unity in this land of ours.

It is not my purpose today to talk of the many European problems and particularly the many problems in the lands of your forefathers.

We are all concerned first of all with the problems of this land, because we realize that without a strong America, freedom may be menaced in many lands.

The subject of my talk today is "The American Ideal—the Common Denominator."

In other words, let us talk briefly of the common thread which runs through all Americans.

Americans are not all alike in terms of material things.

Some of us are rich; some of us are poor. Some of us are farmers; some of us are laboring men. Some of us are office workers; some of us are lawyers or doctors. Some of us have been educated for many years; and some of us have only the education of the little red schoolhouse.

Some of us live in sections where there are tall mountains, and some of us live in the part of the country where there are many lakes. Some of us live along the fertile Mississippi, and some of us live in the broad wheat fields of Kansas. Some of us live in the shadows of great forests. Some of us live in the Badlands; some of us live in deserts. And some of us live where we can look to the sea.

Some of us are Catholics; some of us are Protestants; some of us are Jews; and some of us are Gentiles. Some of us are white and some of us are black. And there are some Americans who have red skins or yellow skins.

But, my friends, we are all Americans.

If we are all so different—if we have such differing ancestries, so many blood streams, such varying geographic backgrounds, and so many physical differences—what is it that makes us all Americans?

My friends, there are many things which make us all Americans.

More than a century and a half ago men fought and died that you and I might be Americans. They left us certain great charters of human liberty. They left us the Bill of Rights. They left us the Declaration of Independence. They left us the Constitution. They left us with freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press, the right to a trial by jury, government by the consent of the governed.

They left us with a permanent love for liberty, and they left us with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

These are the things which each of us has whether we be rich or poor, black or white. This is the common thread. Our liberties, our rights, and our duties—these are all part of our common heritage, and that heritage, we can perhaps refer to as the American ideal.

One force which has given strength to our land has been the fact that we have always been a haven and a refuge for the oppressed. Because we have been such a sanctuary, men and women from many lands and many blood streams have settled here. And if you will pardon a personal reference, I might add that my own parents were immigrants from Norway.

These people of many blood streams added to the vigor of our land. They added something to our culture and to our character, and they fused with the people of this country so that we became one mighty, united people.

We are a united people today. We still share that common American ideal. Our only allegiance to this land and only hope for the future freedom in this country or for the future freedom in any country lies in the victory of the United Nations.

It is possible that other lands can find their inspiration and their route to peace from the example of the American people. If the peoples of other lands can submerge their racial differences in one common ideal of freedom, then they, too, can look forward to

a peaceful horizon where men may have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

You people know the mistakes that have been made in the Old World—mistakes that have been made for a thousand years—mistakes that are still being made.

Our job is to see that those mistakes shall never be made in this land—and our job is to help so that they shall not be made again in other lands.

We must always fight against bigotry and intolerance. We must always fight against oppression—political oppression, social oppression, or economic oppression—and above all, we must forever keep aflame the American ideal and what it means to us. As a part of that job, we must also do everything in our power to insure that in the future it will never again be possible for bad men or bad ideals or bad government to run amuck throughout the world.

Editorials Advocating the Reelection of Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is with some considerable satisfaction that I have recently read several editorials from newspapers in the great State of Illinois, some of them Republican, I am informed, endorsing and advocating the reelection to the Senate of the United States of our Democratic colleague, Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun of August 3, 1944]

REPUBLICANS FOR LUCAS

Formation of strong independent committees for Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, both downstate and in Chicago, demonstrates wide support for the Senator among what might be called normally Republican circles.

Thoughtful Republicans have good reason to advocate Senator LUCAS' reelection. His opponent, Richard J. Lyons, is a perennial office seeker with no distinction save the extent of his ignorance on foreign affairs, and no promise save that of an obedient errand boy for the Tribune.

Mr. Lyons won nomination by the brute power of Governor Green's State machine, which put him over as ordered, to reward him for being a good boy and not trying to unseat Senator Brooks in 1942. As an isolationist and a narrow nationalist, he does not represent the foreign-policy views of the party's rank and file. Yet, once in the Senate, he would unquestionably attempt to wreck cooperative peace settlements.

Wise Republicans know that would be good for neither the Nation nor the future of the Republican Party. They know that the best way to break the grip on their party of a little band of die-hard nationalists is to defeat Mr. Lyons. That is why there were 142,000 Republican votes against him in the primary, and why there will be many more against him in November.

[From the Quincy Herald-Whig of July 31, 1944]

REPUBLICANS FOR LUCAS

A dispatch in Sunday's papers told of the Republicans-for-Lucas League which has been formed in this State and which is made up of some of the most prominent Republican businessmen of the State. There will be clubs of this kind arise all over Illinois. The first reason is that SCOTT LUCAS has been the kind of a Senator that Illinois has needed. He has been right on foreign problems at all times and has been discriminating in the kind of support he has given administration domestic measures, displaying an independence that has been more than encouraging in these days. The second reason is that the comparison between the two candidates is so striking that Republicans are quick to see the difference.

SCOTT LUCAS will appeal to great numbers of voters this year who appreciate keeping able men in the Senate. Quincy businessmen who are Republicans would do well to become affiliated with the Republicans-for-Lucas organization, throughout the State.

[From the Chicago Daily News of August 5, 1944]

INDEPENDENTS' OPPORTUNITY

Formation both downstate and in Cook County of bipartisan organizations to support the candidacy of SCOTT W. LUCAS for reelection to the United States Senate, is a commendable and encouraging manifestation. This presidential year it is evident that both major parties are split. It is to be hoped that this will result in more party members joining the ranks of the independent voters and splitting their tickets. Neither party has a monopoly on able men nor sound principles of government. The intelligent voter will vote for men in whom he has confidence and for principles in which he believes, regardless of party labels. SCOTT LUCAS, on his record, merits reelection. In the words of A. A. Sprague, chairman of the Businessmen's League for Lucas:

"It is unthinkable * * * that our State, with its great traditions, should be represented in the United States Senate by a man of the type of Senator LUCAS' opponent."

[From the Illinois State Register of July 31, 1944]

REPUBLICANS FOR LUCAS

There is a favorable augury in the formation in Springfield Saturday of a Republicans-for-Lucas League headed by such men of independent thought and action as Otto Beich, Bloomington candy manufacturer; George W. Barrette, editor of the Republican Peoria Journal-Transcript; and Dr. A. F. Barnett, surgeon, of West Frankfort.

Headquarters are to be established in Hotel Abraham Lincoln in Springfield, and the organization extended into every congressional district in the State.

We say this augurs well because it indicates independent thinking. We are in the midst of a cataclysmic war. Victory seems at hand as an approach to peace. The problems confronting the Nation and the world are as vast as the war itself.

Senator Lucas has a record of long and constructive service in Congress. He has disagreed with the President on some domestic policies. He has done much independent thinking and voting. He was a stalwart supporter of the program of preparedness for war when some opportunists in both parties were wavering—when isolationists were blind to the inevitable.

The senior Illinois Senator not only stood firm against the HAMILTON FISH type of hate-spreaders, and powerful groups which failed to see the approach of war until the crash came at Pearl Harbor, but he led the fight for votes for soldiers. He fought consistently to safeguard the Nation and its fighting forces.

The Republicans-for-Lucas League will become an important factor in the approaching campaign. It will encourage independent voting which is one of the essentials of this critical period when the future of the world hangs in the balance.

Congress Should Be on the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an excellent editorial entitled "Congress Should Be on the Job," published a few days ago in the Kansas City Times. I am heartily in sympathy with the sentiments expressed therein. This statement comes from one of the ablest editors of the West, and I think reflects the overwhelming sentiment of the people of that section of the country. They believe that the problems now before the Congress are of the highest importance, and feel it is a time when the Members of Congress should stay on the job. I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD BE ON THE JOB

The excuse for futher congressional inactivity, after a recess extending over a period of more than 5 weeks, is that important bills having to do with various phases of reconversion are not ready for action. If not, where does the responsibility lie except with the majority in Congress which controls all committees? The bills were supposed to be made ready in the recess period of 5 weeks so that Congress could reconvene this week and go right on with its work.

Instead of that, Majority Leader MCCORMACK, of the House, criticizes Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, for urging a resumption of congressional work on the ground that the war in Europe might end sooner than expected and preparation for such an event should be made. Mr. MCCORMACK says, "This is not the time for responsible political leaders to build up an expectation of an early return to the ways of peace," but "it is rather the time to inspire a grim determination to go forward and win the war."

And how could Congress do its part in going forward and winning the war? By loafing on the job, staying at home and mending political fences, or by getting back to work? Even Majority Leader MCCORMACK would agree that staying on the job is what war workers and everybody else at home should do. Is Congress exempt?

River and Harbor Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, New Orleans, La., on July 27, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No other organization to my knowledge has exercised a greater influence on the field in which it serves than the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Its long record of service reflects vision, sound judgment and unselfish devotion to the development of our Nation's waterway possibilities. I have attended many of its annual and special meetings and have observed with interest the discussions and deliberations that have taken place relating to proposed projects. Initiated by its resolutions and supported by its subsequent activities, outstanding additions to our national waterway program have been enacted into law.

Responding to the desires and wishes of the administration with respect to the use of transportation facilities, you have made it your business to avoid meeting in convention for over 2 years. And in keeping with good judgment and common sense, it has been your announced policy to defer nonmilitary construction for the duration.

The purposes, as outlined by President Short in his official call for this special session, are representative of the constructive thinking that has always guided your studies and actions. I am delighted to be with you again—particularly here in New Orleans where the importance of flood control and waterway improvements have long been appreciated.

Twice before during my service as Chief of Engineers, it has been my pleasure to address your meetings. The first time was at Miami, a scant month before this country's declaration of war in 1941. There we recognized that the times, even then, were laden with grave responsibilities. To preserve the democratic processes of this Republic, under our Constitution, we saw the necessity of presenting a united, determined effort against the totalitarian flood that threatened to engulf the entire world.

Never in human history has there been a darker chapter than that which followed during the next few months after your Miami meeting. The Axis fortunes were at high tide. With most of western Europe at his mercy. Hitler drove his powerful forces east and south in a series of lightning advances. Although they exacted a heavy price for every foot of ground they yielded, the dauntless Russians were pressed back toward Moscow and Stalingrad. In north Africa the Nazi armored forces rolled on toward Egypt. Japanese aggression spread octopuslike to the Aleutians, to the islands of the Central and South Pacific, and to the very doorway of Australia. They took Hong Kong, Singapore, Batavia, and Rangoon.

Had the two Axis partners been successful in joining hands in the Near or Middle East, the hopes of man for generations to come might have been blasted.

When we met at Chicago in May of 1942 a grave situation confronted the world. As a nation, in joint efforts with our allies, we were seeking desperately to stem the flood-tide of Axis might. We were deploying all available men and equipment to this end. We were establishing supply lines to our troops overseas and to the other United Nations. In every possible way we were rushing preparations to meet the surge of power which the enemy had developed over a period of a decade. Against that background we examined, at your Chicago meeting, our great inland-waterway system, and found it ready for a heavy responsibility in the full development of American striking power.

The oceans that had long been considered as protection against attack from other countries presented a major problem. To bring our striking power effectively against the Germans and the Japanese, we had to engage in the greatest overseas military operations the world has ever known.

The magnitude and efficiency with which these operations have been carried out are a tribute to our Navy, to our Coast Guard, to our merchant marine, and to others who have kept the supply lines open and flowing. This record is also a tribute to the wisdom and foresight of those who provided for improving our transportation outlets to the overseas world—of those who provided our inland waterways that are carrying raw materials and fuel to production centers and finished products to our coastal ports. This inland-waterway system—fostered over the years by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress—has relieved other forms of transportation of a war shipping burden that might well have caused them to break down at the most critical time in our history.

Our national transportation system has functioned with credit to all its components. The railroads have established a grand record in pressing to the very limits of their capacity the movements of troops and war goods. The trucking industry, carrying on in the face of fuel and equipment shortages, has maintained a vitally essential service. A network of pipe lines has supplemented other transport in the movement of liquid fuels, and the aviation industry has come of age in a way that forecasts its profound influence on future commerce.

Equally spectacular has been the performance of our inland waterways. Their history of past performance and their record of present service are your inspiration and encouragement to press forward with determination in the cause for which you have long supplied leadership. Our inland waterways accommodated steadily increasing tonnages throughout the so-called depression years, and with the outbreak of war, they were ready to adapt themselves to the sudden heavy increases in war shipments.

The shipping requirements of World War No. 1 have been dwarfed by the tonnages now moving to the battle fronts. In May of this year, almost 4,000,000 measurement tons of Army cargo moved overseas. The peak tonnage in the last war was in November 1918, when we shipped less than 1,000,000 tons.

The overseas movement of war cargo is but the end product of a whole chain of freight movement in this country—raw materials and fuel to processing plants, components to assembly plants, and completed units to depots and ports. The increases in our inland waterway shipping have been correspondingly great. The channels of the Great Lakes are carrying far more tonnage than during the last war. The Mississippi River system last year handled over 3 times as much tonnage as it did in 1917, and similar increases are evident on other rivers and waterways.

But we were ready to accommodate these increases. The work of improving and extending our waterways has gone steadily forward. Since 1918 we have made substantial investments in these developments. We have spent a quarter of a billion dollars improving our major coastal harbors, over a hundred million dollars on our intracoastal waterways, and an equal amount on the channels of the Great Lakes. Navigation investments as a whole in our rivers, harbors, and other waterways since the last war amount to more than three-quarters of a billion dollars. Savings in transportation costs during peacetimes justify these investments, but of timely significance is the fact that they have been our insurance against transportation break-down in war.

Our inland waterways have also enabled the shipbuilding industry to move much of its production to interior points, to areas adjacent to supplies of materials and manpower. Flood-control works have given protection to important industrial and agricultural production areas. Commerce and industry have been freed from many of the costly disruptions caused by floods. Hydroelectric power, generated in connection with certain of our waterway developments, is serving war plants and other military installations.

There is an incidental benefit to the Nation from river and harbor and flood-control works. It has been demonstrated beyond any question of a doubt that the actual experience during peacetime of supervising large construction projects has made the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers well nigh indispensable in preparing engineer officers for the emergencies of war. Our process of developing engineer officers on civil works in years of peace has paid dividends in developing officers for their assigned tasks in modern war—tasks that call for every extreme in the planning, engineering, and construction of military works both at home and in the active theaters of war.

The results thus far speak for themselves. Whether we measure them in terms of equipment, methods or leadership, the test of the present war has demonstrated the superiority of American engineering. This war has become man's greatest construction job. It has called for vast production and training facilities; for airfields by the hundreds, both at home and abroad; for ports and roads and railroads and bridges; for pipe lines, storage tanks, hospitals, warehouses and shops.

It was no accident that the American Army was the first in the world to adopt heavy construction equipment as standard troop issue. The Corps of Engineers, by vitue of its varied experience on civil works, knew well the value and the potentialities of such equipment. It took such equipment to give flood protection to the lower Mississippi valley, to build the Fort Peck and Denison Dams, and to prosecute other major construction. It takes such equipment, as well, to handle the construction requirements of modern war.

Planning for new waterway projects and the continued maintenance of existing projects are primary objectives of this meeting. Since sound national policies have been developed over a period of more than a hundred years, you have a foundation upon which to proceed. These national policies have been constructively established and should be securely and religiously maintained. In spite of the greatest military responsibility of all times, we of the Corps of Engineers have been able, within certain limitations, to continue our program of planning, designing and engineering of worthwhile waterway projects. However, this class of work, I am sure you will agree, should continue only when and where it does not interfere with the war effort. In fact, there is no other answer—our war effort comes first in everything.

As a result of our pre-war investigations and planning, and that which we have been able to accomplish during the war, we now have a

potential backlog of beneficial Federal improvements in the interests of navigation, flood control and other water uses totaling some $4,600,000,000. These projects are widely disseminated among our important river basins and among our States. They are geared to the fullest ultimate use of our rivers. For navigation, they include dam and lock construction, dredging and rock excavation, river regulation works, and revetment and breakwater construction. For flood control, they include reservoirs, flood walls, levees, diversion channels, channel improvements and related works.

When conditions of manpower and materials again permit, these projects can be placed under way and prosecuted as rapidly as the Congress may direct. There will be no delays for the preparation of plans and specifications.

These improvements for the national welfare will be carried out in the same systematic way that our flood control and navigation works of the past have been carried out. The several Federal agencies involved in the development of comprehensive plans for our river basins work in cordial and effective cooperation. While misunderstandings and differences of opinion arise from time to time, the end result is always the same—mutual respect and thorough coordination. Any failure along these lines exists only in the minds of selfish pressure groups who seek to gain their own narrow ends by trying to excite a rivalry which does not exist.

While we are fighting this war to perpetuate the right to plan and to work for the greatest good to the greatest number of people, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should rededicate itself to the challenge that still lies in the wealth of our water resources—to control destructive floods, to accommodate our rivers and other waterways to the expansion of commerce yet to come, and to build into our river basins the other benefits that can come only from well-conceived and well-executed comprehensive plans. It is well enough to dream and to scheme, but at the same time, we must keep our feet planted firmly on the solid ground of reality. We must maintain the perspective to see clearly ahead for 10, 20, and perhaps 50 years, but always we must preserve the judgment to plan valid and logical steps toward the attainment of long-range goals.

Through our Federal legislative procedures, proposed improvements for navigation and flood control have always been investigated and reported upon by direction of the people; they have been authorized for construction by and with the advice and consent of the people, and they have been prosecuted to completion, maintained and operated with funds appropriated and expended with full knowledge and understanding by the people. It rests with these same people—the people of the Nation—to see that this democratic and thoroughly proven process is never tampered with and that it is kept everlastingly on the beam. You who are here today, together with your Nation-wide memberships, are on the lookout bridge of this ship of democracy and you can do much to keep it on its charted course.

Out of the struggles and sacrifices of this war, we are finding a new breadth of vision, a new strength, and a new courage. We have always worked for progress like civilized human beings. But in certain other countries, there are those who are intent upon bringing us all down to their level of barbarism. Until this danger is removed we must fight with unity and a singleness of purpose.

With every hope of the future still at stake, there is no place for piecemeal efforts—no time to jeopardize victory by faltering when the initiative is at last ours. The glorious traditions of America are being rewritten with new brilliance by our fighting forces along the war-torn and bloody roads to Berlin and Tokyo, and by those at home who support their efforts. When and where this awful strife will end, no one can know. The armies of Hitler and relegated Tojo are still strong and well equipped. We of the Allied Nations must remain prepared for long months of struggle and sacrifice. The price is too great to gamble with victory.

The total defeat of those who seek to spread their savage doctrine by subtle propaganda and by force of arms must be achieved before security can be restored to the world. Then, and then only, can we resume the full scope of our peacetime works for the benefit of man.

An Appeal to Governor Dewey on the Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an item which appeared in this morning's New York Times entitled "An Appeal to Governor Dewey on the Soldier Vote."

This article, which is apparently a paid item submitted by Republican, Democratic, and independent voters of an organization known as the Citizens' Nonpartisan Committee for the Serviceman's Vote, impresses me because it very definitely and succinctly explains the unfair deal being accorded New Yorkers in the armed forces as well as those serving in the merchant marine, Red Cross, and U. S. O., who will not be permitted to exercise their right of suffrage next November. It clearly lays the responsibility for this shameful situation at the door of Governor Dewey who has arbitrarily refused to reconsider the Republican legislation that he approved only a few months ago and which, in effect, bars men willing to sacrifice their lives upon the altar of their country from casting their vote in our coming national election. The article follows:

AN APPEAL TO GOVERNOR DEWEY ON THE SOLDIER VOTE

Governor Dewey: Recently you issued a statement to the press.

In your statement you said:

"The New York soldier-vote law is a model of simplicity."

Why, then, Mr. Governor, have only 130,000 applications for war ballots been received—and these are your own figures—when 900,000 New York State servicemen are eligible to vote? Compare this with Pennsylvania, where, under a Republican administration but a simpler soldier-vote law, more than 450,000 servicemen have already applied, out of an eligible 500,000.

If the law is so simple, why, Mr. Governor, did William T. Simpson, your own appointee, as head of the State war ballot commission, declare that he expected no more than 250,000 New York State servicemen to vote?

Mr. Simpson's doubts were very well founded for the following reasons: In Pennsylvania, for example, any friend or relative can have a ballot sent to a serviceman, but in New York the serviceman must apply in writing himself. Imagine, Mr. Governor, the men in the fox holes of Normandy and the steaming jungles of the southern Pacific taking time out to study the complicated New York law and writing to Albany for a ballot. The soldier's first job is to fight; it is your job and ours to find a simple method whereby he may vote.

Remember, Mr. Governor, that last year your attorney general permitted ballots to be sent to men overseas without their sending in applications for them. But what was considered constitutional a year ago has suddenly become unconstitutional in 1944—and now only the soldier himself can apply. Why did this happen, Mr. Governor? Isn't the willingness to die for his country application enough for any soldier?

And if the soldier does apply, Mr. Governor, what guaranty have we that his vote will be received by November 3? Why do we require the serviceman's vote to be in before the civilian vote—4 days before election day? In 1942 and 1943, ballots from servicemen overseas were counted if received by December 10.

Examine the red tape involved in the voting procedure, Mr. Governor.

First, the soldier must apply in person for a ballot.

Then, but not until September 7, the ballot must be sent to the soldier.

If the ballot reaches the soldier, he returns it to the State war ballot commission.

Then the State sends it to the county.

Then the county sends it to the assembly district and the election district—and all this incredible process must be accomplished within 57 days.

Governor Dewey, do you really believe this to be a simple law?

In your statement, Mr. Governor, you said: "A group has been playing partisan politics with the right of New York State's fighting men to vote."

But, Mr. Governor, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Citizens' Union, and many other publications and civic organizations have objected to the complexity of this law. Surely, they cannot all be accused of partisan motives.

Mr. Governor, why not remove, once and for all, the whole issue from politics. This can be done by simplifying the law and making it as easy as in Pennsylvania, for example, for the soldier to vote. You can do this by permitting anyone to apply for ballots to be sent to servicemen, by extending the time limit for receiving ballots, and by broadening the law to include merchant marine, the U. S. O., and Red Cross workers. If you think these changes can only be accomplished by a special session of the State legislature, we urge you to convene one immediately.

This is not a partisan appeal, Mr. Governer. There are Republicans, Democrats, and independent voters on our committee. We ask only that men willing to die for their country be allowed to vote in its next election. We beg you—simplify the soldier vote law and make certain that all New York servicemen will be able to vote.

CITIZENS' NONPARTISAN COMMITTEE
FOR THE SERVICEMAN'S VOTE.

A Hero of the Beachheads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, when the history of World War No. 2 is written the achievements of a modest 20-year-

old Coast Guard man of Indianapolis will shine with undying luster.

On three occasions, twice at Salerno last September, and again on D-day at Normandy, this young man, who is an expert swimmer, carried a life line from landing craft to the beachhead in the face of withering fire that brought death to all around him.

His deeds were of a quality that a master of literature like Milton or Shakespeare might immortalize in an epic of the battle fronts.

Gene E. Oxley is the name of this returning, soft-speaking youth. Gene is the name by which he is known among the boys and girls of the Broad Ripple section of Indianapolis where he grew up.

Notwithstanding the extremely perilous nature of his exploits in the theaters of war, Gene did not receive a scratch.

After being feted for several days in Washington as one of the outstanding heroes of the war, he left today for Indianapolis to visit his mother whom he has not seen for over 2 years.

A vivid description of Oxley's valorous conduct on D-day is contained in the following press release issued by the Public Relations Office of the Coast Guard:

INDIANAPOLIS COAST GUARD MAN HAS THREE SHIPS SHOT OUT FROM HIM—LOSES ONLY SEAT OF HIS PANTS

AT A SURVIVOR BASE IN SOUTHERN ENGLAND, June 25.—How a 20-year-old Coast Guard man, Gene Oxley, R. R. No. 16, Indianapolis, Ind., voluntarily swam ashore in the face of heavy German .88s and machine-gun fire to secure a lifeline to the beachhead and subsequently lost the seat of his pants and three ships, was disclosed here today.

On D-day, Oxley's ship, a Coast Guard LCI, nosed her way toward the beach with a load of soldiers. While still some yards off the shore and in the midst of unexploded mines, she was stopped dead by six hits from German .88 shore batteries. Oxley volunteered to swim ashore with a man rope, so that the soldiers could pull themselves into the beachhead.

"I swam the line ashore while machine-gun bullets were dropping around me like rain," Oxley related. "I stood on the shore holding the man rope. As four soldiers were coming down the ramp an .88 shell blew the ramp away. From then on, 36 soldiers came over the side.

"They started pulling themselves toward the shore through the withering fire. Only six made it."

The ship's stern anchor winch was knocked out by shell fire and she began to drift. German batteries, firing at point-blank range, put shells through the wheel house, chewing the clothes off Chief Quartermaster Charles O. McWhirter, Dallas, Tex. The vessel, blown to a shambles, sank a short time later.

Oxley left on the beach, dug a foxhole along with the surviving soldiers. The beachhead at that point was only about 15 yards deep.

"The tide came in," Oxley said, "and forced us out of our shallow foxholes. It pushed us too high and Nazi snipers got some of the soldiers.

"I had to crawl on my belly," Oxley continued, "and then run for it. When I first jumped out of the hole, they started spraying machine-gun fire at me.

"I finally got aboard an LCI and they started firing at it." The Coast Guard craft, already suffering from several shell hits, put out for another load of troops with Oxley aboard.

The LCI took on her cargo of troops and threaded her way back to the beachhead through unexploded "teller" mines. Oxley, who had already survived two sinking vessels, said to a crewman of the craft, "I think I'm a jinx!"

Just then the Germans got the range again. The Nazi batteries whizzed two through the wheel house, landed two on the starboard box, put a shell in the troop officers' quarters, and riddled the port side with 155 millimeter shells.

By that time Oxley had left the craft and was on the beach again surrounded with German fire.

"I lay there in a foxhole from 3 p. m. to 5:45 p. m. It was hell! Dead soldiers were all over the beach. The destroyer U. S. S. *Doyle* was sent in to pick us up but she couldn't take us all. I waited till the last trip.

"The back of my trousers was shot off sometime while I was running on the beach," Oxley remarked.

"I was pretty scared, but I guess that was natural. I stayed over in France 3 days and sweated out the air raids. When I got back to England I found the guys all thought I was dead. I guess I was just lucky."

Win the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the June 22 issue of The Progressive Labor World, published in Philadelphia, carries a lyric poem by James Patrick McGovern which is so timely and inspirational as to be worthy of a musical setting by one of our Nation's great composers. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The verses are as follows:

WIN THE WAR

Win the war,
There's nothing comes before;
Win, win, win the war.
This vital call rings clarion-clear
To all who have the will to hear,
To all who hold their country dear;
To every woman, child, and man,
To every American—
Win the war.

Win the war,
There's nothing comes before;
Win, win, win the war.
This goal transcends all civil strife,
Now that the need is doubly rife,
Now that the millions fight for life;
So let each woman, child, and man,
Let every American—
Win the war.

Win the war,
There's nothing comes before;
Win, win, win the war.
The soldier fights where hell holds sway,
He bleeds through twice 12 hours a day,
He dies with duty his aim and pay;
Then have each woman, child, and man,
Have every American—
Win the war.

Win the war,
There's nothing comes before;
Win, win, win the war.
The fronts abroad and home are one,
A shot may mean we've lost or won.
Whate'er your part be sure it's well done;
Then may each woman, child, and man,
May every American—
Win the war.

Win the war,
There's nothing comes before;
Win, win, win the war.
The slacker smites at each one's breast,
He serves himself who serves the rest,
The country of all, by all be blessed;
So must each woman, child, and man,
Must every American—
Win the war.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Letter From Technical Sgt. John H. Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Technical Sgt. John H. Hill, Company E, Eighteenth Infantry, First Division.

Technical Sergeant Hill is an only son. He has been overseas for about 2 years and as a soldier in the famous Fighting First took part in the Tunisian and also the Sicilian invasions and campaigns. The New York Times reported that the First was one of the first divisions Gen. Omar Bradley asked for for the invasion of France. Technical Sergeant Hill was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with a citation for high courage, fine leadership, and unswerving devotion to duty. He is 22 years old and recently married Miss Morrison, of Paisley, Scotland. He is the son of the Millard Hills, of Union Springs, N. Y. The Famous First has written one more page of glory in its great history.

His letter follows:

SOMEWHERE IN FRANCE,
July 1, 1944.

DEAR DAD: Here I am, Dad, with a few lines. Mom says that you never got my other letter. I don't know what I am going to write now that I have started it. I guess I might as well tell you what has happened so far. I won't mention any places so I guess it will pass. I don't like to write things like this to Mom.

Here is what it is like:

On D-day it was very windy and the channel was rough as hell. We were on a big transport about 14 miles out in the channel. As day broke we could see our planes overhead. There were hundreds of them. All the men on the ship were tense and nervous. Many of them had never seen combat before. As I stood on the deck and watched the planes I gained confidence. We could see them bombing the coast and the battleships and destroyers shelling the coast, too. As I watched the tremendous barrage on shore I figured that it would be very easy to seize the high ground.

The time came for us to go. We scrambled down the nets with our equipment into small assault boats, about 30 men to a boat. We were around in the rough sea for about an hour until all our unit was ready to go. Then we started ashore and went past the battleships and destroyers. Things looked very good. Each man had a heavy load of ammunition and rations, plus other things with which to destroy enemy installations. Many men were sick before we hit the shore.

Now we could see the hill with pill boxes on it and obstacles in the water. They consisted of triangular pieces of railroad track driven into the sand with mines attached to them. You can see for yourself what that would do to a boat if it hit one. Then the Germans opened up with 88 mm. guns and heavy mortar fire. Things looked bad now and you wondered how they could have survived the pounding the Air Force and Navy gave them. A few of the boats are blown up before they hit the shore. The waves are very high and they immediately wash the bodies ashore.

As they let the ramp down on your boat, machine-gun fire is immediately brought upon you. Other boats have sunk when they hit the obstacles but a few get ashore. You have 900 rounds of steel coming at you each moment plus the mortar and artillery fire. It is this way all along the beach. They have a chance to fire now because our Navy has lifted their fire so they won't hit us. You hit the beach and see many dead and wounded being washed ashore and hear their cries for help. You can do nothing for them so you move along looking for shelter from the flying shrapnel and small arms fire.

You have with you maybe a squad when you left the ship and you turn around and find only one or two men with you. Naturally you don't know whether they are lost, killed, wounded, or what happened to them. I had one squad of my men in my boat and the other four were in four different boats.

Days before the landing you are given an objective. You must take it or die in the attempt because you have your back to the water and ahead of you are the machine guns. You can't get a shot at them because they are dug in and on a hill, while you are on the bare beach with a small sand dune ahead of you.

An "organization" of men is a hard thing to do under fire. That is why it is so hard to retreat. Everybody is thinking of his own hide and is very panicky. Finally, you manage to get a handful of men together. An assembly position is given to the battalion for the purpose of reorganization, but you haven't yet reached it. You know where it is from your study of maps and the prominent terrain features. So you start over the hill and get plugged at all along. Finally some of the Huns pull out and you get almost to the top of the hill if you have been lucky. All of a sudden you see a puff of black smoke go in the air. The concussion knocks you down. A minute ago there was a man in front of you, but when the smoke clears there before you lies what's left of him, nothing but a leg. Others near him have been wounded by the explosion.

You shake yourself and wonder why you are still alive. That is the way it was with me. You suddenly realize you are in a mine field. It is just as safe to go ahead as to turn around. So far the doughboy is the only one ashore. The artillery hasn't landed yet and the Navy can't give you close supporting fire because they would kill too many of their own men. So you go on, hoping things are going to be O. K.

Men are screaming for first-aid men, but they are all busy. All of them are covered with blood where they have been working on men. There's about one aid man for every 40 men. It really keeps them busy. As you pass the men, lying there wounded, you want to help them and can't.

Now you are at the top of the hill and you see why you couldn't get the Hun. He was dug in so well. In many of the holes he had deep tunnels and living quarters. Many of them had electric lights. Now you are about 400 yards off the beach and the men in front of you have run into the thick hedgerows full of Jap-trained snipers with rifles and machine guns. Again you have more casualties, but you have cleared a way through the mine field and more troops are rapidly moving up to help you out. It was just like jungle fighting.

The enemy is now retreating and you are bothered with only an occasional sniper for a mile. The artillery comes ashore and things start moving. Bulldozers are working and tanks land in support of the infantry. It is early evening and you push inland and dig in for the counterattack you know is to come. Then you organize your outfit to see what you have left.

I could go on and on, but that is the way it was on the first day. It is a small picture, but it will give you some idea of why I consider myself lucky. I was pinned down by fire for about 4 hours and lost my outfit. A lot of the guys thought I was gone, but I turned up next day. This is about all there is to write about, and I hope it gets by. If it does, keep it and when I get home you see if I don't tell the same story. Now I must close. You can let Mom read it if you wish. It just gives you an idea of what the "Fighting First" did in achieving and accomplishing its mission so others could land. Say hello to Mom.

As ever,

JACK.

A Living Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Living Memorial," delivered by me at Whitefish Bay, Wis., where I dedicated an honor roll of boys from Whitefish Bay who are in the service.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, it is a great honor to be asked to speak at a dedication of your community honor roll. It is an honor and a privilege for us to pay our respects and our homage wherever our fighting men are memorialized.

I approach this occasion with the deepest humility. I am keenly conscious of the inadequacy of anything I can say here today.

This memorial, fine as it is, and our words, however fine they may be, can only be symbols of something greater than words and physical memorials.

This honor roll is a symbol of every service flag in a Whitefish Bay window. It is a symbol of the still, quiet shrine deep in the hearts and minds of every mother, father, brother, sister, and sweetheart of a serviceman.

It is a symbol of flesh-and-blood sons, brothers, husbands, fathers, and sweethearts fighting for loved ones back home.

It is sometimes a symbol of those who have gone out forever in the vast quiet spaces where they can watch forever over those of us who remain as trustees and guardians of the great American and spiritual values and the great loves they left behind.

How empty our words must be beside the fulness of their deeds and their sacrifices.

We can erect our honor rolls and our memorials. It is right that we do so, if only to mark our recognition of the trust each of these who have gone forth have left for us to cherish.

Lincoln said it better than any of us can here today. He said, "It is for us the living to be dedicated to the unfinished task which had been so nobly advanced."

I say again that our words today and our honor roll here can only be a symbol—a pledge sacred and enduring.

It is not enough for us to pay homage to these men. It is not enough for us to do them honor.

Our memorial must be a living memorial.

We must cherish the heritage these men have left us. We must preserve the values for which these men fight. We must enshrine the ideals for which these men die.

We must abandon domestic bickering and squabbling. We must submerge all selfishness in the larger task up ahead.

The war is not yet won and the peace is not yet won. To win the war and to win the peace will take every last ounce of initiative, courage, and sacrifice which we can muster.

It is not necessary to say these things here today. You people gathered here today to do honor to soldier sons and daughters—you above all know that these things are true.

It is perhaps fitting, however, that each of us search our souls for a complete understanding of the task of creating a living memorial for these men.

What does that living memorial mean?

It means, first, making certain that when our service men and women return they find this still a government—as Lincoln said, "Of, by, and for the people." A land where government is the servant and not the master as it is in the lands where these men fight to free oppressed people.

2. A living memorial means that we must keep aflame the fires of liberty and Americanism kindled in American hearts by the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. These men of ours have lived in the shadows of emperor worship and Gestapo government—governments by edict and lust. The great documents which are our charter of human liberties will mean more to these men then they have ever meant to us because they have seen the fires of freedom blotted out. Our safeguards for liberty as written into these great human documents will be more than words to these men. They will be something very real—and something very precious, and something very alive—something to be given continued life in every step of our daily life, and something to be given continued life in every step of our national governmental life.

3. A living memorial means that we enshrine the ideal of a land where intolerance and bigotry and racial hatred are forever barred.

4. A living memorial means a land where freedom of opportunity has been preserved—a land where a boy can begin his career as a newsboy, and still aspire to be President of these United States—a land where initiative and thrift and diligence and enterprise are fostered; a land where science and technical achievements are not fetered; a land where there are no economic horizons; a land where servicemen will not return to peddle apples on street corners; a land where there will be jobs and the traditional American opportunities which have always characterized our country.

5. A living memorial means that we must preserve and continue to develop the traditional character of the American people. There must be no repetition of the post-war neuroses which hit our country like a vicious blight after the last World War. We must preserve as a very vital part of our national character the devout dependence on God which our forefathers incorporated into their earliest documents. We must preserve the sturdy, self-reliant, God-fearing character of a people of integrity and honor—integrity

and honor not only as a nation but as individuals.

6. A living memorial means that we must obliterate class hatreds and disunity which would make us a divided people.

7. A living memorial means that we must never again permit the sacrifices these men have made—we must never again permit these sacrifices to be made in vain. We will be false to our trust if we do not painstakingly explore every last avenue of future peace. We will be recreant to our faith if we do not place the full weight and strength of every American heart and every American mind and every American arm behind any workable program for an enduring peace.

All of these hopes and all of these ideals, however, become meaningless lip service if they do not have behind them the fervent deep-rooted convictions of every one of us. Plans and formulas are not enough. Pacts and treaties are not enough. Governmental declarations alone are not enough. Only individual men and women making up an army can fight a war, and only men and women all over this land and all over the world can make an enduring peace, only if they prove themselves adequate—spiritually adequate—for the job. May the light from God shine in our hearts so that we shall not fail them.

And so, fellow Americans, it is my high privilege to dedicate this honor roll today—to dedicate it with the fervent hope that it represents our individual dedication to the ideals of a living memorial to our fighting sons.

Enforcement Activities of Treasury Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting report has just been released by the Treasury Department. This report includes a brief statement relative to interesting cases developed by the enforcement agencies of the Treasury Department. Under the permission granted me I include the release as part of my remarks. It follows:

Owners of $11,000 now held in a special blocked bank account are going to have to do some explaining away of suspicious circumstances before they regain control of the money, the Treasury indicated today.

The $11,000 figured in one of several incidents involving attempts during the 1944 fiscal year to smuggle into this country money suspected of being Axis loot. Elmer L. Irey, chief coordinator of enforcement, reported the case to Secretary Morgenthau in a résumé of important investigations made by the six Treasury enforcement agencies during the year.

Attempt of an airplane passenger to bring the $11,000 into Miami in his baggage led him to grief. The money was uncovered by customs search after the passenger had declared $50, the maximum importation of currency permitted without license under Foreign Funds Control regulation. Investigation traced the money to a prominent citizen of a Latin-American country, but satisfactory explanation of how this person obtained the currency has yet to be presented.

In a similar case a seaman on a Portuguese vessel drew a year in jail for smuggling currency into Philadelphia and attempting to take the proceeds out in the form of travelers' checks.

The Foreign Funds Control also discovered and blocked substantial funds held in a New York bank in the name of an American citizen on behalf of a German residing in Tokyo and employed there by a large German chemical company. Criminal action in the case is under consideration.

Sharp-eyed Treasury agents found one man who made money on the races—at least temporarily. This case was developed by agents of the intelligence unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and resulted in a 5-year prison term and a $5,000 fine for tax evasion for James J. Gavin, of Jeffersonville, Ind. Gavin "beat the races" during the period 1935 to 1938 to the extent of $125,000. He failed to share his luck with Uncle Sam, on the professed theory that sooner or later he would lose it to the bookies.

Sudden evidence of affluence aroused the curiosity of a revenue agent making a routine check of the man's income-tax returns. The Intelligence Unit then developed the evidence of evasion.

A 3-year prison term and a $40,000 fine was assessed Almon B. Hall, and an 18 months' term and $20,000 fine imposed on his brother, Louis C. Hall, on tax evasion charges. The brothers engaged in a chicken-raising business at Wallingford, Conn., and were found to owe approximately $300,000 additional tax.

Almon B. Hall is the individual who testified at the trial, several years ago, of former Judge Martin T. Manton that he paid $62,000 to obtain a favorable court decision by Manton in a pending case.

A little matter of 143 miles of elastic (unstretched) figured in one of the most interesting customs cases developed during the 1944 fiscal year. The case involved Icek M. Mondlak, a European war refugee, who abused United States hospitality by engaging in two-way smuggling operations on the Mexican border, dealing in such items as zippers, light switches, ladies' hosiery and underwear, and other war-scarce merchandise, as well as the bales of elastic and jewelry. Customs officers have seized contraband worth $20,000, and bail bonds of $8,500 have been forfeited for Mondlak and an associate. The smugglers operated near El Paso.

Customs officers at Buffalo, N. Y., broke up a lucrative business in smuggled Canadian silver fox furs with the arrest of Harvey A. Milne, Ferne A. Milne, and William Siegel. One hundred and twenty skins appraised at $6,000 were seized. Harry Friefeld, of New York City, also was indicted in this case, and claims totaling $55,000 are being pressed against handlers of other shipments totaling 520 skins.

Major narcotics case developed during the year involved William Levin, identified by the Bureau of Narcotics as a member of the notorious "Black Tony" Parmagini gang, only recently released after serving a 17-year prison sentence for trafficking in narcotics. Levin reestablished connections with another old offender, Jack Siemen, of Vancouver, British Columbia, and organized a traffic in narcotics out of Mexico, using Morris Irwin, Canadian customs employee, as a courier. Irwin was arrested at Glendale, Calif., February 9, 1944, as he boarded a Canada-bound train with a large shipment of opium. Levin and his wife, Elizabeth, were arrested the following day with more contraband and attempted unsuccessfully to flush down a drain $5,000 they allegedly had received from Irwin in payment for the opium. Canadian authorities arrested Sieman.

William Levin was sentenced at Los Angeles on April 17, to 10 years in prison, and his wife to 18 months. A week later, Irwin was sentenced to 5 years, and Sieman subsequently was tried in Canada, and given a 7-year term.

United States Secret Service officials foresaw a new post-war problem in fighting the forgery racket with the arrest on June 12, by Atlanta agents, of David Flagg, Jr., on charges of theft and forgery of nine $100 checks issued to soldiers as mustering-out pay. Among check forgery cases developed during the year was one involving two 19-year-old Altoona, Pa., girls identified as passers of a number of Treasury and commercial checks; a case involving six 12- to 14-year-old boys at Louisville, Ky., in numerous letter box thefts of checks, and one involving a Chicago woman whose stock in trade consisted of a baby in arms to facilitate passing the stolen checks, and a screw driver with which she pried open mail boxes.

Wholesale thefts of mail in Harlem, New York City, in which Army and Navy allotment and allowance checks were taken, were curbed with a series of arrests made by the Service in cooperation with New York City police and post office inspectors.

Substantial jail or prison terms were handed down by the courts in a number of black market liquor conspiracy cases brought to trial on evidence developed by the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

At Newark, N. J., Harry Sorowitz, Emanuel Kremer, and four others pleaded guilty to selling large quantities of whisky at over-the-ceiling prices, and drew sentences totaling 2½ years to serve, and fines totaling $22,000. Five persons involved in a similar case at Ashland, Ky., drew sentences totaling 20 months and fines totaling $40,000. At St. Paul, Minn., Sam Taran and six others drew fines amounting to $51,000 in addition to prison sentences totaling 2 years.

An Intricate Analysis of a Simple Subject, the Nature of Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, much is being written about money these days. Anyone who seeks information concerning money by reading current articles on the subject usually finds himself threading through a maze of devious and intricate analyses as presented by our economists, when, in fact, the fundamental principles of money are as simple and controlling as the laws of gravity.

I have just read an illuminating (?) article by the economist Anatol Murad, published in the Southern Economic Journal, entitled "The Nature of Money," which is submitted for the consideration of my colleagues. However, as a preface to the eminent economist's treatise, I will insert my conception of money and the principles of economic law controlling the money function.

In considering the money subject we must differentiate between cash and credit. Many things are susceptible to being used as a medium of exchange, including checks and other credit tokens. But anything to be real money must be legal tender. Money has three functions—a measure of value, a medium of exchange, and a storage of wealth.

The creation of money is naturally a government monopoly. Money, to be stable in value, must increase in volume evenly with the growth of population and commerce. While values are almost universally measured in terms of money, credit and credit tokens are in general use in domestic transactions as a medium of exchange in place of money. The volume of money in circulation in conjunction with the volume of credit and credit tokens used as money, affected, of course, by the law of supply and demand, establishes the commodity price level—a drastic reduction in the volume of credit used as money will cause a fall in prices and reduce the commodity price level, thereby increasing the purchasing power of money, which is usually attended by a depressing effect on business and employment.

A money volume that is increasing evenly with the growth of population and commerce, roughly estimated to be 3 percent a year, is the best safeguard to a stable national economy and the prevention of financial depressions and a reduction in employment.

Credit is an unstable element, dependent on business confidence, and is subject to being withdrawn from use as a medium of exchange when most needed, with a disturbing effect on prices, business, and employment.

The money problem was met and solved by the founders of our Government at the time this Nation was established, when a monetary system had to be adopted to supply the money function with which taxes might be levied and paid, and settlements made for services and commodities. Congress simply decreed that 27 grains of standard gold and 416 grains of standard silver each was a dollar and made the dollar in the metric system our standard of value, legal tender for all debts and dues public and private. There was nothing complicated or intricate about this money plan. Gold and silver dollars were made the money of ultimate redemption by law and all obligations and credit tokens were redeemable in dollars of gold or silver specie. The price of all things adjusted themselves to the value of the dollar. The production of the gold and silver by the miners who could take these money metals to the mint and have them coined provided the steady increasing supply of money of ultimate redemption that kept pace with the growing money needs of increasing population and commerce.

This money system gave to the young American Nation the wherewithal to purchase Louisiana, Florida, add Texas, California, and the Oregon country to our national commonwealth during the period of our country's greatest growth and expansion in the gold and silver money era between the Revolution and the Civil War.

And now for the intricate explanation of the nature of money by one of our eminent economists:

THE NATURE OF MONEY

(By Antatol Murad, University of Southern California)

This paper is devoted to a critique of the commonly accepted definition of money. A correct and unequivocal definition of money is in itself of sufficient importance to command the attention of the student of economics. The critique here presented is, however, not concerned with verbalistic polemics, but attempts to unravel some basic misconceptions and confusions which seem to lie hidden beneath the customary definition—misconceptions and confusions which have a crucial bearing on some aspects of monetary theory and policy.

I. THE TRADITIONAL DEFINITION OF MONEY

1. Money is commonly defined as a commodity serving as a medium of exchange, a standard of value, a standard of deferred payments, a store of value, and a reserve for bank credit. Some elementary textbooks on money omit one or the other function from their definitions; others include additional functions or subdivisions of the functions of money. While the emphasis placed upon the several functions varies, the great majority of textbooks single out the medium of exchange function of money as primary, relegating the remaining functions to secondary or subsidiary status. Except for such minor differences, this definition of money is accepted as axiomatic. Writers on more advanced phases of monetary theory, presupposing the readers' knowledge of so elementary a proposition, usually neglect to refer to it even in passing.

If money is a commodity serving primarily as a medium of exchange, it must, of course, possess certain qualifications which make it eligible for such service. Elementary textbooks teach us that the money commodity must be (1) portable, (2) indestructible, (3) uniform, (4) cognizable, (5) divisible, (6) malleable, (7) useful, (8) of stable and high specific value. Precious metals, particularly gold, possess the largest measure of these qualities and for this reason are supposed to have superseded the earlier and less practical money commodities, such as cowrie shell, cattle, hides, etc.

The prevailing view, then, is that money is an article, a useful thing, a commodity; that this commodity must possess certain qualities enabling it to function as a medium of exchange; that it becomes money by virtue of the primary function; and that, in addition, it has some subsidiary functions. Presumably, if there were no such exchange commodity, there would be no money.

2. It can be readily understood that such an interpretation of the nature of money should have appeared convincing and self-evident when money exchanges (purchases and sales) actually involved the transference of a piece of metal, coined or uncoined, or of some other "money commodity." But it is difficult to see why it should continue to command such a wide following even today, when checks, bank notes, and similar credit instruments constitute the bulk of our media of exchange, while payments in coin account for only a small fraction of total payments; when, furthermore, all coins are token coins—their metallic content being utterly irrelevant and of no interest whatever to the recipient, who would accept a piece of paper with equal readiness; when the "exchange commodity" par excellence, gold, is not used as a medium of exchange at all, is no longer coined anywhere in the world, and its use for monetary purposes is forbidden in most countries; when, finally, these facts are not only recognized, but even emphasized by all writers on money.

The apparent contradiction between the definition of money as the commodity used as a medium of exchange, and the fact that we do not use any commodity at all as a means of exchange, should at once arouse doubt regarding the validity of that definition. Yet, instead of subjecting their basic concepts to rigorous criticism in an attempt to fit their definitions of money to the observed facts, most writers on the subject torture the facts into the framework of their a priori definitions.

II. THE MEDIUM OF EXCHANGE

3. The definition of money as the medium of exchange implies that the media of exchange must be money. If the media of exchange happen to be credit instruments, then these credit instruments must properly be regarded as money. Some authors following this line of reasoning therefore speak of credit money, bank money, or deposit money.

Yet it is generally recognized that credit instruments are not money, but evidences of debts (or claims) stated in terms of money. To say that credit instruments are money is to say that money is an evidence of debts (or claims) stated in terms of itself. Such a statement is obviously absurd. If credit instruments must be stated in terms of money, they themselves cannot be money. Money clearly, therefore, must be something else than the pieces of paper and other tokens (all expressed in terms of money) which are used as media of exchange.

4. It may be thought that the difficulty could be escaped by admitting that the credit media of exchange are not themselves money, but merely claims to money which because of their unquestioned and immediate convertibility into real money are capable of functioning as a substitute for money. Some textbooks, accordingly, take the position that bank money is not really money, even though it performs the medium-of-exchange function.

There are several objections to such a view.

In the first place, if the medium of exchange is not money, but something that circulates in the place of money, then money is not the medium of exchange.

Secondly, if the medium of exchange is not money, but at best a money substitute, the question remains: a substitute for what? What is the real money commodity?

If it be answered that money is that into which the credit media of exchange are convertible, we are once more trapped in a cul de sac. Though there is apparent historical justification for regarding the power of credit instruments to perform the medium of exchange function as resting upon their convertibility into the money commodity (gold, silver, etc.), the present-day situation clearly does not support such a view. Credit money today is convertible, not into any money commodity, but only into whatever the Government decrees to be a legal tender in the payment of debts. Such legal tender universally consists of central bank credit in one form or another, and of Government note currency, usually—like bank notes—in the form of a promise to pay a certain sum of money, and always stated in terms of money.[1] In other words, credit money is convertible only into other credit money.

The contention that the actual media of exchange (credit instruments) are but substitutes for the real media of exchange (money) into which they are convertible, only serves to make confusion worse confounded. Money, apparently, is nowhere to be found. One is led to the conclusion that there is no money, but only money substitutes—credit media of exchange—unless the latter are defined as money. And that course is foreclosed by the uncomfortable fact that media of exchange must be stated

[1] Nor can coins be regarded as the money commodity, or real money, into which the credit media of exchange are convertible, since these coins are without exception token coins containing an amount of metal worthless than their face value and circulating entirely by face value. Therefore, like credit instruments, they must be regarded as media of exchange stated in terms of money—and not as money itself—even if they possess unlimited legal tender power.

in terms of money and, consequently, cannot be money.

5. Some writers, unwilling to include all actual exchange media in their definition of money, yet unable to exclude them all from it, settle on a compromise course. They treat, by implication at least, all legal tender media of exchange as money, relegating other currency, especially check currency, to the status of substitute money. Justification for such procedure would seem to lie in the fact that the money into which credit media of exchange are convertible is legal tender currency.

Once more, however, logical difficulties force a rejection of such a view.

In the first place, there remains the fundamental difficulty that all legal tender media of exchange today are credit instruments (or token coins) stated in terms of money and, therefore, cannot be money themselves.

Secondly, it is conceivable that the State may not confer legal tender powers upon any of the means of payment. It is true that today every State has endowed some currency with legal tender power, but, after all, "the development of the legal tender concept is a comparatively recent phenomenon."[3] Money was used and talked about long before there was a legal tender. Certainly it could not be held that money would not, and did not, exist in the absence of legal tender laws.[4]

6. One other consideration casts doubt on the validity of the proposition that money is a commodity functioning as the medium of exchange. The notes and checks which are our actual media of exchange can hardly be regarded as commodities. Checks may be useful as devices for transferring purchasing power from one person to another, but the material of which they are made is obviously not useful or valuable except in a sophistic sense. Banks hand them out free of charge. If these credit instruments are, nevertheless, regarded as the objects endowed by law or custom with a value which enables them to function as media of exchange, this is simply due to a confusion of the amount of money indicated on the face of the credit instrument with the instrument itself. It would be tantamount to regarding a freight car loaded with gold as more valuable than a freight car loaded with coal. The conveyance itself is, clearly, something else than the value which it conveys.

Furthermore, it is quite possible to conceive a monetary system which does not include any thing passing from hand to hand as a medium of exchange. Even today a large volume of payments is made, not by the exchange of tangible credit instruments but by offsetting bookkeeping entries. Payments between banks in the United States are largely effected by credit and debit entries on the books of the Federal Reserve Banks. The Giro system which is widely used in central Europe does not involve the passing of credit instruments. If such a system were perfected to the extent of doing away with all tangible media of exchange and if central bank book credits were declared to be the only legal tender, then certainly it could not be held that the medium of exchange is a commodity, an article or a thing. According to the customary definition of money there would then be no money, since there would be no commodity or article circulating as a medium of exchange. Obviously, however, this could not be the case, since debits and credits on the books of the banks (as well as prices and debts generally) would still have to be stated in terms of money, even as today.

7. These considerations lead to the conclusion that money, whatever it may be, is not the medium of exchange. Media of exchange, or means of payment, are debits and credits, usually (though not necessarily) evidenced by tangible credit (or debt) instruments. Credit instruments possess varying degrees of negotiability or circulation power. Those endowed with the highest degree of circulation power—the most current credit instruments—are currency. Currency, in turn, may or may not possess legal tender quality.[4] Finally credit instruments—the tangible evidences of debts and claims—may be made of any material found convenient for the purpose: Paper, metal, wood, porcelain or anything else. The material is entirely irrelevant to the basic credit nature of the means of payment. A credit instrument made of copper, silver, or gold cannot be money any more than a legal tender note or a traveler's check. The mere fact that a certain commodity, e. g., gold or silver, may be employed as the material of which credit instruments are made does not warrant the definition of such a commodity, or of the credit instruments made of it, as money. A correct definition of money, therefore, must not imply that money is the medium of exchange nor that the medium of exchange is a commodity.

III. THE STORE OF VALUE

8. Value may be stored in the form of real property, chattels, rights of all descriptions, or in the form of current media of exchange. Only value stored in the latter form is, or could be, held to be money, for otherwise all commodities, all things of value, would have to be called money. For this reason the store-of-value function of money is generally thought to derive from the medium of exchange function. But if the medium of exchange is not money, then it follows that money cannot be the store of value (in the sense of media of exchange) either.

Writers on money who do not regard credit currency as money frequently point out that the use of money as a store of value has become unimportant in the western world, where people generally store their value in the form of securities or bank deposits. Usually they turn to the Orient for illustration of the use of money as a store of value. In India, for instance, people are said to insist on hoarding money—gold and silver.

On what grounds can such metal stores be called money? When the Indian ryot purchases a silver ornament or a few ounces of silver bullion at the bazaar, he buys not money, but a commodity which in time of need he can sell again—which he can reconvert into perhaps more or less of the same currency in which he paid for it. It so happens that age-old custom impels him to invest his surplus funds in precious metals rather than in real estate, bonds or savings accounts preferred by his more gain-loving occidental fellowmen.

When, on the other hand, he hoards coins, he merely amasses a supply of media of exchange, representing purchasing power by virtue of their nominal money value, and not because of their metallic content. That the Indian peasant mistakenly believes the value of his coin hoard to lie in the metal of which the coins are made, and that, consequently, he sometimes refuses to hoard bank notes or other paper currency which would serve his purpose equally well, especially if they possess legal tender power, proves only that he shares the misconceptions regarding the nature of money prevalent among economists.

Sometimes it may indeed prove wise to hoard coins rather than bank note currency or bank deposits, because of an anticipated depreciation of the latter types of currency due, for instance, to bank failures; or because of an expected rise of the metal value above the face value of coins resulting from upward revision of the mint price of metal or from abandonment of the "metal standard."[5] In the first case, the preference for coin is but an expression of a demand for legal tender currency, in the second case it represents speculation in the metal of which the coins are made. When only token coins are available such speculation would naturally lead to purchases of the metal in the market, which would be cheaper than the hoarding of coins.

Whatever money may be, it is not the commodity serving as the store of value, even as it is not the commodity serving as the medium of exchange, or currency. Conversely, currency, whether used as a medium of exchange or as a store of value, cannot be defined as money without involving an obvious contradiction. For if currency were defined as money, a new name would have to be invented for that in terms of which currency must be stated.

IV. RESERVE FOR BANK CREDIT

9. If money is not a medium of exchange and, therefore, not a store of value, it cannot be the commodity serving as bank reserve, either. The thought that banks must keep a reserve of "real" money in order to be able to convert their notes and other credit instruments circulating as money "substitutes" is obviously a carry-over from the time when such bank currency actually had to be convertible into metal, and when metal was universally believed to be money. Today banks must still maintain reserves since they must still be able to assure the convertibility of their obligations, but these reserves do not take the form of metal nor, as a rule, even of any kind of tangible currency.

101. Any commercial bank must always be ready and able to convert its obligations (deposits) into such other means of payment as its creditors may legally demand. Demand for conversion is most frequently demand for a deposit with another bank. Bank A, let us say, is asked to convert a part of its deposits into deposits with bank B. Bank B, in turn, will be willing to create the desired additional deposit liability only in consideration of a sufficient inducement. Quantitatively, the most important inducement which bank A can offer to bank B are claims upon the latter. In other words, conversion of bank deposits is largely effected through clearing. if bank A cannot offer bank B a sufficient amount of claims against B, it could offer a claim against itself instead. More frequently, however, bank B will want something better than a claim on A. It will want a claim against banks in general, or generalized bank credit. Central bank credit is such generalized bank credit. Therefore, conversions of bank obligations, insofar as they cannot be effected through clearing, are accomplished through transfers of central bank obligations.

Demand for conversion of bank obligations may also be demand for legal tender means of payment. The bulk of legal tender currency (except coin) consists of notes issued

---

[3] Nussbaum, Arthur, Money in the Law, 1939, p. 44.

[4] The same objections must be leveled against Knapp's definition of money as anything which the State accepts in payments to itself. Today payments to the State are made predominantly by check. Again, there was a time when the State was nonexistent, or at any rate did not receive payments other than payments in kind. Yet money undoubtedly existed even when no payments were made to the State.

[4] Legal-tender power, however, need not necessarily be attached to a tangible thing, but may equally be conferred upon intangibles, such as book credits with central banks.

[5] It is, of course, perfectly possible for the abandonment of the "metal standard" to be attended by a decline in the price of the metal in question. Germany's abandonment of the "silver standard" and Sweden's temporary suspension of the "gold standard" during the World War may be cited as examples.

by the central bank—again, central bank obligations.

The bank's ability to convert its obligations into whatever the creditors may demand is, therefore, assured as long as it has a sufficient supply of central bank obligations or even the power to obtain such obligations at short notice, for instance, by rediscounting. For this reason banks maintain primary reserves in the form of central bank deposits, and secondary reserves in the form of assets readily convertible into central bank deposits.

Neither of these reserves could in any sense be regarded as money—the commodity serving as bank reserve. Secondary reserves are securities—interest bearing credit instruments. Primary reserves are demand deposits. They are neither commodities nor money, but demand obligations stated in terms of money. Bank reserves, then, consist of central bank credit, not of money; and money cannot be defined as the commodity serving as bank reserve.

11. This conclusion might be considered irrelevant on the ground that the reserves, which, according to the textbooks, consist of money, are not the reserves of commercial banks, but those of the central bank itself; that granting the fact that commercial bank reserves are but another form of credit—central bank credit—these reserves, in turn, must be secured by reserves of real money, if the whole credit structure is not to collapse.

If bank reserves are required to assure convertibility of bank credit, and if central bank credit represents the highest stage of conversion through which a credit instrument may be carried, then the question naturally arises, Why should central banks maintain any reserves at all? Legal tender central bank obligations (whether in the form of deposits or notes) are by definition not convertible into anything but themselves. The central bank could always meet any demands for conversion of notes or deposits by giving its creditors again notes and deposits. Any "reserve" under such circumstances would seem to be, and actually is, entirely superfluous and fictitious. A central bank reserve consisting of central bank credit could, moreover, not be regarded as the money commodity any more than commercial bank reserves which consist of the same intangible central bank credit.

Central banks, nevertheless, maintain reserves, not because they must be able to convert money substitutes into real money, but because as a general rule they are expected to maintain convertibility of domestic currency into foreign currencies at a fixed, or at least at some rate of exchange. For the reason central bank reserves consist largely of claims upon foreign banks and central banks.

A reserve consisting of gold would, of course, answer the same purpose as long as all countries are prepared to buy and sell gold at a fixed price, for then the possession of gold becomes synonymous with the power to obtain foreign exchange. Under the so-called international gold standard a majority of all countries actually had established a fixed price for gold and central bank reserves could, therefore, take the form of gold. Gold was a means to an end, the end being conversion of domestic into foreign money claims. As long as there is a "gold standard," gold may, for brevity, be identified with these foreign money claims. It functions as a sort of international money claim. But gold as such is, of course, a commodity bought and sold, like any other commodity, at a price, i. e., in terms of money. Price being value in terms of money, money could have no price, and, therefore, gold (a commodity bought and sold at a price) cannot be money. Even the stanchest metallist could not regard gold bullion as money. Central bank reserves, then, again are credit instruments. They are claims stated in terms of foreign money, but are not themselves money.

V. THE STANDARD OF VALUE

12. If money is neither a medium of exchange, nor a store of value, nor a reserve for bank credit, what is money?

Textbooks tell us that money is also the commodity serving as a standard of value and as a standard of deferred payments.

Apparently we are to understand that a distinction must be made between these two functions. The standard of value supposedly serves as the common denominator in terms of which we express the value of commodities; it enables us to put prices on commodities. The standard of deferred payments, on the other hand, permits us to use a common denominator for debts and claims.

Now, debts and claims arise from contracts involving valuations of commodities. Insofar as these valuations are made in terms of the standard of value, the debts and credits must also be stated in terms of the standard of value. In other words, the standard of value is also the standard of deferred payments and therefore is the standard of deferred payments. To say that money is the standard of deferred payments in addition to being the standard of value is very much like saying that the kilogram is a standard of weight and a standard for contracts to deliver a certain weight of something in the future.

The definition of money as the commodity serving as the standard of value and standard of deferred payments is tautological.[6] There is no separate standard of deferred payments. Moreover, if there were a standard of deferred payments in addition to a standard of value, one or the other would have to be something else than money. And yet money is asserted to be both.

13. The process of elimination followed up to this point leads to the conclusion that money must be the standard of value and that it cannot be anything else. The standard of value in terms of which we state prices and debts is money. To assign the same name to the means of payment would involve a confusion in concepts, since, as shown before, the means of payment are not the same as the standard of value, and must themselves be stated (like all money claims or debts) in terms of the standard of value. But to deny the name money to the standard of value would be simply quibbling about terms.

While money is certainly the standard of value, it remains to be seen if the standard of value can be a commodity.

14.[7] By definition, a standard is a measure of things, a commonly accepted unit in terms of which certain characteristics such as length, weight, or value can be measured. The extent to which an object possesses the characteristic of length could be expressed by saying that it is twice as long, or half as long as some other object. A difficulty, however, would arise if the length of the reference object is not known to the person to whom the length of the first object is to be conveyed. To obviate this difficulty, the relation between any particular length or distance and any other length or distance is always expressed in terms of a standard unit of length which is universally known and which, therefore, can promptly be translated into the length of any object. To say that an object has a length of 1 meter, is to say all at once that it has twice the length of an object half a meter long, half the length of an object 2 meters long, one-tenth the length of object 10 meters long, and so on. The standard unit of length, then, expresses the length of any object relative to the length of any and all other things.

Similarly, the standard unit of value expresses the relative degree to which a thing possesses value. The only kind of value which such a standard unit could express is, of course, exchange value—or the power of that thing to command other things in exchange for itself. The purchasing power of, say, a bushel of wheat could be expressed by saying that it could be exchanged for 2 bushels of corn. However, this would mean nothing to someone who does not know to what extent a bushel of corn possesses exchange value, or the power to command other goods. Here again, it is necessary to express the degree of exchange value (purchasing power) possessed by any particular commodity in terms of the values of any and all other things possessing exchange value—or in terms of all other commodities. This is accomplished by expressing exchange value in terms of standard units of value, even as length is expressed in terms of standard units of length. To say that a bushel of wheat has an exchange value of one unit (e. g., $1), is to say all at once that it has an exchange value twice as large as that of a commodity with an exchange value of half a unit (50 cents), half as large as that of a commodity worth two units, and so on. The standard unit of exchange value or purchasing power, then, expresses the exchange value of any commodity relative to the exchange values of any and all other commodities. It expresses exchange value in general or command over commodities in general.[8]

These observations make it clear that standard units are always magnitudes of the characteristic which they are employed to measure; they are never things possessing these characteristics. The standard unit of length (foot length, meter, etc.), is a certain length, not an object possessing that length. The standard unit of exchange value (e.g., dollar, pound, franc), is a certain exchange value or a certain degree of command over goods in general, not a commodity possessing that exchange value or command over goods in general. The standard of value could under no circumstances be a commodity.[9]

15. Nevertheless, the thought that the standard unit of length is something possessing length and that the standard unit of value is something possessing exchange value is deeply imbedded in our minds. Some of the familiar standard units of measurement even bear the names of things or objects—as foot, grain, ton. This identification of the standard unit with a thing is primarily due to the fact that a common unit of measurement originally had to be derived from something which was universally known and which possessed the relevant characteristic in a fairly uniform degree. For instance, the length of the foot of a grown man is known to everybody and since the variations in the size of feet are not very great, people in a more primitive age could express the length of any object by comparing it with their feet. Thus, the foot became the standard unit of length. To have insisted that the standard unit was not the foot, but the foot length, would have seemed to them, as it would to most people today, pointless quibbling. In practice, the distinction may actually be unimportant. While in the quest for greater exactness later generations have transformed the originally vague concept of a normal or average foot into a more precise concept of length and no longer use a real foot to measure length, the foot is still approximately the length of a man's foot.

---

[6] Cf. Professor F. M. Taylor's criticism on the same point in his Some Chapters on Money, 1906, p. 29. However, he denies the separate existence of a standard of deferred payments on the ground that any contract must be stated in terms of the things to be delivered. Under a money contract, money must be delivered. He thereby identifies the standard of deferred payments not only with the standard of value, but also with the medium of exchange.

[7] Sections 14–17, inclusive, are based on arguments presented in Murad, A., The Paradox of a Metal Standard, 1939, ch. 8.

[8] Ibid., pp. 176–177.

[9] Ibid., p. 183.

To establish a standard unit of exchange value the same procedure would have to be followed. The exchange value of a fairly uniform commodity known to all members of the community is chosen as the standard unit of exchange value. Thus, in a pastoral society, where practically everybody is raising sheep, the exchange value of a sheep may be used as a common denominator for all exchange values. An ox, then, is worth 10 sheep, a pound of gold is worth 100 sheep, and so on. The sheep has become the standard of value—and again, it might sound like hairsplitting to insist that it was the exchange value of a sheep, not the sheep itself, which had become the standard.

The importance of the distinction will, however, reveal itself upon further development of the examples cited above. The foot which has become the standard unit of length is a length familiar to everyone. Now, if it were supposed that a certain vitamin diet doubles the size of feet, it would be quite natural and correct to say that the average foot measures two foot—or two standard units of length. To insist that the actual (average) foot is the foot, would, in fact, be to change the standard unit of length pari passu with the changing length of human feet. Fortunately, no one insists that the standard unit of length is a real foot or the length of a real foot. The average length of feet undoubtedly fluctuates, but these fluctuations do not in any way affect the foot.

Similarly, the sheep which has become the standard unit of exchange value, is a value, a degree of command over goods, familiar to everyone. It expresses command over one sheep or one-tenth of an ox, or one-hundredth of a pound of gold, and so on. Now, suppose that a disease reduces the number of sheep, so that the exchange value of sheep is doubled. A sheep would now be worth two sheep—or two standard units of purchasing power.[10] To insist that the actual (average) sheep is the sheep, would, in fact, be to change the standard unit of value pari passu with the exchange value of the sheep. Since the exchange value of sheep, or of any other commodity, is subject to continuous variation, this would mean that the standard unit of exchange value would have to be changed continuously.[11]

Moreover, if the community has outgrown the pastoral stage, most people will no longer be familiar with the value of a sheep. The change in the purchasing power of the sheep would have to be announced by some public authority—and the only way this change could be announced would be by reference to the already established standard unit of value. The new sheep would have to be expressed as two old sheep. Similarly, if the prevailing average length of feet were accepted as the standard unit of length, this average length would have to be conveyed to the people as a ratio of the already established standard unit. The new foot would be declared to equal two old foot. Since the only purpose of a standard unit is to provide a commonly accepted measure of a particular characteristic, there would be no point in making such a change which could be accomplished only by reference to an already established standard unit; and it is quite clear that the established standard unit is not the average length of feet or the exchange value of a sheep (or of any other commodity).

16. There are some important aspects in which the parallelism between the standard units of length and of value does not hold.

A. The standard unit of length is a constant, static magnitude of length. A foot means the same to us as it did to our forefathers. The standard unit of value, on the other hand, is a changing, dynamic concept. A dollar does not mean the same to us today as it did 10 years ago or as it did to our forefathers. Today, let us say, it represents command over 10 cigars, or 2 pounds of butter, or 1 theater admission, etc. All these commodities, however, are subject to value fluctuations—and since their exchange values are expressed in terms of dollars (or prices), any change in that exchange value must be expressed by a changing price. Any alteration in the price of even a single commodity, in turn, will change the amount of purchasing power expressed by $1. Such a change in the value of the dollar would be infinitesimal. People would say that the dollar has remained unchanged, but that this or that particular price has changed. But if material shortages or intensified demand cause the exchange values of many commodities to rise successively, the amount of purchasing power expressed by $1 will diminish noticeably and after a while the value of the dollar will be said to have fallen. Conversely, if decreased demand and abundant supplies set off a chain of price decreases, the value of the dollar will appear to have risen. While from one day to the next a dollar expresses its meaning may change drastically over approximately the same purchasing power, longer periods of time. Rip Van Winkle, awakening from his 20 years' sleep, would find his concept of foot unchanged, but he would have to learn from scratch the meaning of "dollar." [12]

B. The foot conveys a precise idea of length. A distance of 1 foot can have precise meaning because it is always the same. On the other hand, the fact that the amount of purchasing power expressed by the standard unit of value is continuously modified as a result of the interplay of all changes in the relative values of goods, implies that this standard unit cannot establish a precise concept of a definite magnitude of purchasing power in the minds of the people. The most that can be expected of a standard of value is to signify to the individual an approximate degree of command over goods.[13]

C. Because it is precise and unchanging, the foot can be embodied in a concrete measuring instrument—a footrule. On the other hand, the standard unit of value could not possibly be embodied in a concrete measuring instrument, e. g., a sheep or a piece of gold. The exchange value of a piece of gold fluctuates continuously; and while the standard unit itself expresses a continuously fluctuating amount of exchange value, there is no reason to assume that the two would fluctuate identically. Even if it were conceivable to find a commodity with an exchange value varying directly with the exchange value expressed by the standard unit, it would still make no sense to employ it as a measuring instrument since its exchange value would have to be determined by recourse to the market. It could not operate as a gage of continuous and permanent applicability. It would be comparable to a footrule of ever-changing length which has to be continuously adjusted to an ever-changing foot. Recourse to the market alone can give us from one instant to the other the necessary corrections and adjustments for our concept of value. There is neither any reason nor any opportunity for applying a gage or measuring instrument of value.[14]

17. Summing up these general and specific characteristics of the standard unit of value, the following definition may be formulated:

The standard unit of value is a vague concept of an ever-changing magnitude of purchasing power which is not capable of embodiment in any concrete measuring instrument.[15]

On no account, therefore, could the standard of value be regarded as a commodity, such as sheep or gold. Gold could certainly not be the standard of value any more than it could be the standard of length or weight. These standards must be a unit of value, a unit of length, a unit of weight, respectively. Nor could gold (or any other commodity) be the material measuring instrument of value (as it could be the measuring instrument of length or weight) since the exchange value of gold is not stable vis-a-vis the standard unit of value and since that standard unit itself is a constantly changing magnitude.

The identity between the value of gold and the standard unit of value under the so-called gold standard is, of course, simply the product of a price-fixing arrangement. As long as the monetary authorities stand ready to buy or sell unlimited quantities of the metal, they can actually bring the fluctuations in the value of gold into conformity with the fluctuations in the magnitude of value expressed by the standard unit. This results in making the standard of value a stable and exact expression of command over gold, not over commodities in general. Certainly it does not make gold the instrument for measuring value.[16]

18. The thought that money is an abstract concept of value, not representing any particular commodity or represented by any particular commodity, is not new. Perhaps the first reference to it was made by Plato who, explaining the economic organization of the city-state, stressed the need of money as a symbol for the sake of exchange.[17] The "moneta imaginaria" in terms of which media of exchange were customarily tariffed between the thirteenth and eighteenth centuries again indicates a recognition of the abstractness of the measure of value. Debts and claims could be stated in terms of moneta imaginaria, and coins—the media of exchange—were decreed to be valid tokens for the transfer of purchasing power expressed in terms of moneta imaginaria.[18]

---

[10] Cf. Turgot's example (reflexions sur la formation et la distribution des richesses, 1770, quoted by Nussbaum, Arthur, Money in the Law, 1939, p. 6, n. 25.

[11] Murad, A., The Paradox of a Metal Standard, 1939, p. 180.

[12] Ibid., p. 180.

[13] Ibid., p. 181.

[14] Ibid., pp. 183–187.

[15] Ibid., p. 187.

[16] Ibid., pp. 188–189.

[17] Cf. Monroe, Arthur E., Monetary Theory Before Adam Smith, 1923, p. 5; Nussbaum, Arthur, op. cit., pp. 8–9, n. 31. Professor Nussbaum suggests that Plato did not use the term symbol in the abstract sense at present associated with the term, but that he simply indicated "that money, technically appearing as a token, is the customary medium of exchange." Even if this interpretation were accepted as correct, the question still remains; a token of what? If money is regarded as a commodity it must be held to be the equivalent in exchange, rather than a token assuring the future delivery of equivalent value.

[18] Cf. Nussbaum, op. cit., pp. 10 ff.

Professor Nussbaum maintains that in spite of the apparent tariffing of coins in terms of an abstract unit, "the value of the coins did not depend on the value of the unit, but the value of the unit was determined by the value of the coins" (p. 11). It is true only that the metal contained in the coins had a value independent of the relation arbitrarily established between the coin itself and the abstract unit. If that value happened to be greater than the tariffed value of the coin, then, of course, the coin would be clipped or converted into bullion. To avoid such tampering with the currency, the coin had to be "raised" to bring the market value (in terms of imaginary units) of the metal contained in the coin into line with the nominal value (also in terms of imaginary unit) of the coin. Thus it seems that the imaginary unit was adjusted to the metal value of the coins. But when the nominal value of the coin exceeded its metal value, then the value of the coin was clearly determined by the value of the imaginary unit. As long as tariffed coins circulated as currency, i. e., by face value, their value was derived from the imaginary unit.

In modern literature the concept of the abstract unit of value appears with increasing frequency under various names, such as "unit of value," [19] "unit of account," [20] or "money of account." [21] This abstract unit, whether it be named "the dollar," "the pound sterling" or anything else, is, of course, the standard unit of value, or standard of value,[22] in terms of which prices, debts, and credit instruments (including currency) are expressed. Nevertheless, these same authors who recognize the abstractness of the standard unit of value which is money still insist on reserving the term, "money," to designate the means of payment. The use of terms is unfortunate since, as pointed out above (section 13), it leads to a confusion of concepts, if not in the minds of the writers themselves, certainly in the minds of the readers.

19. Mr. Keynes, for instance, opens his Treatise on Money by stating that "money of account, namely, that in which debts and prices and general purchasing power are expressed, is the primary concept of a theory of money," [23] and later says that "the age of money had succeeded to the age of barter as soon as men had adopted a money of account." [24] He then proceeds to call currency (or the money things) money itself.[25] But, by his own statement, money of account (the standard unit) is fundamental to the existence of a money system. It is possible for a money system to exist without money-proper (tangible media of exchange), but money proper could not exist without money of account, since it "derives its character from its relationship to the money of account." [26] Accordingly, it would be possible for a money system to exist without money itself. Mr. Keynes' meaning is, of course, quite in line with the thesis of this paper, but his terminology seems unfortunately confusing.

If the abstract unit of purchasing power which is the standard of value is the decisive criterion on which the existence of a money system depends, then logic demands that it be given the name "money." To insist upon a terminology which reserves that name for the tangible media of exchange which are not essential to the existence of a money system and which themselves must be stated in terms of money, is to be subservient to a custom rooted in multiple confusion and is, to that extent, to perpetuate that confusion.

Not only is the designation "money" for the abstract standard unit of value a logical one; it is also one that agrees with common usage. People use the term "money" when they mean currency as well as when they mean the standard of value. The popular confusion of these two distinct concepts, implied by attaching the same name to both, is not only natural in view of the confusion which pervades monetary literature, but is probably also innocuous. It is not important that the proverbial man in the street should have a correct understanding of the complexities of money. But there is no justification for the argument that even economists should continue to use the term "money" for coins and paper currency on the ground that it is generally used in that sense. People generally use the term "money" also when they mean the standard unit of value. They express prices in money, they state debts in money, they are concerned about the value of money, they bargain for money wages. The man who bargains for money wages is hardly concerned with the specific method of payment. He will take his wage in coin, in notes, in checks, sometimes in credits with the bank or the company store, or even in merchandise. On the other hand, the worker is very much concerned with the value of money as indicated by recent widespread demands for wage increases to meet the higher cost of living. The "man in the street" would probably be much more baffled if he were told that is bargaining not for so much money a week, but for so many ideal units or units of money-of-account, than if he were told that his weekly pay check is not money, but a credit instrument stated in terms of money, or if he were told that his check is not money, but currency.

Money is certainly that in which prices are expressed and debts and claims stated. The value of a thing is stated in terms of money—dollars, pounds, francs, etc., not in terms of coins, notes, checks, or book entries. The dollar, then, is money, not the coin, note or check stated in terms of dollars and it seems unnecessary and unreasonable to deny the designation money to the former and to reserve it for the latter.

20. The distinction between the standard unit of value and the medium of exchange, and the application of the term "money" to the former, also helps to clear up some common and glaring historical misinterpretations. We are told, for instance, of the cattle money of antiquity and are expected to believe that the ancients used cattle, sheep, and other domesticated animals as media of exchange.[27] Certainly it does not show great reverence for the high civilization of the Greeks to imply that they were too unintelligent to find a commodity more highly endowed with the qualities of portability, indestructibility, divisibility, uniformity, etc.—in short, the qualities required of an exchange commodity—than an ox. Oxen are certainly not uniform. Hercules himself could not have carried an ox very far; dividing the ox means to destroy him. In fact, the only requirement which the ox possesses in a high degree is that everyone can recognize it as an ox.

It should be obvious that oxen were never used as common media of exchange,[28] but as a common measure or standard of value. Every community entering the era of indirect exchange had to derive its standard of value from the value of a commonly known commodity. In a cattle-raising community the value of cattle naturally became the standard—hence, the cattle money of the Greeks. Only the confusion of the standard unit of value with the medium of exchange can account for the suggestion that the Greeks carried oxen in their purses. We know that cattle were used as the standard unit of value even at a time when coinage was already firmly established.[29]

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

21. It has now been shown that it is erroneous to regard the media of exchange (which are also used as a store of value) as money; that these media of exchange are all tokens of claims or debts in amounts determined by reference to money; that money is the standard unit of value; that the standard unit of value is an abstract concept of an ever-changing magnitude of purchasing power and that it could never be a commodity nor even the purchasing power of a commodity.

Therefore, the definition of money as the commodity functioning as a medium of exchange, a standard of value, a store of value, a standard of deferred payments, and a reserve for bank credit is wrong. It harbors two fundamental misconceptions.

The first of these is that money is both the medium of exchange and the standard of value (all other functions are derived from these two). The means of payments are qualitatively different from the standard unit of value. They are the tangible or intangible manifestations of debts and claims, arising from indirect exchange and expressed in terms of the standard of value, or money.

The second misconception is that money is a commodity. Neither the means of payment nor the standard of value could be regarded as a commodity. The standard of value is bound to be abstract. The means of payment may assume concrete form; they can be made of paper, nickel, silver, gold or some other commodity, but they can never be media of exchange by dint of this materialization.

A correct defintion of money must not imply that there is any connection between the standard of value and a commodity, nor that the standard of value and the medium of exchange are two aspects of the same thing.

22. The importance of a correct defintion of money becomes apparent when applied to the central problem of monetary theory—the value of money. The traditional view of money as a commodity serving as the medium of exchange and the standard of value inevitably had to lead up to the quantity theory of money. Changes in the value of money had to be explained in the same manner as changes in the value of wheat or apples, namely in terms of demand and supply. Just as a shortage of apples would force up the price of apples, so, it was thought, an inadequate supply of money would surely raise the value of money. Conversely, an expansion of the money supply would inevitably result in a lower value of money, or a higher price level. No matter how modified and qualified, all versions of the quantity theory must necessarily be rooted in this fundamental proposition. In fact, monetary theory as a separate branch of economics could not exist save on the preconception that fluctuations of price levels (and, therefore, indirectly of output and employment) are due to special monetary causes not encompassed by the theory of (relative) value.

The error of such reasoning is at once revealed when the distinction between standard of value and media of exchange is observed.

The value of money is clearly a phenomenon of the standard. No other meaning could be attached to the statement that the value of the dollar has decreased than that the magnitude of purchasing power expressed by $1 is smaller than it was before. Now, the standard of value, being an abstract concept, could not possibly have a value per se in the same sense that apples or wheat have a value which is influenced by changes in supply. Nor could there be any such thing as a supply of the abstract concept of value which is the standard.

The "supply of money" or "quantity of money," on the other hand, obviously must be interpreted as a phenomenon of the medium of exchange. There can be more or less "money" in circulation, more or less deposits, notes and coins. But how could

---

[19] E. g., Knapp, Georg F., The State Theory of Money, 1924; Wagemann, Ernst F., Allgemeine Geldlehre, 1923.

[20] E. g., Helfferich, Karl, Money, 1927; Feavearyear, A. E., The Pound Sterling, 1931.

[21] E. g., Keynes, John M., A Treatise on Money, 1930; Hawtrey, R. G., The Gold Standard in Theory and Practice, 3rd ed., 1933.

[22] "No more can be said than that 'dollar' is the name for a value which, at any definite moment, is understood in the same sense throughout the community, and since goods and services are evaluated in terms of the dollar, that unit is a measure or a standard of value." Nussbaum, op. cit., p. 6.

[23] Keynes, op. cit., vol. I, p. 3.

[24] Ibid., p. 4.

[25] Ibid., p. 3.

[26] Ibid., p. 3.

[27] E. g., Kemmerer, E. W., Money, 1937, pp. 5–6.

[28] There are, however, many indications that cattle and other domesticated animals were frequently used to make payments in kind, especially to the temples for sacrificial purposes, fines, etc., and probably also sometimes for personal services.

[29] Cf. Burns, A. R., Money and Monetary Policy in Early Times, 1927, pp. 6 ff.

it be maintained that a change in the quantity of credit instruments (or a change in the volume of transactions giving rise to credit instruments, including currency) could eo ipso bring about a change in the value expressed by $1? A credit instrument of a face value of $1 represents purchasing power to the extent of $1—whatever that may be. The "value" of the credit instrument is determined by the amount of purchasing power expressed by $1, not the other way around. To state the opposite would be like saying that the quart becomes a smaller measure of capacity if there are more quart bottles.

Changes in the "value of the dollar," i. e., in the magnitude of purchasing power expressed by $1 are, in fact, never determined by quantitative changes in the supply of media of exchange, but are the result of the continuous interplay of all the forces of supply and demand affecting each and every commodity. There are no separate monetary forces responsible for changes in price levels. Any attempt to seek the explanation for fluctuations in price levels, output and employment in changes of the quantity of exchange media is to pursue a mirage. Similarly, any attempt to control or prevent such fluctuations through quantitative control of the media of exchange is necessarily doomed to failure. The both grow out of a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of money.

Mr. Speaker, it might be well to point out to our economist that when the mints of the world were open to the free coinage of gold and silver these metals were money wherever they existed, the finder or owner had only to transport his gold or silver to the mint to have the metal coined and handed back to him to be stored or spent into circulation, as he might elect. The old prospector of placer mining days had only to weigh out the dust from his poke to purchase any merchandise that was for sale. His gold had a fixed value at the mint.

Arnold Faces Congress Uproar Over His Continued Use of the WASPS—Miss Cochran's Lady Flyers Now Replace Instead of Releasing Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from the Washington Merry-Go-Round, by Drew Pearson, which appeared in the Washington Post on August 6:

WASHINGTON.—Air Forces commander General "Hap" Arnold may not know it, but he is facing a regular cloudburst from Capitol Hill as soon as Congress gets back to a full-time job.

The Congressmen are up in arms over Arnold's efforts to sidetrack the law by continuing to use the WASPS while more than 5,000 trained men pilots, each with an average of 1,250 flying hours, remain idle. All this has happened after Congress refused to let the WASPS be incorporated into the Regular Army.

Fact is that the Government has spent more than $21,000,000 training lady flyers, primarily at the behest of vivacious aviatrix Jacquelin Cochran, wife of financial magnate Floyd Odlum. Magnetic Miss Cochran seems to have quite a drag with the "brass hats" and has even persuaded the Air Forces' smiling commander to make several secret trips to Capitol Hill to lobby for continuation of her pets, the WASPS.

Though not generally known, 25 WASPS have already been killed while ferrying planes in the United States. Further, after almost 2 years of training and the expenditure of millions of dollars, only 11 WASPS are able to fly twin-engine pursuit planes and only 3 are qualified to pilot 4-engine bombers. Bulk of the WASP work has been on training planes, production of which has been practically eliminated.

BACK-DOOR STRATEGY

After Congress refused to let the WASPS into the Army, Arnold and Miss Cochran adopted back-door strategy. It was arranged to sign the WASPS up as WAC's, then have them reassigned to the Air Forces, this despite Congress' clear ruling that the WASPS should not be taken into the Regular Army.

When Col. Oveta Culp Hobby, head of the WAC's, got wind of this deal, she sent emissaries on forced marches to Capitol Hill to have her rank raised from colonel to brigadier general. Oveta was afraid that Jacquelin Cochran would be made a colonel in the WAC's and wanted to outrank her.

All of which has made Air Corps pilots and transport flyers see red. Hundreds retiring from active combat are anxious to stay in the Army as transport ferry pilots. More than a thousand discharged pilots are unable to get jobs with the air transport command, but still Jacky Cochran trains more WASPS. These flyers point out that the WASPS, like the WAC's, claim they were recruited to release men for active service. Now they say the WASPS are "just replacing men, period."

Last May, the Ramspeck Civil Service Committee began a determined inquiry into the WASPS, was ready to recommend that they be dropped immediately. However, fast-working, charming "Hap" Arnold made a quick trip to Capitol Hill. After that, one sentence was eliminated from the report. It read: "We urge that the WASPS be wiped out completely."

Thus, the battle of the WASPS continues.

We Honor the Boys and Girls in Our Country's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year the citizens of Bristol, Va.-Tenn., erected an honor-roll plaque in honor of those now in the armed service and those who may hereafter join. The plaque already contains the names of all those in the armed service from the Twin City, and other names will be added from time to time as our other boys join the colors.

Dr. Robert Yost, one of the Godliest, one of the ablest and one of the best beloved men in our section, delivered the dedicatory address. For years he has been one of the outstanding teachers at King College and has exerted a wonderful influence for right living and true Americanism upon all the boys who came under his guidance. His address is so replete with words of truth, so expressive of the true American spirit, that I think it should be given wide circulation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein Dr. Yost's address:

This large representative gathering speaks emphatically and prophetically for American patriotism. It is an optimistic declaration. We are here in behalf of our country and her soldiers. Though this plaque is quite common in the materials of which it is made, it is marvelously uncommon in what it represents. It is made of iron, clay, sand, marble, pebbles, and water. That is all so far as materials are concerned. Skillful trained hands took this common wayside dust, molding it into this silent symbol. Back of the hands is a brain whose magic cells dreamed the idea, in its completion. And back of the brain is the passion and heart of Bristol.

It is a worthy attempt to express the highest and noblest of sentiments. Once a people in exile, learned in bitterness the meaning of this sentiment and in the consciousness of their irreparable loss, wailed their woe as a warning to succeeding generations. "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget her cunning and may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth." And once a sinless man, standing on a lonely hill, looked upon the capital of his native land, and foreseeing its utter destruction and waste, cried "O Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thee" and then that lonely hill was stained with tears, divine. I make no apology but emphatically repeat, the noblest of sentiments is coming from Bristol's aching heart today. By this act we are striving, as best we know how, to express to our men and women in uniform our gratitude for what they have done, our faith in their ultimate victory, our earnest, passionate hope, that victory may be decisive and speedy, and our love for what they are—our first line of defense. There are no fox holes or caves or dugouts in Bristol. We have no need for them. We wear no gas masks to protect us from the deadly poison of a pagan foe. There is no fear this sabbath afternoon that we will be disturbed by death rained from the skies, as some Zero sails through on its deadly mission. Nor from some armored tank on State Street grinding our helpless bodies to dust. We are not afraid that our old men and women and little children will be herded like cattle and shot like wolves. We do not even suffer the trifling inconvenience of a black-out. Our so-called irregularities are so insignificant and inconsequential, that life is almost normal. With three-fourths of the human family living in terror, in agony of body, soul, and mind, why are we exempt, and so at peace?

Because our Bristol soldiers, united with millions of other American soldiers, have pushed that defense line across the ocean, thousands of miles from our peaceful shores. And if any citizen can contemplate that fact without feeling overwhelmed with a flood of gratitude that torments him and thunders for expression; all I can say is that I am profoundly sorry for such a soul. He must be mentally deranged, or have a heart of stone. Linked with that gratitude is an honest faith in the righteousness of our cause and its final triumph. Being right it must be victorious. Will not, the Judge of all the earth do right? God has never failed us yet, and it is too late to begin now.

Neither have our warriors ever failed us, and we may depend upon it, that defense line will not break. Centuries ago the great Chinese people built a wall of stone where every invader's threat would end. After the last war, France built the Maginot line, a challenge to every foreign foe. Belgium likewise threw up a defense line on her frontiers and felt secure. China's wall has been crumbling, but let it be said not her people. France's Maginot line is occupied by the enemy.

Belgium's stone defense crumbled in a night's time. Their lands overrun, despoiled, robbed, their people enslaved, starved, murdered and raped. What reason have we to believe our defense line will stand before the pagan might? Just because our line is movable as to space and place, and eternal, being made not of stone and steel, but of the American spirit. That is a wall our enemies have failed to comprehend. Dr. David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University, made this statement: "As long as there were Romans, Rome endured. So long as Americans keep the American spirit there will be an America." The men whose names are here enrolled are made of that spirit. They are coming home as conquerors. The flag will still wave o'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave. It will return with added splendor. That is the tribute to, and our faith in our Bristol soldiers.

But this plaque has a message for the home front. There must be Americans of the same unyielding spirit here as there. Now and always. Its message is both a challenge and a trumpet blast. It is most gratifying to record that Bristol citizens have boldly met every financial demand our Government has made for the prosecution of the war. I have no doubt we shall continue that course to the bitter end. Should that spirit be lost through carelessness or indifference we shall stand at the bar of judgment, condemned and doomed. It can be lost. I mean that defense line, the spirit of Amer- —that guarantees our security and free- n. The pages of history are replete with examples. That was the way Venice ended a thousand years of glorious independence, in slavery and shame. That was the way ancient Rome fell an easy prey to the hordes of barbarians sweeping down from the north.

There were no Romans left. America will endure so long as Americans live. We are not a warlike people. We are not taught from childhood to hate, murder, and destroy our national neighbors. But a real American is one who though loving the ways of peace, has the iron resolution to do what he ought to do when he ought to do it, whether he wants to do it or not. That is the trumpet call from this monument. May we need it—and thus guarantee to our warriors that America is worth suffering for even unto death. That is the spirit of our country.

Free Enterprise Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Post of June 12, 1944:

"FREE ENTERPRISE" DEFINED

What is "free enterprise," anyway? One of the chief dangers to its survival lies in the misunderstanding, confusion, and suspicion as to the meaning of the term that is being heard so often these days.

Many laboring people think "free enterprise" means the return to business conditions of 20 years ago, with benefits solely to the owners and management, and the loss of gains made by organized labor. To many farmers the private enterprise system means oppression of the farmer in the interest of labor and business. Even businessmen differ in their understanding of the term, their conceptions ranging all the way from the old autocratic czarlike capitalistic system to the more progressive liberality which forward-looking modern executives have found desirable.

As clarifying an explanation of the phrase as we have heard or seen was given Monday by James A. Farley, of New York, former Postmaster General and chairman of the National Democratic Executive Committee, in an address at French Lick, Ind.

He told how the founding fathers of our Government had guaranteed to the free people of the United States, through the Bill of Rights, freedom of religion, of speech, and of the press; the right of petition, the right of the people to be secure against unreasonable search and seizure, the right of trial by jury, and protection of private property against seizure without just compensation. All these rights and safeguards have made possible and brought into being the "American way of life"—trite words themselves, variously construed, which yet "have a real significance in their every interpretation that is predicated on the pride of those enjoying the privileges they indicate." And, continued Mr. Farley:

"These privileges in their essential elements are what makes us a free people. They compose the very basis of our liberties. They are the distinguishing factors that set us apart as Americans. Their meaning can best be demonstrated in the simple declaration that under our system of a free government for a free people, every American has a right to live his or her life in any way he or she pleases, so long as any citizen's action does not infringe on the rights of his or her fellow citizens. Consequently, since the American way of life is predicated on these basic individual liberties, it can only continue to prevail if these liberties are secure."

A noteworthy part of his definition of free enterprise was an exposition of a point which, to many, somehow does not seem consistent. That is that under our system some may voluntarily surrender these rights to an association of mutual benefit, while others may, if they wish, work out as individuals their own economic salvation.

"Some there are who prefer to have the protection of groups. Others prefer to select their own mode of working and individually make their own terms of employment. Both must be protected in their choice of method. There are surely in our complex economy opportunities sufficient to make successful the operation of legitimate trade unions without infringing on the heritage of liberty possessed by those individuals who go it alone. In business also there is ample opportunity for associated capital to gain the benefits that may accrue from cooperative management without shutting out the opportunities of others who, as individuals, can profit from the fruits of their energy and intelligence. To insist on complete control of any segment of our economy along any single path would be regimentation. To keep open all roads of advancement multiplies opportunity, promotes industry, and encourages incentive in the true American way."

Such is the system of free enterprise; the system that has made possible the development of the world's greatest civilization within a century and a half; the system which has enabled this Nation to meet the demands of the present holocaust; and the only system whereby we can solve the economic problems that will confront the country at the close of the war.

Germany Will Be Strong After the Shooting Stops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. BUELL SNYDER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Evening Standard of Uniontown, Pa., by S. W. Calkins, president of Uniontown Newspapers, Inc., on suggestions relative to post-war problems:

A military decision for ourselves and our Allies on the continent of Europe is now in sight.

Whether or not that decision means complete victory or merely thwarted ambition of world conquest depends upon conditions in post-war Germany for generations to come. Its defeat will be bitter, and at a time when everything will seem lost to Germany, let us be sure that no spark of hate and revengeful ambition be allowed to kindle a flame that will sear the instruments of peace and decent living and leave the ugly ashes of war on our doorstep for future generations to put out.

The loss of life to all the countries of Europe has been terrifying but it has been much less in Germany than in the countries where the European battles have been fought. Germany will emerge after the war with a tremendous advance in science of war and with the manpower of her European enemies decimated out of all proportion to her own.

Where are the men who made up the armies of France, Belgium, Poland and the other countries that felt the crushing blow of the Nazi heel? What has happened to the women and children who struggled in the path of battle? These dead represent their countries' greatest sacrifice. We must be true to the memories of these dead and to the broken bodies of the living. We must forever carry their trust into living, breathing action that will bring lasting peace and liberty.

This cannot be done by making another Treaty of Versailles. It cannot be done by the smug business of earning dollars and seeking additional comfort for ourselves. It could be done by allowing the German homeland to be overrun as the German armies overran other lands and let annihilation run unabated until the proportion of dead be equalized. But this must be ruled out as inhuman.

It has been suggested that the rabid Nazis be forcibly exported to some of the undeveloped areas in Africa. This has two advantages. It would help to restore normal living and thinking in their homeland and the Lebensraum problem would be solved. In practice it would serve a political purpose for Germany as French Guiana furnishes a criminal problem purpose for France.

After the incurables have been eliminated a 100-year protectorate should be placed over Germany and the following program put into effect:

1. Forced education equivalent to our own high school for all.

2. Elimination of war colleges. Textbooks on war eliminated.

3. Establish production on a basis of 80-percent agriculture; 20 percent industry.

4. Rotate the outside executives governing official Germany every 10 years.

5. Establish a universal language and encourage the free exchange of ideas with other nations for the creation of better living.

6. Let there be a single power in Europe and in Far East sufficiently strong to keep the peace in their respective spheres of influence and with all people free to use the natural resources of the world for peaceful purposes and in equity.

The Tax Problem of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me before the City Business Club of Philadelphia on August 4, 1944:

On the beaches of the Normandy peninsula I saw long lines of German prisoners being marched to the ships to be taken to prisoner-of-war camps. These German prisoners were astounded at the immense amount of materials for making war to be seen on every street and on every Norman farm. Many Nazi soldiers commented: "You have so much of everything. If we had half as much, we could have knocked you back into the sea."

"You have so much of everything."

I want you to know and I want you to realize with pride that you put those words upon the lips of the captured enemy. You put that bewilderment, that surprise, that astonishment before the Nazi soldiers' eyes. You fixed the helplessness of the German war effort in the Nazi soldier's brain.

How did you do this? You did it on the production front, which forges the tools of victory. The war front is utterly, wholly dependent upon you.

If the emphasis has been on what great generals have achieved, if the story has been presented to us from a standpoint of famous leaders and sweeping movements, similarly the emphasis on the production front would appear to have been upon the output of huge industrial plants.

Today I want to discuss what the smaller industrial plants are doing in this great national war effort. I want to discuss it in somewhat the same spirit that motivated Ernie Pyle in telling us of the achievements, the viscissitudes, and the problems of the man in the ranks. I am not comparing the small producer with G. I. Joe. Rather I am pointing out that our smaller war-production plants have also made impressive contributions to the cause and merit both recognition and official consideration.

Do you remember, back in 1942, those urgent, dramatic demands of both Army and Navy? "Give us the stuff we need. Our boys are dying. They must have it now."

And do you remember how industry, both large and small, responded with a wholehearted, all-out drive? That response was almost miraculous. American production exceeded Washington's most sanguine hopes, astonished the world, confounded our enemies, and—it may now be said—made victory certain.

What made it possible for this Republic—the unprepared, the peace-loving—to create in a few months a volume of fighting equipment that quickly surpassed the output dictator nations had spent years in constructing, and tipped the scales in history's most crucial moment? Why could this Nation, alone of all the world's nations, perform a miracle of adaptation and production?

Here is the answer. It was our ability to make the small plant of today into the big business of tomorrow. Our industrial greatness springs from a pattern as clear as a blueprint, and as American as the Stars and Stripes. Here are the familiar steps.

First, a man with vision and courage starts a small manufacturing plant of his own. There follows a period of dogged and desperate effort. If he is weak or incapable he fails—as many do. If strong and able, he survives. Then comes a season of growth, of the plowing back of profits into better production facilities, of judicious expansion, larger pay rolls, more factory space, until finally—often within the mature lifetime of a single individual—another giant industry takes its place in our great American system.

More than any other element, the wholesome, natural growth of small business into large, epitomizes the idea of opportunity which the name "America" has come to mean throughout the world. It fills a tremendous proportion of our Nation's pay envelopes, and holds open to every man the door to opportunity. Through the establishment of his own small business he may progress to goals limited only by his own enterprise and abilities.

Picture, if you can, the United States without small business. A drab future for our returning sons, or for any young fellows with the will to succeed. All would be employees of either great corporations or of Government. There could be no new ventures started by individuals. There could be no room for the constructive developments of an Edison or a Budd.

Americans are by tradition a venturesome people. The history of America is the story of enterprise, plus opportunity. We must keep opportunity alive. It is our great national asset; our great distinction among nations—this chance for any citizen to rise to the utmost peak of his own abilities, to contribute to his country's industrial leadership, and to share in its benefits.

But to achieve these things he must be free; free not only to create a new enterprise, but free to develop and enlarge it. He must be permitted the right and the means to install new and more efficient machinery, to expand payrolls, to improve distribution. He and his plant must, in short, be free to grow. Take an example:

An obscure machinist starts a small business of his own—the manufacture of horseless carriages. He might still be making them—one at a time, and by hand at that—if he hadn't been free to use his initiative and pour a swelling stream of earnings back into new equipment, new methods, better facilities.

A farmer was once asked if he would not like to share Henry Ford's wealth. His reply showed one of the clearest concepts of the real nature and achievements of American industry that I have ever heard. "Well, sir," he answered, "it seems to me that wealth is doing a good job right where it is. It's not in cash or bank balances. It's in machinery that makes good jobs for hundreds of thousands of men and women and produces real wealth for nearly everybody in the country."

What if Henry Ford and others like him had not been permitted to plow back earnings? Let's consider such a situation:

Sam and Joe form a partnership. They contribute equally in time and money to establish their venture. At the end of the year partner Sam says: "All right, we made $10,000. That's $5,000 apiece. I want mine in cash."

Joe protests that while the profit was made it isn't in cash. It's in new equipment, raw materials, reserves for losses, and bad times that are sure to come.

But, Sam insists, profits are profits. He wants his in dollars on the barrel head. So either the money must be borrowed to pay him, or the business must be liquidated. It's one of the two—no choice. Obviously such a practice can't continue without crippling and finally killing the whole enterprise.

"Far-fetched," you say? Well, not so long ago you would have been right. But today things are different.

For today a "partner"—an unreasoning and unreasonable partner—intrudes into many small businesses, contributing neither time nor skill nor knowledge nor money. He demands, not just half the profits, but 80 percent of the profits—cash-on-the-line. He is the Federal tax collector, who, due to impractical tax legislation, is in many instances blocking the earnest war efforts of small business by leaving it stripped of the funds needed to operate, to meet pay rolls, and to produce.

This is a serious situation. It is doubly serious at this critical period. For American industry—small as well as large—has not only had to draw upon its reserves to meet pyramiding demands of preparedness, lend-lease, and, finally, all-out war production, it also, at the same time, had to solve the problems of financing for conversion, expansion, and ballooning pay rolls.

In the case of big industry, this was done partly through great cash reserves, but mostly through loans and credit. But the small fellow, serving for the most part through subcontract, often found private borrowing or Government financing unavailable or unsuited to his pressing needs, and the accompanying red tape prohibitive.

Did he then settle back on his well-polished trouser seat and say, "Aw, the heck with it?" He did not. Production was his way of contributing to victory and, come high or low water, he was going to produce. So he plowed back everything he made or hoped to make, and put it into the things his plant must have to meet the Government's call for more guns, more tanks, more airplanes, more ships, more—more—more!

The record shows that the small factories of America, by furnishing parts and services to big industry, actually have carried the major part of our total war production load. One of the biggest companies (Chrysler) is said to have farmed out 80 percent of its production to small plants throughout the nation.

During 1943, for example, half of the construction materials contracts from the Maritime Commission exceeding $10,000 were awarded to plants hiring fewer than 500 persons. Of 7,000 subcontracts let by the shipyards on maritime construction work, 68 percent were handled by small firms.

It is further estimated that small business produces more than 60 percent of all materials supplied to our armed forces and those of our allies. Its pay roll reaches amazing weekly totals, and it employs more than half of all workers in American business.

Much of our rapid expansion for production occurred in 1941 and 1942. Then, on October 21, 1942, Congress passed a tax law, rightly designed to "take the profit out of war." How did this affect the small industrialist who had put back every available dollar into greater production facilities? He found himself in an appalling situation. The tax collector demanded 80 percent of what he earned that year. But these earnings were already invested in equipment, machinery, office desks, building additions—all the stuff he laid in to build his capacity to

meet urgent war appeals. So, as a result, today he simply hasn't got the money. The tax collector has him in a hopeless impasse. For the tax collector's job is to collect. His not to reason why. His duty is to liquidate the business if necessary, but get the money.

It requires no student of higher mathematics to figure out that this doesn't make sense; that it threatens the very heart of the American system, and heads directly toward a socialistic, Government-owned economy. Legislators freely admit that this impossible condition escaped their notice when the tax laws were written. It was neither their desire nor their objective. Nevertheless, the law now stands. Prompt relief from its onerous effects is imperative.

Take, by way of illustration, one essential industry, made up entirely of small companies which can be considered typical of small business in war work. Records show that, in response to urgent demands for more output to meet desperately imperative war needs, these firms have plowed back as much as 55 percent of their net income to enlarge production. Obviously they aren't able to pay out 80 percent of these same earnings, and thus they lack the money to pay the 1942 tax levy. These firms face serious deficits, running from $4,000 to $47,000 for that year's operations alone—deficits they had to carry over into 1943 operations, when taxes again demanded 80 percent of profits, so that in 1943 they could not depend upon even 20 percent of their own earnings.

As though this were not bad enough, the renegotiators now enter the picture and say "even 20 percent of your profits are excessive. We'll just cut that some more," leaving in many cases as little as 3 percent on sales. When asked how the company is to pay for equipment installed and have a reserve to meet possible losses, these gentlemen blandly reply: "That is not our problem."

The figures just quoted are from a highly specialized industry of vital importance to our huge war production schedules—the heat treating of metals, having to do with the vital parts of tanks, planes, artillery, and the like, and with many parts of merchant vessels and warships, which must be scientifically heat treated to give them the required high strength, toughness, and endurance to stand up under gruelling punishment of modern war.

To prepare for mass production—to meet this urgent call—no one of these small companies used more than $100,000 in any year from earnings. Yet they saved Government the tremendous cost of building and equipping new, additional plants, which might later be useless.

Here is one instance of what such companies have done. A manufacturing plant, early in the war, got a contract to produce aircraft parts. To take care of the necessary heat treating, the Government ordered furnace equipment costing $75,000 to be delivered to the contractor. But he had no space to house it. That meant another $30,000 for buildings and more delay.

Then a commercial heat treater entered the picture. By investing a few thousand dollars to expand his own furnaces, he was able to take over the entire heat-treating job, at a total billing of less than $10,000 in 12 months, including necessary labor, fuel, and all other costs. This one case saved the American taxpayer a round $100,000. And not only money was saved, but precious time, and perhaps lives, as well.

Another example:

A foundry obtained a subcontract for a large lot of trench mortar shells for lend-lease. A furnace was ordered to handle the heat treating, but this could not be delivered for 6 months. Meanwhile, a commercial heat treater, at his own expense, rebuilt and remodeled certain equipment, was ready for operation in 60 days, and completed the entire order during the next 4 months—before the primary contractor's furnace was even ready for operation.

These two cases are typical of what the small, independent plant can do if free to exercise its own initiative.

Now, let's look at the effect upon the war effort of assessing an 80-percent tax on earnings reinvested in war production facilities by these and other firms.

The 20 percent left to the manufacturers is tragically inadequate to provide necessary cash in bank to meet enlarged pay rolls and material turnover under expanded war schedules, to say nothing of renegotiation. So the small concern has no funds whatever available to obtain the endless items, large and small, needed to produce for the war.

More serious still, suppose the small manufacturer needs another $1,000 truck, machine, tool, or furnace to do a job. He has to figure that this item will actually cost him $1,000 plus 80-percent tax, or $1,800, because he is using current income to buy it, and must pay $800 on that earned $1,000 invested. No matter what the basis of figuring, he cannot enlarge his facilities to meet war schedules on 20 percent of his earnings and still have pay-roll cash.

From a practical business viewpoint, the logical thing for him to do, therefore, in self-preservation, would be to sit tight, hoard up every earned dollar, and use only facilities on hand, turning down any suggestion for increasing output that would require investment. Had this hard-headed policy been followed by the majority, war production would be far behind its present point and the taxpayers' bill a lot higher.

The first function of profits is to pay off losses—not only past losses but the inevitable future losses that will come in the change from war to peace production, to say nothing of operating losses during depression periods when volume drops to small fractions of today's all-time high levels. Unless adequate reserves are set up now from current income, as a backlog of industry, the post-war period may find us without equipment to make, or firms to manufacture, items essential to our national recovery.

Today, many small businesses are swimming hard—but they are gasping. To make matters worse, small business is still so preoccupied in meeting the cry for war materials that it can give little thought to the fight necessary to survive the smothering effect of taxes that threaten its very life. It is traveling on momentum, using up its reserve on a day-to-day basis, and expecting relief as a matter of justice. But financial starvation cannot be withstood indefinitely.

With all its difficulties, small business offers no complaint about the huge size of the tax bill. It is willing to pay, and keep on paying, but it simply must have time to work the thing out. A fair and simple arrangement has been suggested to permit continued operation at efficient levels, that would lose Government nothing. Briefly stated, it proposes that:

1. The Congress should recognize by amendment to the revenue laws, that earnings up to some limit, say $100,000, reinvested in facilities needed for war production in any one year, be considered as overhead cost for that year.

2. Where these facilities become an asset, and, therefore, a profit, that one-fifth of their value be added to current earnings for tax purposes each year for 5 years. For example, if earnings were reinvested in war production facilities in 1942, they would be added to operating expenses for that year, but their taxable value as an asset would be distributed over the years 1943 to 1947, inclusive.

By this plan, Government would get the taxes in full, while small business would escape the danger of being strangled to death by Government's effort to squeeze from it money that it just hasn't got.

By this plan, small companies could meet obligations and not be forced into insolvency. Such a plan would meet the needs of small firms the country over, including contractors and subcontractors who found it impracticable to get a certificate of necessity. The latter, now revoked, provided no real tax relief for the small concern, since the 20 percent annual write-off obviously failed to offset the 80 percent tax payable the first year, and was in other ways not suitable for the needs of most small concerns.

Big corporations with securities listed in the stock market can raise capital at low interest rates for plant expansion by selling an issue through investment brokers. Small business can't raise capital this way, nor has it reserves for expansion, depreciation, replacements. In other words, it lacks access to the funds that large business gets with comparative ease. (The new War Contract Termination Act is of no help in this situation.)

To some, the word "profit" means getting rich out of the war. They think of profit as cash left in the till after a transaction. But it's seldom as simple as that. Under businesslike management—the only kind that permits survival—most profit is put aside to replace worn-out equipment, or to see a firm through the inevitable rainy days and lean years. Such reserves are by no means "windfalls." They are legitimate essentials for any firm that expects to stay in business.

I have found in my talks with smaller industrialists that they do not ask "tax forgiveness." They want to shoulder their full load, both materially and financially, in these serious days of war and the critical days to follow. But they ask fair consideration. Their only chance seems to lie in this suggested relief from Washington—a step which would be in line with the announced congressional policy of giving consideration to the small taxpayer.

For some time the Ways and Means Committee of the House has been studying the need for revision of our present tax laws, especially as they affect industry.

Committees of the Congress welcome constructive ideas from our citizens. The weight of your opinion counts. If you are in accord with the ideas expressed here today, it would be well to bring the matter to the attention of your Representative, asking him to impress upon the members of the Ways and Means Committee the serious and urgent nature of this problem, so that remedial action may be taken without delay and small business be given an even break.

Let us learn to be fair in our dealings, one with another. Government cannot survive without a prospering economy. And 11,000,000 uniforms must some day be laid aside. We had better be ready with working clothes for their occupants.

Jackson Hole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Boston Globe of August 7, 1944:

JACKSON HOLE

A lawsuit trial opening in Wyoming this month is as much the concern of New Englanders who may, after the war, desire to see their own country as it is of the disgruntled cattle owners who have instigated an attempt to deny to the public the newest of their national monuments. A bill in Congress, introduced by a Wyoming Congressman, has the same object: To invalidate the Jackson Hole National Monument established last year.

Jackson Hole is a Federal reservation of some 175,000 acres, established to protect for all Americans for all time a site of scenic grandeur where the Grand Tetons raise their Gothic spires above a plain that reveals one of the most spectacular records of glacial action on this continent. It is an historic spot, and wintering ground of the largest elk herd surviving in the United States.

To preserve this magnificent valley that retains the sagebrush flavor and rugged splendor of the old West, steps have been in progress for 20 years. Four national administrations have participated in its development. John D. Rockefeller purchased some 35,000,000 acres to donate to the public and so round out other land already in the public domain. The recreational importance of the spectacular valley at the headwaters of the Snake River is evidenced by the thousands of tourists who visit it annually and constitute a principal commercial asset of the region.

There are only 241 residents of the area now designated a national monument, who graze about 6,300 head of cattle on a small part of the public domain. Their rights of grazing and cultivation and residence are wholly protected. They and other cattlemen have enjoyed a privilege of drifting their cattle across the public lands and grazing them in the national forests. They would like to consider this privilege a permanent lien and a private right in the public domain and they fear that the need to protect food for the unique wildlife of the reservation may some day limit their grazing privileges, even though these have been specifically guaranteed them and their heirs and assigns. The State of Wyoming owns in State Park about one-half of 1 percent of the monument area, and this it will continue to manage in full control. But the private interests in the valley—so scanty as to make a travesty of their claim against the whole public and future citizenry of America—have raised a bogey of States' rights over the Jackson Hole reservation.

It is late in the day to suggest that the Government is not the appropriate sponsor and preserver of those parts of the public domain which Congress designates as desirable to reserve and protect for the enjoyment of the public. The "rights" which the cattlemen assert in these public lands are actually only a special consideration that has been shown them and which is not now to be taken away. But the attitude of those who have instituted the lawsuit in the name of the State of Wyoming against the United States, and of the backers of the Barrett bill to invalidate the Jackson Hole National Monument, is a hang-over of that view of the public domain and the public interest which has lingered overlong in the West. It is that the public interest is anybody's to exploit, and that what the public owns nobody owns and anyone can take.

Cattle interests, railroad interests, oil interests, have historically taken that attitude to exploit the public lands and ignore the public interest. But this cannot go on forever. The America of tomorrow will have no public lands to enjoy, no monuments to its great continental heritage to possess, unless the public rights in its own domain are protected now. For too long the voice of selfish interests with axes to grind is the only voice that has been effectively heard when such an issue is involved. Too often the defense of the public interest is left wholly to a few public officials. It is time that public opinion was expressed on behalf of that great public whose present rights and future enjoyment are at stake. Jackson Hole belongs to all of us, just as much as Boston Common. We shouldn't let anybody take it away from us.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

After the Bombing Stops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the Congress, either in committee or on the calendars, legislation dealing with these propositions:

Reconversion of war plants.

Demobilization of war workers.

Demobilization of men and women in the armed services.

Disposition of surplus property, including materials, and plants erected with public funds.

Unemployment compensation.

Whether the wars in which we are engaged shall come to an end next month, next year, or 2 or 3 years hence, it is generally recognized that legislation dealing with such propositions must precede the peace.

It is unfortunate that this legislation was not enacted earlier, because, coming at this time, it contributes to the seemingly growing popular belief that peace is near at hand, and that in turn does not contribute to the continued maintenance of an all-out effort on the home front.

The wars may come to a close sooner than any of us anticipates. No one, I care not whom he may be, can foretell when peace will again prevail. I feel myself that it will not come completely for many months ahead. The best way I know of to hasten its arrival is for all on the home front to continue to do their utmost to see that our armed forces are kept promptly and abundantly supplied with the sinews of war essential to the speedy accomplishment of the fighting job. There should be no relaxation on the part of anyone until the day the word is heralded that all of our enemies have laid down their arms. Any other course would be certain to prolong the conflict and every added day means more American dead, more American wounded, more American widows, more American grief-stricken homes. I want to drive that alternative home to the people of America. I know when they realize it that all will strive to the utmost to hasten the day of complete and final victory.

As I said before, certain preparatory measures must precede the peace, no matter how soon or how remote it may be. Back in 1942, in the early months of the war, in addressing the House of Representatives, I said:

Outside of contributing in every way at our command to winning the war, I submit our next responsibility is to be ready when that job is done with jobs—jobs on useful work for men moving out of the defense industries, and for the demobilized soldiers and sailors. There should be no delay then in looking for ways and means to effect the enormous readjustment that must occur. It is imperative, in my judgment, that we build up a backlog of worth-while projects to cushion the readjustment from war to peace.

I reiterated that statement in the House in April, 1943, and added that the provision I was advocating became "increasingly important with each passing day of war."

The problems ahead are manifold and ramifying. Involved in demobilization and readjustment are matters which must await the peace treaties. I wish to cite and remark upon some of them.

It is inconceivable that America will not in the future maintain a large Navy, a strong Marine Corps, a much larger peacetime Army than formerly, buttressed by civilian components of considerably larger proportions than of yore and thoroughly equipped and trained, aviation forces of such dimensions as will insure supremacy at any time, including the means for rapid replacement or augmentation, and a merchant marine that will be adequate, at least, to meet defense requirements over such period as may be determined to be sufficient until replacement or augmentation may be provided.

The measure of military and civilian demobilization, it seems to me, must await the determination of these matters, and such determination likewise will influence the measure of industrial readjustment.

These are matters that presently are under consideration by the respective responsible executive agencies. Final conclusions and recommendations obviously await the termination of the wars. Contraction of considerable proportions no doubt will be determined upon and advocated, to be effected upon the conclusion of hostilities, but the permanent peacetime levels must await the ratifications of the peace treaties.

THE NAVY

I visualize a sea arm wholly adequate to support any United States naval policy determined upon by our military and naval leadership and the Secretary of State. Such force, whether it be kept wholly or partly in full commission, no doubt will be maintained as to combatant units relatively as large as presently projected. Certainly that will be true until the international situation becomes stabilized, and the measure of defense that we should maintain becomes more manifest.

THE ARMY

The Regular Army must be sufficiently large to maintain adequate defense garrisons at all outlying establishments, appropriately to man establishments within continental United States, to provide instructors for the civilian components, to conduct military schools, and to look after the development, procurement, production, storage, and issue of matériel and the care of a reserve thereof.

A restudy unquestionably needs to be made of the civilian components. The National Guard must be considerably more numerous than formerly and the training thereof must be longer and more intensive. Final determination, I should say, should wait upon the time when the guardsmen now with the armed forces will be free to voice their sentiments and advocate their views. There need be no alarm on the part of anyone as to the continuance of the National Guard. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling military appropriations, of which I have been chairman for several years, has seen to it and will continue to see that the National Guard is continued and fostered and made more efficient and valuable than ever.

We have insisted upon the maintenance during the war of the National Guard Bureau in the War Department as a separate entity, and we have continued available since the guard's entrance upon active duty several millions of dollars of appropriated funds for its immediate needs upon release from active duty. Well before the war my subcommittee annually added to the Budget estimates for the National Guard and cooperated with the National Guard Association year after year in making the guard more efficient. I am sure there is not a high ranking officer of the National Guard, on active duty or otherwise, who will not bear me out that my subcommittee championed the National Guard on every occasion, and the best part of it was we were supported in every instance by the House, because the guard was universally popular and I am confident that it will remain so.

I have given some thought to using the National Guard in handling universal military service, should such a policy be determined upon at some future time. State quotas would need to be established and, possibly, a determination made of purely State militia needs in order to arrive at non-Federal costs. Essential officers, particularly for field training, would be available through the Officers' Reserve Corps. This is just an idea, but one that I should like to see thoroughly canvassed if there is to be universal military training.

OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS

I look to an enlarged and better trained Officers' Reserve Corps, to be built up to and maintained at the approved level through the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. There will need to be a more liberal allowance of funds to permit of a larger number of eligibles in senior units than formerly to qualify for commissions in the Officers' Reserve Corps.

FIELD TRAINING

Any post-war plan, in my judgment, must contemplate holding annually field exercises and maneuvers on a far larger scale than formerly, and of a month's duration, and all members of the civilian components should be required to participate therein.

AIR FORCES

The Air Forces, Army and Navy, I look for to be maintained at levels commensurate with needs determined by the heads of such forces in conjunction with the heads of the military and naval services and the Secretary of State. There will need to be appreciable contraction after the war, but the forces then maintained should insure us supremacy at all times over any potential enemy or enemies. There will be need to engage in research to the fullest extent practicable. I look for civilian aviation to become tremendously popular, and hope that the demand for planes will assume such proportions that, in conjunction with peacetime military and naval aviation production, there will be maintained production facilities adequate to provide replacement and augmentation to meet the demands of the armed forces during the early stages of a future emergency situation or war.

We must, upon the conclusion of peace, do everything consistent and practicable to continue research in all fields looking to the availability of the latest, most efficient, and most potent means of conducting war, offensively and defensively.

MERCHANT MARINE

The Government has spent a tremendous sum upon merchant ships. Peacetime demands probably will not support the tonnage that has been and is being built, and that which is needed no doubt will have to be subsidized. There will be need also to lend encouragement in other directions to make sure the greatest utilization of American bottoms. It may be in the interest of national defense to carry a certain amount of tonnage in reserve. That would depend upon the success of other measures employed to keep vessels in operation. We must not lose sight of the need to continue the existence of our best shipyards. The way to do that is to fix upon a maximum peacetime tonnage commensurate with maximum defense requirements on a future M-day. The supporting cost would be lessened by the amount of operating tonnage and reserve tonnage, which would need to be reconditioned periodically and replaced from time to time.

Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and informative address delivered by Paul L. Styles, vice chairman of the fourth regional war labor board, before a meeting of personnel directors and labor officials at Brunswick, Ga., on August 2, 1944, on the subject of industrial peace, together with an editorial from the Atlanta Journal of August 2, 1944, commenting on Mr. Styles' address, under the caption "For industrial peace."

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF PAUL L. STYLES, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE FOURTH REGIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

In appearing before this meeting tonight I am running true to form in that I am following the habits and superstitions of my neighbors in my native State of Tennessee. As some of you probably know, a good many mountaineers, when approaching old age, buy themselves a coffin and place it in the attic, and begin to accumulate their laying-away clothes. We, of the War Labor Board, would like to start building our own coffin and start preparing our laying-away clothes now.

However, to the end that we may have a decent burial rather than have our careers wind up in a lynching party, I would like to make certain suggestions as to the manner in which the body should be interred.

The Fourth Regional War Labor Board is convinced that management and labor in the South must learn in the next few months to make collective bargaining work on a voluntary basis. The Board is unanimous in this conviction. Industry, labor, and the public members of the Board agree that too many cases are coming to the Board in which the full processes of collective bargaining have not been exhausted. We are convinced that the parties in these cases are not bargaining in good faith. We are further convinced that too many employers and unions are in effect saying, "let George do it," and are calling in the United States Conciliation Service merely as a vehicle to obtain certification to the War Labor Board.

Government arbitration of labor disputes is certainly a weak substitute for sound, legitimate collective bargaining. No one knows better how to settle a controversy than the people who are involved in the controversy. I would like to make several suggestions here tonight on the conduct of negotiations between employers and unions with special emphasis on the general public's stake in these negotiations.

All too often the parties to a labor dispute are of the opinion that the dispute affects only themselves. This, of course, is not true today—I doubt if it ever was true. Our economic system is so closely geared that we are in the same position as three men riding in a canoe. Our canoe and its riders can best be illustrated by saying that labor and industry have the paddles and the public is engaged in bailing out the water which ships over the sides. Obviously, if the two paddlers insist on paddling in opposite directions it will be impossible for the third member of the trio to keep the boat on an even keel and bailed out.

Unless capital and labor settle down and start paddling in the same direction, the general public is going to insist that it be given the right to decide who is going to paddle and where he is going to paddle.

Just that sort of thing has happened during this war. The public in the person of the National War Labor Board has settled the labor disputes in this country. This condition, unsatisfactory as it is, is necessary during the war. However, the minute the war emergency is over the War Labor Board will cease to be. Management and labor will no longer be able to say, "let's let George do it," but will have to sit down once again and settle their problems.

Leadership must be developed by both industry and labor. This leadership can only be developed among men who are willing to assume responsibility in the field of labor relations. The best training for this leadership is actual association with and knowledge of the problems that require leadership. The best way to acquire this knowledge is through day-to-day association with industrial labor problems within a plant, and the

development of practical techniques for solving these problems.

If industry and labor are to push the Government out of labor relations you must build up a sound structure of collective bargaining, a field of mutual understanding and trust, so that the Nation's productivity will not be impaired. This refers particularly to the war-time powers of the War Labor Board, which, under the pressures of the war has to a great extent taken over the leadership in the field of collective bargaining by ordering wage rates and conditions of employment.

With the end of the emergency, it is to be expected that the wage-stabilization program and the War Labor Board in general, will immediately go out of business. If industry and labor have not found a field of mutual agreement within which they can operate by that time, public opinion in this country will not tolerate a return of jungle law in American industry. Management and labor must provide leadership which can negotiate constructively at the conference table or governmental controls, similar to those now exercised by the War Labor Board, will be carried over permanently into the peace.

All of us are expecting and praying for a great expansion of industry in the South. With this expansion will inevitably come an expansion of unionism. This is not only inevitable, it is desirable. We cannot have political democracy for long without at the same time having industrial democracy. The best safeguard against communism and fascism in this country is a strong labor movement, negotiating with strong, well informed progressive employers. Unless some means are found to avert the wave of strikes and lockouts which seem eminent after war-time restrictions are dropped, this industrial expansion in the South will be nipped in the bud. The Nation will not allow industry and labor to go back to the law of the tooth and the fang. Jungle law was made for beasts and not for men.

In my opinion, the one bright ray of hope in this situation which confronts us at the present time is the fact that since January 12, 1942, the day the National War Labor Board began business, hundreds of industry, labor, and public panel members have been trained in industry-labor relations by the Board. These people, respected citizens in their home communities, have become experienced in labor problems. In these panel members we have a great force, which properly utilized, can alleviate the worst of our industrial headaches in the South.

In every town of any size in the South we have appointed panels composed of labor, industry and public members. These people are now working in this field for the Government at great personal sacrifice. There is no reason why they should not voluntarily serve their local communities, since all of them are necessarily public-spirited citizens, with the welfare of their community and Nation at heart.

In order to utilize the experience gained by these panel members in the past few months, and prevent a return to jungle law in the relations between labor and industry, I would like to suggest that the following procedure or something of its kind be developed voluntarily, by labor and industry, on their own initiative, free from Government interference:

1. That the labor organizations, both A. F. of L. and C. I. O., and the various business and industry groups, such as chambers of commerce, boards of trade, personnel associations, trade associations, and other groups, cooperate and set up in each industrial community in the South a voluntary mediation board to be composed of equal representatives of public, labor, and industry. Membership on these boards should not be restricted to War Labor Board panel members, but should extend to outstanding industrialists, labor leaders and public men in general—men of goodwill—men of vision—men who merit the fullest confidence of all segments of the community.

2. Members who serve without compensation and would be available at all times for consultation with labor or industry. In order to facilitate this work, the mediation board should be as large as possible without becoming unwieldy.

3. The mediation board should meet at least once a month for general policy discussions. At such meetings the possibility of better techniques for handling labor disputes should be freely and frankly discussed with an end to arriving at a more satisfactory procedure in handling disputes.

4. The parties to a threatened dispute as well as anyone in the community should feel free to call upon the mediation board to use its good offices to prevent a cessation of production.

5. The board should be headed by a chairman in a position to give a substantial amount of his time to the work. Upon receipt by the chairman of notification of a dispute he would immediately call in a representative panel of labor and industry members, who would call the parties in for separate and, if necessary, joint conferences. It will probably be found that a good number of situations will clear up when the labor member of the board talks to the union involved, or when the industry member talks to the company.

6. If the labor and industry members of the panel selected are unable to settle the difficulty, the chairman, with the aid of labor and industry members, should select a public member or members for the panel. The panel should then hear the case in a manner similar to the operation of War Labor Board panels. A great number of cases will probably be settled during the panel hearing. In the small number of cases not settled, the panel would either recommend arbitration of the dispute, or might make a recommendation for settlement of the dispute. Although there would be nothing binding in such a recommendation, the fact that a recognized mediation agency made the recommendation would secure compliance in a majority of cases. The bright light of publicity might well be invoked if the parties did not accept the recommendation.

The mediation board will probably need the aid and assistance of the United States Conciliation Service. Commissioners of Conciliation, attached to that agency, are always available. In addition, the Service has available a trained staff of technicians and arbitrators. A wire or phone call to Clarence Williams, regional director of the Service in Atlanta, Ga., will always receive prompt attention. If the matters involved are subject to wage-stabilization control, the regional war labor board will be very glad to advise the panel of its policies. The board will set up a division to handle these requests.

In my opinion, we should not wait until the War Labor Board goes out of the picture to set up these local mediation boards. Now, while the Board is still functioning and the Board's panels are still in existence and can render invaluable aid to these local boards, we should proceed immediately to place the settlement of labor disputes back where it belongs, in the hands of the parties and the local community.

In closing, may I point out that the success of such a plan as I have proposed depends entirely on the cooperation of labor and industry and the general public. As I have said before, unless labor and industry start paddling in the same direction—an improved standard of living for all our people—John Q. Public, through his Government, will insist that agencies such as the War Labor Board, be continued into the peace.

As a firm believer in the American way I sincerely pray that labor and industry will seize this opportunity to put their representative houses in order and once again sit down to the conference table and work out their joint problems in the only really satisfactory way to settle labor disputes.

[From the Atlanta Journal of August 2, 1944]

FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE

Without having to go too far, you may hear nowadays that when the war ends and Government controls expire there will be grave industrial conflict on the home front. You may hear the Bourbon capitalist say, in effect: "We'll put those unions in their place." You may hear the agitator in the ranks of labor say, "With patriotism and war pledges out of it, we are going to get ours."

It is possible, of course, to exaggerate the gravity of the outlook forecast by such radical statements. Things usually turn out better than pessimists predict, for there is a lot of character and a lot of sense distributed among the American people of all classes. But it would be the part of wisdom for management and organized labor to give earnest consideration now to the establishment of a mode of living in amity and mutual help when Hitler and Hirohito shall have been beaten. The transition from a war economy to that of peace will be difficult enough at best for both sides of the pay window. Bitter strife between management and labor on a sectional or national basis would bring chaos and disaster.

Paul L. Styles, vice chairman of the fourth regional war labor board, which functions in the Southeast, made a suggestive talk on this subject to a meeting of employers and labor leaders at Brunswick Wednesday. He urged the setting up of mediation boards in every sizable community in the South which, operating on a voluntary basis, would harmonize differences between management and labor. These home-town boards would be composed of "men of good will representing labor, industry, and the public—men of such outstanding leadership in their communities as to deserve the fullest confidence of all segments of the population."

Mr. Styles points to the present panels which already have been set up as subsidiaries of the War Labor Board—citizens now working at great personal sacrifice for industrial peace. "In these panel members," he says, "we have a great force which, properly utilized, can alleviate the worst of our industrial headaches in the South. There is no reason why they should not voluntarily serve their local communities, since all of them are necessarily public-spirited citizens, with the welfare of their community and Nation at heart."

Mr. Styles argues that management and labor must learn to make collective bargaining work on a voluntary basis. He believes too many cases have been coming to the War Labor Board in which the full processes of collective bargaining have not been exhausted; on both sides there has been an unwholesome disposition to put cases into the lap of the Government. And, he says, with a wisdom which will find wide acceptance, "Government arbitration of labor disputes is certainly a weak substitute for sound, legitimate collective bargaining."

The importance of preparing now for the future is stressed by Mr. Styles in saying: "All of us are expecting and praying for a great expansion of industry in the South. With this expansion will inevitably come an expansion of unionism. This is not only inevitable, it is desirable. We cannot have political democracy for long without at the same time having an industrial democracy. The best safeguards against communism and fascism in this country is a strong labor movement, negotiating with strong, well-informed, progressive employers. Unless some means is found to avert the wave of

strikes and lock-outs after wartime restrictions are dropped, this industrial expansion in the South will be nipped in the bud. The Nation will not allow industry and labor to go back to the law of tooth and the fang. Jungle law was made for beasts, not for men."

Flood Control and Valley Authorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered on Thursday, July 27, 1944, at a special session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in New Orleans, La., to wit:

While flood-control works are as old as recorded history, they began in the United States at New Orleans along the Lower Mississippi River. Following the great flood of 1927, Congress declared that flood control along the lower Mississippi River was a national problem. A national flood-control policy for all rivers in the United States was adopted for the first time in 1936. More progress has been made in flood control in the United States in the past 15 years than in the preceding 15 centuries. There is a reason. The Federal Government provided for flood control along the lower Mississippi River in the Flood Control Act of 1928 by the Mississippi River Commission under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army. "Old Man River" has been tamed. The kinks have been eliminated. Every method of flood control has been utilized. Levees have been constructed to keep the floods out, and reservoirs have been built to hold the floods back. Cut-offs have been made to accelerate the flow and thus reduce flood heights. Floodways and spillways have supplemented levees.

Under the Flood Control Act of 1936, the planning and construction of works are under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Soil conservation, water retardation, and reforestation are under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture. There has been cooperation between the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Agriculture. Reforestation, water retardation and soil conservation supplement but do not supplant flood control. Generally reservoirs for power and reservoirs for flood control are incompatible A full reservoir is essential to the development of power, but an empty reservoir is required for the storage of flood waters. However, reservoirs may be constructed for multiple purposes. Provision can be made in the first instance for water for the development of power. Additional provision can then be made for the storage of flood waters. All existing flood-control acts provide for the installation of pen stocks. Power may not be presently developed, but provision is made for the future development, where practical, of power in all reservoirs. Water uses are frequently involved in the building of dams. Under the national policy, provision has been made for the utilization of water for all purposes. The plan is to make water serve and not destroy man, nor man's property.

RIVERS

Rivers interest me. There is a romance and there is a mystery about rivers. The Garden of Eden was situated between the Tigris and the Euphrates Rivers. The Romans worshipped the Tiber. The Egyptians worshipped the Nile. The East Indians worshipped the Ganges. The Indians revered the Mississippi as the Father of Waters.

Throughout human history rivers have influenced the course of civilization. They have molded and served man in the past and in the future they will help to make nations great. Some rivers are gentle and romantic. Others are stately and majestic, but there is a glory about all of them. I agree with Victor Hugo, who said: "I love rivers; they do more than bear merchandise. Ideas float along their surface. Rivers like clarions sing to the ocean of the beauty of the earth, the fertility of the plains, and the splendor of the cities."

The Mississippi is the greatest and longest navigable river in this or any other country. The levees along the Mississippi River overshadow the great walls of China. Man has never made any marks across the face of the earth comparable to the levees along the Mississippi. The cycle of floods has been constant through the ages. "All the rivers run into the sea, * * * unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again." In this quotation from Ecclesiastes, chapter 1, verse 7, the Bible condenses the flood cycle to four phases. First there is evaporation from sea and gulf. Secondly, the clouds are blown two or three thousand miles over hills and valleys. Third, there is the rainfall following the condensation of the clouds, and, fourth, the run-off when the floods return to the sea.

But important rivers like famous men are not all large. There are small rivers that are important, just as there are small men who are great. Great rivers like great men are not always large in size. Many of the most important rivers in the world are comparatively small, while the names of others much larger are seldom heard.

Floods have occurred in all centuries and along all rivers. They have occurred the world over. The Babylonians constructed flood-control works along the Euphrates River, and Alexander built works along its tributaries. There are records of floods along the Seine in Europe that go back 400 years. There were erosions long before the advent of the white man in America. Man is thus responsible for only a small part of the silt. Dust storms are not new. Geologists tell us that the soil of the Eastern Central States from a few inches to several feet in depth is the accumulation of the dust storms of the past. There was a great flood along the Ohio River in 1783. The Lower Mississippi River was in flood when it was discovered by DeSoto in 1541. Rivers either build or destroy; but they lose none of their beauty and none of their fascination as they travel toward the sea and gulf.

ESSENTIAL IN WAR

Flood control is essential in peace. It is more essential in war. River transportation and inland waterway transportation are important in peace. They are more important in war. The English, Russians, and Germans have utilized their rivers in peace, but they are utilizing them more in war. The more fierce the war, the more widespread is the use of inland waterways. The great battles between the Russians and the Germans have been fought along the rivers of Russia. We should always remember that during the First World War it was necessary for the United States to use everything that would float, as has been said, "from a bateau to a battleship." Ships are important. Barges are necessary. Improved waterways are fundamental. Flood control and navigation are as essential in the war in the New World as they are in the Old World.

METHODS TESTED AND APPROVED

The history of floods in the United States and other countries is well known. They are not now more frequent, but because of the advance in civilization the destruction is greater. The forces of nature have been constant through the centuries. The time for argument and disputation with respect to the methods of solving flood problems has passed. All factors of safety have been utilized. The methods have been tested. The policy and the program are sound. Congress has manifested foresight. The adopted projects are flexible and can be expanded. All works constructed as authorized will be utilized in the program of expansion. As new problems arise new solutions will be found.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

There is no valley in all the world comparable to the Mississippi. It lies between the Alleghenies and the Rockies, and between the Great Lakes and the Gulf. It is the most important valley on the face of the earth. The future of the United States will be determined by the development of this valley. Factories will be safer with the mountains separating them from the seas. The idea is for the factories to be near the field. The soil of the Mississippi Valley is the most fertile in this or any other country. It is not too much to say that the civilization of the valley will determine the civilization of the United States.

The supreme aim of America in fighting the greatest of all wars is to save America, and the supreme rehabilitation following victory is the rehabilitation of America. Property and people must be protected in peace as well as in war. Flood-control works have been tried. They have been tested, and they have not been found wanting. The program and the policy that has obtained along the Father of Waters and the father of floods should be extended to all of the rivers of our common country as we plan for a fairer day and a great country following the victory for which the flower of the youth of America is fighting and dying.

FALLACIES

There are many fallacies respecting the causes and remedies for floods. There are all kinds of superficial theories, lopsided plans, and falacious remedies to solve flood problems. There are those who maintain that soil conservation and reforestation will prevent floods. Others assert that reservoirs along tributaries and headwaters are the only remedy. Unfortunately, many who advocate reservoirs for local flood control make the mistake of asserting that the policy of levees has failed. In their eagerness for local protection, they would destroy protection in the lower Mississippi Valley. In all countries, in all ages, levees to protect from floods along alluvial rivers have been constructed.

In an editorial on May 31, 1944, the Washington Times-Herald made this statement: "The prediction has been made that if the levee method is used long enough, the Mississippi eventually will be running along a big walled ditch far above the level of the adjoining country. It hasn't come to that yet, but it is on its way." We meet in New Orleans today. The Mississippi River is from 100 to 200 feet deep along the New Orleans waterfront. Careful investigations and studies have been made. Nowhere has the bottom of the Mississippi River risen. Instead of being near the surface, the Mississippi River is as deep today as it ever was. The popular fallacy that the bottom of the Mississippi River is rising or has ever risen is quite frequently asserted. It has no basis whatsoever in fact.

MISSOURI RIVER AUTHORITY

Following the floods of 1943 and 1944 along the Missouri River, a Missouri River Authority has been advocated to solve the flood problems along the Missouri River. The praises of the Tennessee Valley Authority have been sung. A similar organization for the Missouri and the other river basins has

been suggested. I have favored and supported the Tennessee Valley Authority. I concede to the Tennessee Valley Authority all of the accomplishments that it deserves, but the Tennessee Valley Authority is primarily for the development of power. Its reservoirs and its dams are primarily, I repeat to emphasize, for the development of power. The authority was intended to provide a yardstick for the cost of hydroelectric power. But it is a fallacy to assert that the T. V. A. has protected the Tennessee Valley from floods. I recall that in the Ohio flood of 1937 it was stated that there was no major flood as a result of the T. V. A. along the Tennessee River. It was asserted that the T. V. A. had protected Cairo. There were unprecedented floods along the Ohio and many of its tributaries, but there was no unprecedented flood in 1937 along the Tennessee River.

The flood of 1937 exceeded all previous gages by some 10 feet at both Cincinnati and Louisville. It was caused by continuous and excessive rains in the lower Ohio Valley below the location of the dams and reservoirs on the tributaries. The Norris and Joe Wheeler Dams had been constructed, but there was no great flood in 1937 along the Tennessee River. The building of the Norris Dam and the Joe Wheeler Dam was given as the cause of the prevention of such floods. It might as well be said that there were no great floods along the Arkansas River in 1937. No reservoirs had been constructed along that river. The two cases would be analogous. It was a question of rainfall. The rains in the upper Tennessee Valley were well distributed, and, while unusual, the aggregate for the month of January in the headwaters of the Tennessee River was 13 inches, while in the lower stretches of the Tennessee River and along the Ohio River there were 23 inches and more of rainfall. The rains fell below the dams. The river gages tell the story of floods along the Tennessee River. At Knoxville in 1927 the gage was 19 feet. There was no dam or reservoir above Knoxville. In 1937 the gage was 19 feet. At Chattanooga in 1927 the gage was 33 feet. In 1937 it was 32.9 feet. The Norris Dam is above Chattanooga. At Johnsonville, where the rains were excessive, some 90 miles from where the Tennessee empties into the Ohio at Paducah, in both 1927 and 1937 the gage was 41 feet. Comparisons are always odious. This is especially true when they are not apt or correct.

I repeat that I have supported the Tennessee Valley Authority, but Congress has made other provisions that have resulted in the reduction of power rates. The Public Utility Act and the Securities Exchange Act, both established by Congress, have played a part in the reduction and adjustment of power rates, but the T. V. A. yardstick has been most helpful.

The reservoirs along the Tennessee River in the flood of 1937, according to accurate reports, contributed to the reduction of flood heights at Cairo substantially 1 inch or 1½ inches. Other dams have been constructed since. They will further reduce flood heights at Cairo to something more than 2½ inches. But I repeat that it is a fallacy to say that the T. V. A. has provided for the control of floods in the valley of the Tennessee River. Its objective was hydro-electric power. Its purpose was to supply that power at the lowest practicable rates. Instead of protecting the Tennessee Valley, the construction of dams from its mouth to its source has converted the entire valley to reservoirs. The T. V. A. has put in the bottoms of reservoirs substantially all of the lands that were subject to overflow before the river was improved for hydro-electric purposes.

The Tennessee River is a mountainous river, ideally suited for the development of power. The lands formerly subject to overflow are now submerged, and the flood problems of the Tennessee Valley have been eliminated by submerging its valley.

A similar authority would not be advisable for the Missouri River. The development of power from Sioux City to its mouth for some 760 miles along the river is not desired. It is not practicable. The need is to protect the valley of the Missouri from floods. The purpose is not to destroy the valley by overflowing it, but to preserve it as a part of the breadbasket of the country. A T. V. A. for the Missouri Valley is unwise. It is unsound for other similar valleys. The purpose of flood control in the great alluvial valley of the Mississippi is to preserve that valley, the richest soil in the world, for cultivation and for crop production. A T. V. A. along the lower Mississippi River would be thoroughly impracticable and would change the lands from agricultural uses to serve as bottoms of reservoirs.

I concede that the dams along the Tennessee River, and particularly the Kentucky Dam, are of some benefit to flood control along the lower Ohio and thus along the Mississippi, but the discharge of the Tennessee River is 500,000 second feet. The Mississippi River below Cairo carries floods of about 3,000,000 second feet. It was not the T. V. A. that saved Cairo in 1937, but it was the floodwall at Cairo and the New Madrid floodway authorized and constructed by the Mississippi River Commission under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers under the Flood Control Act of 1928. It is not practicable to control floods in the lower Mississippi Valley by reservoirs alone. They have their place. I favor them on their merits. Levees are being supplemented by reservoirs, but the reservoirs cannot supplant the levees. Congress has authorized 35 reservoirs in the Red, Arkansas, and White River Basins; 5 reservoirs in the Yazoo and St. Francis Basins; 9 in the upper Mississippi Basin; 85 in the Ohio Basin; and 25 in the Missouri Basin. A total of over 150 reservoirs have thus been authorized. These reservoirs are planned primarily for local flood control, but they have a beneficial effect on flood control in the lower Mississippi River. As has been said, the Army engineers are in the reservoir business in a big way. But T. V. A. is not the solution for floods along either the Mississippi, the Missouri, or other large rivers with valleys and industry or agriculture to be protected. Flood control in the Tennessee Valley is incidental. The river is well canalized. Navigation has been promoted. Power is the objective. Some newspapers and some individuals have advocated the T. V. A. as a solution of the flood problem along the Missouri River. Their position is untenable.

LUMP SUM APPROPRIATIONS

Authorities contemplate lump sum appropriations. Under the policy of national flood control, all authorized projects are recommended by the Chief of Engineers. They are authorized by Congress. Congress makes the appropriations, and properly so. The representatives of the people levy taxes against citizens, and the citizens expect that their representatives shall have a voice in the appropriation of the taxes so levied. The representatives and the people are entitled to accurate information before definite projects are approved. Authorities contemplate directors. Divided authority is often worse than no authority at all. There are differences between the directors. Central authority and central control are essential for successful construction and administration.

The blessed sunlight of publicity should shine upon the expenditures of taxes. Taxpayers want no experimental agency telling them what to build, without scrutiny of appropriations and without general supervision by the Representatives of the Congress and of the country.

I am anxious for the T. V. A. experiment to work out and to succeed. At present there is no occasion for any further T. V. A.'s, and there is no occasion for any more National Resources Planning Boards. The people and the Congress intend that they both shall be heard and considered. The adopted policy of flood control provides that waterway and flood control legislation should be authorized and appropriated for by the elected representatives of the people.

COMMISSION

The House has passed a flood-control bill authorizing additional projects in all of the basins of the country at an estimated cost of $810,000,000. The two major projects are along the Missouri River and the Mississippi River. Authorizations for increasing the navigation channel to 12 feet from Cairo to Baton Rouge are provided. These authorizations are particularly essential to provide revetments to protect the banks and the levees along the lower Mississippi River. Two hundred millions of dollars are authorized for flood control along the Missouri. It has been suggested that a commission similar to the Mississippi River Commission be authorized for the Missouri River. While I have an open mind on the subject, I have by no means reached the conclusion that the commission is the solution. A commission similar to the Mississippi River Commission has been suggested as I have stated. I am inclined to think that a smaller commission similar to the Sacramento River Commission would be preferable. I shall continue to urge, however, that the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, along both the Mississippi River and the Missouri River, and along other rivers, shall have the final say. I shall continue to insist that the chief administrative agency of the Missouri and of all other river basins in the United States shall be a division engineer of the United States Corps of Engineers, and that by and large the agency for the planning as well as the execution of flood-control works along the Missouri and along other river basins shall be composed primarily of representatives of the Corps of Engineers.

As civilization in all countries advanced, man attempted to improve and control rivers. Sometimes he undertook to control the ravages of disastrous floods by keeping high waters within the banks, and between levees supplementing the banks. Again he utilized diversions and constructed floodways. At other times he stored in reservoirs the excess waters in rainy seasons for use in time of scarcity. Dams have been constructed to detain the flood waters to prevent the overflow of the valleys.

DOMINANT INTEREST

The Committee on Flood Control has adhered to the policy of reporting bills and reporting projects where the dominant interest is flood control. It often appears that navigation, irrigation, or power is involved. All interests are heard, and only those projects where the preponderance of the testimony shows that flood control is paramount are authorized.

RESERVOIRS

Flood control is a national problem, and while local works are required in many cases, local works are not effective in other cases. It is most difficult in reservoirs to determine and to distribute among local interests the cost of construction. Moreover, reservoirs in one State detain waters that flood another State. Floods know no State lines. Reservoirs are authorized under the act of 1936, but they were only constructed in the far West where there are no fertile valleys and where areas are largely canyon without much value. Reservoirs were authorized along the tributaries of the Ohio and of the Connecticut, but they were not constructed because in many cases they did not benefit or protect from floods the areas in the States where they

were located, below the dams. The protection extended to other States.

The country insisted that levees and flood walls should be supplemented wherever practicable by reservoirs. The Corps of Engineers asserted that the waters should be detained at their source. Experience demonstrated that such reservoirs could only be constructed by the Federal Government assuming the costs of easements and construction. In local works the principle of local contribution obtains. If the policy of the Government paying the costs of rights-of-way for reservoirs were abandoned, flood control would be irretrievably set back.

There was opposition particularly in New England to the United States' furnishing easements for dams for flood control, under the guise of States' rights, but no matter how sincere, the opposition in reality voices the policy of the power trusts. There are those who still oppose the construction of reservoirs for flood control where those reservoirs contain power possibilities. The opposition is without merit. Water is our most valuable resource. If the floods can be detained and if provision can be made economically for the development of power for the benefit of all the people in the area where dams are located, a Federal policy that prevented the development of such power would be shortsighted. It would not be in the public or the national interest. It is passing strange that those who oppose the Federal Government developing power and disposing of it to the people in the area where produced, giving to public institutions the refusal of the power with provision for compensating from the proceeds of power sold, the State and local jurisdictions for taxes that might otherwise be levied against private interests at the same time advocate construction by the power interests. Those who oppose the Government developing and disposing of power so produced advocate reservoirs for the generation of power by private corporations. I know of no more effective prevention of monopolistic power rates than the Federal projects that we have as a yardstick where they are justified in the river basins of the United States.

We have heard about reservoirs being authorized and constructed in one State, and we have heard that the beautiful valleys and farms in that State have been destroyed for the protection of other States. It is time for careful thinking. No reservoirs for flood control in the valleys of the United States east of the Mississippi River were constructed until in 1938, when the construction of reservoirs was authorized at Federal expense. There is a reason. It is difficult to apportion the cost among the citizens and the States. It is difficult to ascertain and by State compact or otherwise distribute, in all fairness, the cost. It is passing strange that objection is made to the construction of reservoirs in some States where the same States accord to the private power companies the right to condemn and to flood the beautiful valleys of those States. It is all right for the power companies, but it is all wrong for the Federal Government to protect the lives and property of the people and to provide for reasonable yardsticks for the utilization of the water resources of the country.

CONSISTENCY

The Rocky Mountain area has been benefited as no other section of the United States, by the construction of Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Boulder Dams. They were constructed at Federal expense. There isn't the same opposition as there has been to the construction of reservoirs for flood control in New England. I have been disappointed, however, because some of those in the West in opposing the flood-control project along the Missouri River have been collaborating with New England interests and with other interests that oppose the construction of reservoirs by the Federal Government at Federal expense. If the opposition obtains, no reservoirs would be constructed along the Missouri or along any other river at Federal expense.

FLOOD CONTROL AND RECLAMATION

It is a source of satisfaction to me that there has always been cooperation between the advocates of flood control, rivers and harbors, and reclamation. Utilization of our natural resources has been promoted by all. Unfortunately, there is rivalry not only among groups but in governmental departments. There is room enough in this broad land of ours for all activities to utilize water for the progress of man. There is no real occasion for rivalry between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. There is no occasion for conflict. Those who promote discord and those who undertake to drive a wedge between advocates of flood control and reclamation are rendering both interests a distinct disservice.

Much has been said about the appropriation of waters and about the rights of States to the uses of water. The Committee on Flood Control has been most careful to recommend no project and to include no provision in the bill now pending in the Senate that would in any way retard reclamation. As I have indicated no project has been reported unless the dominant interest is flood control. The committee went out of its way. It invited the Commissioner of Reclamation. He was heard not once but several times by the committee. Those who shared his views and his fears submitted their arguments to the committee. The States have no power of appropriation or power of use that is not accorded to them under the Constitution. While the paramount right under the commerce clause of the Constitution is in the Federal Government, in every way, even to the extent of stretching the Constitution, the Federal Government has cooperated with the arid land States and has promoted and aided reclamation. I am sympathetic with the uses of waters in the arid States for domestic, agricultural, and industrial purposes. Personally, I would like to see them detain for such purposes all the waters possible. But there is no occasion for quibbling. Reclamation projects constructed will be under the supervision and control of the Secretary of the Interior, under the bill reported by the Committee on Flood Control.

I am aware that some friends of reclamation are disturbed about the Missouri River project. All reasonable safeguards to show that it is the intent and purpose of the authorization to recognize existing rights are contained in the bill. In fact the Committee on Flood Control has leaned over backward in an effort to cooperate with the Bureau of Reclamation.

Reservoirs along the main stem of the Missouri River above Sioux City will not provide for any waters except waters that empty into the main river from the tributaries, and I emphasize that there is nothing in the bill to prevent the waters on the tributaries from being utilized for the development of the arid lands before and after it reaches the main stem of the Missouri River. The people who suffer from devastating floods on the Missouri River below Sioux City and on the Mississippi River south of St. Louis will be more than pleased if the waters are not only utilized but detained at the source.

There is no occasion for the West to be apprehensive. I favor the utilization of waters within the States for domestic use and for irrigation. I want to protect citizens of all the States in their riparian privileges and in the enjoyment of their riparian rights. All such rights in the West or elsewhere along navigable rivers are under the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. The Western States are protected in the pending flood-control bill. They are protected in the continued utilization of the water resources under the existing law. Quibbling, misinterpretation or misrepresenting with respect to existing or proposed legislation, whether State or Federal, can only hurt the cause of reclamation. Flood-control projects in the West have been constructed along the Sacramento and other rivers for years. No conflict with respect to the domestic use of water or the use of water for irrigation has arisen.

PUBLIC WORKS

National flood-control appropriations, except in emergencies, have been discontinued for the duration, but a backlog of sound flood-control projects is essential to provide for unemployment, as well as for the protection of the lives and property of the people of the United States, following the war. But war comes first. After all has been said and done, there are but two fundamental issues confronting the American people. These questions are war and peace. It is essential in peace to prepare for war. It is just as essential in war to prepare for peace. We believe in freedom. We agree with Pitt: "Where law ends, tyranny begins." We believe in private initiative and free enterprise We believe that those who possess character and genius are the benefactors of civilization.

I have faith in America. I believe in the future of the United States. I believe in the Republic. Others may despair. Others may doubt, but as for me, I believe that the United States will not only survive the greatest of all wars, but I also believe that in the spirit of our forefathers we shall improve our heritage and thus sustain and make better the Republic.

History teaches us that when the political horizon is the darkest, the stars appear. I am optimistic enough to believe that man who has spanned the oceans, that man who has sent his voice around the world, cannot be so perverse as to climb new heights and reach new mountain peaks only to fall and break himself to pieces from the greater heights. Sometimes, "What shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue."

MISSING

We are in the most critical period of the war. It is all over but the fighting, and the fighting has just begun. The casualty lists are mounting day by day. There is one word that lingers in my mind day and night. That word is "Missing." Seldom a day passes that I do not receive a message from some anxious father or anxious mother asking me to inquire if there isn't some further word respecting the son who is reported as missing in action. They ask me to verify. They want some ray of hope. "Missing in action" means a lot. When the lad left, father and mother both said, "Be brave." They restrained their tears until the boy was out of sight. Day and night, mother and father have looked at one another. They have said nothing. Their thoughts were the same. Day and night they have thought of the plans and of the hopes and ambitions of the son. But the lad never complained. He went away with high head and proud heart. He said, "My place is with my fellows."

We are determined to keep America free. We are determined to maintain a government that is the servant and not the master of the American people. We are determined for those who may not be "missing in action" to keep America the kind of America the dad planned for the lad who is "missing in action."

More than a year ago a cargo transport, as reported by the public press, steamed steadily in the ice-infested waters of the North Atlantic. The men had slept well that night. They were nearing port. It was only 90 miles to the dock. Fifteen minutes after 1 o'clock in the night a torpedo struck amidship. The

engines were silenced, scores were killed beneath the decks. Until very recently the losses of the *Dorchester* were the heaviest of any sinking of the 2 wars. Out of 904 personnel, 678 were lost. It is said that there were 4 chaplains on the *Dorchester*, and that these 4 chaplains were of 3 faiths. They came to the upper deck; they quieted the panic; they lifted and assisted others to get into the lifeboats; at the last they took off their own belts and put those belts around enlisted men. It is reported that when they were last seen they were standing on the bow, the 4 of them side by side, as the bow came up high and slid under. They were not seen again. A Catholic, a Jew, and 2 Protestants—the 4 had learned the fine art of living together on that ship, and having learned that art, they were not divided in death. Let us all, of all creeds, and of all classes, be united for total victory and for total peace.

Creating Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely and thoughtful editorial entitled "Creating Peace," published in the Birmingham News-Age-Herald of July 16, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CREATING PEACE

It now is quite clearly established that the Roosevelt administration's program for international collaboration after the war is largely founded on the principles and achievements of pan-American cooperation. What are these principles and achievements? The American people obviously should very clearly understand them. Yet we wonder how many Americans are adequately conversant with these conceptions.

The Peoples Mandate Committee for Inter-American Peace and Cooperation, of which Dr. Mary E. Woolley is chairman and Miss Mabel Vernon is director, long has been contributing to the upbuilding of a wider understanding of pan-American collaboration. Believing, with the national administration, that this collaboration does offer valuable ideas and policies for utilization in the quest for worldwide peace, the committee is striving to develop the utmost possible comprehension of just what those ideas and policies are.

Recently it has issued a new booklet on the subject, Pan-American Principles Fundamental to World Cooperation, by Florence Brewer Boeckel. It is an admirable summary which has been highly commended by pan-American leaders. It outlines the report of the executive committee on post-war problems of the governing board of the Pan American Union made in 1943 as a contribution to the study of international organization.

This report emphasizes that the pan-American system is cooperative rather than based primarily on force, group domination or a balance of power.

"It (the system) is founded," says the Peoples Mandate Committee's booklet, "on the principle of absolute juridical equality and the complete sovereignty and independence of each state and on the thesis that the welfare of each is dependent on the welfare of all. It holds that international relations should be governed by laws agreed to by the community of states and that the faithful observance of treaties is an indispensable rule in the conduct of international relations."

In brief, the pan-American system regards peace as a positive reality to be achieved, rather than merely the absence of war brought about simply by the prevention of fighting.

It is the absence of an absolute commitment to the use of force and the emphasis on sovereignty in the President's plan that has evoked much of the criticism of it. There are many condemnations of the administration program on the general ground that everything depends on force. Then there are those who say that because there would be no surrender of American sovereignty under it, no real progress would be made toward the development and rule of international law.

It seems to this paper that such criticisms show a very limited and even cynical attitude toward the problem of peace.

Surely we know that sheer domination by force does not in itself constitute peace. While military power might, of course, operate effectively to discourage and even curb aggression, it is no fundamentally dependable or final solution.

A durable, creative peace can be established only by the development of genuine confidence, good will, and cooperation among the nations.

Such an international state of affairs is not to be sought through some merely emotional change of sentiment. Rather enlightened self-interest should motivate and guide the nations as they strive toward that goal. They should realize ever more clearly that the welfare of each is dependent on the welfare of all.

As progress is achieved based on understanding and collaboration, there can be hope for the gradual strengthening of the entire system of world law. Under such a growing system, national freedom should be enhanced as it confidently yields growing responsibilities in the international sphere to the evolving system of collaboration.

Reconversion of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Bill To Make Unemployment Blissful," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of August 10, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—A BILL TO MAKE UNEMPLOYMENT BLISSFUL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, August 9.—Even as amended by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, the Murray-Kilgore bill for the reconversion of industry is a lazy man's dream, or a collectivist's, or the vision of one of those union labor politicians who thinks organized workers should be the favored class and that the size of the national debt is nothing because we owe it to ourselves.

A great amount of space would be required to make a worthy summary of the measure which is supported by new dealers in Congress, spokesmen for organized labor, and devotees of the Communist system of government as modified by the gradual, instead of the instant, economic leveling of those who have won a competence by hard work and talent. But a fairly good idea of this bill can be gained by inspecting its highlights.

Its political philosophy, aside from the pragmatism represented in the design for vote-getting, is founded on these bases: Deficit spending is essential to a high national income. The Government owes every good citizen a good living, and doubts of the citizen's qualification as "good" should generally be resolved in his favor. If he was not in uniform the Government must assume that he performed comparably on the home front, and give him almost as many benefits as it gives to veterans. The Federal establishment, through power of the purse, must retain over the States its role as the source of individual bounties, larger than the States will give because Washington's heart is as big as the taxpayers' funds which Congress long ago turned over to the Executive.

On these foundations Senators MURRAY and KILGORE and those who helped them prepare the bill have put a shining pile of promissory notes which are pledges for a sum that cannot be calculated within tens of billions annually. Here are some of the outstanding items:

SOME PROVISIONS

If it shall be the administration policy to suspend or overlook statutes and constitutional provisions that may interfere with the operations of the bill, the Attorney General is encouraged to "legalize" that policy by inaction (sec. 103 (e) (1)).

The continuation of work on contracts which "will not be needed for the prosecution of the war" is permissible if the contracting agency decides that "some or all of the work * * * will benefit the Government" (sec. 201).

The Work Administrator (using the compulsions of a national service law) is authorized to pay the transportation of "workers and ex-servicemen," including the costs of moving their dependents and household effects, from their last previous residences to the sites of new jobs, with certain limitations as to expenditure (sec. 306 (a)).

He is authorized to give 6 months of free training for a job, with maintenance allowances running from $50 to $100 monthly, to any person he may select (sec. 307 (b)).

Beginning 3 months after the enactment of the bill and ending at the start of the twenty-fifth month "following the termination of war," interim placement benefits shall be paid amounting to 75 percent of an individual's "weekly wage" but not exceeding $35 a week for a citizen with 3 or more dependents. Once fixed, the rate of payment shall not be reduced (sec. 309 (b)).

If the citizen "failed, without good cause, to accept suitable work" on a certain day, his unemployment pension will lapse, and nonsuitable work is defined as that created by a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute, work at less than union or neighborhood prevailing wages, or offered with the condition that the worker must join a company union, refrain from joining a labor union, violate labor union "laws" or lose seniority rights (sec. 308 (d) and (f)).

After State unemployment agencies have determined what amounts would have been

payable for these interim benefits under the State laws, the Work Administrator will notify the Treasury to pay to the States the excess prescribed by the Murray-Kilgore bill. This is to be a gift, not a loan, encouraging low State pay standards (sec. 310 (d)).

The Secretary of Labor is directed to investigate and report on "the extent to which * * * annual wage systems would contribute to full employment and rising standards of living," with a break-down of the industries that might be affected pro or con. A Secretary favorable to this idea would, of course, turn in an affirmative report (sec. 313 (a)).

A FEW SAFEGUARDS

There are some safeguards in the bill to prevent the post-war United States from being the scene of an unending paid vacation and fish fry, with the fish limited to caviar and pompano and champagne substituted for beer. "Dependents" are defined with some sense of moderation. If a citizen is receiving certain other public bounties his participation in the Murray-Kilgore fund is restricted. He is disqualified if he has been "properly discharged" or "suspended" from a job for "misconduct," but as usual the burden of proof will be on his employer if New Deal boards and a New Deal Work Administrator are operating the law.

For those who believe in the extreme of Government protections of the individual, in maintaining the special privileges granted to union labor in the Wagner Act, and so forth, in deficit spending, in making little distinction between post-war benefits to ex-servicemen and civilians, and generally in the superstate concept, the Murray-Kilgore bill lives up to expectations.

Constitutionality of the Hatch Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article and editorial from the Washington Daily News of August 9, 1944, relating to the recent favorable ruling by a Federal court in the District of Columbia on the constitutionality of the Hatch Act.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULING ON HATCH ACT APPEAL UNLIKELY BEFORE ELECTION DAY

(By Charles T. Lucey)

Upholding the constitutionality of the Hatch Act, a three-judge court has cleared the way for action in some 200 cases in which United States employees are charged with political activity and apparently has nailed down the ban which will keep nearly 3,000,000 Federal jobholders out of the Presidential campaign.

The opinion, joined in by one United States circuit judge and two district court judges in the District of Columbia, will be appealed to the United States Supreme Court by the United Federal Workers of America, a C. I. O. union, but ruling before election day would be unlikely. The C. I. O.-backed Political Action Committee is pledged to President Roosevelt.

MR. POOLE WAS ACTIVE

George P. Poole, an employee of the Philadelphia Mint, is the man whose case may become a cause celebre in the history of the fight on this issue.

Mr. Poole was one of some 700 persons in the mint against whom complaints were received in connection with alleged political activity. A joint Civil Service Commission-Treasury investigation showed enough evidence to warrant letters of charges to these employees. Evidence seems to show that the mint workers had served as Democratic ward committeemen, as poll watchers, and in other branches of electioneering.

In its petition the union admitted that Mr. Poole had violated the Hatch Act. The claim of lack of constitutionality was based on an alleged conflict between a provision of the law barring Federal workers from taking any active part in political management or in political campaigns with the freedom-of-speech clause of the Constitution.

The opinion, which apparently makes mandatory the dismissal of Mr. Poole from Federal service, went back to Thomas Jefferson for a quotation supporting the laying of certain restrictions on Government employees.

"The President of the United States," said Mr. Jefferson during his tenure as Chief Executive, "has seen with dissatisfaction officers of the General Government taking, on various occasions, active parts in the elections of the public functionaries, whether of the General or of the State Governments.

"Freedom of election being essential to the mutual independence of governments and of the different branches of the same government, so vitally cherished by most of our constitutions, it is deemed improper for officers depending on the Executive of the Union to attempt to control or influence the free exercise of the elective right."

DIDN'T DENY VOTE

Mr. Jefferson made it plain, as does the Hatch Act, that this did not abridge the right of any Government worker to vote as a qualified citizen.

The three-man court pointed out that "There has been a strong development towards safeguarding employees of the Government from insecurity attributable to political affiliation." The C. I. O. union had charged the law was discriminatory because it exempted legislative employees, employees of the President's office, and certain policy-making officials, but the court held that "it is perfectly obvious that these classes of employees are in very large measure political" and would change when an administration changes.

Under Civil Service Commission procedure, when complaints of political activity are received against an employee, the Commission notifies the Federal department concerned and asks it to join in an investigation. If this investigation gives evidence to support the complaint, the accused person is given opportunity to answer the charges. Dismissal is the mandatory penalty where guilt is established.

THE HATCH ACT UPHELD

A three-man Federal court in the District of Columbia has just upheld the constitutionality of the Hatch Act, which prohibits political activity by Federal jobholders—a fact of special importance in this Presidential campaign year when there are nearly 3,000,000 on the Government's pay roll.

The court went back some years to quote a former President in support of its finding:

"The President of the United States has seen with dissatisfaction officers of the general Government taking on various occasions active parts in elections of the public functionaries, whether of the general or of the State governments.

"Freedom of elections being essential to the mutual independence of governments and of the different branches of the same government, so vitally cherished by most of our constitutions, it is deemed improper for officers depending on the Executive of the Union to attempt to control or influence the free exercise of the elective right.

"This I am instructed, therefore, to notify to all officers within my department holding their appointments under the authority of the President directly, and to desire them to notify to all subordinate to them.

"The right of any officer to give his vote at elections as a qualified citizen is not meant to be restrained, nor, however given, shall it have any effect to his prejudice; but it is expected that he will not attempt to influence the votes of others nor take any part in the business of electioneering, that being deemed inconsistent with the spirit of the Constitution and his duties."

That was well said by Thomas Jefferson in 1801 when he was President. It is as sound Government philosophy now, as then.

Relations With Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our Great Doublecross," recently written by Mr. Frank Waldrop, and published in the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR GREAT DOUBLE-CROSS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The No. 1 double-cross for our side in this war of many double dealings is now approaching its climax. Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk of Poland is on his way to Moscow, where he will grovel before Stalin as Austria's Premier Dollfus once groveled before Hitler at Berchtesgaden. And the result will be much the same.

Only this time Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill, instead of shouting their horror, are pushing the victim forward with advice to make the best deal he can, while he can, though the war in Europe is all supposed to have started just to save this particular victim from that particular kind of an end.

The official record of this double-cross can be checked by reference to the Encyclopedia Britannica yearbook for 1940 and in any number of standard reference volumes for the years after that.

It begins with the historical fact that Poland is an essentially Roman Catholic settlement that for about 900 years has faced away from Russia westward. Stalin is now twisting Poland's face around to the east; and if he breaks her neck in the process, so much the better for his purpose.

In the Dark and Middle Ages, before America had been started on her upward way and

Britain was still an unimportant island, the Poles were holding the gates of western civilization against eastern barbarism.

They had, for those days, as enlightened and cultivated a government as there was in the world. It became too cultivated, if anything. For as the toughness went out of Poland her less-civilized neighbors ganged up in the latter part of the eighteenth century and partitioned Poland out of existence.

But the Poles were a terrible nuisance to their rulers, and when the great war of 1914–18 came they rebelled in all directions to prove they were still Poland, not pieces of Russia, Prussia, and Austria-Hungary.

Result: The peace treaties of 1918–20 reestablished Poland as an independent nation with definite and respected boundaries. The Poles settled down to keep a balance between their obviously menacing neighbors, Russia and Germany, and prayed for peace.

As Europe boiled up again with the inevitable menaces and threats of war, Poland became the test case of alliances. Other nations stiffened or slackened their attitudes, depending on Poland.

When Hitler opened his 1939 campaign for deals and trades, the Poles were still undecided about how tough to be with him. For they were little and he was big, and who'd help them?

The British and the French politicians went to work on the answer to that one, and Britain's Prime Minister Chamberlain rose in the House of Commons on March 31, 1939, to boast that:

"In the event of any action which clearly threatened Polish independence and which the Polish Government accordingly considered as vital to resist with their national forces, His Majesty's Government would feel themselves bound at once to lend the Polish Government all support in their power. They have given the Polish Government an assurance to that effect.

"I may add that the French Government have authorized to make it plain that they stand in the same position as do His Majesty's Government."

On September 1, 1939, the Germans tested that pledge by invading Poland. Britain and France declared war. On September 17, 1939, Russia invaded Poland, too, and marched clear up to the Bug River, one-third of the way across Poland from the Russian border. Britain and France said nothing.

Many Poles, deceived by Russian propaganda, fled into Russia to escape Hitler, expecting friendly aid. Instead they fled right into concentration camps and before firing squads.

For instance, some 10,000 officers, the kind of men upon whom Poland would have to depend in rebuilding any system of government after this war, disappeared behind barbed wire in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk early in 1940.

In June 1941 Hitler turned on his old pal, Stalin, and eventually the German armies rolled past Smolensk. In April 1943 the Germans announced discovery of mass graves in the Katyn Forest—and in those graves were the 10,000 missing Polish officers.

The Germans blamed the Russians and the Russians blamed the Germans. Then, when Poland's government in exile asked to have the International Red Cross investigate the matter, that gave Stalin the chance he had been looking for. He said the government in exile wasn't representative and instead produced a hand-made Russian puppet outfit in Moscow.

So things remained until last week. Then Russian troops hit the Bug River line in Poland again, and Stalin gave out that this would be the border of the new Poland after this war.

Without asking anybody, he simply let the world know he has annexed the 13,000,000 people and 48 percent of Polish land lying east of the Bug.

Poland's premier, Mikolajczyk, in London, looked to Churchill to see if the 1939 promise means anything now. All he got was a lifted eyebrow. Same from Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The Atlantic Charter counts against Hitler but not against Stalin.

From Stalin he got a crook of the finger to fly to Moscow and sign a deal legalizing the Bug River border line and otherwise acknowledging Uncle Joe is the boss. He is flying.

It is a bitter end to a dirty story. And Franklin Delano Roosevelt's part in the writing of it is plain for all to see and remember.

The Big Issue in 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an article by Frank R. Kent, able newspaper columnist, which appeared in the Washington Star Wednesday, August 9:

HILLMAN AND SIX MILLION CAMPAIGN FUND LIKELY TO BE BIG ELECTION ISSUE, SAYS KENT

(By Frank R. Kent)

As the weeks go by it becomes clearer that the Russian-born Mr. Sidney Hillman, with his communistic background and affiliations, his C. I. O. Political Action Committee, his communistic-controlled American Labor Party, and his $6,000,000 fourth-term fund, is the outstanding figure in this campaign, and that he and what he represents are likely to become an outstanding issue.

And they should be. For this is their fight. It has been from the start; it will be to the end. And success will put the forces lined up behind Mr. Hillman in a position to dominance and power such as no one dreamed they could achieve.

For the first time the radical and subversive elements are not only lined up solidly behind a Presidential candidate but, taking practical possession of his party, are making the fight for him. That is not exaggeration; it is a simple statement of the facts.

And when you link them with a Federal machine of 3,500,000 job holders, plus the weight of the Kelly-Hague type of city bosses, the formidable nature of the fourth-term combination can be realized.

That this situation is distasteful and offensive to the great bulk of the American people there can be little doubt. Nor, once clearly comprehended, can there be much question that the reaction would be strong and unfavorable.

TEST OF DEWEY'S ABILITY

The difficulty is to get the facts home to them. This will be the big test of Governor Dewey's ability as a candidate. For, it is accepted that he is going to meet the C. I. O.-Communist combination head on. Not to do so would be stupid as well as craven and Governor Dewey is neither.

As every vote the C. I. O. can influence and every Communist in the country is pro-Roosevelt anyhow, it is clear he can lose no votes by a bold challenge. On the contrary, if his challenge is strong enough and his attack skillful enough, there is no other way in which he can gain as many votes.

Particularly will this be true if, as now seems gratifyingly certain, the German collapse comes within a short time. That, to a considerable degree, would eliminate the surface excuse for the fourth-term attempt. Certainly, it would diminish the effectiveness of the Commander in Chief pose and make it easier to gain popular consideration for vital domestic issues.

Thus Governor Dewey's chances to promote his own political prospects and at the same time serve the Nation would be enhanced. But, it is no easy job ahead of him. The publicity and propaganda facilities of this administration and its supporting agencies are the greatest that have ever been behind a presidential candidate.

The C. I. O., itself, has one of the largest, best equipped and financed publicity divisions ever created. In addition, the number of commentators and broadcasters deeply committed to the fourth term has markedly increased within the year.

The strategy of these is to minimize the political importance of the C. I. O.; to deplore the charges that it is the chief Roosevelt sponsor and backer; to deny that it is saturated with Communism; and to depict those who see in its success this time a grave menace to the national interests as Republicans, or reactionaries or "Roosevelt haters" or as inspired by some selfish or sinister motive or as seeing ghosts or having nightmares.

That is the party line. That is the way the administration has met every criticism in the past and that is the way it will meet this attack. In addition, Mr. Hillman is being painted as a gentle, lovable, and unsophisticated character whose sole desire is for the general welfare, instead of as the shrewd, ruthless, hard-boiled, self-seeking labor politician he really is.

ANSWERABLE CASE

To offset this, Governor Dewey has many facts with which to build up an unanswerable case For example, he can show beyond dispute that the C. I. O. and the Communists started the fourth-term ball rolling; that Mr Hillman and his P. A. C. have shoved Chairman Hannegan and the Democratic National Committee aside and are really running the campaign. He can show the closeness of the C. I. O.-Roosevelt link.

He can show that Mr. Hillman calls the White House often by phone and frequently confers with the Commander in Chief. He can show, too, that Mr. Hillman was strong enough at the Democratic convention to turn down Justice James F. Byrnes, whom Mr. Roosevelt had indorsed for the Vice Presidential nomination, and that the reason Mr. Roosevelt turned to TRUMAN after he had ditched Mr. WALLACE was because no one not acceptable to Hillman could be named.

He can show also by the recent primaries in Missouri, where Senator BENNETT CLARK ascribed his defeat to the C. I. O., and in New York City the degree to which Mr. Hillman, working through the Political Action Committee, and the American Labor Party, which he heads, and backed by the Communists, is taking over the Democratic Party.

There are many other facts Mr. Dewey can bring out, including the unsavory character and record of the leaders in some of the unions for which Mr. Hillman now speaks and with whom he has been closely associated.

All this ought to be pie for Governor Dewey. It is an ideal case for a prosecuting attorney and he is one of the best prosecuting attorneys in the country. All he needs to win this case is the unclouded attention of the American people.

Address by Brigadier General Tyler Before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Brig. Gen. Max C. Tyler, president, Mississippi River Commission, delivered before the National Rivers and Harbor's Congress, New Orleans, La., July 27, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When your able and accomplished secretary invited me to speak at this meeting he told me I could talk about anything provided I confined my remarks to the Mississippi River. It is difficult to say anything about the Mississippi that has not been said before. The river has long been famed in song and story and is the subject of books too numerous to mention. In the span of little more than a hundred years the alluvial valley has been forcibly wrested from domination by the river and developed from a wilderness of forest and swamp into a veritable empire. The record of that struggle and achievement fills shelves in our public libraries and stands out in the files of the press. This thriving and romantic metropolis, New Orleans, with its splendid harbor, where ride the ships from all the seas, occupies a larger place in our literature than does any other American city. I can add little to the voluminous record.

However, since for several years it has been my duty and privilege to work with the people of the alluvial valley and the port of New Orleans toward the solution of their navigation and flood-control problems, I would like to spend the time allotted me in a brief résumé of the accomplishments in this region of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, the Mississippi Valley Association, the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, the Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, the levee boards in the valley and your predecessor associations and groups of able public-spirited men.

The best way I know by which to assess the value of the work of an individual or an association is to compare conditions before and after the individual or association got on the job. So let us briefly review the record on the Mississippi River and at the port of New Orleans.

A hundred years ago steamboat navigation on the Mississippi River was a hazardous business at good stages and impossible during the lowest water. The alluvial valley was largely a wilderness, subject to flooding whenever the river went overbank. The flood of 1844 was the highest of record in the upper valley up to that time and many towns below Memphis were under water with heavy loss of property and some loss of life. New Orleans was a growing town and port with plenty of water down to the mouth of the river but with entirely inadequate depths over all of the bars. The hope of ocean shipping interests was for the maintenance of a dependable depth of 18 feet on the bar at Southwest Pass.

The first difficulty to be overcome by the advocates of the Federal improvement of harbors and rivers in the interest of commerce was a legal one.

On June 11, 1844, President Tyler vetoed an act making appropriations for the improvement of certain harbors and rivers on the ground that such action was unconstitutional. He argued that the States, in ratifying the Constitution, had not given to the United States the right to improve harbors or rivers within their borders.

However, at the same time he approved an appropriation for the improvement of the Mississippi River, stating in his approval that "The Mississippi occupies a footing altogether different from the rivers and water courses of the different States. No one State or any number of States can exercise any other jurisdiction over it than for the punishment of crimes and the service of civil process. It belongs to no particular State or States, but by common right, by express reservation, to all the States. It is reserved as a great common highwy for the commerce of the whole country. * * * The United States, therefore, is charged with its improvement for the benefit of all, and the appropriation of governmental means to its improvement becomes indispensably necessary for the good of all."

On August 3, 1846, President James K. Polk sent a veto message to Congress refusing his approval of a bill appropriating $1,376,450 for some forty-odd rivers and harbors improvements in which he stated that such a law would open the Federal Treasury almost beyond restraint and concluding with this statement:

"The Constitution has not, in my judgment, conferred upon the Federal Government the power to construct works of internal improvement within the States, or to appropriate money from the Treasury for that purpose."

Some 18 months later, in vetoing a similar bill, President Polk reaffirmed his belief that such appropriations were unconstitutional. In that message he called attention to the provision in the Constitution which provides that "no States shall, without the consent of Congress, to lay any duty of tonnage." The practice had been, he said, for the States, with the consent of Congress, to lay tonnage duties for clearing harbors, improving rivers, and other purposes. This practice, President Polk told the Congress, was, and I quote, "a safe provision for the improvement of harbors and rivers in the reserved powers of the States."

All this may have been good legal reasoning and safe, but it did not help our young and expanding country to get better transportation, which it had to have, nor did it meet with the approval of the leaders of the people and the people themselves.

They apparently did not think highly of the interminable delays which would be involved in independent action by many States, nor did they see how a uniform system of improvements of harbors and rivers could ever result from State legislation. They proceeded to do something about it.

Two great river improvement conventions met in Memphis in 1845. Six States were represented at the first, and there were 500 delegates representing 12 States at the second. John C. Calhoun presided. In 1847 another river-and-harbor convention assembled at Chicago. It is stated that Abraham Lincoln and Horace Greeley were present. A convention met at Burlington, Iowa, in 1851. The requests and recommendations of these conventions seem to have been directed at the improvement of the Passes, so as to allow vessels of deeper draft to reach New Orleans from the Gulf, snagging and improvement of the river channel so that navigation would be practicable the year round, the removal or bypassing of obstructions to navigation, like the Rock Island Rapids, the falls in the Ohio at Louisville, and the great raft in Red River, and the prevention of overflow by crevasses, floods, and freshets whereby the fertile lands along the banks of the river were damaged.

Apparently these various conventions brought some results, for we find that the Congress made an appropriation in 1852 of $75,000 for opening a ship channel at the passes of sufficient capacity to accommodate the wants of commerce, the work to be done by contract. A mixed board of one Navy officer and three Army engineer officers was convened to decide how the appropriation should be applied. The board reported that with this small sum nothing more could be done than to stir up the bottom in the channel. A contract was entered into with the Towboat Association under which the bar channel at Southwest Pass was dragged and harrowed and a depth of 18 feet maintained for an entire year. You will notice that the appropriation was made first, without engineering advice, and then the engineers were directed to find a way to spend the money.

The 1852 board reported that there were several methods by which the ship channel might be improved or obtained, and stated them in the order of their simplicity, ease of work, and initial cost, as follows:

1. Stirring up the material of the channel bed by various means so that the river currents might carry away such material while in suspension.

2. Assisting the stirring method by dredging and carrying the dredged materials away by barges, etc., for special deposit outside the channel.

3. By narrowing, revetting, and jettying the mouths of the passes selected for ship channels and then closing the other passes.

4. In case the above methods prove unsuccessful, then by connecting the deep river channel at some suitable point between New Orleans and the passes by a ship canal to deep water in the adjoining gulf.

The board recommended that these methods be tried in the order stated. The first and second methods were considered doubtful as to permanent results, but worth trying.

The 18-foot channel secured with the appropriation of 1852 having disappeared, Congress in 1856 appropriated $330,000 for further work and another contract was made with the Towboat Association.

An interesting comment on the plan of securing a channel by dragging and harrowing is contained in a letter of that distinguished soldier and engineer, Gen. G. T. Beauregard, to the president of the Chamber of Commerce of New Orleans and dated May 29, 1852. General Beauregard was then a brevet major and lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers stationed in New Orleans on the construction of the customhouse. He wrote:

"Having always taken a lively interest in the important question of deepening the channel over the bar at the mouth of the Mississippi, which has become of such vital necessity to the trade and future prosperity of this city, made still more apparent by the memorial which the chamber of commerce has lately addressed to Congress, and in which it calls for an annual appropriation of from $100,000 to $150,000 'to induce parties owning steamboats to contract to keep the channel open by constantly raking up the mud, so that the current of the river can diffuse and carry it forward into deeper water' I have thought that a more general phraseology would have answered better, as it would have permitted other parties who are desirous of attaining the same end by other means to have put in their propositions."

Major Beauregard then went on to show why the dragging and harrowing of the bar

channel would not be successful, and then continued as follows:

"But the question naturally presents itself then, Is there no system by which the obstructions of the bar can be removed? I am of the opinion that there is a most certain and infallible one, because founded on the true principles of hydrostatics and the invariable laws of nature; in proof of which I submit to your consideration the following proposition.

"I hereby offer to enter into a contract with the city, the State, or the General Government to deepen the channel over one of the bars to the depth of at least 20 feet by the lead at low water, over the shallowest part of it, and wide enough for a towboat with one ship on each side to pass at all times; and to maintain this condition of the bar for the period of 25 or 50 years for the sum of $100,000 a year. The first sum to be paid only the moment I shall have succeeded in obtaining the depth and width above stated; but should I be able to obtain and to maintain at least 25 feet instead of 20 feet, I will then be paid annually the sum of $125,000 instead of $100,000.

"By the above it is seen that no risk is to be encountered by the General Government in case of nonsuccess, whereas should I succeed, as I think there is every probability of my doing, the benefit to be derived from it, not only by New Orleans but by the whole western country, will more than counterbalance a hundredfold the above annual appropriation.

"I have submitted my plan to both professional and practical men, and I have not yet met with any serious objections to it.

"Of course it is hardly necessary for me to add that in order to enter into a contract with the General Government I should have to resign my commission in the Army; but I feel so confident of success that I would not hesitate a moment to do it."

There can be no doubt that General Beauregard based his proposition on the use of jetties. The similarity of his proposal to the one submitted by James B. Eads in 1874 and written into a contract in 1875 for the construction of jetties at South Pass is striking, to say the least.

The War between the States stopped all progress, not only in the hit-and-miss kind of work authorized but in the development of an orderly system for the initiation, investigation, and authorization of improvements of harbors and rivers.

I have gone into this somewhat ancient history to show that up to the time of the War between the States those who worked to obtain harbor and river improvements had many difficulties to overcome. The Congress had not yet worked out a procedure providing for a careful engineering investigation before adoption of projects and appropriation of funds.

At the close of that war river and harbor conventions were again convened. There was one in 1866 and another in 1867. We find a board of engineers recommending canals around the Rock Island Rapids and the Des Moines Rapids in 1866. The conventions apparently were making progress in getting engineering investigations and reports, and the basis for an orderly procedure was beginning to evolve.

Gradually the Congress adopted the policy of calling for thorough engineering examinations and reports before adopting projects for the improvement of harbors and rivers. Finally, in 1902, the Congress set up the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and required that all reports made by the Engineer Department on improvements of rivers and harbors be reviewed by that Board before being forwarded to Congress by the Chief of Engineers. So in the last 42 years river and harbor investigations, authorizations, and appropriations have followed an orderly system designed to safeguard the public interest.

The development of a national policy for dealing with floods was much slower than for the improvement of harbors and rivers. The first attempt of national legislation dealing with floods in this valley was by the Swamp Land Acts of 1849 and 1850, which granted to the several States all unsold swamp and overflowed lands within their limits. Funds accruing from the sale of these lands by the States were to be applied to drainage, reclamation and flood control projects. Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas and Missouri organized offices for the sale of the lands and appointed commissioners for the construction of levees. This attempt to obtain flood protection failed, largely through lack of comprehensive planning of the works among the different States and districts. As a national flood control measure the swamp laws were a failure.

The War between the States put a stop to all levee construction. After that war levee districts, organized under State laws, carried on the work with funds obtained from bond issues. Gradually by extension of district levee systems a semblance of a connected or continuous levee line for each major basin in the valley was secured.

Congress organized the Mississippi River Commission in 1879 and directed it to make surveys looking to the control of the river from Lake Itasca to the mouth for the improvement of navigation and the protection of the people living in the valley. Although the problems of navigation and flood control are inextricably related, the old question of constitutional authority kept the Congress from appropriating funds for flood control works except when they could be shown to be useful for the benefit of navigation. Consequently, until a more liberal view of the authority of the Government became current, the Commission built only such levees as could be assumed to assist in improving the river channel.

Beginning in 1917 a broader view of the responsibility and authority of the United States was taken by Congress, and in that year the expenditure of Federal funds directly for the construction of levees was authorized on the basis of the Federal Government paying two-thirds of the construction cost while local interests paid one-third and furnished the levee rights-of-way. A period of extensive levee construction and enlargement followed and by 1927 there was a general belief that the valley had been made reasonably safe. Then came the record-breaking flood of 1927 to breach the defenses all up and down the valley.

The congressional delegations of the valley States, the levee boards, State engineering organizations, the Mississippi Valley Association, Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, rivers and harbors associations, civil organizations in the valley generally and the press by a united effort convinces the public that flood control in the alluvial valley and navigation on the river constitute a single great problem of such magnitude that it can be dealt with only by the United States Government with the assistance of the local people and their constituted flood-control organizations. As a result the existing project was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1928. Since then all flood control and navigation works have been built by the engineer department.

The project adopted in 1928 was a sound engineering plan. It visualized the use of all the engineering methods applicable to the problem in the valley. The levees were to be raised and strengthened, the river channel was to be improved in its alinement and stabilized in order to improve navigation and to prevent destruction of the levees by its meanderings. Greater floods than those which could be carried between the main line levees were to discharge their excess waters through floodways.

The project has been amended from time to time as new conditions have warranted.

Leaders in the Congress from the valley, assisted by the flood-control organizations, levee boards, and the public, have seen to it that the Congress has been kept aware of the necessity for adequate appropriations. As a result excellent progress has been made in the construction of the project works in the last 15 years.

This organization and the others I have referred to with which it works so closely can take great pride in what has been accomplished for navigation and flood control through the individual and combined efforts of all. You have been responsible in a large measure for the establishment of an orderly and sound procedure for the initiation of river and harbor works. Under that system, here in the alluvial valley, substantial defenses have been raised against floods. Over 3,000,000 people live behind those defenses. There are 35 States in the Union, each of which has a population less than that of the alluvial valley. The existing levee system affords substantial protection to 2,500 miles of main-line railways and to 2,000 miles of main-line highways. It protects a large proportion of the country's cotton acreage and the sugar industry of Louisiana as well as its oil and sulfur developments.

The voice of the steamboat is again heard in the land. The all-year channel of 9 feet or better north of Baton Rouge is carrying many times more tonnage than was ever moved in the romantic packet days. The channel is so well buoyed and lighted that navigation at night for the largest tows of upward of 15,000 tons is the rule, even at the lowest stages.

The heaviest movements are in gasoline, crude oil and oil products, and sulphur upbound to war industries in the upper valleys and steel and general freight down-bound. One of the contributions of the river to the war has been that of permitting all inland boat-building yards to work to capacity in turning out war vessels. Many hundreds of these vessels have reached New Orleans and gone across the oceans of the world from yards on the Lakes, on the Ohio, the Illinois, the upper Mississippi, and the Missouri.

In recent years there have been several reports to the Congress for the improvement of the port of New Orleans, the Gulf Intracoastal Canal, and the flood protection of the alluvial valley. All have been approved by the Chief of Engineers. Some already have been approved by Congress and the work completed. Others are included in legislation which has been passed by the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate.

These reports include provisions for increasing the depth in Southwest Pass from 35 to 40 feet; widening and deepening the Gulf Intracoastal Canal west of New Orleans to 125 feet by 12 feet; routing of the intracoastal canal east of New Orleans from the Industrial Canal to the Rigolets; lease of the Industrial Canal and lock to the Government in order that it be operated free of tolls; the construction of a new lock for the Intracoastal Canal to supplement Harvey lock; the elimination of the Eudora floodway through southeast Arkansas and northeast Louisiana from the project for flood control of the Mississippi River with a corresponding revision of main-line levee grades; protection of the Yazoo backwater area and part of the Red River backwater area from all but the great floods, and, finally, a report submitted by the Mississippi River Commission in February last recommending stabilization of the channel of the Mississippi River from Cairo

to Baton Rouge for the purpose of maintaining the reduction in flood heights obtained by channel realinement between 1932 and 1943, protecting the levee lines from set-backs and the consequent abandonment of the best lands in the valley, provision of secure industrial sites on the river, and, as a byproduct of this work for flood-control purposes, an increase in the navigable depth at low water from a minimum of 9 feet now maintained to a minimum of 12 feet.

You will see only a part of this great river harbor while here in New Orleans. It extends from the Head of Passes to Baton Rouge, 230 miles, and all that distance has depths adequate for the safe passage of the largest cargo carriers in the world. Along the banks there is unlimited room for industrial development. The 30-foot channel maintained in South Pass and the 35 foot channel maintained in Southwest Pass, together with the wharves maintained by State and private interests, make this one of the great seaports of the world for which no apologies need be made on the grounds of safety, efficiency, or economy.

While the location of New Orleans on a natural deep water river harbor has permitted its development as a major world port for overseas commerce, its location at the crossing of the river and the Gulf-Intracoastal Canal is making it also of first-rate importance as a harbor in the great inland waterway system extending from Pittsburgh, Chicago, Minneapolis, and Omaha to Florida and the Mexican border. Cities at the crossings of much used trade routes have always prospered. The recommendation for the construction of the Intracoastal Canal west of New Orleans was based on assurances that it would be used by not less than 500,000 tons of commerce annually. Last month it carried more than 1,200,000 tons through Harvey Lock or at the rate of 14,000,000 tons per annum.

When this war is finally won, there will be lots of arguments as to who won it, the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces, industry, agriculture, the railroads, etc. That question will never be settled to anyone's satisfaction for it will have taken the efforts of all.

There is one statement, however, which this organization can make without fear of contradiction. Without the excellent harbors on our seacoasts we could not have built and sailed the ships to carry our forces overseas and to supply them there. Without these ports we could not have built the largest Navy ever to sail the seas. Without the harbors on the Great Lakes and the improved channels between the Lakes and our improved inland rivers we could not have produced the steel to build our ships, our engines of war and munitions. And those harbors and channels might never have been in existence today had not organizations like yours insisted that the welfare of the Nation demanded their construction.

This organization has great influence. It also has great responsibilities.

The purpose of this meeting of the Rivers and Harbors Congress is clearly stated in your President's call for a special session.

The opponents of coastwise and inland water transportation are better organized and more liberally financed than they have been for many years. Able men represent them at all hearings of committees of the Congress where they oppose the adoption of all new projects or the enlargement and betterment of existing projects. They skillfully use all their old arguments against the value of water transport to the general public and some new ones. Their purpose is to indoctrinate the public with the idea that, in general, publicly financed water routes of trade are economically unsound and that privately financed railroads and pipe lines can do everything the waterways can do, quicker, better, and cheaper.

Your organization has been able, therefore, to meet such attacks. The fights you have won in the past were mere skirmishes compared to the battle just ahead of you.

Neither your organization, nor any other, can hope to win such a battle unless your position is thoroughly sound. To take the stand that all water transportation is cheap and economical and that all harbor developments are necessary and desirable in the public interest is just as unsound as is the claim of your enemies that all inland water transportation is unduly subsidized, circuitous, slow, and uneconomical. There are waterway projects which can be supported by facts, figures, and costs which cannot be attacked successfully or even shaken. There are proposals for Federal expenditures on harbors, rivers, and canals which cannot stand a searching analysis. Those are the proposals which give the opponents of Federal financing of waterway improvements their strongest arguments and widest publicity. No association, no group, can support such unsound proposals, or even borderline cases, without risking the loss of public confidence.

The record of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress of backing only those projects which have stood the test of a thorough engineering and economic investigation is the basic reason for its great success.

A Year of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio speech delivered by my colleague, Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, over N. B. C. on June 20, 1944, entitled "A Year of Decision":

These are anxious and eventful days. They are eventful days in world history. They are anxious days for young men on freedom's front and for their kinfolks back home. Each day we take account of what is happening on the invasion front and the progress of young Americans far afield who are moving in the direction of victory.

Grim as the thought may be we cannot escape the feeling that these are the last days on earth for many young men.

In the deathless language of Colonel MacCrea who left for us the touching and poetic legacy of Flanders' Fields we think of young soldiers who were nurtured and suckled on the bosom of this Republic as living, throbbing vital young men who "Short days ago, lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow, loved, and were loved," and now they are engaged in grim and undramatic business to which they freely give their all.

Where they are on the battle front is but an extension of the home front where we are.

We cannot ponder their absence on a mission of victory and freedom without breathing a gracious prayer that they may manfully endure the hard tasks which lie ahead.

We cannot ponder their absence without experiencing a new burst of faith, a new hope for the future of this world, and a new reverence for the obligations which are ours on the home front.

It is for us to invest the victory that they will soon achieve with a durable purpose by a complete and moral worthiness for the sacrifices which they now make.

Let there be devotion and humility in our hearts this day and every day and give us a new appreciation of the price of freedom.

II

The costly sacrifices which young men are making on distant battlefields should enlarge our own sense of political responsibility as nothing else could do.

Political liberty and the precious right to choose those who shall make and administer and interpret the laws is an essential part of the whole structure of freedom.

What a rich and eloquent testimony it is to the true grandeur of our system of government and to the spirit of our people that in the midst of a far-flung conflict, we can have an election to fully assess and pass judgment upon those who are in authority, to estimate the merits of those who present themselves for high office and to determine who shall direct the affairs of communities, States, and the Nation in the years ahead.

These are precious rights and with them go great obligations.

The same spirit which bids us pay more taxes, buy more bonds, work harder, and do our full share for victory and freedom must also urge a larger and more sustained interest in the decisions, the leaders and the policies which will be presented to the people in this year of decision.

It would be plain stark tragedy if we on the home front fail or neglect to use the rights on the home front for which young men fight and die on the battle front.

In a small way, we can requite our obligations by study and discussion of the issues both foreign and domestic, by earnest consideration of those who will be selected for the roles of political leadership, and by letting nothing short of the most valid reason deter us from exercising the right to vote in this eventful year.

III

Now, permit me a few personal observations.

In November of 1943, about two score Members of the Congress urged me to seek some recognition on the Republican national ticket.

Perhaps it is not unduly immodest to hope and believe that in taking this action, these Members of Congress were moved by the belief that one who had served for 12 years in Congress and who may have developed some familiarity with the highways of a complex and sensitive government structure, might add strength to the Republican cause in the days ahead. Because of their action, I felt an obligation to make a campaign and visit in many sections of our land.

There has been opportunity to journey into more than one-half of the States of the Union and I can report that it has been an enriching and stimulating adventure.

It gave me a chance to visit with their people back home and to give them an appraisal of the diligence, the earnestness, and the loyalty which Members of Congress have brought to their task and to the problems with which we have wrestled.

It supplied a chance to audit the thoughts, the hopes, and the reflections of people everywhere and to find inspiration in the resolve and quiet courage with which they keep the vigil on the home front.

It offered an opportunity to see and to find new hope in the incredible genius and versatility of this Republic.

Above all else, it afforded a chance to enjoy a rich fellowship with Americans everywhere who in their hearts and souls still keep step with the music of the Union. Many of them were the fathers and mothers of young men who are this very day fighting upon the soil of the Old World to combat the brutal idea that might makes right and to restore peace, serenity, good living, and sweetness to a world which for generations has been steeped in bitterness and unrest.

What an adventure of the spirit that really was, for in the people one finds no dreamy despair nor the dross of defeatism.

The refining fires of war have burned away whatever of dross there might have been and left only a quiet resolve that calls for audacious action, for victory, for the crown of peace, for a new spirit of amity in the world, and for a maintenance of that freedom for which young men are this day being bruised in body and mind.

Truly, there was about all this a majestic adventure like the stars whispering to the soul, and so to those whose faith and esteem made this possible, I shall be ever grateful.

IV

Let us go back for a moment to these good people in every section of the land.

What do they say and for what do they hope in the days ahead?

In their questions, one could easily trace a common pattern which is a gracious testimony to the fact that to know our country, one must look into the common heart.

When will the war end?

When will peace come?

When will our boys come back?

It's not just, "When will the boys come back?"

It's when will "our" boys come back. In that one pronoun, you see the kinship of Main Street with Cherbourg, Anzio, Pearl Harbor, New Guinea, and with the struggle which engrosses the attention of the whole world.

Will we achieve a peace this time which will have a chance to endure?

What are they fighting for and when it's over, what will be the effect upon our future?

These are the thoughts and hopes with which we must deal as each political party prepares to make a bid for the trusteeship of power for the next 4 years.

Speaking as a Republican, what is in the common heart should suggest to us that the spirit in which we seek responsibility and power is everything.

It should suggest that as we frame politics and select leaders, that we be moved by a constant courage which is worthy of the millions of young Americans who are this day on freedom's frontier.

It should suggest that the danger and jeopardy to which our men in the service are exposed shall have a value and that if the way to the stars is hard, let us go the hard way if it is right.

It suggests that the course which we chart for the future should become a pin-up charter in every American heart.

V

But let's go back to these good people in all parts of the land who think, who hope, who ask questions, and whose hearts are prayerfully attuned to the undramatic business now at hand.

"When will our boys come home?" they ask.

That blessed day will come.

A telegram or telephone call will one day announce to a proud father and anxious mother that a soldier son is back in the land of his birth and soon he will be home.

What preparations there will be to give him a welcome that befits a hero and what anxious hours and days must be endured until familiar steps upon the stoop will unmistakably declare that he is surely back home.

Then the joys of homecoming will be complete.

A mother in the hard and vigorous embrace of a soldier son. A son encircled by the loving arms of a mother who day in and day out prayed for his safe return, but also prayed that he manfully perform the tasks that were assigned by the cause of freedom.

What a recital it will be! What adventures he experienced from the day he enlisted or was inducted until that glad day when a deafening stillness was heard round the world and peace had returned to assuage the long and engulfing and costly bitterness which afflicted mankind.

With drama and gesture he will tell where he was and what he did. It will be a narrative of high service and an accounting of what he did for the cause of freedom and the American system of living.

Then, of course, comes the inevitable $64 question. What's been going on back home while I was gone?

Then comes the time for us on the home front to give an accounting of our stewardship.

VI

That question from a million lips is the key to the real issue before us, and it can be phrased in the form of a question: "What will they find over here when it's over over there?"

From the statements and speeches which one encounters from time to time there is the implication that unity and morale are in issue. They are not issues. They are duties which every American gladly embraces. Morale is the spiritual reserve upon which we must draw as the casualty lists throw their lengthening shadow upon the land.

It will be said and is being said that victory is the issue. It is a bit strange that such an issue should even be suggested, because victory is the grim unfinished business of the whole Nation.

It is said that peace and cooperation are in issue. How can there be an issue in the great spiritual hope which moves every thinking person to seek a workable pattern which carries with it the assurance that peace will have a full and fair opportunity to endure, and that young men will not again be bruised and broken upon the altar of war.

These are not issues.

These are but duties upon the "must" list of every American. Unity, morale, victory, peace, and cooperation are common responsibilities. They are but duties for the task force on the home front.

The real issue in this year of decision will be simply this: What will they find over here when it's over over there?

Will the hopes and prayers which have been uttered in the foxholes on the battle front be rendered into ashes by the ideologies and policies which come from the foxholes on the home front?

Will the American system of living, which rests upon the morals of individualism become the victim of a pious collectivism, and will freedom be just a word or a way of life?

To abandon even a small part of the freedom we have known and which accounts for the greatness and leadership of this land is to abandon the greatest spiritual adventure of civilization.

Without freedom there can be no full healing at home.

Without freedom there can be no strength to bring succor to a confused world.

On of our greatest attributes is our power of example to bewildered people everywhere.

As we boldly announce our devotion to the four freedoms, shall we set a dismal example for other peoples in an hour of doubt and confusion by departing in the slightest degree from the ideal for which we fight?

If so, we may well ask why young men fight and die.

To the Congress, the President in his annual message spoke of a second Bill of Rights.

How can there be a second Bill of Rights if the first Bill of Rights is impaired?

How can there be security unless the freedom of action and the incentives to achievement are kept intact to provide that security?

Long ago we had a legacy of freedom and today it is in issue. When we find the answer to the question of whether collectivism or individual freedom shall prevail in this Republic, we shall the better know whether victory had a durable purpose.

VII

Conflict today is in the realm of ideas as much as in the field of parties and personalities.

Those who have labored long and earnestly in the national scene and have had a chance to see and to assess the forces which are at work, are fully familiar with the fact that collectivism is on the march. It is more than a mere footnote to economic discussion. It is no longer heresy but accepted gospel in high places.

More and more, we see the effort to chain the individual and individual rights to collective and group action, and when it becomes complete, what happens to freedom and the moral basis of the American system.

Collectivism in which the individual is considered as but a part of the mass or group is but another name for totalitarianism and if that should be the destiny of our Nation, what a mass frustration we would see in days to come as bewildered young men, inspired by the pride which will be justly theirs for having achieved victory, peace, and freedom for other peoples of the earth, should find that freedom foreclosed at home.

In the record of the immediate past one may easily read the march of collectivism, control, and management by government, and one may also read the tragic impairment of those institutions which have always been regarded as the safeguards of freedom, and that record will be none too reassuring as we re-echo the question, "What will they find over here when it's over over there?"

VIII

That record needs but brief highlighting on this occasion because it is so familiar to all. What is this collective philosophy of government we hear so much about? It is but another name for totaltarianism. It means that the individual must be hitched to the group. Whatever is good for the group, must be good for him. His individuality, his personality, his rights are of secondary importance. Human dignity is of but secondary importance. Yet all these are the very essence of freedom.

To bring about the collective way of life in this land, all power must sooner or later be concentrated in the Federal Government. Those institutions which for a century and a half we come to regard as the safeguards of that freedom must be modified, weakened, impaired or destroyed.

Nearly 10 years ago, the apostles of the new order have freely stated that there must be commitments to those changes in our institutions wherever necessary to bring about an expression of our national aims.

This is precisely what has happened during the last decade. This is the pattern which is so clearly discernible.

The forgotten man became the common man and it became the purpose of government to keep him common.

To make life more abundant, freedom was to become less abundant and to bring this about, there must be political weapons. These weapons have been forged over a period of years.

IX

Consider the growth, the centralization and the ruthlessness of Federal power.

It begins with the delegation of broad powers to the Executive and the issuance of more than 3,600 Executive orders in the first 10 years of the present administration.

There is the unending stream of directives and orders and the building of a structure of administrative law which prompted one administrator to say: "We do make the law."

There is a wilderness of alphabetical agencies, so baffling and varied in character and

number as to bewilder citizens and public servants alike.

There is a staggering public civil pay roll of nearly 3,000,000 persons, half of whom are not directly engaged in the war effort and 80 percent of whom are scattered through the 48 States of the Union. There is the subtle management of public opinion by more than 30,000 full-time and part-time persons who annually release hundreds of millions of pieces of literature to keep the people submissive.

There has been the use of more than one-half billion in blank checks by the Chief Executive.

There is the calculated erosion of the law-making power of the Congress by means of Executive orders.

There was the noxious scheme to pack the Supreme Court for the purpose of securing packed decisions.

There was the shameful use of relief funds with which to debauch free elections.

There is a host of financial experts, who because of an enormous debt, much of which was created before the demands of war began, are now suggesting that our fiscal solvency demands that controls continue and that they become the managers of the people's business.

There is the constant effort to keep emergency agencies alive, despite the fact that the emergencies have long since ceased to exist.

There is the habit of taking objectionable personnel from agencies liquidated by Congress and transferring them to other agencies that their bold radicalism might continue to ferment in government.

There is the practice of agencies created by the Congress, prohibiting their employees from testifying before courts or committees of Congress concerning the contents of their files.

There is the coddling of radicals in various agencies of Government to such an extent that Congress felt impelled to exercise its power over the purse to dislodge them

The Price Control Act bears living witness to the fact that the jurisdiction of Federal courts has been destroyed in order to achieve an economic objective, and there is the amazing thing that groups clamor for a continuation of this destruction of the power of the courts.

What is all this but part of the design to centralize power, destroy government by the people, and thus destroy individual freedom.

There has been a slow and steady expansion of the commerce clause of the Constitution to the point where States become but convenient geographical designations for tourists.

By this expansion janitors and charwomen in a Pennsylvania office building come within the scope of the Federal Wage-Hour Act only because certain products manufactured in that building move in interstate commerce.

A modest Illinois dairy, producing and selling milk wholly within the State, must knuckle under a Federal order because the milk which it produces and sells "might" come in competition with other milk which moves in interstate commerce.

When the Federal Government becomes so powerful that all human endeavor becomes subject to Federal law, what happens to our Federal Union? What happens to the grass roots? What happens to freedom as we knew it?

For a decade there has been an erosion of the law-making powers of the Congress.

The planners are steadily planning for continued controls which lodges in the hands of bureaucrats, complete powers over the people.

The Congress is regarded as but a convenient appendage of government to provide authority and funds for such plans.

When it displays some independence of spirit, it is forthwith castigated and villified that the duly elected representatives might be demeaned in the esteem of the public.

It had its culmination in the calculated assault upon Congress by the Executive, which reached such proportions that the majority leader of the Senate displayed his anger and resentment by proclaiming on the floor of that body: "This is a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress of the United States."

When the courts and the Congress became the object of attack by the executive branch to bring about personal government in this Nation, what happens to freedom, to balanced government and to government by the people?

It finds its ultimate expression in the stateord of the past, one can see the pattern for planned, controlled, managed, centralized government and our rapid march toward collectivism.

It finds its ultimate expression in the statement of the Attorney General that "No business or property is immune from Presidential order in time of war."

As one appraises the power of the governmental weapons which have been forged in the fires of a collective philosophy and estimates the determination of those who want to substitute the collective system of life for the American way, he can only re-echo that question which has been asked countless times by those who are fighting for freedom, "What will they find over here when it's over over there?"

Sometime ago, Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, wrote an article which was widely publicized and which bore this challenging title "America Is Being Made Over—And We Won't Like It."

We know the American system is being made over and we won't like it.

It is being recast in the image of what in 1935, Dr. Rexford Tugwell called disciplined democracy.

Control is the essence of discipline.

When people learn to dislike it enough, the soul will stir and then we must again go through the agony of recapturing freedom no matter what the price.

The spread of collectivism can be arrested and we can again return to the high road of freedom and individualism at the end of which there lies the greatest glory of this Republic. Somehow, one cannot escape the conviction that from ringside seats we are watching the quiet destruction of the Republic, the abandonment of the American way of living, and the impairment of freedom in a turbulent period when young men die for freedom. It is not a pleasant thought.

The very thought should move us to utter two prayerful hopes. The first hope must be for them—the young men who are away—that they may manfully pursue the grim task that destiny has assigned. The second hope is that when it's over over there, they may return to find us practicing the very freedom for which they fight.

We the people shall have full opportunity to pass judgment on all this in November of 1944. Truly, this is a year of decision.

The Greatest Homecoming of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a homecoming address entitled "The Greatest Homecoming of All," delivered by me at Shiocton, Wis., July 22, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, it is a great privilege to be here with you today at this homecoming. It is a great privilege to be a part of such a splendid tradition as the homecoming celebration.

That word homecoming is rich with meaning. Here in this land of ours, it usually means that relatives, old neighbors, old friends, playmates of school days—folks who have left the home territory for other parts—these relatives and old friends all come back to their own home community.

The renewal of old friendships—the swapping of yarns about old times—these are all part of homecoming celebrations. The institution is part of the American customs—the American folklore—the American way of life.

From communities such as Shiocton, men and women have traveled far—but always they have retained in their hearts a warm love and affection for the place of their birth and for the home of their early years.

Now in recent years, particularly, men and women from communities such as Shiocton—all over this great land of ours—have traveled far to other lands and to other peoples.

In the windows of the Shioctons of America, there are small blue stars, and sometimes gold stars—symbolizing a loved one who has traveled far from his native home.

Behind these windows in American homes, and behind the little gold stars and the little blue stars are the mothers, the fathers, the wives, the sweethearts, the brothers and the sisters and the children of the men who fight for us.

Behind every service star is the aching but fiercely proud heart of an American mother or an American father. Behind these stars are the homes of America—the heartbeat of our land.

Without these homes, without these loved ones, without these lovely familiar home communities like Shiocton, there would be little left to fight for.

The heart and the mind and the pulse beat of the mightiest nation on earth is right here—here in the Shioctons of our Nation.

The ideals, the hopes, the dreams, and the strength of our country are not found solely in Washington—they are found here in Shiocton, in Park Falls, in Sioux City, in Kalamazoo, or in Austin, Tex., or anywhere in this land where American mothers and American fathers pray at night for the safe return of their sons and daughters.

This, then, my friends, will be the greatest homecoming of all—that glorious day when our loved ones can come back to us with heads high and hearts singing because they are coming home, and because they are coming home to a land of free men and women in a world where tyranny and oppression and slavery have again been driven into the shadows.

In normal times the folks of any community have an obligation to their fellow-townspeople who have left the home community. Their obligation is to preserve the warmth and the friendliness, the decency, and the character of the community along with the beautiful tree-lined streets and a few of the old familiar landmarks.

In wartime, we of the small communities—and I come from the small community of Chippewa Falls—we have an even greater obligation.

It is an obligation to preserve intact the values for which we fight today. It is an obligation to preserve a land of freemen and freewomen—a land where there is no economic or political bondage.

It is an obligation to preserve a land free from bigotry and intolerance. It is an obligation to preserve a land where there are no racial barriers.

It is an obligation to preserve a land where there are no class distinctions—a land where we do not set up a caste system—a land where we do not divide our strength by pitting class against class.

It is an obligation to enshrine in this community and in every community throughout the land, the sacred and inalienable right of every man to worship as he sees fit.

It is the obligation to preserve the decent orderly processes of a government of free men, where government is the servant and not the master—where the people are sovereign.

It is the obligation to preserve a land of opportunity where a farm boy from Shiocton can become President, and where a businessman from Cadott can build a great enterprise from the back room of a village garage. It is the obligation to preserve that freedom of economic opportunity where a man has a right to retain a just portion of what he earns.

It is the obligation to retain a land where there are no Gestapo agents, no drumhead courts, no blood purges, and no mass executions—a land where every man is entitled to a trial by jury—is entitled to justice before God and before the law.

It is an obligation to preserve forever the sacred and inviolate right of the free-born American to have his say, to speak his mind, to express his convictions without the fear of government reprisal.

It is the obligation to safeguard the right of every American to write his convictions. It is the obligation to preserve a free and unfettered American press.

In short, my friends it is our obligation to preserve for our fighting men all of the great values and all of the great freedoms which our forefathers have won for us.

It is our obligation to preserve the rights laid down in our great charters of human liberty—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We who stand in the doorways of 40,000,000 American homes—we are only the trustees—the guardians—of these homes and the great values they represent.

While men are fighting in Normandy, on Saipan, we in Shiocton or in Thorp or in Marshfield or in Kansas City or wherever it may be—we are the custodians of the legacy, the heritage, our fighting men have left behind. We are false to our trust if we do not devote every possible moment to safeguarding that trust.

My friends, I do not speak to you today of legislation in Washington. I am speaking now of homes and men and women without whom there could be no Washington. I am speaking now of custodians back home—trustees of great values. All that is necessary in Washington is to cut through the maze of complicated and confused thinking to one basic yardstick. That yardstick must be used to measure all legislation, and in fact to measure everything we do. It is the simple yardstick—the simple test—that everything we do must safeguard or enhance the values for which we are the trustees.

Because there are communities like Shiocton; because there are decent, God-fearing, home-loving Americans such as we find here today; because there are people and homes and communities like this all over America—because of these things we can face the future unafraid.

This is the strength of our land. You people, your convictions, your ideals, your prayers, your hopes, and your dreams—these are America's secret weapon. And it is a force more potent than any robot bomb ever devised.

And so, my friends, I conclude as I began, by extending my thanks at being privileged to be a part of this inspiring gathering, and to express my fervent conviction that this homecoming is an omen of a greater homecoming in the days up ahead when war-weary sons and daughters will come back to the land they know so well, to the homes they cherish so dearly, and to the people they love so deeply.

Peace Despite the Filibusters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8), 1944

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Peace Despite the Filibusters," written by me and published in the New York Times Magazine of June 25, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE DESPITE FILIBUSTERS

SENATOR PEPPER ARGUES THE CASE FOR THE USE OF AN EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT INSTEAD OF A TREATY

(By CLAUDE PEPPER, Senator from Florida)

If the United States is to win the peace and begin effective world collaboration at the end of World War No. 2, it will have to be not by treaty of peace but by executive agreement.

We are in war probably because we did not prepare for war in times of peace. All of us should agree that the time to prepare for peace is in war. Surely we were not prepared for the peace after World War No. 1. The American people had not been educated to the problems of winning the peace, and the machinery for gaining the peace had not been adapted to the immense demands which effective collaboration would exact.

True, the American people throughout their history had been seeing farther and farther away from their own shores and had become more and more aware of the necessity of playing an integral part in world affairs. They had seen distances diminished and communications improved so that the world had become more completely one physical community. They had come to realize the impact of ideological and cultural forces of one part of the world on almost every other part. They were aware in some general way that the destiny of the world was interdependent.

Theodore Roosevelt had undoubtedly accelerated this understanding more than anyone before Woodrow Wilson. By the time of the World War, and certainly by the end of the World War, Woodrow Wilson had made the American people emotionally aware that ours had become one world, and that forces comparable to those which preserved order and life and property in a given community had to be set up in the world order. Undoubtedly the American people, stirred by Wilson's great words and spirit, not only were prepared for but demanded that the United States take the leadership in setting up the kind of an organization which would embody that concept.

It is not strange, therefore, that Senator James E. Watson admitted to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, when the latter asked him to assume leadership in the fight against the League of Nations in the Senate, that at least 80 percent of the American people favored the League. Surely the League's opponents in the Senate or in the country would never have been willing to settle the issue by a fair referendum of the American people. Nor were the opponents of the League willing to submit the issue to a fair vote of the Senate. There was never a time when a great majority of the Senate was not in favor of the League. It is probable that if, at any reasonable time after the League was laid before the Senate by President Wilson, the Senate had been given an opportunity to vote by the opposition, a two-thirds vote in favor of its ratification would have been obtained.

But the American people were totally unprepared for the discovery that the machinery by which their Government, for them, could agree to our membership in the League and to setting up and putting into effect the best organization to preserve world peace which the leading statesmen of the world had been able to devise was utterly inadequate to express the will either of the American people, of the Congress, or of the Senate. Many were appalled and many more bewildered at the exposure of how antiquated and deficient the machinery of their Government was for formulating and executing an effective foreign policy for the United States.

There are many of us, therefore, who are very much concerned as to whether with the same machinery at the end of this war we can achieve a better result. We think it is imperative that the American people focus their attention upon the technique by which the American people formulate and express their foreign policy, and determine with deep earnestness whether this time the peace is to be lost because we have no effective way of winning it. Or to put it another way, whether even now we are going to formulate a set of mechanics by which we may assure that we shall win the peace after the Nation, with so much blood and treasure, shall have helped to win the war.

Our Constitution, formulated in 1787, provides that the President negotiate treaties with other countries, but they do not become effective until they are ratified by two-thirds of the Senators who vote upon ratification. The House of Representatives has, therefore, no part in the making of the peace, although it must by a majority vote agree to a declaration of war.

The founding fathers themselves had grave misgivings about the wisdom of the two-thirds rule. A month after the Constitution was signed Washington wrote: "I am mistaken if any men, bodies of men, or countries, will enter into any compact or treaty, if one of the three is to have a negative control over the other two, but granting that it is an evil it will infallibly work its own cure."

Let us examine the two-thirds rule more closely. How did it get into the Constitution in the first place, and what has been its effect on our national and international life?

One reason often cited for adoption of the two-thirds rule is that it was intended to compensate for exclusion of the House of Representatives from treaty-making deliberations. The men who wrote the Constitution thought that secrecy was necessary in such discussions, and they did not believe secrecy could be maintained among a group as large as the House. The early Senate, on the other hand, consisted of only 26 men; in a body of that size executive sessions were possible. Precisely what logic there was in this form of compensation is not clear, but at any rate secrecy is no longer considered desirable in such cases. Indeed, one of the chief arguments advanced by supporters of the two-thirds rule is that it prolongs discussion and therefore draws public attention to the issues.

Probably a more important factor than the desire for secrecy was the existence in the Constitutional Convention of 2 minority

groups, either of which could strangle any treaty as long as the two-thirds rule was in effect. The 4 States in New England and the 4 in the South were strongly treaty-conscious, the former because of a desire to protect their fishing rights, the latter because they feared that a deal with some other country might interfere with shipping on the Mississippi River. Under the two-thirds rule the 8 Senators from either of these groups of States could, by getting only 1 of the remaining 18 Senators to vote with them, block ratification of any treaty. So the two-thirds rule, which was scrapped for general legislative purposes because it had proved so obstructive and impractical in the Continental Congress, was retained as necessary for treaty ratification.

The two-thirds rule had prevented the annexation of Texas and of Hawaii, consequences which might have had an immeasurable effect upon the future of the Nation had they not been avoided by a method which circumvented the rule. But it was when the two-thirds rule, coupled with the privilege of unlimited debate which prevails in the Senate, defeated the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations that the American people were really shocked into concern about the adequacy of their Government under the Constitution to meet the demands of world events today.

For more than 8 months the Treaty of Versailles languished in the Senate, while it was made the subject of a political assault the like of which the American people had not up to that time seen. It was more than a year later, in excess of 3 years after the armistice, that finally the United States made a separate peace with its former enemy, Germany.

The opponents of the League had control of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which for months held the treaty away from the Senate floor, and made its hearings the platform for the dissemination of the propaganda which was eventually to destroy the League in the Senate. Likewise the opponents of the League had control of the parliamentary procedure upon the Senate floor. This accentuated the evil of the two-thirds requirement, because the consideration of the treaty was so manipulated that it was not allowed to come to a vote in the Senate when it might have had a two-thirds vote of the Senators voting upon its ratification.

It will be remembered that while the Senate debated the League of Nations the world waited for peace. The 25 other Nations besides ourselves which had been signatories of the Treaty of Versailles waited to know what the United States would do about ordering the affairs of the world.

After this spectacle the American people began to wonder whether, with the two-thirds rule in effect, the United States could effectively have any foreign policy, or could make the kind of decisions which a great Nation has to make concerning world affairs.

The executive branches of the other principal powers of the world have authority to negotiate international agreements. When ratification by their parliamentary bodies is necessary it is a matter accomplished with dispatch. These powers, therefore, are able to make international commitments and to inform authoritatively other nations what they will and what they will not do.

But what can an American President or Secretary of State commit this Nation to, and what responsible advice can the American Government give any other power as to our course, so long as any international agreement is subject to unlimited delay in committee in the Senate, and then to unlimited debate upon the Senate floor, and then to the requirement of a two-thirds vote when eventually its consideration is reached?

Surely what Russia is to do after the war, and what England will do in the same period, will depend to a large extent upon what we are prepared to do. It is obvious that if Russia and England are going to have to rely upon their own strength for their future security they must achieve a strategic position after the war which will give them the safeguards upon which they are willing to rely. The alternative is international understanding and commitments by which we will all agree to band together against the aggressor and to use force if necessary and such other means as may be required to restrain international aggression and to maintain the peace of the world.

How long will Russia and England, in determining what territory they will occupy when the enemy is crushed, be willing to wait for the Senate, according to its present procedure, to make up its mind as to what America will do? Or how long will these countries jointly wait upon the Senate determining what we are willing to commit ourselves to after the war, when those two Governments can at any time under their governmental procedure enter into effective agreements and understanding about their own courses?

Moreover, with our system of political parties in the United States, there will always be a certain number of Senators who will make political capital even out of a treaty concluding a war which the opposite party in control of a government may negotiate. That is a severe indictment, but I suggest to good citizens that it has occurred in the past.

John C. Calhoun, when he was Secretary of State, wrote concerning the fight over the treaty providing for the annexation of Texas: "I cannot but hope that the treaty would be sanctioned * * * when the Presidential election will be over, and the party motives that have led to laying the treaty on the table shall have passed away."

In the fall of 1919 Senator Albert J. Beveridge wrote to Will Hays, chairman of the Republican National Committee: "* * * if Wilson gets this thing [the League of Nations] through, especially if he gets it through with Republican support, I think that our prospects of winning [the national election], which 3 months ago seemed a certainty, will be gravely diminished."

Even if it were possible to get a vote upon a treaty at any time in the Senate, the two-thirds rule is almost prohibitive of ratification of the kind of treaty which has to be made after a world war today. The power of filibuster, which the Senate jealously preserves, makes it possible, however, for even less than a third to defeat a treaty, for a few determined men under the rules of the Senate can even keep a measure from being made the pending business before the Senate.

Many filibusters have revealed that power and the willingness of the Senators to exercise it adamantly. Debate on the League of Nations showed that there was a little group of Senators who would forego no power to defeat the League. Surely the isolationists and those who do not believe in international collaboration are in the Senate today, and they are determined to use every means within their power to prevent the setting up after this war of the kind of international organization, and the kind of world collaboration, which most of us believe essential to the winning of the peace and to the prevention of World War No. 3.

One naturally asks what can be done. Several of us, including myself, have proposed a constitutional amendment which will provide for the ratification of treaties either by majority of the Senate, or a majority of the Senate and House of Representatives. I advocate that ratification be by majority of the Senate and the House. The House should have a part in making peace comparable to its part in the declaration of war. The House is the body closer to the people. Surely the principle of providing checks upon the power of the Executive and balance between departments of Government can adequately be obtained by preventing any treaty negotiated by the executive department becoming effective unless it is agreed to by a majority of the Senate and the House.

I go further, however, and provide that a majority of the Senate and the House must have authority effectively to fix the time of the vote. In other words, to prevent a filibuster.

But an amendment to the Constitution can be proposed to the legislatures of the States only by a two-thirds vote of the House of Representatives and the Senate. While I believe the House is prepared to abolish the two-thirds rule in favor of a majority rule in the Senate and the House, the Senate, I am sure, is not ready to do so, and will not do so.

The alternative under the Constitution is for two-thirds of the States to propose such a constitutional amendment to the Congress. In that case it would be obligatory upon the Congress to provide for a constitutional convention to consider such a proposed amendment. If such a convention submitted a proposed amendment, then it would be the duty of the Congress to submit the proposal to the States for ratification by the legislatures, or conventions, as Congress might determine, in three-fourths of the States. While everyone who believes in the abolition of the two-thirds rule should work for action in the State legislatures, it is vain to hope that we can accomplish anything effective by the end of this war.

The only effective way, therefore, to circumvent the two-thirds rule, although that does not overcome the senatorial power of filibuster, is to seek the adjustment of post-war problems and international collaboration on the part of our Government by executive agreement, approved by a majority of those voting in the Senate and the House.

The executive agreement with such approval by the Congress is historically as old and almost as well recognized as the treaty. In fact, Washington himself used the device of the executive agreement approved by the Congress. Since his time about 1,200 compacts with foreign governments have been concluded by the executive-agreement method, while only some 800 treaties have been ratified.

You may wonder about the difference between the treaty and the executive agreement. It is doubtful if anyone could draw a definition which would accurately describe the difference in the two in the light of our history. While there are many good theories, it may be said that an executive agreement is an instrument pertaining to international affairs which the Senate and the House are willing by a majority vote to treat as an executive agreement, binding upon this Nation, while a treaty is such an instrument which the Congress will not recognize unless it is ratified by two-thirds of the Senators voting upon its ratification. Congress, therefore, has the power of substituting a majority rule of the Senate and House for the two-thirds rule of the Senate.

The present machinery does not prevent the Congress and the Executive from so working together that we can have an effective foreign policy, and can make decisions on international affairs with promptness and responsibility. The danger is in whether Congress will allow a minority of the Senate to abuse the power to defeat an effective foreign policy.

One readily sees, then, how important it is that the views of Members of Congress be known upon this vital question. It is doubtful if any attitude of a Member of Congress is as important to the winning of the peace and the prevention of World War No. 3 as whether he, or she, is willing to break the stranglehold of the minority of the Senate upon our power to participate in foreign affairs.

Bretton Woods Monetary Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. SCRUGHAM
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 8, 1944

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter signed by 26 Senators, addressed to the President of the United States, dealing with the international monetary fund plan, and a statement prepared by me dealing with the Bretton Woods Monetary Agreement.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRETTON WOODS MONETARY AGREEMENT

(By Senator J. G. SCRUGHAM)

In my opinion the Bretton Woods Agreement for monetary stabilization, in its present form, will fail to receive the approval of Congress for the following reasons:

1. The absence of a statement saying that it is the objective of the signatory nations to restore the gold and silver standards. Instead, it is clear that the international monetary fund is designed to facilitate the adoption of managed currency plans by individual nations and groups of nations, and eventually by the world at large.

2. No conditions whatever are attached to the utilization of the credit facilities of the fund by nations whose balance of payments will be adverse due to conditions within their control. As a minimum, such countries should promise to take steps that would improve their balance of payments position, so that they would not have to resort to the fund chronically for assistance.

3. No price for gold is set in the fund, each nation being free to select any initial parity for its currency that it wishes, with provision for changes in such parity subsequently, thereby deliberately providing a means of circumventing stabilization.

4. No price for silver is set in the fund. In fact, unlike gold, no provision is made for any price for silver. Article V, section 4, which contains the only reference to silver in the agreement fails to specify the basis on which silver may be accepted as collateral for a loan for a country that has exhausted its quota in the fund, and gives no assurance whatever that silver will be accepted by the fund if tendered.

5. No provision is made for special credits to nations that desire to acquire gold and silver for coinage, so as to substitute actual coins or representative paper money for fiat currency.

Fundamentally, the international monetary fund plan seeks to substitute managed currency for the triad and tested gold and silver standards. I do not believe our Congress will approve the plan unless it is modified to correct this defect.

President Roosevelt received a letter signed by 26 Senators, at the time that the Bretton Woods Conference was started, expressing their concern over the lack of provision for a metallic base for currency, and particularly over the failure to include silver along with gold in the original draft of the experts' plan. The agreement as published is open to this same objection. Failure to respond favorably to the Senators' letter, and to heed the objections raised, will necessarily affect the attitude of many Members of Congress when the Bretton Woods Agreement is presented for ratification.

For the information of those who have not seen the letter referred to I desire to insert it into the RECORD at this point:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE
INVESTIGATION OF SILVER,
June 21, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have studied carefully the international monetary fund plan that has been made public by the United States Treasury. Since whatever plan is ultimately adopted will have to be approved by the Congress, we feel it is our duty to pass on to you without delay certain conclusions we have reached pertaining to the plan.

The experts' plan suffers from a basic, organic defect in that no place in it is assigned to silver. As a result, there will be an insufficiency of media for the settlement of international balances, and the use of silver as money will be undermined.

We strongly urge, therefore, that the plan be revised forthwith so that parities for the currencies of member countries will be fixed in silver, as well as gold. By specifying fixed parities in terms of silver also, the following results would be attained:

1. The physical supply of standard money would be expanded for the enlarged needs of the post-war world.

2. The preference of a large part of the population of the world for silver money would be recognized.

3. The nations of Europe and the Far East now in the throes of wild paper money inflation could return to silver coinage on a sound basis.

4. The remonetization of gold and silver would thus be effected simultaneously and internationally.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER THOMAS, chairman, Special Silver Committee; EDWIN C. JOHNSON; PAT MCCARRAN; SHERIDAN DOWNEY; JAMES E. MURRAY; ABE MURDOCK; ERNEST W. MCFARLAND; HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD; E. V. ROBERTSON; CARL HAYDEN; MON C. WALLGREN; GUY CORDON; GERALD P. NYE; J. G. SCRUGHAM; B. K. WHEELER; HUGH BUTLER; HENRIK SHIPSTEAD; DENNIS CHAVEZ; JOHN THOMAS; KENNETH S. WHERRY; ELBERT D. THOMAS; CHAN GURNEY; CARL A. HATCH; RUFUS C. HOLMAN; D. WORTH CLARK; E. H. MOORE.

Civil Aeronautics Military Cadet Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, on March 30 the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] disclosed here on the floor of the House a very remarkable story and a story of which every American can well be proud.

He told how, back in 1939, a group of civilian flying-school operators were called in by General Arnold and General Yount and told that the Army had neither the necessary personnel nor the time to build primary flight-training facilities if we were to be ready when the storm clouds of war should break.

He told how in this emergency, an Army board had toured the Nation hunting civilian schools that could do Air Force training and how finally nine schools operated by this little group of experienced operators were selected because of their long years in training flyers; because they had the buildings, equipment, fields, and facilities all set up for such work; because they had the trained pilots, mechanics, and organization with 20 years' experience, necessary for the job.

He told how this group of men were asked to plunge immediately into the work of training pilots, so badly were they needed, on the chance that the money to finance the work eventually could be secured, although there were no contracts and no guarantee that such would be the case.

He told how these operators gambled everything they had and went heavily into debt to take on the job of teaching thousands of our young men to fly airplanes, without any assurance that they would get their money back. They even did this before Congress appropriated the money. It is a great example of American free enterprise.

He told of the unprecedented teamwork that was set up, with the Army Air Forces and the Nation's civilian schools working together with a new standard of efficiency and unprecedented economy to create the most powerful Air Force the world has ever known, and to do it with an unprecedented safety record.

I have recently returned from my district in southern California where two of these schools are located. Out at Ontario is Cal-Aero Academy, operated by Maj. C. C. Moseley, a World War No. 1 veteran and fighter pilot in that tiny group of airmen who fought the Germans overseas in 1917 and 1918, a man who officially destroyed Germans in aerial combat in the last war and one who has devoted his life to aviation, one of these original nine experienced operators who took that long chance back in 1939. Up at Lancaster is Mira Loma Flight Academy which Major Moseley also set up a year later when General Arnold's second appeal for more and more schools was made.

I spent some time at these two fields and I learned some things I think the Congress ought to know. The people who are running these schools spend their time training pilots and more pilots. They do not take much time out to talk about themselves. They know that theirs is a grave and dangerous responsibility—that they have been entrusted with the precious lives of the pick of our land. They are too busy doing the job to waste time talking about it. Their amazing accomplishments are not generally known.

Now, if you do not think there is a story worth telling in these schools, just listen to this one fact:

Moseley's schools have trained over 20,000 pilots. Over 1,000 of them have been decorated over and above the call of duty, including awards of the Congressional Medal of Honor, Victoria Cross,

and so forth. They have flown a total of more than 1,630,000 hours, or 163,000,000 miles. One school's safety record is so good that a cadet—and this, mind you, is a cadet in training, learning to fly—can depend on flying around the world 260 times, or make 1,254 round trips from Washington, D. C., to Los Angeles, or continued flying, night and day, for 7 years, without a fatality. Compare this with the fact that overseas in War No. 1 the cadet training record was 1 fatality every 1,100 hours, and in 1939 the record was 1 fatality about every 16,000 hours. Considering these Army-civil schools are doing their training, in large volume, under wartime pressure makes this accomplishment one of the greatest of this war.

And here is something else I learned: The Army is saving the taxpayers a staggering amount of money with this civilian school set-up. When the Army had to do its own primary training—that is the job of just teaching the man to fly, before the Army takes him over and teaches him to use his airplane as a military weapon—it cost about $55 per flying hour. Now, by using these civilian schools and their equipment and their personnel, they have reduced that cost by more than 80 percent. In other words, these civilian schools have enabled us to train a man to fly for less than a fifth of the accepted cost. When you figure that more than 100,000 pilots have been trained these last 5 years, this saving gets into astronomical figures.

Then there is the manpower saving. There are two or three angles to that. The one that interested me most was the length they go to in reducing what they call the wash-out rate. Wash-outs are cadets who are eliminated as being unfit to be a military pilot. There is no disgrace in washing out. Either a man can be taught to fly or he cannot. But it is harder to develop this ability in some men than in others. These civilian schools go to the most amazing lengths to get a man through if they possibly can. For instance, they have developed what they call Squadron X. When a cadet does not progress in his training as well as he should, they transfer him to Squadron X. The man at the head of Squadron X is pretty good at getting under the boy's skin and figuring out just what is holding him back. When he figures out what is wrong, he assigns the lad to an instructor who fits the cadet's particular peculiarities. This instructor becomes a second father to him. He labors and sweats and works his soul out to make a pilot out of his problem child. And first thing you know, the boy suddenly gets the hang of it, and there is one less washed-out cadet—one less wasted man. If you do not think this sort of thing is important, listen to this: When the civilian schools took over this job of primary training, the accepted wash-out rate was 40 percent. With a class of 275 cadets that would mean that 110 men would be eliminated. Well, just the other day Mira Loma Flight Academy graduated a class of 275 cadets, and there were just 4 wash-outs. Four wash-outs instead of 110; 106 more pilots for the Air Force.

And while we are on this subject of manpower, you should know that the use of these civilian schools and their personnel has released over 100,000 officers and enlisted men for combat duty—men who otherwise would have been tied down as instructors and mechanics and cooks and maintenance people. Their personnel largely do not qualify for Army duty. For instance, I met an instructor who has 16,000 hours of flying to his credit. Remember that when Eddie Rickenbacker finished his flying in the last war, he had only 350 hours. This man has 16,000 hours. Of course, he is too old for combat, but think what those 16,000 hours of experience mean in teaching new pilots to fly. And that man is no exception. In fact, the average flying experience of all the hundreds of instructors out there is more than 2,500 hours each, and 9½ years' flying experience.

That is one reason—and a big one—why these schools have been able to set new standards of training. There is no substitute for experience and these veterans of aviation have that experience—experience that only comes from years and years of trial and error.

So, then, I found that without any fanfare but with a tremendous amount of good common sense and good business administration, the Army Air Forces and these civilian contract schools have set up a proposition that is actually sensational. Millions and millions of dollars are being saved—as much as $250,000,000 a year; manpower of staggering proportions is being saved; safety heretofore undreamed of is being accomplished and all this while maintaining the highest standards in the finished product of any air force in the world.

Now all this is not only noteworthy and significant in these days of war which we all hope and believe are drawing to their close. If anything, it is even more significant for the days of peace that lie ahead. And here is why:

It takes only rudimentary intelligence to know that this Nation never again dare be without a powerful air force—an air force capable of enforcing peace. Only a merciful providence and gross errors of judgment by our enemies saved us from a fate we dare not contemplate, when the approach of war found us with only a handful of pilots and few combat aircraft. It is too much to expect that fortune would favor us a second time. We have learned the hard way and we would be indeed unworthy of the kindness bestowed upon us by that providence if we refused to profit by what we have learned.

It is one thing to build and equip an air force. It is another thing to maintain one. In no other field is the turnover rate so heavy. A man of 25 has reached the top age for fighter aircraft piloting; at 27 he is passing his usefulness as a bomber pilot. Eighteen is the minimum for starting to train. Thus a military combat pilot's effective life, from start to finish, can be but 9 years at the most, of which one, at the minimum, must be his training period.

So, obviously, this training of new pilots must go on and on and on, if we are to safely be prepared to enforce peace in the world. And it is one thing to spend money in wartime and quite another thing to spend money in times of peace.

Herein lies the blessing of this Army-civilian school team. With costs reduced by 80 percent, the taxpayer from now on can get his military pilots and keep 80 percent of his money too. We have learned how to buy pilots at bargain prices without lowering our high standards, without wasting our manpower and, best of all, with almost fantastic safety.

Certainly no one is better fitted to do peacetime training as an integral part of our national defense system than these unsung heroes of this war—the civilian schools who have proved their ability to do a job safely, efficiently, inexpensively.

The gentleman from Alabama characterized this proposition as "great military leadership teamed up with civilian know-how in a typical American partnership." Let us resolve to preserve for all time this partnership that has worked so well.

Where Does Agriculture Go From Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an address which I delivered before the annual meeting of the International Baby Chick Association in Chicago, Ill., on July 28, 1944:

I am happy to have the opportunity to attend this conference and to address the members of the International Baby Chick Association and others interested in the poultry industry.

There may have been a time when poultry and eggs could be considered as mere pin money but that time has long since passed. As a matter of fact, poultry has always been one of the leading sources, as well as the most diversified source, of farm income. This is true to an even greater extent today. Last year poultry and egg production topped the $2,000,000,000 figure and that is big business even in these days when we speak as glibly of millions and billions as we did of hundreds and thousands in earlier periods.

The evidence is increasing every day that we are now entering the last stages of the European phase of the war. This isn't intended as a prediction that the war in Europe is going to be over in a month, or 3 months, or 6 months, although it could possibly end any time within those periods and probably will. Irrespective, however, of the date when unconditional surrender takes place, the fact remains that the pattern of victory has been marked out. The glaring weaknesses of Germany both on the military and home fronts which have been revealed since the beginning of the current offensives are proof sufficient that the end is in sight and that the exact date probably depends more upon psychological and morale factors than it does upon military prowess. The Pacific war will take longer, but there, too, the factors which make victory certain have already been achieved and the result is only a matter of time.

When the story of our participation in this war is finally written, it will be found, I am sure, that our greatest contribution to victory has been that of production on the home front. This is not said in any way in disparagement of our great achievements on the battlefield or the unequaled and unparalleled heroism of our soldiers and sailors and marines in all quarters of the globe. Their achievements will brighten the pages of history for all time, and surpass anything recorded of the past. It is in the field of production, however, that we have displayed our greatest superiority over our enemies and have been able to render the greatest assistance to our gallant allies.

When it became apparent that we could produce 100,000 airplanes in 1 year and other offensive weapons in the same proportion, that we could build within the space of 3 years a navy greater than the combined navies of all nations of the earth, and that we could build merchant shipping at the rate of 20,000,000 tons in a year, Allied victory was assured. A great deal has been said about this miracle of industrial production and everything which has been said is deserved. It is an achievement which it is impossible to exaggerate in the telling.

Less has been said about the farmers' part in war production. His stay has not been so dramatic or spectacular, yet, in many ways, the achievements of agriculture in war production have been more remarkable than those of industry. It must be remembered that our increase in industrial production was possible because of a tremendous expansion in plants and plant capacity, because of greatly increased personnel, and because of priorities which made it possible to secure needed materials. The farmers lacked these advantages.

He secured an increase of 24 percent in food production between 1939 and 1943 in spite of the fact that in 1943 he had less labor, less machinery, and less transportation equipment than he had in 1939. This great achievement occurred notwithstanding all of the harassments, inconveniences, delays, and confusion which are to a greater or lesser extent inevitable accompaniments of a shift from peacetime to wartime economy. While those engaged in industrial war production had their operations underwritten by the Government and took no chance of loss, this was not the case with farmers. It is true that in some cases farmers had assurances of support prices for their products, but even then they took all the risks of weather, insect pests, and plant and livestock diseases against which there is no insurance. In many cases at the request of their Government farmers planted crops with which they had no experience and for which they did not have suitable or adequate machinery and equipment. In most cases, farmers risked a large part of their capital in their expanded operations yet few hesitated to take the risk. Farm days are always long but since the war they've been even longer. In most parts of the country farm operators have worked from 12 to 13½ hours per day, and in many cases it's a 7-day week. Farmers out in Kansas jokingly refer to their 8-hour day—8 hours in the forenoon and 8 hours in the afternoon. Yet, in spite of everything, the goals set by the War Food Administration have been equaled and, in many cases, exceeded. This miracle of farm production has been made possible only because of the patriotic, untiring, everlasting work of the American farmer and every member of his family.

No group of agricultural producers has made a more outstanding record than the poultrymen. The increase in production in that field is really something to crow about. Between 1939 and 1943 egg production increased 39 percent and chicken production 83 percent. Something was said a few years ago about two chickens for every pot. That goal has just about been reached. Furthermore, a large proportion of this increased production has gone directly into the war effort in the way of food for our armed forces and on lend-lease to our allies.

Our great achievements in both industrial and agricultural production ought to give us great confidence for the future. We have demonstrated a capacity which we ourselves did not know we possessed. This great miracle of production has been achieved through the cooperation of industry, labor, agriculture, and government. It has demonstrated what the American people working together can accomplish. Yet there are many who now view the future with apprehension. They are worried, not about production, but about consumption. They wonder if after the war when Government buying ceases, whether our people will have the buying power to support this immense productive capacity. Farmers, as well as industrialists, and working people, are concerned about this. Perhaps farmers are more concerned than any other group of producers because it is harder for them to adjust their operations downward than anyone else. Large industrial units can control their production, but 6,000,000 farmers competing with each other cannot do it satisfactorily or without great loss. The tremendous increase in agricultural production under the stimulus of war was a great and difficult achievement, but to cut down production substantially if that should be necessary would be even more difficult.

Fortunately for the adjustments which may be necessary, the need for ample food supplies will not end with the war. We do not have exact information as to what will be needed for relief in Europe when the war ends but we know that for a year or so we will have to supply some food to the war-torn areas. The length of time this will be necessary cannot be foretold now. Also, we know the Japanese war will continue for some period after hostilities are over in Europe and this means continued demands from military sources and a continuation—even if on a restricted scale—of our war production program.

Also there is on the statute books legislation passed by Congress which provides price support at 90 percent of parity for most important agricultural products for 2 years following the termination of the war. No one knows better than this audience that price support programs don't always function 100 percent, especially on perishables, but I have no doubt but what Congress and whatever administration is in power will stand behind this price support program.

This price support program plus the fact that the end of the war will come in two phases will help hold the line long enough to enable farmers to make adjustments and for agriculture, business, labor and Government to work out post-war policies.

Just what will the situation be with reference to agricultural production after the war production program is terminated? First, what about acreage? That's only one factor in agricultural production but, of course, an important one. The phenomenal crops of 1942 and 1943 were grown on about the same acreage as the average from 1935 to 1939. For 1944 the estimated acreage is a little larger but not materially so. Some of the increased production per acre was due to exceptionally favorable weather but in considerable part it was due to improved farming practices. Advancement is being made continually along this line and we may expect that in the post-war period yields per acre will gradually increase. Therefore, even if we could continue to consume as much as during the current period, it is probable that 10 years from now it could be grown on a smaller acreage if necessary and desirable.

What about manpower? Well, our production in 1943 was achieved with the smallest number of persons working on farms in the whole 35 years for which statistics have been available. It is indicated that the number for 1944 will be still less. This, however, is in line with the trend for many years. According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, agricultural production per worker, in 1940–43 as a whole, averaged 25 percent greater than in 1935–39 and 67 percent greater than in 1910–14. These gains, of course, were due to mechanization, improved practices, better varieties and strains of crops and livestock and other factors making for greater efficiency, all of which may be expected to continue.

Will those who have left the farm during the war period return and, if they do, what will be the effect on agricultural production and prices? A great deal depends upon the answers to those questions. Perhaps no one knows the answer but preliminary surveys indicate that a large proportion of those who have left the farm for industry would like to stay there. I think we are safe in assuming that they will stay there if they can get jobs at good wages. If jobs are not available, they'll return to the farm for there is no place else to go. This is in entire harmony with what has happened in the past and has resulted in the seeming paradox that when farm prices are good, people leave the farms and when they are bad, there is a movement back to the farm. The explanation is that good farm prices come with employment and good wages in the cities, and poor farm prices with urban unemployment and low wages, coupled with the further fact that even in times of farm prosperity wages in the city are more attractive, and life on the farm, under any conditions, is better than unemployment in the city. If, through a lack of jobs in industry, most of those who have left the farms return to agriculture, we will, in all probability, find ourselves with farm surpluses for which there is no market because surplus labor in agriculture means surplus production. This means that the key to the entire problem is jobs. Jobs in industry mean markets for farmers.

It all adds up to the fact that the post-war problems of agriculture cannot be separated from these of industry and labor. All are interdependent. If we can maintain industrial employment in this country sufficient to give jobs at good wages to all who want to work, we will have, in a large measure, solved the problem not only of labor but of industry and agriculture. If this can be done, agricultural producers can count upon a domestic demand for farm products almost equal to our production during the war period, although it may be necessary to make shifts in types of production. Unfortunately, because a considerable part of its expansion went directly into war sources, the poultry industry will likely be required to make some downward adjustments even under conditions of full employment. Perhaps, however, no greater than those which have already been made.

We can have full employment and abundant production in this country only if agriculture, labor, industry and government get together on such a policy. As far as farmers are concerned, they instinctively favor such a policy. They are satisfied only when producing. In recent years many farmers have cooperated in programs for adjusting and reducing production but they have done so without enthusiasm and because it seemed the only way out of an otherwise hopeless situation. Yet if post-war policies on the part of government, industry and labor contemplate restrictions on production, agriculture will have to follow suit. For the whole of industry or labor such a policy would be just as harmful as it would be for agriculture. Yet there are some branches of industry in a position where

they can follow monoply practices, which may conclude that their selfish interests can best be served by restricting production and depending on high prices and high profits. There are labor organizations which have, in the past, kept down the labor supply by a combination of the closed shop, restrictions on union membership, and slow-downs. Undoubtedly those who advocated and followed such practices felt that they were benefiting themselves. Perhaps they were. Even if they want to do so, there is no way by which farmers can follow the practices of industry and labor in restricting production. The Government will have to do it for them. That means bureaucracy, conferences, consultants, statisticians, and coordinators, none of which are particularly popular with farmers no matter how necessary they may be, and it doesn't mean fair prices or prosperity. We learned that from 1933 to 1939. During that time we tried about everything in the way of agricultural programs. We spent billions of dollars on agricultural adjustment payments alone. The number of employees in the Department of Agriculture increased fourfold. In spite of all this we wound up with prices at only 75 percent of parity when the war began in September 1939. Yet in a comparatively short time the war, by creating a demand and buying power for farm products, more than doubled net farm income.

We can feel encouraged over the fact that all over the Nation today groups representing industry, labor, and agriculture are working on post-war plans. Several of these are national groups, such as the Committee for Economic Development and the National Planning Association. Labor organizations, industrial groups, and farm groups are hard at work over the Nation. There are perhaps 3,000 State and local groups considering post-war planning. Government departments are busy, and congressional committees have done much. We have won the battle of war production because millions of Americans worked together with one common purpose in mind. Is it too much to hope that a similar united effort now will bring about a program of abundant production following the war?

I hope the emphasis which I have placed on cooperation between Government, industry, labor, and agriculture to bring about abundant production has not created the impression that this is the whole problem. Each group has its separate and specific problems. Some of those pertaining to agriculture are as follows. The order in which I have arranged them is not based on their importance.

1. The disposition of Government-owned property. Of direct interest to agriculture are four types of such property. First, supplies of food and other agricultural commodities which may affect prices when they are thrown on the market. These must be disposed of with as little loss as possible. At the same time their disposition must be calculated to cause the least possible disturbance of prices. Second, land purchased for defense installations. Much of it is fertile crop land. There will be demands that this land be returned to private ownership as soon as possible and that former owners and war veterans be given a preference in its purchase. Strong arguments can be made for this course, but I suggest we approach the matter with caution. Why not keep this land in Government hands until we are sure it is needed for productive purposes. When and if it is, its disposition will be simple. Third, plants which might be used after the war for the manufacture of fertilizer. We should take care to see that their disposition and use are not adverse to agriculture. Fourth, plants which have been constructed by the Government for the processing of agricultural products.

2. Our Federal reclamation policy should be such that new land will not be brought into cultivation and production until it is definitely needed.

3. Foreign trade policies. Abundant production means an expanding foreign trade. It means more imports as well as more exports. Such a program need not be inimical to agriculture. If properly worked out, it can be helpful. This could be the subject of an entire discussion, but time forbids more now.

4. Conservation of our land resources. From a long-time standpoint, this is perhaps the most important subject of all. In the immediate future it will be helpful if it can be integrated with production adjustment programs.

5. There should be further study and investigation of crop insurance. Experiments along this line up to date have not been entirely encouraging. There is nothing, however, which will do as much to stabilize agriculture as a workable system of crop insurance. The matter is so important that nothing should be left undone to work out a practical program.

6. Further consideration of what constitutes parity with a view of obtaining a more up-to-date formula. Poultry producers are justifiably interested in a basis which gives greater weight to their production costs.

7. A better marketing system for farm products. No producer in the world has as little to say about the price and disposition of his product as the farmer. It is doubtful if any other business could survive such a marketing system. The House Committee on Agriculture is about to begin a thorough investigation of this subject. This investigation will be fair, objective, and thorough. Its sole object will be to determine how well our present system is working and what improvements might be made in it. The investigation will cover all phases of marketing, including transportation, terminal market facilities, commodity exchange, surplus disposal, and cooperative marketing. I consider this one of the most important investigations ever authorized by Congress.

8. Provision whereby farmers working in cooperation can take temporary or seasonal surpluses off the market. Perhaps all surpluses could not be handled that way. Surpluses of nonperishables which might be carried through more than one season might need Federal financing but even in those cases it would be preferable if they could be handled through farmer owned and controlled organizations.

9. Any post-war plans for agriculture should take into consideration that, as time goes on, we will need less rather than more manpower in agricultural production. Since 1900 the proportion of our working population in agriculture has fallen from 37 percent to 15 percent and it is still falling. There may be temporary checks in this descent but mechanization and better farming practices will continue to increase output per worker and probably at a greater rate than the increase in agricultural consumption. For this reason, we ought to be very careful and conservative in any plans to put returning soldiers on the land lest we do both the soldier and existing farm operators an injustice. Undoubtedly there are many men in the armed forces who came from farms and will want to return to them. They should be given every opportunity to do so, and the further opportunity to acquire land ownership and the equipment with which to farm it where this can be done on the basis of values which will enable profitable operation. However, there is danger that in our commendable desire to assist soldiers in reestablishing themselves after the war we will do them a great injury by letting our hearts rather than our heads determine the policy to be followed.

All of you can think of other questions which must be considered in connection with plans for post-war agriculture. Time does not permit me to mention all of them. At the risk of further imposing on your patience, I want to suggest one more. That is the matter of living conditions on the farm. Not long ago I heard a brilliant farm woman speak on this subject. She told of her experience after she went to the farm as a bride, of the many inconveniences with which she had to contend and how her beautiful new kitchen was cluttered up with the firewood, the incubator, and even sick chickens and pigs. When she mentioned this to other farm women, their usual reply was "Well, it just has to be that way on a farm." All of us who have lived on farms know the conditions under which our mothers and grandmothers worked. They've improved somewhat but there is still plenty of room for more improvement. Any planning for agriculture ought to have for one of its objectives parity of living conditions on the farm including health, education and recreational facilities, vocational opportunities and the complete conveniences of modern life in the way of housing, sanitation, water supply, electricity, and good roads. Probably, it is too much to expect that people living in rural communities will be able to keep up with those living in the city in attaining all of the conveniences of modern life. For this there are compensations, because there are advantages which country people enjoy which cannot be duplicated in the city. Certainly, however, people who live on our farms are entitled to ask that they have the same over-all opportunities for health, education, and recreation possessed by those living in the city.

These are great days. Never since the beginning of recorded history has the world faced such stirring events as are occurring everywhere today. Even as we meet here the mighty panorama of battle is roaring to a climax in every quarter of the globe save that in which we live. Soon as we count time it will be over. This war will be won by the greatest combination of military power ever assembled in all history. It will be won because we and our allies have been able to work together and fight together in a great common cause.

But winning the war is not enough. As the day of victory approaches, we see that if we are to win the peace it will take the same mighty effort, the same cooperation, which it took to win the war. That is true in the international field. It is true here at home. Mark what I say. Our most difficult days are ahead. It's going to be harder to secure united effort after the war ends. The pressure of national danger will be gone. The solidarity that comes in fighting a common enemy will be missing. Some of the hatreds which we have turned against the enemy are going to be turned into channels which will create disunity here at home. There will be attempts made to array group against group and class against class. These efforts must not succeed. There must be harmony. Industry, labor, agriculture, and Government must remain united. There is no other way to win the peace.

Our Kids Are Bums?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday on leaving the National Naval Medical Center I gave a lift to a uniformed merchant marine seaman going into town. This boy, and I

might add just an average typical American boy, carried a heavily bandaged arm in a sling. After a little patience, I got his story.

A ship had been blown from under him in the South Pacific by a torpedo from a Jap submarine. The crew, unarmed, took to the lifeboats, the Jap submarine then surfaced, and its laughing crew of beasts raked the lifeboats with machine guns.

After a considerable pause he said, "I am going to be well by January 1, in time to go on my new ship; I am going to be in the invasion of Japan."

Then slowly and sadly, as he looked into the distance, he added: "They killed my twin brother, they killed 58 of my friends on my ship."

There we have the evidence of just a typical American boy and his sense of the obligation of American citizenship responsibility. It is the answer to the title of the following editorial in the Macomb Daily Journal of Macomb, Ill.:

OUR KIDS ARE BUMS?

Again, and again, and again: Would you please, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, go back in a corner somewhere and sit down and keep still. In any weather you're bad enough, but in this heat you're almost too much.

Some months ago the First Lady (that's hard to take) predicted that American boys would lose their regard for human life and their sense of fair play as a result of war service.

Now it is her idea that youngsters lack citizenship responsibility. American school systems, she says, "have fallen down so terribly in providing instruction in practical self-government." To develop citizenship responsibility she advocates compulsory military training after the war for both boys and girls of age 18.

Some of Mrs. Roosevelt's children may be a keen disappointment to her, and if so, there is some reason for it, but she has no right to assume that every parent is equally unfortunate. Indeed, all facts contradict her.

Where, we would like to ask, has there been grander demonstration of citizenship responsibility than by hundreds of thousands of American youngsters who with serious loyalty and enthusiasm are serving in the armed forces?

Most of them, we would remind Mrs. Roosevelt, entered the service as buck privates. The shiny bars of a captaincy were not handed to them on a platter. However, any sense of inferiority they might have felt was more than offset by mental complacency made possible by their freedom from marital worries and the complications that may be incidental to a string of ex-wives scattered over the country.

If Mrs. Roosevelt were ever in the White House it would be in order to express the hope that the edifice soon ceases to be a glass house from which stones are hurled by an individual whose own failures as a parent and whose demonstrated love for collectivism moves her to advocate giving the state a hand in the rearing of children after the Russian pattern. But she is not often there. She races hither and yon across the country and not infrequently invades other countries, there to give counsel on the shortcomings of the younger generation, explain her odd theories of democracy, or attempt to advance the prestige of her husband.

Which leads us back again to this thing of citizenship responsibility.

Transportation facilities are so overtaxed that young men in uniform, who, according to Mrs. Roosevelt, lack citizenship responsibility, are forced to sleep in the aisles of hot and dilapidated day coaches. These same men who on furlough are allowed such a meager ration of gasoline that they have to do a bit of chiseling if they want to drive out of sight of their homes. It is preached to the public day after day that the shortage of gas and tires is critical, that people must stay off trains so that troops and wounded men can be moved.

Yet Mrs. Roosevelt travels continually.

What do you mean citizenship responsibility, Mrs. Roosevelt?

If every civilian were as lacking in citizenship responsibility in this respect as you are Mrs. Roosevelt, and if every citizen had traveled only half as much, it would have been impossible for this country to have moved a single soldier to embarkation points.

Correction in Printing of the Resolutions of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in the Congressional Record of June 8, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, 1944, I asked leave to extend my remarks by including therein the resolutions adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs at their annual convention April 25–28, 1944, at St. Louis, Mo. Through some inadvertent error two of the resolutions were not printed in full, and I am asking leave to print these two resolutions in full as they were adopted at the convention.

On pages 2 and 3 the resolution on international cooperation for peace and post-war planning and the one on crude oil have inadvertently been run together. The two resolutions read:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR PEACE AND POST-WAR PLANNING

Whereas two world wars in a single generation have brought upon humanity immeasurable death and destruction and have demonstrated the urgent necessity of international collaboration for the maintenance of peace and justice among the nations; and

Whereas the United States, after attempting to remain apart from each of these wars, has, in defense of its own security and freedom, been drawn into them at heavy cost in human lives and material wealth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, hereby expresses its conviction that international machinery must be created for the establishment of a just and lasting peace and the prevention of future aggression, and that the United States in its own self-interest must participate therein.

Presented by:

WAR SERVICE DEPARTMENT AND STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN OF THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS.

CRUDE OIL

Whereas it is a well known fact that the citizens of the United States are faced with a definite crude oil shortage which will become increasingly acute; and

Whereas the present price of crude oil offers no incentive to the discovery and development of new fields, but an increase of 35 cents per barrel in trade would provide this incentive, increasing the price of gasoline to the consumer 1 cent per gallon; and

Whereas statistics show that raw material prices increased 35 percent from June 1940 to September 1943, while crude oil prices remained stationary, and since crude oil is an important commodity in winning the war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, April 1944, requests the President of the United States, the governors of the several States, and each Member of Congress to use their best efforts to advance the present price of crude oil 35 cents per barrel and thereby create an incentive for drilling an adequate number of exploratory wells, which will increase our rapidly dwindling crude-oil reserves; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Secretary Harold Ickes, Paul Davies, and the Chairman of the Committee on Production.

Presented by:

Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.
Mrs. HARVEY W. WILEY,
Chairman, Legislation Department.
Mrs. T. M. FRANCIS,
Chairman, Conservation of Natural Resources Committee.
Miss ETHEL FOSTER,
President, Texas Federation of Women's Clubs.

Farley Bows Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD, an editorial from the Tulsa World entitled "Farley Bows Out." The great respect I have for Jim Farley and the fact that the editorial appeared in a leading newspaper in my district gives me leave to believe that this should be made a permanent record:

FARLEY BOWS OUT

Resignation of James A. Farley as Democratic chairman of New York frees for individual action one of the best politicians and most admirable men ever known to American politics. This relinquishment of an official post he had long held puts Mr. Farley in position for leadership in the Chicago convention, where he is expected to make a spirited fight against a fourth term for President Roosevelt. With no inhibitions, he will probably be a towering figure on the convention floor.

Jim Farley, as he is popularly called everywhere, has eminence because he was chairman of the Democratic Party in a key State, because he was national Democratic chairman and Postmaster General. In all these positions he was effective, popular, and correct. It is likely that he is today the most popular individual in the United States. There are definite reasons for these distinctions. Mr. Farley was an admirable chairman; his acquaintance over the country was such and his knowledge and affability was such that he was never at a loss in any situation.

On the personal side Mr. Farley is a man among men. He is far above the average in

intelligence and his character is flawless. He is clean personally, highminded, and devoted to any interest in which he may be concerned. Few such characters have emerged above the smoke and dirt of our national politics.

One of the greatest overturns in our political history was the falling apart of Mr. Farley and President Roosevelt. The chairman was the genius of two campaigns, but gradually the President let him down. He was for several years Postmaster General, and he was a successful and admired administrator. When the third-term agitation arose, Mr. Farley put himself squarely against the idea. He was, consequently, minimized and even assailed. Through all of this he has remained a stanch Democrat and is still looking out for the welfare of his party. His freedom from political posts and all alliance with the administration make him a leader of the informal sort. It is certain he retains a great influence and it is inevitable that he be listened to with close attention and great respect.

Treasury Breaks Black Market in Liquor—Customs, Intelligence, Narcotic Divisions, and Secret Service Report Activities for Last Fiscal Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the enforcement agencies of the Treasury Department in their annual report of activities for the last fiscal year show an excellent record. These agencies always show fines and additional taxes exceeding by many millions their annual appropriations. This last report, like previous reports, indicates millions have found their way into the Treasury as a result of their outstanding work.

Under the permission granted me, I include, as part of my remarks, a statement just issued by the Chief Coordinator of Enforcement, Hon. Elmer L. Irey. It follows:

Treasury's Alcohol Tax Unit, smashing at the black market in liquor during the last 8 months of the 1944 fiscal year, brought 548 cases to United States attorneys with recommendations for criminal prosecution, Elmer L. Irey, Chief Coordinator of Enforcement, today reported to Secretary Morgenthau.

These cases involve 1,174 individuals. Before the close of the year, June 30, grand juries had indicted 485 persons in some 200 cases, and convictions had been obtained in the courts of 175 persons. Liquor, otherwise legal, worth $700,000, had been seized in connection with black market investigations.

Stewart Berkshire, head of the unit, said that reports from the industry and from agents in the field indicate that liquor sales at over-the-ceiling prices have been effectively curbed at the wholesale and manufacturing levels where the Treasury has controls.

The Treasury agents worked closely with the Office of Price Administration in the offensive against the black market.

The last 6 months of the fiscal year saw an upward trend in seizures of moonshine stills and mash, compared with the extremely low figures of the earlier war months, but such violations continued well below prewar levels. During the fiscal year, 6,801 stills were seized, compared with 5,654 in 1943. Virtually all such illicit operations were small scale affairs, and 94 percent of them were in 14 Southern States. Greater availability of sugar is believed to have contributed to the increase in moonshine operations.

With an average of fewer than 1,900 agents employed, the 6 Treasury investigative agencies accounted for 10,500 convictions of violators of laws within their jurisdiction during the fiscal year. The agencies are the Intelligence and Alcohol Tax Units of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the United States Secret Service, the Bureau of Narcotics, and the investigative divisions of the Bureau of Customs and the Foreign Funds Control.

As a result of their activities, there were potential financial returns to the Government of $61,500,000 in the form of fines, penalties, and value of seizures, taxes and penalties recommended for assessment, and offers in compromise.

Enforcement work incident to the prosecution of the war continued a major function of the Treasury agents. The Customs Service exercised strict scrutiny of merchant shipping, of imports and exports, and of individuals arriving in and leaving the United States.

E. J. Shamhart, Deputy Commissioner of Customs, reported that a sharp increase in small-scale liquor smuggling attempts partially offset fewer seizures in other lines, and total confiscations of smuggled commodities were 9,640, compared to 10,80? in the 1943 period. Liquor seizures made up 7,110 of this total, but there was no evidence of organized, large scale rum running such as flourished some years ago. Liquor seizures in 1943 fiscal were 3,920.

Quantities of narcotic drugs seized by Customs and Bureau of Narcotic agents declined compared with 1943, and 9,796 ounces to 4,436, and marihuana seizures also dropped sharply. There was, however, a slight increase in arrests for offenses against the drug laws, from 2,571 in 1943 to 2,629. H. J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, reported illicit drugs continued extremely scarce, and prices high. Persia, India, and Mexico were the main sources of smuggled drugs. Mexican authorities are cooperating in efforts to stamp out the traffic over our southern border.

The Foreign Funds Control Compliance Section, under T. H. Ball, continued to ferret out assets of enemy nationals concealed in this country, and, working with the Bureau of Customs, built a wall against the entry of possible Axis loot, especially currency and objects of art.

The Intelligence Unit, of which W. H. Woolf is chief, investigated more than 1,000 cases of suspected tax evasion during the year, involving probable ultimate additional receipts to the Government of nearly $46,000,000. Of 87 criminal-tax evasion cases brought to trial, 85 resulted in convictions; while 100 percent convictions were obtained in 28 additional cases involving other offenses. Federal judges generally handed down stiff sentences for wartime tax evaders.

Chief Frank Wilson of the Secret Service reported that losses to the public from counterfeit bills and coins dropped to another all-time low of only $27,362. The annual loss ran as high as $1,000,000 a year prior to 1937.

The Service found its work cut but for it in the field of safeguarding Government checks from thieves and forgers, with the total of such checks issued during the fiscal year exceeding 300,000,000. Educational methods similar to those used in combating counterfeiting contributed to keeping the number of forgery cases down to a moderate increase, with 1,691 arrests in this field, compared to 1,004 in the 1943 period.

In cooperation with investigators of the Office of Price Administration the service arrested 192 persons for trafficking in counterfeit War ration stamps, and reported 149 convictions for these offenses during the fiscal year.

The Service met successfully the security problems involved in the historic trips of the President to Canada, Cairo, and Teheran. Its uniformed force had under its protection a total of nearly $500,000,000,000 in money, stamps, and Government securities.

Do We Want a Monopoly on Transportation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, railway transportation in this country has been the subject of much legislation as a result of the efforts of the American people to protect themselves from monopolistic practices of the carriers. The advent of the automobile, with the coming of truck and bus transportation, and now the airplane has practically eliminated this monopoly and given rise to other transportation problems.

There is submitted for the consideration of Members of the House, a letter from Publisher Eldridge Haynes and my reply thereto:

MODERN INDUSTRY,
New York, N. Y., August 9, 1944.

The Honorable COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Should industry favor the establishment of unified transportation companies? Modern Industry's Debate in Print, a regular feature of this industrial magazine with more than 50,000 readers among management men in 31,500 plants, covered the pros and cons of this timely question in the June 15 issue.

The readers of Modern Industry, given an opportunity to have their say on this question by means of a post-card ballot, voted as follows:

	Percent
No	70.2
Yes	29.8

Donald D. Conn, executive vice president of Transportation Association of America, wrote in favor of unification. His opponent was John V. Lawrence, managing director of American Trucking Associations.

Breaking down the total vote by regions, opinion across the Nation lines up in this way:

	(Percent)	
	Yes	No
New England	7.7	92.3
Mid-Atlantic	27.7	72.3
North Central	35.3	64.7
South	40.1	59.9
West	29.3	70.7
Pacific Coast	18.7	81.3

If you'd like to receive tear sheets of this debate, please let us know. And we shall also welcome your comments on this issue.

Cordially yours,

ELDRIDGE HAYNES,
Publisher.

Mr. ELDRIDGE HAYNES,
Publisher, Modern Industry,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HAYNES: Answering your inquiry concerning my views on unified transportation, there is an old saying "Competition is the life of trade." I might add that a stable national economy is an adjusted national economy.

I know of no practical way to bring our national economy into equitable adjustment other than by free play of fair competition. The business trend that has eliminated competition has thrown our national economy out of adjustment, a trend that must be curbed.

Unified transportation will restrain competition and intensify the maladjustment of our national price structure. Such a policy is detrimental to the national welfare. To have free enterprise and keep open the door of opportunity to the American people, we must eliminate artificial monopoly by fostering fair competition.

Sincerely yours,
COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAN R. McGEHEE
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to pay tribute to one of the greatest Democratic leaders that this country has ever produced. A man who kept alive the Democratic organization in the State of New York for many years just as the South has done for 80 years.

During this long period as the political tide ebbed and flowed, the Democratic Party many times reached a very low status, and the man I am paying tribute to and a few other men of the North, together with the solid South, continue to keep unfurled the Democratic banner and march forward with it in every political battle.

It is a source of regret to all good Democrats that this man saw fit to withdraw his official position of leadership in the party. The one I refer to is the Honorable James A. Farley, of New York.

Jim Farley should be today the leader of the Democratic Party, because he is a Democrat and not poisoned with New Dealism and every other "ism" that is foreign to the principles and doctrines of true democracy.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the Nashville Tennesseean of Wednesday, July 12, 1944. This editorial expresses the uniform feeling and sentiment of all good southern Democrats relative to the life work of Jim Farley for the Democratic Party.

The editorial follows:

GREAT DEMOCRAT

The voluntary withdrawal of Jim Farley from a position of official leadership in the Democratic Party, after all these years of untiring, unselfish service, can only be a source of genuine regret to good Democrats everywhere.

Jim Farley is and has always been a big man, a fine and capable leader; the best organizer either party has known in a generation, and a man whose personal traits of character have endeared him to the thousands who could feel they knew him well.

"A man who always would act according to his own conscience," is the tribute paid Mr. Farley by another former national chairman, Edward J. Flynn, at the testimonial dinner upon the occasion of his retirement from the New York State chairmanship. And that expresses only inadequately the admiration all good Democrats feel for this man.

Mr. Farley is a man of deep-seated convictions on political principles. But even among those within the party, who entertained opposing principles, there is ungrudging acknowledgment of his superior qualities as a man and of the party's debt of gratitude for services freely and smilingly rendered over a period of 35 years.

Jim Farley was for all those years and still is one of history's great Democratic leaders.

Problems Facing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress reconvened August 1, after its summer recess, to face a number of serious and complicated problems. Heading the list are those of contract termination and reconversion, jobs for the returning veterans, and disposal of surplus Government property.

The Government owns thousands of military and naval establishments throughout the country, with their attendant equipment. It owns war plants geared to the production of vast quantities of war matériel, and war matériel only. And, when the victory has been won, all this property must be disposed of, as must the factories, unless we are to have State socialism, or communism, and an end of private business, of opportunity for the individual.

When the war has been won, our servicemen, numbering into the millions, will be returning, seeking jobs. We must plan so that those jobs will be ready for our boys.

As everyone is aware, the greater percent of our factories and industries is devoted entirely to war production. Accompanying the success of our military and naval operations will be the necessity for terminating war contracts, converting to civilian production. That cannot be accomplished overnight. And, during the transition period, workers will necessarily be idle. The effect upon our civilian economy of that period of idleness may well be disastrous.

The Special Committee of the Senate and House on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning have made an investigation of these comprehensive subjects and a bill has been introduced providing for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants. The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which committee I am a member, is giving consideration to that bill.

It takes no effort of the imagination to realize the enormity of the task confronting Congress in determining upon a course of action which will most adequately meet the needs of all our people. Millions upon millions of dollars worth of Government property cannot just be "dumped" upon the market without adversely affecting regular production and market trends as well as employment. Millions and millions of returning veterans cannot be permitted to seek vainly for jobs. Some provision must be made for their absorption into our economy without displacing other workers.

Every Member of Congress would be glad to have suggestions as to how the curtailment of jobs which will follow the cessation of war orders can best be avoided. Everyone wants to avoid unemployment but just how it can be done still remains a problem because, with our ever-increasing debt and interest charges, payment of wages, even if possible, to those out of employment, as proposed by unemployment compensation bills, is no solution. That would give temporary relief, act as a sedative, but would not cure nor end unemployment.

Some remedy must be found through the cooperation of labor, employers, and Government. Congress is seeking the solution. The cancelation of many of the restrictive, paralyzing Government rules, regulations, and directives will help.

War Record of American Citizens of Indian Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the record made in this war by our citizens of Indian blood is a record that we are all proud of. The Japs know what the war cry of the Sioux means—they know what the unerring aim of these warriors means.

The hereditary enemy of the Sioux, in North Dakota, the Gros Ventres, the Mandans, and the Arikara are equally as valiant in our armies across the sea. To let the public know the mental attitude of these Indian warriors, I quote a full letter from Bennie Black Hawk in Italy to his sister. This letter was delivered to me by Bennie's mother, Mrs. Ernest Black Hawk, Van Hook, N. Dak.:

ITALY, *May 19, 1944.*

DEAR SISTER: Got your letter the other night, and I'm really glad to hear from home again.

How are you and mother getting along at home? And the rest? Fine I hope. For my part I'm still O. K. over here in Italy.

I am back from the front for a rest, but will be going back up again soon.

I heard from Ivan and Sammie and Charley Parshall; they're all O. K.

If I don't get knocked out I am going to try and stick to the fight until the war is over. And still got the Japs to knock the hell out of it; after we finished Germans.

Today I am sending you some things I picked up in one of the towns we took over.

Now it's getting pretty hot here in Italy—bombs bursting all around us—but we are pushing the Germans back fast.

No further statements about the war, the regulations are pretty strict.

The paper you are getting from home tells you more than we can from here.

Hope to hear from you again.

Your brother,

BENNIE.

What the Centuries Say Against the Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a very moving and inspiring sermon delivered in the First Baptist Church of Tampa, Fla., on Sunday morning, April 30, 1944, by Dr. Roland Q. Leavell, whom Senators will remember as having on one occasion officiated as Chaplain of the Senate.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE CENTURIES SAY AGAINST THE HOURS

(Sermon delivered by Dr. Roland Q. Leavell, in the First Baptist Church, Tampa, Fla., on Sunday morning, April 30, 1944)

Text: "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to bear affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward." Hebrews xi: 24–26.

Some people are more concerned about where and how to spend the day than where and how to spend eternity. Spiritual nearsightedness is more tragic in the long run than physical blindness. Emerson said, "Religion is believing what the centuries say against the hours." To be sure, this is not all of religion, but true religion should lead one to take the long view of things. True religion should keep one's ears open to the teachings of history, and one's eyes open to the realities of the future, while one's hands and heart are directed to the duties of the present.

The author of Hebrews, writing in the eleventh chapter, saw people of his own day in the heat of the battle of temptations and persecutions. He inspired them to take the long look toward the heights of future attainments by telling them about those of the past who had attained through faith. Moses was the greatest man of all time before the days of John the Baptist and Christ. It has been said of him:

"By Nebo's lonely mountain,
On this side Jordan's wave,
In a vale in the land of Moab,
There lies a lonely grave;
But no man knows that sepulcher,
And no man saw it e'er,
For the angels of God upturned the sod,
And laid the dead man there.

"This was the truest warrior
That ever buckled sword,
This the most gifted poet
That ever breathed a word;
And never earth's philosopher
Traced with his golden pen,
On the deathless page, truths half so sage
As he wrote down for men."

—*Cecil Frances Alexander.*

Why was he the greatest of antiquity? It is because he took the long look to the future rather than living merely for the present. He listened to what the centuries said against the hours. He chose exile with the children of God rather than power over the people of Egypt; he chose affliction in doing the will of God rather than the pleasure of a sinful society; he chose the reproach of Christ rather than the treasures of Egypt. He listened to the centuries rather than the hours.

Like Moses, every one of us will have both a desert and a crown, but the order in which we take them makes a vast difference. Moses could have had a crown for the day, but he would have had a desert during all the centuries of the unfolding future. He chose the desert for the day in order to be crowned for all time and eternity. He had respect for the recompense of the reward of righteous living. It behooves us today to get some eternity in our living. As we listen to what the centuries say against the hours let us hear three outstanding truths which are taught.

I. MORAL RIGHTEOUSNESS IS HAPPIER THAN THE PLEASURES OF SIN

1. Sin always leads to sorrow. The hours say, "Take a social drink"; the centuries clamor for sobriety. The hours say, "Drink will bring joy"; the centuries say, "It brings inevitable pain." The hours say, "Drink and have friends"; the centuries say, "Drink leads to loneliness and friendlessness." The hours say, "Drink and get rich in business"; the centuries say, "Drink is a sure forerunner of failure and poverty." The hours say, "Use the Sabbath day for worldly pleasure"; the centuries say, "Use the Lord's day for worship of God and spiritual development." The hours say, "Live in sensuality"; the centuries say, "Devote yourself to purity in all things."

2. Honesty is better than policy. Benjamin Franklin said, "Honesty is the best policy"; L. Q. C. Lamar said, "Honesty is better than policy." The hours say, "Get while getting is good"; the centuries say, "Get only that which is for our good." The hours say, "Questionable gain displays shrewdness and cleverness"; the centuries say, "Honesty is the greater cleverness."

We are told that Mark Twain was engaged with a partner in a business which failed because of his partner's incompetence or dishonesty. If any man ever had a right to claim the bankruptcy law and avoid paying the debts of a business, surely Mark Twain did in that business in which he owned only a small proportion of the stock. However, he knew he had a moral obligation to pay. He could have avoided much poverty and sacrifice for the hour, but he would have suffered immeasurable loss through the centuries. He took a trip around the world writing a number of books and articles and used all of the money to pay the debts that were incurred by his partner. Today, as the century after Mark Twain's life is speaking, it declares that he displayed the greater cleverness by his complete honesty.

3. Crime does not pay. When we see the Dillingers and Al Capones of crime in the heyday of their power revelling in the preeminence and pleasures of their ill-gotten gain, we are tempted to say that they have chosen the way that pays best. Time tells in the tragic death of Dillinger and in the complete destruction of health, mentality, and fortune of Capone. When a short-sighted man like Mussolini sees the Japanese overrunning and exploiting Manchuria, he believes that that is the wiser way. In turn, the nearsighted Hitler sees Mussolini overrunning Ethiopia, so he follows in his footsteps to overrun the little countries of Europe. The unthinking man is tempted to say that the way of the aggressor and the dictator is the better way. The long look of the centuries shows us a debauched Alexander, a suicidal Hannibal, a murdered Caesar, an exiled Napoleon, a disgraced Mussolini, a beleaguered Hitler, and a Japanese Government tottering on the brink of complete collapse. The centuries tell us of the folly and failure of the principle of ruthlessness, selfishness, and crime.

4. Truth is stronger than falsehood. A mother who had caught her little son in a falsehood asked him what the Bible says about a lying tongue. In the typical philosophy of the short-sighted and dishonest of view of things, he said, "A lying tongue is an abomination unto the Lord, a very present help in the time of trouble." He, too, was listening to the hours instead of the centuries. Truth, unvarnished and unadulterated, always pays.

Once I met Alonzo Stagg, who for 45 years was the athletic idol of the students of the University of Chicago. He was loved as much for his character as for his coaching. Some months ago a successful business man told of an incident in a baseball game when the University of Chicago was defending its title. A Chicago man was on second when the batter knocked a single. The man on second raced around, cut the third base sack, and was rushing toward home plate. Stagg ran out swiftly, waved his hands and yelled frantically, "Go back, go back to third. You cut third by a yard." The runner answered, "But the umpire did not see me." Stagg continued his frantic waving and screaming, "That makes no difference. Go back. You cut third by a yard. Go back." Chicago lost the game, but Stagg won a character by his truthfulness. This present-day successful businessman determined there to play the game of life honestly as long as he lived.

It is the old story of the difference between the waves and the tide.

"On the far reef the breakers
Recoil in shattered foam,
Yet still the sea behind them
Urges its forces home;
Its chant of triumph surges
Through all the thunderous din—
The wave may break in failure,
But the tide is sure to win.

"The reef is strong and cruel;
Upon its jagged wall
One wave, a score, a hundred
Broken and beaten fall;
Yet in defeat they conquer,
The sea comes flooding in—
Wave upon wave is routed,
But the tide is sure to win.

"O mighty sea! Thy message
In changing spray is cast;
Within God's plan of progress
It matters not at last
How wide the shores of evil,
How strong the reefs of sin—
The wave may be defeated,
But the tide is sure to win."

—*Priscilla Leonard.*

Truth, as well as the tide, is sure to win.

II. UNSELFISH SERVICE IS MORE PROFITABLE THAN SELFISH GAIN

The hours said to Moses, "Choose the court of Pharaoh"; the centuries said, "Go to the desert by the will of God." The hours said, "The wealth of Egypt is yours"; the centuries said, "The reproach of Christ is eternally glorious." The hours said, "Look out for number one"; the centuries said, "Unselfish service is the pathway to glory."

Again, it was Emerson who said, "See how the masses of men worry themselves into nameless graves, while occasionally some great soul forgets himself into immortality." Many years before Emerson, Jesus said, "If any man would be great among you, let him become the servant of all."

1. Moses' choice of unselfish service was immortally wise. The centuries have proved that his service was more profitable than selfishness. The literature of the hour was the literature of Egypt; the writings for the centuries came from the golden pen of Moses when he wrote the immortal first five books of the Bible, and the glorious ninetieth Psalm. The nation of the hour was the pagan nation of the Egyptians, but the centuries have proved the power of the people of God under the leadership of Moses. The music of the hour was the sensual songs of the Egyptians; the music of the ages is the "song of Moses and the Lamb" to be sung even in the glory of the hereafter.

2. Unselfish service is the higher selfishness. It is impossible to render an unselfish service to others without receiving a double recompense of reward. Following the Boxer revolution in China many nations of the world exacted a heavy indemnity from the Chinese people. The others kept their booty, but the United States of America returned her indemnity to China by building a big school in Pekin and furnishing scholarships for Chinese students to attend American universities. The territory gained by France and Germany has been lost by them. The money kept by England has long since been dissipated. The international friendship cemented between American and the Chinese is priceless in value to us today.

Jesus demonstrated the heavenly truth that unselfish service is the pathway to greatness, and his experience shouts down to us through the centuries, "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it" (Matthew xvi: 25). "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not a thing to be grasped to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore, God also hath highly exalted him and given him a name which is above every name" (Philippians ii: 5-9).

"Speak, History, who are life's victors? Unroll thy long annals and say,
Are they those whom the world calls victors—who won the success of a day?
The martyrs, or Nero? The Spartans who fell at Thermopylae's tryst.
Or the Persians and Xerxes? His judges or Socrates? Pilate or Christ?"

III. SPIRITUAL GODLINESS IS MORE GLORIOUS THAN MATERIALISTIC ATHEISM

Again let me remind you, the hours said, "Take the treasures of Egypt;" the centuries said, "Choose the reproach of Christ." The philosophy of the hour always counts on the bird in the hand of present day possessions being worth two in the bush of faith for the future. The philosophy of the centuries leads us to order our life today with due respect for the recompense of the future reward for our faith.

1. Materialistic atheism never produced greatness. Neither sheer materialism nor its attendant atheism has ever produced a great group of men, or a great age of literature, or a great contribution in art or music or sculpture. Materialism and atheism do not build asylums and hospitals nor advance education and civilization. Those who are willing to share the offense of the cross and are anxious to walk humbly with God are those who live glorious lives of victory and usefulness. Hear the voice of the centuries today and choose Christ. Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth, young people. If you are wise you will take the long look. Selfishness and ungodliness have never produced any happy old people. You need faith in Christ which alone can bring you spiritual godliness.

Religion is often defined with platitudinous phrases about indefinite concepts. The dictionary realistically defines it thus: "Religion is an awareness or conviction about a Supreme Being, which arouses love, gratitude, and the will to serve and obey." Today I would urge you to take God into account, to find Him through faith in Jesus Christ, and let godliness be the dominant dedication of your life as you live in obedience, service, and love.

2. Godliness gives amazing returns in the life that now is and promises a heavenly recompense of reward in the life that is to come. The ungodly people of the Bible are not the liars and thieves and murderers and such vile people of wickedness. Such people are spoken of in the Bible as the wicked people. The ungodly people may be clean and law-abiding citizens, paying their debts and living faithfully in their homes, but they leave God out of their lives. They never pray, they play golf instead of worshiping on Sunday, they give no time to Bible study, they make no contribution to the missionary enterprise, and they never lead a soul to Christ. The most glorious and profitable life known to man is one characterized by loving God with the whole mind, heart, soul, and strength, and loving one's fellow man as himself.

3. Are you convinced? Are you taking the long look? Are you willing to take Christ by faith today? Can you, and will you, now maturely decide to put your hand in the hand of God and walk toward the darkness of the future, counting that better than a light and safer than a known way? Today, hear what the centuries say against the hours. Take the far look of faith. Get some eternity into your life. Trust God and walk with Christ.

Speech by Hon. Abe Murdock, of Utah, Nominating Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, for Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago on July 21, 1944, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] was honored by having his name placed in nomination for the high office of Vice President of the United States. The nominating speech was made by another distinguished colleague of ours, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], who in his usual felicitous and happy manner paid deserved tribute to the fine qualities of heart and mind which have endeared the senior Senator from Utah to all Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the nominating speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The man whose name I shall place in nomination for the high office of Vice President of the United States of America has already attained eminence as a Member of the United States Senate. He was elected to the Senate the same year Franklin Roosevelt was elected President, and he has since risen in the Senate to a position of influence and prestige surpassed by no one—equalled by but a few.

His Senate committee memberships have been important ones. From them he has gained knowledge, training, and experience, with which to meet the military problems of the remaining years of this war, with which to meet the problems of diplomacy and international relations of the post-war years, with which to meet the problems—social, economic and political—which here in America we have yet to solve, if the hope and promise of this land to mankind are to be fulfilled and the comman man is to rise to full stature.

He is ranking member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. He and the other members of that committee have shaped the war legislation, which has lifted this Nation from a nearly fatal disaster, to the position of the greatest military giant in the world today.

He is also a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. How fateful a role that committee plays in the lives of men, women, and children all over the world—with war and peace, life and death, at stake—we are all too well aware. All who are here remember how after World War No. 1, a few "willful men" without vision in the minority party on that committee sabotaged a peace, and for petty, personal and partisan reasons, brought the world again to the misery, terror, and destruction of war.

These two committee memberships have given Utah's senior Senator experience and training in the military tasks necessary to be done during the remaining war years, and training and experience for far-sighted statesmanship, even more necessary, during the post-war years, in dealing with the complex relations between our country and the rest of the world.

The people of this land are united as never before on the demand of our commanders for the unconditional surrender of the enemy, and the people are equally, if not more firmly, united on their own demand for cooperation with our allies, and the other nations of the world, through international organization, to assure for our sons and daughters a lasting peace. Our Senator has devoted a lifetime of study, travel, writing, and teaching, as well as his 12 years in the Senate, to that end.

His tact, good humor, and resourcefulness, his wide experience and scholarship, have gained for him the esteem of his associates in the Senate. He knows its business; he has the good will and support of its Members; he has often presided over it.

He is chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Workers of all classes haven't a more intelligent or more courageous champion in public life. He has exposed factory espionage and labor terrorism; he has advocated full employment and increased standards of living. Realizing that most workers are not members of either of the two great labor unions, he urges higher

wages and standards of living for them, including the white-collar workers.

His work in the Senate reflects his high regard for the place of education in American society. He is the author and sponsor of the Federal aid to education bill to provide equal educational opportunity, and he is the author and sponsor of the educational provisions of the legislation known as the G. I. bill of rights, providing opportunity for returned soldiers to resume or pursue their education and training.

He is a Jeffersonian Democrat; he is a Jacksonian Democrat; he is a Wilsonian Democrat; but, better than all of these, he is a Franklin Delano Roosevelt Democrat.

The humanitarian in the White House, whose great-hearted works for the welfare of mankind, for aid to the aged, the sick, and afflicted, the unemployed, the unfortunate, and the sorely pressed will endear him to the hearts of men and women all down through centuries to come, has disciples among all liberal-minded men.

Not by any means the least of these is Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, scholar, author, soldier, statesman, liberal humanitarian, whom I am privileged and honored to nominate for the office of Vice President of the United States.

Fourth of July Address at Milwaukee by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a talk delivered by me on July 4 over Station WISN, in Milwaukee, Wis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We celebrate today the one hundred and sixty-eighth birthday of our beloved Nation.

In the year 1776, on the 4th day of July, the representatives of the several States in Congress assembled, formally declared the independence of our land, so that we might forever here in America enjoy "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." I repeat these words, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—they are words of dynamite to tyranny.

In the second paragraph of the Declaration the Members of the Continental Congress stated that "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind" required them to declare the causes for their action.

Because the Continental Congress set forth their reasons so clearly we can profitably review them here today—particularly as they apply to our land as we again face a turning point in our history.

To begin with, the Continental Congress asserted its belief that it was a self-evident truth that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Those are golden words. Life and liberty were threatened in 1776, and life and liberty are again menaced today.

"Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." How complete a definition of American ideals has been compressed into so few words.

In the lands which have fallen under the shadow of dictator control, these words are only a hollow mockery. In Japanese-controlled portions of China and in Nazi-terrorized Norway, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Low Countries—everywhere the Japanese and German war lords have marched—everywhere in these lands life is cheap, liberty only a dream, and the pursuit of happiness only a cherished memory.

We waged war in 1776 because we believed that governments should derive the just powers from the consent of the governed. We believed that freemen were entitled to liberty as a natural heritage from their Creator.

We still hold that belief today, and that is why we are at war with those forces which would ruthlessly ravage all liberties and all freedoms.

Over a century and a half has passed since men of conviction first wrote this immortal charter of human liberties, and during that time the doctrine of human liberty spread to many lands and many people. But in our generation it met with the resistance of an organized barbaric tyranny.

Because we seek to keep faith with our ideals of human liberty we are again at war.

During the Revolutionary War we were poorly equipped in every sense but one. We had no money and Congress had no authority either to levy taxes or to borrow. We faced the largest navy in the world. We had only a few small vessels. We faced an army that was well trained and had everything necessary for comfort and military efficiency. Our colonial volunteers were unskilled and sometimes undisciplined. They were poorly supplied and fed. Very few of our men had uniforms. Enlistment terms were very short.

But with all these shortcomings, we had had one tremendous fighting force on our side. We had the knowledge that we were right. We had the conviction that our cause was just. We had the comfort of an ideal of human freedom. We had the driving force of a burning desire for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We had a deep and reverent faith in the beliefs for which we fought—and we had a devout confidence in a divine Providence. We were spear-heading one of the great movements of the race, in a pivotal period in history.

These things we had then—and these things we have today.

It is true that today we fight a war of machines—but it is also true that war is still a battle of men and ideals.

It is with these men and with these ideals that we are most concerned today. It is our sacred obligation to keep faith with the men of the Revolutionary War and with the men of this war and with the men of every war where freedom has ever been at stake.

It is our sacred trust to keep faith with the ideals which made us a free land and which have served as guiding polestars ever since. Freedom and liberty are not mere catch words to our fighting men. They are flesh and blood realities for which men die and have died ever since the beginning of time.

Our fighting men give life to liberty on the battlefronts. We at home must give more than lip-service to the same ideals.

Because our beliefs in freedom and liberty and the pursuit of happiness are deep-rooted in the hearts and minds of every American, we can look to the future with hope and assurance.

In 1776 this day was the birthday of liberty. Today all over this land it is our fervent hope that this year or next year will again witness a new birth of liberty—a liberty for oppressed peoples everywhere from the whiplash of tyranny and oppression.

One hundred and sixty-eight years have passed since the first Fourth of July. In this land we have—since that day—witnessed more material progress than any other land since the beginning of time. Along with the material progress and the material change we have, however, retained the basic ideals which made this a great country.

In other lands there has also been material progress in the corresponding period, but there has too often been little spiritual growth. That made dictatorships possible.

In this land on this Fourth of July we can again renew our faith in the pledges of the founding fathers. We fight for those ideals today and it is our prayer today that soon we may enjoy them in an era of peace.

We, on this birthday of a nation, pray for adequacy, individual and national adequacy, so that we may loyally and efficiently meet the demands upon us and transmit unimpaired the great freedoms of America to the generations that follow.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on "Jim Farley's Resignation," written and published by former United States Senator Walter Walker in the June 14 issue of his newspaper the Grand Junction Sentinel. Mr. Walker is one of the most forceful and dynamic country editors in the Nation and his brief appraisal of the leading Democrat in America is right down the groove. Many Members of Congress will want to read it.

I intended making this request before the recent recess of Congress, but owing to a technicality and a misunderstanding, it was not acted upon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JIM FARLEY'S RESIGNATION

It goes without saying that the resignation of James A. Farley as chairman of the largest and most influential Democratic State committee in the Nation has been one of the chief subjects of comment and speculation in political circles.

For 14 years, Jim Farley has been New York's State chairman, and 2 years previous to that long continuous service he was its secretary. No abler man ever held a similar post in any one of the 48 States. Triumph after triumph of the Democratic Party in the Empire State in the last decade and a half were due in a large degree to the tireless efforts, the impeccable character, the attractive personality, and the amazing organizing ability of James A. Farley. His resignation did not come as a surprise, but it did call forth widespread regret, and this regret was not confined by any manner of means to those who saw eye to eye politically with this man who not only distinguished himself as a leader in New York State but who made a

record in many ways unmatched, and to the credit of himself, his party, and his country, as Democratic national chairman and as Postmaster General.

Clearly, concisely, and with the sincerity and honesty that have always marked Jim Farley's career and activities, he set forth his reasons in a brief statement. Without Mr. Farley's having made any effort to make it so, that statement is a masterpiece among political announcements in its simple language and its genuine nature.

There was no comfort to those who hoped to see the great political leader bolt his party in the answer he made at a press conference to a reporter who asked him about his future political activities. He said, "It is only natural for a fellow who has always been a Democrat to be interested in the success of the Democratic Party."

There isn't any political designation, honor of assignment that the Democratic Party could have given or could give to Jim Farley that would be too big for him. His remarkable ability will be missed in New York State party organizations and in national political party organizations.

Jim Farley, still one of the most popular figures in the political, public, and business life of the Nation, will continue to wield a tremendous influence in national affairs.

The Republican Party and Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by a very wise citizen of this great country to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor, a great newspaper, upon the very pertinent subject Can We Again Trust the Republican Party, If Dewey Is Elected President, Not To Return to Political and Economic Isolationism After the War Is Over? I commend to my colleagues the reading of that very able letter and profiting by its counsel.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 31, 1944.

EDITOR, CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Can we again trust the Republican Party, if Dewey is elected President, not to return to political and economic isolationism after the war is over?

In the Harding-Cox campaign the Republican Party promised on its word of honor to give us a better league of nations than the the one Wilson offered. The party made more positive promises in this respect then than it does today. Harding said that he would give us a league. Hoover said that the Republican Party had given us its word of honor to establish a league. And Root, Hughes, Taft, and many other Republican leaders, more outstanding than any of the men the party has today, made speeches saying that the surest way to secure a league of nations was to vote for Harding.

But the Republican Party chucked the League out of its plans as soon as Harding was elected. The Republican Party double-crossed the country in the Harding-Cox campaign and returned to political isolationism. That party finally wrecked us with economic isolationism, also in Hoover's administration, when it passed the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill.

As a result of the duplicity of the Republican Party, every man and woman who voted for Harding in 1920 voted also for World War No. 2, and voted away the lives of thousands of our boys in a second world war which could have been avoided.

The promises of the Republican Party regarding our international relations after the war is over are not as forthright as they were in the Harding campaign. The party does not give us its word of honor this time to work wholeheartedly with other nations in establishing permanent world peace and trade. As Willkie says, Dewey can do anything he wants to do, for or against international cooperation, under the planks in the Republican platform. And the set-up of the Republican Party today is as bad as it was in the Harding campaign. Its candidate for President is a so-called honest Harding who was an isolationist up to shortly before Pearl Harbor. The control of the policies of the Republican Party today is still largely in the grip of isolationist leaders, just as it was in the Harding administration.

Again, in any case, hundreds of thousands of voters are going to be double-crossed if the Republican candidate for President wins. The party must either double-cross the isolationist and members of the subversive America first movement on whose votes it is hoping to win, or double-cross the patriotic Republican voters who are for full cooperation with other nations in preserving world peace.

Judging by the Republican Party's record in the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations, and by its record in the Senate and House of Representatives the past 4 years, it would again be the Republicans who favor international cooperation who would be double-crossed if Dewey is elected. The overwhelming majority of Republicans in the House and the Senate voted against lifting the arms embargo, the Selective Service Act, lend-lease, and every other measure Roosevelt advanced to prepare us for war and to enable the British and the Russians to survive the German onslaught. If the Republican Party had been in power the Germans would have won the war. And what good are Dewey's promises anyway regarding international cooperation when we know he would be obliged to overcome the unalterable opposition of Republican isolationists and reactionaries in the House and the Senate to fulfill them?

Can we again trust the Republican Party with the lives of our boys of another generation and with the problem of preserving lasting world peace?

Sincerely yours,

BRAD STEPHENS.

Our Chance for Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Chance for Lasting Peace," by Hon. Littleton Upshur, editor of the Greenwood Commonwealth, of Greenwood, Miss.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CHANCE FOR LASTING PEACE

The two most pressing domestic problems after the war will be jobs and taxes. And they both hinge on the profitable operation of private industry. That raises the question, Where will our industries find their markets?

In the future, with air transportation shrinking the globe to little more than a 24-hour trip to any point, our markets must be world-wide. Therefore, we must have a foreign trade policy that will enable us to sell, as well as buy, from our neighbors. Recognizing this condition, the statement of the newly organized Committee on International and Economic Policy, of which Winthrop W. Aldrich is Chairman, calls for a multilateral trade agreement for the United Nations, creating an international economic charter to define the rights of traders and investors in foreign countries. It endorses unconditional most-favored-nation treatment, rejects regional preferential agreements and exchange restrictions, and states that if governments strengthen their policies of production and restriction to achieve security "in a contracting world economy * * * the end of that road is a third world war."

On this statement of fundamentals, Harry D. Gideonese, president of Brooklyn College, says: "This is an excellent doctrine, elementary free enterprise economics and sound political thinking. The repudiation of the trade-agreements program at this juncture would be a national tragedy. After the war there will be a crying demand for America's mass-production goods and farm products from every country in the world. If we maintain a liberal policy regarding imports, this demand can create thousands of post-war jobs in this country, utilizing industrial and agricultural capacity which otherwise would be idle.

"But to export, we must be willing to import. Hence, the renewal of the trade-agreements program is essential for maintenance of employment and business activity at a high level after the war. Moreover, in the Atlantic Charter the United States is pledged to the long-run principle that all nations, great and small, should have access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world.

"Every country, therefore, if it wishes to promote the expansion of world trade, which is a fundamental condition for the establishment of a durable peace, must show greater willingness to accept the goods of other countries. In other words, the lowering of tariffs under the leadership of the great trading nations is an essential means of realizing the program of economic and political cooperation endorsed by the United Nations."

How Truman Won Over His Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "How Truman Won Over His Enemies," by Willard

Shelton, from the Chicago Sun of August 13, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TRUMAN WON OVER HIS ENEMIES

(By Willard Shelton)

One of the interesting stories about Senator TRUMAN, the Democratic Vice Presidential nominee, is the way he overcame the hostility, and gained the admiration, of the St. Louis afternoon newspapers in his own home State. If this column seems personal, it is because I was writing editorials for the St. Louis Star-Times during that period and had the benefit of sitting in front of the teacher in what might be called the Truman school of applied democracy.

Boss Tom Pendergast, in his Kansas City heyday, never had more vigorous enemies than the St. Louis afternoon papers. Both are liberal, both are antimachine, and they fought the boss at every chance. When a Democratic Governor, Lloyd C. Stark, became convinced that Pendergast was personally crooked and went after him in 1939, the newspapers seized the opportunity to set the State aflame. A bill removing control of the Kansas City police from Pendergast was reluctantly passed by a State legislature which did not dare defy the eruption of public opinion.

STARK CHALLENGES TRUMAN

How does this involve HARRY TRUMAN? Well, Mr. TRUMAN had been sent to the Senate in 1934 with Pendergast's blessing, and his term was expiring. And in 1940, naturally enough, Lloyd Stark decided to challenge Mr. TRUMAN.

Missouri's liberal newspapers found the situation somewhat difficult. The Truman-Stark contest was complicated by the entrance of a third candidate, Maurice Milligan, the prosecuting attorney who had sent Pendergast to prison. Worse than that, Senator TRUMAN'S record was embarrassingly difficult to attack.

It was all very well to say that to destroy the Pendergast organization root and branch, every beneficiary should be defeated. But Governor Stark himself had originally been a beneficiary. And Maurice Milligan, who had no reason to love Mr. TRUMAN and had enormous investigatory powers, was unable to find a stain in the Truman record.

The Truman record, in fact, demonstrated not only unassailed personal integrity. His Senate career had been almost unexceptionable.

The Star-Times, despite these doubts, opposed Mr. TRUMAN in the primary, and I wrote many of the editorials against him. The Post-Dispatch opposed him. But neither of us could find any arguments except that vague Pendergast connection.

NEWSPAPERS EAT CROW

Mr. TRUMAN was renominated, and it was not long until the newspapers which had fought him were publicly eating crow. For he suddenly emerged, as chairman of the special committee investigating national defense, as the most useful single Member of the United States Senate.

I don't know what Lloyd Stark might have done in the Senate, but I know that TRUMAN'S patience, his fairness, his capacity to lead some of the ablest members of both parties, made his committee a great center of light revealing errors in a difficult period of the war conversion program.

He is credited with saving a billion dollars by his investigations, and many more billions by the simple fact that his committee was operating. More important in fixing the man's stature, I think, is the fact that, though a personal New Dealer, he never concealed unpleasant facts merely because they gave ammunition to the President's enemies.

This was the final factor which shifted liberal Missouri newspapers and taught some of us, at least, that selfrighteous opposition to "machines"—though the bad ones must be fought—is not a sound standard for judging every candidate. It wasn't you see, with HARRY TRUMAN—to whom a lot of people have made handsome apologies.

Proposed Washington Hospital Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hospital of the Future," published in the Washington Evening Star of August 13, 1944, and an editorial entitled "Hospital Project," published in the Washington Post of August 14, 1944. Both editorials relate to the bill recently introduced by me in conjunction with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, relative to the construction of a modern hospital center in Washington.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of August 13, 1944]

HOSPITAL OF THE FUTURE

While the two are not directly related, the significance of Senator TYDINGS' bill proposing construction of a modern, adequate hospital for Washington is better understood when it is studied against the background of recent testimony of Surg. Gen. Thomas Parran of the United States Public Health Service before a Senate committee.

Dr. Parran, with many other distinguished physicians and laymen, sees a great awakening of public interest in all matters pertaining to health. He predicted a post-war demand for hospital care, as well as other forms of medical and health service, which seems certain to exceed anything we have known in the past. We must plan soon to meet these demands. We should plan now to evaluate the adequacy of our health facilities.

Senator TYDINGS' bill is a tangible move of great importance in anticipating the demand. It gains in importance by the nature of the support behind it. It is the direct result of many months of planning and study by Washington physicians and laymen concerned with the city's voluntary hospitals. The nucleus of the plan is the enthusiastic willingness of two of the city's largest voluntary hospitals—Emergency and Garfield—to combine their resources in the operation of what should be a model hospital plant, retaining only enough of their individuality to preserve their endowments, and welcoming the voluntary affiliation of other Washington hospitals.

The need for a new, modern, and adequate hospital for Washington requires no elaboration. The physical plants are not merely inadequate, but in many cases the original faults of poor planning have been magnified by obsolescence of equipment and an inability to operate without recurring deficits. But as Dr. Parran pointed out the mere building of more facilities is not the whole answer. "Along with the new facilities must go the ability to purchase care and the professional skill to furnish the service." The adequacy of hospitals of the future will not be measured merely in terms of bed space. Economies through scientific planning of facilities, joint use of maintenance services, and sound business management, together with the growth and perfection of prepaid medical insurance to relieve the hospitals of the expense of so-called charity cases, must bring the cost of hospital care within the reach of all who need it.

The community aspect of the hospital proposed in the Tydings bill is accentuated by the make-up of the board of the proposed hospital corporation, which includes representatives of the United States Public Health Service, the community chest, and the municipal government, along with the boards of Emergency and Garfield. Such administrative control would assure operation of the hospital in conformity with the over-all health needs of the community, while preserving what Dr. Parran refers to as "the present large capital and human investment in voluntary hospitals (which should be) protected and utilized to full capacity."

The Tydings bill offers a vehicle for general support, already indicated by the co-sponsorship of Senator BILBO and Representative RANDOLPH, chairmen of the two District legislative committees and Chairman D'ALESANDRO of the Health and Welfare Subcommittee of the House District Committee, and by the preparatory work of public-spirited citizens and physicians of Washington whose ideas have been given expression by Senator TYDINGS. Here is hopeful evidence of a real start in preparing for the sort of hospital care that the future will demand, and that Washington must provide.

[From the Washington Post of August 14, 1944]

HOSPITAL PROJECT

The bill which Senator TYDINGS has introduced jointly with Chairman BILBO of the Senate District Committee and which Representatives RANDOLPH and D'ALESANDRO will sponsor in the House has at least the virtue of reducing the proposal to construct a modern hospital center here to relatively concrete terms. In our opinion, it has a number of other virtues. One of these is that it ties the hospital center project in with two of the city's existing hospitals and leaves the way open for affiliation of other hospitals with the proposed center if they should decide to coordinate their activities with its junction.

As we understand the proposal, the medical center would be a combination of public and private enterprise. The Federal Works Administration would be instructed to acquire a site and construct the necessary buildings. But the Government would not undertake to manage or operate the center. Its business affairs would be carried on by a nonprofit corporation to be known as the Washington Hospital Corporation and the active operation of its medical facilities would be entrusted to Garfield and Emergency Hospitals. Both those institutions, as well as the District Commissioners, the Community Chest, and the United States Public Health Service would be represented on the proposed center's board.

Probably many citizens will dislike this mingling of public investment with private operation, even though no question of profit making arises. It must be readily admitted that the arrangement is not ideal. But the real question is whether a reasonable alternative is at hand. Difficulties might arise if the District attempted to operate such a medical center for the entire population along with its hospitals serving principally those who cannot pay their own way. On the other hand, there seems to be no prospect of

raising private capital for such an undertaking. With large incomes almost taxed out of existence, endowments for hospitals as well as colleges and other semipublic institutions are sharply curtailed. And when no private funds for such purposes are available, the Government must necessarily step in and meet the public need. In the case of hospital care it is particularly imperative that public funds be supplied when that becomes necessary to safeguard the health of the people.

Consequently this bill seems to us to merit prompt, thoughtful and sympathetic consideration by Congress. It is not regarded by its authors as a finished product. Rather it represents a compromise approach to a difficult and important problem. We hope that its critics will be content to improve the plan and not to resist a necessary community project.

The Recent Powhatan Mine Disaster

REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, many modern industries in which men earn a living for themselves and their families, and which in this time of war produce the raw materials for fabricating the weapons of war, are extremely hazardous. Coal mining is one of the most hazardous and intrinsically dangerous of industries and few industrial workers face more varied and ever-present dangers than the coal miner.

Death rides with him into the darkness of the mine and follows at his heels while he works in the dim light of the lamp on his cap and sometimes—all too many times—it catches up with him, usually suddenly and without warning. Sometimes it catches him in a blinding flash of light caused by a short circuit from the high-voltage trolley wire strung just below the roof of the entry through which he walks and within reach of his head or hand. Sometimes it catches him with a rumbling string of empty coal cars and leaves his body crushed and dismembered between the rails over which the coal is hauled. Sometimes it suddenly catches him in a narrow place in the entry and crushes his life out between the coal cars and the rib or side of the entry. Or sometimes it crushes him between the clashing steel bumpers of the cars. At other times it may suddenly and without warning drop upon him with crushing weight as the roof, coal and rock, over his head gives way and buries him under tons of debris; or it creeps upon him stealthily in the air he breathes loaded with the poisonous gases found in many mines; or sometimes an accidental spark or the backfire from a miner's shot ignites the coal dust and sets off an explosion that may travel hundreds of feet down an entry or haulage-way.

Mr. Speaker, on July 5, 1944, death came to 66 men who worked at the coal mine of the Powhatan Mining Co., at Powhatan Point, Ohio, in my county of Belmont and in my district. Some of them were miners and some were members of a surveying crew who were surveying the mine.

Details of what occurred may differ but reports agree that a sudden fall of stone broke the electric trolley wire which, being thus short-circuited, set fire to the coal, trapping some 65 men back of the fire. Heroically desperate but futile efforts were made to extinguish the fire. In a heroic attempt to save the trapped men, George Emery, mechanization foreman of the mine, in some manner got beyond the fire and was himself trapped.

When it became apparent that the fire could not be put out, work was immediately started at the direction of Roy W. Fox, mine superintendent, to drive an entry around the fire through the solid coal to the men who were trapped beyond; but when this effort seemed about to succeed suddenly the fire broke through the intervening coal and the rescue entry itself became a burning inferno. The fire was then beyond control and it was finally reluctantly decided to seal the mine as the only means of extinguishing it.

But even then it was still hoped to save the trapped men. Some of the men were experienced miners and knew how to brattice themselves against fire and the poisonous gases which it produces and it was hoped that they would thus seal themselves in their entry beyond the reach of the flames. In this hope it was suggested by Adolph Pacifico, vice president of district No. 6 of the United Mine Workers of America, that a hole be drilled from the surface of the hill overlying the entry where the men were trapped into the entry through which fresh air could be pumped and food and water could be supplied to the men until the fire became extinguished. This was done, but when the drill hole reached the entry no signs of life could be found. Apparently all had perished.

The names and residences of the men who thus lost their lives in one of Ohio's greatest and most tragic mine disasters are as follows:

Ambridge, Pa.: Andrew Punko.

Bellaire, Ohio: John Burda, Edward Dennis, Henry Johnson, Wilson McFadden, Lester Marling, Hampton Mathews, Tie P. Miller, Fletcher Reives, Charles Stevens, Melvin Smith.

Bridgeport, Ohio: James Jobb.

Cameron, Ohio: Edward Pletcher.

Captina, W. Va.: Glen M. Wingrove.

Clarington, Ohio: Glenn Cook, Henry Hawley, William Hawley, Charles Nelson, Boyd Taylor.

Glencoe, Ohio: James Gibson, Harry McGilton, Dwight Mellott, Virgil Preston, Andrew Sichi, John Yablonski.

Jacobsburg, Ohio: Russell Caldwell, Mike Chimley, Myron Wright.

Neffs, Ohio: John Johnson.

New York, N. Y.: Dain Bragg.

Powhatan Point, Ohio: Floyd W. Aberegg, Jacob Bellville, Charles Brown, Odell Brown, Wilson Brown, Alex Cieslewski, Sherman Cordery, Clinton Corwin, George Emery, Earl R. Gibson, Adam Gursky, Raymond Jackson, Roy Jennewin, Dale Jones, Charles Kacir, Wilbert Knuefener, Samuel Larkin, Denver Lee, James McConaughey, Ralph McGonagle, Robert Munas, Virgil Newkirk, John Stewart, Mattia Simonetti, Pete Utka, Ned VanGosen, Avrel Vaught, Ralph Vilkoski, John Warsnick, George Wisor.

St. Clairsville, Ohio: Frank Reick.

Shadyside, Ohio: Dorsey Hartline, Mike Harvey, Dewey Munas, Tony Wach.

Wheeling, W. Va.: William Zemmik.

Mr. Speaker, without the mining of coal our modern civilization could not exist, and our tremendous war effort would never have come into being. This disaster—for such it was—reminds us that the occupation of a coal miner is an extremely hazardous and honorable occupation and is one that is absolutely essential to the well-being of each one of us and to the very existence of the civilization of which we are so proud.

Mr. Speaker, while it will be impossible, under the rules of the House, to chronicle the deeds of individuals who helped in the rescue work, this should be said of them: Each one of them has in his soul the stuff of which heroes are made, and it should also be said of the men who were trapped in the mine behind the fire and who lost their lives that, had they been on the outside of the mine and others trapped, they, each one, would have shown those same qualities of fortitude and heroic courage displayed by the rescuers and would themselves have heroically volunteered for the rescue work.

Out of this terrible disaster let us hope and pray that new safeguards may be evolved for the men who daily risk their lives in the mines that we may be warmed and the wheels of industry may not stop, and that the Nation, now engaged in the death struggle of war, may not lack the weapons to conquer a speedy victory.

To the members of the families of these brave men whose death has saddened whole communities in eastern Ohio, let us express our sorrow and our deepest sympathy; and for that purpose, Mr. Speaker, let us pause a moment in the deliberations of the Congress of the United States in honor of the memory of these men of the mines and as an expression of sympathy for those who have been bereaved.

Editorial on the Recent Powhatan Mine Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor for this short time to present to the House an editorial written

by a newspaper man of my district, Mr. W. H. McWilliams, of St. Clairsville, Ohio, known to newspaper readers as "Hi Waters."

This editorial was written on July 8, 1944, and was inspired by the terrible mine disaster which took the lives of 66 men in the burning coal mine at Powhatan Point, Belmont County, Ohio. This editorial, inspired by the tragic deaths of so many men, must have given some measure of comfort to their relatives and friends and, in my opinion, expresses an attitude toward death which we all might well adopt.

The editorial is as follows:

There's hardly anything in this life which is more uncertain than life itself.

And in this big world of ours—which is getting smaller and smaller—one of the most important things is when and how we leave it. There's no question, of course, who leaves it because everybody does that sooner or later.

We come into this world with just a minor flutter of interest and that generally is localized to the immediate family and small circle of friends who slap the father on the back, get a cigar in return, and a more or less embarrassed nod from the mother.

We rate considerable more of interest while we are growing up, going to school, entering business or the trades and, in turn, raise a family. If we are very fortunate—depending on how you look at it—we get national attention because we become President, Congressman, or dog catcher.

But all in all, outside those whose names are in headlines every day or week, the world never hears of us until we get up from life's party and walk out into the golden horizon of the hereafter.

If we do it in a sensational manner, we get lots and lots of attention. If we just casually saunter out after being around for numerous years, nobody practically notices our departure. But, as I said before, it's by far the most important thing we do—from a public standpoint—and will always be that way until this old world gets tired herself and disintegrates in the starry heavens where she has rotated so long.

Down at Powhatan on July 5 some 66 citizens of that community walked out of this life in a most unexpected manner and without any previous warning, notice, or intention. Those men, miners, did what every one of us will do later on and at times not now known. We will do it, likely, singly and individually and will not cause near the commotion as we would do were we to walk out all together. But we will leave just the same.

The above few paragraphs represent the things I would say to the survivors of those brave Powhatan miners who were victims of a sudden and unexpected accident deep in their coal mine, were I called upon to preach their funeral sermon.

I could think of a few things to say which I would regard more soothing than by pointing out that everybody on this planet, sooner or later, will have to depart from the party of life and that it is just a part of a broad plan to get all of earth's people into a permanent location.

A person does a lot of thinking back in the hollows of Cats Run with the majestic moon looking down on the silent trees and the towering hills and upon the throbbing sorrows of men. A person gets to speculating that you're pretty small fry putting your 2 cents' worth against the forces of Nature.

Down there in that darkened corner of sorrow men from all walks of life had gathered to help—if they could. There were preachers, storekeepers, auto dealers, insurance agents, farmers, and bankers. Probably the most experienced brains in the coal industry from both sides of the table were there and doing everything they could.

The most sensitive instruments known to science and the most modern inventions of the skilled minds of man were put to use trying to outflank a quirk of fate that had happened far under the verdant trees that spotted—like stubby whiskers—the face of Nature.

As the tops of the hills grew gray with early morning light and the night's dew shimmered and brightened as if Nature herself were weeping tears of remorse, men still labored on, and you couldn't help but feel warm that men had become, overnight, neighborly and helpful and compassionate.

The men who are today lying under the hills of that wildly beautiful spot back of Powhatan and who walked out so unexpectedly can be thankful in the new life, that an entire community and State and Nation had paused a moment in their mad rush of existence to drop a tear at their dramatic departure—to pay respect to their memories.

And the survivors of those 66 can be thankful that their loved ones have only moved on a piece leaving behind them the satisfaction of a job well done; that they performed their parts in life's struggle in this particular sphere with worthiness; that they left in valor; that they are now in repose from the most uncertain thing in this life, which is life itself.

Post-War Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Post-War Lend-Lease," which appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Post, August 8, 1944:

POST-WAR LEND-LEASE?

The report that Britain is requesting a continuance of lend-lease after the war, and that the request is being seriously considered in high administration circles, will probably surprise most of our people. Even more surprising are the grounds upon which this request for more billions in aid is made.

In the first place, British officials urge that continued lend-lease after Germany quits is absolutely necessary if Britain is expected to play the part expected of her in the Pacific war. We might ask here what is meant by the part Britain is "expected" to play in the war against the Japs?

We should assume that Britain would strain every resource to get back Hong Kong, Malaya, Singapore, Burma, and Borneo, all British possessions. Japan has no territory belonging to the United States except the Philippines, to which, long before the war started, we had agreed to give complete freedom in 1945.

But the implication is that the Jap war is our war and that we expect Britain to help us defeat the Japs because we are helping her beat Hitler. This certainly was the implication in the pledge thrice given by Churchill on notable occasions that Britain would "fight side by side" with us until the Japs surrendered. Why, unless they thus implied that it was our war, was any such pledge necessary?

In the second place, it is urged that Britain faces a serious economic situation because of her war losses. She has lost over half of her foreign investments, in considerable part because of the Japanese conquest of her Far Eastern possessions. Also, that Britain's position as mistress of the seas has declined and it may be years before she can regain her pre-war status unless the United States should turn over the bulk of the big new merchant marine built here during the war.

Finally, the British officials point out that their Government has pledged itself to raise the living standards of their people. But the only way, apparently, that this pledge can be kept is for us to give them the money to pay for the things they must buy. We might point out here that our Government has pledged itself to raise the standard of living for our people, and to provide billions to tide our returning veterans over until they can get new jobs.

Throughout all the discussions over this extension of lend-lease, it is stated the British have rejected all suggestions that such post-war assistance should be on the basis of direct loans. No, they say; their war debt is already too big, ignoring the fact that ours is bigger even in proportion to population.

As it is expected similar claims for continued post-war lend-lease aid will be made by Russia, France, Belgium, Holland, and other countries, it is no wonder that the American officials who are reported to favor the British request fear that the proposal will meet with a lot of sales resistance in Congress.

Natural Gas Versus Anthracite

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the suggestion by Sidney S. Swensrud, vice president, Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, regarding the change-over of the Big Inch pipe line and the 20-inch pipe line from oil to natural gas in the post-war period, and, in view of the devastating effect of this change-over on the coal industry, both bituminous and anthracite, there is an urgent need to study the pros and cons of the proposal before the matter becomes formalized as a specific proposition.

Mr. Swensrud, before the A. I. M. M. E., February 24, points out the following: First, that the pipe lines would probably not compete with tankers in the post-war period; second, with a large unserved market at one end, a large supply at the other end and a potentially idle combination of pipe lines between, the possibility of using the war emergency lines after the war for natural gas service obviously seems worth considering; third, that a potential market exists for one hundred to one hundred and twenty billion cubic feet of gas per year in the New York-New Jersey-Philadelphia area which is now served with manufactured gas of 530 B. t. u. value at an average price of around $1 per thousand cubic feet; fourth, that natural gas could be delivered in the holders for local distribution at a cost estimated from 20.3 to 22.8 cents per thousand cubic feet; fifth, that manufactured gas of 530 B. t. u. is now costing the gas companies from 16 cents up to 24 cents per thousand cubic feet; sixth, that there

are adequate reserves of such natural gas sufficient to furnish fuel for this new market for many years. Converting to natural gas of 1,000 B. t. u., this would be equivalent to a range of about 30 to 45 cents per thousand cubic feet as a manufacturing cost.

Since the market for most of this gas is planned for residential space heating, it constitutes an immediate threat to the jobs of thousands of miners and to the anthracite industry in its most vital primary markets. Since gas is "laborless" to a degree that exceeds any other fuel, it is obvious that coal cannot compete in this market against natural gas at low cost.

A post-war destruction of the primary markets for anthracite coal would be accompanied, undoubtedly, by the loss of many thousands of jobs for miners, the bankruptcy of many mining companies, and the destruction of invaluable natural resources.

It is undoubtedly a matter of important public concern that such a devastating blow should be permitted by the Federal Government.

The report of the Federal Anthracite Coal Commission, appointed by the President "to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite coal-producing regions"—April 21, 1942—made the following statement:

Since 1933, $169,238,000 has been spent for Work Projects Administration and $142,434,000 for other types of public assistance in the five important anthracite counties. This amounts over the period to $268 per capita, as compared with only $183 per capita for the rest of Pennsylvania, and $142 per capita for the United States as a whole. In December 1941, 10.7 percent of the population of these counties was on public assistance or Work Projects Administration as compared with 5.8 percent in the rest of Pennsylvania. Together with Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration funds, total relief expenditures since 1933 approach one-third of a billion dollars. The Federal Government has a major interest in reducing these disproportionate relief costs in the anthracite area by a positive long-term approach to the economic and social rehabilitation of the area. This would be far less costly than supporting a large permanent population on relief.

Mr. Speaker, since the relief expenditures in the anthracite-producing region far exceed the total cost—estimated $165,000,000—of both the Big Inch line and the 20-inch line, it is obviously against the public interest to convert these war-emergency lines to natural gas in view of the inevitable results in terms of total Federal expenditures.

It is evident that the Federal Government cannot be asked by one industry to take a position in favor of the compeitive advantages of that industry against another industry. However, it is entirely proper that the anthracite industry should make the strongest possible appeal to the Federal Government to prevent competition from the oil or gas industry which would bring about an unfair competitive relation as a result of public expenditures for the carrier pipe lines built for the war emergency. Such a move by the Federal Government would be tantamount to subsidizing a laborless fuel in order to destroy the anthracite industry whose cost is roughly 70 percent labor. Almost all authorities are in agreement that employment is the major problem in the post-war period. Converting the emergency pipe lines to natural gas with the subsequent destruction of employment in the anthracite and bituminous and railroad industries which would inevitably follow would constitute a specific defeat of the Nation's effort to secure maximum employment in the post-war period.

According to Dr. A. C. Fieldner, Technological Chief of the Bureau of Mines, the proven reserves of natural gas in the United States, as of January 1942, were 85,000,000,000,000 of cubic feet. Dr. Fieldner states that production of natural gas in 1941 was 2,800,000,000,000 of cubic feet or 30 years' supply at the present rate of production.

The United States Geological Survey gives a slightly higher figure, namely, 100,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of proven reserves with 35 to 50 years of life at the present rate of production.

Estimated reserves of bituminous coal run as high as 3,800 years at the current rates of consumption, while anthracite is estimated at about 175 years.

Mr. Swensrud, vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, in his paper entitled "A Study of the Possibility of Converting the Large Diameter War Emergency Pipe Lines to Natural Gas Service After the War," makes the following statement:

The quantity which might be moved through the lines, here under consideration, of say 110,000,000,000 cubic feet a year, would constitute less than 4 percent of the total and annual consumption of the country. If both of the war-emergency pipe lines were converted to natural gas, and operated at an average throughput of say 110,000,000,000 cubic feet a year, then in 10 years they would have moved approximately 1,100,000,000,000 cubic feet, or about 1 percent of the present known reserves of the country. It seems apparent, therefore, that there is no real question of availability of gas for conservation of the lines so far as total quantities are concerned.

Perhaps the most powerful argument against converting the emergency pipe lines into natural gas centers around the question of overall fuel conservation.

From the standpoint of the anthracite industry, Mr. Swensrud's proposal that 130,000,000,000 cubic feet a year of natural gas be brought through the primary anthracite market constitutes a threat which cannot be taken lightly. With such a large percentage of current anthracite production coming from marginal properties (estimated at 15,000,000 tons per year) and with such a high percentage of direct labor costs—estimated at 60 to 70 percent of the total cost per ton—it seems inevitable that the sudden influx of low-priced natural gas would shut down many companies. The preliminary calculation would indicate that 110,000,000,000 cubic feet per year would displace from five to seven million tons of annual production of coal.

Since the market proposed for the gas is admittedly designed to enter the residential space-heating field, anthracite's most profitable market would be directly affected; that is, the space-heating sizes. The abandonment of valuable coal reserves which would result from the bankruptcy of marginal companies would constitute a loss of valuable natural resources which would probably never be retrieved. It is likely that many mines with years of reserves ahead of them would be allowed to flood and cave to a point where they could never be subsequently mined on a profitable basis.

Here is widespread destruction of a natural resource which has shown itself to be of the utmost importance in the national fuel economy.

The scavenger salvaging of the remaining low-cost coal with the abandonment of any marginal areas would result, and bootlegging would undoubtedly start up at an accelerated rate, with the consequent destruction of more markets and still more valuable coal properties in the anthracite region.

Anthracite mine labor is highly specialized and not easily adapted to other work. Miners and their families are rooted in the soil where they own houses and their children attend schools for the most part in localities where there is no other industry to offer employment in case the mines shut down.

The war emergency pipe lines built with the public-tax funds, partly paid by the anthracite-producing companies, should not be permitted to become a competitive weapon with which the anthracite industry can be destroyed. It is doubtful whether airplanes built for war purposes will return to compete with private air lines, and many other similar cases could be cited. The Surplus War Property Administrator, Mr. William A. Clayton, issued a statement of policy on July 13 which is here quoted in part:

The objective is to establish a pricing policy that will put surplus machines back into production as quickly as possible, creating post-war jobs, stimulating national income and wealth and at the same time be recovering for the Government as much of its investment as possible.

While this statement refers only to surplus machine tools now in Government possession, it provides an indication of the point of view which can be expected from Government quarters. The Defense Plant Corporation, which owns the pipe lines under consideration, and the Petroleum Administrator for War, who operates the pipe lines during the war emergency, would probably be subject to similar policies as laid down by legislation now under consideration.

Assuming that these policies will prevail, it is evident that the destruction of a commodity that provides so many jobs as anthracite should not be brought about through public action which would supplant such a fuel with natural gas which provides, relatively speaking, no jobs at all.

Speaking from the public point of view on a national basis, the strongest argument against the exporting of natural gas from Texas and Kansas by pipe line will probably center around the synthesis of gasoline from natural gas.

Informal estimates of the Bureau of Mines indicate that gasoline can be synthesized from natural gas—costing from 5 to 7 cents per thousand cubic feet—by the Fischer-Tropsch method—at a cost ranging from 7 cents per gallon to 14

cents, maximum. Synthesis of gasoline from coal, on the other hand, is estimated to cost at least 14 to 15 cents per gallon.

Thirty million dollars has recently been appropriated to develop pilot plants and methods for synthesizing gasoline from sources other than petroleum due to the declining petroleum reserves. It seems obvious that the gasoline should be made at the source, where it can be bought for about 5 cents per thousand cubic feet, for the reason that it requires an estimated 10,000 cubic feet of gas to make 1 barrel of gasoline—42 gallons. Using Mr. Swensrud's figure of 22 cents wholesale gas laid down in Philadelphia, it is apparent that it would not pay to transport the gas and synthesized gasoline at Philadelphia as compared to transporting the finished gasoline from the plants in Texas.

There is considerable agitation in Texas and Louisiana against exporting such a valuable cheap fuel which might otherwise attract new industries to new localities within their States. This sentiment presents a real opportunity for the protection of the coal industry against natural gas.

The Nation as a whole should be alert to the threat to the employment in the mining industry, the railroad industry, and the retail fuel industry—three very large employers of labor—at a time when post-war employment is a matter of grave concern to the Nation.

Employment and Income Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. MURPHY, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following compilation by the Department of Labor:

In 1929, 31,149,000 American men and women were at work on nonagricultural employment.

In 1930, the number had dropped to 28,996,000.

In 1931 it had fallen to 26,125,000.

In 1932 it reached the low level of 22,921,000.

There was a turn for the better in 1933 when the figure rose to 23,060,000.

There was a further rise to 25,449,000 in 1934.

The trend continued in 1935 when the total reached 26,599,000.

In 1936 it rose to 28,809,000.

In 1937 the number was 30,627,000.

There was a drop to 28,663,000 in 1938, but by 1939, the number of wage earners increased to 30,353,000.

In 1940, there was a further increase to 31,784,000.

In 1941, representing the year before we went to war, there was a rise to 35,668,000.

In 1942 with the war-production program under way, the number increased to 38,447,000, and last year it reached 39,728,000.

So much for employment. Now let's take a look at what happened to average weekly pay rolls in manufacturing industries over the same period.

In 1929, these amounted to $209,495,000.

In 1930 they dropped to $169,586,000.

In 1931 they declined to $128,632,000.

In 1932, as in employment, they reached the low watermark of $88,652,000, but pay rolls, too, began to rise, in 1933 reaching $95,087,000.

It continued in 1934 to $122,454,000.

In 1935 it reached $140,590,000.

In 1936 it rose to $162,751,000.

In 1937 the advance was to $194,381,000.

It was decreased to $148,881,000 in 1938, but there was a quick recovery to $180,584,000 in 1939.

The trend continued in 1940 with an advance to $206,776,000.

This continued in 1941, and the figure reached $302,530,000.

In 1942 the average weekly pay rolls in manufacturing reached $437,505,000.

Last year they totaled $571,306,000.

And now let's see how the farmers made out over this period:

In 1929, the net income of farm operators from farming amounted to $5,878,000,000.

It sagged to $4,340,000,000 in 1930, and to $2,894,000,000 in 1931.

Again, as with employment and manufacturing, pay rolls hit the bottom in 1932, amounting to $1,872,000,000.

Here, too, recovery was first registered in 1933 when farming income went up to $2,265,000,000.

It amounted to $3,099,000,000 in 1934.

It rose to $4,522,000,000 in 1935, and to $4,731,000,000 in 1936.

In 1937, it reached $5,352,000,000, with a drop to $4,332,000,000 in 1938.

Again in 1939, it showed an upturn when the figure reached $4,566,000,000.

It increased to $4,699,000,000 in 1940, and totaled $6,694,000,000 in 1941.

In 1942, the total reached $10,116,000,000, and last year it was $12,306,000,000.

So much for the Nation's wage earners and farmers. Now, let us take a look at what corporations did over this period:

In 1929, after taxes were deducted, these profits amounted to $7,972,000,000.

By 1930, they were cut to $1,279,000,000.

In 1931, they went into the red to the tune of $3,225,000,000.

In 1932, as in employment, pay rolls, and farm income, the corporations also hit the bottom, their deficit amounting to $5,462,000,000.

In 1933, this loss was cut to $2,390,000,000, and in 1934 corporations were out of the red, showing profits of $129,000,000. These increased to $1,672,000,000 in 1935.

In 1936, they went up to $3,898,000,000.

In 1937, they were $3,897,000,000.

There was a drop to $1,515,000,000 in 1938, but here, too, recovery was quick, and, in 1940, their profits amounted to $4,847,000,000.

In 1941, there was a large increase to $7,331,000,000.

In 1942, profits were $8,535,000,000.

Last year they were $8,963,000,000.

Strongest Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Strongest Front" which appeared in the Lawrence, Mass., Evening Tribune, July 22, 1944:

STRONGEST FRONT

With the renomination of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the selection of Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, as his Vice Presidential running mate at the Chicago convention that ended Friday night, the Democratic Party will present its strongest possible front in the election next November that will be one of the most vitally important in the Nation's history.

His past record at the polls clearly makes President Roosevelt the most formidable standard bearer the Democrats could put in the field for Chief Executive, while his brilliant and successful leadership in the war to date and the present unfinished status of the conflict establish him unquestionably as the logical candidate for the party to submit to the Nation's voters at this time. In addition to keeping his hand firmly on the helm in directing affairs on the home front, from the war's beginning the President has been the Commander in Chief of the American armed forces in fact as well as in name and the extremely favorable progress thus far has been due in large part to the general strategy that has been planned by him in close cooperation with our military and naval commanders and the leaders of the other United Nations. Although the present outlook is favorable and the end of the war seems in sight in the not too distant future, a lot of difficult work remains and the United States needs the invaluable aid of President Roosevelt in finishing the job properly, just as it also requires the incomparable efforts of Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, and MacArthur, Admirals King, Nimitz, and Halsey, and all our other great commanders. In the great task of bringing the war to a successful conclusion and in effecting a permanent peace, this country needs the leadership of its ablest and most experienced citizen and President Roosevelt meets those qualifications fully. The Nation is most fortunate that he is able and willing to serve and he merits highest commendation for continuing like a good soldier, even when his natural personal inclination might lead him to want to retire to quiet private life after the 12 trying years through which he has just passed.

This year's choice of a Democratic candidate for Vice President was tremendously important because of the widespread belief even in high Government circles that, if reelected, President Roosevelt may not serve out his full 4-year term, but may resign after the war ends, either to head the American delegation to the peace conference to make certain of the right result there or for health reasons. In that event, of course, the Vice President would become President and anticipation of that possibility, however remote, called for the selection at the Chicago convention of a man wholly capable of sound guidance of American destinies in the difficult post-war world.

A superb choice was made in the nomination of Senator TRUMAN, because his brilliant record as a Member of the United States Senate and the ability, initiative, sincerity, and courage he has shown as chairman of the so-called Truman senatorial committee in investigating war expenditures stamp him as a man of Presidential caliber. With the Missourian as his running mate, the American people can vote for President Roosevelt with the fullest confidence next November, in the full knowledge that his reelection will guarantee continuance of the highest type of national leadership as long as he serves thereafter, while in case of retirement for any reason his mantle will fall on the shoulders of a man eminently well qualified to fill satisfactorily the highest office within their gift.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address delivered by the able gentleman from Virginia, Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, before the annual meeting of the Shenandoah Valley Electric Cooperative, on the subject of rural electrification.

As I have said, time and time again, this rural electrification movement is the greatest thing that has ever been done for the farmers of this country, and we expect to keep up the drive until we reach every farm home in America.

I wish every Member of the House, and every farmer in America, could read Mr. ROBERTSON'S address. The results in his own district must give him a thrill of pride, especially in view of the fact that he has been one of the most consistent supporters of rural electrification in this House.

Take the results in Bath County, Va., which was practically without any rural electrification at all 6 years ago, when with the help of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] I put through my amendment for the first $100,000,000 for rural electrification. As a result of that legislation, today 95 percent of the rural homes in Bath County are electrified; and the chances are that it will soon be made 100 percent. What has been done in Bath County, Va., can be done, and must be done, in every other county in America.

I am particularly proud to insert this address of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], for the reason that while he was helping the farmers of Virginia in supporting our rural electrification program, he was also helping the farmers of Mississippi, and of every other State in the Union.

Mr. ROBERTSON'S address follows:

The best and soundest help to an individual is to help him to help himself. Rural electrification gives that type of help and hence its unqualified success as a part of the Government program to aid agriculture. It has been a program I have been proud to support.

About 20 percent of the Nation is dependent upon agriculture for a livelihood, but agriculture does not receive for its services a pro rata share of the national income. That unfortunate situation became apparent before the death of Thomas Jefferson more than 100 years ago and has continued ever since. The two major factors creating that income disparity has been the use of hand labor on the farm compared with the use of machinery in industry, and the sale of basic farm products on a free market and the purchase of farm supplies on a protected market, supplemented by the actual or the equivalent of private monopolistic price control. During the past century the history of agriculture has been high, or relatively high, prices during a major war period followed by a disastrous slump. The slump that followed World War No. 1 commenced in 1922 and lasted for 20 years, with the exception of the temporary inflation of the stock market boom between 1926 and 1929. That experience must not be repeated. The present Government promise of 90 percent of parity for 2 years after this war is at best just a stop-gap cushion to a precipitous decline in farm prices. For the long pull a broader and more adequate program is indicated. The goal, as I see it, is full production at prices that will cover the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. To sustain full production there must be foreign outlets for surpluses above domestic requirements; for instance, 40 percent of cotton, 30 percent of tobacco, and 20 percent of wheat and apples. No industry in America is dependent, for full production, upon a foreign outlet for more than 10 percent of its production. And a factory owner can shut down when his market disappears, but the farmer cannot.

To compete in world markets as well as to sustain the present volume of domestic consumption of farm products when the national income drops from $150,000,000,000 to a much lower figure, the Government should aid farmers to reduce the costs of production through the use of more and better machinery. In such circumstances power on the farm is a necessity and not a luxury. The rural electrification program has done much to meet that need, but much remains to be done.

In the 50-year period prior to rural electrification, urban communities fully enjoyed the blessings of electric power and light, but that advantage of a scientific age reached only 10 percent of our farmers. Since the inception of the rural program in 1935, R. E. A. has built 392,000 miles of line and other electric facilities, extending electric service at reasonable cost to over 1,000,000 farm families and other rural consumers, and 400,000 additional rural homes are in reach of lines already built. That's a 400-percent increase in service to rural homes, yet only 41.9 percent of all rural homes. Within the potential reach of rural electrification are 5,000,000 rural homes and some of them are in our proud State. In Virginia, 114,000, or about 30 percent of the rural homes, are now being served, while 234,000 rural dwellings are without any source of electric service. While there is a cooperative in eastern Virginia larger than any in our section, I am proud of the fact that the Seventh District leads the State in the percentage of rural homes being served. Rockingham County leads the procession, with Bath a close second. In 1938 Bath was the lowest in the entire State in rural electrification. Now 95 percent of rural homes in Bath are served, as compared with the State average of 30 percent.

The Shenandoah Valley Electric Cooperative is a million-and-a-half-dollar project with a system of 1,235 miles serving 3,711 members. The cooperative also serves 6 hatcheries with a chick production of 500,000; 3 lime-grinding plants producing 35 tons of agricultural lime per hour; food-processing, low-freeze, and cold-storage plants; a sawmill; a large manganese plant; and a machine shop called Shenandoah Valley Defense Cooperative. All of those commercial plants are contributing to the war effort, and in the post-war era will give jobs to returned soldiers. Without the cheap electric power they would not exist.

The major purpose, of course, of the rural electrification program was to aid the farmer, although the importance of the development in rural sections of small industries is a valuable byproduct. Benefits of the program to the farmer can appropriately be listed under the two heads: "Monetary Gain" and "Social Gain."

1. MONETARY GAIN

(a) Grinds feed for all farm stock.

(b) Ten to 20 percent increase in egg production by poultry house lighting.

(c) Ten percent saving on feed by electric brooding and lighting and 2 weeks less finishing time for broilers.

(d) Marked increased efficiency in dairying through electric milking machines, sterilizers and coolers, cream separators and churns, and light in winter months in dairy barns.

(e) Saving in fences through the use of electrified fences.

(f) Electric hay driers especially valuable in curing alfalfa and pea hay.

(g) Workshop, grinding mowing blades and repairing farm machinery.

(h) Pumping water for household use, farm stock, and irrigation.

(i) Labor-saving devices in the home such as washing machines, vacuum cleaners, electric irons, churns, ranges, hot-water heaters—in a word, the full equipment of a modern city apartment designed to be operated by the housewife without servant help.

(j) The development of summer homes for city people.

2. THE SOCIAL GAIN

(a) Radio and prompt news coverage.

(b) Adequate lighting, including study lights for school children and lighting for schoolhouses and churches.

(c) Sanitary facilities made possible by pressure water systems.

(d) Deep-freeze and locker units for winter consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables as the means of a better balanced rural diet and the conservation of perishable foods.

(e) The stimulation of community pride and the accentuation of the advantages of farming as a means of life by reducing the drudgery and inconveniences involved. The time saved to farm mothers in not having to fill oil lamps and clean lamp chimneys, churn by hand and not having to bend for hours over washboards can now be devoted to the improvement of family relations and to community enterprises.

Again I say it is a sound program and one I have been proud to support. Cooperative temporary delinquencies in Government loans have amounted to only $215,576 in a total program of $379,592,354, while prepayments to R. E. A. now total $15,229,507. Against good collateral, plus a good moral risk, the Government has furnished working capital to cooperating farmers, and through unity they have found a new strength. Their sons will come back from the war to a cleaner, greener land.

Speedy Help Urged for Warsaw Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of August 15:

SPEEDY HELP URGED FOR WARSAW POLES—LONDON SAYS STALIN PLEDGED HIS AID—PLANS FOR BOMBING OF NAZIS SENT TO MOSCOW—PATRIOTS' POSITION GRAVE—POLISH OFFICER STATES UPRISING WAS TIMED TO DIVERT ENEMY ARMOR FROM RED ARMY

LONDON, August 14.—The Polish underground army, which is striving desperately to hold the city of Warsaw against the savage fire of German tanks, heavy artillery, armored trains, and gunboats, has begun to

receive token deliveries of Allied arms, but Polish political leaders in London, agonized by the destruction of the city and the slaughter of its citizens, asserted today that help must be given on a much vaster scale if the besieged patriots are to be rescued.

It was disclosed that Premier Stalin as well as the British and American High Command in London had promised to send aid to the ill-armed Polish forces and that detailed plans for the delivery of arms and the bombing of German strongholds had been dispatched to Moscow.

With a red-lined map of Warsaw before him, a colonel of the Polish Army described today how the rising of General Bor's underground forces in Warsaw 2 weeks ago today had been designed specifically to frustrate a counterattack by four German armored divisions against Red Army forces closing in on Warsaw from the east. "This was a very great help to the Russians," he asserted.

Jan Stanczyk, Polish Minister of Labor and vice president of the Polish Trades Union Council, explained why the uprising began when it did.

General Bor, commander of the Polish home army, he said, had been empowered to strike "at a moment that would be considered opportune."

Toward the end of July, Mr. Stanczyk said, the Germans ordered the evacuation of the city, including its factories, and began mass executions and arrests. The uprising was ordered, he continued, to frustrate this slaughter and to hamper the Germans in their counter-attack against the Red Army.

A Moscow statement said yesterday that the attack had not been coordinated with the Red Army.

To move the four German armored divisions from the west to the east across the Vistula River, the Polish colonel explained, the Germans had to use the three bridges crossing the river inside the city. The Polish plan was to deny these crossings to the Germans, and at 5 o'clock on the afternoon of August 1 they opened their attack to occupy the central sections of the city dominating the avenues leading to the bridges.

Expecting an early Russian assault, they disregarded their shortage of arms and ammunition and lack of heavy weapons. At first their tactics succeeded. All three bridges were blocked.

The first German counter-attack succeeded in opening the route to the most southerly of the bridges, Poniatowski Bridge. Until August 6 it was the only crossing of the river controlled by the Germans.

On that day the Germans began literally to burn their way to the Kierbedz Bridge, the middle one of three, setting fire to the buildings along its approaches. After 2 days the enemy opened the way.

Then on August 9 the Germans brought up two armored trains on the loop railway linking all Warsaw's railway stations and blasted a path to the third, and most northerly, bridge, which bears both a railway line and a motor road.

In between these routes, however, the Poles still hold large sections of the city, and on August 11 the Germans started to attack the old town of Warsaw between the northern and central bridges. An artillery barrage from the Praga district on the east side of the Vistula, plus fire from gunboats in the river, poured into the underground army's positions.

All this time the underground forces were sending frantic appeals to London for arms. "We are without any material or moral support," said one message, which remarked that the only aid given had been a speech from London.

On orders from Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, complete instructions were sent to Moscow for dropping a Russian liaison officer in Warsaw, for delivering arms and for giving air support to the Poles. As early as August 7 a Russian captain in Warsaw relayed a message through London with similar instructions and appeals for contact with the Russian Army.

Meanwhile, last Thursday German planes dropped leaflets containing a surrender ultimatum to the Warsaw patriots.

A Look at the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I submit a letter written by me and printed in the New York Herald Tribune this morning:

A LOOK AT THE RECORD—MR. TABER WRITES ON GUAM, MILITARY APPROPRIATIONS

To the New York Herald Tribune:

Almost never have I paid any attention to communications to newspapers, but my attention has been called to an article on the editorial page of your issue of Monday, August 14, 1944, which is so filled with misinformation or deliberate false statements that I feel that attention should be called to it. It was signed by Edward Dexter.

Some of the statements in the letter are a part of the deliberate false statements which have been made by the candidates and speakers and propagandists of the Roosevelt administration. Others indicate simply a lack of knowledge of what has been going on. No deliberate statement is made as to how I voted, but the fact that I am the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee in the House and that I would be chairman is referred to so that inferentially I assume that Dexter was striking at me.

I shall list some of his statements and call attention to what he has said so that there may be an end to some of these false statements appearing in your paper:

1. He states that Republicans voted, 135 to 15, against strengthening the defenses of Guam. That is a deliberate false statement. The question of strengthening the fortifications of Guam never was brought up. This was covered in a report filed by Senator WALSH of Massachusetts, the Democratic chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, in the Senate, on June 7, 1944, in which he tells the country that Mr. Roosevelt never submitted to the Congress any question of fortifying Guam, and the Congress never passed upon that question.

2. Dexter states that the Republican Party voted, 122 to 5, against the military appropriations bill of 1939. That is not true. What happened was this:

The Republicans in Congress, realizing the serious nature of our military situation and that we had no planes designed or planned which would be of any value to build, attempted to cut down the number of airplanes that might be built and at the same time increase the funds for experimental purposes by $10,000,000. The Democrats voted against this amendment. They have repeatedly been making statements that Republicans had voted against military appropriations when they were the ones that voted against the military appropriations. The sequel was this: None of the 5,700 planes that the Democrats appropriated money for was ever built because there were no designs to build them on, and the Congress in the latter part of 1939, after the war in Europe had started, voted $10,000,000 for experimental purposes that the Republicans tried to vote in January and February, 1939.

3. For my own part I have voted for the Selective Service Act and for exery extension of it, just as I have voted for every preparedness measure.

4. We did have an embargo act; we did have a neutrality act, which was passed with the support of President Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt approved it in 1935 and 1937. Some of us didn't vote for it and some of us believed that we should get out of the mess without violating international law. That did not appeal to Mr. Roosevelt, and that caused many votes against his way of doing things.

I am wondering if it is not about time that some of these people stopped trying to base their opposition to Republicans coming into power entirely upon false statements. Is it not time for the people of the United States to wake up and realize that, instead of being forward looking where preparedness was concerned, the Democratic Party, under President Roosevelt, has been backward looking and that a Republican administration means a more vigorous representation of America?

JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 14, 1944.*

Letter to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter to my constituents in Louisiana:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Dear friend, it has been my privilege and honor to be your Congressman for the past 2 years, representing and serving you in the Nation's Capital. You placed your faith and confidence in me when you sent me here and I feel that I have kept that faith and confidence. My record of hard work, efficiency, and accomplishments speaks for itself. I have worked shoulder to shoulder with our two Senators, namely, Senators OVERTON and ELLENDER, in the interest of our great State. It was Senator ELLENDER who led the fight for Federal aid to the school lunch program in the Senate, while I was one of those who worked so hard for this legislation in the House.

The members of the armed forces look upon me as their champion in Congress. While it is physically impossible for me to explain my accomplishments in this letter, I want you to know that I performed thousands of tedious tasks in getting word to parents about their sons who were either wounded or captured, straightening out and untangling thousands of allotments, aiding and assisting in securing trucks, school busses, farm equipment, machinery and a hundred and one other things of a similar nature. These were all extremely tedious tasks. However, they were of great benefit to you people. I shall continue in the future to do these things just as I have in the past.

By voting for and electing me in the first primary over my opponents, you will give me added prestige and power and I will be able to do even more for you in the future than I have in the past.

Feeling that my efforts, work, and records of achievement are deserving of another term, I am taking this means of asking you for your vote and support in my reelection on September 12.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

Camp Bedilion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution of the Marietta (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce in appreciation of the naming of a training camp by the Navy Department of the United States of America honoring the memory of the late Commander Robert W. Bedilion, United States Navy:

Whereas the Navy Department of the United States of America, by naming the training camp at Port Hueneme, Calif., Camp Bedilion, honored the memory of Commander Robert W. Bedilion, a respected citizen of our city, who gave his life in the services of his country on September 7, 1943; and

Whereas the citizens of Marietta City, Ohio, are deeply appreciative of the honor bestowed in memory of Commander Bedilion, and justly proud of this deserved recognition: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Marietta, Ohio, and on behalf of the citizens of the city, express to the Navy Department of the United States of America its sincere and grateful appreciation of the recognition given Commander Robert W. Bedilion; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary cause a copy of this resolution to be forwarded to his Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America; to Hon. James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy Department; and to Hon. P. W. Griffith, United States Representative from the Fifteenth District of Ohio, with the expressed hope that the same may be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to Mrs. Martha Daker Bedilion, of Alexandria, Va., the bereaved wife; to Augusta K. Bedilion, of Marietta, Ohio, the sorrowing mother, and that this resolution be spread upon the records of our organization.

Adopted May 12, 1944.

MARIETTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
GEORGE WHITE,
FRANK J. MCCAULEY,
D. T. SCHOONOVER,
WILL P. MCKINNEY,
A. A. SCHRAMM, *Chairman.*
JOHN E. NORTHWAY, *Secretary.*

Surplus Property Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following short article by Thomas P. Scanlan, editor of the Surplus Record of Chicago, Ill.:

Now that the greatest production job of all time is so nearly mastered, the task of redistributing the most tremendous surplus of materials, plants, and equipment the world has ever known confronts the American people. How it will be handled with the least possible effect upon our national economy has not yet been definitely decided. It is a problem that will tax the best brains in the land and even then the solution can only be arrived at through trial and error.

For a year Congress and other governmental bodies have been making surveys and studies of various plans which have been submitted by farsighted businessmen and associations who, while not relaxing in their efforts to speed our ultimate victory, have found time to give thought and study to the economic future of the country. Some idea of the amount of effort put into the surplus war property problem may be evidenced by the fact that more than 40 bills have been introduced into Congress containing plans for the disposition of war goods and equipment which must be absorbed by the public and industry or be dumped on the scrap pile.

The questions in the minds of business and labor and the farmer, too, are: How is the regulation for surplus disposal going to affect me? Will I be able to buy a jeep for 10 cents on the dollar? Shall I wait until the Government starts to sell off some of the billion dollars' worth of late-type machine tools to reequip my shop? This man expects to be able to buy modern machinery at one-fourth of what it would cost new. And there will also be with us the opportunist who expects to buy a completely equipped manufacturing plant for a song.

Well, from our observation post, nobody is going to steal anything from Uncle Sam this trip. Government and business are determined that this will not happen again—the promoter is persona non grata in all of the recommendations for surplus disposal which have been submitted. Self-interest groups have two strikes on them already.

Now let's get down to the practical way of looking at this job. We have called it "the greatest merchandising task of all time." Compared to selling $15,000,000,000 worth of War bonds, the best securities in the world, the job of selling twenty-five billions or even $75,000,000,000 (you guess) in merchandise—shoes and socks, needles and pins, bacon and eggs, planes and tanks, lathes and planers, motors and generators, plants and buildings, and probably a million and one separate and distinct items which are ordinarily distributed by ten thousand and one industries and divisions of trade—becomes a surplus problem of colossal size. We repeat, it is the greatest merchandising task of all time.

Probably we are becoming too alarming, or these statements may sound like the proverbial cry of wolf, but we have observed during the past 25 years how difficult it is to dismantle and dispose of even a single industrial plant or auction off a hardware store without giving the stuff away. The time, market, publicity are all important factors.

We hark back to a war plant which was scientifically and intelligently dismantled and sold after World War No. 1. It was the largest munitions plant in the world in 1918 and cost Uncle Sam (that's you and I) $90,000,000. This plant was practically new when the war ended. Within a square-mile area it contained the complete processing equipment and power plant necessary to manufacture powder from the base ingredients to the shipping containers. The people who handled the dismantling and disposal of this vast plant took some 10 years to finally dispose of all the equipment and buildings, and only some $15,000,000 gross were realized after all this time. They were experienced people in this kind of work and spent thousands of dollars in advertising and research to seek out markets and in reconverting special equipment, in careful dismantling and the salvaging of every possible stick of lumber and nail. And after all of this time and effort, they were able to realize only a little over 15 cents on the dollar gross.

Ask any crane or boiler manufacturer or builder of chemical or electrical equipment how much it costs to sell his highly publicized new products and you will find out that the job of reselling a war plant is in no way comparative. In the first place, there is mental objection that the war-plant equipment is second hand; secondly, the buyer expects to purchase it at a fraction of the original price. Add to these facts the necessity of describing, cataloging, and dismantling the plant, cleaning and checking the equipment for broken or missing parts, and rigging it for shipment. Also, dozens of other obstacles arise because the machine did not come from the original builder.

This case is only one of thousands of plants which were not as successfully liquidated after the last war. One might say someone benefited by the bargains which were made available, but are we not still paying for the last war?

Probably you are saying to yourself after reading this preamble: "So what? What is this guy driving at?" Simply this: The United States Treasury has paid out some $200,000,000,000 in gearing up for this war. Probably half of this sum has gone into plants, materials, machinery, and what not. Much of this is salvageable. If our surplus property agencies can recover for the Treasury 50 percent or only 25 percent of this money, even that represents fifty or twenty-five billions going back into the Nation's cash register.

We all know that this surplus disposal job is not one for boondogglers or amateurs. True it needs intelligent Government supervision, but most of all it needs careful planning, scientific marketing, economic control, test campaigns, advertising, selling by every single method and means which Sears, Roebuck, Marshall Field, General Motors, Warner & Swasey, A. & P., and other great concerns would use in merchandising their products or wares.

Every merchant and manufacturer in America should lend a hand in this gigantic merchandising job and every merchant and manufacturer and engineer who puts his money and ingenuity into it should receive the proper compensation for his effort. The experienced foreign market experts should be consulted. The knowledge and background of the advertising expert should be counseled. The experience of the technical reconversion engineer should be utilized. In fact, all who can contribute their brains or muscle to the beating of swords back into plow shares should be put to work as soon as the wheels of industry begin to hum in civilian production.

The responsibility lies primarily in the hands of those who have this vast job to do and it is up to industry and business to not only see that it is directed properly but also to take an active part in it.

It is an accepted fact that this Nation was built upon the system of free enterprise. If we hope to preserve it, business and labor will have to be vigilant. We mentioned just compensation for those who through knowledge and experience assist the governmental agencies in finding markets for war surplus. Even before our declaration of war, thousands of patriotic citizens gave freely of their time and energy to accelerate the production program. In the reallocation and disposition of the war surplus the Government will be placed in the position of competing with private enterprise. This makes it almost mandatory that if business contributes to the merchandising of these

gigantic surpluses that it be justly compensated in dollars for the effort put forth.

In summation, who is better qualified to do this job than American businessmen. Most of them, large and small, learned through cold hard experience. The butcher, the baker, the department store operator, the automobile dealer, the machinery dealer, the merchandising counselor, the auctioneer, the mill supply man, and hundreds of others too numerous to classify are the people of whom we speak. Tell me where you will find a better group the world over who can handle this job more intelligently and energetically.

Sound International Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, among the many informed and thoughtful people of this country that are devoting their attention to the solution of the international money problem we are indebted to two prominent citizens of the State of Iowa, where there is no silver- and gold-mining industry to influence their judgment, for the proposal of a sound monetary program embodied in the form of a resolution which is submitted herewith for printing in the RECORD. Mr. Titus is an able writer on the money subject and it will be my privilege to present further correspondence and articles by him on the international money issue:

SERIES OF WHEREASES AND SUGGESTIONS BY G. M. TITUS OF MUSCATINE AND EX-SENATOR VAN ALSTINE OF POCAHONTAS COUNTY, IOWA, ON THE POST-WAR MONEY PROBLEM

1. Whereas a sound monetary standard is essential to the stabilization and welfare of all people; and

2. Whereas for many years the world used both gold and silver as its basic money at a ratio of 16 to 1, with comparatively slight variation; and

3. Whereas England and the United States demonetized silver in the years 1870, 1873, and 1874; and

4. Whereas a cubic box forty feet in dimension could contain all the gold of the world at the present time, thus rendering inadequate the amount of gold to properly transact the business of the world and thus rendering it important for the world to return to international bimetalism; and

5. Whereas the emergency conditions of the world war have practically eliminated the traditional use of either gold or silver as a basis of monetary values; and

6. Whereas practically all the monetary gold is now held by the United States and a very few of the other nations; and

7. Whereas about three-fifths of the people of the world use silver for practically all ordinary business transactions; and

8. Whereas we believe that the use of both gold and silver is absolutely essential to the adequacy, safety, and stability of a well-balanced basis, for world monetary standard of values; and

9. Whereas the assistance given member nations renders it possible for member nations to acquire a surplus of products, the board of governors of the international bank shall, from time to time, warn all member nations of such possibility and thus avoid a decrease in price of any commodity and a resulting depression.

Now, therefore, we respectfully recommend for your consideration: That gold and silver be duly adopted and established as a basis for our monetary standard of value and that the relative content of each metal in the standard be determined by the present and prospective commodity value of said metals, and taking into account the anticipated effect of this act on such commodity values to the end that parity in the purchasing power of gold and silver be established;

That each participating nation shall certify to the international bank its established monetary unit, the amount and fineness of the gold and silver therein, and any prospective change in the content of such monetary unit shall be published and made known to the international bank at least —— months before such change shall take effect.

That in case any such participating nation neglects to give such notice of intention to change the content and fineness of such monetary unit, then the international bank may, at its option (or shall) notify such nation of such omission, neglect or failure, and inform such nation that unless the conditions and requirements of this act are fully complied with, the privileges and the connection with the international bank may, at the option of the said international bank, be withdrawn from such delinquent nation.

That any nation failing to maintain the amount of gold or silver in its metallic money as established by such nation and approved and published by the international bank, shall thereupon forfeit its membership in and all privileges of its connection with the international bank.

That said international bank shall maintain proper facilities for testing the gold and silver content of basic money offered by any nation and shall refuse to approve or accept any basic coinage not complying with the established standard of such nation.

The international bank shall be established on a nonprofit basis with the privilege of making only such charges as shall be necessary to cover the expense of properly conducting its business and provide for reasonable reserve for possible losses.

That if, in the judgment of the board of governors of said international bank, the time should come when a dividend could be paid, all member nations should share in such proportion as their interest in the bank.

That the said international bank shall be authorized to change its ratio between the gold and silver content of basic coinage whenever such action is necessary to maintain monetary parity, and shall give member nations reasonable notice of such proposed change.

That any member nation may withdraw from said international bank on 6 months' notice at any time.

That in the opening of said international bank, gold shall be valued at —— per ounce and silver at —— per ounce.

Urges Showing of Soviet Film of Kharkov Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent by me to the Director of the Office of War Information:

AUGUST 8, 1944.

Hon. ELMER DAVIS,

Director, Office of War Information,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: The Soviet documentary film, "Justice Is Coming" (I am informed) is open for bookings in the United States. It is a documentary reproduction of the Kharkov trials in December 1943, when three German jackal Nazi officers and a Russian Quisling were condemned to death by hanging because of their torture and massacre of innocent men, women, and children in Russia.

It is a hard, grim picture.

In the final scene, the four guilty brutes swing from four gallows posts.

The demands for the showing of this picture of crime and punishment have arisen all over England. Englishmen are infuriated by the dreadful havoc caused by robot bombs. They seek retribution, and rightfully so. They wish to see this film. They see reflected therein their thirst for vengeance.

At the film's inception there are quoted words by Stalin, as follows: "We shall bring the German criminals to book." And the promise is performed. There are shots of burning Russian villages and devastated cities, and of the charred bones of dead children. Interspersed between pictures of rapine, rape, and plunder by Nazi monsters are such shrill phrases as "Be ye accursed, ye murderers."

The prisoners confess at the trials. They admit the gas-filled vans by which they suffocated their victims, the truckloads of children shot and then kicked into mass burial pits. The audience cheers the verdict of death as well as the springing of the nooses.

This is the type of cinema we need in America. It is horrible, maybe sickening, yet necessary to arouse placid Americans out of their complacency with regards Nazi atrocities. They probably have heard of so many that their feelings have become numbed.

Many of us remember the last time. We then called them "Huns." We vowed to set up atrocity courts. We made direful threats to bring all the Boche guilty of heinous crimes to trial. Teddy Roosevelt here, Lloyd George in England, promised to hang the Kaiser and make the Huns pay to the last farthing. Books, pamphlets, newspaper editorials of 1917 and 1918 reflected the same demands for punishment to fit the horrible crimes of the German culprits.

Yet, all came to naught. Kaiser Wilhelm was permitted a confortable exile as the Squire of Dorn in Holland. Hindenburg, Ludendorff, Von Tirpitz, Von Bismarck lived on in iniquity and the planning of World War No. 2. The Junkers, the Prussian military clique, the Gestapo, will live to bring forward another Schicklegruber on a white horse unless we punish and pay them the wages of their sins.

But, Americans, with intense sentiment and tender stomachs, will want again to withdraw from the mess as soon as the last shot is fired. That must not be.

Hitler, Himmler, Goebbels, Goering, and all the vile brown-shirted Nazis must hang from gallows five times higher than the one from which Haman swung.

Bring on this movie. Show it all over the United States.

I am sure a patriotic Hollywood and the cinema distributors and theater owners would cooperate wholeheartedly in the showing of "Justice Is Coming."

Yours very sincerely,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Extracts From Speeches of Hon. Hamilton Fish, of New York, Against Racial and Religious Intolerance and Persecutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extracts from various speeches I have made during my service in Congress against racial and religious intolerance and persecutions. The extracts cited are selected and brief quotations from only a few of many such speeches I have made on this subject since I have been in public life, but they are sufficient to prove to any fair-minded person that I am not and have never been anti-semitic and have consistently raised my voice and used whatever influence I have possessed to protest against any discrimination against racial minorities whether at home or abroad.

The extracts follow:

On December 14, 1925, I introduced a resolution, perhaps the first action taken by any Member of Congress—House Joint Resolution 76, Sixty-ninth Congress—to stop the spread of fascism in the United States. This resolution provided, in part, as follows:

Whereas it is reported in the public press that Benito Mussolini has urged the creation of Italian centers in the United States to inculcate foreign ideals and teach of fascism, which is subversive of our republican form of government guaranteed by the Constitution; and

Whereas the Italian Prime Minister has recently deprived the Italian Parliament of all authority to amend or alter his decrees, has denounced liberty as a sham, and by force of arms has ruthlessly uprooted popular government to obtain which the people of all civilized nations have for centuries past shed oceans of blood; and

Whereas the present Italian dictatorship and despotic form of government is inconsistent and subversive of American ideals of government based on the consent of the governed: Be it

Resolved, That the Congress regards with disfavor any attempt by a foreign power to interfere with the internal affairs of the United States by creating centers for their nationals or their former nationals in this country, and commends the American Legion for their activities in encouraging and establishing American centers to promote the practice of American ideals, customs, and habits, and the Americanization of all immigrants in the United States, with a view of their speedy absorption as naturalized citizens into the American body politic having the same identical rights, liberties, privileges, and duties as all other American citizens.

In a statement issued in connection with this resolution, I said:

The teaching of fascism in America would be as dangerous to our institutions as bolshevism, and as subversive of our form of government. It would mean the destruction of our Constitution and with it popular government, and cost us our hard-won liberties, and our most cherished rights and privileges. We want no centers in the United States where fascism can be promoted, either directly or indirectly. We want none of it, nor will we stand for outside influence in the Americanization of our aliens.

Again, on January 4, 1932, I introduced a somewhat similar resolution—House Joint Resolution 169, Seventy-second Congress—against any foreign interference in our internal affairs, through the creation of centers to inculcate foreign ideals and allegiance in the United States, and providing that—

The Congress of the United States is opposed to interference by any nation or nations in our internal affairs through the creation of centers to inculcate foreign ideals and allegiance for their nationals or their former nationals in this country, and looks with disfavor on the teaching of fascism in the United States as inconsistent with American ideals and liberties and subversive of our republican form of government as guaranteed by the Constitution, and demands that the activities and propaganda of both Fascists and anti-Fascists shall cease.

In the House of Representatives, June 30, 1922—speaking on behalf of House Joint Resolution 322, favoring the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, of which I was the author:

This resolution favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and is based on justice and humanity * * *. It is an expression of our sympathetic and favorable attitude in establishing in Palestine a refuge for the persecuted Jews of the world, where they can develop their own culture, law, and ideals in the ancient land of their fathers, given by Jehovah to Abraham and consecrated in the hearts of the Jewish people as the birthplace of their traditions.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Speech at the protest meeting held under the auspices of the American Jewish Congress, at Town Hall, New York City, March 16, 1930:

Multitudes of Russian priests, Jewish rabbis, Zionists, Catholic priests, and Protestant ministers are being arrested and on flimsy charges exiled to Siberia if they are not secretly executed by the Ogpu, the terrible secret police which has recently been reestablished to spread terror among Christian and Jewish worshippers in Soviet Russia. * * * The active, relentless persecution and terrorism has resulted, according to the statement of an eminent rabbi who has just returned from an investigation in Russia, in driving three-quarters of the Jewish people away from the faith of their fathers. This is an almost unbelievable statement to anybody who has studied the history of the Jewish race. In spite of all the pogroms and persecutions that Jews have suffered in the past centuries, they have always retained their religious beliefs until the terrorism of the Ogpu, the dreaded secret police, has made life an abomination and desolation for them. * * * There is one silver lining to the religious persecution of the Russian people, and that is the concurrence of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews to champion religious liberty and to present a united front against the attempts of the Communists to exterminate all religions based on a belief in God. The united protest of Christendom and Judaism, that most ancient of all faiths, marks a cornerstone in history, for in union is not only strength but understanding, which will bring glory to God in the highest and on earth peace and good will toward men.

Statement as ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 21, 1933:

It is none of our business what kind of a government there is in Germany, Russia, or Italy, but it is our duty to protect the lives and property of American citizens wherever they may be. Attacks on American citizens of Jewish origin in Germany must cease immediately. * * * The rise of anti-Semitic propaganda and the persecution of the Jews in Germany turns civilization back to the dark days of the Inquisition in Spain and the pogroms of the Cossacks under the Czarist regime in Russia.

In the House of Representatives, May 24, 1933:

I introduced the following resolution (H. Con. Res. 19), and it will depend upon the unanimity and character of the support given it by the Jewish people in the United States and their friends whether I shall request immediate consideration. If it is shown clearly that the Jewish people are united in demanding immediate and favorable action on this resolution, I shall urge prompt consideration and adoption:

"Whereas the German Government is pursuing a relentless and ruthless policy of economic persecution and repression of Jews in Germany; and

"Whereas it is the avowed intention of the German Government to deprive the Jews of their civic, political, and economic rights; and

"Whereas the comparatively small number of Jews in Germany, not exceeding 600,000, constitute a peaceful, law-abiding, industrious, and defenseless element of the population: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States regrets the continued persecution of the Jews in Germany and expresses its sympathy for them in their hour of trial, humiliation, and economic discrimination, and requests the President of the United States to use his good offices and make friendly representation to the German Government in the interest of humanity, justice, and world peace, to respect the civic and economic rights of their citizens of Jewish origin, and to put an end to racial and religious persecution."

Letter to Justice Wendell P. Stafford, American National Conference Against Racial Persecution in Germany, at a meeting held in Washington, D. C., June 5, 1933:

I regret exceedingly that, owing to a previous engagement, I will be unable to attend your protest meeting against the tragic and inhuman attempt of the Hitler government to destroy the economic rights of German Jews and deprive them of citizenship. No nation, or no people, particularly the American people, accustomed to equal opportunities under the law, can remain silent at the cruel, brutal, and systematic policy being pursued by the German Government to turn the hands of progress back 2 centuries and force peaceful and law-abiding Jewish citizens to return to the poverty and disease of the ghetto. The American people are shocked and horrified that any civilized government could in our day and generation undertake to outrage civilization by strangling through economic weapons a whole race. Stupid and ruthless leadership turned the world against Germany 20 years ago, and God forbid that it should again come to pass. By encouraging and promoting intolerable injustice to the Jews, the German rulers are

prejudicing their own demands for justice before world public opinion. The fight has just begun, and must continue until human rights and Jewish rights prevail. I would appreciate the active and militant support of your Congress toward securing a favorable report and action on my resolution (H. Con. Res. 19) requesting the President to make friendly representation to the Hitler government regarding the economic and racial persecution of 600,000 German Jews, in the name of justice, humanity, peace, and friendly relations between nations.

Letter to Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, chairman of Special Committee to Investigate Nazi Activities in the United States, March 19, 1934:

I favor the adoption of your resolution, and a thorough investigation of Nazi propaganda and activities in the United States. There is no more room for Hitlerism in our American Republic than there is for communism. Both of these foreign forms of dictatorship, one representing the right and the other the left, constitute a complete repudiation of our free institutions and our republican form of government guaranteed to each State by the Federal Constitution. Furthermore, the American people are opposed to the injection of racial and religious issues, which are contrary to the spirit of our institutions and violate the guaranties of civil liberties contained in the Constitution. What we need in the United States is more tolerance, not less, more civil liberties, not less; and more insistence on freedom of speech which tends to dissipate both racial and religious bigotry. I hope your committee will nip in the bud any indication of Nazi propaganda and activities from alien and foreign sources in the United States. I wish you every success in your efforts to stamp out the seeds of foreign propaganda in our country.

Statement released to Jewish congregations in my district, September 1, 1936:

The Jews throughout the world have much to be thankful for as a result of the assistance, moral and financial, from their English speaking brothers in America. American Jews have been shocked by the persecution of their coreligionists in certain foreign lands and have made every effort to assist them in their affliction. In these days of enlightenment, we cannot understand this persecution of the Jews in foreign lands. In America the Jews have contributed much in every walk of life, and in the city of New York have helped by their charitable gifts to build great institutions for the aged and to relieve the sufferings of the sick and destitute. American Jews enjoy the same civil rights and blessings of liberty guaranteed by the Constitution to every American citizen and will continue to do so as long as our free institutions and the Constitution of the United States shall endure. In spite of the present-day persecution of Jews in certain nations, they will emerge from these temporary attacks, as they have done in the past, to even greater opportunities for service to humanity and the fulfillment of their hopes and aspirations in Palestine and destiny as a great race.

Statement on July 26, 1937:

The proposed partition of Palestine by the British Government is an amazing suggestion, and a deliberate breach of trust. * * * There is more need at the present time for a refuge for the persecuted Jews of Germany and of Poland in Palestine than ever before. Relying on the promises and pledges given in the Balfour resolution and our treaty agreement with Great Britain, millions of dollars have been raised in the United States to rehabilitate and develop Palestine and make it once again a land of milk and honey. These generous contributions from America have made it possible for tens of thousands of Jews, driven out of Germany and Poland, to find a home and livelihood in that ancient land of their forefathers. Great Britain accepted the mandate and it is her duty to fulfill her pledges given to the Jewish people and live up to her obligations to the nations of the world, including those to our own Government.

Speech over Intercity Broadcasting System, February 4, 1938:

I have come here this evening to raise my voice with others in condemnation and protest against the tragic racial persecution of the Jewish people in Rumania. We are familiar with the situation in Germany, where the Jews have been outlawed and declassed, where there are only 600,000 Jews to a population of 60,000,000 Germans, while it is claimed that there are a million or possibly a million and a half Jews in Rumania, out of a population of 19,000,000. The inhuman and brutal treatment of the Jews in Rumania has shocked the American people. They are opposed to all forms of racial and religious persecution, in the interest of humanity, justice, and world peace. As a liberal Republican, I loathe and abhor all forms of political, economic, racial, and religious repression and persecution, whether in this country or elsewhere.

Speech of Representative SIROVICH, of New York, in the House of Representatives, January 6, 1938:

Permit me to congratulate the distinguished son of illustrious forebears who has served humanity loyally and faithfully, not only in our country but throughout the civilized world. In the resolution I have introduced today calling on the President to intercede in the name of humanity against the shameful treatment accorded by the Rumanian Government to its religious and racial minorities, it might interest my colleague to know that on July 22, 1872, your distinguished grandfather, Hamilton Fish, who had been a Member of Congress of the United States from 1844 to 1846, Governor of the State of New York from 1849 to 1851, United States Senator representing the Empire State from 1851 to 1857, and Secretary of State under President Grant from 1869 to 1876, dispatched upon a similar occasion of violent religious persecution in Rumania, an official communication to all American diplomatic representatives stationed in Europe and stated: "Although as a rule we scrupulously abstain from interfering directly or indirectly in the public affairs of that quarter [Rumania], the grievance adverted to is so enormous as to impart to it as it were a cosmopolitan character, in the redress of which all countries, governments, and creeds are alike interested. * * *" I congratulate the distinguished Member of Congress from the State of New York, HAMILTON FISH, for following in the footsteps of his father who also served in Congress as well as the magnificent contribution of his grandfather, one of the most eminent Americans in our history, upon the altar of humanity.

Other speeches on this subject appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, 1938, and January 25, 1938, protesting persecution of Jews in Rumania.

Statement, November 15, 1938:

If the technical recall of Ambassador Hugh Wilson from Germany by Secretary Hull is intended as a protest and remonstrance against racial and religious persecution of the Catholics and Jews in Germany, it deserves the wholehearted approval of the American people. They have been shocked by the systematic brutality and persecution of the Jews in that country for the past few years. A continuation of these racial and religious atrocities will set the hands of human progress back 1,000 years into darkest barbarism. I cannot too strongly denounce these inhuman practices.

On April 28, 1938, I spoke in the House of Representatives against the confiscation of property belonging to American Jews in Germany, and on numerous other occasions in behalf of the Jewish homeland in Palestine.

Radio address over Columbia Broadcasting System, November 25, 1938, on America's answer to religious and racial persecution:

I speak tonight not as a Jew but as an American who loathes and abhors all forms of political, economic, racial, and religious repression and persecution, whether in this country or elsewhere. I propose to discuss the American viewpoint rather than to detail the infamous and inhuman actions of Hitler, the Nazi dictator, who has set the hands of progress back 1,000 years by his attacks on race and religion. To all appearances Hitler has become stark, raving mad, and he and Goebbels and his gang of ruffians are engaged in an orgy of racial and religious persecution, not only of Jews but of Catholics and Protestants as well. The people of America, regardless of party affiliations join with all other civilized people in denouncing this retreat to darkest barbarism in Germany. * * * There can be no compromise with the Nazi groups in America, who are trying to sow the seeds of racial and religious persecution and to tear down our own free institutions and republican form of government. The American people look with sorrow and abhorrence on the disgraceful and tragic events in Nazi Germany, where a ruthless dictatorship is bent on destroying free speech, free press, and free institutions and substituting for them a government by the bullet, racial and religious persecution, robbery, terrorism, and armed violence. American citizens have not only a right but a duty to protest and remonstrate against racial and religious persecution of Jew and gentile in Nazi Germany. * * * The inhuman acts of the Nazi government put it outside of the limits of decency and fair dealing. Hitler, Goebbels, and other fanatical Nazis are undermining the fundamentals of civilization. * * * We must profit by the events in Nazi Germany and make sure that they shall not happen in America. I urge all loyal American citizens not to compromise in any way with the spread of nazi-ism or Nazi bunds or Nazi ideals in free America. There can be no compromise with either nazi-ism on the right or communism on the left.

Address at Mecca Temple, New York, November 2, 1938:

The Jews in America have served our country loyally in time of peace as well as in war. No one has the right to impugn their patriotism or love of America. No group owes more to our country, and none should be more willing to make greater sacrifices and uphold and defend our free institutions and representative and constitutional government, under which they have found security, peace, and prosperity as in no other nation in the world. With large parts of Europe aflame with violent anti-Semitism, I am proud of the fact that I introduced the Zionist resolution, which has already helped to provide a refuge for 400,000 persecuted Jews. Large sections of Palestine have been restored and rehabilitated by these Jewish immigrants, from Dan to Beersheba. I hope and pray that the British Government will permit several hundred thousand of the exiled German,

Austrian, and Rumanian Jews to find a place of refuge and a home in Palestine, that ancient land of their fathers.

Speech as president of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union Conference, at Oslo, Norway, August 16, 1939:

I present to the delegates briefly a plan, or possibly a vision, on a large scale, backed by prominent and wealthy Americans, providing for the settlement of refugees in the undeveloped and sparsely populated but healthy uplands of Central Africa. The African continent is the only place left in the world where there are vast territories, rich in natural resources, and where over population is not yet a problem. This problem of the refugees is inseparably connected with the preservation of peace. The problem is by no means a Jewish or a racial problem, it involves Catholics and Protestants as well, and people of many nations. It is essential to discover a new homeland for these unfortunate refugees, driven out by dictatorial governments, where they can find peace, security, employment, and civil liberty. * * * I am not giving away any diplomatic secrets when I tell you, my colleagues, that I discussed the refugee problem with both Lord Halifax, the British Foreign Secretary, and M. Bonnet, the French Foreign Minister, both of whom expressed a definite desire to cooperate in ascertaining if there were any sparsely inhabitated but livable lands within their colonial possessions that could be developed by modern science, engineering, irrigation, and medical research and supervision. I also had the honor of discussing the refugee problem with M. Mandel, the French Colonial Minister, who volunteered to have an immediate survey made in the French Colonial possessions in Africa and particularly that section to the south and east of Lake Tschad, and invited me to meet him early in September in Paris, after his survey had been completed. * * * I plead with my fellow delegates to consider this problem, and to cooperate in solving the refugee problem by providing a new homeland for these people where they may have plenty of elbow room and an opportunity to provide for themselves in peace and security free institutions of their own making. It must be a democratic state under representative or parliamentary forms of government, with freedom and liberty for all.

Unfortunately, the war broke out in Europe before the plan I submitted could be followed up, and there was no way in which it could be accomplished at that time, or until the war is won.

In the House of Representatives, December 9, 1941:

The Jewish people, who have more at stake in this war than any other people in the world, who have suffered more, who have been the victims of barbarous treatment in eastern Europe, who have been outlawed and discriminated against on account of their race and religion, who have been deprived of their economic and civic rights and by inhuman and brutal persecution by the Nazis forced back into the poverty and misery of the ghetto or into concentration camps, should have the unquestioned right to fight. Let us give them that opportunity without delay. Let us give them some of our lend-lease money as we have given it to the Poles, the Czechs, the Free French, and the Greeks. Let them have an army in Palestine of 50,000 or even 100,000, with American lend-lease money with which to obtain equipment and guns. Let them have a Jewish military unit under their own flag, under the Star of David, and manned and officered by their own people.

The President and General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial on the President and General MacArthur, which was published in a recent edition of the Youngstown Vindicator:

THE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MACARTHUR

Amid the discussion as to whether President Roosevelt's trip to the Pacific was political or not, at least one man is glad that it was made.

This man in General MacArthur. As everyone knows, General MacArthur has not been happy over the way he has been treated. At one time he was very unhappy, not for himself so much as for the whole situation in the Pacific. Intensely devoted to the Philippines, he felt that the decision of the President and Mr. Churchill to give first place to the war in Europe condemned the Filipinos to years of suffering. It appeared to him that his own counsel was disregarded and that he was set down in a subordinate position.

It is now known that these are the reasons why General MacArthur allowed his name to be mentioned for President. He never had any serious intention of running, but he believed that if people back home talked about him they could not help thinking about the war in the Pacific and what was needed there.

It was natural that, having to do so much with so little, General MacArthur should consider himself forgotten. Battles that would have been won in a few days if he had had men and equipment became major campaigns. His long struggle and the sufferings of his men in the steaming jungles became an epic chapter of the war. Yet he heard after the Quebec conference last summer that his command was to be secondary to that of Lord Mountbatten.

If this decision was made at Quebec it was not carried out. Instead, General MacArthur was given more of the things he needed and conditions began to change. After fearing for months that he would get no farther than New Guinea, he was able to begin his rapid advance. Gradually the Nation's eyes turned again to the Philippines and General MacArthur was confident that he would soon lead the reconquest and liberation of the islands. A correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, Lewis B. Sebring, Jr., who has just returned from 2 years at his headquarters, wrote yesterday that it was when General MacArthur became sure of this that he issued his statement that he would not consider nomination for the Presidency and would not accept it if it were offered.

This was the background of the meeting between President Roosevelt and General MacArthur at Hawaii last month. Mr. Sebring writes that "The feeling of optimism that General MacArthur developed last spring over his prospects for returning to the Philippines over a route that he would choose himself and which he would command has been clinched by President Roosevelt's meeting with him, as well as with the commanders of other American forces in the Pacific, and by the President's subsequent statements that General MacArthur most certainly will return to the Philippines."

President Roosevelt publicly confirmed this at Bremerton Saturday night. As General MacArthur heard it and heard also the President discuss not only our strategy in the war with Japan, but the steps we propose to take in the Pacific to protect ourselves against future aggression, he must have felt that his ideas were finally receiving the recognition they deserved. This will be heartening to him, and to Admiral Nimitz and to the million men under their command. The address began so informally that the President seemed to be speaking extemporaneously; but as he went on to tell of what the Pacific islands mean to the United States and of what we mean to do there, it became an historical declaration of American policy. Even the President's critics must admit that it and the trip which had such a result were worth while.

Soldiers Can Read Balzac's Droll Stories But Cannot Read Yankee From Olympus, a Biography of Justice Holmes—Hatch Act Again Revealed as Asinine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, because of the Hatch Act, which is supposed to prevent pernicious political activities, the War Department has withdrawn from Army libraries and Army educational courses six well-known history text books—among them Our Nation, by Barker and Commager.

The Council on Books in Wartime have also proscribed The Republic, by Charles A. Beard, which appeared recently in serial form in Life magazine. Yankee From Olympus, by Catherine D. Bowen, is a biography of the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. A condensed version appeared in the June issue of the Reader's Digest.

The Hatch Act as amended prevents the circulation among the armed forces of any pamphlet, literature, or material that might contain political argument or political propaganda calculated to affect the result of a Presidential, senatorial, or congressional election.

That is mighty broad language. Even the Bible might come under the ban.

I believe the War Department has applied a rather tortured and strained construction of the act. Nonetheless, if the mumbo-jumbo of this legislative monstrosity means what the Department says it means, then let us get rid of it.

This Hatch Act, a statutory abortion if ever there was one, prevents G. I. Joe from reading in the camp library the best book of the year, Yankee from Olympus. Yet, the same G. I. Joe can buy the book in the town book shop or department store, or borrow it from the local library.

It might also be pointed out that the Hatch Act has proven its worthlessness

a score of times. It deprives 3,000,000 Federal workers of their right to participate in the coming important Presidential election. It is a denial of the right of free press and speech to those millions of workers, not only in Washington but in mills, factories, and shipyards and aircraft plants all over the country. It is flagrantly violated. It is unenforceable. Grand juries refuse to indict, petit juries refuse to convict, and judges in the rare cases of conviction suspend sentence or inflict a fine of 1 cent.

It is another ignoble experiment. Like prohibition, let us be done with it. It must be repealed.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, probably no other man ever stepped from the political stage with more friends in all political parties than James A. Farley, who recently resigned the chairmanship of the New York Democratic State Committee. Many newspapers of the Republican Party have joined the press of the Democratic Party in showering encomiums on him.

The Indianapolis Star, a newspaper not of Mr. Farley's political faith but which appreciates friendliness, character, and uprightness as being among the highest of human values, has joined in the chorus of praise showered on Mr. Farley since he made his valedictory and retired to private life. In submitting for the RECORD excerpts from an editorial printed in the Star on June 10 last, I am happy to present to the House and to the country a great newspaper's opinion of a great American, as follows:

JIM FARLEY STEPS FROM POLITICS

Big, kindly, canny James A. Farley, of New York, the man who won the 1932 Democratic Presidential nomination for Franklin Roosevelt by his practical and astute spadework with party leaders from precinct committeemen to State chairmen throughout the land, has bowed out of the political scene. He resigned Thursday as New York State Democratic chairman, the last of his prominent party affiliations.

Now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Sales Co., seeing to it that "cokes" get to our fighting men in all theaters of operation, he said business took all his time and, therefore, he was retiring from the political post.

Whatever the basic reasoning in his resignation, the country lost one of its most loved, one of its fairest and one of its most able politicians—not only of this period, but of all its history—when Jim Farley gave up the New York State chairmanship. And that's using the word politician in its very best sense—a real servant to the cause of honorable self-government by a vast people. As national party chairman and as Postmaster General, Mr. Farley has the highest esteem from the Nation. His has been a true personal contribution to the American scene—an example of what a politician should be. All Indiana offers him a handshake of good will for the future.

The United States Air Transport Command and the Chinese Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Merry-Go-Round of the Washington Post this morning appears a very important article on the war. I have had similar facts before me for some time. Mr. Drew Pearson has stated the situation so well that I do not believe any further elaboration is necessary. I quote the article:

Now that President Roosevelt has stepped up the pace of the drives against Japan, more attention is being given to the part which Chinese troops can play in the war. In this connection one of the most important unwritten chapters of the war now can be revealed—the part which Chinese troops and the United States Air Transport Command played in blocking the invasion of India.

At the time the Japs were driving into northern India last spring several thousand Chinese troops were flown into India and succeeded in stopping the onrushing Japs.

Day after day the British army had been pushed back, until the Japs menaced the Imphal rail line and seemed on the verge of spreading out into northern India. British-Indian troops had been powerless to stop the Jap advance. One year before, at Quebec, the advance through Burma had been announced and Lord Louis Mountbatten had been placed in charge. Instead of an advance through Burma, however, the Japs reversed the process.

In this emergency the United States Air Transport Command loaded several thousand Chinese soldiers into transport planes, flew them over "the hump" (the Himalayas, highest mountain range in the world), and dumped them down in northern India.

PACKING 'EM IN

The Chinese were packed into the planes in such numbers that they practically lay on top of each other. They were literally like sardines. Flying over 20,000 feet over the Himalayas they were without oxygen tanks, and numbers of them passed out. Unloaded in India, many were dragged from the plane unconscious, laid on the ground, and had to be revived.

However, given food and a week's rest, they bucked up and made admirable soldiers. They proved tough jungle fighters, which the British and Indian troops are not. Thus the Japs were stopped and the Assam Valley was saved.

Two facts stand out as a result of this hitherto untold chapter in the war. One was the amazing performance of the Air Transport Command, which flew in all kinds of weather over the most difficult terrain in the world. They took General Chennault's gasoline and flew it in reverse, not to aid China but to aid India.

The other was the example of what the Chinese troops could do in a pinch and what they might be able to do against Japan in north China if properly equipped and led.

Early in the war, before the Japs took Burma and Singapore, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek formally offered Chinese troops to Prime Minister Churchill to fight in India or any other place in the Orient. The offer was refused. The Chinese believed at the time that Churchill did not want Chinese troops in Burma, a country once part of China, which the Chinese sometimes talk about getting back.

CHINESE ON THE JOB

Since then the Chinese have done a great job in building the airports from which United States B-29's take off for the bombing of Japan. And with proper leadership and equipment many believe they could do an A-1 job in taking other objectives.

The final decision probably depends (1) on political factors; (2) on transportation. Regarding the latter, the Air Transport Command continues to perform miracles in carrying every drop of gasoline, all airplane parts, personnel, food, and every conceivable type of equipment to United States air bases in China.

As the enemy now full well knows—though the United States public may not—these transport planes now fly during the monsoon season, which the British previously said was impossible.

Mr. Speaker, I can only add that the American people have a right to be proud of our Air Transport Command and also that the confidence we have in the Chinese and our reliance upon them has not been misplaced. Given the tools with which to fight, the Chinese can utterly destroy every Japanese army on the soil of China. The present campaign in Burma to clear the Burma Road is a most strategic move. The way has been rough for us in this war because we were so peace loving that we forgot to defend ourselves. We are fast moving to a position where we, with our allies, command the offensive, and no more important offensive was ever undertaken than that of reestablishing the Burma Road.

B'nai B'rith Serves All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with its long-established policy of rendering service to humanity, B'nai B'rith organization, over 100 years old, is rendering an outstanding service to the men and women of the armed forces of this Nation.

I am happy to be a member of the B'nai B'rith war-service committee that is constantly planning and establishing the comforts of home to every man and woman away from home. I herewith include in my remarks an article about the B'nai B'rith hospitality house established at Los Angeles, Calif., which appeared in the Civilian Front on July 29, 1944:

"THIS GUY BENNY B'RITH" RATES TOPS WITH SERVICEMEN GUESTS OF FREE HOSPITALITY HOUSE

Los ANGELES.—The battle-scarred marine drawled, "I don't know this guy 'Benny B'rith'— but if he's the guy who gave me this, you can thank him for me." And a sailor from Kansas exclaimed, wide-eyed, "You mean all this is free? It doesn't cost me a cent? Geez!"

These were the words of the first two servicemen who registered last Christmas Eve at the B'nai B'rith Hospitality House in Los Angeles, the world's largest free servicemen's hotel. And with those words B'nai B'rith knew its idea to help relieve Los Angeles' servicemen's weekend housing problem worked.

A year ago the weekly influx to Los Angeles of tens of thousands of men in uniform on weekend leave from the many Army and Navy installations in California created a housing crisis of major proportions. Hotels and rooming houses were jammed and thousands of Uncle Sam's finest were compelled to sleep in hotel lobbies. doorways, on lawns, and sidewalks, and even against buildings and lamp posts.

B'nai B'rith, the Nation's largest Jewish service organization, decided the situation required action. The Hollywood Lodge of B'nai B'rith opened a small dormitory in Hollywood but that only scratched the surface of a real job. It was at that point that Phil Goldstone, a member of Los Angeles B'nai B'rith Lodge, owner of the Alexandria Hotel and the long vacant Alexandria Hotel Annex on Spring Street, offered B'nai B'rith the use of the latter building—rent, heat, and light free—for use as a free dormitory for servicemen.

The offer was promptly accepted and representatives of all B'nai B'rith groups in Los Angeles created the B'nai B'rith Hospitality House, Inc., with the sole purpose of providing a free dormitory for men of all branches of the armed forces, without distinction as to race, creed, or color. Eleven B'nai B'rith lodges now participate in financing and manning the dormitory, which has 500 beds.

Since the Hospitality House opened on Christmas Eve, 1943, over 14,000 sleepers have been accommodated on Friday and Saturday nights, the only nights the place is open. In addition a thousand more have slept or dozed on chairs and settees in the lobby.

The doors are open all night Friday and Saturday and servicemen drop in at any time during the night for coffee and doughnuts. Over 60,000 doughnuts with coffee have been served thus far.

B'nai B'rith men and women serve as volunteers every Friday and Saturday night in 2- or 3-hour shifts. Members of Aleph Zadik Aleph, B'nai B'rith's youth organization, serve at the snack bar, wash dishes, and do odd jobs.

Servicemen guests are permitted to sleep until noon unless they leave calls at the call desk. A checking system for extra clothing and a safe for valuables are provided. All men registering must present furlough or leave passes and list their service numbers.

Stationery is also provided free. Comfortable chairs, magazine racks, a game room are other features of the house.

One of its most unique features is a time clock manned throughout the night by B'nai B'rith volunteers. When each man registers he is asked when he wants to be called in the morning. Next to his name the time is indicated and if he has to catch an early train or make an early mass the B'nai B'rith men on duty are sure to call him in time.

But the most popular thing about the House is the clean bed with fresh white sheets and the showers. A large recreation room has been converted into an extra dormitory because the need for sleeping quarters was found more important than recreation.

The housing shortage is so acute that many men arriving at the House refuse coffee and doughnuts for fear of losing bunks assigned to them. Only when they are assured that their beds are secure and that no one else would get them do many boys relax in amazed relief.

A homesick corporal turned to one of the registrants and whispered hoarsely, "You know, this is the nicest thing that's happened to me since I joined the service. You guys are O. K."

And B'nai B'rith says that Uncle Sam's boys are O. K., too.

The Danger of the Falange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me on July 27, 1944, over Station WEVD, New York, N. Y.:

If we permit ourselves to forget, in purblind escapism, the meaning of all the danger signals that pointedly marked the road to World War No. 2, our inevitable victories on the continent and in Japan will prove hollow. Smashing the Fascist, Nazi, militaristic pattern in Germany, Italy, Japan and ignoring the same dread pattern in Spain which has extended to Argentina, Paraguay, Bolivia, and Chile would be like pulling out the weeds, but taking pains to leave the roots intact.

The political mentality of the Spanish Falange is Nazi. No Franco double-talk can make it otherwise. Deliver us, in the name of Allied ships sunk off Gibraltar, in the name of military secrets betrayed to the Axis through the work of Spanish embassies, in the name of wolfram, in the name of iron ore sent by Spain to feed Hitler's death machines, deliver us from Franco's neutrality.

We need not preen ourselves that our expensive wooing of Franco kept Spain neutral. Spain is neutral only because German militarists wished it so. (Churchill's kindly words about Spain notwithstanding.) Militarists planning a war do not overlook the possibility of defeat. A "Thousand-year reign," such as the Reich envisioned, is most scrupulously prepared for. If defeat should come again, the war machine must go underground for another try as it did in 1917. It is not for nothing that Marshal Goering said, "Spain is the key to two continents."

Thus, now that an Allied victory is imminent, it is well for Spain to make placatory gestures toward the Allies and at the same time to do the Axis' bidding. She has promised to cut down her wolfram shipments to Germany, but nothing has stopped her from sending 45,000 tons of iron ore a month to German-occupied territory. She has promised to withdraw the Spanish Blue Legion fighting against Russia on the eastern front, but nothing has stopped her from seeing that the Blue Legion is incorporated into the Nazi columns. The Falange militia is dissolved, Franco announced with braying trumpet, but the fact remains that the Falange militia was made part of the Spanish Army, thus strategically placing key positions in the hands of the Falange, and, most significantly, the appropriations to the Falange has been tripled this year. But the cunning hand of the German chess player is clearly visible. The gentleness of the Allies toward Spain is well marked. It is apparent that Franco Spain will not be crushed as will be Germany following an Allied victory. What a springboard for Germany's comeback.

Yes, what a springboard right into Latin America. The work of the Falange has been done very well indeed in Argentina. Step by step with the coup that put them in power in Argentina on June 4, 1943, the colonels' clique known as the G. O. U. (Grupo Officiales Unidos) has followed the antics of the Falange in Spain and the Nazi Party in Germany. Nor is that anything to marvel at. More than one-half the moneys appropriated to the Spanish Falange by the Spanish Government is earmarked for use in Latin America. It cannot be said that this money has been spent in vain. The administrations of ex-President Ramirez, of President Farrell, followed closely the Franco brand of neutrality. Riding high and handsome now is Col. Juan D. Peron, Argentina's Vice President, a member of the colonels' clique, who has steadily advanced forward and who is now rumored to be ready to replace Farrell. When accused of organizing labor and capital along totalitarian lines, Peron blatantly declared, "If the Nazis think along these lines, then the Nazis must be right."

The neutrality practices of Franco are assiduously aped by Argentina. True, after much pressure, Argentina enacted the farce of breaking relations with the Axis but the smuggling of vital war materials to Germany such as platinum, industrial diamonds, drugs (including insulin) continues. The violently anti-United States—anti-yanqui—newspapers are encouraged to vilify the northern neighbor. Although trade between Germany and South America has been ostensibly suspended, the big German trusts have kept up their interests in the Argentine markets and are making more money now than they did before the war. Upon the insistence of the United States, 38 German spies were arrested by the Argentine Government. Of the 38, 32 were released and 6 held because they prematurely confessed. It is interesting to note that the 6 who had to be held because of open confession have not been sentenced. German benevolent and cultural societies are permitted to function while all prodemocratic groups have been forbidden to assemble under any pretext whatsoever. Nazi-controlled newspapers receive without any difficulty added allotments of newsprint, but those of more liberal tinge are closely rationed. In fact, it has been said that if one wishes to know the next Argentine move, it is best to read the Nazi sheets circulated in Argentina.

The censorship of newspapers, radio, the theater and movies is stringent. Anti-Semitism is officially practiced. Notables in radio, science, the arts, and education have been withdrawn from their posts. Books of liberal slant are banned. Can parallels be more obvious between Argentina and regimes in Spain and Germany?

How did it all start? Well, there is the German General Wilhelm von Faupel, now head of the Ibero-American Institute in Berlin. A far-seeing institution, it created the overseas Falangist movement as the key to Fascist penetration in Latin America through the medium of the Spanish Falange.

And so Falange these many years has been busy selling Berlin to Latin America. As is pointed out by Allan Chase in his splendid book Falange. General von Faupel had an excellent background for such purpose. Until 1926, he was military counselor to the

Inspector General of the Argentine Army when he left to take the same post in Brazil; from whence he departed to serve as Inspector General of the Peruvian Army, before his return to Germany. Von Faupel knows his Latin America well, you may be sure.

If we are still persuaded that the Falange is a purely internal affair of Spain and "none of our business," what have we to say to the declaration of Mexico's attorney general? "During 7 years," he said, "sinarquism has spread among the peasants the ideas, programs, and norms of conduct of the Spanish Government based on falangism and fascism, disturbing public order and clandestinely urging the Mexican Army and people to revolt against the Government. Up to the present, sinarquism limited itself to the organization of a potential force for the conquest of power, but articles published in El Sinarquista reveal that they believe themselves ready to take control of the Government." Let it be noted that this statement was made as late as July 8, 1944.

All about us seeps through the evidence that Franco's Falange is widening its orbit. Serious charges have been leveled against a pro-Franco group that has worked its way into the government-in-exile of the Philippine Commonwealth. Nor have we forgotten the congratulatory notes sent by Franco to Jose Laurel, puppet head of the Japanese-held Philippines.

Throughout Latin America, especially Paraguay, Bolivia, Chile, as well as Argentina, in a soil made ready by the Falange, German industry has planted its economic stronghold. From control of a country's economy to control of its government is not too big a step to contemplate. Regardless of what happens to Hitler, industrialists of the Reich are prepared to "carry on" Germany's destiny. Twenty-six hundred German firms, officially blacklisted both by the United States and England, thrive in Latin America. In Argentina, the blacklist is not recognized by the Government. Through operations carried out through Spain, the investments of Germany in Latin America are increased. Germans have their say in such financial pies as the public utilities, the electrical and building fields, and the arms production in the Argentine. Operating in Buenos Aires are the Banco Aleman Trans-atlantico and the Banco Germanico, German-dominated cartels such as the Siemens-Schukert, I. G. Farben, and Bayer drugs shovel in their huge profits in Argentina merrily. In addition to those openly operated, hundreds of other cover-up or straw-front German businesses exist. It is most certainly a beautiful field day for fifth columnists.

Chile, although it severed relations, still allows the Banco Aleman Transatlantico and Banco Germanico to continue. Interests like the A. E. G., the electrical trust, are in German hands. In Uruguay, the big importing houses like Kurt Berger and Merck Chemical still have their way.

Bolivia, as one of the chief Nazi centers, has within its borders all kinds of Nazi enterprises. Paraguay, of course, with its Axis sympathies, has many a German industrial outfit. Colombia and Venezuela are not neglected by German firms. It is not a picture to be lightly viewed and then put aside.

Last month we recalled Norman Armour, United States Ambassador to Buenos Aires. The day before yesterday Buenos Aires announced the recall of Adrian Escobar, Argentine Ambassador to the United States. Allied victories on the Continent have not resulted in the cessation of pro-Axis activities within Argentina any more than they did in Spain, in spite of Spain's promises and in spite of the Argentine so-called break in diplomatic relations with Germany and Japan. To the present governing heads of Spain and Argentina, the defeat of Germany is merely a hope deferred. There will be much work to be done after the war to raise the German banner again.

So Franco and his Falange dream. Undoubtedly the Reich's master minds have watched with deep satisfaction the poisonous tentacles of the Falange reaching forth to corrupt and destroy. The Reich's investment in the Spanish civil war has paid high dividends.

Our coddling of Spain must cease. We must recognize that Spain is an Axis Nation, that Spain is dedicated to the onerous purposes of the Axis, and that in defeating the Axis our victory remains a half measure unless Franco Spain is crushed along with its begetters. A democratic Spain must be our goal. Let us be sure this time.

Secretary of State Hull deserves highest commendation for the forthright statement condemning the Fascist Government of Argentina. That statement was long due. The pro-Axis Fascist clique under Farrell and Peron, now in control of Argentina, is endeavoring to spread the Axis doctrine throughout pan America.

Our duty in Argentina is plain. We must smash the Axis there as we are smashing it in Europe. It is insufficient to provide for diplomatic isolation. It must be implemented by an iron-clad quarantine. Our attitude must be firm and hard. We must isolate Argentina completely. To this end, we need the active cooperation of Great Britain. However, with heavy investments in Argentina, the British may be loath to take such steps. Her trade with Argentina gains while ours declines, but Britain must be made to see the light. She must refrain from importing wool, beef, wheat, and corn, and we must refrain from importing Argentine cheese, vegetable oil, corn, turkeys, and other foods. Both America and Britain may have to tighten belts. We should preclude the shipment of newsprint from Sweden, which Peron gives to Nazi publications but denies to pro-Allied papers. We must deny Argentina access to iron and steel for her huge armament program. I wager that if Great Britain, with the cooperation of the United States, would completely refuse navicerts and build an economic wall around Argentina, the Farrell-Peron regime would crumble in a fortnight. The unprecedented Argentine prosperity upon which Farrell and Peron have built their Nazi citadel would collapse.

Justice to Our Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 5185, which provides disability benefits for members of the armed forces who are discharged on account of disabilities that were declared to exist by the draftee or inductee at the induction center or which were revealed by the induction examination.

In my handling of veterans' claims I have encountered many cases of obvious injustice which this bill will correct. Men who are known to have a history of disabilities are taken into the service, nevertheless, and when later they are discharged they are denied disability benefits with the curt explanation that they had the disability before they were taken into the service. This simply is not right. If the induction authorities are given fair notice that a preinduction disability existed it does not lie in good conscience for the Government to say after the man's disability has grown worse and he is thrown out of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, "You are not entitled to relief because you had the disability before you entered the service." If the Government accepts a man because it regards him as a good physical risk it should stand by its bargain and in all fairness accord to him as generous treatment as it extends to all other men who are taken into the service.

The bill introduced by me is as follows:

Section 1. In any case where a man on his induction or enlistment in any of the armed services notifies the authorities at the induction center that he has had a case history of a certain specified ailment or that he is suffering from a certain specified disability, or when the induction examination reveals that he has such an ailment, or disability, and when later, after he has been taken into the service, said ailment or disability or some development or outgrowth of said ailment or disability becomes evident to the extent that it becomes necessary to discharge said man, the said ailment or disability shall be assumed to have been aggravated by service and said man shall be entitled to be paid disability benefits at the usual disability compensation rates.

SEC. 2. If a draftee or enlistee at the time of his enlistment or induction deliberately and deceitfully and by untruthful testimony conceals a disability he shall not be entitled to the benefits of this act.

Enough Water in the Missouri if Stored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesaay, August 16, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, most of the questions about handling the Missouri River floods, and use of its waters, turn on the question of how much water would be available.

The Missouri River States Committee, composed of the Governors of nine States in the Missouri Valley, and other appointee members in those States, created a subcommittee of the several State engineers to make a determination on this point.

Their report has been completed and I am glad to say that their conclusion is that there is an adequate water supply for all contemplated uses, if a proper system of storage reservoirs is constructed.

Under permission given by the House, I include for the RECORD the report of this engineering subcommittee and commend it to the attention of all who are interested in solving the flood problems of the Missouri Valley and of converting the water from destructive to constructive uses.

REPORT OF THE ENGINEERING SUBCOMMITTEE TO THE MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE

Pursuant to the resolution adopted by the Missouri River States Committee on March 14, 1944, your subcommittee submits the following report.

Meetings of the subcommittee were held on April 20, at Omaha, Nebr., and on May 2-4, inclusive, at Washington, D. C. At these meetings conferences were had with the United States Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation engineers, and engineers of the United States Geological Survey. On May 22 the subcommittee convened at Omaha for the preparation of this report.

WATER SUPPLY

The longest record of stream flow in the basin is that on the Missouri River, at Fort Benton, Mont., 1882–1943. The discharge of the Yellowstone River has been computed by the Army engineers for the period 1898 to 1943 by the use of records obtained for shorter periods at Livingston, Glendive, Intake, and Sidney, Mont. While there are short records at various points prior to 1929, no general program of stream gaging along the main river below the mouth of the Yellowstone was started until that year. With few exceptions these records, compiled by the United States Geological Survey, are now available for the 1929–43 period.

By the use of such data the Army Engineers compute the average annual run-off of the Missouri at Yankton, S. Dak., to be 23,050,000 acre-feet (equivalent to 31,800 cubic feet per second) for the period 1898 to 1943, inclusive. Using the 12-year period, 1931 to 1942, inclusive, the Bureau of Reclamation computes the average annual run-off at Yankton to be 14,935,000 acre-feet (equivalent to 20,600 cubic feet per second). For this same period the Army engineers' figures shown an average of 15,536,000 acre-feet per year (equivalent to 21,440 cubic feet per second), arrived at by correcting Yankton discharges for evaporation and storage at Fort Peck Reservoir.

It is the opinion of your subcommittee that neither the 1898–1943 period nor the 1931-1942 period accurately reflects the amount of water that, with regulation by storage, can reasonably be made available for use.

As to the longer period, the record at Fort Benton, and that on the Red River at Grand Forks, N. Dak., both available since 1882, show that water supplies in the Missouri and in the adjacent Red River Basins during the three or four decades prior to 1942 had undergone downward trends of large proportions. In this period the Red River, unaffected by irrigation, declined from an average of 2,500,000 acre-feet per year for the 10-year period 1901–1910 to 490,000 acre-feet per year for the 10-year period 1929–1938, a decline of 80 percent. Beginning its decline somewhat later, the upper Missouri water supply declined from an average of 7,556,000 acre-feet per year for the 10-year period 1908–1917, to an average of 3,716,000 for the 1929–1938 period, a decline of 51 percent. According to United States Census figures, the larger part of the present irrigation development in the upper Missouri Basin took place prior to 1919. Concerning the shorter period, it embraces essentially what is known as the drought period of the thirties, including 11 successive years of unprecedentedly low-water supply. To use a much longer period than that over which it might be possible to provide regulation by storage, or to start a shorter period with the beginning of a term of dry years without the benefit of accumulated storage, does not, in the opinion of your subcommittee, reflect the amount of water that can, with reasonable regularity, be made available with the storage, which both Federal agencies propose to construct in the Missouri Basin.

Using the 30-year period, 1914–1943, an average annual water supply at Yankton of 21,898,000 acre-feet (equivalent to 30,228 cubic feet per second) is taken from compilations supplied by the Army engineers. There is an average annual gain of 575,000 acre-feet between Yankton and Sioux City. When this is added to the average annual water supply at Yankton, the subcommittee finds an average annual water supply at Sioux City, the proposed head of navigation of 22,473,000 acre-feet per year.

We believe that reservoir storage in the basin can be provided which could effect reasonable regulation between wet and dry periods.

IRRIGATION REQUIREMENTS

The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that above Sioux City, Iowa, there is now a total of 2,265,600 acres irrigated and their plan proposes to irrigate an additional 3,576,000 acres in that area. In the entire Missouri River Basin the Bureau estimates that there are now irrigated 5,027,700 acres and it proposes to develop an additional 4,760,000 acres. They estimate the annual consumptive use of water on land now irrigated, including evaporation from reservoirs, to be 8,000,000 acre-feet, of which 3,600,000 acre-feet are consumed above Sioux City, Iowa. This amounts to about 14 percent of the total undepleted water supply of the basin above Sioux City. They estimate annual consumptive use in the entire basin for new development to be 9,000,000 acre-feet, of which 6,800,000 acre-feet will be consumed above Sioux City. These estimates appear to be the best information available.

NAVIGATION REQUIREMENTS

The Army engineers in 1932 estimated the minimum flow for an 8–9-foot channel as 30,000 cubic feet per second during the navigation season (240 days—14,281,000 acre-feet). They now state that this figure must be considered as an assumption made solely as a basis for hypothetical operation studies. They advise present indications are that, during the wetter years, characterized by frequent flash rises from tributary streams entering below Sioux City, more water will be required for maintaining a navigable channel than during the drier years.

They also advise that the regulation of stream flow both on the main stem and on the major tributaries, which will be afforded with the completion of the proposed reservoirs, will tend to control the adverse effects of the variable climatic factors, and that the river improvement works, which are to be constructed to further contract the navigation channel, will enable an increase in channel depths to be secured without an increase in demand on the flow of the river. This improvement would be obtained by revetment of banks, construction of permeable dikes to contract and stabilize the waterway, cut-offs to eliminate long bends, closing of minor channels, removal of snags, and dredging as required.

SANITATION REQUIREMENTS

Quoting from a United States Public Health Service report, the United States Army engineers advised that sewage from a population of 1,205,000, and industrial wastes with a population equivalent of 2,375,000, making a total of 3,580,000, are produced on the Missouri River and lower reaches of tributaries. They estimate winter low flow requirements for pollution control during normal winters to be 5,500 cubic feet per second at Yankton, S. D., and 8,000 cubic feet per second below Kansas City, Mo., 5,500 cubic feet per second for 125 days (nonnavigation season) amounts to 1,364,000 acre-feet.

LOCATION OF LEVEES

The proposed levees would be constructed, in general, along the high banks of the river with 3,000 to 5,000 feet of floodway between them. The width of the channel between existing river improvement works varies from 700 feet at Sioux City to 1,100 feet near the mouth. The proposed levees would not reduce the width of the improved channel and, therefore, would not directly reduce the amount of water required for navigation. Although the flood-control reservoirs will, in general, result in a more uniform flow of the river, it is not believed that any material reduction in the width of the river will be practicable. At least, at this time, it is considered inadvisable to assume that any appreciable saving in the amount of water required for navigation will be effected by this means.

Appendix I, showing maps and charts to accompany report, on review of reports of House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, second session, and House Document No. 821, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, on flood control, main stem of Missouri River, Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth, indicates the height and location of levees, and areas to be protected.

CONCLUSION

After a complete examination of the reports of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, it is the conclusion of your subcommittee that these agencies have each in their sphere accomplished in a complete and comprehensive manner the tasks assigned to them, and, together, their reports constitute a sound basis for the development of the Missouri River Basin. If it should appear that under certain circumstances there might be possible conflicts in use of water it must be remembered that both agencies recognize that their plans constitute a broad framework, and that details are to be worked out during the years of the development period, through the coordinated and cooperative efforts of Federal and State agencies and local interests.

Time will indicate more accurately the quantities of water required for the various uses in the basin. At this time the Bureau of Reclamation cannot determine definitely the acreage that ultimately will be irrigated, nor when complete irrigation development will be accomplished, nor what the ultimate consumptive use of water will be. Likewise, the Army engineers cannot determine definitely the amount of water required to maintain a navigation channel.

As construction proceeds and details are developed, your subcommittee believes that the States of the basin, through the Missouri River States Committee, or a similar agency to succeed it, should continue active, and thus work with the Federal agencies throughout the period of development of the basin.

Respectfully submitted.

Colorado, C. L. Patterson; Iowa, L. A. Winter; Kansas, Geo. S. Knapp; Missouri, R. E. Duffy; Montana, Fred E. Buck; Nebraska, Wardner G. Scott; North Dakota, J. J. Walsh;[1] South Dakota, Dean W. Loucks; Wyoming, L. C. Bishop.

OMAHA, NEBR., *May 25, 1944.*

[1] Edward Booth attended in place of J. J. Walsh.

Pertinent Observations Bearing on the Coming Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

IT WILL BE NO PUSH-OVER

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the national conventions have been held, candidates selected, and issues made clear.

The opening guns of the campaign have been fired. A real battle is in prospect, a regular knock-down and drag-out battle with no punches barred. When Harrison Spangler, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, said "Anyone we nominate will be elected," he was indulging in a bit of wishful thinking. The Roosevelt forces are still formidable and practically intact. The Republican leaders must not overlook the horde of Federal office holders, some 3,000,000 of them, scattered all over the United States. They number more than three times as many as the total of all State employees, and they have been placed largely in key states, such as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, New Jersey, and California—where they can be the most effective. These Federal pay rollers will be out on the front lines fighting to hold on to their jobs. Nor dare the Republican leaders underestimate the strength of the Hillman Political Action Committee and its communistic affiliates.

According to advance estimates, the Republicans have only a 50–50 chance at this writing. However, they have selected a well-balanced ticket and adopted a forthright platform, not patterned after New Deal philosophy, as it was in 1940. The American voter this November is to be given a clean-cut choice—something he did not have in the last Presidential campaign. He is going to be told in no uncertain words that the Republican Party is for America and the American people, and that our first duty is to our own country and our own people. The Republicans cannot hope to outdo Roosevelt in playing the role of world Santa Claus. Republicans should preach the doctrine that the salvation of America lies in an independent judiciary, in our American system of private enterprise, and in unhampered creative toil. They should take issue with the New Deal philosophy that the less we produce the more we will have, and "we need not worry about the national debt because we owe it to ourselves." The Republican Party should stage an aggressive campaign that will make clear to the American people the vital issues that are to be settled in the November election. The voters then can make their choice between New Deal collectivism on the one hand and the American system of economy on the other—as we have known it and prospered under it for the past 160 years.

A WIN-THE-PEACE ADMINISTRATION

Plans for the post-war world have been made and are in the making. These post-war plans cover world financial agreements, a world food set-up, world relief agencies, world air-transportation agreements, and a world organization to preserve peace. All of these post-war plans—before they can go into effect—must be written into law and must win the approval of the Congress. Because of this situation the next Congress and the next occupant of the White House must work together cooperatively, with perfect teamwork, if these enormous world problems are to be solved and settled right; otherwise there will be world chaos.

In 1919 Woodrow Wilson had his plans made for the post-war world, but unfortunately he did not take the Congress into his confidence. He did not sell his post-war international program to the Members of Congress, but simply said, in effect, "Here it is. This is what I want. You place your stamp of approval upon it." The Congress balked. There was no cooperation or teamwork between the Congress and the White House and a world depression resulted. Will history repeat itself? Will 1945 be 1919 all over again? The answer is obvious. It depends entirely upon whether there will be perfect teamwork and cooperation between the White House occupant and the Congress next year and the years following. We must elect this fall a "Win-the-Peace" administration. The responsibility rests squarely upon the American voter.

THE WORLD MONETARY CONFERENCE

The World Monetary Conference held at Bretton Woods, N. H., has completed its work and gone home. Tentative plans have been agreed upon to achieve world monetary stabilization in the post-war era by the establishment of an international monetary fund of eight to ten billion dollars, and also a world bank of $10,000,000,000, of which the United States will furnish about half, with the rest of the world furnishing the other half. Fortunately, however, these tentative plans must be submitted to the Congress for approval and passage in the form of laws. This canot be done before the next Congress meets in January. It is highly probable that a revised plan or even a new plan may be adopted, such as the plan already submitted by Congressman CHARLES DEWEY, of Illinois. Public hearings will be held by the appropriate committees of the Congress before any action is taken.

This is just one more very important matter, the outcome of which hinges upon the November election.

A BACKWARD LOOK

The Big Three of World War No. 1 sat around the peace table to arrange a "permanent and lasting peace." England was represented by Lloyd George, who had two objectives—to maintain the balance of power in Europe and to acquire more territory for the British Empire. France was represented by Clemenceau, who had only one objective—to make France safe. The United States was represented by Woodrow Wilson, who also had one objective—to establish permanent world peace. Because of these conflicting objectives a compromise was agreed upon, the Treaty of Versailles, the terms of which prevented the accomplishment of any of these objectives. England, France, and the United States, therefore, lost the peace after winning the war. This failure at Versailles brought on, and was the direct cause of, World War No. 2. Why the failure?

President Wilson was an idealist. He expressed his idealism in his Fourteen Points. He was a tired, worn-out, sick man, in no condition to match the brilliance of Lloyd George or the stubbornness of Clemenceau. He lost his fight "to make the world safe for democracy" because he did not pin down England and France to a post-war program during the war, but waited until after Germany had collapsed and the armistice had been signed. England and France, out of danger after the collapse of Germany, were a different England and France to deal with than they would have been when they were on the verge of defeat at the hands of Germany, dependent entirely upon the United States for the help needed to win. Wilson missed his opportunity. He did not use his advantage when he had it. Will history repeat itself? Will a tired, worn-out, sick idealist be outmaneuvered at the coming peace table—this time by Stalin and Churchill—because he also failed to pin down his Allies to a post-war world program while the war was going on and before Germany collapsed?

THE ST. LOUIS CONFERENCE

Tom Dewey, at St. Louis, took 25 governors and welded them into a vote-getting machine that promises to become the most efficient and effective the Republican Party has had since the election of 1896. This feat in itself proves that he is Presidential timber, and demonstrates his ability as an organizer. In the face of handicaps—irritations and ruffled feelings from the previous Governors Conference held at Hershey, Pa.—Dewey was successful in winning the confidence of all 25 Governors and also the assurance of their active, aggressive, whole-hearted support in the fall campaign. In handling the controversial subject of States' rights against Federal control, Dewey proposed a program of Federal-State collaboration in the solution of all post-war problems, unemployment compensation, reconversion, public works, labor standards, and so forth, that completely satisfied the Governors and promises to make that group a much more potent force in national affairs that they have ever before been. The St. Louis conference was a very successful one. It places the Republican Party in an advantageous position for the coming campaign.

FOUR FORCES FOR FOURTH TERM

With 3,000,000 Federal jobholders interested in holding their jobs; with Hillman's P. A. C. and its fund of several million dollars dedicated to a fourth term; with the big city machines and their Kelly-Hague bosses lined up for a fourth term; and with every Communist and Communist-controlled labor group in America supporting President Roosevelt for a fourth term, his reelection this fall is certain unless the American people as a whole—Republicans and Democrats alike—become aroused to their danger and do something about it. These four groups constitute the fourth term shock troops upon whom the President depends for victory. These forces have taken possession of the party in power and will dominate its campaign activ-

ities. If successful in their purpose to reelect President Roosevelt for a fourth term they will be in a position to dominate our post-war economy beyond the dreams of the most ardent radicals 10 years ago. These four groups are for a fourth term, but not for the "four freedoms."

OUR COMMANDER IN CHIEF

President Roosevelt by constitutional provision is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy during peace as well as during war. He claims to be, but is not and never has been, Commander in Chief of the American people; in fact, he is the duly elected servant of the American people. Every President we have ever had except three—Washington, Jackson, and Grant—has been a civilian, knowing nothing at first-hand about war, war strategy, or war aims. Roosevelt is no exception to this rule. No President ever before assumed to call himself Commander in Chief of the American people. No President ever before considered himself indispensable. Every President before Roosevelt acknowledged by his action in stepping out at the close of two terms that he was dispensable.

POST-WAR LEND-LEASE

This Nation is faced with the question, Shall Uncle Sam continue lend-lease to England and Russia after the war? That is a question that must be answered "Yes" or "No." Our public debt today is three times the public debt of England. The Russian public debt is not known because of state control and state ownership of all the means of production under the Russian economic system. England wants lend-lease continued after the war to support Britain's domestic economy. This would save England from going deeper into debt and stave off a serious depression the English anticipate, but it would sink us deeper into debt to the tune of several billion dollars each year. Congress is still in control of the purse strings of the Nation and can refuse next June to extend lend-lease. Therefore the question, Shall lend-lease be continued after the war? will be settled by the next Congress, the Congress that will be elected this November.

High Standards for the Egg Industry in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the situation in New Jersey which confronts the poultrymen, as a result of an order of the War Food Administration.

The State of New Jersey, by legislative action, has defined what a fresh egg is, and, acting under such legislation, the egg industry has reached a high state of efficiency, and the public has benefitted materially. Under the new regulations and the price ceiling established by the O. P. A., a large part of the effectiveness of these standards will be destroyed and the public is the loser.

The State of New Jersey is being penalized for its foresight in establishing high standards for the egg industry. Manifestly this is unfair, and I trust will have the consideration of the Food Administration. However, action on the part of the poultrymen in defiance of these regulations is hard to condone, and it is to be hoped that calm judgment will resolve the matter in a better way.

Nevertheless, this matter brings the question of States' rights very forcibly to the foreground, and the interests of the country demand that States' rights be preserved. The following editorial, appearing in the Asbury Park Evening Press, for Tuesday, August 15, entitled "Fight This Egg Order," is very much to the point. This newspaper enjoys a large circulation in Monmouth County, N. J., and represents the thinking of the people of that community.

I commend the editorial to the Members of Congress for their reading:

FIGHT THIS EGG ORDER

The decision of the Federal Government to impose its own inspection and grading of eggs on New Jersey producers offers conclusive proof of how Federal bureaucracy not only invades States' rights but works against the interests of producers and consumers.

New Jersey is the only State which defines a fresh egg by law. As a result, its egg standards have been raised, and the public has been protected. Moreover, eggs of highest quality have commanded a premium, because the consumer can be certain that he gets what he pays for.

Other States have been lax in establishing or enforcing standards which are lower than New Jersey's, and because of this the War Food Administration has issued an order which would eliminate the "New Jersey fancy" grade of eggs, now commanding a premium of 2 cents a dozen over O. P. A.'s highest price for grade A eggs, and substitute what will be known as "U. S. special" grade. Under the order New Jersey egg markets would have to employ Federal inspectors to retain the premium price already established by the State's own standards.

New Jersey is thus penalized because of the failure of other States to take the steps which this State took far in advance of price control. Moreover, New Jersey is not given credit for an egg grading and inspection system which has successfully served the public. There is no legal relief from the order, which leaves resistance as the one means of combating Federal invasion of the New Jersey egg business.

The directors of the principal egg auction markets in New Jersey have voted to defy this order which became effective yesterday. It is a serious matter to take such a step, and the directors must realize they face a difficult battle. By their action they have become champions of States' rights, and as such they should have the full support of consumers as well as the assistance of their State government.

Behold the Tabernacle of God With Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following sermon preached at the golden jubilee mass of Sacred Heart Parish, Lynn, Mass., June 18, 1944, by Rev. John J. Wright, S. T. D.:

Today we celebrate, with gratitude to God, the creation of this parish 50 years ago on June 13, 1894. The beginnings were modest, and the first pastor, Father Denis Sullivan, could scarcely have dreamed at that time the beauty of the glorious temple that was destined to be dedicated in September 1912 by our late Cardinal Archbishop.

Even in this brief span of years—for 50 years are not so many in the life of the ancient church—how rich are the memories which have clustered around this parish. What force for good has radiated from it into the life of this diocese and of this civil community. How great a debt is owed this altar and this pulpit for public honesty and civic loyalty learned here, for family discipline and personal sanctity fostered here and preached, for faith and hope and charity nurtured here and practiced. How many personal memories, wonderful medleys of experiences human and divine, must by now take their concrete form from the material features of this church Holy memories of moments we most yearn to recapture, of communions worthily received, of graces almost sensibly perceived, thousands of men and women recall all these in terms of this church and of its sanctuaries. Tender memories, for those whose marriages were sanctified here and their children christened; secret memories of hope reborn and joy recaptured will hallow forever the confessionals of this church for some; sweet memories and sad, confided to no man, will always bring to certain of you the vision of these shrines, hushed by the whispered hopes and fears and holy confidences of the sons and daughters of this parish; bitter memories, now almost made palatable by a sacred savor given them at this altar, for those whose beloved dead were brought here for the last prayers of this parish and the last blessings of its priests. Memories of holiness, memories of happiness, memories of Christ.

Christ Himself might be considered the founder of parish life. "Wherever two or three are gathered in My name, there am I in the midst of them"—so spoke Jesus Christ. Now every parish is essentially a group of souls gathered in the name of Jesus, gathered about a tabernacle in the care of a priest, a tabernacle in which Jesus dwells under the sacramental species of the Eucharist. The parish is the normal point of contact between Jesus Christ and His faithful. Parish life is the ordinary means by which we become citizens of and active in the Kingdom of Christ on earth, the church. The parish, with its pastor and priests, its altar, its confessional, its pulpit, its schools, its good works, its sinners and saints, is a microcosm; it is the whole church in miniature, and through it Christ does for a limited community what He founded the universal church to do for all the world. Through it, a group of the faithful, in a corner of the world, do for Christ what all the transcendent church; in heaven, in purgatory,

and on earth, does for Him throughout creation. Christ is adored in the parish liturgy; Christ is preached in the parish pulpit; Christ is praised by the parish choirs; Christ is meditated in the parish convent; Christ is imitated, reproduced, in all the mysteries of His life, by the hidden lives of unknown parish saints, by the public zeal of parish workers, by the sufferings of the parish sick.

The parish priest, custodian of the keys of the parish tabernacle, is, in miniature, Peter himself, custodian, as vicar of Christ, of the keys of heaven. That is why there is no need for a man ever to leave his parish, in life or in death, in order to receive from the church everything needed in order to bring him from earth to heaven. When a child is brought to the parish church to be baptized, his parish priest does not inquire what he seeks of the parish or of its priest, but rather "What dost thou ask of the church of God?", as if the parish priest were prepared to give in his local church whatever of faith and of life everlasting the child might expect to receive from the total church, everywhere. Only in material terms—in point of territory and the mere measurements of area and population—is there a distinction between the parish and the church. Only materially is the parish a portion of the church. Spiritually, the parish is the church, the whole church. Just as the entire Christ is present in any consecrated particle of the Eucharist, so the church is present and at work in any canonically erected parish, however fragmentary. There is a sense, familiar to every Catholic, in which the church is Christ; there is also a sense in which the parish is the church, the whole church, the church in miniature.

The history of the parish in the life of the church suggests how this is true. The parish has come to be a definite territory, with a church under the direction of a priest, to which the faithful of a particular area belong; but the parish is a late development in the church. In the very beginnings of the apostolic church there was, of course, but one flock, gathered timorously about the apostles at Jerusalem. Scattered by the winds of Pentecost, however, the apostles left Jerusalem to catholicize the church, to render Jesus Christ and His redemption universal. Wherever they went they founded new cenacles, patterned on that at Jerusalem, new tablernacles, multiplying the presence of Christ throughout the world. Because these apostles were bishops, the first territorial divisions made in the church were dioceses. They were founded and ruled by those who, together with St. Peter, had received at once the priesthood and the episcopate. Peter, bound forever to Christ, was the bond which united among themselves these several and scattered sees of the single church—the church. Between the faithful and the church, there was but one intermediary—the bishop. Peter was jealous of his flock, committed to him by Christ's double charge, and he did not wish the distance between him and them to become too great. He wished his voice to reach the furthermost boundaries of the believing world echoed by the bishops, but without other overtones or the accents of other voices. And so the primitive dioceses had each but one church, the cathedral; each one baptistry, one altar, one pulpit. The diocese was then a parish, and the bishop was its parish priest.

But the flock grew great; as Christ had foretold; the grain of mustard seed grew and multiplied, reproducing itself a thousandfold. Into the towns and villages the news of redemption spread like wildfire, and everywhere men gathered to thank God for it and to insure the perpetual presence of its channels in their midst. Then the bishops became obliged to delegate to auxiliaries some part, at least, of the mandate they had received from Peter, as Peter from Christ and Christ from the Father. And so priests, hitherto cocelebrants at mass around the altar of the bishop, assistants around his throne, received from the bishops, while remaining still subject to them, power to offer mass at local altars, to bless and forgive and preach and baptize in local churches. These priests received a portion of territory with a group of faithful, and on the territory thus assigned them they built a church which was to be an image of the cathedral, as the cathedral had been an image of the original cenacle, as the cenacle had been an image of heaven. Thus was the parish born.

Four elements, then, blend in the notion of a parish: Territory, people, priest, and church. Of these, territory is first because in it all other elements, physical and spiritual, nonhuman and human, have their roots. Out of its territory, its mere earth, comes the water which cancels, through the sacrament of baptism, the sin inherited by the children of the parish, and puts to flight, when blessed in sacramentals, the spirits hostile to the parish life. Out of its land, in symbol at least, comes the wheat which, made into bread, gives place to the body of Christ in the eucharist; out of land come the wine, the olives, the oils which sanctify in the sacramental life of the parish, which strengthen and save its members. Out of its land come the flowers which make glad its altars, the materials with which its church is constructed and adorned. Thus, mere land, mere matter, comes to share in the ends and the purposes of the parish, the ends of the church, the purposes of God.

The second element is the people: The souls of the parish, as the ancient idiom of the faithful calls them, the parishioners. In the life of the church parishioners and brethren are interchangeable terms. The prayer at the parish altar or in parish devotions pro fratribus nostris absentibus—for our absent brethren—means a prayer for our absent parishioners, and it is on the parish as a family of brethren that the priest calls down the blessing of God when, in the liturgy, he prays: "Respice quaesumus, Domine, super hanc familiam—look down, we beg Thee, O Almighty God, on this Thy family." The domestic spirit of the parish is never more manifest than on Sunday, the day reserved to God, and of all days the most typically parochial. On that feast and in the liturgy of the parish mass the people carry on, as it were, a family conversation with their priest, following his every movement at the family table, the parish altar, with their reverent gaze; answering "So be it. * * * Amen," to all the supplications he makes in their name; answering "Et cum Spiritu tuo * * * to you, with us," to all his paternal good wishes; striking their breasts in humility of spirit with him whenever he does so in their name; bowing their heads together with him whenever he names their Elder Brother, Jesus their Saviour; and suddenly growing silent as he pauses in the mass to recall the names of their living and their dead.

The parish priest is the third element in the notion of the parish, for of this family he is the father. If the voices with which our children speak echo the accents of their earthly fathers, the thoughts their voices learn to speak echo the teachings of the spiritual fathers who are their priests. At every stage of their lives they seek him out and he them. With the dawn of reason and the possibility of revolt from God, he is present to guide them Godward and to nourish them with God Himself. In the crises of adolescence he prepares them for the strengthening and the confirmation in the faith which the bishop comes to his parish to bring. On the threshold of maturity he fosters in them their vocations, and whatever these may be has paternal part in them, whether it be as official witness to their weddings, or as their responsible directors towards the priesthood or other consecrated lives. And while his people in their fields or shops, at home or abroad, wage their unrelenting battle of life, their parish priest, like Moses on the hill of Raphidim, lifts his arms unceasingly in prayer for them. More powerful is he than Moses as he intercedes for them, for Moses held in his hands the symbol of God's power, but our priest holds in his hands the God of power Himself.

Last of the elements in the notion of the parish is the parish church itself. If the parish is a family of which the parish priest is the father, the parish church is its house, its hearth, and home. All the little rites and observances of a domestic life take place within its walls, with God Himself made at home, so to speak, within it. All of the houses in which Jesus dwelt during His life on earth, all of the homes made holy by His presence, have their little history renewed in the liturgical life of the parish year. Bethlehem, Nazareth, Cana, Bethany, the Cenacle, Emmaus—all these dwelling places where God found hospitality when He visited our earth, are reconstructed one by one to house Him mystically in the parish church.

And mystically, once more, for their little time each year, there gathers about the same Divine Guest the ancient family of the faithful, numbering like shepherds to those of Bethlehem, like Wise Men to those from the East, like Apostles to those of Galilee, new Marthas and other Marys, Lazarus again and Zaccheus, and all the others whose homes were ever houses for the Lord Jesus find their counterparts within the walls of the house of God that is the parish church. With all the ancient needs, the timeless tears, the unceasing petitions, the same gratitude, the same joy, the same faith, the Catholic people find in the parish church their home, the House of God among men.

Oh! my parish church! Not even death can separate me from thy love. The liturgy offered within thy walls will always include me in its supplications. If anything on this devastated earth has made me dream of heaven, it is what I have seen and heard and felt in the moments when I visited Thee. If the paradise in which I believe will one day confirm for me the faith by which I have believed, I owe it to the things which were done to me and taugh me under thy roof. Small wonder, then, that I love thee, O my parish church. For the life I first learned to live in thee is the undying life that I will live in heaven, if I be faithful to thee. The gate of heaven is the door to thy temple; the key to heaven is the key to thy tabernacle; the joy of heaven is the possession forever of that God whom first we found on earth at home within thy holy walls.

Making Idleness Blissful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am including as an extension of remarks an editorial appearing in the Brattleboro Reformer of Monday, August 14, 1944.

The editor strips the flesh off the Kilgore-Murray-C. I. O. bill and exposes the grinning skeleton of proposed further unlimited wasting of the hard-earned dollars of the taxpayer in a vain attempt to spend this country into post-war prosperity under a government of men and not of laws.

It certainly is an exposé worth reading. Here it is:

MAKING IDLENESS BLISSFUL

The Kilgore-Murray-C. I. O. bill for reconverting industry, and for unemployment compensation and other benefits to labor, points up the real issue between the New Deal party seeking a fourth term for President Roosevelt and the supporters of the Republican nominee, Governor Dewey, of New York, in the opinion of the Hartford Courant. It does so far more emphatically and realistically than do the platforms of the two major parties. While the measure was decisively beaten in the Senate, a similar measure will come up this week in the House of Representatives.

New dealers wrote the Kilgore-Murray bill with the aid and indeed at the direction of the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. Several weeks ago the Courant stated that the new dealers did not like the Baruch-Hancock recommendations for reconversion. It added that legislation translating those recommendations into action was deliberately being delayed, that in good time the new dealers would attempt to throw Mr. Baruch and all his works into the ashcan, and that under the plea of impending emergency they would seek to jam through Congress their own scheme for reconversion. Unfortunately, that prophecy has come true.

The Kilgore-Murray bill is based on the philosophy of unlimited public debt, of spending the Nation into prosperity. It assumes that war work on the home front entails as great a sacrifice as fighting on the battle fronts—a gross insult to the men and women in uniform—and it seeks to set up a government of men over our government of laws.

The real issue between the supporters of this legislation and its opponents is not whether those persons placed in economic distress by reconversion of industry shall have or shall not have decent and respectable and adequate relief. The issue is only what amount of relief is adequate, and how it should be administered. The proponents of the George bill, which incorporates the recommendations of the Baruch-Hancock report and has been adopted by the Senate, are as fully cognizant of the need for protecting the livelihood of the workingman as are the New Deal backers of the Kilgore-Murray-C. I. O. bill. But the George bill "is no lazy man's dream" as is the Kilgore bill, nor does it lead to collectivism and the arbitrary rule of men as opposed to the orderly process of rule by law.

Nobody knows within tens of billions of dollars what the cost of the Kilgore plan might be. The only certainty is that it rewards idleness handsomely—as much as $35 a week for a front-porch sitter who cannot find just the work he wants, under just the conditions of unionism he is supposed to prefer.

In essence, the Courant concludes, the Kilgore-Murray-C. I. O. bill reflects the political principles of Murray, Hillman, Bridges, Browder and their adaptation of a foreign "ism" to the American scene. The George bill rests upon the governmental philosophy of the founding fathers, of Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, Wilson and all the champions of liberty founded on law.

Farm-to-Market Roads

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, as a former long-time member of the Roads Committee, and as one who will always be deeply concerned about highway improvement, I would like to emphasize the importance and need for bold and intelligent action on highway matters by this body.

One can now say with conviction that the war is in its last phase, the phase of final victory. As our vicious, anti-Christian enemies weaken and succumb, we are brought closer and closer to a new challenge, the challenge of peace. That challenge is not easy to meet. To restore what we may call normal times, preparedness is a necessary instrument. Let us be prepared for the peace as we should have been prepared for war.

Throughout the land, preparedness is under way. Being a highly civilized nation which attempts to provide the necessities and comforts of life for all citizens, a large share of its workers must work on jobs that come through the production of raw materials and processing and selling of manufactured goods. Therefore, it is gratifying to know that business and industry are facing the future now—that they are making plans not just to create jobs but more to create healthy business conditions which will produce the jobs along with opportunity.

Government, too, has responsibility. Government must do everything in its power to re-create the conditions that will bring renewed vigor to private enterprise, whether the business be farming or manufacturing, and to make it possible for a free people to live unfettered and in an atmosphere wherein hard work will be justly rewarded.

Looking to the future, to provide jobs and opportunity for returning servicemen and for released war-plant workers and others engaged in many ways in the war effort, we know there must be more employment on all fronts. We know that all the jobs existing before the war must be brought to life again, and that millions of additional jobs must be produced. If there is any doubt of that, turn the pages back to 1940 when, even despite war orders, the unemployed and those working on emergency Government projects totaled some 8,000,000.

No, we cannot toy with the future. If we do, another depression will surely wrap its tentacles around surviving taxpayers.

With Government, however, keeping in step with the hopes and aspirations of farmers, of businessmen, and of workers, there need be little fear about the future.

One of the things we must look forward to, and be prepared for, is a tremendous demand for transportation facilities, particularly on the highways. Prosperity cannot exist under the handicap of poor, inadequate, and costly transportation. Provision of adequate highways is a job that only Government can perform. Extending Federal assistance for highway construction is one action Government may take which will produce direct, foreseeable, and tangible benefits.

It is a wise government which, after a war, rebuilds or replaces those things destroyed. Highway building agencies have not been able to properly maintain the highways during the war. Shortages of materials, equipment, and manpower have caused an alarming neglect of all classes of roads. Highways are a casualty of the war. Failure to recognize that will set back the recovery of this Nation many, many long and costly years.

In considering Federal highway legislation we must deal in large figures because highway transportation and needs are so vast as to stagger the imagination. In 1941, for instance, our motor-vehicle mileage totaled some 350,000,000,000 car-miles. That traveling was done on some 3,000,000 miles of roads and streets.

A vast amount of work remains to be done on the main State highways. These are the roads that connect cities and most towns and villages. Thousands of miles of roads built shortly after the First World War have long outlived their usefulness and must be replaced. Moreover, traffic conditions have changed greatly. To meet the needs of today's heavier traffic flows and heavier and speedier vehicles, main State highways must be straightened, widened, and reconstructed.

Cities, too, face a big job in fitting streets, particularly principal thoroughfares, to the traffic that will come after the war. Aside from repairing thousands and thousands of miles, cities must build express highways to reduce congestion and accidents.

However, I want to emphasize needs that have been too long existent on local roads. When I say local roads, I mean the farm-to-market roads, the roads over which most of the Nation's foodstuffs must first travel. As everyone knows who has been interested in highway improvement, local roads in general have suffered so that the main highways could be adequately improved; yet, farm and rural populations have contributed vast sums in State and Federal taxes on the motor vehicle.

The war has brought a new appreciation of farm-to-market roads. The production and availability of foodstuffs have constituted one of our principal engines of war. Farmers living along what might be called isolated roads have made it possible for this Nation to feed itself and to feed its army, and to feed the people and armies of our allies.

In the peace that is to come, it will be essential to provide the rural areas with highways which can bring quickly to market dairy products, vegetables, and other produce which this Nation must have to exist. It has been demonstrated

time and time again that improvement of farm-to-market roads widens the demand and market for produce and manufactured goods of all kinds. Bad roads discourage travel, and they discourage commerce.

More than 40 percent of the communities, large and small, in this Nation are without railroad transportation. They are entirely dependent upon motor vehicles and highways. For the most part those communities without railroad transportation are the centers of agricultural areas. Farm-to-market roads are as important to those people as are streets to cities.

There are upwards of 2,500,000 miles of secondary or local roads in this country. Only a relatively small portion of those roads have been improved to give year 'round service. Obviously it would be impossible and impractical to surface all of those highways. Nevertheless, several hundred thousand miles of the most important of those roads should be graded and drained, or graveled, or light-surfaced. From a study of the mass of statistics available, I get this simple conclusion—most of our farmers are still stuck in the mud.

In the past some help has been extended by Congress to the States in meeting the stupendous rural road problem. The assistance given, however, was limited in amount and was confined to the secondary roads. The annual authorizations, given before the war, ranged from $15,000,000 up to $25,000,000. Obviously, no State received enough Federal aid to make much progress on the secondary roads. My State of Nebraska, for instance, received from $300,000 to a little over $500,000 per year. That is not much when you consider that, exclusive of the main State highway system. Nebraska has about 90,000 miles of secondary and farm-to-market roads.

Recently the House Roads Committee reported out a Federal highway-aid bill which would extend Federal assistance to farm-to-market roads not included in the Federal-aid systems. Under the terms of that bill, Nebraska, for example, would receive some $2,100,000 per year. That is certainly a step in the right direction.

Testimony presented this summer to the House Roads Committee by Mr. M. D. Jones, Nebraska's chief highway engineer, shows the surface only has been scratched in properly improving Nebraska's important farm-to-market roads. In Nebraska some 10,000 miles of roads are eligible for the Federal-aid secondary highway system, which includes the principal farm-to-market roads. So far only some 3,400 miles have been included in that system. More than 6,600 miles of eligible roads are still left out in the cold. Beyond that secondary Federal-aid system, which is miserably far from completion, there are the other thousands of miles of local roads in Nebraska likewise waiting for some measure of highway improvement. That plight is shared by all States.

In the process of adopting a Federal highway-aid bill, probably a number of changes will be made. I very strongly recommend one important change.

The present bill, H. R. 4915, places unlimited authority over the funds designated for local roads in the hands of the State highway departments. That shuts the door on hundreds of fine county highway building agencies.

In the days of trial ahead we must utilize all resources to obtain the widest possible spread of employment. All capable agencies must participate in our over-all post-war program if we are to have the employment and the prosperity everybody wants. Certainly our post-war highway program will be more quickly and evenly gotten under way and carried on if we make it possible for capable county highway departments to assume a full measure of responsibility in planning and constructing the local roads under their jurisdiction.

I believe it is somewhat unfair to place an additional burden of local road improvement on State highway departments, which already have a job of tremendous proportions in building and maintaining the main State highway systems. So, in shaping final Federal-aid legislation, I urge that the resources and personnel of county highway agencies be utilized to the fullest possible extent.

Since our local roads have never been adequate, the neglect brought about by the war has reduced them to a condition requiring bold treatment. The problem is national. The Nation cannot have adequate highway transportation until thousands of miles of farm-to-market roads are lifted well beyond the mud and dust stage. It is high time progressive action be taken on these, our bread-and-butter roads. Extending Federal aid on a reasonably large scale to farm-to-market roads is a necessary step in the Nation's program to obtain a future of prosperity for all.

The Magnesium Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE DOW CHEMICAL CO.,
Midland, Mich., August 12, 1944.

Hon. DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NELSON: Your order M-2-b, issued on July 15, 1944, has caused us great concern as to the future of magnesium, and I am writing this—an open letter—in the hope that I may convince you that the public interest demands the immediate lifting of all controls from all forms of magnesium and its alloys. If the present controls continue, it will not only be difficult to take up any slack in employment, but also there will be greater difficulty in realizing the industry's potentialities after the war in the way of production and employment.

The facts are very simple and almost speak for themselves. When the war opened, the Dow Chemical Co. was the sole American producer of magnesium and had been for some years, for the reason that no other company cared to take the risks and the losses of carrying on an industry which, although not new, was undeveloped. It is not necessary for me here to repeat the efforts of the Dow Chemical Co. to interest the Government in expanding an industry which we in our company believed would be vital, both in war and in peace. The Government eventually, through the Defense Plant Corporation, expanded the industry from the 18,000,000 pounds a year which Dow was producing early in 1941 to a rated capacity in excess of 600,000,000 pounds a year.

Recently the War Production Board made a series of cut-backs reducing the production to approximately 300,000,000 pounds a year. We are not informed concerning the reasons which motivated the selection of concerns to be cut back, but apparently the selection was influenced more by manpower than by costs of production. There is already a large stock pile—running somewhere in the neighborhood of 100,000,000 pounds. If the present rates of production be maintained, a stock pile of stupendous proportions may be accumulated. If, on the other hand, production be cut to consumption or below, the industry will be on a skeleton basis. In either case we are threatened with the possible destruction of a vast potential industry.

As matters now stand, the industry is entirely capable of supplying all possible needs of the Government, either for domestic use or for export, and the stock pile is of such proportions as to give ample insurance against any kind of shortage. Therefore, as far as the needs of war are concerned, there is no longer any reason to keep the magnesium industry under any form of control or allocation.

The order M-2-b to which I have referred above has been represented to the public as removing controls over magnesium. That is not true. The order M-2-b, while it modifies certain controls over magnesium products, leaves the industry in essential respects under the same control as it was before. Ingot magnesium is still under allocation.

The uses of magnesium in the war have been impressive. The metal has proven itself. But as yet there has not been the opportunity to promote the peacetime use of the metal. The Nation has, I believe, a great industry in the making, and if the industry now had the opportunity, it could go ahead developing markets for peacetime consumption and in so doing would be developing opportunities for the employment of our boys, as and when they return to civilian life. Every day that the Government now delays in freeing the industry means a greater delay later on in providing employment.

The case is clear, and I would respectfully suggest that it is the plain duty of the War Production Board to remove at once all controls from the industry and to permit it to function as a private industry. Such a course would save the people money, because the Government could buy magnesium on a competitive basis. Also, and of greater ultimate significance, there would be the opportunity for the industry to get on a self-sustaining basis and be ready to meet both the opportunities and the responsibilities of the peace. If this Nation is to continue to have a magnesium industry, it will at some time have to be allowed to stand on its own feet. The time, I submit, is now.

Very truly yours,

WILLARD H. DOW,
President.

Address of Hon. Joe R. Hanley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of the Lieutenant Governor of New York, the Honorable Joe R. Hanley, before the New York Republican State Committee at Albany, N. Y., on Tuesday, August 8, 1944.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the State committee of the Republican Party of the State of New York, the rising tide of republicanism in the Nation, presaged first by our great victory in the State of New York 2 years ago, leads to inevitable victory at the polls on November 7.

For 12 years now, the Republicans of the Nation have been in the minority. But there is in resurgence now the fundamental and good grain of sound republicanism throughout the Nation. We have seen it function in the State. We have been tempered by the trials and tribulations that have affected the party. We have been made strong through the experience that we and our Nation have undergone in past recent years.

Our opponents have resorted to defamation of the high standards and good works that have been accomplished by the Republican Party in the State of New York. This is a desperate attempt by a weakened, worn-out and degenerate political machine to fend off the conclusion that will be sealed on November 7.

Among these baseless attacks, fostered by well-financed political organizations through false press releases and widely distributed pamphlets, has been the one on the 1944 war ballot law of the State of New York.

I have been a soldier in two of the wars in which my country has been engaged. To the best of my ability and energy I have been active in veterans' organizations. My two sons are presently serving in the armed forces of the United States. I believe I am qualified to give the picture as I see it concerning this very important issue.

As American, every Republican is anxious that every soldier and sailor who wishes to vote will have the right and the facilities for exercising that vote. As Republicans, we are doubly anxious that that right and the exercise of that right be fully effective and untrammeled. We know that our soldiers and sailors, like their friends, relatives, sweethearts, and wives at home, are feeling the critical need of our Nation for having a rededication to sound and constitutional Government. This, they know, can only come from a Republican victory on November 7.

Under the great leadership of our Governor, the Presidential candidate of the Republican Party, the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, the legislature, with the Governor's approval, has enacted a model soldier vote law—one that meticulously complies with every constitutional requirement and yet is instinct with a liberalism and a profound recognition of the sacred character of the right to vote of our brave soldiers and sailors.

Let me give you a bit of history. In 1917, the State of New York was one of 17 States having a soldier vote law. That was under a Republican administration. Then, it was one of the most liberal and efficient soldier vote laws among the States. Then, as now, our State constitution required that—and I quote: "Every citizen * * * shall be entitled to vote * * * for all officers that are or hereafter may be elective by the people."

Accordingly the soldier war ballot of World War No. 1 was a full ballot.

This 1917 law provided for the polling of ballots at Army camps—as much like civilian voting as was feasible under war conditions. It was upon this law that the 1942 and 1943 war ballot laws of this State were patterned. The experience of World War No. 1, the machinery that was then used successfully, and the legislation were all utilized.

The operation of the laws of 1942 and 1943 were disappointing. They were disappointing because the Federal authorities told us that the machinery was too cumbersome, that the papers and documents to be shipped and reshipped were too bulky and were displacing vital matériel of war. They told us that their function was primarily to conduct the war and only secondarily to facilitate the election.

In 1944 we had the benefit of specific advice by the military authorities. We had the benefit, too, of the recommendations of the Congress of the United States incorporated into what was to become Public Law 277, the Federal war-ballot law.

Now, heed me well. Wherever possible, under our State constitution, we followed that advice and those recommendations. We followed them in detail. Sometimes we even exceeded the suggestions that were made, where that was possible.

At the request of the Army, we dispensed with polling machinery in Army camps at home or abroad. We provided in our law as Congress recommended—that the post card which, under Federal law, must be distributed by the Army and Navy to all servicemen would be accepted as an application for a State war ballot. In fact, the application required by our law is far simpler than that provided by title 2 of the Federal law. Thirdly, we followed the recommendation that the applications should be received by the War Ballot Commission for prompt transmittal to local election officials. Fourthly, we followed the recommendation that the local officials should assume the burden of mailing the ballots. Fifthly, we followed the recommendation that the State ballot envelopes be distinctly marked. Sixthly, we followed the recommendation that at least 45 days be permitted for mailing and collecting the State ballots prior to the election. In fact, we allow up to 57 days for this purpose. We followed explicitly the suggestions and requirements as to the weight and size of ballots and the enclosing envelopes.

There are two things that, because of our State constitution, we have required. I do not mention those requirements apologetically for they stand for fundamental principles imbedded in our Constitution—the people's Constitution. But apart from argument or debate, the fact is that our Constitution had certain requirements and we followed them. Would any one dare say that we should have violated our Constitution? Would any one have expected us to? If so, the pass to which this Nation has come is sad indeed.

Those two requirements are as follows: (1) That our ballot must be full in the sense that every office that is elective must be covered by that ballot. (2) That the waiving of the necessity to be personally present in one's election district on election day is confined to our soldiers and sailors. Here is what our Constitution says on that subject. It says, and I quote:

"Provided however that in time of war no elector in the actual military service of the State, or of the United States, in the army or navy thereof, shall be deprived of his or her vote by reason of his or her absence from such election district."

That language is plain and clear. There is no room for so-called "interpretation." The military voter must be in the Army or Navy of the United States. As much as we would like, its meaning cannot be stretched to include life-risking members of the merchant marine, those fine people who share many of the hazards of battle—the members of the American Red Cross, those good Samaritans—the Quakers, the civilian employees of the U. S. O., or those brave women in the Women's Auxiliary Service Forces.

Let us see how this law of ours works and will actually work during this crucial year of 1944. The Federal Government, mandated by the Congress, must distribute to every soldier and sailor a post-card form. The soldier gets this card without request, without any action on his part. That post card, when filled out, signed, and mailed becomes automatically an application for a State war ballot. This is the only act that the soldier must perform in order to complete all the requirements before actually making out his ballot. All the other things to which I shall refer are acts to be done by agencies at home. In response to such applications received before September 1, a war ballot must be sent to every eligible applicant on or before September 7. These ballots, I repeat, are not to be sent on September 7 or thereafter, but before September 7. Applications arriving after September 1 will be responded to with ballots as fast as they are received, as long as there is sufficient time to return them before election day.

The ballot which the voter will receive will contain every office to be voted for in the voter's district, from the high office of President of the United States down to the humbliest local office. It will contain the name of every eligible candidate for each of these offices. All the soldier need do is mark with a cross the box next to the name of the candidate for whom he wishes to vote. It will take him no longer to do that than it would for a civilian at home to vote a paper ballot. The ballot he will receive will contain the names of the candidates for the particular congressional, State, senatorial, and assembly districts in which he is entitled to vote. He will not have to consult any bulletin boards, catalogs, or encyclopedias to ascertain the districts in which he is entitled to vote or the names of the candidates for which he may vote. His right to vote for every office is fully and conveniently preserved.

On the other hand, let us look at the Federal supplementary ballot. It is a shorter ballot, but is it a simpler ballot? It contains six blank spaces—a blank space for the candidate for President and Vice President of the United States, for United States Senator, for Congressman from the district in which the soldier resides, and for two Congressmen at Large. There are no names of candidates on that ballot. Our soldier voters—and many of them now will be at the actual battle front—will have to write in the names of candidates for President and Vice President for which they wish to vote. The names of those candidates the men will know, but the hazards of misspelling, errors in first names and initials, are apt to be great. Will he know his candidate for United States Senator? Most will not; to learn that he will have to consult literature which will embrace the 48 States. After he has spent the time necessary to ascertain the name of his candidate for United States Senator, he will then need to know his congressional district. We all know that the ordinary person, especially from the larger cities, does not know his congressional district. Therefore, the first thing the voter will have to do is to ascertain his proper

district. He will then have to ascertain the name of the candidate.

When he comes to the offices of Congressmen at Large his problem will be complicated even more, for there he will have to ascertain whether one or two or no Congressman at Large is being elected in his State. After he ascertains that fact, if he can, he will have to learn the names of the candidates. How many of our soldiers and sailors will take the time in the midst of battle exhaustion to ascertain these facts? Is there any doubt that a soldier voter who conscientiously tries to vote for all of the Federal offices under that ballot may have to spend hours at this task, and then he will not know whether his labors have yielded a result free from error which will not jeopardize his ballot. When he is finished, as I have indicated before, he will not have voted for any of the other very important State offices.

We believe that in the days to come, the strength and soundness of our State and local government can do more than any other factor to prevent our entire American system from degenerating into something else and into something hateful.

There are other reasons why our soldier ballot is the only possible ballot of which we now know that can fulfill the guaranty to every citizen given by our Constitution. Any other system ambraces two most dangerous hazards. One is that it would place in certain public officers the power to choose which offices with regard to which the voter will be entitled to exercise his franchise. This is a very dangerous power indeed. Secondly, any other course will throw our elections—national, State, and local—so far as the ballots of this State are concerned, into the courts. There, by reason of legal disabilities, the people's will may be frustrated and, in any event, the result kept in doubt for a long period of time.

As a former soldier, as a father of soldiers, and as one experienced in public office, I am very proud indeed of this war-ballot law. It is a model of simplicity.

But our task, and particularly your task, is not ended in expressing pride in this war-ballot law. We have a greater and more important task before us. Each one of us, as good Americans and as good Republicans, must see that every soldier and sailor who is eligible to vote in this State exercises that franchise on November 7. We know and believe that our soldiers and sailors are no different than the Americans at home. They, too, are seeking a Republican victory—not for partisan reasons, but for the recovery and reconstitution of the American Government. Every party worker, like every other American, must apply himslf to the task of bringing the franchise to the soldier—the franchise that will make our victory on November 7 universal.

The Fourth-Term Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under date of July 13, 1944, W. K. Kelsey, an eminent and fearless commentator of the Detroit News, expresses his views about President Roosevelt's acceptance of the fourth-term nomination, and I am constrained for the benefit of my colleagues because of the fairness and the clear reasoning of the writer to insert in the RECORD the commentator's remarks, which he captions "The Sense of Duty."

I am certain that anyone who is fair and understands the humankind will agree that the commentator has made a correct analysis which many of us perhaps have improperly appraised. I feel that his searching and sound analysis deserves preservation in the RECORD:

THE COMMENTATOR

(By W. K. Kelsey)

THE SENSE OF DUTY

The manner of President Roosevelt's acceptance of a fourth nomination—for that is what his statement meant, although the nomination has not yet been accorded—was admirable in its straightforwardness. In response to Chairman Hannegan's letter saying that a majority of the delegates favor his renomination, he might have remained coyly silent. Or he might have replied, "Well, let 'em," keeping his acceptance in partial doubt.

Instead, he spoke what was in his mind. Called on to accept for another term the responsibility of the world's hardest job, he said he would remain on it, if that should be the people's will.

Some people may smile and shake their heads, declaring that Mr. Roosevelt is so enamored of authority that he would like to be President in perpetuity. The commentator disagrees. He is somewhat younger than the President, and, so far as he knows, in good health. Yet he has reached the age when even his comparatively slight responsibilities often weight on him so heavily that he would gladly retire to a wilderness, and live on locusts and wild honey, if any were available without effort. How much greater must, at times, be the President's weariness.

But, one may say, Mr. Roosevelt thinks constantly of his position in history.

Of course he does; and so does any man who occupies high office. But Mr. Roosevelt has already made his place in history. He could retire today with that place securely fixed. He has been the greatest modern leader of the attempt to make the United States a more democratic country, with less distance between the extremes of wealth and poverty, of power and impotence, of knowledge and ignorance. He has maintained the government of the Constitution in two great crises testing its very existence—the crisis of depression and the crisis of war. His is a record of patience and moderation equal to Lincoln's, and Lincolnian has been his faith in the people. History will write, as contemporaries close to the scene are already testifying, that he saw the war catastrophe coming, that he did his utmost to arouse the people to a sense of danger, while at the same time he sought to avert, or postpone, the approaching peril. Is his "quarantine" speech of 1937 forgotten, or his forecast of the use of air power? We scoffed at the time, many of us.

THE VERDICT OF HISTORY

President Roosevelt could retire today, and stand in history with Washington and Lincoln. He can continue in office and risk that sometime in the next 4 years he will suffer a failing of his powers, so that he will make mistakes that will alter history's judgment.

Consider how high the estimate of Woodrow Wilson would be today, if he could have laid down his office on November 11, 1918! Yet only 2 years later his own party was giving him but the feeblest of lip-service.

Nearly a quarter century has passed, and his place in our historic record is still far below what it some day will be, when we can view it in the same perspective with which we view the lamentable failures of Jefferson's second administration. Those failures have been largely forgotten in our admiration of Jefferson the man.

So will Woodrow Wilson's failures be, when they have been overcome by recognition of his magnificent idealism, his heroic effort to bring this country into active cooperation with others to solve the world's problems. It was not Wilson who failed; it was we who failed him. That is the fact which is so hard for us to swallow, so that we prefer to blame him, rather than ourselves.

President Roosevelt, renominated and reelected, faces the same perils that President Wilson faced—and he knows it. He can lead the Nation to victory in war; but can he lead it to victory in peace? Every man of high honor guards his reputation as his most precious asset; indeed, as the sum total of his wealth. To lose it, either through his own error or through his neighbors' misunderstanding, is the supreme calamity.

Franklin Roosevelt assumes that risk, not gladly, but in the course of duty. If the people wish him to continue in office, he will face future vicissitudes as he has faced those of the past. Few statements have been issued by men in public life nobler than the President's acceptance of further service to his country, if it demands that he serve.

LONELY DECISION

A man of great integrity and a high sense of his duty may frequently face a problem which he feels he must solve alone. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt knew of her husband's decision only when she was informed of it by reporters. She testified thus:

"The President doesn't discuss these things with me. Many people think that he does, but most often the first I know of some decision is when I see it in the papers."

There is the incontrovertible proof of Mr. Roosevelt's sincerity when he said that "if the people command me to continue in this office and in this war, I have as little right to withdraw as the soldier has to leave his post in the line."

Having decided as to his duty, the President saw no need of discussing it with his wife. Whatever the consequences of the decision, she would have to accept them. Of course, the President knows that Mrs. Roosevelt, too, is a good soldier, who would accept his considered judgment without question or quiver. Fortunate, indeed, is the man who possesses such an understanding, high-principled mate.

Must Extend Old-Age Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article, entitled "Must Extend Old-Age Pay," by Warren Carberg, which appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Post, August 13, 1944:

MUST EXTEND OLD-AGE PAY—WAR CONDITIONS TURN UP LOOPHOLES IN SOCIAL SECURITY—MANY MORE SHOULD BE BROUGHT WITHIN CODE

(By Warren Carberg)

The war has brought home to the American people the undeniable fact that the Social Security Act must be quickly and drastically expanded to provide insurance against want for all.

Out in the cold under the present set-up are the millions in the armed services, the thousands who left their regular peacetime jobs to accept work in Government shipyards and in arsenals, the great army that went into agricultural work, the self-employed small businessman, those in domestic service, and the others who work for State, Federal, or municipal governments.

John F. Hardy, regional director of social security in New England, one of the most progressive thinkers in the country on social security expansion, told Legionnaires at their department convention just closed in Boston that the veterans' G. I. bill failed to include provisions to protect the social-security rights of veterans under the old-age and survivors' insurance program of the Social Security Board.

Unless action is taken, he pointed out, the social-security protection of servicemen will be reduced, and some will lose it entirely. There will be a loss of thousands of dollars in insurance rights in the case of those who are killed in action or who die after they have been demobilized and before they have built up their rights again.

In such cases, he said, widows and other dependents may find themselves with no claim at all to old-age and survivors' insurance benefits. The loss will be particularly serious in the case of those who die from causes not connected with their military service. Under existing laws the families of such men may get neither veterans' nor social-security benefits.

Senator WAGNER recently introduced a bill in the Senate to correct this unfair situation, and the bill is still pending.

In commenting on the bill, Mr. Hardy said that it would not only preserve the social-security rights which service men and women had earned prior to induction, but they would build up their rights in the same way as those now in civilian employment. The bill has the endorsement of all veterans' organizations.

"In the last analysis," Mr. Harry said, "veterans' legislation as such cannot guarantee the heroes of this war the security and opportunity for which they are willing to give their lives, for the security of the veteran depends on the prosperity of the whole Nation.

"We cannot help but realize," he said, "that though an individual's rights must be defended, no individual can stand alone. All of us have responsibilities to each other and to the community, which we must fulfill if we are to survive as a nation. It is not enough that we provide protection to the veteran. We must provide adequate social-security protection to his family as well."

FIVE MAJOR HAZARDS

Another bill now in Congress is known as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for social security. It is designed to provide for the wives and children of the veterans, and for the millions of other persons in our country, insurance protection against the five major hazards of life—unemployment, sickness, disability, old age, and death.

The bill is not a featherbed for the indolent but rather a safeguard for our system of free enterprise, which cannot function properly if large portions of the population are without income.

"The welfare of the veterans is the welfare of the Nation," said Mr. Hardy. "Though this G. I. bill of rights protects him during the transition period back to civilian life, his well-being in the long view must rest with the kind of country we build for him and for all of us, as well as the kind of relations we establish with the other nations of the world. Social security can help make the earth a truly civilized planet and should guarantee a full measure of security to the veterans' security not only after the war, but security against all future wars."

Paradoxically enought, those thousands of men and women who were motivated by patriotism to leave secure and easy civilian tasks for rough and strenuous toil in Government owned shipyards and arsenals are similarly out of luck unless the Government enacts legislation to correct present social-security evils.

Under Federal law they are compelled to turn over 5 percent of their pay, although there is small chance to benefit, since, in order to do this, they must be under civil service for a period of 5 years in order to collect.

The President, who was instrumental in fathering social security, has already recommended that legislation be passed to overcome these shortcomings which, in the light of wartime conditions, loom so prominently on our social background. Both the Republican and the Democratic platforms urge the expansion of social security. There is every hope that the plan, if amended to take in all American adults, will prove to be a prime factor in the success of our post-war transition period.

The Wagner bill would make it possible for a couple over 65 to receive a maximum of $120 monthly instead of the present $85. More than 600,000 eligible men and women past 65 have jobs now, primarily, because of wartime opportunities.

SHOULD TAKE CARE OF DISABLED

They may claim their benefits whenever they stop work. Many other men and women, past the age of 65, who have received benefits, have given them up temporarily in order to take jobs. Apparently these figures indicate that Americans prefer a job to retirement income when there is a job and they are able to work.

There is general agreement among almost everyone that social security should take care of the man or woman who becomes disabled or sick and who is compelled to stop working.

Under present provisions the worker ceases to develop a wage record and the payments are steadily reduced so that at the age of 65 there would be virtually nothing left. This gaping hole in the provisions of the law is just one more instance of how inadequate it is in its present form.

Down in one of the old Chandler buildings, erected originally by the Coca-Cola king in Baltimore, some 76,000,000 wage records of those covered by social security are on file. I am told that they have tabulating machines there that make the new lightning calculator at Harvard mere child's play.

They have such amazing machines in that vast building that, given your correct name and social-security number, they can find your wage records in a minute and a half.

A few days ago the Social Security Board put into effect its one millionth monthly benefit under the Federal family-insurance system, better known as the old-age and survivor's insurance.

The millionth benefit check, amounting to $58.49, was presented to Mary Rex Thompson, 33-year-old widowed wife of a Cleveland war worker, on behalf of herself and her two children, Dale Bernice, 4, and Jerald Robert, 1.

These benefits will continue for 17 years, until the youngest child is 18, and unless Mrs. Thompson remarries, the payments will be resumed after she reaches the age of 65.

Altogether, the payments on the social-security account of her husband, John Robert Thompson, may total $15,000. Thompson paid $145 in taxes over a period of 7½ years prior to his death and his employer paid a similar amount.

GIVEN WIDE PUBLICITY

The payment was given wide publicity, principally in order to acquaint widows with the benefits they are entitled to under social security. Many of them lose considerable money because they wait too long before filing their claims. The retroactive clause on such claims go back only three months. Thus, if a widow waits a year before filing, she loses nine months of benefit payments.

In Massachusetts about 50,000 claims have already been settled totaling benefits of about $1,000,000 monthly. Of the 1,000,000 beneficiaries already receiving payments approximately 400,000 or 40 percent are retired male workers; 600,000 or 60 percent are women and children. This program of Federal family insurance, even in its infancy, is beginning to serve its real purpose: to prevent destitution and to provide a basic minimum subsistence for American families in which the breadwinner dies or stops work because of old age. It supplements other resources such as life insurance or savings.

In the last annual report the Social Security Board also recommended that because of the wartime situation it is particularly urgent that coverage be extended to farm workers, to domestic workers in private homes, employees of nonprofit organizations, and self-employed persons.

"The high levels of current employment and earnings," the report stated, "would now make it possible for many workers to pay contributions and thus gain insurance rights which they may not be able to acquire in future years, in particular the older workers who may be in need of the retirement provision when the war ends and younger men return to civilian life.

"Extension of coverage would not entail serious administrative difficulties. For appropriate groups it might be appropriate to use a stamp system, under which employers purchase stamps at post offices or from rural mail carriers to place in a book which evidences the contributions made by workers and employers.

"Extension of the basic protection of old-age and survivors' insurance to public employees—Federal, State, and local—would also be feasible and would round out insurance protection of survivors, now lacking, to nearly all these employees, and provision for old-age retirement, now unavailable to many, and would assure continuity of rights. Extension should be made in such a way as not to endanger any rights of these workers under existing special systems and to increase, not lessen, the total insurance available to them.

"An immediate problem related to coverage arises from the situation of the millions of persons now in the armed forces. Because of the eligibility provisions and the methods of computing benefits under the program, the insurance protection which service men and women may have acquired before their induction will be partly or wholly used up, and the amount of potential benefits payable to them or to their survivors will be diminished." Men and women in the service are protected against death while in the service, or after from service-connected causes. After discharge, however, many veterans will be without this protection in the event of death from non-service-connected causes.

Firemen Boo Down Speech Assailing Governor Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of my very close friends, George Roesch, of 341 Brooks Avenue,

Rochester, N. Y., who was conspicuously identified with the New York State Volunteer Firemen's Association sent me a clipping appearing in the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, August 16, 1944, entitled "Firemen Boo Down Speech Assailing Governor Dewey." Mr. Speaker, volunteer firemen's associations and volunteer firemen throughout the country are nonpartisan organizations. They render a great service to the community in which their organization exists; in fact, no community can get along without a volunteer fire company, and the services that they render cannot be computed on a cold, hard basis of dollars and cents.

The reason my friend, George Roesch, sent me this clipping was to emphasize the fact that people today are thoroughly disgusted with the old-time repulsive smear campaigns and they will resent any unjust criticism that will in any way approximate the assassination of character, regardless of the occasion. The article is as follows:

FIREMEN BOO DOWN SPEECH ASSAILING GOVERNOR DEWEY

(By Joseph R. Malone)

Henry Epstein, who was State solicitor general under Governor Lehman, picked the wrong place to make a partisan political speech last night.

Billed with Lt. Gov. Joe R. Hanley, of Perry, as guest speaker at the convention dinner of the New York State Firemen's Association at the Hotel Seneca, he was booed down when he launched into a lengthy prepared address bitterly critical of Governor Dewey.

Epstein, solicitor general from 1933 to 1943, and Democratic candidate for attorney general in 1942, waded into his speech in an increasingly hostile atmosphere after it became apparent to the crowd that he chose to ignore the suggestion of Gordon A. Howe, toastmaster and Greece supervisor, that speeches be brief and nonpartisan.

HANLEY STEALS SHOW

In an uproar of booing and amid shouts of "We want Dewey," Epstein abandoned his set speech entirely and wound up by reciting doggerel verse picturing the Governor as an inept young man with diaper trouble, unable to make up his mind or come to a decision. The booing rose to a crescendo as he sat down.

Hanley, following Epstein, quickly stole the show by making an old-fashioned riproaring Americanism speech, devoid of rancor or partisanism, such as Hanley well knows how to make. The Lieutenant Governor's appeals to the audience's patriotism won hearty applause from a dinner crowd of 1,000 perspiring men and women packed into the banquet room and adjoining hall.

Epstein quoting Republican Governor Wills, of Vermont, described the Republican 1944 goal as bringing government back to the village pump, which gave Hanley opportunity to retort:

OFFERS PRINCIPLE

"Henry talked of a garden hose and village pump. If he had lived up where I do in the country, he'd think they were pretty good things to have around. We know how to use them but down in New York, they don't."

Hanley said there were differences of opinion and he hoped the time never would come in America when they weren't expressible. American citizens, he declared, must be alert to preserve their constitutional rights and privileges. Hanley offered as his principle:

"I'm for America first and for international cooperation afterward."

"In this campaign," he said, "we must make sure of one thing, whether we are Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, American Labor, one creed or another, one race or another: We must all make sure that when our boys come home they find a free America waiting for them."

American troops, he said, are accomplishing the impossible all over the world. At home, Americans are making sacrifices, Hanley declared, but every constitutional liberty given up for victory must be restored, he held, when the war is over.

"Give America the facts," he said "leave the avenues of information open and she'll do the right thing and she'll elect the right kind of man."

Speechmaking began at 9 and Howe warned it must be over by 9:30 so a floor show could go on. Epstein, first speaker, said he was fully aware the firemen's association was nonpartisan and nonpolitical. But he paved the way for his speech by saying:

"Representatives of both political parties are here and you won't take it amiss if I discuss some of the issues before the people from an international viewpoint."

CROWD PATIENT AT FIRST

The crowd was patient while he arraigned the Hoover administration for taking no action when Japan seized Manchuria, declared the Republicans proposed cuts in naval appropriations when Hitler was rising and Mussolini's "pugnacity was rampant." But the booing began when he declared Dewey ridiculed Roosevelt's "clarion call for a program of 50,000 planes a year and a revitalized Army and Navy," and it continued to grow in power when he held Dewey has yet to express himself "on the isolationist pratings of NYE, BROOKS, CLARE HOFFMAN, and the like."

"You've got to expect those things," Epstein remarked philosophically following the meeting. Epstein managed to complete 3 pages of a 7½-page manuscript.

PORTRAIT PRESENTED

Guests at the speakers' table other than Firemen's Association officials included Thomas E. Broderick and Roy F. Bust, Republican and Democratic county chairmen; Mayor Dicker; George F. Rogers, Democratic candidate for Congress; and Public Safety Commissioner Tom C. Woods.

Leon H. Ingersoll, of Cincinnatus, retired president of the association, was presented a large framed portrait of himself, with Henry W. Sprague, of West Webster, making the presentation. Albert J. Foley, of Dunkirk, will succeed Ingersoll as president today.

Disposal of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the greatest merchandising job in the world is covered by this bill which handles close to $100,000,000,000 of surplus war property. Unless the surpluses are handled intelligently, we could have a grave upset in our national economy. The selling of this property could seriously interfere with private employment and business. It is urgent that some action be taken at once which will set up the machinery and outline a blueprint with certain guide posts, which, when put into operation, would do the best job.

Industry and labor have mastered a great production job. It will have as tremendous a job when it comes to disposing of surplus property, plants, and equipment.

In the past year some 40 bills have been introduced into Congress which contain certain plans for the distribution of this war goods and equipment.

Just how well Congress handles this post-war headache will depend upon the law we pass and its administration. It will depend on how much of a reaction is produced in this country and I mean by reaction, how much unemployment and disrupting of the civilian economy will be caused by the disposal of this surplus equipment.

There are many people and groups now writing to Congressmen who are concerned about the problem. There are some who think they may be able to purchase a jeep, a truck, typewriter, and other equipment for a few cents on the dollar. There will be some individuals who would like to buy a complete manufacturing plant for a song. I believe it is the duty of this Congress to set up the machinery which will prevent anyone stealing from Uncle Sam.

Within a few blocks of this Capitol there is a surplus supply depot. I personally visited this plant several times. I am satisfied that the equipment coming to this surplus depot is not being disposed of in a manner which is to the best interest of this country.

The disposal of surplus materials is not a job for boondogglers or amateurs. There must be careful planning, scientific marketing, economic controls with advertising and selling by every known method.

I have listened to the debate in Congress on how this job should be done. I am about convinced that the job should not be left to any one administrator who would have unlimited powers. It is too big a job for any one man. It is more responsibility than any good man should have, and certainly more than any poor administrator should be given. I believe it can best be handled by giving the administrator a board made up of experts who have the knowledge and background of advertising, engineering, and of selling. It is quite possible that all the surplus land should be funneled through the Department of Interior. The United States now owns much land under the direction of this department.

There would, of course, be rigid controls set up by an administrator and a properly organized board or commission. It will certainly take men with knowledge and courage to contribute everything they have in this great program of beating swords back into plow shares if we are to keep the wheels of industry from stripping gears. The commission should be appointed by the President and approved by the Senate. The commission should report to Congress at frequent intervals.

The legislation we are considering today is important because of the magni-

tude of the anticipated surplus and the effect it will have on post-war recovery. This legislation is important to the American worker and the returning soldier. It is important if we expect to give men jobs. It is important if we are to have a prosperous and growing post-war America. America has grown great because it was built upon a system of free enterprise. If we are to continue to grow, labor and business must move forward with full production and full employment. Labor and business should be watchful to preserve the principles of free enterprise.

Yes; this is a big merchandising job. It should be handled by businessmen familiar with the property to be handled. It should be handled through the regular channels of business. It should be handled by men who have learned the cold, hard way. It is too big a job for one man. Let us have a commission. Let us avoid the mistakes made in the last World War.

Surplus War Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial on surplus war property, which was published in the Washington Post.

I am in full accord with the opinion expressed by this great newspaper. It is my firm belief that no single individual should be given the tremendous discretionary powers granted in the House bill. I believe that due consideration should be given the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON], which amendment is printed in the RECORD on page 7003.

A select board of seven, instead of a one-man control should be better qualified to formulate surplus disposal policies within the framework of the broad statement of objectives contained in the House bill.

The editorial follows:

SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY

The bill on surplus-property disposal now being considered by the House vests tremendous discretionary power in the hands of the proposed Surplus Property Administrator. It may be taken for granted that hard and fast rules cannot be laid down for the disposal of surplus property running into billions of dollars, and consisting of a vast variety of articles from shoes, clothes, and drugs to farm lands and huge manufacturing plants. It is doubtful, however, whether Congress ought to empower a single administrative official to formulate surplus disposal policies within the framework of the broad statement of objectives contained in the House bill, referred to by one critic as "pious words." However honest and efficient the official entrusted with this tremendous task may be, Congress should not shift to his shoulders responsibilities for making important policy decisions that might vitally affect the post-war economy. Admittedly it is difficult to lay down specific directions for the guidance of a surplus-property administrator without impairing his efficiency. Nevertheless, the difficulty of the task does not excuse a failure to tackle it.

The method of dealing with the disposal of war plants provides an outstanding instance of the inadequacies of the safeguards thrown about the exercise of power by the proposed administrator. It is estimated that the Government has invested more than $15,000,000,000 dollars in manufacturing plants and other productive facilities. Congress quite rightly does not wish to assume direct responsibility for the disposal of these plants. For if Congress were to retain a veto power over sale of war plants every Member of Congress would be in hot water with his constituents, and the whole disposal question would inevitably become a football of politics. While steering clear of political complications, Congress could and should maintain supervision over the disposal of Government-owned plants to a much greater extent than contemplated. To be sure, restrictions are placed upon the sale of synthetic rubber and aluminum plants, which have cost the Government $5,000,000 or more each. The bill also seeks to avoid violations of the antitrust laws in disposing of plants. However, the problem of disposal is much broader than indicated; it is not limited to the two industries singled out, nor to the avoidance of monopolistic trends. In disposing of agricultural lands the Administrator is also given a virtually free hand, with the proviso that, to the extent feasible, former owners of surplus real property acquired by the Government shall be given an opportunity to reacquire it.

No doubt it is desirable to put on the statute books legislation dealing with surplus property as soon as possible. But the hurry is not so great as to preclude taking time to tighten up some of the loose provisions of the House measure. For after all we already have a Surplus Property Administrator whose office was created by Executive order. He is prepared to carry on until the statutory agency is set up, and in all probability he will continue in office thereafter.

Irish Needlepoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from today's edition of the Washington Times-Herald by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop:

IRISH NEEDLEPOINT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

A troublemaking old party by the name of John T. Flynn, whose highly unofficial biography of our peerless leader you may have read under the title of "County Squire in the White House," dropped in yesterday with a wild story to the effect that he opposes a fourth term for our peerless leader because he was convinced against it by the words of several of the Democratic Party's most revered figures, including Woodrow Wilson.

"Look," he said, "I've got it all written down here." Flynn, who is a member of the New York City Board of Higher Education, is always writing things down.

A careful analysis of the evidence he produced does seem to give him a shadow of excuse for saying that the Democrats may have persuaded him to this contrary attitude by what they have had to say in times past against even a third term.

Early in February 1928, said this Flynn, the shadow of Calvin Coolidge still hovered over the coming Republican convention, even though Coolidge had said in August 1927: "I do not choose to run."

Later, in December 1927, he amplified this by saying he meant it and that he expected his party to seek other candidates. But some busy New York politicians were maneuvering to force him to run for a third term. At this point Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE (Progressive of Wisconsin) introduced a resolution, which read as finally passed:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the precedent established by Washington and other Presidents of the United States, in retiring from the presidential office after their second term, has become by universal concurrence a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic, and fraught with peril to our free institutions."

This resolution was debated at length—not so much because anybody favored a third term but because some Senators felt it a free-handed slap at Mr. Coolidge, unjustified by anything on his part.

And who do you suppose was there leading the fight to keep Coolidge from accepting something he had already declined and hadn't been offered, anyhow?

Well, one was the then minority Democratic leader, Senator Joe Robinson, of Arkansas, who later became F. D. R.'s first Senate majority leader.

Another was the late Senator Pat Harrison (Democrat, of Mississippi), also a party veteran of his day.

And there was that war horse of the New Deal, now honorary chairman of Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee, former Senator George Norris, of Nebraska.

He not only voted for the resolution but spoke several times for it. Now he is out in his gray hairs, after his long liberal career, whooping up the fourth term for the man who called a great power dam after him.

But who else was there voting against a third term and for a resolution which said that any departure from the time-honored tradition "would be unpatriotic and fraught with peril to our free institutions"?

Who but that brave ALBEN BARKLEY, of Kentucky, who made the nominating speech not for a mere third term but for a fourth term? And, of course, almost all the Democrats voted for the resolution, including Senators MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, GLASS, of Virginia, and others still in the Senate.

But, after all, this opposition to the third term is a historic Democratic Party doctrine, according to Flynn.

Jefferson said: "If some termination to the services of the Chief Executive be not fixed or supplied by practice, his office, normally 4 years, will in fact be for life."

Gen. Andrew Jackson, a special saint in the Roosevelt calendar, said:

"It would seem advisable to limit the services of the Chief Magistrate to a single term of either 4 or 6 years."

He repeated this opinion many times in official documents.

When friends of General Grant, urging him for a third term, had revived the question, it was a Democratic Representative, William M. Springer of Illinois in 1875 who offered a resolution after the election worded much like the La Follette resolution. It was adopted by a vote of 234 to 18 and every Democrat in the House voted for it.

Grover Cleveland, a great Democratic President, had sharp things to say about the

temptations of long Presidential careers tied to patronage, and the Democratic Presidential candidates of 1896, 1900, and again in 1908, each pledged himself if elected he would not seek even a second term.

In 1912, when Wilson was elected, the party platform contained the following plank:

"We favor a single Presidential term and to that end urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making the President of the United States ineligible for reelection and we pledge our candidate to this principle."

In pursuance of this pledge, the Democratic Senate in 1913 passed a constitutional amendment providing for a single term of 6 years with no reelection. It was passed by a vote of 47 to 23. A year later European upheavals sidetracked the idea, and Wilson got busy preparing to make the war to end war, and so forth.

Needless to say, Flynn hasn't been around to headquarters of the Democratic National Committee with any of this foregoing material, but you are free to take it there if you like.

The Military Factor in Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am including an address delivered by Col. Herman Beukema at Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., on August 6, the occasion being the celebration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of Norwich University, an outstanding military collegiate institution of the country.

Not too many people know that Alden Partridge, one-time Superintendent of the Military Academy at West Point, having made up his mind that we never could train a sufficient number of professional soldiers, nor should we, to offer and afford the necessary military defense which the country should have, 125 years ago left West Point to establish what he then called the American Military, Literary, and Scientific Academy, wherein those who were assembled were taught the arts of war and the pursuits of peace on the basis of his contention that no citizen was properly trained unless and until he was trained as a soldier as well as a civilian, prepared to meet any emergency which might confront him or his country.

Alden Partridge, as a man of vision, takes a place alongside Jackson and Jefferson as a nation builder. The institution which he founded has for 125 years observed and respected the traditions he established.

Upon the stone gateway at the entrance to the grounds of Norwich University is placed a tablet bearing the following inscription:

This institution was founded upon the principle that a citizen soldiery is essential to the maintenance of free government. Through a hundred years this principle has been cherished, and the men have here learned that obedience to law is liberty. In the centuries to come let all who enter through this gate be faithful to the past.

This is the Norwich ideal. To a Norwich man it is always an inspiration and a challenge. He loves peace, knows what war costs, and is never a militarist, except when his country calls.

The address of Col. Herman Beukema, professor of economics, government, and history at the United States Military Academy, follows:

Norwich commemorates the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding at the most momentous period in modern history. There have been other days when humanity's eternal struggle to preserve or to advance the cause of human liberty and the dignity of the common man has hung in the balance. There have been days when that struggle was lost, days when serfdom or slavery became the common level of all save the privileged few. But somehow the torch passed on by Miltiades at Marathon, by Aetius at Chalons, left a spark which continued to glow until at last it rekindled the old flame at the dawn of modern history.

Five years ago that white light had again become little more than a pale flicker. A self-styled master race, two master races, in fact—one white and one brown—had ordained a new order, a world of masters and slaves. A little handful of masters and a world of slaves, with even the instruments of the masters' power, the German and Japanese nationals duped into slavery to their concept of the modern state—this was to be the pattern of civilization. The blackest days of ancient Assyria's military despotism threatened to become the normal pattern for humanity. The campaigns under way, we were told, would determine the course of civilization for a thousand years. Let us hope that Hitler's prophecy was right, and that its fulfillment marks not only the destruction of his every hope but of the spiritual soil which gave them birth.

Divine providence and the courage and skill of our fighting men have warded off this latest and most dangerous threat to our liberties. And now that ultimate victory over our enemies is assured, it is time to take stock of our situation, and to discover where and how the danger to our existence as a free people could have become so great in so short a time. It behooves us to learn the real reasons for the losses we have taken—for that oil slick which through the first half of 1942 extended the Atlantic coast from Florida to Newfoundland; for the hopeless situation of our Philippine garrison, finally wiped out after battling for months against impossible odds; for the bloody job that remains to be done. We realize at last that these things need not have happened. We know that this war could have been scotched at the outset. We find the courage to admit as a Nation that the fault is one for which the voter can best find a scapegoat by looking into a mirror. The crisis could have been averted, the causes underneath that crisis could have been destroyed if, at the fateful moment, we had possessed the force to meet our national and international obligations and the will to use that force. We had neither. Our lack of these two vital essentials of safety accurately recorded the concrete desires of the overwhelming majority of our citizenry.

And now we are given another chance. It may well be our last. We have the opportunity to analyze past mistakes and to make sure that, within our lifetime at least, they will not be repeated. In our analysis we can begin with the old rule that the key to any human problem in which the element of force is the final determinant lies in the availability of trained men, properly equipped, ready to meet and overmatch the threat. Whether it be an incipient street riot or the opening guns of what may become a world war, prompt and effective counteraction by trained forces is the one certain means of destroying the danger. It is not beside the point that, as late as May 21, 1938, little Czechoslovakia's partial mobilization put a prompt end to a projected move of the German Army into that state. The Munich Conference had still to come.

In the early days of our national independence, when memories of its cost were still clear, America's leaders entertained no illusions as to the role of force in international affairs. The views of men like Washington, Hamilton, Monroe, and Andrew Jackson are familiar to everyone who has studied American history. Less well known is the stand of Thomas Jefferson, perhaps because his later biographers, emphasizing the humanitarian ideas of the great libertarian, deliberately chose to ignore the iron qualities in the man. Said Jefferson, "that Government must prove the strongest on earth where every man * * * would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern." Those words were written in a day when our hard-won independence was far from secure.

Jefferson was specific as to the measures to be employed in creating and maintaining the core of a sound defense. Writing to Monroe in 1813, he stated, "We must make military instruction a regular part of collegiate education. We can never be safe till this is done." The following year, in outlining a national system of education, he included military and naval architecture among the subjects to be taught in professional schools, and recommended general military training for the younger students as a form of recreation. The mass of the Nation's youth, under his scheme, would have received enough instruction in the use of arms and the routine of military drill to make their transition into soldiers a relatively simple matter in the event of a national emergency. And the intellectual elite were to receive the more advanced and technical instruction necessary to fit them for service as officers in the event of war. The essence of this modest program of national insurance was its emphasis on a limited degree of military competence for all able-bodied men (a reminder of the Anglo-Saxon fyrd of King Alfred's day) and an elite corps of trained leaders.

Unhappily such wisdom and foresight was lost on a people to whom a soldier had become a symbol of the tyranny from which they had fled when they sought asylum in the new world. The views of the electorate were properly expressed in that gem of legislation passed by Congress in June 1784, 9 months after the signing of the Peace of Paris. It declared: "Standing armies in time of peace are inconsistent with the principles of republican governments, dangerous to the liberties of a free people, and generally converted into destructive engines for establishing despotism. * * * The commanding officer is hereby directed to discharge the troops now in the service of the United States except 25 privates to guard stores at Fort Pitt and 55 to guard stores at West Point." Just emerged from a war in which they had been compelled to mobilize 400,000 Continentals and militia against an enemy who never had more than 42,000 men in the field, these early Americans could still reduce their armed forces to two tiny groups of quartermaster storekeepers. They placed their trust in the width of an ocean not yet shrunk by modern technology.

That bit of folly in our initial item of peacetime military legislation assisted in the birth of a tradition for which we have paid so heavily and so often that the lesson may at last have been learned. That we have

never gone down to final defeat in any war under policies so dangerous to our national safety can be attributed to many causes. Among them is the fact that sound military training never quite died. Through the intervals of peace it survived on a skeleton basis. Always there remained a small nucleus of trained officers and men which could be, and was, expanded in times of emergency to meet the crisis. The cost, or to be specific, the wanton waste of that haphazard way of buying national insurance shows how far the American people were ready to gamble with their security. Only a rich nation could so have indulged itself. There was, moreover, a margin of safety in the fluctuating backlog of trained and partly trained men produced through private initiative. As the records of every war have shown, this reserve pool, the product of our military colleges and academies, was rich in officer material. Many of such graduates embraced a permanent military career. Today's roster of that contingent begins with the Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, and continues with an imposing list of officers exercising high command in the field or vital staff positions. Among them are two outstanding major generals in the armored forces, both of them Norwich products—Maj. Gens. Ernest N. Harmon and Edward H. Brooks, Jr.

From the first, military instruction under civilian auspices and as a feature of higher education has been a peculiarly American institution. It has never had a true counterpart abroad. Seeking its origin, one discovers it here in Norwich University or, to be specific, in Norwich's predecessor, the American Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy, which opened its doors at Norwich, Vt., in 1819. To the farsighted vision of one man, Capt. Alden Partridge, founder of the institution, must be given the credit for this inspired step. Captain Partridge, product of a rugged environment in which merit alone could pave the way to advancement, returned to his native Vermont in 1819 with well matured views as to the young Nation's educational needs. Thirteen years of service with the faculty and staff of the United States Military Academy, during which period he had successively held the positions of professor of mathematics, professor of engineering, and superintendent had given him the opportunity to test his views.

A grim moment of his West Point service which occurred June 18, 1812, is worth recalling. On that day Congress declared a state of war against England. And on that day West Point was an empty shell, devoid of instructors and cadets. Of more than 300 candidates appointed to the academy in the previous 2 or 3 years, not one had entered. The hostility of William Eustis, Madison's Secretary of War, had prevented the certification of their credentials. In the meanwhile cadets and officers already stationed at West Point had been scattered throughout the Army, on the ground that their services were needed elsewhere. If any serious protest was ever registered against Eustis's policies, it does not appear on the record. The Military Academy Act of 1812 provided a tardy correction for this state of affairs.

Captain Partridge logically concluded that sole dependence on a national academy as a source of trained officer material was dangerous—all the more so because of the widespread and continuing hostility among his countrymen against anything that savored of a professionally trained force. So long as public opinion favored a militia of citizen soldiery, it appeared wise to make the best of the situation. But even in a militia there must be men qualified to command and to lead. Counting on support from those elements of the population who put a proper valuation on military training as a feature of higher education, he decided to launch his project. His plan called for the preparation of a youth "in the best possible manner for the correct discharge of the duties of any station in which he may be placed." It is interesting to note that, more than a century before Captain Partridge's time, John Milton, England's greatest poet, less well-known as a practical pacifist, had declared in his tractate on education, "I call a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly skillfully, and magnanimously, all of the offices, both private and public, of peace and war." Whether Milton's terse pronouncement had ever been brought to Captain Partridge's attention is not recorded. It is interesting to note in passing that the views of the author of Paradise Lost have been significantly disinterred for frequent quotation in these days of blood letting, when higher education is once more surveying its function and objectives.

Captain Partridge charted his course along lines which broke sharply from the traditional immersion in the classics then in vogue. True, Latin and Greek and the modern languages were available to those who preferred the classics. The major emphasis, however, was on the pure and applied sciences leading to and including the study of engineering. Ultimately, courses in agriculture were set up. What most disturbed the educational die-hards of his day was Captain Partridge's organization of the student body as a military unit and the inclusion of military drills and exercises in the daily schedule. He was soon to hear civilian educators refer to his cadets as "janissaries"; his academy, as an "infidel institution." Nevertheless, it was not long before he had definitely proven his case. "Partridge makes men" became the well-known comment of the day; and within 5 years after its foundation the academy was drawing students from 18 of the 24 States in the Union, and from several of the organized Territories and foreign countries as well. Judging from the distribution of its student body, no other private institution of that day could lay so just a claim to being the "national university" on which Alden Partridge had set his heart.

Before he laid down the reins of authority Captain Partridge was to see his example emulated in many parts of the country. Indeed, in addition to the American Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy, he founded five other academies in as many States. Lack of time forbids discussion of how the destruction by fire of the original academy buildings at Norwich led to its removal to Northfield, or of its chartering by the State of Vermont in 1834 as Norwich University. The sprout planted by the founder had borne its fruit and scattered its seed to every part of the country until the military colleges, to use the War Department's technical description, and the secondary schools of the same type were a commonplace in the Nation's educational pattern. Out of the wartime experience with their product was born the R. O. T. C. system, the source of more than 100,000 officers for the present war. Just how far the availability of this pool of elite material affected the speed and quality of our rearmament program after 1939 and the war effort itself is a matter calling for further study. It is safe to say that the net benefit was tremendous and that the cost of the peacetime maintenance of R. O. T. C. training has been repaid manyfold in the dividends declared on the battlefield.

There is a less rosy side to this picture, one which accurately reflects our costly obsession with the notion that world peace could be had by fiat, or in any event that this country could remain aloof from whatever storms might be raging outside our national boundaries. Our enemies of today entertained no such illusions. In the states which comprised the Axis and in some of their imitators as well the pattern of education from bottom to top, had been reshaped into the various types of training peculiarly necessary to a people planning a course of all-out aggression. Pure research, the processes of honest analysis, and truth itself disappeared from the classrooms and the textbooks.

The reaction of America's teachers and commentators to this deliberate pollution of the stream of education was one of righteous scorn. What we failed to note at the same time was the weaknesses in our own system. Only at the very last, when our active entry into the war had become merely a question of time, did we discover that for more than 20 years the product of our institutions of higher education had received, along with their diplomas, an assortment of false illusions on every major issue touching the obligations of the United States to its fellow nations, and of themselves as individuals to their country. There is no fitter commentary on the student's state of mind than the language and the spirit of the petitions which poured in on Congress from the campuses during the debate on the selective-service bill. True that situation has been corrected, at least for this day. I am told on good authority that not a few of the rabid petitioners of 1940 are listed among the men posthumously decorated for valor beyond the call of duty. Still, before we decide to close the books on this matter, we will do well to remember that the foolish effusions of these youths merely gave back to society what society had given them. It is comforting to add that no one has been readier to admit responsibility for the dangerously visionary teaching of these past years than the educators themselves. That fact clears the ground for the realistic, honest approach to the problems of the peace to come, problems just as important and far more complex than that of achieving military victory.

False motivation was not the sole weakness of our educational system in these years of truce. Almost as serious was the progressive decline of interest among the students in what they describe as the tough courses, particularly those in the technical fields. The deterioration was most marked in the secondary schools, giving the colleges a steadily weakening supply of entering material. For a nation which prides itself on having outstripped all others in its technological advances, this situation was bad enough in peacetime. For a nation, destined soon to fight for its existence and to provide at the same time the flood of supplies necessary to keep its allies in the fight, appropriate comment is best left to the imagination. Happily the trend is reversed; classroom emphasis has gone back to the tough courses and to individual merit. We can hope that 25 years hence no foreign ambassador can respond as did Admiral Nomura 3 months before Pearl Harbor when a fellow guest at a dinner party asked him whether he thought America would maintain her stand to the point of going to war. "No," responded the smiling Admiral, "too many Beauty Rest mattresses; too many chocolate-milk shakes." The admiral's comment obviously indicated not only his estimate of a softening mental and spiritual fiber, but took in physical fitness as well. The record of our induction centers since 1940 bears him out. Nomura might have added: "Too many coonskin coats; too few players' uniforms."

This recital of shortcomings, all of them inimical to our national potential for war and for peace, might readily be dismissed as bygones which are best forgotten. In a day when our armed forces are driving to victory with a power and skill never surpassed in our history, we would all prefer to dwell on

that sum total of human fitness and unquenchable spirit which is achieving victory. That has been the pattern of our past wars, and of the periods of peace which followed. Focusing our minds on the ultimate victory and blocking out the painful memories of the price paid for victory, we lost the lessons of the avoidable waste which entered into the cost. So doing we threw away the one real safeguard against a repetition of the folly. Better this time to keep the bygones before us as warning signs, better to hold them as object lessons lest we again become soft in mind and fat in body, ready in the estimation of some future self-styled master race, for the kill.

It will be a lean, hard America that emerges from this war. It will arrive at the hour of victory, the hour which one recent author characterizes as the most dangerous in all history, trained to the minute. That America need not fear the squandering of the fruits of the war, as we squandered those of World War No. 1, so long as our people as a whole show as much courage and mental honesty in facing our national problems, as our soldiers are showing on the battlefield. There is no other route to safety in a day when the robot bomb and the B–29 have reduced the word "frontier" to a technical abstraction, when boundaries will be safe only so long as any future renascence of the will to world mastery is promptly identified and then destroyed at the source before it is too late.

How and to what extent America will take to heart the lessons learned since the outbreak of this war in Manchuria 13 years ago rests with the electorate. In this Nation the "sovereign will of the people" is no empty phrase coined by a dictator for his own purposes. The executive instrument of the Government, including the armed forces, can do no more than implement that sovereign will, as expressed in the acts of Congress. The rule of the people which survived the two greatest crises of our past, first when we fought to secure national independence and again when we preserved by force the unity of the Nation now faces a greater test. This time the stakes are all that humankind has achieved in its struggle of sixty centuries to establish the dignity, integrity, and sanctity of the common man.

Military victory over our enemies will be but a first major step toward the ultimate goal. Whether the fruits of that victory will again be squandered, as our generation squandered those of 1918, whether we will achieve only a breathing space before the issue of human liberty is again put to the test of battle, depends largely on the vision, courage, and tenacity of the American people in the years ahead. One fact alone sets them apart from all other nations. Under their control lies a total combat potential such as no other nation can boast. Whether it be latent, as it was in 1940, or supremely effective as it is today on every fighting front, the sovereign people who speak in terms of such power carry a responsibility which cannot be overestimated. Nor, as Pearl Harbor has shown, can the issue be dodged. The one road to safety and to the peace which, in the President's words, has become "indivisible," lies in the full acceptance by the people of the obligations inherent in the status of the United States as a great power.

Responsibility so broad and far-reaching can be met only by a people ready for it. The preparedness I have in mind is not so much one that can be expressed in terms of combat divisions, and in naval and air task forces, maintained against the day of war but rather one which tallies with Thomas Jefferson's definition, previously quoted, under which every man is ready to meet invasions of the public order as his personal concern. Such readiness, to have any value, must begin with a proper understanding of the issues at stake. Hand-in-hand with understanding goes the physical and spiritual fitness which qualify the individual to make a proper contribution to the nation's cause. If this formula appears to point toward a projected race of supermen, let me hasten to say that the word is best forgotten. At the same time we need something considerably better than the average which has been processed in our induction centers these past 3 years. And if we are to get it, education, higher education must point the way.

The immediate challenge to education is one which any real teacher will welcome. The human raw material now flowing into the campuses is in many respects quite unlike that of 5, 10, or 15 years ago. Some have already had their taste of battle. Nearly all have relatives in uniforms. And with few exceptions they show a comprehension of world events which would put to shame many an international relations major of 5 years ago. Above all they feel that no glib, stereotyped interpretation will explain to them the inner elements of the present struggle, nor of the problems still to come. Instead they are eager to wrestle with the issues facing us all, beginning with the acceptance of the fact that we cannot again break faith with the dead. It will not be difficult to mould such material to the end that the sense of personal responsibility will be fully developed, and to the further end that the college product, returning to its native community, will in due time provide sound, enlightened leadership for those who have been denied the opportunity of higher education. Nor should it be hard to drive home the need of physical fitness for all as a proper counterpart to mental development. If that ideal appears visionary, let us not forget that the college product of the last 20 years of truce accurately reflected the weaknesses of higher education in executing its vital mission. The cost of that failure is too heavy to be dodged by our consciences, too far-reaching to escape the historian. In blocking off that blind alley to futility, we will find it easier to keep to the straight road in the future.

You will note that I have said nothing to this point on the subject of military training as an element of higher education. Inasmuch as it is involved in the broader question of compulsory service, an issue now under consideration by Congress, I am omitting it from my discussion. What can be said at this time is that the role of the military colleges and universities like Norwich will play a continuing vital part in the rounded development of our youth. Adding to other requirements of their curricula a prescribed course in military training, thereby inculcating a sense of self-discipline which enures to the student's lasting benefit, they offer no asylum to the type who seeks merely 4 years of delightful exposure to a campus environment, untroubled by too much pain of concentrated effort. The appeal must continue to go to the youth who realizes that the worth while things of life come the hard way. So doing, the military colleges spare themselves much wasted time and energy. They cannot, it is true, adhere longer to the full import of Alden Partridge's rule for the training of mind, body, and character, so blended as to fit a man for "all of the offices, both public and private, of peace and war." Technology and its offspring, specialization, compel a contraction of a program so broad. The fundamentals, however, which point a man toward the desired goal, can and should remain unchanged, ensuring the Nation that this institution continues to train men properly for the duties of both peace and war. Then, as once was said of Alden Partridge, it can still and always be said, "Norwich makes men."

The Truth About Farmer Cooperatives and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, following up the correspondence with Ben C. McCabe, of the so-called National Tax Equality Association, over the question of the taxation of moneys held in trust by farm cooperatives for their members, I ask consent to include with my remarks two statements released by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives which tell the truth about this whole situation:

THE TRUTH ABOUT FARMER COOPERATIVES AND TAXES

Despite clever propaganda to the contrary, farmer cooperatives are not exempt from taxation. Generally speaking, they pay taxes the same as any other business.

They pay State and local property taxes.

They pay excise taxes.

They pay transportation taxes on the movement of goods or persons and taxes on communication services.

They pay social-security and unemployment-insurance taxes.

They pay stamp taxes, use taxes, import taxes, occupational taxes, and miscellaneous taxes on various commodities wherever other businesses pay them.

Many of them even pay income taxes—the reason that others do not, is that they have no income to tax.

For farmer cooperatives are service—not profit—organizations.

Cooperatives operate on the basis of deducting from the returns to the farmer for his products, or adding to the price of supplies purchased for the farmer, an amount sufficient to cover estimated costs plus a margin for operating contingencies. What is left after actual costs are covered belongs to the farmer-member or patron and is systematically returned to him. Even the margin left for contingencies if unused is returned.

It is in no sense a profit to the association; it is a revolving fund into which balances due the patron are from day to day accumulated, pending settlement with the farmers, and from which excess contingency charges are from day to day paid out.

Furthermore, like all individual citizens, the farmer must report all taxable income including refunds from cooperatives which he receives in cash or stock; and for that matter, all equities that may be credited to his account on the books of the cooperative.

Any other corporation operating on such a nonprofit basis, would also pay no income tax, for the simple reason that there would be no income to tax. This method of doing business is actually being followed by many concerns other than farmer cooperatives. In other words, there is nothing to prevent any industrial or commercial corporation from contracting to refund to patrons all proceeds, less expenses of operation, thus operating on a cost basis as does a cooperative.

The relationship between a cooperative and the farmer is essentially that of agent and principal. To tax the cooperative for balances of earnings, or savings which it is obligated by law, charter, or agreement to

handle as trust funds for, and, to pass on to, the farmer, would be taxing an agent for income belonging to his principal, the absurdity of which is obvious.

If the farmer gave his hired man $10 with which to buy 3 bushels of seed potatoes on his trip to town, and the hired man was able to get the seed for $9, including truck hire, and later returned the $1 to the farmer, nobody would maintain that the other $1 was income or profit and should be taxed to the hired man. Yet the taxation of proceeds received by a farmer cooperative for one of its patrons would be nothing more than taxing the hired man.

Farmers set up their cooperatives to provide themselves needed services—not to make profits on capital investment in unrelated enterprises.

In the event of liquidation, the net assets of a cooperative are prorated to the members or patrons on the basis of the use they have made of the association; if they are stockholders they can receive as such no more than paid-in value of their stock. In addition, they may receive as patrons, their equity in any undistributed balances on hand. Thus, the principles of nonprofit and patronage refund, termed recently by a Federal judge as part of the "warp and woof" of any cooperative, are carried out not only in operation but also in the process of liquidation.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

SHALL THE FAMILY FARM BE PRESERVED?

In American agriculture the producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative has been developed as a vitally important means by which the farmer preserves and exercises his right of free enterprise. Shall this right be denied?

An attack that will strike straight home to three out of every five farm operators in America has been launched by certain business and financial interests.

It would strike at these farmers by denying them the right to use their producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperatives on a cost-of-doing-business basis.

Farmers set up these cooperatives because they needed them.

They use them to provide services they need to carry on their farming operations—services that in most cases would not be practical for the individual farmer to provide for himself on his own farm.

There can be no doubt about this statement. The figures themselves prove it. Farming is a small business, and the average member of a farm cooperative requires the services of his cooperative to the extent of less than $1,000 per year.

Yet, the opponents of cooperatives, operating as they are behind a false front—for the officers and directors of this anti-co-op drive do not reveal the real forces back of it—would take from farmers the right to join with their neighbors to provide themselves on a sound basis with the services they need.

Such an attack threatens free enterprise right at a time when two opposing and contradicting philosophies are under test in America.

The newer of these philosophies looks to the National Government to solve our problems, meet all emergencies, and to regulate and order the economic life of the individual.

The older and traditional philosophy calls for the individual to be strong and self-reliant, through the exercise of his own initiative and the application of his own courage and resourcefulness.

In American agriculture, the producer-owned and produced-controlled cooperative has been developed as a vitally important means by which the farmer, working with his neighbors, preserves and exercises his right of free enterprise. Without some such means of mobilizing their economic strength, farmers will become either the serfs of other interests or a ward of the Government.

If he lands in either position, free enterprise in the United States will be dealt a death blow. The very foundation of our economic life rests on the ownership and operation of land by the maximum number of freeholders.

Certainly if farmers are denied the privileges of cooperative endeavor because of the opposition of selfish financial and business interests, there can be no common ground for cooperation between the farmers of the country and finance, industry, and commerce. This is a fact which businessmen everywhere should ponder.

FARMING IS A FAMILY ENTERPRISE

There are 6,096,799 farms in America. There are only 530,131,000 acres of tillable land. This means that the average American farm has only 87 tillable acres.

Although farms as a whole are the important producers of basic wealth, the average farm is a family-sized business. Yet the individual farmer has the same problems of buying and processing and selling that the big corporations have—and without their concentration of money and facilities.

To enable the individual family farm operator to cope with the advantages in capital, trained personnel, and research facilities of the other great industries of the country, the United States and the legislatures of all the States in the Union have authorized the organization and operation of producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations by farmers. At the same time the legislative bodies of the country imposed certain conditions which effectively safeguard both farmers and the general public from the misuse of cooperatives, such as:

Restrict participation to bona fide agricultural producers.

Limit the return on invested capital.

Base control on membership rather than investment. One man, one vote.

Provide that cooperatives shall do business at cost—any overcharges for services rendered are returned to the members in proportion to the use they made of these services.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

"Come Before Winter"

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have through the years listened to and read many great sermons, but I have never heard or read one that has been so much of an inspiration to me as one that came to my desk recently entitled "Come Before Winter." Last night I gave it to one of the young men running an elevator in the House Office Building, and he told me that he has not read anything more inspiring in his time. It was preached by Rev. J. B. Baker, D. D., of St. Matthew's Lutheran Church, York, Pa., in my district.

The sermon is as follows:

"COME BEFORE WINTER"

(2 Timothy 4: 21)

These words were written by that grand old warrior of the faith, Paul the Apostle, to his young convert and ministerial son, Timothy. Paul is a prisoner in Rome in the days when prisons were often little more than cisterns, with no light entering them save that which seeped in through the hole at the top, through which the prisoners were lowered. The Mamertine dungeon in which Paul was kept, a vile hole about 20 feet in diameter, is still shown to tourists.

How little we easygoing Americans know what it cost some men to be Christians. A little while ago one of the German puppets tyrannizing Norway called the bishop of Oslo into his office and said:

"You triple traitor, you ought to have your head chopped off."

The bishop looked down at the cross that hung from his neck and simply said: "Here I am."

And if you read the rest of this letter of Paul to Timothy you will find that Paul said practically the same thing. "I am now ready to be offered up."

One said, "I am now ready," the other said, "Here I am."

"Must I be carried to the skies
On flowery beds of ease,
While others fought to win the prize
And sailed through bloody seas?"

This grand old warrior had two needs there in his dark, damp dungeon, one for his body and one for his mind. God was abundantly caring for his spiritual needs, so he wrote to Timothy:

"Bring the cloke that I left in Troas with Carpus and the books, especially the parchments."

The increasing dampness and coolness of his dungeon is indicated by his pathetic request to "come before winter."

There are two reasons why Paul asked him to come before winter; one was his own need and the other reason was the hazard of winter travel.

Ships were often compelled to put up for the winter in ports even in the Mediterranean and those who took the risk often lost their cago, sometimes all and sometimes their ship.

But we are not going to linger in the Mediterranean Basin. Coming before winter has too wide a significance for that.

Paul's words to Timothy are God's words to you. Everybody wants to come to God sometimes.

Every person with a normal mind knows that we are all heading for a great unknown, that we will all need more than human strength and human wisdom very soon, and that to get it we must get right with God and not expect Him to get right with us.

The only question on which we differ is the question of time.

Felix said to Paul when he pricked his conscience: "When I have a convenient season I will call for thee."

Felix has more descendants than the original Smith.

A wiser than Felix said: "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth," which means come before winter.

The same two reasons which made it wise for Timothy to come before winter make it wise for you to come before winter.

Paul needed him and the saints need you.

You say "Me," "a drunk," "a vagabond," "me, who swears and sneers at the church and church people, who has not read the Bible or gone to church for years," "you're just talking."

No, friend, I'm not just talking, and these people who just a few minutes ago sang "For

You I Am Praying" know that I'm not just talking. There isn't a man living, there isn't a woman living, be they ever so vile or so low, who cannot become a comfort to the saints, who cannot warm their hearts as that cloak of Timothy warmed the body of Paul.

Suppose you are a drunkard. Jerry McCauley, and Samual Hadley, and John B. Gough, and Sam Jones, and Sam Small, and John G. Wolley were all drunkards once upon a time, and when Jerry McCauley died more redeemed men followed his body to its grave than ever followed a hearse in the city of New York.

Suppose you are a vagabond. So was John St. John, the superintendent of the Bowery Mission, and hundreds of other men brought to Christ in the Bowery missions, many of them college graduates, wanderers from home, estranged from their families, damned by rum.

Suppose you do swear. Mothers warned their children against going near that profane tinker who bore the name of John Bunyan. John Bunyan gave his heart to God and God purged his vocabulary as he will purge the vocabulary of every Christian, for no Christian swears. And with his new heart and renewed mind and purged vocabulary John Bunyan, with his glorious Pilgrim's Progress, has cheered and comforted and inspired and blessed thousands upon thousands.

Suppose you haven't been in church for years. Neither was the son of Jacob Reiss, the right-hand man of Theodore Roosevelt in clearing up New York. He hadn't been inside a church for over 20 years. That is long enough to starve a man to death spiritually. But God can raise the dead and that is what he did for Mr. Reiss. On the day that news came of the terrible destruction of Rotterdam a strange impulse took him to a church in New York and to his amazement he found that there is something solid in religion and that he had been mushing around in dirty sand all those 20 years and more. The result was that he was honest enough to admit it and write his confession and give it to a national magazine so that the whole world could read it. You can imagine how the saints were comforted by his confession and his manly declaration of it. But it went further than that. Maybe you too heard your mother sing:

"Ring the bells of heaven,
There is joy today
For a soul returning from the wild.
See the Father meets him
Out upon the way,
Welcoming his weary, wandering child.

"Glory, glory, how the angels sing,
Glory, glory, how the loud harps ring.
'Tis the ransomed army, like a mighty sea,
Pealing forth the anthem of the free."

That song is based on the words of the Lord that there is joy in the presence of the angels over one sinner that repents.

Oh, come before winter. You have something, no matter how vile or how low you are, that will warm the hearts of saints and cheer the hosts of heaven.

But that is not the only reason why I plead with you to come before winter.

Each season of life, like each season of the year, has experiences and blessings that cannot be found in any other season. If missed, they are missed forever.

Who would want to jump from winter into summer and miss springtime; spring, with its roses and peonies, its anemones and arbutus, its apple blossoms and forget-me-nots, its returning robins and mating wrens, its luring streams and calling woods?

Taking spring out of the year would be like taking boyhood out of life. In fact, Tennyson called spring "the boyhood of the year."

"There is no time like Spring,
When life's alive in everything."

Don't forget that there is a spring to the Christian life, too, and that he who comes to Christ in winter misses one of the sweetest experiences in Christian living.

The past presidents of the York County Luther League meet once a year in a banquet of food and memory.

A number of them are no more active in the league, but when it was mentioned at the last meeting that the league will shortly celebrate its fiftieth anniversary, the past presidents decided to pay for a souvenir program to be used then, in appreciation of what the Luther League did for them in the springtime of their life. That is when all of them learned to speak in public, pray in public, and live a useful Christian life.

Come before winter that you may have something satisfying to carry with you through the years. Memory will be a flat purse if you don't. And who would want a year without a summer?

Sitting one day in the long ago with a man so loved and honored by all that everyone called him Uncle George, and looking from his front porch out over a field of golden grain waving like a drowsy sea, he said:

"My folks want me to sell and move to town, but how can I leave a scene like this?"

And everything else was in harmony with the wheat and his soul; the hay was already in the barn, the apples and the peaches ripening, the berry bushes bending, the garden full of earth's richest offerings, and the bees gathering their nectar.

A few years without a summer, and we would all die. Summer is just as valuable in Christian living as it is in general living.

Someone said, "Oh, for a thousand years of mid-life." We can't have that many, of course, but mid-life is the summer of the soul. Come before winter if you want a real harvest. This means more than present satisfaction.

The Word declares that "They that be wise shall shine as the stars forever and ever." Daniel xii: 3.

But some stars are brighter than other stars, and some of the wise will be brighter than others, and for only one reason.

Each will be rewarded according to the deeds done in the flesh.

A Christian life without a summer will be very apt to be like a farm without a summer, bins empty, hayloft empty, cribs empty, everything empty.

Come before winter. Come when your great production mid-life can yield harvests for God. Don't give him a summerless offering, a sucked out orange, an empty barn.

A spring well managed and a summer well spent brings an autumn well filled. It is then that the Creator gives the forests their richest hues, then that the very angels of heaven seem to hang out their choicest draperies as the sun goes down, then that the caverns of winds breathe out their crispest breezes. It is then that the tiller of the soil on whose industry we all live feels at his best. Riley, the Hoosier, tells it all in his—

"When the frost is on the pumpkin and the fodder's in the shock,
And you hear the kyouck and gobble of the strutting turkey cock,
And the clackin' of the guineas and the cluckin' of the hens,
And the rooster's hallelooyah as he tiptoes on the fence;
O, it's then's the time a feller is a feeling at his best,
With the risin' sun to greet him from a night of peaceful rest,
As he leaves the house, bareheaded, and goes out to feed the stock,
When the frost is on the pumpkin and the fodder's in the shock."

In his quaint Hoosier dialect he says that if there was such a thing as the angels wanting boarding he'd want "to accommodate the whole endurin' flock, when the frost is on the punkin and the fodder's in the shock." And thinking of everything gathered in, the barns and cellers and the attics and pantries and shelves full, he says:

"It sets my heart a clickin 'like the tickin' of a clock,
When the frost is on the punkin and the fodder's in the shock."

That same feeling pulsates the heart of the Christian who remembered his Creator in the days of his youth and gave the Lord the spring and the summer of his life. There is a deep satisfaction that the late comer can never know.

The treasures which Christ tells us to lay up in Heaven are the soul harvests which need a spring and a summer as well as the field harvests do.

Come before winter. Come while you still have strength for service left. He alone will save you, but even He cannot reward you above your deeds. The Bible is very specific in warning us that we shall be rewarded according to the deeds done in the flesh.

All the mercy of God, and it is as fathomless as the sea, cannot give you more yonder than you have earned. Our entrance into heaven is a pure gift but our station in heaven is our own achieving. How can you work 6 and 7 days on earth to be somebody here and be so perfectly willing to be nobody hereafter, when this life is just the draft of a breath and that life endless?

Come before winter. But there is another reason for warning you against a winter acceptance of Christ and that is in the fact that winter travel is dangerous.

Beginning with Dr. Starbuck many students of religion have proven by elaborate charts and diagrams that most of the people who have come to Christ have come in their youth. A few before 12, many between 12 and 20, a goodly number between 20 and 30, then the line drops down like a shot eagle, with a small number between 30 and 40, a still smaller number between 40 and 60, and only a very rare conversion after that. In the 40 years of my ministry, I have confirmed only one person in the eighties.

Youth is by far the best traveling time to Christ, youth with its alertness, its idealism, its dreams, its ease of choice, its quickness of motion.

Youth is the time of great decisions, of location of trade and profession, of marriage and methods. It is in youth that we decide whether we are going to be prodigal or thrifty, slipshod or systematic, cooperative or selfish, superficial or thorough. Not a classmate to my knowledge is different in essentials today from what he was in college 45 years ago. Come to Jesus now.

Don't wait until your eyes are dim and your ears dull and your arteries brittle and your joints stiff and your gait limping.

Christ gave you a 33-year-old body, don't give Him a dried up carcass. He died for you in His prime, don't live for Him in a worn out body.

Even if you do come like the dying thief in the eleventh hour it is still a bad bargain for you, because you might have done so much better.

But the chances are that, if you put it off till winter, you won't come at all.

In the stormy days of the English-Scottish wars the English sovereign offered all the Scotch chiefs pardon, if they came before the end of the year and acknowledged his sovereignty.

They knew that further resistance was useless, and one by one went down to bow the knee, but one of the Scotch chiefs, McIan by name, decided that he was going to be the last to do it, and so he waited until just a few days before the end of the year to start.

A blizzard, however, developed in those last few days and prevented McIan from reaching the king in time. The result was that he was ignominiously put to death for his pride.

Of course, the Lord Christ would not do that to any mortal, but the tragedy is that

he who waits till winter will likely not arrive.

He will be like the touring party that came to Mount Washington and spurned the idea of taking a guide with them because they had a geologist with them. With their geologist, who knew rocks but not Mount Washington, they started up the slopes. In the afternoon a snowstorm developed which became worse the longer the afternoon wore on. In a short time they were traveling in circles and when the morning sun rose the next day they were all cold in death not far from the house they had hoped to enter.

Lost in sight of refuge. Don't you make that mistake, brother. Come before winter and accept our guide, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Wanted: An All-American Bard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. NEWSOME

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David L. Cohn, published recently in the Atlantic Monthly:

WANTED: AN ALL-AMERICAN BARD

(By David L. Cohn)

What the country needs is a poet laureate of Congress. This is the sense of a bill recently introduced by Representative W. C. COLE (Republican, Missouri) and now in the hands of the House Library Committee for consideration. The bill proposes as first laureate Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, of Troy, Ala., an employee of the Capitol Architect's office. A better selection could scarcely have been made, for not only is his name rich in literary connotations but he is demonstrably an excellent poet who now quite properly gives his work a patriotic slant. This, for example, is a stanza from Mr. Carlisle's stirring poem, Uncle Sam's WAVE:

"Methinks, many a brave,
That's escaped with his life,
Will come home to his WAVE,
And will make her his wife.
And throughout the long years
That are likely to come,
Free from sorrow and tears,
They will sing Home, Sweet Home."

The use of the word "methinks" shows that the poet is as familiar with verse forms as you are with the old picket fence on Sycamore Street; yet there are surly critics in this country who will say that Mr. Carlisle is not a poet at all. These are the people who have got American poetry off the beam, and Congress, recognizing the damage that has been done, is trying to get it on again. Mr. Carlisle's verse takes us back to the simplicities of our forefathers, and anybody who does not want to return to the simplicities of his forefathers is at best a poltroon and at worst a traitor. For what do we find even in the little stanza which we have quoted? A celebration of the very things for which this country was founded and which we are now fighting to preserve: the right of a brave to marry a WAVE and spend the rest of their lives singing Home, Sweet Home.

Congressmen, whatever their aesthetic blind spots, have passionate convictions about the uses and beauties of poetry; to them poetry is not, as it is to so many of us, an empty hodge-podge of words about larks, long-winded Greeks, and plowmen breaking the stubborn glebe. They regard it as a tool of their profession and even the prosiest orator breaks his oration every now and then, coats his tongue with honey or with fire as the case may be, and lets fly—"as the poet said." This does something to popularize poetry among their still rude constituents and bears out their contention that it has practical angles.

Congressmen, moreover, are so enamored of verse that they ratified the appointment of Archibald MacLeish, a practicing poet of great ability, as Librarian of Congress. And although Mr. MacLeish is less often quoted by Congressmen than is Eddie Guest and his standards are by no means those of the proposed laureate, Horace Carlisle, the fact that he presides over the great Library is indicative of the trend.

It is heartening, then, to record that with unerring good taste our legislators, who move to the contrapuntal music of no sound, have picked the right man in the person of Horace C. Carlisle. He is vouched for by no less an authority than the good gray poetry lover, the Honorable THEODORE G. BILBO (the Man) of Mississippi, who secured consent to publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Carlisle's poem entitled "Brumidi in the District of Columbia Room." Brumidi, let me say for the benefit of those who are lamentably ignorant of the works of art in their Nation's Capitol, is the little-known genius who painted so many of the murals that adorn the Capitol's walls. The last stanza ends on a note of lofty idealism and intimations of immortality:

"The District of Columbia room belongs to all the States,
And yet it does, in fact, belong to none—
Herein the District laws are planned, but from it emanates
The rule of conduct for none but its own.
The artist, we presume,
Resolved to give this room
The very best that it was his to give—
And, through the coming years, down to the day of doom,
In these, his pictures, will Brumidi live."

Name a Ship "Ann Arbor"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission granted by the House, I am including in these remarks a petition signed by leading citizens and groups of Ann Arbor, Mich., urging that a ship of the United States Navy be named "Ann Arbor." This request gives the reasons why such action on the part of the Secretary of the Navy is advisable. It is as follows:

We respectfully petition that a ship of the United States Navy, of appropriate size, be named after our city.

We are aware that in population Ann Arbor is exceeded by many other American cities, but its influence and importance are entirely disproportionate to its size.

One of the earliest settlements of southern Michigan and from the first a governmental, business, and cultural center, Ann Arbor derives its unique quality from its peculiarly close relation to the "Mother of State Universities," the University of Michigan, whose home it has been since 1837. This, the first publicly supported and publicly governed university of the United States to be successfully organized and operated, has admittedly been the pioneer of public higher education and the model after which the system of State universities of the central and western parts of the country has been fashioned.

The influence and fame of the University of Michigan have been extended far beyond the limits of this country by the teaching, writing, and discoveries of the eminent scholars of its faculties. The late President James Burrill Angell was illustrious both as an educational leader and as a diplomat; Thomas McIntyre Cooley's Constitutional Limitations is one of this country's legal classics; Michigan scientists of both the past and the present have benefited mankind by their discoveries in medicine, chemistry, physics, and engineering.

Since the University of Michigan was first established 133,623 persons have attended it, of whom 82,051 completed the course and received their degrees, and 106,376 are still living. These men and women came literally from all parts of the United States and from all the countries of the world, and as alumni they are correspondingly distributed. There are 7,000 of them in the State of New York and more than 4,000 in California, with large groups in all the intervening States both north and south. Hundreds are to be found in China, India, and the Philippines; hundreds also in Canada, the South and Central American republics, and substantial numbers in every country of Europe, Asia, and Africa. All of these, who as university students walked the pleasant streets of Ann Arbor and lived in its hospitable homes, cherish a deep affection for the city in which the happy and profitable years of their youth were spent. Into whatever port an American naval vessel bearing the name Ann Arbor might come, it would be instantly recognized and welcomed by many who know and love the place.

Apart from the university, Ann Arbor has other reasons for believing itself to be an appropriate sponsor of an American naval vessel. Its picturesque name, based on a tradition of its earliest settlement, is unique. Its beauty of location, its wealth of comfortable homes and handsome streets, its parks, hospitals, and public services are unusual. It offers cultural advantages—concerts, lectures, dramatic performances, library facilities—to be found in few cities except those of the largest size. Its industries, dependent rather upon skilled labor and inventive genius than upon mere size, produce articles which in turn many other industries depend. It is the governmental and cultural center of a large and important area, typically American and highly influential in American life.

In the present war, both the city of Ann Arbor and the University of Michigan are making noteworthy contributions. We are told that the city leads the entire country in its per capita purchase of War bonds. We know that fully 95 percent of its industrial products go into war materials. Outstanding and vitally important items made in Ann Arbor include optical fire-control instruments, broaching tools, that have revolutionized gun making, aircraft parts, radio parts, ball and roller bearings, gun recoil and engine springs, shells, gauges, filters, machine tools, bomb racks, baling presses, and precision instruments of many kinds. The city has sent about 4,000 men into the armed forces, and approximately 3,000 of its citizens are registered for various types of civilian defense.

At the University of Michigan, which has been designated as a training center by both the Navy and the Army, the teaching skill of the faculty, the educational apparatus of laboratories and libraries, and the facilities for lodging, feeding, and caring for the welfare of military and naval personnel in training have been loyally dedicated to national purposes even before December 7, 1941. In its extent and variety, and in that it has not been confined to the mere housing of personnel but has consisted of a wide variety

of educational services which only a highly organized university is fitted to provide, the University of Michigan's war-training service is unique. The institution has also sponsored more than 100 research projects bearing upon war problems, among them some of immediate practical value to the Navy. It maintains an excellent Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, is now conducting the United States Naval Academy's Graduate School of Naval Architecture, and has more than 1,300 seamen and marines in the naval college-training program. Of the university, 128 are now on leave for war service with the Army, Navy, or other Federal agencies; of the alumni and former students, 20,000 are estimated to be in the armed forces. Already 62 have lost their lives in the country's service. Two of the latter were awarded Congressional Medals of Honor posthumously; in honor of one of them, First Lt. George Ham Cannon, United States Marine Corps, the Navy has named one of its new destroyers.

For all these reasons we believe that Ann Arbor is a name which would proudly and most appropriately be borne by an American ship of war. Already known far and wide, it stands for a truly American community, of the kind that has been the special pride and cherished possession of our country, and a community from which have gone forth thousands upon thousands of leaders in public life, the industries, and the professions—Congressmen, Senators, Cabinet members, governors, judges, soldiers, and sailors, engineers, lawyers, scientists, doctors and surgeons, dentists, teachers, and writers—men and women who have importantly helped to shape the thought, government, and social conditions of the country we live in. Ann Arbor has done much for America.

What Price Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, back in pages of past CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS recording the debates in both branches of the Congress on money legislation, we have been told many things about gold and many fallacies about silver. Who could have convinced those old leaders, John Sherman—the gold standard advocate—and Senator Aldrich with his elastic currency scheme, all of which have been demonstrated as impractical and unworkable, that gold alone as a basis of world currencies would prove so inadequate that its value would actually be increased from $20.67 to $35 an ounce, and that it would be seriously proposed in this country to increase the value of gold to $120 per ounce.

These financial leaders and monetary experts were successful in demonetizing silver and in keeping the value of the metal silver on a commodity basis but what has their success done to the value and stability of money throughout the world? And how are we to maintain the stability of our money with a national debt estimated to reach $300,000,000,000 when the war is over with an annual interest charge $9,000,000,000? How much more in taxes will the American people have to raise annually to meet the Government's operating expenses and make payments to reduce the national debt?

We have reached a time when the metallic base of our currency must be broadened for the safety of business and credit in the country, not by increasing the value of gold, 70 percent of which is produced in the British Empire, but by remonetizing silver. The reported plan to increase the value of gold published in the Siskiyou Daily News and my reply thereto follows:

ONE-HUNDRED-AND-TWENTY-DOLLAR GOLD CLUB

A new type of club, designed solely to promote an increase in the price of gold to bring the value of the yellow metal to par with world economic needs, is in process of being launched in Siskiyou County.

Its sponsors hope that its membership will spread first over all California, thence over the United States, and then over the world. They plan no dues, fees, or assessments, requiring only that members work actively for one objective.

That objective will be to bring the price of gold into line with present economic factors and assure that it will be kept in line by regular, periodic price revisions thereafter on a world-wide basis.

The immediate intent is to work for a price of $120 per ounce, troy weight on gold.

That price is based upon years of study of economics and gold by Kenneth K. Ash, Yreka mining engineer, who has attracted international attention from monetary authorities.

It is hoped the objectives of this club will be achieved by spreading knowledge of the need involved, so that first individuals, then mining, then economic organizations and Government officials will be attracted to its support.

As a first step, Mr. Ash has outlined tentatively, as follows:

THE $120-GOLD CLUB

This is a nonprofit club formed for the sole purpose of advocating and actively working for an increase in the value of gold from $35.40 to $120 per fine ounce, troy weight.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 16, 1944.
EDITOR, SISKIYOU DAILY NEWS,
Yreka, Calif.

MY DEAR SIR: It is interesting to receive marked copies of your Daily News advocating the raising of the value of gold $120 an ounce.

While you are planning the advancement of gold what about silver?

Do you realize that the bulk of the gold produced in the world comes from the Eastern Hemisphere and the bulk of the silver in the world is mined in the Western Hemisphere and do you know that there is 400 million ounces of gold proven and in the unmined reserves of South Africa.

Let us take cut a pencil and paper and figure for a minute what an increase the price of this gold from $35 an ounce to a $120 an ounce would mean to the gold miners of the British Empire; $95 an ounce would increase the value of the unmined South African gold by $38,000,000,000 to say nothing of the gold in the British possessions, India, Australia, Canada, and the South Sea Islands.

Did you ever stop to think that the twenty-two billions of gold we have stocked in the Fort Knox vaults of this country was obtained by the products of American labor; surely we cannot afford to raise another mountain of gold purchasing power in the hands of our competitors to take away from American industry the fruits of its labor.

Let us return to a sound adequate money system, based upon the use of both the precious metals of gold and silver, the money that brought the bulk of the territory embraced within the United States and placed America in its present preeminent position among world powers.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Address by Hon. Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania, Before Blair County, Pa., Political Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] on August 13, 1944, before the Blair County, Pa., Political Action Committee, at the Chestnut Street Hall, Altoona, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In addressing this meeting, I cannot but recall the tremendous change which the New Deal has brought to organized labor in western Pennsylvania.

As a small boy I first became interested in the problems of labor and laboring men and their families when I witnessed the eviction of a number of miners and their families from the company houses at the mines located in Possum Hollow, Sewickley Township, Westmoreland County. They were compelled to erect muslin tents on the bar in the river because no one in the neighborhood would lease them land on which to erect their tents. The hardships on the children who were my age or younger excited my sympathy.

Later I remember the bloodshed and violence by which Henry C. Frick crushed the Knights of Labor in the Connellsville coke region. A few years later came the Homestead strike, when Andrew Carnegie viewed with safety the scenery on the Upper Nile in Egypt and let H. C. Frick crush the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers. For 30 years thereafter Frick and the steel magnates ruled western Pennsylvania through the coal and iron police, the State courts, and the State government at Harrisburg. Many of you who hear me today can remember those days when it was worth a workman's life to have it known that he was trying to organize labor in the steel industry. As soon as it was discovered he was put on the black list and his name and activities were furnished to all the other steel companies and manufacturers in western Pennsylvania. You men all know what the black list means.

And just to show you how all these things hang together, it was Henry C. Frick, of Pittsburgh, together with Senator Knox, of Penn-

sylvania, Mr. Frick's personal attorney, and Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, who defeated Woodrow Wilson's ideals and the League of Nations after the last war. It is said that Frick spent more than a million dollars toward this end, thus making certain another world war. The same man who had the strikers shot down at Homestead and at the Morewood Mines and the Trotter Mines of the Frick Coke Co., at the latter 2 of which more than 150 workers were killed or wounded, is the man whose actions a generation ago forced you to send your sons and brothers overseas to fight another world war.

It is well to remember at this time that the second World War has cost 20,000,000 lives and will cost this country at least $300,000,000,000 which you, your children, and your grandchildren will have to pay. The longer I live the surer I am that we face the same kind of enemies at home and abroad as we did in 1920 and we must be eternally on guard to prevent them from destroying our rights and freedom.

To the railroad workers in Altoona I call attention to the fact that Frick's hatred for Woodrow Wilson was caused by the passing of the Adamson Act in 1916, which permanently established the 8-hour day for railroad workers.

I would like to tell you, as a man who has been in politics for over 40 years, that the United Steel Workers and the other C. I. O. unions are doing the only thing which will effectively protect your rights and freedom. You are organizing politically, so that what decency and dignity you may acquire by collective bargaining cannot be taken away from you by political judges, controlled police forces, and private thugs. And I also tell you that, unless you and your friends exercise vigilant watch over the control of the affairs of your cities, counties, State, and Nation, you will never be secure from the threat that some future Henry C. Frick might again beat you down into blood-stained and profitable submission to his will. There are still plenty of Sewell Averys of the Montgomery Ward Co. and Mittens of the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Co. in the Republican Party.

To protect your wages, your hours of labor, your dignity as human beings and your rights as American citizens, you must register and you must vote, and you must make sure that your votes are counted. You must register and vote for your friends and against the enemies of labor.

You are fortunate today in that you have had the matchless liberal leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt for the last 12 years—and we are going to have his leadership for the next 4 years. He is a true friend of labor because he is a true American. He has been called a traitor to his class because he saw that a house divided against itself cannot stand, that this Nation cannot endure half bond-holders and half bread-lines. He saved labor and he saved capital, and his chief reward for this, so far as capital is concerned, has been to be called every dirty name in the book.

My record in politics has been consistently liberal—I have given unstinted loyalty and support to all the great Democratic liberal leaders of my time, including William Jennings Bryan, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and constantly admired the liberalism of Theodore Roosevelt, Robert La Follette, Sr., and George Norris, of Nebraska. I put the Bituminous Coal Act on the statute books and fought many a battle, successful as well as otherwise, for the liberal measures sponsored by President Roosevelt's administration. The kindest thing that the Republicans have said about me is that I am a politician. I have come to the conclusion that, in Republican eyes, a liberal who fails is a statesman, a liberal who succeeds is a corrupt politician, and a liberal who leads successfully is a dangerous demagogue. Well, I haven't made a political failure of my liberalism, so I guess I'll never be called anything but a politician, except among my friends.

You know that I led the fight for the renomination of that great American and great liberal, HENRY WALLACE, at the Chicago convention. I am sorry that the convention did not select him as President Roosevelt's running mate, because, in my opinion, HENRY WALLACE is one of the greatest living liberals in the world today. He is a comparatively young man—and has much time—and I am sure that this Nation has not heard the last of HENRY WALLACE.

However, I am frank to say that since HENRY WALLACE could not receive the nomination, I am delighted that the convention chose HARRY TRUMAN to be President Roosevelt's running mate. For 9 years I sat beside HARRY TRUMAN in the Senate of the United States. We have always voted together on every measure for the rights and dignity of labor and for the welfare and protection of our servicemen. HARRY TRUMAN went out to do battle against the huge corporations which had graciously consented to manufacture the weapons needed by our armed forces, and he forced them to disgorge millions upon millions of dollars of unearned and exorbitant profits. He did this with such skill, knowledge, and dignity that I have yet to hear anyone call Senator TRUMAN a demagog. They do call him a politician. The rights of American labor and the privileges of American citizens will be in safe hands with Roosevelt and TRUMAN on the ticket.

I shall, of course, support Roosevelt and TRUMAN all the way down the line, as I know you will do. I rely on you to help carry Pennsylvania for Roosevelt and TRUMAN next November. We of the State Democratic organization cannot do so without your active support. We not only need you to register and to vote, we need your advice, we need the cooperation of vigorous leadership.

For I tell you that organized labor, under the leadership of Phil Murray and the C. I. O., is one of the most dynamic sources of social action, the only testing ground of political leadership in modern America. Everywhere else, the springs are running dry. Outside of the Farmers' Union, there is little farm leadership today that is not admitted to be subservient to the packers, millers, processors, and warehousemen. If the farms could again produce an Abraham Lincoln, you can rest assured that the Republican National Committee would throw him out on his ear and probably have MARTIN DIES investigate him as a Communist. The last great leader of American capitalism died before we entered the last war—the elder J. P. Morgan. The living great leader of American industry is now in his eighties and I see no new Henry Ford springing up with a billion-dollar business. Only in labor organizations do we find the vigor of leadership, the courage, and the imagination which gives hope for the future of our institutions. We call on you to work with us and to share the responsibilities and rewards with us. We don't want electoral cannon fodder; we do want full and fair political partnership.

This is particularly true with respect to the changes which are coming throughout the Nation, particularly in the South. Certain reactionary southern political bosses, who are Republicans in everything but name, have long been waiting for the twentieth century to blow over. Since the twentieth century intends to keep on rolling along for two or three more generations, these southern reactionaries have become desperate.

Here is an example. The Chamber of Commerce of the State of Virginia has adopted a resolution which opposes the industrialization of Virginia. This is because industry brings labor, labor organizes, labor pays its poll taxes, labor registers, and labor votes. And if labor votes in Virginia, then there is no hope for the old machine. But the South is being industrialized. Southern labor is organizing, southern labor has registered, and is voting. MARTIN DIES, of Texas, is no longer to be in Congress. JOE STARNES of Alabama is also going on a permanent vacation from the House of Representatives after next January. Senator "COTTON ED" SMITH of South Carolina has also been retired by the voters of his State, but CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, and LISTER HILL, of Alabama, both liberals and friends of labor, were renominated in the face of the biggest corporate slush-funds in the history of southern politics. The Roosevelt-haters and labor-baiters are on their way out. Practical liberalism is on the march and labor is marching with it, shoulder to shoulder.

That is why I repeat to you—organize, organize, organize; register, register, register; vote, vote, vote. Make your votes count and see that your votes are counted. Vote for your friends and against your enemies. That is American history and the American way.

It would be a great mistake to assume that a few victories here and there will do the trick. The reactionaries are desperate and are up in arms. They will use money on a scale never before witnessed in American politics. They will resort to every known trick and use some new ones to hold down the vote and juggle the election returns. They have already succeeded in making it practically impossible for the bulk of our servicemen to vote this year and they admit that they did so because they knew our soldiers and sailors would vote 10 to 1 for Roosevelt. They rely on the dislocation of industrial labor by migration to war plants to hold down the labor vote and they rely on differences between the leaders of organized labor to divide the labor vote. They will appeal to every prejudice, every gripe, and every grouch. They will try to turn the farmers against labor and to turn the professional and businessmen against both farmers and labor. They will appeal to foreign isms and passions and spasms to hyphenate the electorate, just as they did in 1920.

That means that victory in this campaign, like victory in this war, depends almost entirely on you, and your wives and daughters. If you don't register, if you and your wives and daughters don't vote, if you don't make your votes count and if you don't see that your votes are counted, the enemies of organized labor may steal this election the way they stole the presidential election of 1876 from Samuel J. Tilden and the way they counted out William Jennings Bryan in 1896.

All I can offer to you in the way of solidarity and service is yours for the asking. I am for Roosevelt and TRUMAN—I am for the New Deal—I am a life-long liberal Democrat. I am also an American and I unhesitatingly phophesy that unless Roosevelt is reelected this November the fate of America will not be pleasant to contemplate. No Republican leader, however plump or youthful, could stand up for 5 minutes against the avalanche of greed and graft, reaction and ignorance, which would sweep into office with him.

Everything that labor has fought for and achieved during the past two generations would be knocked down and the country as a whole would be paralyzed and divided at the moment when our whole future depends on unity of purpose and decisive action. This is labor's responsibility and labor's opportunity. On you, the men and women who staff our giant industries, depend to a great extent the hope for liberalism and organized labor.

Pollution Problem of Delaware River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered by me at a meeting of representatives from governing bodies of municipalities located in southern New Jersey, at a meeting called by Mayor Dempsey, of Paulsboro, N. J., to consider the subject of pollution in the Delaware River, and held in the high-school auditorium on the evening of August 17, 1944:

There is no doubt that the waters of the Delaware River in the Camden-Gloucester-Philadelphia area are polluted. The odors that result are nauseating. It is disgraceful. It should never have been permitted to reach the outrageous conditions that now exist, nor should it be permitted to continue. It calls for the united action of all public officials and citizens.

In finding a remedy for it there are many conditions, having a bearing upon the subject, that must be given consideration before a decision can be made as to whether it is a national, State, interstate, or local responsibility, or a joint responsibility upon the part of some or all of these.

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

In the first place, what is the cause of the pollution of which we complain? Much has been said about it being the duty of the Federal Government to clean up the mess. Those who advocate this cannot and do not say that it has been caused in any degree whatsoever by the Federal Government. What is the cause of it? Who is responsible for it?

It is admitted to be the direct result of raw sewage being dumped into the river by cities and towns bordering on it or its tributaries, and the waste that comes from industries similarly located.

The chief offenders in this vicinity are the cities of Camden, Gloucester, and Philadelphia. Of course, there are other contributing factors, but these three cities are the chief offenders. If they assumed the responsibility they each owe to their own citizens and treated the raw sewage before it was dumped into the river, the conditions of which we complain would in large measure disappear.

They owe such a duty not only to their own citizens, but likewise to the citizens of every community in the surrounding area who now suffer from the obnoxious odors arising from the filth these cities pour into the river every day.

Every municipality in this area, outside of Camden and Gloucester, have constructed sewage-disposal plants to provide proper sanitary safeguards for their citizens. And, from information I have, the same is true of the municipalities bordering on the city of Philadelphia.

Why should the cities of Camden or Gloucester, in defiance of the laws of New Jersey, be permitted to dump their sewage into the river and thereby help create an annoyance for every citizen within miles of either city? Or, why should these cities expect to be privileged above all others in the United States and have the Federal Government build their sewage-disposal system out of the Federal Treasury?

The Federal Government never has done it, and it is my opinion it will not and cannot in the days ahead with a $300,000,000,000 debt staring us in the face, and an expanded Budget that will be necessary to take care of our maimed and handicapped soldiers, their widows and orphans, and to provide increased hospital facilities, unemployment compensation for returning soldiers and unemployed war workers, and all the other additional and exceptional expenses incident to the war. No; the Federal Government will have need of all the income it can get to take care of these necessary expenses that are the outgrowth of the war. This will preclude any possibility of a change of policy in this regard at any time within the foreseeable future. To accomplish it would be necessary for the President to reverse the stand he has already taken in these matters. I will make further reference to the President's opposition to the type of legislation proposed by Mr. Morrissey, solicitor of the city of Camden.

In my opinion it is not only unfair to other communities but it is unjust and unpatriotic in times such as these for the representatives of Camden and Gloucester to demand, or to expect, that the Federal Government shall use the receipts from the income taxes collected from the citizens of Collingswood, Oaklyn, Haddonfield, Westville, Woodbury, Paulsboro, Pitman, Glassboro, Elmer, Woodstown, Swedesboro, Salem, and, all the other communities here and elsewhere to help pay for a sewage system for these two cities and any others that have been delinquent in performing up to this time the responsibility they owed to their citizens.

MORRISSEY PROPOSAL CONTRARY TO NATIONAL POLICY

Furthermore, an important fact, in the history of Federal antipollution legislation, has been entirely overlooked by the representatives of the cities of Camden and Gloucester in their advocacy of the so-called Morrissey proposal (H. J. Res. 303), which would require the Federal Government: "To construct such new sewage-disposal system or systems; alter, repair, improve, and modernize such present sewage-disposal systems as by such survey the Chief of Engineers shall determine to be feasible and necessary."

That requirement is without a doubt one of the most preposterous, or, probably I should say ambitious, declarations of policy that to my knowledge has ever been proposed as a remedy for pollution in navigable streams. If that policy were to be adopted it would mean that the Federal Government would not only be required to construct new sewage systems and alter, repair, improve, and modernize existing disposal systems in the Delaware River Basin but also everywhere else in the Nation, because you couldn't adopt such a policy for this locality and deny it to others.

But, the important fact that has been entirely overlooked by those who drew the proposed Morrissey bill, and those who now promise to introduce it in Congress and procure its passage, is that it is directly contrary to the policy laid down by President Roosevelt when he vetoed an antipollution bill passed by both Houses of Congress in 1938.

VINSON-BARKLEY ANTIPOLLUTION BILL

The bill to which I refer was the culmination of 20 or more years of effort to provide a national solution of the problem of pollution in the navigable waters of the United States. It had the support of the United States Department of Public Health, all of the State departments of health, local departments of health, national and State associations organized to combat pollution in streams, business, industrial, sportsmen, and recreational groups. There was practically a complete unanimity of support. The authors of this legislation were two of the strongest and most outstanding supporters of the present administration. They were Senator BARKLEY, Democratic leader in the Senate, and Congressman FRED VINSON, whose close contact with the present administration is evidenced by the fact that he was appointed a United States Circuit Court judge by the President and later recalled by the President to act as Director of Economic Stabilization, who together with former Supreme Court Justice Byrnes, as Director of War Mobilization, are the two most powerful and important personages in the official life of Washington, outside of the President. The fact that they are often spoken of as Assistant Presidents is an indication of their strength and importance.

I have mentioned the names of Senator BARKLEY and Congressman VINSON as the authors of the antipollution bill that the President vetoed after it had passed both Senate and House, to indicate (1) the strong support from a political standpoint that was back of the bill, and (2) that if these two important persons in the present administration were unable to get enacted an antipollution bill because of a Presidential veto, it is preposterous to take seriously the promises of prospective candidates as to what they would do if elected.

The passage of the Vinson-Barkley antipollution bill was looked upon as the first step, but an important step, in remedying the conditions growing out of pollution in navigable streams. It created a division on pollution in the United States Public Health Bureau and was to be operated in conjunction with the office of Chief of Engineers of the War Department. It provided for studies and surveys in connection with State departments of health and interstate commissions where such were in existence. It recognized State and local jurisdiction. It authorized an initial appropriation of $300,000 to be expended by the new division on pollution and $700,000 to be divided between the several States faced with the pollution problem to enable them to make the several studies and surveys that might be necessary. And, most important of all, it provided for 30-percent grants and 70-percent loans, at low interest rates, to municipalities that might not otherwise be financially able to bear the cost or raise the money for construction of sewage-disposal systems. It also provided loans to be granted to industries, at a low rate of interest, to enable them to construct facilities that would purify their waste before pulling it into navigable streams.

The grants and loans to municipalities and loans to the industry were provided for in the Vinson-Barkley bill on the basis of P. W. A. grants and loans in effect at that time. This provision was made a part of the bill to encourage municipalities and industries to eliminate the contribution they were making to the pollution of streams by dumping raw sewage into such streams. The bill was finally passed by both Houses of Congress after long and comprehensive hearings and careful deliberation. The unanimous support accorded the bill was a recognition of the need for such legislation and the fact that a satisfactory solution of the problem had been attained.

VETO OF VINSON-BARKLEY ANTIPOLLUTION BILL BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Having in mind the years of effort that finally culminated in the passage of the Vinson-Barkley bill, you can readily realize the keen disappointment that was felt when the President vetoed the bill. All the work and effort that had been put forth went for naught. It was all lost.

The basis of the President's veto was that under the terms of the bill the Bureau of the Budget, which is under the direction of the President, was not given an opportunity to pass upon the merits of such projects "in

their proper relation to the merits of other projects of a similar nature, and all of those projects be then considered in their relation to the needs of the other Government activities that are presented for incorporation in the annual Budget."

The President in the same message said: "I appreciate the importance of the results sought to be accomplished by the legislation, and I fully approve the establishment of a Division of Water Pollution Control in the Public Health Service." In view of this acknowledgment by the President as to the importance of the legislation, many of those interested in the bill felt that, under all the circumstances, it was unfortunate that such a good cause had to be lost because of what seemed to them to be a technical reason.

MORRISSEY PROPOSAL (H. J. RES. 303) CONTRARY TO PRESIDENT'S POLICY

Therefore, we are faced with the fact that any bill that does not meet the requirement laid down by the President in his veto message would never have a chance of becoming law.

Thus, the so-called Morrissey-Wene proposal would not have a chance of successfully avoiding a Presidential veto, even though it passed Congress, and there would be no likelihood of it doing that. It fails completely to recognize the necessity of Budget control in any of its provisions. Furthermore, it does not comply with the policies or plans laid down by the National Resources Committee composed of representative experts from the Departments of War, Treasury, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, and from private and State agencies. This committee at the direction of the President, made a study on water pollution in the United States, together with the financial, technical, and administrative aspects of such a program. The report when made to the President, was transmitted to Congress with his approval. Thus it represents the viewpoint of the present administration in Washington.

This report and the President's messages to Congress leave no doubt that there is no intention upon the part of this administration to construct sewage disposal plants for municipalities as provided for in the Morrissey-Wene bill (H. J. Res. 303). The President has made this very clear in his message transmitting the report of the National Resources Committee to Congress. With reference to this subject, he said: "No quick and easy solution of these problems is in sight. The committee estimates that an expenditure by public and private agencies of approximately $2,000,000,000 over a period of 10 to 20 years may be required to construct works necessary to abate the more objectionable pollution. Inasmuch as the needed works are chiefly treatment plants for municipal sewage and industrial waste, the responsibility for them rests primarily with municipal government and private industry."

Another enlightening statement was made by the President in the same message when he expressed his viewpoint with respect to the extent that the Federal Government should participate. He said:

"It is my opinion that pending further experimentation with interstate and State enforcement activities Federal participation in pollution abatement should take the general form of establishing a central technical agency to promote and coordinate education, research, and enforcement. On the basis of recent experience, it should be supplemented by a system of Federal grants-in-aid and loans organized with due regard for the integrated use and control of water resources and for a balanced Federal program for public works of all types. The time is overdue for the Federal Government to take vigorous leadership along these lines."

Thus, it will be seen that the President is of the opinion that the Federal Government is not primarily responsible for the construction of municipal-sewage systems, but that such responsibility belongs to the municipalities and private industry causing the pollution, and, that any Federal contribution can be only on a grant-loan basis to municipalities and loans to industry.

PENDING BARKLEY-SPENCE BILLS PROVIDE SOLUTION

I assume that having called to the attention of the sponsors of the Morrissey-Wene bill that it is not in conformity with the President's program, and, that they are working at cross purposes to the President, that they, as loyal supporters of the President, will cease to advocate the passage of that bill and will give their support, as I do, to Senate bill 1989, introduced in the Senate by Senator BARKLEY, or its companion bill, H. R. 4741, introduced in the House by Congressman SPENCE.

The above mentioned bills provide for water-pollution-control activities in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes. The bills would charge the United States Public Health Service with certain responsibilities and duties in the preparation of comprehensive plans for eliminating or reducing pollution and improving the sanitary condition of the navigable waters of the United States and streams tributary thereto after investigation and in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, the encouragement of cooperative activities by the States, and the rendering of technical aid in specific pollution problems of States, political subdivisions, and industrial plants. The bills would also provide for Federal aid in the form of grants or loans for the construction of necessary treatment works, and authorize appropriations to provide for the costs of approved projects and for allotment to the States for the promotion, investigation, surveys, and studies necessary in the prevention and control of water pollution.

A study of these bills will show that they have been carefully drawn and satisfy the principles and policies laid down by the President as a basis for this type of legislation. These bills should have the support of all municipal bodies and citizens who are interested in remedying the evils of pollution in navigable streams.

I have discussed the question from a legislative standpoint to make plain that the Morrissey-Wene plan is doomed to failure from the very beginning. The bills already introduced known as the Barkley-Spence bills are the only ones that merit and should have the support of all who are sincerely in favor of anti-pollution legislation. No good is accomplished by advocating a bill that is contrary to the President's program and for which administration support could not be obtained. We must be realistic in these matters if we wish to accomplish anything. Knowing as I do the situation, from my years of contact with the subject, I am unwilling to give lip service to a bill that I know cannot be adopted or receive Presidential approval. The Barkley-Spence measures are the only bills that have a chance of surviving a Presidential veto. Therefore, I am wholeheartedly in support of these measures.

CITIES OF CAMDEN, GLOUCESTER FAILED TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF P. W. A. FUNDS

Now, I wish to bring to your attention several matters that have direct relationship to the overall picture. First, why didn't the cities that are now causing the pollution of the river apply for P. W. A. funds when such were available. Under that program the cities of Camden and Gloucester and all other similarly situated could have received 55 percent of the cost of sewer disposal systems as grants from the Federal Government and the balance of 45 percent on long-term loans at a low rate of interest. They made application for and obtained Federal assistance for many other worthwhile projects, as well as for some that were not so worthwhile. They received hundreds of thousands of dollars, in fact, I think it would amount to several million dollars, to carry on such projects. When such application were made it was my privilege and pleasure as Member of Congress from this district to assist in obtaining such funds to relieve unemployment.

Why wasn't similar application made by the authorities of Camden and Gloucester for the construction of sewage-disposal systems? If they had done so and brought their applications to my attention I would have gladly and willingly done my part in having them approved and funds allotted. But, no man, no matter who he is, or, his standing in Congress, could obtain funds under P. W. A. or W. P. A. without an application first having been made by the municipality sponsoring the project. This was not done to my knowledge by either Camden or Gloucester cities. In fact, according to my information, no detailed plans and specifications have ever been drawn for such sewage-disposal systems. I have been further informed, and, it is a pleasure to know, that Philadelphia has already taken steps to do their part in preventing pollution of the river and their plans are far advanced toward a $42,00,000 expenditure for sewage-disposal systems.

COURT ACTION TAKEN AGAINST CAMDEN AND GLOUCESTER TO STOP THEIR POLLUTING DELAWARE RIVER IN DEFIANCE OF STATE LAW

The situation that now confronts Camden and Gloucester is how to finance their construction of sewage-disposal systems. Unfortunately, they are now faced, as they have been for more than 2 years, with a suit in the New Jersey Court of Chancery instituted by the New Jersey State Department of Health, seeking an injunction to prevent them from longer polluting the Delaware River. For years these two cities have been openly and flagrantly violating a State statute by dumping untreated sewage in the river. When every peaceful means had been tried by the State board of health to get these two cities to desist their unlawful practices without avail, and, their patience having been exhausted by delaying tactics, then, the State board of health took their case into the court of chancery. Although that case was started more than 2 years ago, these two cities have adopted every subterfuge conceivable to trained legal minds to keep the case from being tried on its merits. However, at last Gloucester City has admitted its guilt and consented to a decree being entered against it. The case against the city of Camden is scheduled to come before the court this coming October. It will be interesting to see whether some new effort for delay will be made or, will that city, like Gloucester, admit its guilt.

We all know that pollution of the river has been a continuing offense. Officials of both cities have been aware of it, as well as knowing that the cities over which they had authority were guilty of contributing to it. Why has no interest been taken toward eliminating it until this time? From statements that have been made by some of those responsible for this delay and do-nothing attitude, I am inclined to wonder whether it has not been brought up at this time for political purposes, or, as a further basis of delay of the suit now pending in the court of chancery. It may be contemplated to ask for another adjournment on the ground that Congress is expected to do something by way of constructing a sewage-disposal plant for Camden. Well, if such is the thought of

those who now agitate the matter, let me warn again that the Morrissey bill will be a weak straw on which to lean.

It is regrettable from the standpoint of the citizens of Camden and Gloucester that there hasn't been more action and less talk by their officials. It is particularly regrettable that neither of these cities, in the interest of their citizens, did not avail themselves of P. W. A. funds when they were to be had as work relief assistance. If they had done so 55 percent of the cost would have been contributed by the Federal Government and the balance loaned for a long term of years and low interest rate. Today, those funds are not available and yet these cities advocate a bill that would require the Federal Government to pay the whole cost of construction, and the cities supply merely the land.

FUTURE FEDERAL ASSISTANCE UNCERTAIN

Looking into the future no one can tell at this time whether P. W. A. will be reinstated in the post-war period to supply employment by public work. Congress is now devoting its attention to legislation that will provide unemployment compensation. If there is general unemployment during the post-war period, it is a question whether the Federal Government will be in a position to carry on both programs for unemployment assistance. I am certain legislation will be passed for unemployment compensation. As to whether there will be another P. W. A. program, I do not know at this time. The committee having the matter in charge has not made its report as yet. We do know, however, that with a public debt of $300,000,000,000, and the added expense under the G. I. bill, caring for our returning soldiers, which may amount to $6,000,000,000 per year, together with all the other expenses for increasing the number of hospitals, providing hospitalization, disability compensation, etc., there will be little opportunity for the Federal Government making any large grants to municipalities. If the Federal Government does not do so, then the cities of Camden and Gloucester will have a difficult problem to solve.

There is much more I could and would like to say on this subject, but time prevents. Although much that I have said has applied to Camden and Gloucester, yet, it is justified because when you consider the pollution problem, it is necessary to ascertain who is contributing to it. Philadelphia, Camden, and Gloucester are the chief offenders in this locality. Philadelphia is getting ready to do its part to remedy its part of the problem, and, the cities of Camden and Gloucester should do their part or there will be no relief from the noxious odors that now permeate the air.

In conclusion, permit me to say that I have brought to the attention of the United States Public Health Service, the New Jersey Department of Health, and the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, and also the chief of Army engineers in the War Department, the complaints that have been made relative to something in the air that eats paint off of houses and turns silverware a dark color. By some it is claimed that this is due to the pollution in the river. That may be true, I don't know. It seems strange that this condition did not exist in the past, so far as I have heard, and yet we have had pollution in the river for several years. Therefore, I have asked the agencies of Government to which I have referred to make an investigation of the cause. It may be due to some of the chemical plants operating in this locality.

As to this, as well as the question of pollution, I give my sincere assurance of my desire to cooperate with governing bodies of our several municipalities and their citizens in finding a practicable and worth-while solution of the problem.

Establishment of a Stable Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Governor Dewey's forthright statement, outlining plainly some of the basic principles on which alone a stable peace can be established. This should clear the atmosphere of any uncertainty regarding his position and that of the present-day Republican Party on this all-important matter, and should thereby contribute materially to the success of the talks soon to begin between the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China.

It is high time we had such plain speaking and vigorous leadership. To straddle or be vague on such a vital matter would be to betray the millions of Americans who are risking their lives to win victory so that we can have another chance to solve our basic problem of getting nations to live together in peace on this planet.

The statement recognizes that what most of us Americans want is not a Republican or a Democratic foreign policy, but an American foreign policy; just as the Monroe Doctrine has always been an American foreign policy, not partisan but national, and therefore stable, continuing, predictable.

Furthermore, it makes clear that while we Americans greatly desire an international organization to work out and maintain peace because we realize its importance for our own future political and economic security, nevertheless we cannot be misled into taking a Four Power alliance as a substitute.

Sovereign equality of nations does not mean that nations are or ever will be equal in size, strength, or power. It means that they are and must be equal before the law—that is, all bound, whether large or small, by the same mutually agreed-upon rules of conduct in their international relations, just as New York and Rhode Island, though unequal in size, population, wealth, are still bound by the same law.

It is daydreaming to imagine we can get real peace under any system which would have, in effect, one set of rules for the strong and another for the weak. There can be no hope for peace except as we succeed in achieving in full, frank cooperation with all other like-minded nations agreement as to the "traffic rules" by which the relations between all law-abiding nations are to be conducted. The Big Four necessarily and properly will make larger contributions than the smaller nations, but they must themselves agree to the same rules and procedures as the weak—otherwise it will not be a fair and just order, will never be accepted by the sixty-odd small nations, and can lead only to early renewal of strife.

We in America, both officials and people, need to be reminded frequently of this blunt fact, and so do the governments with which we are negotiating. It is reassuring to have Secretary Hull disclose that no arrangement based on a return to power politics by the strong is contemplated. It is impossible to avoid alarming speculation and rumors when we have to go for months without authoritative statements from those in charge of our foreign policy. The whole Nation, and our allies as well, are greatly indebted to Governor Dewey for his timely, clear-cut, and unequivocal restatement of these tested and eternally sound principles.

Mr. Dewey's statement follows:

Simultaneously with smashing military victories which bring the day of peace ever nearer, it is good that representatives of the British, Russian, and Chinese Governments will meet shortly with our State Department for preliminary discussion of a permanent international organization to maintain the peace. Partial proposed plans have already been made public by the American, British, and Russian Governments. The American people are agreed upon the need for world organization. It is a bipartisan objective. It has been repeatedly urged by the Republican Party and its leaders. The future of the world will depend upon the ideals, the sound thinking and the justice of the results achieved at these conferences.

I have been deeply disturbed by some of the recent reports concerning the forthcoming conference. These indicate that it is planned to subject the nations of the world, great and small, permanently to the coercive power of the four nations holding this conference.

TWO ASPECTS INVOLVED

In order that there may be no apprehension, I should like to make clear some fundamentals as I see them. The problem of future peace has two aspects. One relates to Germany and Japan. They must, of course, be wholly and conclusively defeated. More than that, they must be rendered permanently powerless to renew tyranny and attack. Their defeat will be achieved primarily by the united power of Britain, Russia, China, and the United States. To insure that Germany and Japan shall never again be able to disrupt the peace of the world, these four allies must maintain their present unity.

I have consistently advocated the maintenance for some time after the war of close military cooperation among the four powers so that if the Germans or the Japanese hereafter seek to evade their disarmament, we may strike quickly, together and with overwhelming might. That is a specific responsibility of the victors. It is an essential part of the winning of the war. This responsibility to keep Germany and Japan disarmed should be shared with liberated peoples, but it cannot immediately be delegated to a world-wide organization while such organization is yet new and untried.

In organizing permanent peace among the rest of the world, after the difficult post-war period, a very different attitude must be taken. In some of these proposals there appears to be a cynical intention that the four great Allied Powers shall continue for all time to dominate the world by force and through individual agreements as to spheres of influence. I hope and pray that no such reactionary purpose will be allowed to dominate the conferences, else the peace of the world will as surely as night follows day again be destroyed.

The fact that we four have developed overwhelming power as against our enemies does not give us the right to organize the world so that we four will always be free to do what we please while the rest of the world is made subject to our coercion. That would be the rankest form of imperialism. Such a proposal would be rejected by the American people.

Within the area of peace-loving nations, peace is a task of cooperation among equal and sovereign nations. Force is essential in any realistic program for the permanent maintenance of peace. But in the long-term solution of international problems, peace and security cannot be left to the sanction of force alone. To leave them exclusively in the hands of a permanent military alliance of four victorious powers would be immoral. It would be a denial of the ideals for which we are fighting.

DENOUNCES IMMORAL FORCE

The millions of Americans are not fighting and dying to dominate the world or impose our will upon freedom-loving people. We are fighting for our own freedom and to establish once and for all the rights of people everywhere to live in peace and freedom, safeguarded from the coercion of more powerful nations.

As Americans we believe with all our hearts in the equality and the rights of small nations and minorities. We believe in the essential equality and dignity of the individual, wherever he lives. We believe in his right to freedom as well as our own. We do not believe that we or any other power has the inherent right to control his destiny. We are fighting this war to a victorious conclusion for these very principles. They must not be lost in a cynical peace by which any four powers dominate the earth by force.

We must not sink into the abyss of power politics. We must rise to a new high level of cooperation and joint effort among respected and sovereign nations to work for and to preserve the peace of the world through all the years to come, based on freedom, equality, and justice.

PLEADS FOR FULL RIGHTS

The kind of world organization we seek must concern itself with the basic causes of world disorder. It must promote a world opinion that will influence the nations to right conduct. It must develop international law. It must create an international tribunal to deal with international disputes.

In the kind of permanent world organization we seek, all nations, great and small, must be assured of their full rights. For such an organization military force must be the servant, not the master. Only thus can we achieve the fellowship of peoples which is the essence of lasting peace. It would be a tragedy if the coming conference among the British, Russians, Chinese, and ourselves should be distracted from the task of planning for a genuine world organization for peace by proposals which amount merely to a permanent four-power military alliance to control the world.

Interstate Commerce Commission

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in response to many requests from representative groups of my district, State, and region, I am today introducing a bill to require the continuous membership of some New England resident on the Interstate Commerce Commission.

For many years past, this important section of the country which has made notable contributions to the industrial, financial, and general economic progress of the Nation, and whose present contributions to the war effort continue to be so outstanding and certainly unexcelled by any other section of the country, was represented on the Interstate Commerce Commission by the late and very much lamented Joseph B. Eastman.

Commissioner Eastman, one of the ablest administrators of his time, rendered exceptional service to his country. During a period that saw many revolutionary changes in transportation, industry, and concepts of interstate commerce, and which was characterized by unusual and successful expansion of transportation and commerce, Mr. Eastman played a dominating part in shaping and directing the policies of this most important governmental agency.

Naturally, the people of our section believed that his successor would be selected from New England, whose interests are so powerfully interwoven with American industrial and transportation patterns. For the first time in very many years, if the nomination of Mr. Eastman's successor is confirmed by the Senate, New England will be without representation in this vital field of Federal control.

I am not questioning in any respect either the character, the ability, or fitness of the present nominee to the Interstate Commerce Commission. I know nothing about his background, his availability, or his qualifications, and certainly do not wish even to appear to be questioning them. On the other hand, I am taking this means of emphatically protesting against the omission, perhaps for the first time since its inception, so far as I know, of a representative of the New England States on this Commission.

Many other sections of the country are represented on this body, and it is right and proper that they should be. Every section of our great Nation has special interests in transportation facilities, rates, and the general flow of interstate commerce, and for that reason it is only fair and just that each section should have some representation on this Commission acquainted with its special problems in a position to defend and advance its interests.

As presently constituted, the Commission is comprised of members from Indiana, North Dakota, Oregon, Iowa, Idaho, Washington, D. C., Pennsylvania, Texas, Tennessee, Alabama, and South Carolina. It is obvious from casual examination of this roster that it is out of balance, that it does not take into account many important industrial and agricultural States, and sections.

Undoubtedly, a statute might be drawn requiring specific representation of all the principal regions of the Nation with reference to their particular economic interests, leaving some members to be appointed at large without regard to sectional considerations. For the present, however, because I am intensely interested in insuring appropriate and deserved representation on this Commission for New England and desire to bring the matter forcibly to the attention of the Congress, I have thought it wise to present this measure, and I am certain that the appropriate committee of this House will consider the measure as soon as is practicable with a view to reporting it to the House for action. I will welcome suggestions and perfecting amendments which will make this measure responsive not only to the needs of New England alone, but to the needs of every section and group in the entire Nation.

Shall We Fight a Third World War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brownwood (Tex.) Bulletin of June 22, 1944:

SHALL WE FIGHT A THIRD WORLD WAR?

The citizens of these United States must decide whether there shall be a third world war.

Parents, wives, brothers, and sisters of men who are giving their lives to preserve the right of Americans to decide such matters must choose which road the Nation shall follow.

It would be quite simple if all were permitted to vote ballots labelled "For" and "Against" a third world conflict. But the issue is likely to be confused; it is likely to be cloaked in elaborate camouflage. And the longer a decision is delayed, the more certain is the issue to be clouded.

Every school child knows that in times of peace the United States has maintained only a token military force; that we have never been fully prepared for any war in which we have engaged. Twice within 25 years the Nation has had to prepare while our citizens were being killed by the enemy. Luck and providence have been on our side.

Whether there shall be a third world war depends upon the American people. No nation would dare attack a fully armed and equipped United States of America.

We were lulled to sleep, after the First World War, by talk of permanent peace. We were told that no one would dare start another such cataclysm; that the world could not afford another war.

Jap bombs falling at Pearl Harbor provided a rude awakening.

The world has never known permanent peace.

Certainly there can be no substantial and lasting peace unless we buy insurance against a third world war.

Universal military training for American youths, coupled with adequate and sustained development of military, naval, and aviation material, is such insurance.

When peace comes again, this Nation can choose one of these two paths:

1. It can become a hermit Nation.

2. It can accept the responsibilities of a great world power.

China once chose the first course. China built a Great Wall to shut out the barbarians. China wanted only peace. Today China is fighting for its national life against invading hordes. Science developed weapons to tear down the Great Wall.

Wide oceans and solemn treaties were our Great Wall after World War No. 1. With Germany, Japan, and other nations we signed an agreement never to resort to force as a means of settling disputes. We negotiated another treaty limiting navies, and sank some warships to prove our good faith.

Then we dozed—and awoke to find bombs falling around us.

If we are to avoid a third world war there must be more than walls, more than treaties. We must have insurance which will protect us against foreign aggression.

Such scientific strides have been made that in the third world war—if we do not prevent it—armies will span wide oceans within the space of a few hours aboard huge warships in the air, on the sea, and beneath the sea. Scientists of many nations are striving to explore and to convert into power the tremendous energy of the atom. When that is accomplished, ocean barriers will fade away. And in the islands of the Pacific and on the beaches of Europe our amphibious forces have demonstrated that walls cannot be built to withstand modern arms. In the next war the power of offensive weapons will be immeasurably greater.

But peace might be perpetuated by building and maintaining a force capable of putting out small fires of conflict before they grow into world-girdling conflagrations.

We can do that through democratic universal military training.

Switzerland, a democracy, has universal military service and has managed to stay out of two world wars without being attacked. That proves false the claim that universal military training is an approach to militarism.

In America, more than a million young men finish high schools each year who need to learn discipline and who need the benefits of military training.

These youths could be trained for 1 year, during which they should be given vocational education along with military training. They should receive college credits enabling them to go from military classrooms and barracks into colleges of their choice as sophomore students.

Thus in 5 years the Nation would have a reserve of 5,000,000 trained youths, all under 25 years of age, ready for any emergency.

A sufficient number would select military careers to provide a regular army of 1,000,000 men.

The advantages of this program are tremendous.

It would protect the Nation against all aggressors.

It would improve the health, mental alertness and habits of these young men.

Remember the profligate youths of the twenties? Some called that a "lost generation." Rather, it was an underprivileged generation, denied the opportunity of training in responsibility. The crimes and wild escapades of some of those youths filled the front pages of American newspapers.

The large percentage of young men rejected by selective service examiners in this war constitutes a challenge to the Nation. Only through a program of disciplined health habits can the physical standard of American youth be raised.

Military training in peace is cheap, compared to the prodigal waste of such training during a war emergency. Twice within 25 years the Nation wasted billions in hurried preparations for war—enough to equip and maintain forever military naval and air reserves sufficient to protect the country against any combination of enemies.

Universal military training in peace time is economical and sound.

We can set an example before the world of a Nation strong and vigorous whose young men will be trained and equipped for the responsibility of protecting their country and who will be better citizens for such training.

We can build here a citadel of high civilization, with intelligent help for less fortunate peoples. And back up that friendly world attitude with the grim determination of a people who twice have paid the high price of unpreparedness, who have banished forever the opium dreams of a false utopia and are prepared to do their share, in concert with other nations whose interests and ideals parallel our own, to minimize and isolate wars, to discourage international animosities and to encourage freedom everywhere.

But an aroused public consciousness that will not be deceived on issues is necessary to prevent a third world war.

Now is the time to act. Now, while men are dying for peace, is the time to make possible a continuation of peace, once it has come, by demanding that America take out adequate insurance against a third world war.

The democratic kind of peace insurance: Universal military training for American youths.

If we do that, we may find that we have set up a permanent force capable of preventing wars.

Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. Let us call now on our Senators and our Congressmen to strike a blow for a permanent American armed force to preserve and protect the peace and prevent the next great war.

It cannot be done too soon. After this war might be too late.

Address by Mexican Secretary of Foreign Affairs at Rio de Janeiro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Madam President, the third meeting of consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, held at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, January 15–28, 1942, was an historical event of unusual importance.

The Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Mexico, Hon. Ezequiel Padilla, was in attendance at this conference as chief of the Mexican delegation, and delivered several addresses which have come to be recognized as outstanding contributions to the solidarity of this hemisphere.

I feel that it is in the interest of inter-American goodwill that the people of the United States be aware of the contribution made by the Mexican Secretary of Foreign Affairs to the war effort of the United Nations on that occasion. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the three addresses referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

These addresses are short, but powerful and persuasive.

It has been estimated that the printing of the addresses will require two and three-quarters pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $143.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE OPENING MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE, JANUARY 15, 1942

We are here to deliberate on the fate of the Americas. War enfolds and stifles us, and day by day menaces us here, there, and everywhere.

As illustrious Chancelor Aranha has said, all our ideas are in imminent danger of perishing. We may no longer cherish the illusion that we are living in a quiet backwater where we shall be safe from the world catastrophe. Blood flows on every side and suffering lacerates all the continents.

Here, in this very hall, we have just heard from Secretary Sumner Welles' own lips one of the most moving narratives in the history of this continent. On December 7 last Japan treacherously launched an attack on the United States and sank several ships. Since then hundreds of men born in America have daily been falling as the course of war develops.

The first thing we must realize is that this attack on the United States by Japan is not only an assault on that country; it is an aggression by the totalitarian states on the world's democracies. It was not only an attack on the United States, on an American nation; it is an onset by a totalitarian power against the whole of America!

The men who gloriously fell on Wake Island and in the Philippines, wrapped in the folds of that very flag which we here see intertwined with the other 20 flags of the American continent, as a symbol of indissoluble unity, have not fallen in the defense of the honor and sovereignty of the United States alone. They have also met their death in the defense of human liberties and the free destinies of these Americas.

Amid circumstances thrillingly dramatic we have assembled at Rio de Janeiro. It is as though in response to an admonition of fate that we meet on that flank of our continent, which is, as geography teaches us, the most vulnerable point along its whole length. We have assembled not to discuss what cause it is that the Americas defend, for our forefathers have already pointed out the way, when conflict arises between liberty and despotism. We have met to perform our commitments of honor, to sign and seal American solidarity. We have assembled to plan the common defense of our hemisphere, to prepare an America that shall be ever stronger, more united, more invulnerable.

For reasons which we cannot analyze at this time, we were unable to face this terrible crisis with a big enough military force, with material power abundant enough to place at the service of the dramatic contest now being fought out in the cause of human freedom. There is, however, one treasure that all the nations of this continent can contribute: this is the unity of the Americas.

Enlightened minds have beforehand blazed the trails of continental solidarity, but there is something that draws us closer together in heart and will at this time: War, the danger that menaces with phosphorescent eyes that blink all around us in this darksome night that enfolds us.

As I crossed the Andes a few days ago, I sensed in imagination Bolivar's mighty figure and felt that his genius lay in having foreseen the destinies and the duty of the Americas. I called to mind those days so pregnant with unrest, when all the world's

tyrannies framed a conspiracy, under the name of the Holy Alliance, to extinguish the urge for freedom of the nations. Then I realized the great resemblance between those times and these in whose grip we quiver.

Now, as then, a group of totalitarian nations, though this time much more powerful, leagued together to efface the very sources of human dignity. Now, as then, the Americas are in danger.

What would happen, what would the future of our Americas be, should war succeed in dividing and separating us from one another? This point has been analyzed by all the previous speakers. We would sink down into slavery. We would be carved up into colonies under masters utterly devoid of sympathy for human suffering. Our peoples would clash with one another, and a heritage of hate would spring up. America would ere long become a replica of what Europe is now: nations torn by discord, racial ferocity and rivalry, thirst for revenge ever unsatisfied.

If this is the international picture summoned up, within our peoples, dissensions easily inflamed by invisible war with all its technical advances, would sweep away, not only our incipient material civilization, but also something worth much more, the loss of which would be more painful still: our progress toward free institutions, brotherhood, and peace.

But it cannot be; I am sure that there is not one, among the noble peoples of the Americas, that will face so tremendous a responsibility. At the hour of the onslaught upon our nations, we shall not hear in the halls of American brotherhood those sinister words recorded in the first book of the Bible: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

On the other hand, if we can, united together, begin to live a truly pan-American life, how great a wealth of blessings will be showered upon the Americas. If we proclaim the pan-American doctrine, without falling into the grave responsibility of leaving it to unilateral initiative, because it is a doctrine that calls for action by all of us; if we pool our potential resources, together with the technics, the capital, and the initiative that we have available throughout our continent; if we can bequeath to our children, as a legacy, those splendid words that say that if any one of our countries is attacked by a nation outside this continent, all the nations will rise up, not merely one nor two, but the whole of America, to repel the invader just as though the outrage upon its sovereignty had been inflicted on its own flesh. Lastly, if we win the right to occupy seats at the council table of peace, what an enormous service we shall be able to render our Americas, by upholding a platform of national and international justice, for only from it may peace permanent and enduring flow.

Twenty-five years ago the victory of the Allies led us to believe that peave would last for ages. A single generation, however, has been sufficient to let loose another war, even more cruel and destructive, to scourge humanity. What was lacking was organized justice between the peoples. And when a single iniquity is left standing, it is even as the stone in David's sling, or a fiery torch in the hand of hatred and despair.

We must, on this continent, build up a world that shall be fairer to all, we must here work out a platform that shall mean justice to all. Iniquity still existent on vast areas of these Americas gnaws the very heart of the laboring masses.

If we can thus succeed in organizing not only an economic system but also in creating an American moral entity, we shall thus be able to show by means of our deliberations that what interests us is not only the building of shipyards and the construction of airplanes, of such enormous value in war, but also that there is something higher that we are anxious to build up—freedom for man in the Americas!

We have need of such things as cadmium, molybdenum, and other strategic material for war, but there is one other product that we must not overlook: free man in America, on whose brow shall shine the dignity of his manhood; man the consumer, the soldier, the custodian of liberty!

We must efface the very last stain of slavery on this American continent. Just as we must tear down the opprobrious gates of the Guiana prisons, for to this continent only men who seek liberty may come. In the same manner we must do away with economic servitude by promoting production free from slave competition in other regions of the earth!

If we can succeed by our own production in bestowing an existence measuring up to the standards set by the dignity of man, on the workers of the Americas; if what we advocate is not self-sufficiency, but only that in commercial interchange, such products be sold only to nations where salaries worthy of men and not starvation wages prevail; if we can, by means of the exchange of our wealth and work, uplift and dignify the life of man in the Americas, then, how grand would this Pan American Union become, how ethically magnificent, how crystal clear, how strong, to win the support of all the masses of the Americas!

The peoples of the Americas listen to the voice of democracy and hear us when we summon them to the defense of the American spirit. But we may not disregard the fact that the peoples of the Americas are still clamoring for justice; we must reflect that totalitarian philosophy is exploiting the pain of the multitudes, to instill into them a mystical force that gives them strength, that turns them into fanatics, that leads them to sacrifice.

If we, in turn, by our decisions, by our clear vision of the future, by our resolution to build up mighty American nations, should yet fail to create a doctrine, a faith, a hope, that will make the youth of the Americas feel proud to live for, they will not, either, be ready to die in their defense.

Arduous is the task that lies before us, but the atmosphere and the omens are favorable. There is unity in all of us. We all realize that we are face to face with destiny. This is a rendezvous in history that we may not fail to keep.

Mexico is a peace-loving country. "Respect for the right of others is peace," said Juárez, endorsing our action in the lawful defense of our soverignty; but Mexico, like all the other nations of the Americas, above all things craves the victory of human liberties. I deem this moment both solemn and propitious to declare that Mexico will, with the same energy, the same courage with which she has marched to sacrifice, to the struggle, often in the teeth of adversity and in unequal fight, to defend the principles of her sovereignty and her dream of social justice, Mexico will on this occasion step forward, full of conviction and devoted to the cause of democracy and the unity of the American peoples.

I want to bring this to a close by acknowledging with emotion that the 21 peoples of the Americas, and we might also say the glorious Canadian Nation as well, if only in the spirit, are here assembled with full conviction of the indestructible power of freedom and democracy. And as I send out, here in this mighty Brazilian Republic—that wonderful nation, the hope and pride of this continent, abounding in limitless material and spiritual wealth, equalitarian, tolerant, generous, and beautiful, for which my own country overflows with affection—a message of brotherhood and unity to all the peoples of the continent, I desire to express Mexico's wish and belief that we, at the deliberations of this historical assembly, shall only be guided by one command—the supreme imperative to defend the free destinies of the Americas.

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE MEETING OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE CONFERENCE ON WHICH OCCASION A RECOMMENDATION WAS ADOPTED TO THE EFFECT THAT THE AMERICAN NATIONS BREAK OFF RELATIONS WITH THE AXIS POWERS, JANUARY 23, 1942

This is a moment, there is no doubt about it, of transcendent historical importance. It is in itself an episode of the war.

I have listened to the representatives of Argentina and Chile, as they set forth the aspirations of their peoples at this assembly. I now, in my turn, look upon it as a right, a duty that I cannot shirk at this tremendous crisis, to lay the ideas of my own country before you. I feel almost certain that I am also about to express the views of the 19 nations that have seconded the proposal made by Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela, that relations be broken off short.

Every ideal, including American unity, must draw for nourishment on the strength of all, like the great rivers of this continent. Two streams may appear to be entirely separate as they flow toward the sea, yet lower down they join at the mouth. I feel sure that our continental ideals will thus converge.

We are here today to debate with the picture of war before us. Our discussions are not going to develop with the calm atmosphere of peace for a background. The course of deliberation must necessarily be dissimilar in each case. The arguments of war are not the same as those of peace. Subjects of debate cannot but differ widely when the peoples dwell peaceably together, from when they clash by force of arms, aiming, on the one hand, to subjugate the world and on the other to save freedom from extinction.

In times of peace commerce between the nations is an artery of prosperity which it behooves the governments to promote and defend. In times of peace, however, the very word "danger" should put statesmen on their guard, so that they may avert it by pacific means, if possible. In times of peace, diplomatic courtesies and protection flourish like orchids in the hothouse of world civilization. But when we are faced by the problems of war we must speak another tongue. It could not be otherwise, for the homelands of the peoples, their heritage of freedom and spiritual values, are in jeopardy.

The peacetime merchant furthers the prosperity of his own country and evidences its brotherhood with all other nations. But he who trades with the enemy in time of war thereby enhances the latter's destructive power. Just as every commodity thus sold is potential aid for ships or tanks engaged in inflicting damage on the nations attacked, so in this present war every item shipped under cover of free traffic with the aggressor powers, helps in the casting of shells intended to lay waste the lands of the democracies and slay our brothers.

How, then, can we speak of danger as an obstacle in the way of adopting a decision? Surely there is a contradiction in this. To be halted by the word "danger" at a time when we are called upon to make up our minds to defend the loftiest moral assets of a people, is to disregard the lessons of history. Had our forefathers used that word as an argument, all these nations of ours would still be colonies. No people on earth would ever have achieved and sealed its redemption.

We are not assembled here today to debate with honeyed words of peace, but to speak in terms of that continental security now so gravely threatened. There are many who would only admit that danger existed when

bombers were actually diving down over our heads, when people were being machine-gunned, and homes were being blasted from the face of the earth. That, however, would no longer be the hour of peace; it would be the hour of defeat.

We must come here, as we all of us have, in response to the resolution of our peoples, ready to face the pain and burden of battle, if it has to be fought. Battle is no picnic. It means the destruction of material wealth; the sacrifice of life itself. Like a fiercely burning pyre onto which enthusiasts and saints cast their worldly goods to save their souls, so peoples throw their material wealth, their economic existence, the lives of their sons, all that they have, into that gigantic bonfire from which their future will emerge cleansed and purified.

This is no time to defend material wealth—the hour of sacrifice is upon us.

The profit motive, the thirst for gain, the urge to save and hoard, count as nothing when the moral assets of a people are at stake. At such a moment we may only seek closer approach in heart and hand with other peoples that uphold the same cause.

It would be ignoble to hope that others will defend that heritage of liberty and justice, that unity of the Americas which we so loudly advocate, while we ourselves sank back into our own selfishness, lulled by a sense of false security. We are all of us in the same boat. At the fateful hour none will be saved by himself alone. We shall all of us, on this continent, be crushed down together under the iron heel of oppression, or we shall all of us rise up victorious with the banner of American unity on high.

We must not even think of discussing the defense of our homelands in a selfish spirit, nor can we undertake this task with open ledgers before us. If it were thus, how could England at this moment, at this epic and gigantic stage of the conflict, as she sees her wealth swallowed up, her cities and historical relics disappear, and incalculable riches sink below the surface of the waves, continue to resist? And yet her luminous spirit, heroically haughty and full of faith, does not flinch. How could the subjugated peoples withstand and keep alive the flame of hope, when all that they ever possessed has vanished utterly? And yet their soul is undaunted and their mind is set on the future. How, then, are we to regard—and it must be said, for a nation of America is involved—how must we regard the United States? A Nation with the highest living standards of all, a country whose people enjoy every comfort and convenience, how can we rightly estimate its action, as we see it cast into the fiery furnace the fantastic figure of its accumulated wealth, and divert into it the whole mighty stream of its prosperity, without thought of danger or of economy, to defend the heritage of its freedom and the untrammelled destinies of our continent? The answer may only be sought in the spirit of self-sacrifice shown by that Nation, in behalf of the loftiest incentives to the onward march of the peoples.

The ideas I have set forth are those cherished by all the ations of our Americas, without a single exception. And we are here present at the diplomatic negotiations of the peoples themselves, not the vain diplomacy of Foreign Offices. This is why I say, with deep emotion, that this document which we have just subscribed is not merely a record of the hands and pens of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs here assembled. Behind each one of us, free from the hesitations of human clay, and proof against the vicissitudes of governments, stand the shades of the heroes and founders of the Americas. They not only endorse the letter of these glorious documents, but also their genuine inspiration.

Let us, then, return home with the certainty of closer brotherhood between the peoples, from the Argentine and Chile to the United States. We are all of us here firmly resolved. We have subscribed the great charter of our American unity, in the midst of the gravest circumstances, as always happens when such instruments are signed. In this hall the banner of that American unity, of the inviolable liberties of our peoples, floats and waves as a symbol of their readiness for the sacrifice and to contribute, if need be, their savings, their material comfort, everything, to the salvation of our destinies.

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE CLOSING SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE, JANUARY 28, 1942 [1]

We are all of us anxious to hear words of faith and hope at a time like this, when the continents are torn asunder in tragic strife, and the war lords are intent on destroying the weaker peoples. They have put aside all thoughts of brotherhood among the nations, for it is their sinister aim, by mechanized power, to wipe out innocent peoples whose only guilt is their want of strength.

Here, at Rio de Janeiro, something really wonderful has happened. The representatives of 21 nations, great and small, strong and weak, in brotherly fashion, on a footing of equality, in the full exercise of their sovereignty, have assembled to deliberate on how human liberties may best be defended.

And what have they resolved to do? To destroy other nations? To raise estranging barriers? To sentence a portion of humanity to death? No. They have upheld generous principles of respect for the sovereignty of the peoples; the freedom of mankind, the elevation of human dignity, ready response to the cry that goes up from starving multitudes athirst for justice. They have decided to assemble in a compact aggregation to defy adversity, and to merge in a single resolution the fate of all.

They have done so, but this is no romantic dream, nor lyrical outburst of inexperienced peoples.

We have realized the fact that serious danger threatens; resolutely and firmly, with full consciousness of the perils defied, with ample faith in the destines of democracy, we have subscribed covenants of indissoluble soldiarity.

If at times we have faltered or wavered it matters not; the constellations grow in beauty as the night advances. We shall soon see how that other constellation formed by the 21 stars of the Americas, shines resplendent in the western firmament.

We are here full of faith, with the firm conviction that we have subscribed a covenant for security based on honor, with the added certainty that freedom is invincible because mankind will never submit to forfeiture of its liberties. There are men who contrive special philosophies of their own, and prate about the welfare of the peoples. They even think that they can strangle those liberties. What they attempt is impossible, for the soul of man will not brook their loss.

Victories not confirmed in the heart of mankind, triumphs not rooted in the age-old yearnings of freemen, are but fleeting. Victories can only be permanent and enduring when they respond to the noblest aspirations of the peoples and when they are wrought of aspirations for democracy and justice.

And what is this document that we have signed here? We have been able to make but a scanty contribution at a time when armies, ships, and constructive might are called for, but we shall all of us united together create them in due course. In the meantime we have signed and sealed the pact of American unity to defy all onslaughts on our common destines. We have broken off relations with the aggressor nations. Why have we done so? Because we feel that one may not trade with enemy peoples, because this means, not neutrality, which is a word denoting complicity, but actual alliance.

We have accepted the breaking off of relations as the proper course to follow, and have canceled the credentials of the representatives of aggressor nations. Why have we done this? Because every diplomatic agent, in time of war, is the agent of a conspiracy. From his armchair he reports the sailing of every ship from American shores loaded with men and condemns it to bombardment on the high seas. He is the wire over which invisible warfare is conducted. Because it is hardly imaginable that we in the heart of the Americas can grant letters of marque to men whom we know are plotting against the peoples of the Americas themselves.

All of our peoples realize this is why we have broken off relations. We must be confident that Argentina and Chile, although they have not yet done so, will follow suit in due course.

Again I ask, why have we acted thus? Because at a time like this only the ability, patriotism and clearsightedness of statesmen can save the peoples.

Oceans and mountains and distance are no longer defensive bulwarks. We can all of us be reached, and are all in danger. When the time comes, and our consciousness shall fully awaken under this unity of all the Americas, our two great sister republics, Argentina and Chile, will move in accordance with their own convictions and shed the light of their generous action on all our assembled flags, face to face with the tragic destinies hovering over humanity.

We are full of faith, simple faith, the simple faith of democracies.

Democracy is invincible throughout the earth. The world marches resolutely on toward freedom. This calls for sacrifice; in the presence of losses that at times seem irretrievable, it calls for confidence. When afar one asks of the sentry, "What of the night?"; he replies, "The dawn is breaking, the victory of human freedom is nigh."

This has been a wonderful meeting of free peoples, a magnificent spectacle that should fill the hearts of true lovers of democracy, who dream of the brotherhood of man, with optimism. To crown this glorious journey's end we have the wonderful contribution made by two nations, Ecuador and Peru, who at this moment * * * could not but show that American unity is no vain word, that the fact of having signed our covenant of unity, respect and brotherhood, is not a sham modeled on old-time diplomacy.

I speak with truth and sincerity. Ineffable rejoicing floods the heart of all the Americas at the reconciliation between these two sister peoples.

I wish to end by saying a few words of strictly personal appreciation. This was a moment when I could have spoken more at length as a result of concentrated thought pregnant with a sense of responsibility and eager longing, words of faith and hope. As you all know, however, I have come as an extempore orator, on the crest of a wave of affection for my country, something for which I am most deeply grateful.

I want to say something about Brazil. I want to say that my country is profoundly appreciative of the evidences of affection that have been showered on us; that I sense all around me this good will toward Mexico. How can I, then, best word the tribute of my reciprocity? Only by quoting a line from a beautiful Brazilian song: "Brazil, how canst thou, great as thou art, yet find room, all of thee, within my heart"

[1] Just as the meeting was about to adjourn, those present asked that the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico take the floor and applauded him warmly as he did so.

1917, 1941, 19—?—Must It Happen Again?—The Answer Lies With You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pamphlet of the Americans United for World Organization, Inc., and a statement presented to Secretary Hull on August 15:

AMERICANS UNITED FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION
PURPOSE

I

To give unity of action in a Nation-wide nonpartisan campaign to help win the war and to establish a just and enduring peace.

To mobilize public sentiment and mass enrollment to attain this goal through political action.

To support candidates of whatever party who subscribe to these principles.

II

To support establishment immediately by the United Nations of a world organization, eventually open to all nations, with authority to adjust disputes and with automatic power to use force to prevent aggression and preserve peace.

To support economic plans to promote the freer flow of trade and to raise the standard of living, so that our fighting men can return to a way of life unshadowed by unemployment.

To promote the conviction that a peace worth winning must be based on the ideal of democracy in practice, remembering that tomorrow's peace is being made while today's war is being fought.

III

To combat subversive activities, and the propaganda of the defeatist, reactionary, and imperialistic minority at home.

PROGRAM

The immediate program of Americans United, in addition to utilization of all the media of publicity, is:

1. To urge acceptance by candidates of the principles contained in this statement.

2. To carry the fight for this policy into State and congressional district campaigns through local committees.

3. To impress upon our war leaders, at every step, the necessity for democratic procedure in dealing with the liberated countries.

4. To promote, for example, a united American observance of Thanksgiving Day—following the elections—as a day of rededication to democracy and good will.

5. To assemble citizens in groups and units and forums in every part of the country to promote all of these aims.

Sometimes, by great good fortune, mankind gets a second chance. This is such a time. What is next done within the next year, yes, within the next few months, will determine whether it will happen again. Can you face your own children and the children you know if you do not put forth every ounce of effort to prevent the third world war?

The only preventive is a world organization in which the United States plays its proper part. The answer lies with each one of us—with you.

SECOND DRAFT OF PROPOSED JOINT STATEMENT

Deeply conscious of the magnitude of the task confronting you and the representatives of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China, as you meet to plan the framework of the General International Organization, the undersigned persons take the liberty of urging upon you certain considerations which they believe to be fundamental.

Although we have signed this statement as individuals, the organizations with which we are identified have previously adopted resolutions in which they have generally agreed upon similar essentials.

The United Nations are now at the point of victory because their military strategy has been planned with imagination and daring, because all the United Nations have cooperated, and because timing has been excellent. Plans for the organization of the world to prevent another war must be conceived with equal wisdom and daring; such planning requires the cooperation of all the United Nations and the timing must be equally accurate.

1. We urge strongly that the world organization be established before rather than after Germany collapses. As there is danger that the German collapse may come before negotiations are concluded, we suggest that a provisional United Nations Council be created at the beginning of your conversations so that machinery for consultation may be available.

The creation of a world organization cannot wait upon the conclusion of hostilities. At that time reaction might set in and policies might be adopted by the nations separately which would make full cooperation in an international organization more difficult. We suggest, therefore, that your negotiations must be concluded quickly and the General International Organization established before the ending of the war in the west.

2. We believe that the General International Organization must be democratically organized and must eventually be universal. The need for the exercise of authority by the great powers on the one hand and for democratic world organization on the other presents a serious problem. We recognize that the great nations must bear a heavy responsibility for security and must have corresponding powers. But there is a vast difference between arbitrary power and power authorized by and exercised in the name of the world community. What is needed, therefore, is a democratic organization, in the formation of which all peace-loving nations will have a voice and from which they will derive certain rights. The authority which the great powers exercise must be exercised within the framework and by the authority of this organization.

3. We believe that security is fundamental to the problem. The world organization must provide, among other things, for agreement on the part of the nations for the immediate automatic use of joint military force to prevent aggression.

We look to the eventual development of a truly international police force, which might be begun as an air force. If certain strategic bases, such as the Japanese-mandated islands, are to be occupied by the forces of the nations having the greatest interest in a given area, such occupation should be in the name of the world organization. An imperialist struggle for bases must be avoided.

Decisions of the world organization must not be paralyzed by requirements of unanimity.

4. Hand in hand with machinery for enforcing peace must come means for just and peaceful settlement of disputes. If conciliation and arbitration fail, there must be a final decision by the appropriate body of the general international organization or by a court. We trust that the Permanent Court for International Justice will be utilized as the court for legal disputes.

5. The general international organization should fulfill the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Moscow Declaration that the nations agree to practical measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

6. We stand with the declaration of the International Labor Organization that world peace is partially dependent upon social and economic justice. The conference of the I. L. O., U. N. R. R. A., and the Food and Agriculture Administration are most encouraging. We hope that further means will be planned for an expanding world economy and for the improvement of the physical and spiritual well-being of mankind. Any such agencies should be coordinated by the general international organization.

We believe that the overwhelming masses of the people of the earth want a strong world organization to prevent war and to advance the general well-being. On the basis of our Nation-wide contracts through our respective organizations we assure you that there is an overwhelming popular demand for American participation in such an organization.

I Wear a Silver Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem, written by Mr. L. H. Beck, of Griffin, Ga., inscribed to his son, who is a pilot in the Air Forces in France:

I WEAR A SILVER STAR

God has been good to me!
The sun has shined on me.
God gave me a son!

Just took him for granted,
Like things that always are.
Never thought I'd miss him,
Never thought to kiss him;
Now I wear a silver star.

When a little tike I'd tease him,
Never really tried to please him;
Just thought I'd always have him,
Like other things that always are.
Didn't play or listen to him.
Put him off for other reasons.
Now I wear a silver star.

As he grew a little older,
Should have been a little closer;
But I took him just for granted,
Like other things that always are.
Didn't enter in his playing;
Never tried to entertain him.
Now I wear a silver star.

Now—he wears his country's colors
And he's gone to do his bit.
But still I—well I just took it
Like other things that always are.
Now I know how much I love him,
How really proud I am of him,
And so I wear a silver star.

God has been good to me,
The sun has shined on me.
God gave me a son.

—*L. H. Beck.*

Address by Hon. Hugh A. Butler, of Nebraska, Before Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] before the Rivers and Harbors Congress at New Orleans, La., on July 27, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure and a privilege to have this opportunity of speaking a few words to this great Congress on Rivers and Harbors.

I want to tell you very briefly exactly how I feel about one of the most important matters with which this Rivers and Harbors Congress and the Congress of the United States are concerned. That problem is how to accomplish the objectives of improving the navigability of our navigable waterways, without infringing upon the beneficial consumptive use of water in the West.

The day has long since passed, when the policy of developing one part of the country at the expense of another can be tolerated. In the early days of our history we know that Great Britain followed a policy of preventing the development of manufacture in the New England colonies. It was anxious that they should be dependent upon the products of the mother country. Our British allies, fighting so valiantly at our side in this war, have reason to know that the policy followed in those early days was unwise. There appears to exist, in some high quarters today, a notion that the development of the great western area of the United States might well be retarded in order that the production of other areas may find no competition. I am glad to be able to say that this notion is not widespread. I am glad to be able to say, on the contrary, that I find, generally speaking, a strong sentiment prevailing throughout the country, as well as in the Congress, in favor of not merely allowing but of encouraging the fullest development in the 17 Western States.

Anyone who has given thought, as I have, to the needs, not merely of Nebraska, but of the West as a whole, is bound to reach the conclusion that the primary need of the West is water for beneficial consumptive use. Much of the area within the Missouri River Basin is not arid in the sense that it never gets a drop of rain. On the contrary, we know from our own experience and the writings of experts on agricultural matters, that there are periods in parts of that area when irrigation is not needed, when the rains have been sufficient for the needs of the farmer. So true is this that the farmer in those areas is likely, during the years of sufficient moisture, to forget about saving water for the lean, dry years ahead. During these periods, he is likely also to forget about pressing for the construction of water conservation works. Then come the dry years. When drought arrives, it is too late to do much about it. There is pressure then for the undertaking of water conservation and irrigation works. But these works must be planned. They must be financed. They must be constructed. It may take years to do all that. In the meantime we see the tragic consequences of lack of foresight: Parched lands, dying cattle, ruined farmers. I hope that the farmers in my own State of Nebraska and in the other areas of the lower Missouri River Basin will see and practice and insist upon assistance from their Federal and State Governments in following the policy of building water conservation works in order to prepare for the periods of drought. In much of our great West, however, we do not have those periods when rainfall affords sufficient moisture for agriculture. In those areas, agricultural development is wholly and completely dependent upon irrigation. There can be, as we know, very little irrigation without stored water.

The Federal Government has made great strides in the field of irrigation. Beginning in 1902 with the enactment of the Reclamation Act, the Congress has, year by year, encouraged and developed irrigation for agriculture in the West. I am proud of the part I have had in this work. I hope to have a share in promoting, in the Senate of the United States, the further enactment of legislation which will make possible in the future much greater development of the western half of this country of ours. I am convinced that great strides will be made in the future. The report recently submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior on the Missouri River Basin is a revealing and inspiring document. It shows what is needed and what can be done for the States in the Missouri River Basin by way of irrigation and other developments. But, most important of all, it shows that the Bureau of Reclamation has come a long way from the time when investigations and plans were made only with respect to one small project, affecting one small area. It shows a degree of imagination and foresight that is worthy of particular note. I congratulate the Commissioner of Reclamation and those who were associated with him in the preparation of that document. I congratulate the officials and private citizens of the State of Nebraska and of the other States in the Missouri River Basin who cooperated in the great work of gathering the necessary information. It can rightly be said that the plans revealed by the Missouri River Basin report of the Bureau of Reclamation involve the expenditure of millions of dollars. But it can rightly be said also that these plans involve the creation of many more millions of dollars in production facilities, both agricultural and industrial. They involve insurance against the hazards of drought, and they will be repaid. Let me emphasize that. These expenditures are not lost to the Treasury and the taxpayer. They will be repaid directly by the farmers, the users of power, the users of municipal water supplies. They will be repaid indirectly through the benefits received from doing away with the losses caused by floods. How much more sensible it is to invest this money in the future of the United States than to pour it unwisely into the laps of our neighbors.

No one feels more deeply than I do the need for flood control. No one feels more deeply than I do that not enough has been done as yet to prevent damage from floods. I propose to continue to lend my support to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers in their flood-control program. The so-called Pick report is, to my mind, on a par in the field of navigation and flood control with the report on the Missouri River Basin by the Bureau of Reclamation. In my judgment, both of these reports fall short of recommending everything that should be done for Nebraska. But I would not for that reason fail to give them my support. I am not willing for one instant to consider these reports from the point of view of one State alone. I congratulate General Pick and those who were associated with him in the preparation of his report.

There are very few points of fundamental conflict between these two reports. I see no reason why these differences cannot be ironed out. The Congress of the United States may be able to do something about that. This solution should and could do full justice to navigation and flood control and to the need for protecting and promoting the beneficial consumptive use of water in the West. I do not pretend that the task of finding and applying the solution will be easy. I propose to do my best. If other Senators and Representatives will join in a cooperative manner, the job can be done. The support of the Rivers and Harbors Congress will be needed. This is your opportunity.

Former President Theodore Roosevelt once said that the rivers of no other civilized country are so poorly developed, so little used, or play so small a part in the industrial life of the Nation as those of the United States.

In the years since that pointed criticism was spoken, we have come a long way. With the approval and authorizations by the succeeding Congresses, our Federal agencies entrusted by law with responsibilities for the use and development of our rivers and streams have made voluminous surveys and studies. With the active support of the national rivers and harbors congress, and other far-seeing, progressive-minded, and public-spirited organizations, the factual data thus acquired have resulted in the initiation of effective improvements for flood control, for navigation, for irrigation, for the development of hydroelectric power, for stream-pollution abatement, for the prevention of erosion, and for other beneficial purposes.

Having been born and lived most of my life in close proximity to the Missouri River, I have a very real concern with the problems imposed by that great, unpredictable stream. I have seen the Missouri on its biannual rampages again and again leaving death and destruction in its wake. And I have seen it dwindle to a stage where lack of water supply and pollution constituted serious problems for the cities in the lower basin, and imposed severe hardships on farmers and stockmen in the upper reaches.

It is only natural, therefore, that a plan to alleviate these conditions, and a program to develop the virtually untapped water resources of the Missouri Basin should hold my interest and command my support. Its basin, an empire of 539,000 square miles, remains the last great river basin in the United States for which no comprehensive plan of development has been initiated.

As a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the United States Senate, I am intensely interested in irrigation. As a long-time businessman in the city of Omaha, on the navigable stretch of the Missouri, I am aware of the importance of cheap water-borne transportation. But as a lifelong resident of the Missouri River Valley, I recognize the fact that our first and foremost problem in that basin is flood control.

The Congress has before it now for authorization H. R. 4485, which contains the plan of the Army engineers for the control of Missouri River floods, and which provides also a broad and flexible framework for the development of the basin. The plan, with which many of you are familiar, was prepared in compliance with a resolution of the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives. It consists of a series of multiple-purpose reservoirs above Sioux City, Iowa, a system of main stem levees on both sides of the river from Sioux City to the mouth, and a series of tributary reservoirs in the lower basin.

This bill, H. R. 4485, has been passed by the House of Representatives, and has been reported favorably by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate.

In considering the plan for the Missouri River Basin, I believe that the House Committee on Flood Control, the House itself and the Senate Committee on Commerce, were impressed with the common sense approach to a variety of problems imposed by the great length of the river and the geographical climatic and economic differences of the vast area which it drains. The plan is primarily a flood control plan, but it also would make available for irrigation, for navigation, for power and other uses, the excess waters of the flood seasons, which in the past 2 years alone have caused $112,000,00 damage and the loss of 30 lives.

I have not found, in the discussions of the comprehensive flood-control plan for the Missouri River, that any responsible agency or interest objects to the fullest use of the water resources of the basin for the irrigation of arid and semi-arid lands therein. There seems to be a unanimity of opinion that the agricultural possibilities of the basin should be developed to the maximum feasible extent. We have been assured by the Army engineers and the report of the committee of State engineers of the nine Missouri River States that the water resources of the basin are adequate to meet all practicable demands for irrigation, navigation, industrial and all other beneficial consumptive uses, if they are properly conserved. The comprehensive flood-control plan provides for such conservation by the construction of strategically located multiple-purpose dams throughout the basin, having a total storage capacity of well over 70,000,000 acre-feet.

In the light of this information I hope Congress will not deem it desirable to attach an amendment to the authorizing act (now before it) that would set up a priority of use of the waters in favor of any particular interest.

In conflict between those favoring the use of water for irrigation and those favoring navigation is relatively minor. This is apparent when one considers that the dams which are to control the releases for navigation purposes are downstream from the large bulk of the irrigable areas in the basin. In other words, the irrigable areas receive the water first. Of a total of about 8,000,000 acres of irrigated and irrigable land within the basin, there are only 1,200,000 acres which are proposed to be irrigated from reservoirs that are operated for combined irrigation and navigation purposes. The total requirement of this 1,200,000 acres is 1,800,000 acre-feet of water per year. When we consider that the total storage capacity of the proposed reservoirs from which this water must be obtained is approximately 54,000,000 acre-feet, the chance of any real or serious conflict between navigation and irrigation practically vanishes. It certainly would appear reasonable that any and all differences should be easily and readily adjusted, so as to avoid a delay of authorizing legislation.

There is also before the Congress at this time a Rivers and Harbors omnibus bill, H. R. 3961, which includes in a list of projects to be authorized for post-war execution, the proposal for a 9-foot channel in the Missouri River from Sioux City to the mouth instead of the 6-foot channel previously authorized and now virtually completed. Deepening of the river channel would be obtained in a manner similar to that used for the Mississippi River, contraction works serving generally to confine the wide shallow portions of the river to narrower and deeper sections, thereby attaining the authorized depth without any additional demand upon the water resources of the basin over that presently authorized.

The 9-foot channel in the Missouri is not a part of the so-called Pick plan for flood control and multiple purpose water utilization. It is, however, a coordinate development. In the same sense, plans and works of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission for the Missouri Basin are coordinate developments to supplement the broad and flexible framework provided by the Pick plan. The authorization of the Pick plan can offer no hindrance or obstacle to the programs of these other Federal agencies which are expert in their respective fields. In fact, the essence of the Pick plan is to hold back excess flood water and conserve it by storage for all useful purposes, thus making more water available for all needs. I am in favor of furthering all of the proposals to bring to the 12,000,000 people of the Missouri Basin the benefits and advantages that await the intelligent development of their too-long neglected streams. I am satisfied that there is adequate water supply for all purposes if properly conserved as proposed in the Pick plan. Any doubt on that point should have been dissipated by the report of the impartial committee of State engineers representing the 9 States of the basin, which determined that the annual run-off at Yankton, based on a 30-year period, was adequate to meet all estimated requirements for the 9-foot channel, for irrigation proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation, and for domestic and sanitation purposes. I am convinced also that should a shortage of water develop at some future time—a condition that does not seem likely—the solution of any temporary problems will be solved by the common sense and good will of the people of the basin.

I know that because of low water in the river my own city of Omaha spent $100,000 to lower its water supply in-take, and river shippers lightened their loads, and neither the city nor the navigationists considered asking the upper basin to curtail by so much as a single drop the use of the water for irrigating the several millions of acres that was depleting the flow downstream. Common sense and good will established the prior use. No legal priorities were sought or invoked. We didn't need them then and we do not need them now.

The urgent problem confronting us today is the control of the destructive floods of the Missouri River. It is conceivable that any restrictive legislative limitation on the plan would prevent the fullest use of the proposed flood-control dams for the prevention of floods. If further legislation is needed to insure the greatest beneficial use of the waters impounded by these dams let us base it upon the experience we gain as the plan develops and upon the conditions that obtain at the time.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a recent issue of the New York Daily News dealing in part with the question of socialized medicine. I may say now that I am against the movement to socialize medicine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION BY GREAT BRAIN

The Roosevelt administration's efforts to communize the United States via socialized medicine and Government control of all forms of insurance are ominous enough to any American who doesn't feel ready for totalitarianism yet. But perhaps the most ominous of these efforts is the continuing attempt by the administration, including especially Mrs. Roosevelt, to make education more and more dependent on the Great Brain at Washington.

There is the trick 10 percent deduction, for one thing, in the new simplified income-tax law—a provision which permits income taxpayers in the up-to-$5,000 brackets to deduct 10 percent for bad debts, alimony, interest, and educational and religious contributions, without having made such contributions, as one means of paving the way for eventual Government taking over of all educational institutions.

MUSCLING INTO SCHOOL SYSTEM

The present administration has long been hot for more and more pumping of cash into State school systems. The United States Office of Education, an old-time Government bureau set up in 1867, has been greatly enlarged under the Roosevelts. Its activities, directed by Commissioner John W. Studebaker, have been consistently aimed at muscling the Federal Government deeper and deeper into public education, hitherto regarded as mainly an obligation of the States, of such churches as wish to operate schools and colleges, and of privately endowed schools and colleges.

The usual excuse is that some States don't or can't spend enough on education. Habitually ignored is the fact that Government cash almost always means Government bureaucrats to direct the spending of it. In the case of the schools, that will mean uniform education, which will turn out mental robots, all cut to the same pattern. The war has considerably helped this effort along, what with the Government necessarily taking over a lot of college plants for various kinds of specialized training.

Hitler began to do this sort of thing in 1933, as soon as he came to power. One of his policies was to round up children of 8, 9, and 10 into what he called the Hitler Jugend (Youth) and what many others called the Hitler goslings. These kids were herded into camps, drilled strenuously, and indoctrinated with Nazi beliefs. Many of them are the robot-minded fanatics whom our men are running into (and knocking the socks off of) on the European fronts today.

GETTING 'EM YOUNG FOR TOTALITARIANISM

What many of us tend to overlook now that Russia is our semially, is that the Russian Communists started this mass-molding of youth long before Hitler did. Lenin's idea was to get 'em young, and pour communism and nothing else into their defenseless little beans, so that their adult minds would be bombproof against any other thinking.

The plan has worked well for the Communists and well for Hitler. Hitler and Stalin, indeed, run two governments which are soul mates in spite of their differing labels and their present mortal war on each other. Both are totalitarian systems.

But is the fact that totalitarianism suits most of the Russians and the Germans a reason why we should be willing to let ourselves be led blindfold into totalitarianism?

There are of course defects in capitalism, as there are in any other human economic and social set-up. A couple of these defects are in the papers just now, namely, Barbara Hutton and Doris Duke, a couple of young

ladies who inherited huge fortunes which seem to have done neither them nor anybody else any real good.

DO WE WANT ROBOT MINDS?

But those are just flyspecks on the American capitalist system. Its real power and value are evidenced by such things as the fact that it has furnished the Russians in this war with more than 10,000 airplanes, half the trucks used in their current offensives, great quantities of food and clothes, and so on. Russia has 60,000,000 more people than the United States, and at least as many natural resources. Yet it is a fair though unprovable bet that Germany would have licked Russia if it hadn't been for United States lend-lease.

Our present educational system is an integral part of our capitalist system. If the Great Brain gets control of United States education, all our schools will sink to a dead level of uniformity, turning out millions of robot minds. If we maintain our public and parochial and private schools, our State universities, our privately run universities like Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Dartmouth, Chicago, etc., etc., and such church universities as Notre Dame and Fordham, we'll continue to have variety in the products of our education, plus continuous improvement through competition. The Roosevelts, though, don't plan it that latter way.

New Orleans Sea Channel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "New Orleans Sea Channel Truly a National Project," written by Walter Parker and published in the Official Daily Court Record, New Orleans, La., in the issue of August 15, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS SEA CHANNEL TRULY A NATIONAL PROJECT

(By Walter Parker)

Obviously the less cost assessed against transportation and port services the greater the net returns on exports to producers, and, on imports, to consumers, and also broader market outlets. A saving of as little as 10 cents on a ton can have the effect of changing trade routes and extending markets.

Some very far-reaching changes in the economy of the world's commerce will result from the war. War debts are monumental, and to service them great burdens will fall upon all people.

Waste, loss motion, and extravagance will be impossible.

The port of lowest natural resistance for the exports and imports of the entire Mississippi Valley is New Orleans.

New Orleans had dug into its taxpayers' pockets for considerably more than $100,000,000 for equipment to make the way in and out for the trade centers of the Mississippi Valley easy and at low cost.

But further great economies are planned.

In order to lower costs to ships and to encourage the largest ships afloat and to become afloat to serve the commerce of the Valley States, New Orleans is asking the Federal Government to extend, widen, and deepen an existing 20-mile channel to deep water in the Gulf so as to give the valley access to the sea via a deep, straight tidewater route, thus avoiding the winding channel of the Mississippi River, its swift currents, and its varying water level.

Equally important, this sea-level channel will make available many thousand acres of now unimproved sea-level lands for the most perfectly coordinated harbors in all the world, where the most complete terminals, commodity handling devices and the like can be installed for the benefit of Mississippi Valley commerce, and for the reduction of costs.

The benefits that will accrue to the Mississippi Valley are many. Low cost boat traffic will be facilitated and made more efficient. Larger ships will come for Valley commerce, which will mean the lowest possible freight rates. Ample ground space will enable the railroads to handle their cars more expeditiously and at less cost. Shipside warehouses, where the time cost between the periods of production and need will reduce costs and facilitate financing. Finally, it will create an opportunity for the United States Navy to set up the kind of navy yard with graving docks for the accommodation of the largest battleships, facilities which it will greatly need on the Gulf coast, and which it needs now.

Other ports will necessarily have to meet the competition of the perfected port of New Orleans, and thus direct benefits will accrue generally.

Any economy that will facilitate and reduce the cost of handling the commerce of the United States will make a definite contribution to the country as a whole throughout the years ahead when the strain of rehabilitation and the financing of the national debt will be great.

The New Orleans project is, in fact, a movement for the Mississippi Valley and for the Nation, and would supply many jobs at a time when jobs are needed, and afterward when the country will endeavor to further raise the standard of living.

United States Neutrality as Reported by the Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to read the press reports concerning the announced policy and the application of the Government's neutrality program, appearing in this morning's papers, the Herald and Post, submitted herewith:

[From the Washington Post of August 18, 1944]

HULL DISAVOWS POWER POLITICS—DENIES ANY COERCION OF SMALL NATIONS

(By Fred Pasley)

Tartly assuring Governor Dewey his fears of power politics and coercion of little nations by the Big Four are groundless, Secretary of State Hull yesterday revealed that the international security talks starting here next week are but a curtain raiser to a full-dress conference of all the United Nations allies to be held this fall.

A world organization will be set up at that time and its delegates will draw up a tentative program of post-war collaboration for submission to the legislative bodies of their various governments.

Hull's blast at Dewey, generally regarded here as the opening administration gun in the 1944 political campaign, was considered so important by the Secretary that he issued it as a formal statement.

While he disclosed no details of existing understandings between this country and Great Britain, Russia, and China, Hull vigorously disclaimed any intent by the Big Four to ride herd on their lesser allies and the world at large.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 18, 1944]

UNITED STATES HALTS FLOW OF GOLD TO ARGENTINA

The United States applied a single premonitory turn of the economic screw to recalcitrant Argentina yesterday, halting the homeward flow from this country of gold owned by the South American nation.

It was the first positive action since Secretary of State Hull several weeks ago described Argentina as a deserter from the cause of the United Nations.

Argentina has been withdrawing gold from the United States for several months, shipments aggregating $20,000,000 to $30,000,000. The Treasury's Foreign Funds Control Division recently refused to permit a shipment from New Orleans of about $2,000,000, and it was understood that no further shipments will be allowed pending clarification of the diplomatic situation.

The possibility of a general freeze of Argentina's assets has been under consideration for months. The order actually has been drawn, but never issued.

The stop on gold shipments is not regarded here as a particularly drastic curb. Argentina, in effect, now acquires the status of a neutral, and loses a preferred status. Neutral countries are not allowed to withdraw gold, but this policy is not applied to Allied or associated nations.

When the Lights Come On Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following short poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

WHEN THE LIGHTS COME ON AGAIN

When the glory-bells of peace ring everywhere,
May they never, never cease, is vict'ry's prayer—
For we'll sing the song again,
"Peace on earth, good-will to men,"
When the glory-bells of peace ring everywhere.

CHORUS

When the lights come on again on Capitol Dome,
There'll be joy again in every Washington home—
And it's peace will radiate
To the homes in every State,
When the lights come on again on Capitol Dome.

When this war of carnage ends, and hatreds cease,
And upon the earth descends the dove of peace,
We will, 'neath the Stripes and Stars,
Write the epitaph of wars—
When this war of carnage ends, and hatreds cease.

Then our swords can into plowshares all be cast,
And our spears can into pruning-hooks, at last,
All be made, and we shall be
From war's devastation free—
Then our swords can into plowshares all be cast.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Keeping 'Em Rollin'

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, all railroad workers are vitally concerned with the operation of the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems. They justifiably regard these systems as their major bulwark against the economic hazards to which most of us are exposed. All of us who live will one day become too old to continue with our regular jobs.

Railroad employees are loyal American workmen. The railroad brotherhoods representing thousands of railroad employees have earned the esteem of not only the Congress but all the American people for their fair representation of the railroad workers' various problems. One has been the recent case for a wage increase. An excellent case was presented by Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, an outstanding labor statesman. He and his splendid staff have definitely proven in my humble judgment that—

First. An increase was necessary to correct maladjustments and inequalities. Statistics prove that wages of transportation workers did not keep pace with the rising cost of living.

Second. An increase was justified and necessary to correct gross inequities as compared with the wage rates in other industries.

Third. An increase was necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war because it would maintain the morale of the workers and halt the alarming flow of manpower from the vital railroad industry to other war industries.

Although Mr. Whitney and his staff adhered to established policy that the earnings of the carriers would not be regarded as relevant to the wage issue, they did develop a line of proof and argument which asserted that the staggering increases in the railroad wartime profits and the inflationary rise of living costs were injurious to workers' morale and contrary to the equitable principles of President Roosevelt's stabilization program.

The railroad employees also encountered obstacles with their vacation pay. That I understand has now been satisfactorily adjusted. These employees are entitled to every consideration, for railroad labor has performed an unbelievable task in carrying on the greatest transportation job in world history. Regardless of their wage rate case and other obstacles—no strikes by the railroaders. Let us salute the railroad employees of America for their magnificent job of "keeping 'em rollin'."

Efforts of Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, to Obtain Greater Production of Farm Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I hold in my hand three impartial news articles relating to the activities of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in connection with the increased production of farm machinery. One of the articles carries a highly commendatory statement by the President himself about the activities of the Senator from Illinois. The other article, also highly commendatory, is based on a letter by Mr. Donald Nelson, chairman of the War Production Board. The third article appeared in the column entitled "The Washington Merry-Go-Round," and bears the heading "LUCAS got the tools."

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in the order in which I have numbered them—1, 2, and 3.

Mr. President, on Wednesday, August 9, 1944, I asked and received consent to publish in the RECORD editorials from the Chicago Sun, Quincy Herald-Whig, and the Chicago Daily News, relative to the candidacy of the Hon. SCOTT LUCAS for reelection to this body. I now request consent to amend those remarks by adding thereto the statement as is pointed out in those editorials that many Republicans are actively organizing in behalf of Senator LUCAS throughout the entire State of Illinois.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not wish to object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Mexico. I merely wish to say that before we adjourn today I intend to make a speech showing the lack of farm machinery throughout the country, and also that the farmers of the Northwest are unable to gather their crops because the big farm machinery companies have not manufactured grain binders or combines. I expect to show that in one county of North Dakota, namely, Hettinger County, the farmers suffered a loss of more than $1,000,000 because the machinery companies had not manufactured the machinery which they agreed with Government officials to manufacture.

With that understanding, and with the further understanding that I may be permitted to put into the RECORD statistics and figures in support of my statement, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Mexico.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOSEVELT TELLS LUCAS' AID IN FARM MACHINES

WASHINGTON, May 26.—President Roosevelt today credited Senator SCOTT LUCAS (Democrat, Illinois) with being the person responsible for pushing for an increase in production of farm machinery, details of which were announced by the President himself.

The President just before introducing Prime Minister Churchill to the American press, told of the work the Red Cross and the Army are doing in the Middle West flood crisis. He wound up by discussing what the flood had done to food production.

The War Production Board, he announced, has allotted enough additional steel to construct 18,690 additional harvesting machines and the total of 55,000 will be ready for this harvest. For the 1944 season manufacturers will be permitted to make up to 80 percent of their 1940 production and have been given an AA2 rating, which is the same as for battleships and planes.

Senator LUCAS, the President said, has been the chief person pushing this effort.

Senator LUCAS has had conferences with the President, the War Production Board, the Agricultural Department, and Stabilization Director Byrnes to get the production of farm machinery, particularly corn pickers and combines, increased.

[From the Washington Post of June 27, 1943]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND—LUCAS GOT THE TOOLS

There was more than meets the eye behind the President's statement that Senator SCOTT LUCAS of Illinois was the man responsible for the W. P. B. order increasing the production of farm machinery to 80 percent of 1940 production.

Actually, Lucas crusaded for more than a year to put this over, ringing doorbells from one end of town to the other. Sometimes the fight seemed pretty hopeless, for he was bucking the combined opposition of Army-Navy brasshats and the W. P. B.

When all avenues failed, however, Lucas appealed to his close friend, the President.

"Something's got to be done right away about releasing more steel for farm machinery, or we're going to have a serious food shortage on our hands, Mr. President," he pleaded several weeks ago. "I know, because I come from a farm State. Most people in Washington don't seem to realize that food is a weapon as essential in wartime as guns."

The President agreed wholeheartedly, promised to take the matter up with Jimmy Byrnes. Lucas waited for a week then wrote Byrnes a bristling letter threatening to stage a "one man show" on farm machinery on the floor.

This ultimatum got results. Byrnes referred the letter to the President, who sent it to W. P. B. Boss Donald Nelson, with a notation to consider an increase of steel for farm implements.

The next day Lucas was called to Nelson's office to help draft the steel-increase order.

[From the Chicago Times of June 11, 1943]

NELSON REVEALS FARM MACHINE BOOM PLANS

WASHINGTON, June 11.—Details of the program to increase production of farm machinery, a great proportion of which is made in and near Chicago, were revealed today in a letter sent by War Production Board Chairman Donald Nelson to Senator LUCAS (Democrat, Illinois), who recently was complimented by President Roosevelt for taking a leading part in getting such action taken.

The letter follows.

"DEAR SCOTT: I am happy to inform you that a substantially increased program for the production of farm machinery will get under way July 1.

"A total of 300,000 tons of carbon steel, with other materials in proportion, has been allocated to the farm machinery program for the quarter beginning July 1. To assure continuous and balanced production, advance authorizations totaling an additional 200,000 tons of steel have also been approved for each of the three quarters from October 1, 1943, to July 1, 1944.

"During the third quarter of this year, special emphasis will be given to the manufacture of harvesting machinery for this year's crops.

"The total authorizations for the quarter and for the year beginning July 1 will make it possible to meet the farm machinery production program requested by the War Food Administration.

"Within a few days the War Production Board will issue a new farm machinery order to replace L-170, under which the industry has been operating. Farm equipment manufacturers are being authorized today by telegram to place orders for materials for the new program. The telegrams include allotment numbers under the controlled materials plan which will make it possible for the companies to place authorized orders immediately. Detailed certificates of authorization will be mailed within a few days.

"In order to assure adequate production, distribution, maintenance and repair facilities, the new order will eliminate the concentration features of L-170. It will provide for production of new machinery at approximately 80 per cent of the 1940 level.

"The whole farm machinery program has been stepped up by advancing the completion dates for the quotas established in L-170 for the year which began October 1, 1942, and placing the farm machinery industry on a new annual basis beginning July 1. Of the 300,000 tons of carbon steel allotted for the third quarter of this year, 83,723 tons will be used for completion of the increased program of harvesting machinery decided upon in March and the remainder will constitute first-quarter authorizations under the new order."

General Brereton, Airborne Commander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial from the August 12 issue of the Shreveport Times entitled "General Brereton, Airborne Commander":

GENERAL BRERETON, AIRBORNE COMMANDER

There is reason for a surge of pride in this region over the news that Lt. Gen. Lewis H. Brereton, former commanding officer at Barksdale Field, has been named commander of the new airborne army formed to operate on the front in western Europe.

General Eisenhower's announcement of the choice means that this unprecedented organization, welding both American and British airborne forces with total manpower estimated at from 60,000 to 90,000 men, is in the hands of an air-force leader who has demonstrated time and again his fitness for such an important and difficult wartime assignment.

Remembered here as a quiet man, dedicated heart and soul to the Air Forces, General Brereton saw service in this war at Manila, in the East Indies, Australia, India, and Egypt before going to England where he was placed in command of the Ninth Air Force, that ravaging arm of vengeance and offensive power which has done so much to ease the path of the invaders of Hitler's fortress on the west.

Once again, the Barksdale Field of pre-war days appears in the role of trainer and preparatory ground for the giants of America's far-flung air forces in combat. Only a little more than a decade has passed since Barksdale became a sturdy unit in what at the start was a small but ambitious air force. Yet now the field has a rich heritage of tradition, an unexcelled record of combat accomplishment which will inspire thousands of young men who will train at Barksdale in the years to come.

Our good wishes, and the good wishes of this entire region, go to General Brereton in his new post of responsibility. He deserves, in fullest degree, the high tribute which has come to him in General Eisenhower's appointment.

Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered over the radio by Grover B. Hill, Under Secretary of Agriculture, at Oklahoma City, Okla., on August 8, 1944. The address was delivered over the facilities of radio station WKY, at Oklahoma City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am proud to have a place on the initial program of this new radio service to southwestern agriculture. This is a farmer's radio program. And I'm glad to represent the U. S. D. A. on it because ours is the farmers' part of your Government.

I am especially glad to do this here in this country which I know and love. I have been in every county in Oklahoma and in most of them many times. I know this State better than any other next to my native State of Texas.

I want to take this opportunity to pay my respects to your Governor who has become a national figure and has done much to bring Oklahoma to the attention of the Nation. Governor Kerr is justly proud of his State, just as was that matchless citizen of Oklahoma, Will Rogers, who seldom failed on any occasion to refer to his native State of Oklahoma.

We can all be proud of the part this State has played in the all-out war effort. You have sent your sons to the fighting front. And you who have not been privileged to serve in the armed forces have done your job here at home in backing up the fighting front. In the production of livestock and crops, in supplying food and fiber, you have made a contribution that is vital.

Oklahoma farmers are forward looking. They are out here in a world in the making. They are the sons of those who looked forward in 1889 and who have built the future which was visioned in the dreams of the pioneers.

The eighty-niners saw the possibilities that nature had stored in the soil of Oklahoma. But before the dust from the greatest horse race in history had settled, the need for conserving that soil was clear. Oklahoma was quick to realize the importance of soil conservation, although it is said that erosion had damaged more land in less time in Oklahoma than in any other State. Today Oklahoma is in the first rank of all the States in a united State-wide effort to save and to protect and to guard for future generations that God-given natural resource, the soil. Oklahoma farmers and ranchers have already organized 59 conservation districts covering almost 32,000,000 acres on 140,000 farms and ranches. Three million acres are already operated on a soil-conservation basis, which increases production while saving the soil for the future.

We have learned that a State, like nations in history, rises or falls with the productivity of its soil. Oklahoma rose on the productivity of her soil and is determined that she will not fall.

It is easier to keep the soil than to regain it when it is once gone. Oklahoma was fortunate that not too much damage had been done by the time our national consciousness was awakened at last to the problem of soil conservation a dozen years ago.

The pioneering spirit is still alive in Oklahoma. Many of the people are the first generation of the forward-seeing pioneers whom hardships and problems did not stop. We can be thankful for that, because the end of this war will bring new problems to this Nation and to this State. We will be living in a different kind of a world—a new world. But you are used to that. You have faced new horizons before.

Let me suggest one of these problems to you now. You have just harvested the greatest wheat crop in your history. You have more livestock on your farms than ever before. You are producing more total food and fiber than you had ever thought possible. You have been doing this short-handed and with limited machinery and supplies.

That record of the past few years suggests what you can do when your boys come home to help and when you can get plenty of machinery and equipment besides. Your guess is as good as mine as to what that tremendous production can be.

This production is what we want. There is no place in America for a philosophy of scarcity. Abundance is the soundest of national policies, and it is plain, common sense to produce all that we can consume and export, within the limits of soil-conservation practices, at a reasonable profit to the producers. The farmer has proved he can do the producing. The problem—and the genius of America will not rest until this problem has been solved—is to make the best use to the State and to the Nation and to the world of that production. It is a challenge equal to that which faced the pioneers when they looked across the unplowed prairies of Oklahoma. I know it is the hope of everyone that we in this generation can meet that challenge as successfully as the pioneers met theirs. History has written their record; the same ruthless history will write ours.

Without going into details, there are two ways to use this food. These are to consume

ft ourselves and to export it to others. But we are now eating more food per capita in the United States than we have ever eaten before, because of our record purchasing power. Whether we can eat still more, or even continue at our present record rate, depends on whether we can maintain our national purchasing power.

Then, in spite of the fact that we are now consuming here at home more food and fiber than ever in our history, we are still exporting great quantities of it overseas. We are able to export this because we are producing more than we consume ourselves, even at our present record rate of consumption. Whether we can export still more, or even continue at our present rate, depends on whether the world continues to buy it, and that depends on how wisely world trade is handled. Just as our domestic consumption depends on sound conditions of domestic trade, just so does the other great outlet depend on sound conditions of world trade.

Perhaps in the past we have been so busy developing our own country that we may have overlooked some of the value of the broad two-way highway of foreign trade, which furnishes an outlet for our own production and which brings us the real value of the production of others for us to consume ourselves.

Now it seems more necessary than ever to work for a greatly expended foreign trade in farm products. We can and should be the best fed people on earth with plenty left over to sell to the other people of the world.

There is no place now for isolationism. Through the growing pains of the war we have come to the mature status of a world power; and we can take advantage of the opportunities that this position affords. This is generally considered a responsibility; it is also an opportunity. If we are to avail ourselves of this opportunity for foreign outlets for our abundant production, we must trade on a two-way highway with the rest of the world.

I am not proposing how this be done. I am simply suggesting the challenge to the forward-looking pioneers of Oklahoma, knowing that when public opinion demands anything it eventually will come about some way.

Hungarian Jews Must Be Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of an open letter to President Roosevelt from the editor of the Jewish Forum:

NEW YORK, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Nazi-Hungarian Government paper, it was reported by the J. T. A., issued the savage threat that 1,000 Jews will be sentenced to death for every air raid the United Nations will make on Budapest. Thus the United Nations are virtually made partners to the murders. Terror may frighten off individuals. It is only a people hoping against hope that the inevitable will thus be delayed, that can resort to such sadism with a view to frightening off whole armies.

The Hungarians, like the Rumanians, may claim that they adopted Hitler's savagery against the Jews under duress. But after people like the Dutch, the Czechs, the Belgians, and the Danes have shown how they could resist such duress, the Hungarians will just have no defense when the day of reckoning comes, as by now they know it must.

Eighty thousand Jews of the Carpathian Provinces have already disappeared by mass extermination, after being sent to the murder camps in Poland. One million Hungarian Jews are doomed unless drastic measures are immediately taken to end this brutality. Such savagery will, of course, be repeated in other satellite countries if the United Nations fail to take the necessary action. A lesson to all who would carry out the Hitler program of murder must be taught the Hungarians.

We appeal to you, Mr. President, to propose to the military leaders of the United Nations to help prevent a constant repetition of such savagery. For the sake of saving many thousands of Jews among the other vassals of Hitler, Hungary must be taught a lesson in a manner similar to that of Berlin. Air squadrons must be sent to Budapest until it is wiped off the face of the earth. That will be a clear indication that the United Nations are concerned for the lives of Jews and will remove the impression among the enemy that Jewish lives have no value. And it should deter other vassal nations from following such Nazi-Hungarian example.

Wherever possible, the destruction should, of course, be limited to structures, so that a minimum of lives be lost.

Such a step will actually stem the oceans of bloodshed, bring a quicker end of the war, save an untold number of lives, including many thousands of Jews, and hasten the return of a normal attitude towards all human beings generally.

Of course, as a token that the lives of Jews are dear to the United Nations, exchange of prisoners for Jews would help.

For the sake of all humanity, we trust such action will be taken speedily.

ISAAC ROSENGARTEN,
Editor, the Jewish Forum.

Reprint of Speeches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speeches delivered by me during the Seventy-eighth Congress:

CONGRESS SHOULD RAISE WAGES OF RAILROAD EMPLOYEES

(Speech of Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives Wednesday, November 24, 1943)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, having discussed this matter some weeks ago, I want again today to speak very briefly in support of the appeal of the railroad men to the Congress for a raise of their wages in the meager sum of 8 cents an hour.

I want to say to the Members of this House that I believe we should vote to give them the small amount they ask. Let me submit my reasons.

First, their wages are too low, compared with the average level of wages. I say average level in order to exclude workers in most of the war-producing plants, because in most war plants the workers are getting at least 50 percent more than the railroad men will get after this increase has been allowed.

Second, they can be granted this raise without breaking the "hold the line" order because such raise will not yet bring them above the wages they are entitled to in comparison with the cost of living or the Little Steel formula.

Third, to grant them this raise will not, in way, raise the cost of living because such raise will not cause the railroads to raise their rates in a single instance.

Fourth, it will settle the discontent and restlessness that the administration and Mr. Vinson's denial of their rights has stirred up among them and it may prevent a general railway strike. The over a million men in these 15 organizations have seen their rights kicked around from one commission to another in a continuous game of "buck passing" till they are becoming aroused.

Fifth, collective bargaining between labor and management is an established institution in this Nation. It is regarded by the laboring men as the foundation of labor's bill of rights. The railroad management and the representatives of the men have met collectively, bargained, and agreed upon the increase of 8 cents an hour, and if we believe in what we have written into the law, that agreement, especially due to the fact that it does not even tend to raise the cost of living, should have been approved at once by Judge Vinson.

Sixth, when precedent and law is being evaded, bypassed, and usurped by bureaucratic and dictatorial methods, it is time for Congress to assert itself and act swiftly and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I fear by our environment we allow ourselves in our thinking to get too far away from our people in our district. We forget the human equation. I want you to think with me for a moment so we can have a meeting of the minds and try to settle this question before this matter results in a Nation-wide strike and the Government finds an excuse to step in and take over the railroads. You remember, I am sure, the miserable and costly failure the Government made in operating the railroads in the First World War. None of us who remember that tragedy want to take a chance on it happening again.

The over a million men who are asking for this raise have not caused by a strike the loss of a day's time in 22 years. They have done a marvelous job in helping to keep the roadbeds and rolling stock in a shape that has made it possible to move twice the amount of freight and passenger traffic since war was declared than has ever before been transported in this Nation. They are among our most respected and patriotic citizens of the Nation, yet over one-half million of these railroad men receive an average of less than 70 cents an hour, and 120,000 of these railroad men receive 46 cents an hour or less. This Congress, in my judgment, should pass the Truman-Crosser resolution, settle the matter, and remove this gross inequity in wages.

OPPOSITION TO NATIONAL SERVICE ACT

(Extension of remarks of Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, March 15, 1944)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to voice my opposition against any sort of a national service act. I am against the Austin-Wadsworth bill, and will oppose any other bill under any name, whether it be one drawn under the suggestion of the President sometime back when he indicated to the Congress and the people that under certain conditions he would favor a national service act that

would draft all people to serve under the centralized power and control of the Federal Government here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed for the past many years the centralization of power and control of the people which has been constantly increasing year by year. Naturally, under the impact of war and the great struggle we are in, there has been less opposition to Government control, because all of the people want to do everything they can do, and all of the people are willing to sacrifice and are anxious to coordinate their efforts toward the winning of the war. There has been much necessary extension of control and regimentation of the people, but under the guise of war there has been much unjustified control fastened upon them and much unjustified centralization of power.

There is a great danger in such times of stress and struggle of such controls and regimentation and centralization of power being carried entirely too far, and it is my candid opinion, and I believe the opinion of the majority of the Members of this Congress, that that point will have been reached and passed if this Congress should approve and pass a national service act.

Certainly such an act should not be passed unless there is unquestioned proof that it is necessary. Certainly such an act is not in step with democracy. It is in step with the theory of a totalitarian form of government. The questions arise, Will it help to increase production of the implements of war? Will it help to increase the production of food on the farms of this country? Will it help to move more goods and materials over the transportation systems of America? Will it release more manpower for the military service of our country?

Of all the articles I have read upon this subject, and of all the speeches I have listened to, I must confess that I have not been convinced that there is a necessity now for a national service act and I have not been convinced that such an act will lead to greater production from our mines, in our industrial plants for the winning of the war, or that it will bring any greater production from the farmers of our Nation, or that it will hasten the delivery of goods over the railways or the transportation systems of our country. In fact, I fear that the passage of a national service act would retard all these endeavors which are so necessary to the well-being of the Nation in these times of stress. Freemen will bring forth greater production than men who are forced and regimented.

Mr. Speaker, I am unwilling to depart from the democracy of this country which has served it so well and embark upon such a totalitarian course unless it be proven without doubt that our manpower situation is so desperate that we must take in this country such a dangerous step in a last final effort to get the production that is necesary to win the war. And if we take this step, we are following in the very footsteps of the Nazi government which early in the war did the same thing to all of the people of that nation.

I think the American farmers and the American workmen, all of them, whether or not they belong to any labor organization, when we take into consideration the miracle of production on the farms and in the factories that has been turned out under the democracy of this country, that they and we have demonstrated that democracy in action can be swift enough even during wartimes to maintain its democracy and at the same time develop the greatest food supply and war machine in the world. There is no question but that the men and women of this Nation have not only produced the best and greatest army in the world in the shortest length of time but they have produced the greatest amount of food, munitions of war, including airplanes, tanks, trucks, guns, and battleships, of any nation in the world. And, in addition, the American people, through production and lend-lease, have sent billions of dollars' worth of farm products and of war equipment to all of the nations of the world. They now have their fighting men on all of the battle fronts of the world, and they have poured twice as much money into this fight, money sacrificed from the savings of the people of this country, than all of the rest of the Allied Nations combined. Yet we are told we must do more, that we must draft every man and woman from the ages of 18 to 65 years, and that under such a law all of these people would be at the beck and call of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the right of workers to higher wages or their right to transfer from one job to another without permission would be denied under the law. All of them would be subject to the assignment and call of the Government.

This step should not be taken. We had better look back into the history of this country and try to hold to some of the sound, fundamental principles that have made this country great. We had better be a little more proud and a little more satisfied with the accomplishments that the American men and women have been able to bring to bear in this great crisis because they have achieved miracles in production on the farms and in the mills and factories, and they have laid out their money and sent their boys throughout the world in this struggle with a devotion to this Nation exemplifying as deep a patriotism as can be found in the history of any nation in the world. The American people are still sound. They still respect the fundamental principles of American democracy and they want to maintain this country along the same lines of Government that have made it the greatest nation in the world.

Forced labor and regimentation, in my judgment, will slow down production—hence, slow down the war effort. I do not believe it can be justified on any premise. It is my opinion that if there ever was any excuse for a national service act that time passed over a year ago. Even Mr. McNutt, at the head of the War Manpower Commission for the past year, while there has been talk of the national service act, has said, "It is not necessary."

Such an act will place too much power in the hands of any government.

Such an act is too far a departure from democracy in this country.

Such an act, in my opinion, is unjustified and should not be approved by this Congress.

RAILROAD EMPLOYEES OF AMERICA

(Speech of Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, October 12, 1943)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of this Congress today to a matter that should have consideration which affects one of the finest groups of laboring men in the Nation, who have backed the war effort to the limit and who have not cost their Government the loss of 1 hour's time during this war by calling a strike. They need our moral support now.

I refer to the railroad employees of America.

There is probably no group of laboring men in the Nation who have rendered a greater service to the people of the Nation and to the war effort than have the men who belong to the various railway brotherhoods and nonoperating organizations who, by their long hours and constant effort, have delivered the greatest amount of freight and passenger traffic over our American railway systems that the world has ever known.

During World War No. 1, at the peak of business in 1918, railroads almost broke down in handling 405,000,000,000 ton-miles of freight and 43,000,000,000 passenger-miles.

With 55 percent fewer locomotives and 26 percent fewer freight cars, last year, in 1942, the American railway men put over the road 638,000,000,000 ton-miles of freight—an increase of 58 percent over the 1918 movement. In the same year they moved 54,000,000,000 miles of passenger traffic, extending the 1918 volume by 26 percent.

It is estimated that in 1943 our freight traffic will reach 725,000,000,000 ton-miles, representing an increase of 80 percent over the business handled under Government operations during World War No. 1. The passenger increase is even greater.

Mr. Speaker, had it not been for over 1,000,000 employees of the railroads who are known as the nonoperating class, this outstanding record could not have been accomplished. This class of railroad men start with the maintenance men, some of whom are known as section hands, and continues on into the railroad yards and shops with the boilermakers, boilermaker helpers, machinists, and machinist helpers, car repairers, blacksmiths, and so forth. They are the men who have kept the roadbeds in shape, who have repaired and kept the rolling stock in such condition as to get this transportation over the road.

It may surprise you to know that a great amount of this unskilled labor during these wartimes and during these high prices start as low as 36 cents an hour and that the top pay for machinists in railroad work, which represent a body of the finest mechanics in America, is only 95 cents an hour.

These men are subject to the same taxes and are up against the same high cost of living as are the more fortunate millions of workers in the war factories of the Nation, who, in most instances, draw twice those amounts in salaries. You know the type of men I am referring to. There are thousands of them in my district who are among our most conservative and respected laboring men. In my district they make up a part of the citizenry of Centralia, Salem, Mount Vernon, Effingham, Palestine, Mount Carmel, Bluford, and other cities. You have them throughout your districts throughout the Nation. They are among our best citizens, they support the schools, the churches, and the bond drives.

These men are underpaid and have been since war was declared. They are asking for more money now and their plea has been almost utterly disregarded up to the present time in the face of the fact that the railroad companies, due to their heavy volume of business, are making more money than in the many years past, because of such increase in business and in increases granted them in rates.

The railroad men of this Nation have given the country little trouble with regard to work stoppages. There has not been a major railroad strike since 1922, a period of 21 years. Due to the fact that living has increased rapidly since the war began, on September 15, 15 organizations, representing 1,000,000 nonoperating employees served notices on the companies that they expected an increase of 20 cents an hour with a minimum hourly wage of 70 cents. This request was denied by the management and later referred to the local mediation board. This board failed to agree and the President, by executive order, appointed an Emergency Board to take the matter under advisement.

On May 24, 1943, this Board recommended an increase of 8 cents an hour. On June 22, 1943, Mr. Vinson, who was appointed recently by the President as Economic Stabilization Director, denied the increase as recommended by the Emergency Board. On August 7, the railroad management and representatives of the various crafts, negotiated an agreement based on the findings of this Emergency Board. Mr. Vinson, the President's right-hand man, who apparently is following the dictates of the President, has consistently re-

fused to approve this small raise, and the railroad men have been refused the meager sum of 8 cents an hour increase.

Every fair-minded citizen who will give any thought to the situation knows that the price of living, within the past 2 years, has increased to a greater extent than the 8 cents an hour raise now refused to the railroad men. The pay of this great group of our citizens is below the average standard pay for the class of work they do and it is hard to understand why Mr. Vinson, who speaks for the President, continues to turn his back against this great group of men who have contributed patiently and loyally to the enormous task of railway transportation in this country.

It is to be hoped that the President and Mr. Vinson will take note of the unjust treatment these men are receiving and grant this meager raise in salary. If they do not the blame should be placed where it belongs. The President and Mr. Vinson, and no one else must be held responsible.

WAR LABOR BOARD SHOULD APPROVE ILLINOIS MINERS AND OPERATORS AGREEMENT

(Speech of Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, Monday, October 4, 1943)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is about time the War Labor Board changed its attitude toward the rank and file of the coal miners of the Nation and began thinking of getting coal to keep the people from freezing this winter rather than to continue dodging the issue in an effort to embarrass the labor leaders who represent the miners. If the War Labor Board and the Government are willing to give up their pet peeve, settle the coal mine dispute, and get greater production of coal for our citizens and the war effort they now have their chance.

The United Mine Workers of Illinois and the coal operators have reached an agreement on the proposed 8½-hour day. All the War Labor Board has to do now is to approve such agreement. Doubtless, if this Board will approve this agreement, its terms will be accepted throughout the Nation with a new wage contract entered into between the mine workers and the operators. It is to be hoped that the President and the War Labor Board will see the urgent necessity of such action. I refer to the President because there is little question but that none of the bureau heads, in an important matter like this, would make a decision without his approval.

Without the renewal of a wage contract the coal miners have carried on with the exception of a short time out on strike, and they have done a good job in production for the Nation. As a class they have not received the consideration and credit that is due them. It should have been evident from the beginning that with the increase of the cost of living that the wages of the miners, either by allowing portal to portal pay or in other ways, must be increased.

Their scale of wages has been far below the scale of wages in the munitions factories. Their work is and has been more hazardous than that of most industrial workers. All over the Nation women with no experience and with only a few weeks' training have been drawing higher wages than the miners, who have spent years in acquiring the skill of their trade. It should have been evident to those in charge of the War Labor Board that you cannot keep a group of men, who are organized and whose ranks number into the hundreds of thousands, at a wage level far below what their neighbors are making in less hazardous work and in better working conditions than are those of the miners. It is to be hoped that the War Labor Board will abandon its hard-headed attitude and that peace may come to the mining industry with a greater production of coal because our output now is lagging behind production goals by over 500,000 tons per week.

This Nation faces a serious fuel shortage during the coming winter. Thousands upon thousands of American homes will be cold because of an inability to obtain fuel. The responsibility for this fuel shortage must be accepted by the War Labor Board, inasmuch as its unreasoning attitude toward the miners is as directly responsible for the strife in that industry as the refusal of the miners to work under conditions which they regarded as intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the great majority of the Members of this House, if they had an opportunity, would vote for the proposal that is now before the War Labor Board. I am sure the coal miners have the sympathy of the majority of the Members of this House who recognize their hazardous employment and who also recognize that this group of men has been underpaid for many months when taking into consideration the high cost of living and the wage standard set for other industrial workers.

It is to be hoped that the War Labor Board will abandon its arbitrary policy, approve this agreement, and stop the uncertainty and strife in the mining industry in the interest of the men who work in the mines and in the interest of the war effort and our civilian economy.

MAKE MEDIATION DECISIONS FINAL

(Remarks of Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, Friday, June 9, 1944)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Banking and Currency Committee for writing into this price control bill section 10, in which the committee provides that the decisions by the Railway Mediation Board, or such agencies settling matters of dispute between railroad management and railway employees, shall be final when rendered.

If this amendment is approved by this Congress it will prevent the playing of politics and the shameful practices by those high in official authority here in Washington who, by their buck-passing and delay, caused a strike to be called by the railway labor men of the Nation which hurt the cause of railway labor organizations unjustly, during the latter part of last year and which brought about a situation which gave the President of the United States an opportunity to seize the railroads all of which could and should have been avoided and which will be made impossible in the future if this amendment is approved by the Congress.

Members of this House will remember that for a year prior to the calling of the railway strike in December of last year through the Board set up for the hearing of such disputes every legal step had been taken as between the railway employees and railway management. The facts are the railway management recognized the railway employees were entitled to more money and the two groups had agreed upon the amount. At that point through the operation and on the advice of O. P. A. the matter was appealed to Director of Stabilization, Mr. Fred Vinson. He ruled against it on the theory that it might increase the cost of living.

The President came into the picture and set up a new Board to make a restudy and a recanvass of the entire matter which had been restudied and recanvassed for an entire year and when the facts were brought in again Mr. Vinson offered some increases but wanted it done in his particular way which was inequitable to the men involved. It was at this juncture that the President seized the railroads, apparently in order to prevent a Nation-wide tie-up of transportation. After the railroads were seized and held for 48 hours they were turned back to the companies and a settlement was made with the men involved at as much or more costs than would have resulted from their contract had the matter never been appealed to Mr. Vinson, to Mr. Byrnes, or the President.

I protested the delay in a speech on the floor of the House at that time; urged that the 15 nonoperating groups and that the 5 operating groups representing over one and one-half millions of among our finest laboring men in the Nation be given the small raise in salary they and the railway management had agreed upon. The official delayers and stabilizers, from Judge Vinson to the White House, would not do it. They delayed the matter and forced the men to vote to strike.

If this legislation is approved, the decision of the Board will be final. Neither Mr. Vinson, the President, nor anyone can delay the execution of the Board's order.

This amendment provides for the using of the Railway Mediation Board and other well thought-out plans for arriving at just decisions between railway employees and railway management growing out of collective bargaining.

It removes the possibility of delay in the future and the possibility of playing politics at the expense of the railway workers and railway management. It compels such disputes to be adjudicated and settled in an impartial way and in a way that has proven satisfactory in the past.

It is the right step in the right direction to settle labor and management controversies by sound principles of mediation which is so necessary to the economy of this country.

The Hand-Out Complex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the Bratleboro Reformer of August 8, 1944, entitled "The Hand-Out Complex":

THE HAND-OUT COMPLEX

The Democratic administration in Washington has developed a severe hand-out complex, the latest manifestation of which is a proposal to increase the amount paid to the unemployed up to $35 a week. This would be accomplished by taking over the present unemployment compensation systems operated by the States and dumping in a lot more money.

This is a telling self-indictment of the Democrats. They are so conditioned to unemployment, the dole, and depression that they don't think in terms of anything else. They have mentally drifted into a world where such things are normal and permanent. All the post-war planning they do consists of more W. P. A., more public works, more hand-outs. They are perpetually proposing to do something to improve the lot of the common man, but so far have never been able to think of anything to do except spend some more Government money. It does not seem to have occurred to them that what the common man wants most of all is an honest job.

The people of this country don't want to go back to dole, unemployment, and depression when the war is over. They want to go back to the kind of America they used to know, where good workers could get good jobs, where people paid their own bills and

didn't expect some alphabetical agency to bail them out of all their troubles. The people want to put Washington back on the American style and the first step will be taken in November.

Aid for Dependents of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, while I have been in Rhode Island I have received innumerable requests for information relative to aid to dependents of men and women in the armed forces. I wish it were possible to explain to every relative of a man or woman in the service that he should write to his Congressman if he has any difficulty, or if there is any information he wants on this subject.

In the Second Rhode Island Congressional District, folks should write to me, JOHN E. FOGARTY, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. I shall be happy to see to it that their problems are taken care of properly.

Any dependent of a man or a woman in our armed forces who is paid $138 a month or less is eligible to receive a dependent's allowance from the Government. It must be remembered that this act applies only to men and women in service whose base pay is $138 a month or less. Those men and women in service who get more than $138 per month come under another system. The new act passed by Congress, effective November 1, 1943, provides a monthly family allowance as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife may get up to $42 per month if she is named specifically in the court order to receive alimony and she receives the amount named. If this amount is in excess of $42, she cannot receive over $42. The child of a divorce, where there is no wife receiving family allowance, can get up to $42 per month regardless of the amount given in the court order. If there is a wife receiving family allowance this amount is $30 and if there are other children it is slightly less. Therefore, if the divorce or court order does not name the child to receive support or name the child for less support, this is disregarded and the above amounts are given. Illegitimate children are also considered as class A dependents of the serviceman if they are proven to be his children either by his sworn statement to that effect or by a court order adjudging him to be the father.

Class B dependents: A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent or two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37. Note: Class B dependents, it must be clearly understood, are dependents who are only partially dependent upon service men and women for support. In other words, if the dependents are dependent upon the service man or woman for 50 percent or less of their support they are classed as B dependents. Those who make application for this family allowance, therefore, should be careful to prove that they are more than 51 percent if they actually need chief support from the man or woman in service, and especially if they have no outside income. Persons who have other means of income unless it is small will as a rule be classed as B dependents. Those who need a great deal of assistance will be classed as B–1 dependents.

Class B–1 dependents: One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; and each additional brother or sister, $11. Two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $79, plus $11 for each additional brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $42, with additional $11 for each additional brother or sister. Note that here again it must be remembered that it is important to prove more than 50-percent dependency where the parents and brothers and sisters actually are greatly dependent. If it is not proven, they are classed as B dependents and receive considerably less money, as outlined above.

HOW TO GET FAMILY ALLOWANCE

Wherever possible, as soon as a man or woman enters service they should make application for the allowance to their dependents. They should do this immediately when they are inducted. The allowance payments do not go back but start with the date of application. Therefore, if the man or woman in service waits a month after induction before they file an application, 1 month's family allowance is lost. The longer they wait to file an application, the more money is lost. It is important to file for this the day they enter.

The man or woman in service should submit the application on a form they can get from the commanding officer. In filling out this form it is good to be careful to spell all names correctly and give exact information as to marriage, dates of birth, and so forth. Many of the troubles dependents have in getting their family allowances are due to the fact that the service man or woman is careless in filling out the blank. An extra minute filling out the blank may save several months' time in getting the allowance approved. The application after careful study and filling out should then be handed to the commanding officer.

In the case where a class A dependent must apply, the Army provides a blank to be filled out, but the Navy requires only a letter in the handwriting of the dependent stating the facts and giving the serviceman's full name and serial number. Class A family allowance is approved regardless of the serviceman's desire for it.

If the man or woman in service with class B or B–1 dependents refuses to make an application for them, no other person can apply, and there is no way it can be given to them. They cannot be forced to apply, and it is started or discontinued at the will of the serviceman. If the man or woman is in the Army and his class B or B–1 dependents know that he will approve their application, they may make the application for him providing he is overseas. When the application is received, he is contacted for his approval. If the man or woman is in any other branch of the service, they must make application regardless of whether or not they are out of the country.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FAMILY ALLOWANCE AND ALLOTMENT

It is well for both the serviceman and the dependents to know the difference in these terms. Family allowance is a sum of money partly paid by the service man or woman and partly paid by the Government. No matter how small or how large the family allowance is $22 is deducted from the service man's or woman's salary and the balance is paid by the Government. Dependency must be shown for class B or B–1 dependents to receive family allowance.

An allotment is a voluntary deduction from a man's pay to anyone he wishes to give it and it is not increased by any amount from the Government. These are referred to as class E allotments and no dependency needs be shown to receive it. The service man or woman is the only one who can request that this deduction be made from his pay.

PARENTS AND BROTHERS AND SISTERS CAN RECEIVE ALLOWANCES AT THE SAME TIME AS WIFE AND CHILDREN

It is also important to know that parents and brothers and sisters can get family allowance even if the serviceman's wife and children get one. In other words, if men or women in service have parents and brothers or sisters dependent upon them as well as a wife and children—all of these dependents can receive family allowance. Because a serviceman has a wife and child receiving this allowance, it does not prevent his parents and brothers and sisters from also receiving it. In order to name them, he has to make an additional $5 contribution toward the family allowance. For example, if he has a wife and child or children receiving family allowance, he is having $22 deducted from his wages in part payment of it. If he wishes also to name his parents or brothers or sisters, he has $5 more taken out or a total of $27. The balance in both cases is paid by the Government.

PARENTS CAN GET FAMILY ALLOWANCE FROM MORE THAN ONE SON OR DAUGHTER IN SERVICE

If parents are dependent upon more than one son or daughter or both in service they can get more dependency allowance. They may get either a B rating from both sons or they may get a B–1 rating from one and a B from another. They may receive family allowance from no more than two sons or daughters in service. This is given where the need is shown to be sufficiently great enough to warrant it.

If you need any further help, contact your Congressman. It is a Congressman's duty to help with such matters. He is your representative in Washington. If you have any trouble at all in this respect, your Congressman is the person to take it up with.

Your Congressman has already helped in more than 5,000 cases. Only 100 of

these are now pending. Your Congressman will settle your case for you and get you every cent you have coming.

FOR THOSE WHO RECEIVED A CUT IN FAMILY ALLOWANCE

Many people received a cut recently in their family allowance. No explanation is given when the reduced checks arrive so here is the explanation.

To begin with, all those who were cut were reduced to $37 per month. In other words, they were given a class B dependency. No matter how many dependents there are in a family, a class B dependency under the new law gives only $37.

What is a class B dependency? A class B dependency is one where the parents or brothers and sisters are dependent upon the soldier or sailor 50 percent or less.

All dependents some time ago were sent a blank to fill out. On that blank they were asked to list their monthly living expenses for the last 12 months and their average monthly income for the last 12 months. If the difference between monthly expenses and income listed on this blank was $37 or less, they were cut to a class B dependency rating. Even if the difference between the monthly income and monthly expenses listed on this blank was $43 or less, they were given a class B dependency, because $43 is closer to $37 than $68—which is the amount for a B–1 rating.

In other words, the dependents' own figures as put on this blank were used as the basis for rating them as B instead of B–1 dependents.

Another thing that reduced many people to $37 per month was the way they filled out the part of the blank which asked how much the soldier or sailor contributed before he joined the armed forces. Many parents put down that they did not know, or put in that the boy contributed nothing to their support or very little before he joined. The more the boy contributed to their support, the better are the chances of the parents to a B–1 rating.

If those who have been cut cannot make ends meet on $37 per month they should take the matter up with their local Veterans of Foreign Wars or local American Legion head or local Red Cross chairman; and if any further information or assistance is needed write me: Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Here Is the History of Events at Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article appearing in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N. Y., under date of July 31, 1944, entitled "Here's the History of Events at Democratic Convention":

HERE'S THE HISTORY OF EVENTS AT DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

(By James L. Wright)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—Maybe it is not too late, even now, to look over the bloody trail stemming from the Democratic National Convention in Chicago.

Political heads went on the chopping block there. Brave hearts were left bleeding from the rapier thrusts of politics; loyalty was trampled underfoot. It was an amazing week of chicanery and deception unequaled in the palmiest days of bossism.

Long has it been said of President Roosevelt by his critics that he is "all things to all men." Senators and Representatives go to the White House with legislation or proposed administration policies, and after discussing them leave the Chief Executive convinced of his support, only to find out later when the show-down comes they have his opposition instead. Again and again and again that has happened.

But never before has this double-talk, if not double-cross, been recorded in black and white, spread on the record over the President's signature, as it was during the hectic week of the nominating convention in Chicago when Mr. Roosevelt was sure of his own nomination for a fourth term, and was being looked to for guidance in the selection of a Vice Presidential running mate.

First one man appeared as the White House favorite, then another and then another. Various letters, contradictory in character, but all written on the familiar light-green stationery the President uses for his personal correspondence, and signed in his own handwriting, appeared mysteriously at psychological moments, and from undetermined places.

First, there was the letter on which Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE counted for renomination. Days before the correspondents left Washington it became known that such a letter would be put in the hands of Senator SAMUEL D. JACKSON of Indiana, slated for permanent chairman of the convention, but as late as the Saturday before the convention opened Democratic National Chairman Robert E. Hannegan said he did not know anything about such a letter.

The next day Mr. Hannegan confirmed the report there would be such a letter from the President and said, "I have an idea what is in it," though he would not say he had read it or had had it read to him. However, even Senator JACKSON, to whom the letter was addressed, told one of his closest confidants that he did not know about the letter, what it contained, or where it would come from, or how it would be placed in his hands.

On Monday an unidentified messenger appeared before the Indiana legislator, asked if he was Senator JACKSON, and being assured that he was handed him the President's letter. The messenger did not say where he came from or who sent him, but the letter was on White House stationery, and the signature was undeniably the President's, so the Senator read it over the radio. On the day before, so it leaked out much later, Mr. Hannegan had had a secret rendezvous with the President on his private car in the switchyards of Chicago.

Of course, the letter was the one which endorsed HENRY WALLACE as a personal friend. "I like him and respect him, and he is my personal friend. For these reasons I personally would vote for his renomination if I were a delegate to the convention," the President wrote.

Not a word about HENRY WALLACE'S loyalty to the President. Not a word about his loyalty to the New Deal. Not a word about the 4 years' work he had done as Presiding Officer of the Senate in getting through the administration's policies.

On the contrary, the President reminded the convention that it had the responsibility of selecting the Vice President, and said it "should give great consideration to the pros and cons of its choice."

Poor HENRY! Former National Chairman James A. Farley is credited with branding the letter as "the kiss of death for HENRY." Turner Catledge, brilliant writer for the New York Times, said: "It's the first time I ever saw a man's throat cut below the belt."

Disemboweled as he was, he fought on, remained loyal to his chief, even after other letters had come to light on the same kind of White House stationery, and over the President's signature, in which he said of Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN and Associate Justice William O. Douglas that "I should be very glad to run with either one of them and believe that either one of them would add strength to the ticket."

That was more than he had said for HENRY WALLACE, the man he had handpicked and forced a rebellious convention to select as his running mate 4 years earlier. HENRY WALLACE and his supporters just wouldn't believe there was such a letter. "We have a letter we can show. If they have one, why don't they show it?" trumpeted Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania.

Subsequent developments lent more than a suspicion that even before the pro-Wallace letter was made public, the other letter had been written, and still a third man, James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of war Mobilization, had rushed out from the White House to Chicago, believing that he personally had been given the President's blessing for Vice President. After all he was "close in," and had been serving as "assistant President" for many months.

When word of the President's Truman-Douglas endorsement circulated, Senator Truman was as excited as a teen-age girl just proposed to.

"I wouldn't believe it myself until I saw it with my own eyes," he said excitedly. "I have just read it. Part of it is typewritten and part of it is in the President's own handwriting. He says I'll add real strength to the ticket. It looks as though I'll have to take it."

Then the row developed in Wallace circles as to whether or not there was such a letter. Finally, Mr. Hannegan accepted the challenge and exhibited that letter, but by that time it bore the date of July 19, and was written in its entirety on the typewriter.

Before that the boom for Mr. Justice Byrnes had grown, budded, bloomed, withered, and died completely under a hot blast from the C. I. O. Over the coffee at breakfast one morning in his ritz hotel suite at the Ambassador-East, where Sidney Hilman was staying, that labor leader "talked turkey" to Senator TRUMAN. Be it remembered that that Missouri solon had promised his old friend, former Justice Byrnes, he would nominate him for the Vice Presidency. Bluntly, Mr. Hillman, with the backing of the Communist-inclined C. I. O. Political Action Committee, told the Senator that labor never would take Byrnes, that it would take him (TRUMAN) as a compromise if Wallace could not make the grade.

That put the Senator in a box. He was most uncomfortable. But he had been tapped with the magic wand. Mr. Byrnes bowed to the will of the President—and the C. I. O. Next morning he issued a formal statement: "In deference to the wishes of the President," it began, "I ask that my name be not placed before the convention as a candidate for the democratic nomination for Vice President." It was curtain for Jimmy. He slipped out of town, back to Washington, like a stranded tragedian.

Last Thursday the Associated Press carried a report from Jimmie's home town, Columbia, S. C., saying that he would remain by the President's side until after the November elections out of a sense of loyalty, but then would resign as Director of the Office of War Mobilization. The report quoted the Columbia Record as saying he had "750 convention votes pledged to him when he went to Chicago—more than enough to nominate, but withdrew his name after party leaders bowed to the will of Sidney Hillman, C. I. O. political boss."

Anyone who knows Mr. Byrnes, the man who stepped down from a lifetime job as an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court to assist his personal friend, the President, in handling his wartime troubles, knows that he would not have gone to Chicago at convention time, opened political headquarters and asked Senator TRUMAN to nominate him unless he felt he had the blessing of Franklin D. Roosevelt. When he learned later it was otherwise, he withdrew "in deference to the wishes of the President."

And "Dear ALBEN" BARKLEY, much wooed in the days of yore. He, too, is left with a bleeding heart, after a touching forgive-and-forget session with Roosevelt, following his sensational break with the President when he vetoed the hard-won tax bill in this session of Congress. BARKLEY believed the Vice Presidential race was a free-for-all, and that he had had the hobbles taken off. Before going to Chicago he had promised to nominate the President for his fourth term and believed he himself would be acceptable to the President as his running mate.

Consequently BARKLEY for Vice President headquarters were opened by his fellow Kentuckians. But 'Dear Alben" was not mentioned as an "acceptable" in any of the letters written by the President. He WAS ignored. Angered, BARKLEY withdrew his nominating speech for the President, as put out in advance, debated with friends all evening and until 2 o'clock in the morning of the day it was to be made whether he would deliver it at all. He finally issued a formal notice to correspondents that they could use it as written upon delivery. He had decided to make it.

But the way in which the old-line political bosses, the Kellys, Flynns, Hagues, and Pendergasts, at first fought and then worked with the newer labor bosses to run the show at Chicago, and get nominated the man both sets of bosses could agree on, is one of the behind-the-scenes manipulations of transcending importance to the American people. It shows complete boss rule.

The truth is that after the President had written his letter saying that either Senator TRUMAN or Justice Douglas would add strength to the ticket, the bosses wanted the word "right from the 'hosses' mouth," so Mr. Hannegan called the President, while Mayor Frank Hague of Jersey City, Mayor Edward J. Kelly of Chicago, and Edward J. Flynn of the Bronx were in the room, and Mr. Roosevelt then "gave Truman the nod," choosing him over Douglas, with whom he had been bracketed in tne second letter.

Asked how he knew he had been "given the nod" and had been chosen over all other candidates, the truthful HARRY TRUMAN said:

"I listened in on the telephone conversation with the President."

Chairman Hannegan, who had never wanted WALLACE renominated and finally openly admitted that he hoped Senator TRUMAN would be nominated, probably never heard of the principle enunciated by Will H. Hays when he was chairman of the Republican National Committee:

"The business of the chairman is to elect—not select."

But then, times have changed.

The Robot Bomb Attacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when Representative SCOTT and I recently visited supreme headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in England, Maj. Gen. Fred Anderson, who has immediate charge of all bombing over the European and Mediterranean theaters, arranged for Sgt. Frank Kelly, of Indianapolis, to take us in the general's car for a survey of the robot bomb damage.

Driving through Wimbledon, we had a blow-out, and we all pitched in to change tires and get under way. We had trouble with the jack, and a smiling lady came out of a notions store to tell us we could use hers. She had in her hand a copy of London's Sketch, with a picture of Representative SCOTT and the speaker. Recognizing us, she introduced herself as Mrs. Mayhead and asked us to autograph the picture. In signing my name, I obtained a promise from Mrs. Mayhead to write me in a few days and tell me about the robots which were then crashing nearby.

Last week I received here the following letter:

WIMBLEDON, S. W. 19, LONDON, *July 15, 1944.*

(At this moment we are on the "alert.")

DEAR MR. CANFIELD: I am keeping my promise to write to you.

When I came across to ask you if you would like a bigger jack for your car, I had no idea I should be speaking to two gentlemen from Congress.

I must be frank. I WAS indeed surprised to find myself speaking to such friendly men as yourself and companion. It is real proof to me that your country and mine are allies in a good cause—to defeat an enemy that has no honor and kindness.

Now London is going through a new phase in this war, but with God's aid we shall come through with our flag flying high.

Your countrymen are the first to help in the flying-bomb damage and destruction. They have rendered invaluable help to the sufferers of Hitler's missiles, and they, too, have suffered from them and not far from here.

My eldest son is attached to the headquarters of the British Increment Section G. L. V1 (U. S.) Corps in Italy, and he has told me all about your countrymen there. My youngest son is in Egypt serving with the R. A. F.

Please tell your countrymen that with the A. A. F. and the R. A. F. we shall soon have quiet nights and days in London.

England kept her chin up in 1940–1 and she will do it in 1944. Only a beaten enemy would resort to this new and terrible method of warfare.

My husband and I wish you a safe return to your country.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. MAYHEAD.

I wish I could have taken Mrs. Mayhead to S. H. A. E. F. and shown her the large writing on General Anderson's wall. It is a quotation from Virgil's Georgics written approximately B. C. 40, and it is as follows:

Germany heard a clashing of arms over all the sky; the Alps trembled with uncommon earthquakes—never did lightnings fall in greater quantities from a serene sky—or direful thunders blaze so often.

Quit Kiddin', Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of August 18, 1944:

QUIT KIDDIN', LADY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

When it comes to pious eye-rolling coupled with fast in-fighting, we give you as No. 1 Anna Eleanor Roosevelt Roosevelt, who long ago quit the role of First Lady of the Land for that of a New Deal politician.

Consider her syndicated column of yesterday on the Senate-War Department fracas concerning political propaganda to the troops.

On the one hand, Mrs. Roosevelt said that she thinks "all of us rejoice" that the Senate has reworded the law which the War Department has been interpreting so strictly that the troops are denied a chance to see a movie of Fibber McGee and Molly.

On the other hand, she said she didn't think it "fair" for Senator TAFT, of Ohio, and others to accuse the War Department of having deliberately misinterpreted the original law and reduced it to nonsense by extravagant enforcement tricks.

And then she wrote:

"The motive behind the original action by Senator TAFT and the Congress was, of course, an entirely correct one. No voters should be so restricted that they do not get all possible information before exercising their franchise, and the information certainly should be impartial."

Mrs. Roosevelt neglected to tell her audience the background that caused the "original action" she mentions. But it so happens that only today there came to this writer's hands eight items that tell the story to anybody who looks at them.

These eight are representative samples of what we are told was a 6,000-ton (yep, six thousand ton) bundle of magazines and pamphlets dumped on a certain pier from a United States Army transport, with directions to let the 6,000 tons' worth go into circulation, at once, in one of the greatest assembly points for United States troops anywhere in the world.

Incidentally, we apologize for such roundabout language, but a closer description of the troop assembly point would be in violation of military censorship, and identification of the man who got the 6,000-ton bundle would put our source of information (a United States Government official) on the Washington hot spot.

We simply tell you the eight samples are here on the desk as this is written. Seven of the eight are labeled "Published by the Government of the United States of America." The eighth is a beautiful four-color photograph on a handsome backing, and only bears the signature of the man pictured—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

But that eighth sample has something in common with each of the seven booklets, namely, that every one of those, too, has a handsome picture of Franklin D. Roosevelt. And further, that all were put out by the Office of War Information, commanded by none other than Uncle Elmer Davis, the celebrated radio baritone reader of news bulletins.

Mrs. Roosevelt did not inform her readers yesterday, though it is true, that Congress had to restrain Uncle Elmer from plastering the United States of America with many thousand tons of such Roosevelt propaganda.

For example, one of the eight samples on my desk is vol. 1, No. 1, of the O W. I. publication, Victory, a beautiful, slick paper job made up something on the form of Life magazine, except better, and containing an article, Roosevelt of America. The opening sentence of this little dithyramb reads:

"From out of America, cradle of democracy, there has come a new Declaration of Independence for the whole world. Its author is Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States."

Mr. Roosevelt is then described as "a brilliant statesman of great sincerity * * * whose social and economic philosophies once before saved his country in a crisis * * * a warm-hearted and companionable man * * * a kindly, loving, and beloved man * * *."

After that subdued beginning, it goes on to credit F. D. R. with practically everything short of invention of the wheel and payment of Europe's World War No. 1 debts to the United States of America.

The campaign for term IV was getting off to that sort of hot start at the expense of all the American taxpayers, when Congress forbade the O. W. I. to circulate any of its tripe inside America.

But that didn't prevent the clever sideslip somebody thought up for Uncle Elmer of dumping thousands of tons of things like Victory in the vicinity of United States troops abroad. Which he has done.

Some of the other samples of his handiwork include: Report from America: The United States Goes to War, with a picture of F. D. R. and 2,000,000 airmen, with a picture of F. D. R. and 185,000 airplanes, with a picture of F. D. R. and the Four Freedoms, with a picture of, etc., and the United States Navy with—sure. Even I Am Not Crazy Enough to Want a War, a study of Hitler's contradictory statements, is decorated with the usual.

Mrs. Roosevelt might have enlightened her readers, yesterday, that it was because of such things, done at the United States taxpayers' expense, that Congress had to put a strong curb bit on the Roosevelt propagandists in Government jobs.

But she, like all the other New Deal politicians, has thrown restraint to the winds to seek a term IV for her husband. So there is no use expecting anything but tough partisan campaigning by her or her husband, either, until they are at last dethroned.

In 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of August 10, 1944:

IN 1964

With the look of a woman bent on keeping a very important date, she was, so she explained, on her way to New York City to meet her soldier-husband of World War No. 2. Her children, a boy and a girl of an age to be in uniform in World War No. 3, provided the present interval of 25 years between the outbreaks of such conflicts is maintained, she had left in charge of her mother on the Massachusetts shore.

Pleased with the immediate prospect, she spoke lightly of many things, but one of her remarks made a listener start with astonishment. It was when she said, "There have always been wars and, of course, there always will be."

That reminded this person of what another woman, a generation older, had been saying a few days before. She was explaining her own interest in the problem of attaining lasting peace. "You see I have four small grandsons." Her own anxiety about the sailor-fathers of two of these small boys is much less than it was, but she looks ahead, beyond her own life expectation. To her those four tiny toddlers just learning to say "Granny" represent the most important group upon earth. Whatever line of national action seems best adapted to save them from the intensified horror of fighting in World War No. 3 will receive her support.

Before the human mind can give itself to thorough consideration of the prevention of future war, it is very necessary to shake off the obsession that wars always will be because they always have been. After all, some progress has been made through the ages. There were many centuries, stretching back into prehistoric times, when human beings were killed by pestilence that would wipe out whole communities. The prevailing theory held by those reputed wise was that nothing could be done about them, except perhaps by appeasing the powers of darkness by some sort of magic.

Modern sanitation and medicine have made such progress in relegating visitations of pestilence to the dim past that only in remote places of the earth is any such calamity feared. And when signs of it appear, strong repressive measures are employed promptly.

Early in the past century, features pitted from smallpox, souvenirs worn by the survivors of that disease, were often seen. But vaccination, backed by law widely enforced, has practically put an end to that. It could not have been accomplished by voluntary action or by fervent exhortation.

It was only at the beginning of this century that United States Army doctors pinned the responsibility for carrying the germs of yellow fever on a certain mosquito. And now the conquest of that disease may be regarded as assured.

At present most people are thinking that aggressive dictatorships, exemplified by the systems set up by Mussolini, Hitler, and long flourishing under the Mikado, are the chief causes of war. It is a pressing question of how to bring certain countries to a better viewpoint once they are defeated in battle.

Something along this line has come about in the memory of those still living. No people that ever lived were more eager for war than the Turks. They gained possession of north Africa and obtained a strong grip on Spain. But taking up the sword for conquest apparently has ceased to interest the Turks. To be sure they have broken with Germany, but only when it seemed certain that the Axis could not strike back. Apparently the Turks, the fiercest fighters of the old world, have lost their appetite for war.

Of course, it will be a tremendous undertaking to discover the ways of making war impossible, but that should be regarded as the major project of the human race. If it cannot be accomplished, there is no hope for anything else. If only the men and women who have a say in our national affairs keep in the forefront of their minds the boys, and also the girls, now under 15 and the babies that will come into the world in the next 5 years, there will be a real prospect of ridding this earth of the most fearful of all afflictions.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Information for Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have become convinced, through my talks with veterans of World War No. 2 who have returned to their homes, that all are not fully informed on the subject of benefits provided for them by the so-called G. I. bill. If any of the boys who are now returning home have any questions on this subject I would be mighty glad if they would get in touch with their Congressman. In the Second Rhode Island Congressional District, I wish they would write to me, JOHN E. FOGARTY, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Among some of the provisions of present law are those which enable the veterans to do the following:

They can buy or repair a home, buy and stock up a farm, start a new business, get a high-school or college education, draw special unemployment benefits if unable to find work, be assured of free and adequate hospitalization.

Benefits extend to men and women of the armed services who have other than dishonorable discharges and who have served 90 days since September 15, 1940, or less than 90 days if they have service-connected disabilities.

It is important to know exactly what the Government now offers, what the terms, the conditions, the opportunities are in each field.

FIRST, TAKE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR HOME BUYING OR FOR BUYING A FARM

A qualified veteran will be able to get the Veterans' Administration to arrange for a Government-guaranteed loan for buying or building a home or for making repairs, alterations, and improvements on a home. Such loans also may be obtained by a veteran to pay off back taxes or delinquent debts on homes. The Government will guarantee 50 percent of the loan up to $2,000 and will pay the first year's interest on the part of the loan that it guarantees. Thus, a veteran can borrow up to $4,000, with the Government standing behind half of it.

These loans can be made by a bank, loan association, or any other lending agency, including an individual or friend of the veteran. If you are a veteran who obtains such a loan, you would have to satisfy the lender as to collateral on your share. But, in the case of buying

a home, the home could be used as collateral. Interest on these loans cannot exceed 4 percent, and they must be repaid in full within 20 years.

In addition, the Government will guarantee fully a secondary loan up to 20 percent of the cost of the property. But the total amount guaranteed by the Government in both loans cannot exceed $2,000. This provision makes it possible for veterans to get cash for original down payments on homes. Interest on such secondary loans can run up to 5 percent. Veterans have until 2 years after the war or 2 years after their discharge—whichever is later—to take advantage of the loan opportunities.

Loans on the same basis are available for veterans who want to buy farms. Money from the loans may be used to purchase land, buildings, livestock, machinery, or other equipment, or for making repairs and improvements. But if you are a veteran and want to buy a farm, you must show that you know something about farming and are likely to make a success of the undertaking.

SUPPOSE A VETERAN WANTS TO SET UP HIS OWN BUSINESS

Here the procedure and conditions for getting loans are about the same as those for buying homes or farms. The money may be used to buy an established business or land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, and so forth. Secondary loans also are available for down payments. But if you are getting a loan for this purpose, the Veterans' Administration will want to know something about your background and experience in this business. In other words, you will have to show that there is a reasonable likelihood that you will make a success of it. Even so, it is expected that many veterans will want to start their own business and will be helped.

IF IT IS A MATTER OF EDUCATION OR TRAINING

When a veteran qualifies for a college, school, or training course, the Government will pay up to $500 a year to cover tuition, laboratory fees, cost of books, and so forth. The student also will get $50 a month living allowance, plus $25 a month if he has a wife or other dependents. He may choose his school, but he must keep up with the work or he will be dropped.

If a veteran was under 25 when he entered the service he may return to school even though his education was not interrupted. That is, he may have left school and been working when he entered service. But anyone who was 25 or over when he went into service must show, in order to qualify, that his education was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with. However, any veteran who desires a refresher or retraining course may take such a course for 1 year.

A veteran who qualifies for college or other schooling will be able to remain at Government exense for 1 year. Then, if he qualifies for further education, he can remain for the length of time, up to a total of 4 years, that he served between Setember 15, 1940, and the end of the war. He has until 2 years after his discharge or after the war ends to return to school. This Government-paid education program stops 7 years after the war ends.

NEXT, AS TO UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Ex-service men and women will be able to claim unemployment benefits of $20 a week for up to 52 weeks if they cannot find jobs. They will be entitled to 4 weeks of unemployment benefits for each month of service, plus additional time allowance for the first 90 days of service. But they are supposed to register with a public employment agency, such as the United States Employment Service, and accept suitable work if offered. Furthermore, they will be disqualified from unemployment benefits if they give up suitable jobs without reason, are fired for misconduct, or, in certain cases, go out on strike. Unemployment benefits will be available to a veteran until 2 years after his discharge or 2 years after the war, whichever is later.

Cash benefits also are provided for self-employed veterans who make less than $100 a month. They can have the Government make up the difference between their net earnings and $100 a month. Like the unemployment payment, this benefit is allowed up to 52 weeks according to length of service.

A Tribute to Pompey Smash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem writen by Mr. P. J. Grimes in which he pays tribute to the place of his birth:

A TRIBUTE TO POMPEY SMASH

There was a town called Pompey Smash
Made up of Irish stock
Not very far from Cherry Lane,
Just north of Old Dan's rock.

Two miles west of Clarysville
Stands this old fashioned town
Of Scotts, and Smiths, and Flannagans,
Of Sleemans, Drumes, and Browns.

There were Sharps, Longs, and Parkers,
Gilmartins, and the Ryles,
And then there came in later years
A family they called Giles.

There are Leakes, and Cains, and Henrys,
And Higgins galore
And on the old Alex Davis farm
You'll find a Stanley Loar.

There are Martins, Coles, and Barbers,
The Fatkins and the Finns,
The latter lived down the road
Just where the town begins.

There was a Thomas Stapleton
And there were Radcliffes too,
Who lived beside the railroad track
Like Murrays used to do.

Then there are the Irish Kellys,
These folks I 'most forgot,
The Hawthornes and the Mahers
Were too, among the lot.

There were Brodes, McGanns and Haleys
And a family named Legeer:
Who came from Ireland—County Cork
And brought the family here.

And there was Granny Lewis,
The Fagans, and LaVelles,
The Winters, Welfords, Beechies,
Who came here from Montell.

There were Bernard Dilleys
For years and maybe more,
The head man of the depot,
They lived by Parker's store.

I think the Tom Delaney's,
As near as I recall,
Lived near, where older folks
Say Pompey got his fall.

The Joneses, Hughes, and Carters,
We knew them very well;
Remember old man Carter,
And the stories he could tell.

The Sherizers and the Hansels,
We nearly forgot to mention,
But if there's anyone we've overlooked,
It wasn't our intention.

There was a place called Meadow Row,
A place they called the tank,
Where people got their water
And horses often drank.

It was pure mountain water for everyone,
For everyone 'twas free,
It came here from the Sand Spring,
Piped through to Number Three.

There was a spring at Sleemans,
'Twas known as the Spout,
Right along the lower road
The wooden pipe came out.

There was Bill Fatkin's blacksmith shop,
Walt Parker's general store,
Where Mr. Parker and Squire Finn
Played checkers near the door.

There was an old Hibernian hall,
Willie Martin's grocery store,
Pat Pryles across from Coles shoe shop,
John Drum's place was next door.

Many a good, old-fashioned dance
I've seen there at the hall,
Swing your partner right and left
You'd hear Muff Maher call.

The Coles were the fairest
You'd find most anywhere,
How the boys and girls would strut about
At the old Hibernian fair.

There was a place they called the Cliff
Near where the school stood,
Miss Teeny Barber taught the kids
As only Miss Teeny could.

The old home town has changed a lot
Since I was just a kid,
They even changed the name a bit
What matter if they did.

The people haven't changed a bit,
They're friends of royal blue,
They'll lend a hand when trouble comes,
They'll help you see it through.

They'll help you out in trying times,
They'll lend a helping hand,
There's not a better lot of folks
In the State of Maryland.

Most of all these old folks are gone,
For them we've shed our tears,
For those who toiled and labored here
Throughout the early years.

Those folks were our grandparents, sir,
Pioneers they were I'd say,
They didn't have the many things
That we enjoy today.

They didn't have the modern things
Things we enjoy it's true,
The men walked miles to do their work,
Walked home again when through.

My very best respect for them,
My deep regard for all,
To each and everyone who lives
Where Pompey had his fall.

I was born in Pompey,
For me that's no disgrace,
In the little old log shanty
Next door to Radcliffe's place.

The old log house is standing still,
Though almost tumbled down,
It was that place we called our home,
When we lived in Pompey town.

Let's drink a toast to Pompey town,
Vale Summit is now the name,
But for me and lots of other folks
It's Pompey just the same.

The Recent Treason Trial in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Colorado has just completed her first treason trial wherein three American women of Japanese origin were accused of assisting two German war prisoners to escape. Thomas Ferrill, Colorado's most famous present-day poet and author, reporting this trial paid not only a fitting tribute to American jurisprudence, but produced a classic in its interpretation of real Americanism. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, appearing in the Rocky Mountain Herald of August 12, 1944, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and especially invite the Nazis and the sons of the Rising Sun to copy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOOTS AND FLO AND BILLIE

I'm writing this Thursday noon. Half an hour ago I saw Toots and Flo and Billie go down the hall to lunch. Twelve men had just gone out another door to decide whether Toots and Flo and Billie were guilty of the one crime defined by our Constitution—treason. These American sisters of Japanese ancestry were charged with having helped two German soldiers escape from a prison camp.

It sounded odd to hear Kenneth W. Robinson, defense attorney, using words like "Bienerhasset" and "overt act." There were people long dead I could have wished to be in the courtroom to hear it: Aaron Burr and John Marthall, yes, and Jefferson too and General Wilkinson, for both of whom Burr became an unsuccessful scapegoat. But more than these, I wanted Nazi judges to be present, and Japanese judges, and Moscow judges. I'd like to have had them sitting there beside Judge J. Foster Symes, listening to Kenneth Robinson, Ivor Wingren, and Tom Morrissey. If anything could have made me happier about being an American citizen, or prouder, I don't know what it could be. Such courteous treatment of the Nazi prisoners, such consideration for the rights of the foolish girls, such emphasis on the specific charges, their meaning and their implications. If we're confused sometimes as to what America is fighting for, this treason trial was at least a reminder of something we possess, have long possessed and must not lose. No outsider can take it from us and we must not jeopardize it from within.

At the press table was a girl from Macon, Ga., and her husband, a Yankee. Their forebears had fought it out. Across from them was a Negro reporter. His being there had been made possible by that conflict, and near me I could see people of Irish and Jewish and Italian characteristics. Outside the door, too late to get in, was a corporal of Oriental origin, whether Japanese, Chinese, or Filipino, I wasn't sure, but his American service ribbons had overseas stars and decorations. Deputy Marshal William P. Dolan was riding herd on the crowd and, as Jack Carberry of the Post told him, "It must be tough, Bill, to have to kick out so many good Democrats." But those who came first were seated, Democrats and Republicans alike. In Germany only the Nazis would have been admitted.

All this made Denver's first treason trial, and one of the few in the history of our Nation, much bigger than it was if you thought it through. At this writing I don't know the fate of the sisters, Mrs. Tsurako Wallace, Mrs. Shivze Otani or Mrs. Billie Tanigoshi, American born citizens in a relocation camp far from their homes. Had they been taken in by the lad from Rommel's Afrika Corps who claimed he was anti-Nazi? Who claimed he'd been in a concentration camp 2 years? Who claimed he'd been beaten by storm troopers and wanted to get back to fight them? "That's a hell of a lot to tell a girl when you're sorting onions," as one of the boys at the press table put it. Clearly, the portentous overtones of their folly were grave despite the character witnesses, their school honors and the pictures of their being baptized in a Christian church. But in Germany or Japan any counterpart of this sordid little tale of love in an onion patch would have resulted in 10-minute justice at the hands of a firing squad. If frailty be treason, they'd have made the most quick work of it, those Nazi judges, those judges of Japan. The brilliant defense by Kenneth Robinson, appointed by the court, the handling of the case by Judge Symes, and the procedure of Messrs. Wingren and Morrissey for the prosecution may be remembered with admiration by Colorado and the Nation.

Post-War Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WORCESTER, MASS., *August 17, 1944.*
Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Organized motorists in Massachusetts represented by the Massachusetts Federation of A. A. A. clubs urges your support for immediate favorable vote on pending post-war highway legislation. Failure of Congress to act before adjournment for election may do unrepairable damage to post-war program for Massachusetts. Most important the Massachusetts Federation of A. A. A. clubs would like to know what we can expect in Federal aid for Massachusetts. We urge your immediate action.

BANCROFT AUTOMOBILE CLUB, INC.

Maneuvers of the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the pen of Westbrook Pegler, which article I am pleased to entitle "Maneuvers of Communists."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK.—During the last 2 or 3 years it has been bruited about Washington that Felix Frankfurter has lost much of his old power in the New Deal. If this be true, the fact remains that many of his old pupils from Harvard, men indoctrinated by Frankfurter during their impressionable years, are still planted in Government positions in which they can impart to their judgments and interpretations the Frankfurter twist, which, in the minds of some, seem to give the law a meaning contrary to the intent of Congress. It is a fact worth noting, too, that the Communists have a way of "going underground" as they put it, when they feel that they have made themselves too conspicuous. The entire United States Communist Party did this a few months ago when it disbanded and assumed the harmless guise of an educational society. A year before, the International Communist Party or revolutionary movement, directed from Moscow, went underground by means of a complicated and deliberately confused document which appeared to announce its dissolution but actually announced no such thing.

Frankfurter's apparent retirement from politics and informal but effective Government administration may be a similar stratagem.

In his reply to the late ex-President Theodore Roosevelt's letter accusing him of writing a misleading report to President Wilson in the Bisbee deportation case, Frankfurter denied that the men deported from Bisbee, in 1917, were planning insurrection. He went into a discussion of organized opposition to social justice in the copper mines which seems to have been beside the point on which Roosevelt had challenged him.

Roosevelt's point was that there was imminent danger to an unarmed community, and this contention was supported by much testimony of reputable men and finally proved in a trial in a State court, of one of the deputized citizens. In his test case, tried in 1920, Harry E. Wootton, a Bisbee hardware dealer, was acquitted in 16 minutes by a jury from which employees of the railroads, copper companies and other big interests were barred. The case is celebrated for the charge to the jury by Judge Samuel L. Pattee, expounding "law of necessity."

The charge was kidnaping. The defense was imminent danger to the community.

Pattee told the jury they could acquit Wootton if they believed there was a "real, threatened, and actual danger of immediate destruction of life and property."

After the test case the other indictments were dropped and no person ever was punished by the Federal Government because it was found that no Federal law had been violated.

Frankfurter ignored, or gave no weight to, powerful evidence that many strangers had sifted into Bisbee, that men and women had been threatened, and that the I. W. W., predecessors of today's Communists, were violently obstructing this Nation's war effort in many western areas.

"The apologists for anarchy are never concerned for justice," T. R. wrote to Frankfurter. "They are solely concerned in seeing one kind of criminal escape justice precisely as certain big businesmen and corporation lawyers have in the past been concerned in seeing another kind of criminal escape justice."

He did not call Frankfurter an apologist for anarchy in so many words but he did say, flatly, "you are engaged in excusing men precisely like the Bolsheviki who are murderers and encouragers of murder."

A recent issue of the Catholic Worker, a radical, but, of course, not communistic paper, the organ of the Catholic worker movement, discusses Frankfurter's friendship for Harold Laski, the English Communist whose writings attack religion and who, also, is well received in Washington, and is more influential there than any other Englishman except Churchill.

Arthur Sheehan, the editor, writes that in 1937 he went to a forum at Ford Hall, Boston, to hear Laski. Sheehan says David K. Niles, now one of President Roosevelt's confidential and anonymous advisers in the White House, was manager of these forums. And he reports that Frankfurter introduced Laski to the audience with the remark that the day he looked forward to in the year with the most joy was the day when Laski came to stay with him in his home in Massachusetts.

No Chips for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, between the C. I. O. bosses and the big city bosses the farmers apparently got little consideration at the recent Democratic National Convention. This is the view taken in an editorial of the Daily Oklahoman. Under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial comment:

NO CHIPS FOR FARMERS—CHICAGO DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION DOMINATED BY FORCES SEEKING CHEAP FOOD

In the Chicago convention's battle over a Vice Presidential nomination the two opposing forces were the big city bosses and the C. I. O. No other element had any chips in the game. No other element amounted to anything at all.

In such a contest where was there any place for the farmers of America? Where was there any place for the farmers of Oklahoma? The farmers nowhere belong to the C. I. O. Nowhere do the farmers belong to the big city machines.

In that sulphurous and highly odoriferous convention battle it did not matter one rupee to the American farmer which faction won. If the C. I. O. had won its fight for Wallace, the triumph would have been achieved by a force that fights constantly for increased prices for manufactured products and reduced prices for agricultural products. The triumph of the bosses was a triumph for men who want to buy farm products at the lowest prices possible. The workers who constitute the rank and file of the C. I. O. are determined to win, if possible, cheap bread, cheap meat, and cheap vegetables. The workers who make up the big city machines are determined to have cheap bread, cheap meat, and cheap vegetables. And cheap bread, and meat, and vegetables spell ruin for the tillers of the soil.

So what difference did it make to the feeders of the country whether the prize was won by the cheap farm-product promoters of the C. I. O., or the cheap farm-product promoters of the city machines? No matter who won, the farmers lost.

Both the C. I. O. and the city machines are determined to employ the Federal Government as an instrument in beating down the prices of the products of the farm. In this the two warring forces are in complete agreement.

For several years now the two warring forces have employed the powers of Government to obtain cheap bread and meat and vegetables. At no time since the Republic was established has less recognition been accorded to the farmers of the country in making up the personnel of the national administration. From the 34 agricultural States of the South and West come only two members of the President's Cabinet. From the other 14 States (all highly industrialized) come the other members of the Cabinet.

Of the nine members of the Supreme Court, only one resides in that vast agricultural empire that lies west of the Mississippi. Five of the nine justices reside northeast of Pittsburgh.

Another Democratic national administration promises a continuation of an uninterrupted discrimination against the agricultural States. The Chicago convention emphasized that discrimination. Neither the farmers nor their interests were represented in that convention. Even the delegations from the agricultural States have boasted of how closely they were in touch with Boss Hannegan of St. Louis. And if they had not accepted orders from Hannegan, their only alternative was to accept orders from Sidney Hillman of the C. I. O., for nobody was taking orders from the farmers of America. In that convention the soil tillers of the country were the forgotten men.

Why I Am an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address, Why I Am an American, sent me by one of my constituents, Mr. George J. Chryssikos. The author has dedicated this address to "every American regardless of race, creed, sex, or birthplace, who is consecrated to the cardinal principles of liberty, justice, and equality, and maintains the high ideals and sacred duties of American citizenship":

In these critical and momentous times, when the United States of America is fighting for its life, and millions of young men and young women are risking their precious lives for our right to exist as a free nation, it is incumbent upon all of us to be self-conscious and deeply cognizant of our duties, opportunities, and responsibilities as citizens of this democracy. We hear it said every day that we are fighting to preserve the American way of life. To understand the meaning of that expression, it is necessary to know what characteristics make one an American. Once these are determined, one proceeds automatically to search for them throughout the depth and length of one's innermost self in order to be convinced of their possession. It is then only that we consciously ascertain why we are Americans.

The need of every American to participate actively as a real citizen in the affairs of this great Republic led, so significantly, to the consecration of "I Am an American Day." To be an American, new or old, is more than a privilege. It is a responsibility, a trust, to be administered for humanity. On this day, in the midst of this unprecedented war, which has taken the Stars and Stripes to all continents, the American Nation lifts its heart and awakens its mind in veneration of the splendid traditions, the high ideals of its forefathers, and the virtues which enabled the American people to rise from their lowly beginnings in the time of the Revolution to their present unequaled position in the world.

But it is not only on "I Am An American Day" that the question is asked of us: How are we going to prove ourselves worthy perpetuators of these traditions and these ideals? And on every day the answer is the same, and it is always a simple one: By being good Americans! We call ourselves Americans, don't we? The Americans who made the United States such a wonderful country, were good Americans. Were it not for the fact that they were good Americans, this would not be so good a land to live in. And how did they start, those Americans who made America for us? What was their equipment for the tremendous task which they undertook on the morrow of the Revolution? Nothing but their will to create a better world for themselves and for all American generations to come; nothing but their individual virtues, their faith in themselves and the Almighty, who helps those who help themselves; nothing but their hard-working habits, their perseverance and, of course, their intelligence. They did not even have the benefit of previous examples set for their guidance or of traditions from which to draw inspiration. On the contrary, they knew that they had to create traditions for their successors and to inspire them with their example. The knowledge of this, perhaps, made them more deeply conscious of their responsibility and fanned the flame of their enthusiasm for their great undertaking.

Yes, this is a good country to live in, in fact a country unique in the world, and we ought to be thankful to the men and women who made it. Let us not forget, however, that goodness is an infinite quality—a quality capable of endless expansion. Even good America can become a better America. And this is precisely the job of young men and young women. Let us not forget also that goodness in this imperfect and ever-evolving world of ours is always found mixed with evil. It is the job of every succeeding American generation to weed out evil from the field of American goodness and to leave the positive elements of the character of this country in a purer and nobler form.

Past generations have performed their tasks with the result that American history presents a picture of continuous improvement and progress. To do our part we must, above all, know ourselves. "Know yourself," admonished Socrates, and it is as true in our day as it was in his. When we have achieved that, our Americanism will enable us to strive and to struggle successfully for the continuation of the process of improvement of our national home.

We call ourselves Americans. But what does it mean to be an American? A purposeful restudy of American history will give us the answer. It will reveal to us the moral character of the American we should strive to be—his attitudes, his soul, his aspirations, his motives, and his creative tools. Let us search ourselves thoroughly and persistently and we will find ourselves possessors of the same moral character. Let us dig it out, awaken it and put it to work for our country and for ourselves.

Let us ask ourselves these questions: Why am I an American? Simply because I live in America and call it my country? Because I was born of American parents or of naturalized American citizens? Or is it because I have something intangible in common with the Americans of the past who put the seal of their spirit and the imprint of their hands on this land?

A little thought will convince anyone that the latter is the correct answer. Americanism is a spiritual quality, a disposition of the mind and the heard. It is the will to be an American, a good and useful citizen of this country. Objectively, Americanism is the treasury of American tradition, the moral inheritance of the Nation. Subjectively, Americanism is one's eagerness to follow the American examples of the past, to make active and full use of the capital of American tradition, to develop and enrich the American heritage and to further embellish the American picture.

Loyalty to the country and to her flag is, of course, included in the meaning of Americanism. Loyalty alone, however, is not sufficient to make one a real American. Loyalty must be accompanied with acts which are typically American, acts which are of the same character and have the same effect as those of the men and women who made this such a wonderful country.

Our country is in a war which it must win in order to survive and to preserve its liberty. Knowing this, should we consider it sufficient for a citizen to declare his or her loyalty to the flag? Certainly not. One must also be ready to defend the flag even at the risk of losing one's life or limb. But even this is not enough. Americans must strive at all times to make the national flag the symbol of high ideals, a flag worth fighting for, a flag which stands for all that is noble and sacred and worthy among civilized people.

Our flag is the symbol of freedom; it is in our hearts, however, that the love of freedom resides. One of the reasons, therefore, for which we call ourselves Americans is that we are a liberty-loving people. Our flag is the symbol of justice, because we who call ourselves Americans believe in justice. Our flag is the symbol of humanity, because we Americans are humane. Our flag is the symbol of civilization, because we Americans are dedicated to the preservation and advancement of civilization. Our flag is a symbol of progress, because American generations have devoted their lives to progress, have shown themselves capable of progress. They have believed that the realization of the hopes and aspirations of humanity lies in continuous progress. Our flag is, finally, the hope of humanity, because the American people believe in the brotherhood of man within and without the boundaries of their homeland. By word and deed, they have shown their devotion to that principle and are ready to do everything in their power to bring about its universal adoption as the basis of international relations.

To be an American, then, means to share all the ideals of the American people and to be ready to serve them. To make real Americans of our youth is the task of school, church, and family. That is their supreme duty. Let it be understood, however, that they are not required to develop any peculiar or novel type of human beings because the moral values which the term Americanism expresses are those which make better men and women in any climate. They are the moral values which the term "Americanism" recognized through the ages as the imperishable treasures of civilized society. Any good man and any good woman can be a good American. No matter what our ancestry has been, no matter where we or our parents were born, no matter what our race or creed is, if we are bent on being good, we are first-class Americans.

In some other countries and in recent years mad adventurers have undertaken to recast human character in order to create a new type of man to suit their purposes. Their moral code and their political principles are the exact opposite of all that is inherent in the meaning of Americanism. They have used the school as a factory of distorted souls. They have reduced the family to the status of a purveyor of living robots without conscience, without ideas of their own, without an independent will, without self-respect, and without that sense of responsibility and self-reliance which are the characteristics of good citizens and worthy members of society. They have even tried, and with some small measure of success, to make the church an instrument of the policy which tends to separate man from God by infusing an evil spirit where the Creator planted the seed of goodness. This sacrilegious policy has borne fruit—the only fruit that could be expected from it—violence, bloodshed, and misery among men and the threat of extinction of civilization.

Americanism condems all that. We are at war with the countries where such distorted ideas prevail, and we are going to defeat them. Our system of government, guaranteed by the vigilance of freedom-loving citizens, precludes the possibility of tyrants turning the people into a herd of animals marching at their command. Our schools, instead of forging tools for malevolent despots to use for their own purposes, are trying to bring forth the best that is in youth, so that they can serve themselves and society with the aid of the positive qualities of their nature. American schools do not subscribe to the doctrine of certain German pedagogues who teach: "Break the character of the child and make a new one for him." Our teachers believe that all that a child's character needs is selective cultivation and the development of those elements which bring him nearer to his Creator.

To all who want to assure themselves that they are Americans and to all who want to know just why they are Americans, I would recommend careful reading of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. The Founding Fathers recognized and publicly proclaimed certain truths, which have become the guiding principles of American policy and American life. If we believe in them, we are Americans. And, vice-versa, we are Americans because we believe in them. As Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence, so we affirm that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,".

This political creed of America is supplemented by the recognition of certain particular rights, without which there can be no liberty and the pursuit of happiness becomes impossible. As a result of this recognition, we enjoy, in this country, all the privileges which are denied to the peoples of countries ruled by autocrats. We can express our opinions without fear of punishment; we have a free press, which keeps us informed of what is happening about us and exercises the right of criticism. We can worship our God in our own way without interference from public authority or from private persons.

American citizenship is a priceless possession. However, Americanism implies duties as well as rights; but the duties which are imposed on us are such as to work for the benefit of the citizenry as a whole and not of individuals or groups invested with power to exact their performance from us. America is our common garden to which every citizen is expected to contribute his share of work and from which every citizen is entitled to reap his share of the fruit.

Senator Austin on the Kilgore Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted me, I am including as an extension of my remarks a newspaper account of an interview recently had with the senior Senator from Vermont, the Honorable WARREN R. AUSTIN, with respect to the so-called Kilgore bill.

The interview as reported in the Burlington Free Press of August 16, 1944, follows:

AUSTIN SAYS GEORGE BILL MARKS TURNING POINT IN UNITED STATES HISTORY AWAY FROM "SOCIALISTIC SYSTEM"—SENATOR DECLARES KILGORE BILL, DEFEATED FRIDAY, WAS A DIRECT THREAT TO SPEED-UP OF WAR AND WAS BASED ON CENTRALIZATION OF POWER SECOND ONLY TO NULLIFIED N. R. A.

Charging that the Kilgore bill, which was defeated Friday in the United States Senate, was "a direct threat to the speed-up of the war," Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN, 43 Williams Street, hailed the passage of the alternate legislation, the George bill, as a turning point in the country's history away from a socialistic system.

In criticism of the bill as a whole, Senator AUSTIN, speaking informally at his home on Williams Street on the eve of his departure for Washington after a few days here, said the bill's sponsors, Senators JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, and HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia, carried the theory of Federal centralization of power over affairs that reached into every household to a greater extent than any measure heretofore considered by the New Deal, with the exception of the N. R. A.

WOULD STEM WAR SPEED

AUSTIN described the N. R. A. as less extensive "insofar as bureaucracy went," but that it was "still so bad that it had to be nullified by the Supreme Court because it violated fundamental rights vested in the States' governments alone."

The Kilgore bill, as it was popularly called, dealt with the establishment of a double-headed Federal agency to handle the mobilization and reconversion problems of industry now and after the war. It would have consisted of a director and a deputy director, a board of advisers, and a set of industrial and area councils. This was criticized by AUSTIN for its overlapping features.

"This war moves swiftly," AUSTIN said. "Production changes often. We must be able to carry on the war efficiently as the demands for war supplies change in the changing stages of the war from light aircraft and light

trucks to more B–29's and B–32's, to bulldozers, heavy trucks, and bigger tanks. In view of these facts, speed is essential in ordering concelations and cutbacks in items no longer needed, for the amount of surplus products mounts with every day's delay."

WOULD DELAY CUTBACKS

He charged that under the Kilgore bill, the cutbacks would be delayed and efficiency hampered for they would have to be deferred until conferences had been held with councils, and advisory boards, and until some agreement had been reached between the two directors.

AUSTIN added that the possibility of conflicts between the two directors had been proved in the old days of the Office of Emergency Management when Knudsen and Hillman were deadlocked, and had led to the establishment of the War Production Board, with a single head, Donald Nelson.

SAYS BENEFITS TOO GREAT

Turing to the controversial title II of the bill, which proposed a Federal system of unemployment benefits for war workers and veterans, AUSTIN charged that the high level of benefits would have been an "incentive against voluntary transfer" of manpower from areas where labor is no longer needed to areas of shortage.

AUSTIN called the situation at the Brewster Aircraft Corporation this spring an illustration when the Navy canceled its contracts suddenly, leaving 13,000 workers jobless.

"The Government found places for 9,000, but the jobs were refused, for the workers were quite comfortable on savings they had made and the unemployment benefits to which they were entitled. Instead of helping to win the war, the Kilgore bill would have increased inducements not to win the war by increasing benefits in money and increasing the length of eligibility of payments." Senator AUSTIN, who is a member of the George Post-war Planning Committee, said that "veterans must return to find a sound economy, not a country impoverished by the cost of this bill, estimated conservatively at ten billions in 3 years."

SAYS VERMONT SHOULD RAISE PAYMENTS

He was firm in his belief that the States were in a far better position than the Federal Government, strained by the cost of the war, to finance unemployment benefits, adding that States with low level of payments, like Vermont, should raise their payments by legislation.

"There is not a State in the Union," Senator AUSTIN said, "that cannot take care of its own unemployed."

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION WOULD GO

The senior Senator from Vermont also specifically objected to the Kilgore proposal to set up a new bureau for the administration of veterans' legislation, and discard the Veterans' Administration, which is the product of years of experience. He added that if this had been his only objection to the bill, it would have been enough.

He stressed the fact that through the long debate, opponents of the Kilgore measure had had alternate proposals in mind that would serve the same general aim, without the defects of the other bill. Approving the passage of the George bill, proposed by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, Senator AUSTIN said "it provided for an advisory board representing labor, industry, and agriculture, making a tight, effective Federal organization that will not tie up the progress of mobilization or demobilization."

AUSTIN called the choice of the latter bill "an important turning point in the history of this country, for the difference between the two bills represents the difference between a free system of government on the one hand, and a socialistic system on the other."

A Message to Members of the Armed Services and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an address which I delivered before the Virginia Department of the American Legion at Hotel Roanoke, Roanoke, Va., August 21, 1944:

I am very happy to have this opportunity of adding my word of welcome to the Virginia Department of the American Legion, and to join the mayor in assuring you that the city of Roanoke now, as always, considers it a great honor to have this splendid organization meet within its gates.

The principles for which the American Legion stands and for which it has fought, are of much interest in this critical period in the history of our country. Although you fought a war to end all wars, yet your sons are on foreign soil, ready to make the supreme sacrifice to save the land and the way of life which we love so much. While they fight abroad you and I have some duties on the home front. Duty No. 1 is to support and back them in their war effort, and I think, considering handicaps, America has done a good job along that line. Duty No. 2 is to prepare for the home coming of those who will return. Some will not return. In that case, we must deal adequately with their dependents. It is with regard to these matters that I wish to address you briefly this morning. We learned many lessons from World War No. 1 and, while I do not wish to dwell on the subject, I do want to say in passing that it is my fervent hope that after the shooting stops in this war, we will not make the fatal blunder we made after the other war when we junked and scrapped all of our defense facilities and were thus caught totally unprepared for the present conflict. Upon some other occasion, I shall dwell more in detail upon this subject. Like the American Legion, through the years, I have fought for an adequate defense establishment.

Another lesson that I hope we have learned is that we were not very well prepared to take care of the veterans who returned from the other war, either from the standpoint of facilities and services or from a standpoint of reemployment. In this instance, we have tried very hard to make suitable provisions. I want to very briefly tell you something about that. In the meantime, however, lest I forget, I wish very much to suggest to you that through the facilities of your organization and in any other way that you may have to reach the men and women in the fighting services, either at home or abroad, that you give them this piece of advice, which I am sure is borne out by your experiences:

VETERANS SHOULD BE ALERT

In order that the veteran may be able to establish, whenever the occasion may arise, his or her entitlement to the benefits which have been provided, it is most important that they observe the following:

1. That they keep a careful and accurate memorandum of the time, place, and circumstances whenever they report for sick call or for treatment, either to a hospital or to a field station. This should be done even though the ailment be then considered trivial. It is hardly necessary to elaborate on the necessity for these records, for some time or other, the veteran will be called upon to furnish such proof in an effort to establish his or her right to benefits, and we know from experience that we cannot always rely upon official records. They may be inaccurate, incomplete, or they may become lost. It would also be well to jot down the names and home address of companions who may know about the case.

2. The veteran must be most careful when he or she is discharged from the service to report to the physician making the examination at the time of the discharge, such facts and information about any physical defects which they may have had in the service or which may exist at the time of discharge. Many veterans of World War No. 1 in their haste to get demobilized, and to get home, and through fear of being hospitalized for tedious examinations, etc., signed forms showing that they were in good physical condition at the time of discharge when this was not the case. Perhaps years after, this statement was laid before them when they made a perfectly just claim for consideration. I hope these suggestions may be passed on.

3. At the time of discharge from the service, in case the veteran has suffered any disease or disability while in the service, or has any reason to believe he or she has any ailment of any description, it is very important that the veteran should immediately have a complete and thorough physical check-up, either at a veterans' hospital, at an Army or Navy clinic, or by a private physician. This is very important because experience has shown that so many times in later years, when the Veterans' Administration is considering whether or not the veteran is entitled to benefits, it becomes necessary to know his or her condition at time of discharge and these facts are often most difficult to obtain.

The procedure which I have set out in paragraphs one, two, and three are most important if the veteran is to have the benefits that Congress has provided and to enable the Veterans' Administration to pass quickly and intelligently on claims. It would be an excellent idea if these simple suggestions could be passed on to the veterans in the service.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Congress has sought, well in advance of the end of this war, to make proper provisions for the veterans. The legislation may not be perfect and no doubt experience will make it necessary to make changes and alterations but certainly we have laid the foundation of a good set-up.

This program is going to cost money. I feel, however, that the American people want the very best care possible for the boys who have gone through this unspeakable horror. We will, of course, use every possible precaution to prevent waste and to conserve funds and materials and services, but I am sure that I voice the sentiment of the American people, as well as Congress, when I say we are not going to let these boys down.

The work of making benefits available to World War veterans at the conclusion of World War No. 1 was divided between the Bureau of War Risk Insurance under the Treasury Department, the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and the Public Health Service. On August 9, 1921, all activities concerning World War No. 1 veterans were consolidated into the United States Veterans' Bureau, and on July 3, 1930, the then Veterans' Bureau, together with the Pension Bureau under the Department of the Interior, and the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers were consolidated into the present Veterans' Administration, which handles benefits for all veterans of all wars and their dependents.

May I say here, in passing, that for the past 12 years I have been chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropria-

tions that has handled the vast sums appropriated for the Veterans' Administration. Something in excess of $11,000,000,000 has passed through my committee. I have had close and intimate contact with the Administration and its able Administrator, Maj. Gen. Frank T. Hines. In my judgment, this is one of the best-conducted agencies in the Government service. It is devoted to the welfare of the veteran and strives to carry out the provisions of laws passed for his benefit. In addition, it is managed on a businesslike basis with efficiency and economy. Unfortunately, this cannot be said about all Federal bureaus.

Much has been learned by reason of our experience with veterans following World War No. 1, and the Congress has taken action prior to the conclusion of this war to assure that veterans of this war and their dependents will be given every opportunity of becoming reestablished in their proper places in civil life.

MONETARY BENEFITS

At the conclusion of World War No. 1 in 1918, there began the demobilization of 4,750,000 men, many of whom were disabled and in need of assistance of various types. At that time, monetary benefits were available to those suffering from disabilities due to service, amounting to as much as $30 a month for those totally disabled. These rates are now from $10 to $100 per month for total disabilities, with additional amounts in certain instances, such as where the veteran was totally blind or suffered the loss, or loss of the use, of both arms, both feet, or one arm or one foot, etc. Payments are also authorized in amounts up to $60 per month for disabilities not due to service. Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, increased certain rates for service-connected disabilities by 15 percent, effective June 1, 1944.

At the end of World War No. 1, hospitals available for treatment of service-connected disabilities only were those of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service. Later, hospitals for the specific use of the veterans were established, at the present time there being 94 facilities situated throughout the United States, with a total capacity of 88,569 beds, of which 73,602 are for hospital cases and 14,967 for domiciliary care.

Hospitalization and domiciliary care is now available to veterans of all wars, whether or not the condition requiring treatment is due to service. Priority, of course, is given to those suffering from disabilities of service origin. Similar benefits are available to veterans of the Regular Establishment if discharged for disabilities incurred in the line of duty for the receipt of pensions for service disabilities. The G. I. bill authorized an appropriation of $500,000,000 for the construction of additional hospital facilities and there has recently been recommended to the President projects totaling 16,000 additional beds in 20 different States. Following the cessation of hostilities, the bed capacity of the Veterans' Administration will be further augmented by facilities which will be made available by transfer from the Army and the Navy.

VIRGINIA FACILITIES

At the present time there is in the State of Virginia a hospital at Roanoke for the care and treatment of neuropsychiatric patients, where 1,687 beds are now available and where 656 additional beds are under construction. At Kecoughtan there is now available 1,121 beds for domiciliary care and 538 beds for general hospital patients. It is contemplated that immediately following the cessation of hostilities, 300 additional beds will be made available in or near Richmond for the care of general medical and hospital patients.

In addition to these facilities of the Veterans' Administration, there will also be available in Virginia and nearby District of Columbia, certain facilities of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service Hospitals. We have made every possible effort in advance of the end of the war to have provisions that will ably take care of all returning veterans who are in need of hospital or medical service.

INSURANCE

War-risk insurance, was available to World War No. 1 veterans, and a large number took the full amount, $10,000. The original Insurance Act was modified to provide not only for payment in case of death of $57.50 per month for a period of 20 years to the designated beneficiary but in the event of total disability suffered by the insured while his policy was in force, $57.50 per month during his lifetime, in addition to any compensation or pension which is payable.

National service life insurance is available to present members of the armed forces, to a maximum amount of $10,000 at rates approximately the same as in World War No. 1. As a result of our experience in paying insurance benefits to beneficiaries of World War No. 1 veterans, the present law provides that in the case of beneficiaries who are over 30 years of age, monthly payments based on the age of the beneficiary will continue throughout the lifetime of such beneficiary, rather than for an arbitrary period of 20 years.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Vocational rehabilitation was provided for World War No. 1 veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities constituting a handicap in pre-war occupation where further training into employment appeared necessary. A similar program has been authorized for veterans of this war by Public, No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved on March 24, 1943. This act provides for a maximum of 4 years' college or school training or for training into employment on the job. In addition to having the cost of training paid by the Veterans' Administration, up to a maximum of $500 per year, the veteran is provided with books, supplies, and equipment up to $300 in order to enable him to pursue his training properly. For his support during the period of rehabilitation, there is authorized, in addition to the compensation or pension payable on account of disability, additional amounts sufficient to bring his monthly allowance up to $80, if a single man, with $10 additional for wife and additional allowances for children and dependent parents.

G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

The most comprehensive act for the relief of ex-service personnel, commonly known as the G. I. bill of rights, was approved on June 22, 1944, as Public, No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress. This has a number of provisions for the readjustment of returning men and women of the armed forces, whereby the change from war assignments to peacetime pursuits may be readily accomplished with a minimum of delay. The various provisions of the act comprise a schedule which will extend for several years subsequent to the cessation of hostilities and allow any veteran, who has the desire, to become readjusted. Specifically, the benefits are for any person who served in the armed forces for a period of at least 90 days, unless sooner discharged for disability incurred in line of duty between September 16, 1940, and the termination of this war, and has been separated under conditions other than dishonorable.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The principal benefits under this act are to provide educational aid to veterans even though not disabled; to guarantee loans under certain conditions for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property, stock, machinery, etc., with interest for the first year paid by the Government on the amount guaranteed; readjustment allowances for veterans during periods of unemployment for as much as 52 weeks; provisions for the construction of additional hospitals for the care of veterans. It gives the Veterans' Administration the status of a war agency insofar as priorities on personnel, equipment, supplies, and material are involved; and specifically provides that certain recognized veterans' organizations will be allowed to send representatives into naval and military installations in order to begin their service to veterans at the time of discharge, so that there may be no loss of time in transplanting a service man or woman into his or her proper place in civil life.

EDUCATIONAL AID

In addition to training which may be available to men and women disabled during the present conflict, the G. I. bill provides education or training for a period of 1 year or the equivalent thereof, for continuous or part-time study for education or training, in any approved school or institution chosen by the veteran, in any subject or subjects desired and for which he or she is fitted. This is available to "Any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, and whose education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service, or who desires a refresher or retraining course, and who either shall have served 90 days or more, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized-training program or the Navy college-training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or shall have been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service, incurred injury, or disability, shall be eligible for and entitled to receive education or training under this part: *Provided*, That such course shall be initiated not later than 2 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is the later: *Provided further*, That no such education or training shall be afforded beyond 7 years after the termination of the present war: *And provided further*, That any such person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with."

To establish entitlement to education or training beyond 1 year, it must be shown that the veteran's education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with because of entry into the armed forces; but this will be assumed in the case of those who entered service prior to reaching the age of 25 years. The total course of training cannot exceed 4 years in all, and cannot exceed the period of service in the armed forces and is contingent upon satisfactory progress in the course pursued. The Government will pay a maximum of $500 per school year for tuition, books, supplies, equipment, and necessary expenses, and a substantial allowance is authorized in the amount of $50 per month, if without dependents, or $75 a month with dependents.

If the training is taken on the job and the man receives payment for productive labor performed as a part of his apprentice training at an institution, business, or other establishment, he may be entitled to receive such lesser sums of subsistence or dependency allowance as may be determined proper by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Educational institutions have met this challenge by making extensive plans for adapting methods and curricula to the contemplated needs of the returning veterans. Some institutions have arranged for veterans to enter classes at the first of any

month, and at least one large metropolitan university has developed a program by which veterans may be admitted at the beginning of each week. Time will be an important factor to the men who have lost so much time from the classroom or jobs, and accelerated courses and educational or training courses on a part-time basis while employed will probably be popular, particularly to the older men. Others will wish to secure the cultural phases of a liberal education which were omitted from accelerated courses in service.

Surely this phase of the law will become of incalculable benefit to each returning veteran who is educated for personal development and social responsibility. The cost must be counted as a wise investment which will bring the strongest fortification to our democracy.

VETERANS' LOANS

Title III of the G. I. bill authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to guarantee under certain conditions a loan or loans for the purchase of homes, farms, and business property, repairs, additions, stock machinery, equipment, etc., in an aggregate amount not to exceed $2,000. The Veterans' Administration is in contact with established agencies experienced in the handling of loans, exploring all possibilities of expediting this program. The law itself includes certain safeguards designed to give stability to the loans and to protect the veteran against exploitation, such as the proviso that the guarantee of a loan be subject to a determination that the loan applied for appears practicable. It is stipulated that the purchase price or construction cost shall bear proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses, and that the purchase price or construction cost, including the value of the unimproved lot, does not exceed the reasonable and normal value as determined by proper appraisal.

BUSINESS ASSISTANCE

To illustrate the interest taken in the establishment of returning veterans in civil life, I refer to a series of pamphlets that have been issued by the Department of Agriculture for the enlightenment of persons who contemplate selecting, financing, and operating a farm or obtaining loans for farm equipment or operation. Information contained therein shows that farms generally are priced much higher today than they were 4 or 5 years ago and prices are still rising. Practical advice is given on this complicated subject.

The Department of Commerce, upon request of the War Department, is now preparing a series of books on the problems of establishing and operating various kinds of business. Each of these books is devoted to basic considerations, such as capital requirements, location, cost, display, lay-out, credit policy, etc., of a specific business which may attract veterans. These books will be used as texts in courses which the Army proposes to give soldiers before demobilization. The lines covered include metal working shops, sawmills, building contractors, painting contractors, hardware stores, service stations, grocery stores, drug stores, electrical appliance stores, shoe repair shops, auto repair shops, heating and plumbing, real estate and insurance, beauty parlors, bakery stores, restaurants, dry cleaning, laundries, apparel stores, and general merchandise stores. This list has been designed to cover the most likely areas of opportunity for returning veterans in this field. As a result of years of experience in advising with business interests the Department of Commerce is in a position to be of constructive assistance to a loan agency in providing factual information and guidance on business problems.

EMPLOYMENT

To give all possible help to the employment of veterans, there is authorized a Veterans' Placement Service Board consisting of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs Chairman; Director, National Selective Service; and Administrator, Federal Security Agency, or whoever may have the responsibility of administering the functions of the United States Employment Service. This Board will determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United State Employment Service. While the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is made responsible for veterans' employment, this is not a function of the Veterans' Administration but is retained in the United States Employment Service. The plans and policies will also comprehend the voluntary services of reemployment services of reemployment committeemen on the local draft boards authorized in subsection (g) of section VIII, Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

UNEMPLOYMENT ALLOWANCES

Unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed are authorized subject to the following conditions:

The week of unemployment must have (a) begun after September 3, 1944; (b) occurred not later than 2 years after discharge or release from active service or the termination of the war, whichever be the later date.

The person is not receiving subsistence allowance for education or training.

To be eligible, the person must (a) reside in the United States; (b) be completely unemployed—or if partially employed, at wages less than $23 a week; (c) be registered with, and reporting to, a public employment office; (d) be able to work and be available for suitable work; however, no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the requirements of this paragraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

Persons will be disqualified from receiving allowances if without good cause they leave suitable work voluntarily, are suspended or discharged for misconduct; fail to apply or accept suitable work; fail to attend an available free training course; or if participating in strikes or labor disputes causing work stoppage.

Within the 52 weeks' limit the total eligibility for these benefits is determined by allowing 8 weeks of allowances for each of the first 3 month of service, and 4 weeks of allowances for each month or major fraction thereof, of further service.

The allowance of $20 per week may be reduced by any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation (other than pension, compensation, or retired pay received from the Veterans' Administration), received by the veteran for the same period of time. Allowances may also be made in the case of veterans self-employed, whose incomes do not reach certain specified amounts. Benefits will be administered by the Veterans' Administration office in the area where the veteran resides, through the State employment security agencies, inasmuch as there is already in operation a widespread organization for the convenience of those concerned.

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS OF THE ACT PROVIDE FOR

(a) Adequate organization of the Veterans' Administration to administer all veterans' benefits, except employment.

(b) The right to have explained to him before discharge or release from active service all rights and benefits to which he may be entitled to as a veteran, and an opportunity, if he so desires, to file a claim therefor.

(c) The right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefit in the use of such appliances.

(d) Adequate safeguards as against forced statements against interest.

(e) Prompt transfer of the essential records of service departments to the Veterans' Administration and prompt adjudication of claims for benefits.

(f) The right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service (1) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (2) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (3) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

NOTE.—Under both (1) and (2) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

Much of these provisions for the veterans of World War II are due to the past experience of, and interest shown by, the veterans of World War I who do not want to see their sons experience the difficulties which they themselves encountered upon discharge from war service. The G. I. bill of rights is evidence that the people have learned through experience, not to repeat mistakes. When signing it, President Roosevelt said that it "gave emphatic notice to the men and women in our armed forces that the American people did not intend to let them down."

Attack on Pearl Harbor

REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I picked up a copy of Collier's magazine of August 26 and read the article entitled "Our Armed Forces Must Be Unified" by HARRY S. TRUMAN, United States Senator from Missouri and Democratic candidate for the high office of Vice President of the United States. Mr. Speaker, I was astounded. I could not believe what I read. I could not believe, but there it was in black and white, that an aspirant for the second highest office in this great country would publicly condemn a man before he was given an opportunity to be heard.

The would-be Vice President of the United States bases his argument for the consolidation of the Army and Navy upon the Pearl Harbor catastrophe, contending that the Japanese surprise attack was successful because of a lack of coordination of forces under the command of General Short and Admiral Kimmel. The would-be Vice President goes so far as to imply that General Short and Admiral Kimmel were not on

speaking terms. This is what he says—and I quote from the would-be Vice President's article:

In Hawaii, General Short and Admiral Kimmel could meet, if they happened to be on speaking terms, or exchange cables and radiograms.

There is no basis whatsoever for that statement.

Mr. Speaker, let me read a paragraph from the letter which Admiral Kimmel addressed to the would-be Vice President, which appears in this morning's issues of the Washington Times-Herald. This is what the Admiral wrote:

Your innuendo that General Short and I were not on speaking terms is not true. Your statements alleging failure to cooperate and coordinate our efforts are equally false. General Short and I, as well as our subordinates, coordinated the efforts of our commands in close, friendly, personal, and official relationships.

For over 2 years General Short and Admiral Kimmel have been waiting court martial. Time and again Admiral Kimmel has appealed for a public trial in order that he may explain exactly what took place immediately before Pearl Harbor. All that he has asked is to be heard, to be given an opportunity to defend himself publicly. Not only has the administration refused an open trial, but we now have the would-be Vice President publicly condemning the two men. The would-be Vice President does not even wait until the investigation now in process has been completed before passing judgment.

The would-be Vice President bases his case on the so-called Roberts report. As I stated in my remarks on the floor of the House on June 5:

At very best the inquiry of the Roberts commission was cursory.

And further:

The Roberts commission was more interested in getting out some kind of a report, fixing responsibility on someone, than it was in learning the real facts.

My statement has now been confirmed by the following from Admiral Kimmel's letter of yesterday. He wrote the would-be Vice President:

The real story of the Pearl Harbor attack and the events preceding it has never been publicly told. * * * The Roberts report, upon which you rely, does not contain the basic truths of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe.

Mr. Speaker, the Roberts report is nothing more than a political document. It was designed to allay the public clamor for information as to the party or parties responsible for our armed forces being taken by surprise. It was designed not to present truth but to prevent the people from knowing the truth. I am personally convinced, and I believe that a true investigation will substantiate me, that the people really responsible for the Pearl Harbor catastrophe were here in Washington on December 7 and not in the Pacific. The administration knows that is true. How can one otherwise explain the unwillingness of the administration to hold the court martial of General Short and Admiral Kimmel? How can one otherwise explain the administration's opposition to the resolution which we passed for the investigation that is now being made by high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy?

The Roberts report states that at about noon—6:30 a. m. Honolulu time—or 1½ hours before Pearl Harbor, a warning message was sent to General Short and Admiral Kimmel of an almost immediate break in relations with Japan. Assuming such a message was sent, I should like to know how long before it was sent the President, the State Department, and the War Department knew that it was Japan's intention to attack Pearl Harbor. If the President knew 3 or 4 days before the attack that such an attack was being prepared, why were not General Short and Admiral Kimmel apprised of that fact immediately? When the whole story of Pearl Harbor is made known, as some day it will, I am inclined to believe that the reason we were taken by surprise was negligence in Washington and not negligence on the part of the commanders in the Pacific. As a cloak to this fact, the Roberts report was devised and to prevent this from being known by the people the court martial of General Short and Admiral Kimmel has been postponed for 2½ years.

There is another interesting development in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe which is beyond understanding. You will recall that two privates operating a detector unit sent a message to headquarters that planes were approaching and they were told by the lieutenant who received the message to forget it. That same lieutenant, one Kermit A. Tyler, is today a lieutenant colonel. Think of it. An officer who obviously was not alert at the time of Pearl Harbor has subsequently been promoted by the Army to the rank of lieutenant colonel. It is beyond understanding.

Mr. Speaker, there are a great many facts to be learned about Pearl Harbor, events preceding and subsequent, and when they become known I believe the country will be shocked. From the article by the would-be Vice President it appears that he would condemn the two commanders—General Short and Admiral Kimmel—even before they are heard. I wonder why.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 21, 1944]

TEXT OF ADMIRAL KIMMEL'S LETTER TO SENATOR TRUMAN

MY DEAR SENATOR TRUMAN: In an article appearing under your name in Colliers magazine of August 26, 1944, you have made false statements concerning my conduct as commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor prior to the Japanese attack.

Your innuendo that General Short and I were not on speaking terms is not true. Your statements alleging failure to cooperate and coordinate our efforts are equally false. General Short and I, as well as our subordinates, coordinated the efforts of our commands in close, friendly, personal, and official relationships.

The real story of the Pearl Harbor attack and the events preceding it has never been publicly told. This has not been my decision. For more than two and a half years I have been anxious to have the American people know all the facts.

The Roberts report, upon which you rely, does not contain the basic truths of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe. This is evident from the fact that no official action has ever been taken upon the basis of that report. The Congress of the United States, of which you are a Member, has recognized the inadequacy of the Roberts report by directing that the War and Navy Departments undertake a full investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster.

Until I am afforded a hearing in open court, it is grossly unjust to repeat false charges against me, when, by official action, I have been persistently denied an opportunity to defend myself publicly.

I suggest that until such time as complete disclosure is made of the facts about Pearl Harbor, you refrain from repeating charges based on evidence that has never met the test of public scrutiny.

I ask for nothing more than an end to untruths and half truths about this matter, until the entire story is given to our people, who, I am convinced, will be amazed at the truth.

I am releasing this letter to the press in the belief that the historic American sense of fair play will approve this action.

Very truly yours,

H. E. KIMMEL,
Rear Admiral,
United States Navy (Retired).

Is the C. I. O. Political Action Committee Above the Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by one of the most outstanding newspapermen of this country. This man discusses a question which must be uppermost in the minds of a great many people in this country today and that is "Is the C. I. O. Political Action Committee Above the Law?"

(By George Rothwell Brown)

In the fourth-term campaign of 1944 Republicans for the first time in our history are being compelled by law to contribute money to the opposition, to be used for the defeat of candidates of their own party, including President, Vice President, Governors, Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

This is only one of the many developments of the left-wing technique now being unfolded throughout the republic which is as alien in its origin as it is foreign to the American tradition of fair play.

These campaign funds which Republicans are now chagrined to see being used to purge Republicans from public life, have been collected in the guise of union dues.

As the subtle leaders of the labor end of the Roosevelt New Deal coalition began to lay their plans for taking over the political control of the moribund Democratic Party, they succeeded in having the "check off" given statutory authority.

Immense sums poured into the treasuries of organized labor unions.

These sums became fabulous as America drew the sword and prepared for war on every world front.

Thousands of new workmen were needed to build barracks and hospitals for the soldiers, to lay the keels of ships, to make tanks, and planes, and guns, and munitions.

There they found the union collector awaiting them. They made the painful discovery that they could not serve the Federal Union without first paying tribute to a labor union.

They could not work for Uncle Sam, in his great hour of need, until they had joined a labor union and had paid their dues.

Some unions, more arrogant than others, demanded initiation payments that bordered on the exorbitant.

A committee of the House of Representatives went into the subject, and produced startling evidence of a labor racket.

What, wondered our unsophisticated Congressmen, did the unions intend to do with all the hoard of money they were piling up?

Well, they know now. The C. I. O. has an immense fund, hundreds of thousands of dollars of which were contributed by good Republican voters who wanted to work for their Government in time of war, and found themselves forced to become dues-paying members of a labor union.

To get around the Hatch Act the C. I. O. has invented a couple of devices to enable it to spend money for campaign purposes notwithstanding the law.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee is above the law.

Thus conservative Democrats and an army of Republican working men and women behold the money they paid into the coffers of the union bosses being used to defeat conservative Democratic and Republican candidates for office, and to perpetuate left-wing control of Government through a fourth Roosevelt term.

Dewey and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Dayton (Ohio) News:

DEWEY AND FOREIGN POLICY

Seizing an interval in the war news, Governor Dewey breaks into view this week with an expression of apprehension lest President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull are planning to be insufficiently international. His dread of the moment is that they might lead our country into a four-power alliance with our present allies, leaving the little peoples of the world out in the cold. "Beware," Governor Dewey says in effect, "I've got my eyes on you."

If Governor Dewey had read the papers he would know that both the President and Mr. Hull have time without number and time out of mind held to the view that the coming world cooperation must be world-wide, with every nation in it as its equal right, with even Japan and Germany, once their present evil controls were loosed and proof given of peaceful intentions, to be received. The full course of the administration, beginning with the good-neighbor policy, has expressed this view.

Roosevelt and Hull, as we pointed out yesterday, were upholding this course when Dewey himself, speaking in isolationist Wisconsin in 1940, was saying: "We cannot possibly remain strong and free unless we reject every entanglement in the affairs of Europe."

The man who said those words 4 years ago is complaining that the administration at Washington is not sufficiently entangling itself in the affairs of Europe and the world. It is about as if Colonel McCormick, arch isolationist, should suddenly attack the administration for isolationism.

One of the chief problems of the political campaign now opening is evidently to be to get a line on Governor Dewey's international views without collapsing from dizziness. Dewey, as his past commitments on this subject are scanned, has been on all sides of all the issues of the pre-war years, and all the issues yet to come with the post-war years. So strangely diverse and contradictory have his statements been that one is compelled to wonder whether he actually has any views on this vital subject of his own. Can it be that, as events call for an expression from him, he merely puts on a phonograph record and gets the wrong one as often as not?

Here he is attacking the President for an alleged plan to form an alliance with our allies in the war. Heaven help us, and last September 5, at the Mackinac Conference, Dewey was pronouncing himself in favor of a permanent alliance with Great Britain. A reporter asked Dewey: "Do you advocate or recognize the possibility or probability of a military alliance between the United States and Great Britain, to continue on a formal basis?" Dewey replied:

"I should think that would be in our interest. We have long had close military relationship with Great Britain, and the American people never suffered such a shock as they did when they felt that the British Navy might be seized by the Nazis."

For an alliance with Great Britain 11 months ago; attacking the administration now on a trumped-up charge that it is for an exclusive alliance with Great Britain—and our two other allies—now.

Dewey went on in this interview of last September 5 to express the hope that Russia and China would be included in the alliance which he favored. This makes the total alliance which he attacks today. About that time the horrified Colonel McCormick cracked the Governor fiercely on the head for his heresy. Is this week's somersault of the Governor an effort to placate the great Chicago anti-Russia, anti-Britain isolationist?

Dewey included Russia last September in the circle of his benevolence. This in itself was another bewildering swallowing of his own words. He had said in a speech in New York in 1940 that "a conspicuous and most unfortunate departure" of the New Deal from sound foreign policy "was the recognition of Soviet Russia." Dewey went on to say: "We need no such partnerships." In Cleveland, in November that same year, Dewey gloried in the fact that it was no Republican "accorded recognition to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

So in 1943 Dewey was proposing that partnership with Russia for which in 1940 he had said we had no need. And now, this August 1944, he attacks the administration with the allegation that it favors such a partnership.

Examples of such unbelievable contradictions and back trackings by Candidate Dewey in the past 4 or 5 years can be multiplied by the dozen. In 1941 he was at first against lend-lease. It "would bring an end to free government," he said. A month later he was for lend-lease, for making an end, we must suppose, to free government. In 1940 he charged the President with sacrificing the friendship of other nations. Today he charges the President with too much friendship with other nations. Today he denounces the President for too little internationalism. In Illinois yesterday he was exciting the adoring approval of Colonel McCormick's isolationist Senator BROOKS for his isolationism.

A plane carrier, the Navy men tell us, has to be quick on the turn, the reverse, the sideslip in order to dodge the bombs of the enemy. From what we now see of Governor Dewey and his flea-like course on foreign policy, he would make an excellent captain of a carrier. But as captain of the great American Ship of State, a vessel whose course today must have some reference to its course yesterday and tomorrow, that is terribly different. A nation made seasick by Governor Dewey's strange dippings and tossings cannot but be apprehensive as it tries to keep track of his curves.

Peace and the Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Sunday Globe of July 30, 1944:

PEACE AND THE FREE PRESS

When Adolf Hitler was shaping his conspiracy against the peace of the world during the middle thirties, he and his Italian understudy, Benito Mussolini, launched a highly significant campaign. Playing upon the all-too-evident disrelish of their neighbors for war, the two dictators proposed, boldly and openly, to France, Britain and the United States, that the first step toward preservation of the peace was to destroy the freedom of the press everywhere, in conformity with the practice already established in Germany and Italy.

These proposals were received with laughter in London, Washington, and Paris. The suggestion that governments move openly to convert the press into an agency devoted to concealing the truth from the public, into an instrument exclusively dedicated to the uses of official propaganda, and thus to furtherance of the self-interest of those who happened to be in control of the machinery of rule at the moment, flew in the face of traditions among the three great nations which Hitler and his stooge addressed.

Tight censorship in wartimes was already familiar to them all, especially in view of the experience of World War No. 1. Ever since the Government of Imperial Japan inaugurated, during the Russo-Japanese War, the policy of shutting off all news of military and naval operations, wartime censorship had been accepted as a necessity.

But total censorship in peace, like governmental interference with political news in wartime, has long been recognized among peoples cherishing the ideals of human freedom as constituting a mortal danger to their liberties. Such proposals clash with the fundamental thesis of democratic government. They assail the principle of popular sovereignty at its foundations. For they deny to those who view government as the agent and servant of the people access to the facts and information without which exercise of popular sovereignty becomes utterly impossible.

The motive behind the demand of the dictators at the time had little to do with fears entertained by either of them about the strength of his domestic position. In Italy and in the Third Reich the press was already prostrate. It had been converted into a propaganda instrument for fascism. What

irked the boss of Berchtesgaden and the inflated egoist at Rome was the continuing, steady flow of dispatches from all parts of Europe and the world to the American, British, and French press—dispatches written by capable, resourceful, and experienced foreign correspondents who cared more for reporting the facts as they found them than for shaping their stories to suit the official views of governments and special interests operating with and behind governments.

It would be incorrect to pretend that such official influences were entirely absent from the fields in which foreign correspondents from the western democracies were accustomed to labor. Pressure from official scurces, especially under the Chamberlain regime in Britain, was often exerted to interfere with free flow of the news. A notorious example was the discharge of Mr. G. F. R. Gedye, one of the greatest of English correspondents, by his publisher, after he had spelled out in a devastating volume the story of the betrayal of Czechoslovakia and underlined its inevitable consequences of major war. British appeasers at the time disliked such bold and inconvenient confrontations with facts.

There also has been present in the field of foreign news collecting and distribution especially since the close of World War No. 1, a strong trend toward monopoly controls in the field of foreign news, supported by official influences. Mr. Kent Cooper, the capable and sober-minded director of the Associated Press, has been at pains to analyze these dangers and lift his voice vigorously against them. His account, published last year in an extremely readable volume needs to be kept in mind as evidence accumulates that this issue of freedom of reporting foreign news and freedom from official or monopolistic interference with its dissemination, arises once more.

One of the major tasks before the public in all Allied countries, once the military operations come to an end, will be to retrieve the liberties of the press from the clutch of necessary wartime governmental controls and censorships. Let no one imagine that this will be easy or that the struggle will be won without the exertion of the utmost pressure from the public and the press as well.

The collapse of the Germans and the formal ending of the war in Europe will remove automatically most of the justification for press control and censorship there on military grounds. Political, social, and economic developments will then assume primary importance among all governments. It is inevitable that efforts will be made to spread, into the realm of political reporting especially, a large portion of the censorship stripped of its warrant by the war's end.

The positions of the great allies, their wide interests, the fog which covers most of the peace problems thus far, the eagerness with which special interests will swarm toward the vacuum created in Europe by the debacle of the Germans—these and a dozen other evident probabilities make it imperative that an early start be made to insure complete liberation of the Allied press from official and unofficial censorship with the close of the fighting. Unless that point is pressed strongly, the ability of the people who have made the sacrifices in this war to understand what is being done with their victory will suffer.

It is good news accordingly, to find that Mr. Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, John S. Knight, president of the Knight newspapers, and Mr. Kent Cooper, in his role as executive director of the Associated Press, have prevailed upon the Democratic Party to place in its platform a clear, strong demand looking toward the reestablishment of the basic principle of freedom of the press, both domestic and international.

"We believe in the world right of all men to write, send and publish news at uniform communication rates and without interference by governmental or private monopoly, and that right should be protected by treaty." Thus the platform plank.

It will be no easy task to translate this wise and sound proposal for freedom in the international flow of news into a treaty as part of the eventual diplomatic liquidation of the war. In large areas of the world, including some controlled by both our major Allies, the effort to achieve a treaty guaranteed foundation for foreign correspondence free of official interference, will not be welcome. Indeed, even in the full tide of war, few Governments permit to the press the elbow room accorded by our own in the field of political reporting and analysis.

The issue, nevertheless, transcends most of the great questions already emerging in relation to any coming peace. It touches the lives of hundreds of millions of people the world over. It affects the question of their future actions, and the materials upon which those actions and the judgments inspiring them shall be formulated. It is second only in importance to the physical freedom of the people.

"They who tamper with veracity," wrote John Morley in his magnificent Essay on Compromise, "from whatever motive, are tampering with the vital force of human progress." They who obstruct or tamper with the flow of truth to society conspire against its liberties and undermine their own.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Fort Wayne Plan for Soldier Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the following editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel:

Unique in the United States to date is the Fort Wayne plan for soldier service, programmed by the Veterans' Aid Commission, recently established pursuant to ordinance by Mayor Harry W. Baals, as city civilian defense director.

This plan is admirably based upon the integration of the seasoned experience and specialized training received by the model Fort Wayne civilian defense organization's thousands of wardens in all the city's blocks, zones, sections, and districts, together with the 12 soldier-service counselors.

The local program for dealing with every sort of problem confronting servicemen and their families is extraordinarily meritorious; not only in that it is built "from the bottom up," rather than made responsive to "directives" from the top down; but also in that it organizes all the numerous skills acquired by the highly efficient local civilian defense personnel in months and months of preparatory training, dating from the days of blackouts and other such protective-service drills.

As the Veterans' Aid Commission has pointed out, "the flow of returning veterans is only a small trickle now; but it is certainly not too early to start planning for the time when it becomes a large stream."

For, it has been calculated that by the middle of 1945—at the earliest—some 6,000 Fort Wayne soldiers and sailors will have been demobilized. And their needs and problems are certain to be numerous and varied. It is to deal with these needs and problems, that the Fort Wayne plan for soldier service has been initiated and is being daily advanced.

Mayor Baals, in his entirely nonpartisan capacity as Fort Wayne's civilian defense director, has correctly stated: "The case of each soldier, whether aid is needed or not, must be carefully reviewed, so that there will be no failure of full community gratitude and appreciation."

He has explained further, that just as our soldiers were called to the colors, so he now is calling upon the local civilian defense organization to implement the program of the Veterans' Aid Commission.

Considering the readily apparent merit of the program, and in the light of the faithful, efficient, and exemplarily self-sacrificing services already rendered by thousands of civilian defense workers in months past, we feel sure that it may be taken for granted that there will be an enthusiastic and sustained response to the mayor's appeal.

Some days ago, the veterans' aid commission issued a statement in which appropriate emphasis was laid upon the fact of jobs in any comprehensive, practical, effective program of soldier service.

Said the commission: "There must be more than a 'touch and go' attitude. There must be no oversimplification, taking the form of 'Here are some jobs—come and get them as best you can.' The same kind of careful planning that converted civilian consumer-goods industries into war-production plants—and which converted nearly 12,000,000 American wage earners into soldiers—will be necessary to reconvert both the plant and the former wage earner back to pre-war tasks."

And if this particular "reconversion" job is to be done right, then it will have to be taken up, in each community, as the particular community's particular responsibility. If there were local draft boards to assume responsibility for taking men out of "civvies" and putting them into uniform or into war plant jobs, then there ought to be the same kind of local assumption of responsibility for reversing the process.

The commission has suitably underscored the point that "Men, unlike plants, were conscripted. Practically every available potential soldier was scrupulously assayed and examined and moved to his military service or war production groove. That was an outstanding achievement. But nothing less should be done on 'the road back'—the road back to post-war adjustment."

It is also highly gratifying to note the Commission's common-sense insistence that "Jobs are the only really sensible soldier monuments, symbolizing as they do in every family that America is actually the 'land of opportunity.'"

Expressions of tribute to our fighting men must not be confined to rosy rhetoric or shiny medals. Nor must our "memorials" be limited to lifeless stone, or parks, or field houses, or stadiums, or libraries, or art galleries.

Any hungry man will gladly trade a medal for a meal, a bronze cross for a cup of coffee.

Any man facing the danger of eviction from his home will gladly swap a ribbon for a rent receipt.

There cannot be the faintest doubt that when our men come home they will be more interested in steaks than in stadiums.

Which of them, torn by the pangs of economic worry, would not eagerly forego a field house for an offer of friendly assurance of freedom from financial fear for his family?

Mindful of these practicalities and following the good old rule of "first things first," the Commission reminds us that right here in our own community we have the primary responsibility for making sane and sensible decisions as to the right thing to do for our

returning heroes and for determining to do the right thing at the right time.

The time to begin thinking about all that is right now.

And this is the right time to take out insurance against having local preferences engulfed in a usurping sea of absentee-bureaucratic decisions and directives.

Before God, therefore, let us resolve that our Fort Wayne boys in the armed services shall come back here to something far more locally friendly and genuinely neighborly than another W. P. A.—which, administered, as it was, according to arbitrary "blanket" formulas, lacked that spirit of thoughtfulness and understanding which it could have possessed, had its functions been performed by a local organization of more fortunate neighbors of the less fortunate.

Such a resolution can find its best expression and fulfillment in the energetic and sustained support—by every home in every block of every neighborhood in Fort Wayne—of the self-evidently well-considered program now being so intelligently advanced under the Fort Wayne plan for soldier service.

Face It—They Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for several reasons a recent visit to the hospital gave me some of the most pleasurable and instructive days of my life. An inconsequential reason is that, the surgeon having cut a hole in me and taken out some of what is sometimes impolitely described by a four-letter word, it will hereafter be my privilege, when old friends begin to talk about their operations, to break in and insist upon talking about my own.

But, seriously, it was my good fortune, just when the Communists were getting me apprehensive, to reach the hospital as 129 casualties from Normandy came in and, while being wheeled into the operating room, to find next to me one of those wounded but courageous young Americans, who, in 5 minutes, will convince the most cynical of us that many of our fears for the future of the Republic are just an old man's nightmare.

Later, this young man—18—brought his buddy, 19, and a WAVE the two of them had met, to my bedside, where we visited for a half hour or more. They afterward came back for more than an hour's additional visit. The first-hand information which these boys gave me—and they were no more than children in years, although men in experience, suffering and worldly wisdom—was intensely interesting and informative.

D-day was not a picnic excursion. It was not at all times an uninterrupted American advance. On the front where they were, many a ship carrying men and motorized equipment was blown out of existence, either by mine or shellfire, before it ever touched the beach and, on more than one, when the landing gates were lowered, well-directed German fire cut down boys like yours and mine as falls the grain before the reaper. It was only after our spotters had located the German artillery and the Navy had blasted some of the heaviest emplacements, as a child would sweep aside a pile of blocks, that our forces were successful in their landing.

Then back came the wounded. The dead remained where they were. And those boys who visited with me—and in all there were a dozen or more—were just back from facing a savage, relentless foe on what may well be described as the doorstep of Hell itself, and never in anything they did or said did they give the slightest indication of any lack of courage, determination, or faith in the permanence of our Republic. When the activities of some of those who are attempting, at the moment by subterfuge, to do away with the Constitution were called to their attention, they just laughed and said, in substance, "We will take care of those birds when we come home."

They were just back from facing Hitler's veterans. They had met and licked his best, and, without exception, those who had a prospect of being restored to health and strength expressed the desire for a speedy recovery in order that they might rejoin their comrades. One, incapacitated for active service, is now on duty at the hospital. He was one of those whose privilege it was to aid in alleviating the sufferings of his wounded comrades and his request to me, with which I am trying to comply, was to get him transferred back to his ship. He said he was lonesome for his buddies.

These young Americans—and none I met had reached voting age—have very definite opinions about our allies; about their mode of life and their general viewpoint of relationship between the races and the sexes. If my understanding of what they had to say is correct and if they represent the average American soldier, when they return, they will eradicate any foreign isms which, during their absence, may have been grafted upon our way of doing things—our way of living.

These boys are firmly determined that, if, when they return, they find the America they left here at home has been destroyed, they will restore it. If I got them right, they expect us to defeat those who, here at home, are enemies of the Republic, as they over there are defeating the armed enemy. If we fail here, they, to our shame, will complete our job when they return. When those boys come back—and above all things, they want to come back—they want to find an opportunity to work, to marry, to have a home, raise a family; to give their children an education; and to see that other folks from other lands do not remake America.

It was my good fortune to be at the hospital when these boys—and some were young enough to be my grandchildren—came in; to have the honor and the privilege of listening to their frank expressions of opinion. They recreated in me—grown somewhat bitter, somewhat discouraged, somewhat cynical—a new and abiding faith that they, who are sacrificing so much, will show the wasters and the spenders, those who would destroy our Government, either by force or by subterfuge, that we can safely rely upon them to, with God's help, keep here the Nation which you and I believe was born for the preservation of human liberty and opportunity.

While they are facing and winning the battle there, let us here at home meet and defeat all those who, by one scheme or another, would undermine constitutional government.

Philippine Independence and the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks regarding matters of importance to the future mutual well-being of the Philippines and the United States, I wish to insert at this point a statement made by Hon. Sergio Osmeña, President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, immediately after President Roosevelt had signed Senate Joint Resolutions 93 and 94, on June 29.

At the time Present Roosevelt signed these resolutions, Mr. Osmeña was Vice President of the Philippines but has since been sworn in as President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines to succeed President Manuel Quezon, who passed away August 1.

It is because I feel the Members of the House of Representatives should know of President Osmeña's feelings regarding these resolutions that I am extending into the RECORD at this point his statement, released on June 30, 1944, which is as follows:

The enactment of Senate Joint Resolutions 93 and 94 is a long step toward the real freedom and independence of the Philippines and its survival as a free and Christian nation. This legislation authorizes the advancement of the recognition of Philippine independence from the date already fixed by law, July 4, 1946; provides for naval and air bases to be maintained not for American purposes alone but for the mutual protection of the United States and of the Philippines; and creates an effective instrumentality for the speedy consideration by the two Governments of matters affecting post-war economy, trade, finance, economic stability, and rehabilitation of the Philippines, including damages to public and private property and to persons occasioned by enemy attack and occupation.

Early in December 1941 when Japan attacked the Philippines, the President of the United States made a solemn pledge that the freedom of the Philippines will be redeemed and its independence established and protected. Thereafter this pledge was reiterated. For this the Filipino people are profoundly thankful. Now, on this matter of fundamental public policy, the Congress, the policy-making body under the Constitution, has taken action embodied in a formal

enactment permanently placed in the statute books of the United States.

Under these congressional enactments, the sufferings and sacrifices brought by this war on our people will be ameliorated as much as possible, the ravages and destruction fully repaired and the economic structure of the country rebuilt and strengthened. While the liberating forces landing on Philippine soil will carry with them tanks, guns, and other weapons of war, the representatives of the Commonwealth Government will bring to our starving people food, medical supplies, clothing, school books, plows, and other farm implements. With the destruction of the power of the enemy, individual rights and political and religious freedom will be restored in the Philippines. And following the orderly processes prescribed by the independence law and the constitution of the Philippines, the independent Philippine Republic, supported by this great and friendly Nation, will emerge safe and secure against external aggression.

When I appeared before the House Committee on Insular Affairs to urge the approval of Senate Joint Resolutions 93 and 94, I said that I considered the passage of these two resolutions of vital importance to the welfare of our two peoples. I repeat this statement now with the addition that the news of this action of Congress will bring new hopes to the Filipino people, now enslaved by the enemy, and will instill in them renewed courage and united determination to effectively assist the liberating forces when our D-day comes.

I believe I express the sentiment of the Filipino people when I say that we are deeply grateful to the President and the Congress of the United States for the approval of this legislation.

Labor and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD a very open-minded discussion and article entitled "Labor and Politics." It appeared in the August issue of the Journeymen Plumbers and Steamfitters Journal and was written by the president of their united association, Mr. Martin P. Durkin, American Federation of Labor.

LABOR AND POLITICS

Within several weeks the attention of the Nation will, momentarily be drawn away from the world-wide battle fronts and focused on the problem of electing a national Government. Campaign oratory will be at its peak. Promises will be scattered around with utter abandon. Political party leaders will hurl charges and counter-charges against each other. The emotions of the voters will be stirred and general confusion will prevail. Barely more than a majority of citizens will exercise their right to vote—though the mere threat to deprive them of the right to vote will provoke a war. All facts considered, however, the campaign will follow a pattern which will be no better or no worse as campaigns go.

In the midst of the campaign confusion stands the organized workingman and workingwoman. Professional politicians will look at the organized workers and see the possibility of snaring a solid bloc of votes. If the campaign gives any indication of being close, the importance of the workers' votes will grow in the estimation of professional politicians. In political parlance, the "balance of power" may lie with the organized workers of the Nation. As a consequence, some consideration of the relation between politics and organized labor is pertinent at this time.

THREE CHANNELS

The political activities of organized workers in America might be channeled in three directions:

I. A labor party could be formed.

II. Support could be pledged to a dominant political party.

III. Political independence could be maintained.

I. A LABOR PARTY

The organized workers of America have never developed a significant political party, despite the fact that the idea has existed almost as long as there has been a political movement in the Nation. The existence of an organized group of people held together by common economic interests has set men dreaming of what could be accomplished politically if these people would vote as a solid group. Indeed, some labor leaders have been attracted by the possibilities of improving the conditions of workers by political power. Likewise there have been equally important members of organized labor who have consistently fought against the creation of a labor party. At the head of this latter group was that grand old man of American labor Sam Gompers. His thoughts and his leadership have become the guideposts of political thinking in the American Federation of Labor. The following excerpt is taken from an address he delivered on the possibility of having a labor party:

"The fact is that an independent labor party becomes either radical, so-called, or else reactionary, but it is primarily devoted to one thing and that is vote getting. Every sail is trimmed to the getting of votes. The question of the condition of labor, the question of the standards of labor, the question of the struggles and sacrifices of labor to bring light into the lives and work of the toilers—all of that is subordinated to the one consideration of votes for the party.

"Which movement, economic or political, in any country on the globe has brought more hope and encouragement, more real advantages, to the working people than the trade-union movement of America has brought to the wage-earning masses of our country?

"The organization of a political labor party would simply mean the dividing of the activities and allegiance of the men and women of labor between two bodies which would be in conflict."

The views of Gompers indicates at least one reason why there has not come into being a dominant labor party on the political scene. His position had been accepted by most of the international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Today there is little or no indication that there will be an effective labor party. Since there is no labor party on the national scene in this election, the channel for the labor vote in this Presidential campaign must be in some other direction.

II. PLEDGING SUPPORT

The second channel through which the votes of workingmen and women could flow into the election of a national government would be to pledge support to one of the existing dominant political parties. Already some C. I. O. unions have indicated that they will pledge the vote of their members in the forthcoming election. This action by the affiliates of the Congress of Industrial Organizations merits close attention.

SOME ELEMENTARY FACTS

Before discussing the advantages or disadvantages of this kind of political action, however, it is worth while to keep clearly in mind some elementary facts which must exist before a worth while pledge can be made. First of all, a promise to deliver the votes of workers to a particular party assumes that, because men are of one mind about trade unionism, they are in agreement over political issues. Nothing can be further from the truth. Every practical politician knows that there are many reasons why voters cast their ballots as they do. Some of these reasons far outweigh the influence exerted upon them by their belief in unionism. Political environment, political patronage, current economic conditions, the personality of the candidates, and many other factors may account for the decision of a particular voter. As a consequence, pledging the allegiance of labor-union members, and actually getting it, are not necessarily the same.

Another elementary fact, which must be recognized when a particular party is promised the votes of labor, is the danger of wrecking the union to win a political victory. It is not impossible that the cost of electing a political candidate may be so high in terms of membership that trade unionism may disappear and only the political party remain alive. A politically minded labor leader may go to such extremes to deliver the vote, that many union members will find themselves unpopular with their fellow members because they refuse to follow the leader politically. In a particularly close campaign, feelings within a local union may run so high that the wounds caused by the political campaign may either never be healed or lead to a sizable decline in union membership. The trade-union movement cannot afford political victories, no matter how important they may seem to politicians, if the price is suicide.

A final fact is that no union leader can guarantee his political chieftains that the vote of labor will be delivered. Political obedience of this kind would indicate an absence of freedom of thought within the union. Actually, if union men and women were so docile, they would not be in labor unions. They would be more than willing to be "yes men" to their employers on matters of wages, hours, and working conditions. Regimented union membership is not a healthy condition within the labor movement. Labor unions exist only in democracies; they must preserve democracy within their ranks.

DANGERS OF PLEDGING VOTES

But even if there were a labor vote which was solidly behind one political party, there would be real dangers surrounding a formal pledging of such support in the name of the union.

The history of the labor movement in America shows that there are certain pitfalls which cannot be avoided when labor unions tie their existence to the kite of a political party. Every time organized labor has been the tail to the kite of a particular labor party union officials have become political officials first and union officials secondarily. As a consequence, the very leadership which could have made the economic program of labor possible has its energies sapped in political maneuvering. In the division of loyalties the tendency is for union men to be drawn more and more toward political success rather than to the success of the labor union.

Another danger arising from being the kite tail is that of contributing funds to the political party. If a union is so thoroughly convinced that its success is tied up with a particular political party, then it must stand ready to contribute funds. The sinews of politics—no less than those of war—are made of money. Success in politics means

willingness to play with the blue chips. Blue chips cost real money. The treasury of the union is too available to politicians when only a little more money is needed desperately. When the treasury of a union is depleted, the union is in a bad way whether the political campaign is won or lost.

If the political campaign is lost, the union may be so weak financially that it cannot protect itself economically from the retaliation which it may incur from the winning party. At the very time when the union will be forced to rely entirely upon its economic strength it finds that its funds have been dissipated. If the political campaign is won, the union is not always strong enough to protect itself from the treatment accorded to it by successful politicians who are safely established in office. The record of political promises which have been kept is not so overwhelmingly clear that unions can rely upon politicians rather than upon their own cash reserves to improve the conditions of the workers. A union without a strong treasury is weak no matter who wins the political campaign.

Still another commonplace fact of politics is that politicians are never overeager to please the voters whose votes are a "sure-thing." When a politician knows that the votes of a labor union are tucked away in his hip pocket, he has nothing to fear. As a result, the benefits which labor can expect to obtain diminish proportionately. Once powerful unions will find themselves reduced to the positions of "hangers-on" and they receive the kind of treatment reserved for such political wheel-horses. Just enough crumbs will be dropped to keep the union in line.

The old adage that "the squeaking wheel gets the grease" applies in politics with especial force. Only a strong, independent labor union can make its squeaks loud enough to be heard by politicians.

POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE

The nonexistence of a Labor Party and the dangers arising from pledging the votes of labor to a dominant political party indicate the desirability of considering the third channel through which the political force of organized labor might flow. As long as the labor movement in America desires to respect the rights of its members and to preserve itself as the protector of the workers, then it must maintain its political independence.

The idea of political independence is known to every trade unionist just as the name of Sam Gompers is known to every union man who is acquainted with even the recent history of the labor movement. It was Sam Gompers who brought before the union men and women of this nation the principle of political independence. He wrote in an editorial published in the American Federationist in August 1908 the following statement:

"We now call upon the workers of our common country to stand faithfully by our friends, oppose and defeat our enemies, whether they be candidates for President, for Congress, or other offices, whether executive, legislative, or judicial."

This principle of electing your friends and defeating your enemies is still worth while today. The ways of politicians have not changed since the days of Sam Gompers. Nor has the need to preserve political independence diminished in the slightest. Rather, there is solid ground for believing that a condition of mutual respect by government and by labor is most necessary in times like these. Labor does not seek to dominate the government and does not expect government to dominate labor.

Political independence does not mean that workers will refuse to exercise their right to vote. On the contrary, this principle accentuates the duty of every worker to vote—but to vote as he sees fit, without regard to party labels and party propaganda. The political ideals of Sam Gompers mean simply that every worker is asked to examine the voting records of the political candidates—not in terms of party name labels—but on the basis of their recorded votes on issues which are important to the labor movement. This kind of participation in the political life of the Nation is far more exacting than simply being the wearer of a political party's collar.

The channel of political independence, therefore, is the proper direction in which the votes of organized labor in America should flow. In this manner the freedom of every member of organized labor to vote as he sees fit will be preserved. The strength of the labor movement will not be dissipated. Domination by politicians will be avoided. Reliance can be placed upon the economic strength of unionism rather than upon the weak promises of politicians to protect the welfare of the Nation's workers. Americans will enjoy the full benefits of a free labor movement. By voting for the individual but not for a political party, organized labor will continue to receive all the benefits derived from the wise counsel of Sam Gompers. Elect your friends and defeat your enemies!

The Jackson Hole Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter from Hon. Charles E. Winter to the editor of the Boston Globe, under date of August 14, 1944.

Judge Winter represented Wyoming in this body for several terms and was a distinguished Member of the House.

Judge Winter has made a lifetime study of the public land question and is the author of a book on the problem. On August 10 last, the majority leader extended his remarks and included therein the editorial of the Boston Globe of August 7 on my bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument. The editor lives a long way from Jackson Hole, and he is just as far off in the facts of the case. He states that Mr. Rockefeller purchased 35,000,000 acres, whereas in fact he purchased 32,000 acres.

In my opinion, Judge Winter has very effectively answered the Boston editor in the following letter:

CASPER, WYO., *August 14, 1944.*

Boston Globe Editorial Department,
Boston, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: I note the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 10, 1944, of your editorial against the bill in the House to abolish the Jackson Hole Monument.

You decry the suit of the State of Wyoming against the Government as an attempt "to deny to the public the newest of these national monuments." Under the Antiquities Act the only possible authority, if there be nothing of historic or scientific interest in the area, then the proclamation of the President was null and void.

We assert that there is nothing of a historical or scientific nature within the boundaries of the proclamation except as the terms would apply to millions of acres in various sections of the country; and not as much as would apply to the whole of New England. We challenge proof to show any feature bringing the area within the act.

You say "it is a historic spot," but give no fact to support the statement. You say it "is established to protect for all Americans for all time a site of scenic grandeur where the Grand Tetons raise their gothic spires above a plain that reveals one of the most spectacular records of glacial action on this continent." The Ice Age extended as far south as Ohio and Illinois and the whole north half of the United States could be said to show spectacular records of glacial action. On that ground the entire northern part of the 11 Western States should be set aside as a monument.

The entire Teton Range, which we admire as much as, possibly more than, the writer of the editorial, did not and does not need and is not affected in the least by the creation of a monument of the plain. When you say "plain," you describe the character of the land, though it happens to be a floor of a valley rather than strictly a plain. But the characteristics of a plain are there—sand, gravel, sage brush. As you say, "it retains the sage-brush flavor," which is hardly "spectacular" or of "historical or scientific interest."

The scenery, the magnificent Teton Range, 13,700 feet altitude, at the Grand Teton, has been and is protected by the creation of the Teton National Park, authorized properly by Congress, is not revealed only by and from the valley floor, the plain; the Tetons are revealed anywhere from west of the top of the Wind River Range, 50 miles to the east. Therefore this enormous area, perhaps a million acres, should be declared a monument. Reductio ad absurdum.

I, as a Member of Congress from Wyoming, helped to settle the matter of the protection of the Tetons by creation of the Teton National Park, encompassing their peaks, their eastern walls, their foothills, and a sufficient area of the valley level for administration purposes and for the public to enjoy them. Moreover it was done in conference and agreement with the National Park Service as a proper and a final solution of the matter.

You call attention to the fact that it, the plain, is the wintering ground of the largest Elk herd surviving in the United States. What has that to do with the matter? As the Representative of the people of Wyoming in Congress I introduced bills and aided in the enlargement of the area which had been and is a Game (elk) Refuge, where the elk do not feed but are fed. That Refuge existed and will exist, without the surrounding country "plain" being "monumented."

You declare that "the recreational importance of the spectacular valley at the headwaters of the Snake (River) is evidenced by the number of tourists who visit it annually and who constitute a principal commercial asset of the region." The recreational importance is not only admitted but asserted by us. We are proud of it and boast of it. All that, and the annual visits of thousands of tourists existed under the conditions before the creation of the monument, and will continue without the monument.

The people of Jackson Hole had before the monument, the "commercial assets of the region" and will have the same and more without the monument. As to the recreation by the people it will be restricted instead of increased. There is more recreation and less restriction in our Forest Reserves than in parks and monuments. For that very reason our forest reserves are visited by

vastly more people than the parks and monuments.

You state and seem to attempt some point of the fact that "there are only 241 residents who graze about 6,300 head of cattle. No matter what their number they are American citizens who own their properties and have the same rights of citizenship, local government, and of property, the same as one or 1,000,000 other citizens.

You add: "Their rights of grazing, cultivation and residence are wholly protected. * * * These have been specifically guaranteed them and their heirs and assigns." They are protected and guaranteed only by the promise of certain persons now in office, but who will go out of office. They do not even bind themselves by their promises, as they may change their minds, as they have done on numerous matters. Much less can they or do they bind their successors in office. Their only real protection is the law. Massachusetts helped to make a government of laws and not of men. Personal government is un-American. There is no such protection or guarantee in the Antiquities Act.

When the Secretary of the Interior says, and he has said, that the "'rights' of grazing permits and leases will be continued in the lessees and permittees and to their heirs as long as they live," he, a devotee of personal government, has not shown and cannot show any such provision in the Grazing Act. There is no such right in perpetuity to be found in the act. You say these things are not "rights" but only "privileges," and "special considerations." How can these be granted and continued and guaranteed to the permittees, lessees, their heirs, and assigns as long as they live? Obviously it is impossible.

You submit that "it is late in the day to suggest that the Government is not the appropriate sponsor and preserver of those parts of the public domain which Congress designates as desirable to reserve and protect for the enjoyment of the public." No one has so contended. But we say that the Government is not the President or the Secretary of the Interior. Government is the people as represented and voiced by Congress. Congress did not designate the area in question as so desirable. On the contrary Congress failed and refused for many years every effort to have it pass a bill making said area an enlarging part of the Teton National Park. That is why the monument method to accomplish the desired purpose was resorted to, suddenly surreptitiously, with no warning, consideration, or consultation with the people of the area, their county, the State, or the Governor of Wyoming.

You speak of "exploitation" and say that these western people have a "hangover" of the idea that "the public interest is anybody's to exploit; that what the public owns anyone can take," that "this idea has lingered overlong in the West." You leave yourself and the East wide open for a return attack. We forbear and stick to the point of the present case. To ring in this old hoary tradition and holier-than-thou attitude of the East is unworthy and derogatory to that degree of intelligence and even semifairness that is supposed to belong to an editorial writer in the Hub of Culture. You approved the "commercial asset" idea in suggesting that the people of Teton County should support the establishment of the monument. They reject it. They do not so "exploit" the area. They refuse what you say will be to their advantage commercially. Is this "exploitation?"

You further state that "unless the public's rights in its own domain are protected now, the American tomorrow will have no public lands to enjoy, no monuments to its great continental heritage to preserve."

The complete and overwhelming answer to that statement is that the Federal Government now owns and controls 455,000,000 acres, in continental United States, 24 percent of our continental area, 88 percent of which is in the 11 Western States, 50 to 90 years after these States were admitted into the Union. Of that total, 250,000,000 are now in reservations. Of this, 22,000,000 acres are in parks and monuments; 140,000,000 acres are in grazing districts for which the livestock raisers have to pay annual fees. Do you want still more taken away from the people of these States? All held free of taxation by these States. The fact is the Government is exploiting the western people and their States. It has violated and is violating a sacred trust—the trust of the lands held, instead of being disposed of to the people. The Government has abandoned the basic principle set forth in the Constitution, to dispose of the public domain. The lands are to be disposed of to the people or to the States for the people of these States; to build free, independent States "on equal footing with the original States." The Government is, instead, charging tribute, royalties, rents, fees, making our citizens renters and sharecroppers instead of owners. This is a denial of the trust and a violation, a reversal of the American land principles. The original States, including Massachusetts, retained the public lands within their borders.

Ten years ago, with less than 30 percent combined State and private ownership, the Federal Government repealed the homestead and purchase laws whereby the people could acquire the land and the States complete their sovereignty. That private ownership and State sovereignty was and must again be the American principle and policy. I lay down to you the proposition that every State in the Union should have been ceded, and thus come into complete sovereignty over every acre within their borders, when they became States. Passing that as now academic, we now hold that the policy of disposition of the lands to the people must be restored, either directly to the people by homestead or sale, or indirectly to and through cession to the States where the land lies. This applies particularly to the 140,000,000 acres in grazing districts, and the 25,000,000 acres withdrawn for survey and classification. All the rest of the 455,000,000 acres is reserved for one purpose or another for the public. Every reservation and park and monument now created is taken from the residue which must be made available to the people for private ownership.

I have an idea that our returning soldiers will demand and command a return, and an immediate return, to the true policy of opportunity for them to acquire the lands.

Are you aware that Federal agencies, in addition to holding the enormous areas of their present lands, plan to secure additional areas of 125,000,000 acres now in private ownership? Are you in favor of land nationalism, the groundwork of fascism or socialism?

If you are in favor of the Government withdrawing still more areas from possibility of ownership by the people, at least let it be done honestly and lawfully. We have gone beyond every reasonable limit of parks and monuments, but if even this must be exceeded, then let it be done only by Congress, the representatives of the people; not by the dash of a pen by one person or executive official, by personal power under guise of an act never intended by Congress to give such authority. Congress should pass the bill abolishing the Jackson Hole Monument, as an act of usurpation of authority, the area not coming within the true purview of the Antiquities act. If by wildly stretching and straining it can be said to be within its purview, still it should be abolished and the act amended so that such an exercise of pretended authority will never again be possible.

CHARLES E. WINTER.

Ship Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a letter from Admiral Vickery of the Maritime Commission showing tonnage output under the Maritime Commission's program through July 31, 1944:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., August 5, 1944.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Believing it will be of interest to you, I am enclosing a tabulation of tonnage output under the Maritime Commission's program through July 31, 1944.

During July American merchant shipyards delivered 126 vessels aggregating 1,274,453 tons dead weight. Deliveries to date since the beginning of the year now total 990 ships, of 9,901,984 tons, and since December 7, 1941, 3,641 ships of 37,322,537 tons. The last figure corresponds to more than half of the estimated tonnage of the entire world's merchant fleets at the outbreak of the European war in 1939.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

Dead-weight tonnage of ships delivered under the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program

Month	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
January	----------	30,330	47,200	197,628	1,007,680	1,204,730
February	31,230	31,628	40,500	289,549	1,236,481	1,372,864
March	18,230	44,627	108,700	291,473	1,513,244	1,538,357
April	25,042	64,219	131,200	401,632	1,603,307	1,593,691
May	34,340	44,457	98,600	619,779	1,782,836	1,537,915
June	31,594	32,399	81,700	749,654	1,670,442	1,379,994
July	18,440	105,121	127,441	791,667	1,669,341	1,274,453
August	33,796	31,514	112,042	752,774	1,690,411	----------
September	37,459	40,738	86,185	1,016,112	1,652,571	----------
October	17,840	59,658	75,290	889,737	1,675,311	----------
November	37,324	90,245	138,254	892,536	1,692,763	----------
December	55,724	62,924	92,175	1,197,191	2,044,239	----------
Total dead weight	341,219	637,860	1,139,293	8,089,732	19,238,626	----------
Number of ships	28	54	103	746	1,896	----------

Reclamation on the Missouri River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial headed "Reclamation Supported on Missouri" from the Western Construction News, published in San Francisco, Calif. This editorial supports the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation for the development and use of the waters of the Missouri River in the interest of the consumptive beneficial purpose which is irrigation. The editorial pays a justified tribute to the work of the Corps of Engineers, but observes that—

> The feeling does exist that some Army engineers are not as keenly aware of the need for careful husbanding of every available drop of water in the arid or semiarid States of the West as they should be.

The Bureau of Reclamation, under the Department of the Interior, is charged with the responsibility for the conservation of every available drop of water west of the ninety-seventh meridian for irrigation and domestic purposes. As the editorial observes:

> The proposals of the Bureau of Reclamation should be adopted and placed under construction, and that a permanent policy recognizing agricultural and domestic uses of water as its highest purpose in the West be pursued.

The proposal of the Bureau of Reclamation is to conserve the waters of the Missouri River for the irrigation of 4,760,000 acres of land and supplemental water supplies for another 538,000 acres now irrigated but having an inadequate water supply. It offers an opportunity for the country to open a new empire in which returning servicemen from the battlefields of the South Pacific and Europe can settle and contribute to the permanent development of the country.

The recent action of the Governors of the Missouri Basin States in recognizing the superior claims of irrigation on the waters of the Missouri River reflects the results of clear thinking on the part of the executives of our States which are closest to the problem.

In Chicago on September 7 and 8, a conference of representatives of some 29 States will be called to consider amendments or modifications of the amendment to the rivers and harbors and flood-control bills now pending in the Senate proposed by the Senators from Western States. I understand that probably 100 representatives will be in attendance from these States, which include some in the New England and Atlantic seaboard and Gulf areas, as well as the Missouri Basin and Far West. It is my hope that out of this conference will come united support for a constructive program that will meet the situation and present a solution of the problem which is necessary to assure the use of the waters of the Missouri River and other western streams for the highest beneficial consumptive purpose.

Now available are printed copies of Senate Document No. 191, which is the Bureau of Reclamation's report on the conservation, control, and use of water resources of the Missouri River Basin in Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri. Every Member of the House should read this report, and I am sure in so doing will be impressed with the necessity for assuring adequate water supplies for the development of the projects in this basin.

The editorial from the Western Construction News of July 1944 is as follows:

RECLAMATION SUPPORTED ON MISSOURI

Some attempt is made in the pages of this magazine to examine the differing programs proposed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for development and use of the waters of the Missouri River.

Surely no one will say that the planning or engineering which has been performed has in the case of either agency been inept or incapable. The differences in the two plans arise from the objectives sought to be achieved. The Army engineers regard flood control and navigation as paramount, while the Bureau seeks use of the major portion of the water for irrigation and power. In the end the conflict is between navigation and irrigation, since flood control and power generation will eventuate to a considerable degree from the adoption of either plan.

It is the studied opinion of this magazine, devoted as it is to a nonpolitical and unbiased program of development of all the West, that the proposals of the Bureau of Reclamation should be adopted and placed under construction, and that a permanent policy recognizing agricultural and domestic uses of water as its highest purpose in the West be pursued.

In making this declaration there is no insinuation that the proposals of the Pick report issued by the Corps of Engineers is technically unsound or that Colonel Pick or any of his staff had any base motives in planning it. The feeling does exist that some Army engineers are not as keenly aware of the need for careful husbanding of every available drop of water in the arid or semiarid States of the West as they should be.

It is the traditional role of the Army engineers to protect and expand the inland waterways of the Nation, and as a corollary, in recent years, to attend to flood-control works as a protection to the navigable streams. In these fields, they have done splendid work, as exemplified on the Mississippi River, the Los Angeles, Calif., coastal basin, the Willamette Valley in Oregon, and in many other places.

While river traffic has been of tremendous importance on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, it has been much smaller in volume on the Missouri. To be sure, it has existed, but due to sparser population and lesser industry, has never achieved the volume or the value of that on the other streams. Its loss, therefore, assuming that it would be lost, would not be a major calamity; in fact, there is some doubt whether it would be entirely eliminated under the reclamation program. At any rate, steadily lowering truck and rail tariffs are removing the single factor which made water transportation desirable, namely, lower cost.

The opportunity for expansion of vigorously productive farm lands, however, is of great and constantly growing importance. Over 4,760,000 acres of land which has never before produced anything could be added to the farm resources of the Nation, and another 538,000 acres now restricted in their yield because of inadequate water supply could be made completely productive. This magazine feels that an opportunity to add such quantities of food to a supply which never in our history has been completely adequate, even without considering the demands of impoverished foreign nations, must not be overlooked or lightly discarded.

Congratulations, Jones & Laughlin Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Port Vue, Pa., a thriving little borough, adjoining McKeesport, became famous because of the former McKeesport Tin Plate Co. and its energetic president, the late E. R. Crawford. Purchased by the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, a great task confronted this company in converting the plant facilities to war production. Nothing was left undone in the purchase of new machinery and equipment in reconverting this plant to the production of howitzer shells and other types of steel shell and bomb cases that are now great factors in the destruction of the German and Jap super war machines. In the brief period since reconversion, the McKeesport plant (Port Vue) of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation has manufactured 4,000,000 shells and bombs. This has only been possible through the magnificent cooperation of the plant workers—both men and hundreds of women—many of whom have several sons in the armed services of our country. W. B. Minch, genial and able plant manager of the company, is representative of the greatest industrial district in America—yes, the hub of the arsenal of democracy. I congratulate both the workers and management on this splendid record. It is this kind of teamwork that will soon spell doom for the ruthless Axis horde. I am happy to include in my remarks the following page article that appeared in the McKeesport Daily News, August 18, 1944:

CONGRATULATIONS TO OUR M'KEESPORT PLANT WORKERS FOR PRODUCING 4,000,000 SHELLS AND BOMBS

The three-millionth United States Army howitzer shell is due to roll down the production line at the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation's McKeesport works during the next 48 hours—making a total of more than 4,000,000 steel shells and bomb cases of various sizes that have been produced in this plant for the Ordnance Department of the Army and sent to arsenals to be loaded with explosives and then go on to the firing lines of our many invasion fronts.

Representatives of the United States Army Ordnance, McKeesport, Port Vue, and Liberty Borough officials, and J. & L. officials will visit the plant next Monday, August 21, to commend the shell-line workers for a job well done.

Congratulations to the patriotic men and women workers who are making these 3,000,000 shells and all the other shells and

bombs in production at the plant, and the millions that will follow, until the Germans and Japs are defeated.

Shells and bombs from the J. & L. McKeesport works will get to the front faster and do more good if we have more helpers. The work is safe—no explosives, as shells are loaded elsewhere. It is light, clean work—especially attractive to young women. Come in and talk it over at the employment office, Port Vue, if you want to help.

JONES & LAUGHLIN STEEL CORPORATION.

Democratic Platform Stands on Record of Wage Freezing—Binding Men to Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1944

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the United Mine Workers Journal of August 1, 1944:

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM STANDS ON RECORD OF WAGE FREEZING—BINDING MEN TO JOBS

The theme song of the Democratic platform, as regards labor, is to stand pat. Even on the matter of racial relations and minority rights, the platform stands pat inasmuch as it merely repeats the 1940 platform.

Comparing the things that the Republican Party promised to do with the Democratic platform fails even to mention, as involves labor—here are the most important:

1. Unfreeze wages—Republicans "Yes," Democrats "No."

2. Unshackle labor from being frozen to the job—Republicans "Yes," Democrats "No."

3. Restore the Department of Labor to union labor—Republicans "Yes," Democrats "No."

4. Reorganize, consolidate, and simplify Government Boards and Bureaus handling labor relations and administer the laws on a basis of equality—Republicans "Yes," Democrats "No."

Such is the comparable score labor won at the Republican convention and lost at the Democratic convention.

The Democratic Party is running on its record—and, consequently, could not do anything other than indorse the wage-freezing Little Steel formula and all other legislative devices and mechanicisms designed to freeze the American workingman as a political servant of the New Deal Party.

This being true, it is only a fair conclusion that, if the Roosevelt administration is given a fourth term, it will carry out its oft-stated intentions in the third term to enact a Manpower Draft Act, such as the Austin-Wadsworth bill, which allegedly was prepared by Roosevelt's Wall Street lawyer friend, Granville Clark.

It will maintain the Smith-Connally-Harness antistrike slavery bill. It will keep labor frozen to its job under McNutt's War Manpower Commission. It will keep wages down under W. L. B.'s Little Steel formula, and it will keep profits high until the war ends.

Although the shooting may be over, it will take its own time about proclaiming the war's end, thus holding effective the temporary war powers given the administration as long as possible.

Most of the Democratic platform is devoted to boasting about the past 12 years. The rescue of the bankers in 1933 is played up, and really the bankers ought to be grateful. There is no reason for a banker to vote against Roosevelt.

The platform says that the New Deal provided employment, being careful not to mention the 10,000,000 who had no jobs when the war broke out in 1939, when "war prosperity" began. Nothing is said about those $55-per-month pick-and-shovel jobs under Harry Hopkins' W. P. A.

The Democratic platform says of all that: "We pledge the continuance and improvement of these programs"—so you know what to expect when the war jobs are through.

The platform doesn't exactly claim that the war is the private property of the Democratic Party, but the platform does claim that the Roosevelt administration saw the war coming and got ready for it. Naturally enough, the sinking of eight battleships at Pearl Harbor by the Japs in a surprise attack, and the destruction of most of our oil tankers on the Atlantic Ocean, are not included in the platform boast of foreseeing the war. Somehow, the administration was modest about those things which the censors have never yet allowed all to be told—and the Pearl Harbor disaster has never been cleared up by a courtmartial of the responsible generals and admirals who may or may not have had the wrong orders from Washington.

Farmers are promised everything they asked, and little-business men—of whom a million have been forced to close their doors in the past 2 years—are also given a nice line of chin music.

As regards post-war programs, we find the usual run of political promises of nearly everything to everybody. Even the bituminous coal industry is remembered with a general promise of possible reenactment of a bituminous coal act on a maybe basis. This promise was not included in the original draft of the platform. The Democratic politicians took the advice of coal operators favoring the passage of a new bituminous coal-control law, who gave assurance that such inclusion would give the Democratic Party a top talking point for votes in coal regions where miners are changing their affiliation from the Democratic to the Republican Party.

Since even the Democrats recognize the stacked-deck deal given the coal miners in the 1943 coal wage controversy, they agreed that something would have to be done; hence the inclusion.

An analysis of the status of bituminous coal legislation will satisfy the most exacting that this gesture was designed for votes and not performance. A bill for reenactment of a bituminous-coal control law has been pending in the United States House of Representatives since January 6, 1943. This bill provides for a commission to administer the Bituminous Coal Act. It was introduced by Republican Congressman JENKINS from Ohio. The Democratic administration objected to this bill because it would reestablish bituminous-coal control under a commission form of administration and thereby lift it from the status of New Deal "burrocratic" domination.

Another bill, H. R. 4576, was introduced by Congressman FLANNAGAN and others on April 14, 1944. This bill was agreed to by representatives of the U. M. W. A. and 70 percent of the bituminous-coal operators. It also provides for a commission form of administration. The administration is against this bill because it shelves New Deal "burrocratic" administration.

The U. M. W. A. and the coal operators are anxious for the passage of this measure. Hearings have been held. Every effort has been exerted to have the measure favorably reported out of the committee. The House Ways and Means Committee is composed of 15 Democrats and 10 Republicans. At least 6 Republicans are favorable to the passage of the measure providing for a commission administration. Yet, this committee, controlled by the Democratic Party, is holding up the proposed legislation which the indefinite promise of a political platform, designed to secure votes, mentions as a possible cause for legislative attention.

It would be unnecessary for the coal industry to exert the time and incur the expense necessary to reenact a bituminous coal act, fundamentally essential for the prevention of cut-throat competition, had President Roosevelt refrained from abolishing the commission form of administration simply to provide "burrocratic" domination, thus making the act subject to New Deal political manipulation.

Acting under his reorganizational powers, and without notice to the officials of the U. M. W. A., President Roosevelt issued an Executive order, effective July 1, 1939, by which the commission form of administration, of which Percy Tetlow of the U. M. W. A. was chairman, was abolished, and the whole authority transferred as a bureau under Secretary Ickes' Department of the Interior.

The indifference of the appointees administering the act became so great, and "burrocratic" domination so far-reaching, that the U. M. W. A. convention, in 1942, specifically instructed the officials to seek legislation restoring the commission form of administration.

So, if the Democrats are ready and willing to repent their original mistake of abolishing the commission form of administration, the bituminous coal industry will be happy to accept speedy enactment of the act as agreed upon.

As evidence of good faith, since the hearings have already been held on the measure and its enactment would not constitute a new form of legislation, and since its practicality has been demonstrated and the necessity for the law recognized by consumers, producers, and mine workers, the logic of the situation would dictate that the Democratically controlled Ways and Means Committee report the bill out now and enact it before election.

But we are told that regardless of any and all platform promises, President Roosevelt will be called upon by the "burrocrats" to veto the bill if the industry insists upon a free and independent form of commission administration.

Chaos in the Production of Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, if you find your beefsteak tough you can blame it on to the several agencies who have discouraged the fattening of cattle.

The Washington press release of August 16 indicates that there is 41 percent less cattle on feed in the Corn Belt States this year as compared to a year ago. Illinois has 34 percent less, Wisconsin 20 percent, Minnesota 60 percent, Iowa 35 percent, Missouri 45 percent, South Dakota 50 percent, Nebraska 46 percent, and Kansas 43 percent. This means about 700,000 fewer head of cattle being fed.

The cause of this reduction can be laid directly at the door of the several governmental agencies who have placed

ceilings on cattle and issued other confusing directives, including the changing of the rules in the middle of the feed lot. Part of it has been due to a shortage of grain and unsatisfactory prices, particularly for the higher grade of finished beef.

This has meant that the so-called utility beef will be available for the public. This comes about because there will be a large run of low-grade cattle on the market. Utility beef is the lowest grade of beef that moves through the retail shops. In ordinary times this beef goes into sausage or other mixed-food products. Most of the butcher shops and eating establishments do not care to handle this type of beef. It is a kind of meat that comes from steers that should be in the feed lot.

I believe that in the long run this will not be good for the beef industry. When the housewife gets a roast or beefsteak of the so-called utility beef she will find her family disappointed. The next time instead of buying beef she may buy a chicken.

Under the rules adopted by the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration the packer gets a certain subsidy if he buys cattle within the price range suggested by the Government agencies. The price paid now at the packers and the sale rings for finished corn-fed beef is over the ceiling. This makes it necessary to buy the other grades of beef well below the established price in order to even up the price paid, otherwise the packer would lose the subsidy offered by the Government. This good finished beef either finds its way into the black market or goes to the better restaurants and hotels. Under these rules it will be impossible for the small packer or the individual with unfinished beef to realize the proper profit upon his animals.

It is very evident from the examination of the sale of finished beef that it is now going through the black market. This trend will continue as long as we have the present meddling by inexperienced bureaucrats with the production of meat.

This week meetings are being held with the cattlemen in an effort to stimulate more feeding. The Government agencies are becoming panicky now because they realize with nearly 50 percent less cattle on feed that there will be a shortage of meat on the market.

These Government agencies are entirely at fault for the condition which now exists because they issue so many confusing orders. This has caused much discouragement to the cattle feeder. He has not been able to feed his animals at a profit. He has not been able to plan ahead as to his feeding operations. The Government agencies have discouraged the feeding of livestock. They now belatedly recognize their mistakes. The same thing occurred with the hog industry. At one time we had too many hogs, now there may be a shortage.

We have prospects for a good corn crop. It is high time that the Government agencies quit bungling the production of meat. If they do not there may well be a shortage of good beef, not only of our armed forces and our allies, but the citizens of this country. If they will quit changing the rules in the middle of the feed lot and leave the cattle producers alone, America can, within the next 6 months, again enjoy prime corn-fed beef. These agencies should realize that the steer which is now being sold underweight with a little grain can carry three or four hundred extra pounds of good meat. It would be the good meat and not the low-grade utility type now being forced upon the civilian population all because of the short-sighted, ridiculous policies which have been adopted by the several agencies dealing with the production of meat.

Must History Repeat Itself?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following very interesting article which appeared in the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., Saturday evening, August 19, 1944:

MUST HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF?

Chelsea, today enjoying its most prosperous economic period in a decade and a half, faces what may be the most serious dislocations in its history unless definite and decisive steps are taken soon to soften the impact which the war's end will inevitably cause in the community and to forestall at least some of the ill effects which will result.

Today, unemployment is practically nonexistent in the area and relief is confined almost entirely to those persons physically incapable of earning a living. Business, despite many problems created by wartime shortages of merchandise and manpower, is at a highly satisfactory level. This is in distinct contrast with the situation that existed only a few years ago.

Chelseans need not have long memories to recall the days of mass unemployment, or drastically shortened workweeks. Throughout the thirties, hundreds of residents of the area were either totally unemployed, or worked but a day or two a week. Many others were employed on relief projects to a limited extent, at wage rates which gave only a bare subsistence. Business reflected the general condition and many stores were forced to close, while others were barely able to keep their doors open.

Whether this condition returns again is in the hands of the people of this city. They cannot control the world-wide conditions that will follow the cessation of hostilities, but they can do much to alleviate the dislocations as they affect this area. The first step in any post-war program for the city is a realization of what is in prospect.

First, a decrease in the number of jobs available is a certainty. Some individual industries may be able to maintain their present standards of employment, but it will be impossible for all to do so. Others may regain their present employment levels after a period of reconversion, but there will be unemployment from these industries during the period of change.

Some of the older men and some women now employed will drop from the labor market with the close of the war, but it is highly unlikely that the number thus withdrawing from the labor market will offset the decrease in jobs. There will also be some absorption of laid-off workers by retail and service establishments that are now undermanned, a temporary boom in this type of business may shoot their employment level above the normal for a time.

The great problem will be the return to civilian work of several thousand men now in the armed services. Many of these, of course, will return to jobs they held before the war, in some cases replacing men or women hired "for the duration" only. Others will find that their prewar jobs are now nonexistent, and some will not desire their old jobs back. But there will be a huge increment to the potential labor force from the younger men who were not in the labor pool before their induction into the armed service, but who will immediately be seeking work after their discharge. These men must find jobs on their return home if the community is to give them their bare dues, and this in the face of a potential shortage of jobs in the area.

The net result of the foreseeable post-war job conditions will be an increased labor supply and a decreased demand for labor. This, if allowed to stand, would inevitably mean depressed conditions, unemployment, lowered wage standards, a breakdown in business.

This is Chelsea's prospect for the future, unless the community is far-sighted enough to take action now to remedy matters.

Our Last Chance in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, recently there have been a good many articles, editorials, and broadcasts in this country about the so-called crisis in China. Whether realized by their authors or not, they are contributing to a systematic, organized, Nation-wide propaganda campaign to discredit the central government of China and its leaders, especially Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, the Soong family, and those western-educated Chinese who for several decades have influenced China profoundly in our direction.

Some of these attacks have been thoroughly scurrilous, others merely a collection of vicious rumors and cheap gossip. In the most widely circulated column I counted 14 statements that I personally know to be utterly false.

No one denies there is a crisis in China, although it is not much more serious now than it has been for many months, and in some respects is less acute. Many persons familiar with Asia have been warning on every possible occasion since 1937, and especially since Pearl Harbor, that increased internal difficulties were inevitable in China unless we changed some of our apparent policies toward Asia. More than 18 months ago

before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and here on the floor, I tried to describe the urgency of the situation in such words as—

China is in a most critical position—more so than America begins to realize. * * * We have got to make our purposes clear and put them in unmistakable terms or else we shall lose China. * * * No longer is it a question, if it ever was, of whether or not we, out of magnanimity and generosity, are going to help the Chinese. The burning question, from the standpoint of America's own security, is whether the Chinese are going to keep on helping us.

The most important thing for us to realize about the present crisis in China is that it is largely made in America. Chiang Kai-shek is in trouble because he gambled his own destiny and that of his nation on his faith in the western democracies and their promises. There is dissatisfaction with him in some circles in China because the democracies have not yet made good, which properly casts doubt on the wisdom of his decisions. There is one way and only one way to resolve the crisis and restore unity. That is for us to vindicate Chiang's judgment and prove by our performance that he was right in placing his faith in the western democracies instead of, first, going in with Japan and the other colored peoples to make this a race war, or second, going in with the Communists to make it a class war.

Let us think for a moment of the enormous extra cost to America in lives and money if China becomes further divided and weakened, and we have to defeat Japan without her full and most effective cooperation. Does it make sense for us to be joining in a concerted attempt to discredit the one man who more than all others combined has kept China on her feet and in the ring on the same side we are on? Surely this is the time to understand and sympathize with him in his troubles and exert ourselves to the utmost to hold up his hands, not kick him. What has happened to our sense of proportion? We should be profoundly grateful for the remarkable degree of stability and progress China has demonstrated through 7 long years of gruelling torture, rather than complain too bitterly about the admitted imperfections and the long way she still has to go.

A frank and challenging statement by Pearl S. Buck of some of the deeper issues involved appeared in the August issue of Common Sense. I am including it and wish it could be circulated and read as widely as the many untrue stories and misleading reports have been. Her analysis of the situation within China is, I think, thoroughly accurate:

OUR LAST CHANCE IN CHINA

(By Pearl S. Buck)

We have now solidly laid the foundations for future wars in Asia. We have laid them in the two most important countries, China and India; but we have not wholly neglected Russia. Should Russia be dissatisfied with us in the future, a thing always possible, she will find two potential allies, numbering between them most of the world's population. It may be, if industrialization is rapid enough, that Russian leadership will not even be necessary.

For we have laid the foundations of future wars with masterful thoroughness. We have neglected no insults; we have been ruthless in our denials. Under able English direction we have completely scorned India; first, by our silence during the Cripps mission and by our acquiescence in the suppression of human rights to a degree which has not been matched, in its ruthlessness, outside of Fascist-owned Europe; second, by careful and total ignorance about her famine, again under direction, and third, by our recent refusal at Bretton Woods to agree that India has the right to spend her own money as she likes. Scrupulously careful always, we have chimed in and agreed with England that the unfreezing of Indian credits in London can be no part of any international agreement.

This disposes pretty thoroughly of India. For a long time to come she will not believe in us. Our fine ideas and sentiments now ring completely hollow to her. She believed in them before this war. Now she knows better. Like the Atlantic Charter, they do not apply to her.

The foundations have not been so easy to lay in China because that country is not quite in the position of India. But in spite of all difficulty we are succeeding there too in alienating the people and in building up dismay and distrust, ready for the next war. As Walter Lippmann has said, it is now very necessary for us to keep close to Britain. We have followed British policy so faithfully that we have lost our own opportunity in this generation for taking a leading part in the affairs of Asia, perhaps of the world. Britain and Russia will tie for the place of highest power in the peace. In any event, we will come in third.

This has been the result of our own ignorance not only of Asia and the world, but our ignorance of ourselves, our own strength, and the strategic place in which this war put us in the world. With the greatest industrial machine in the world, the greatest army and navy and air force, our diplomacy, always subject to Britain, has now put us into third-rate position among the powers. One feared it with the loss of India as an ally, for no one can call a people as sullen as half-starved slaves an ally; one fears it still more in the deep and increasing anger now rising against us in China. Only fools or the most ignorant of people, God keep us from being either, could ignore this anger. It is easy to speak and feel in arrogant terms in Asia while our troops are successfully invading Europe. But it is folly and ignorance all the same.

We have followed the traditional youthful American pattern in regard to China. First we rushed to idolize and to idealize. Those of us who knew China shuddered and trembled. China deserves honor and respect and our friendship above that of all others, for her people are like ours in their belief in independence and democracy. But no country any more than any individual can stand sentimental idolatry and idealization. Revulsion is sure to come. Those of us who knew China's great qualities as well as her faults tried, for the sake of America, to present a balanced and truthful picture, the picture of a great country, caught unprepared for war but fighting bravely against an invader.

It was impossible to get this picture to the American people quickly enough. The controlled radio networks would not have it. The popular press, newspapers included, with only one or two exceptions, were not interested. The pendulum went on swinging. Young journalists, inexperienced and without historical perspectives, judged a country thousands of years old by young American standards. China began to be condemned. Then condemnation could not proceed swiftly enough. Indeed, it was to the interest of those who were guiding our American foreign policies to encourage this condemnation. It provided reasons for not giving China swifter aid, the reasons, too, for not diverting anything from Europe to Asia. By a series of the same masterly strokes that made it clear to us that the real war was in Europe, not Asia, it has now been made clear, or very nearly clear, to the American people that China does not deserve aid from us because of her internal divisions and corruption. China, like India, must first unify herself, "clean her own house," the ancient phrase has it, before she deserves, etc. The conclusion has a curiously familiar ring about it. It is, in fact, an echo of Britain's policy in India, the policy which has succeeded in planting a new hatred of the entire white race in millions of hearts.

Were the foundations for future wars quite so completely laid in China as in India, one would not take time and energy now to perform so futile a task as to try to destroy them. But it is not too late in China. Thousands of Americans, accustomed to liking and even to trusting the Chinese, are not quite ready to dislike and distrust them. They have accepted England's verdict on India—they ask no questions there. But they are still asking questions about China. While they ask there is hope.

What are these questions?

Is China going Fascist? No, there has never been any real danger of China's going Fascist and there is none now. It is true that China was caught by this war while she was in a transition period between the old empire form of government and a modern democratic form, which would enable her to elect her own government. There is no way by which Chinese can elect a president, for example, therefore it is true that Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is the nonelected head of the Chinese Nation. He has risen as any such leader arises where there is no political machinery for election, by his own ability and by common assent. It still remains true that, whatever his faults, he has been the only man who could have led China during this war, in exactly the same sense that Stalin has been the man of the hour for Russia and Churchill the man of the hour for England, if not for India.

But Chiang Kai-shek is not a Fascist. He is first of all a Chinese, and second of all a soldier. As a Chinese there is something contradictory in this, for the Chinese people have never given their highest honors to soldiers. We of the West have glorified the militarist, but China has not. Chiang Kai-shek knows his own people, and since he has the hope of becoming permanent in Chinese history, it is thoroughly Chinese for him now to wish to be something more than a soldier. His trend today is not toward fascism or even militarism, but toward philosophy and scholarship.

This man has his very real faults, as have all our leaders in this war. He is not a world mind, any more than the others are. He is as passionately Chinese as Churchill is English, and has had the same tendency, only in lesser degree, to arrogance and having his own way. He is, however, a man of the lower middle classes, and not an aristocrat, and he has no feeling of superior class. In this he is more comparable to Stalin than to Churchill. Roosevelt and Churchill are alike, and Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek. Some day an interesting study could be made of the curious similarities between these four men who today rule the world. For in spite of the present fashion in America to sneer at Chiang Kai-shek and to speak of his decreasing influence, let us not be so foolish as to think that his power in China is really decreasing because of what some young American commentators are saying and writing. In the hearts of the Chinese, Chiang Kai-shek remains what he has always been since

he assumed leadership, and the contempt with which he has been treated in Washington throughout this war does not weaken his position in China—rather it strengthens it. Many Chinese who might themselves criticize him more severely are rallying to him because he symbolizes China and when he is insulted China is insulted. This attitude is easy to understand. So would we behave if Roosevelt as President of the United States were belittled abroad.

Can the men around Chiang Kai-shek drive him to fascism? No; for they are not strong enough and the forces of democracy in the Chinese people are too strong. The much-talked-about Tai Li, with his secret service and the undoubted crimes that they have committed in some instances, is no new figure. He has been operating for many years. So have the famous Chen brothers. This is not to minimize these men, but it is to say that they are no new phenomena of the war. Nor are they more dangerous to democracy than some Americans could be in our own country. Such men exist in every nation. They are as heartily hated by many in China as they are here and as ardently supported by those few who share their prejudices.

In short, China is going through the same struggle that we are. She knows it. I have heard intelligent Chinese wonder at us for getting so stirred up over their internal condition when in their eyes our own is far more serious. They have no problem of race discrimination, no such division as there is between the South and the North in the United States.

Can China achieve democracy under Chiang Kai-shek? Yes; for Chiang will not be a decisive force in himself. He is a man of temper and some arrogance and he likes his own way as well as the others of the Big Four do, but he is preeminently a leader of men, not a dictator. He will lead the people to democracy if democracy is what they insist upon, for he will lead them, at all costs. In this he is more like Roosevelt than Stalin.

Will China go Communist? Not if the Chinese people can help it, and they can. Non-Communist Chinese today, those who are liberal as well as those less liberal, are determined that their country shall not be split, especially when one of the parts would owe its allegiance to Russia rather than to China. It is not a question with most Chinese as to whether the Communists are right or wrong or whether Chiang Kai-shek is right or wrong; it is that they will not tolerate two armies, two separate governments, two states; and between the Communist state and the Nationalist state, they feel that at least the Nationalist is Chinese and not linked with a foreign power. They feel that there is some hope of correcting the faults of the Government that is their own and none whatever of correcting the faults of one that is not Chinese.

It should be easy for most Americans to understand the common attitude of the Chinese against communism; it is exactly the same as our own. But the Chinese Communist Party has this advantage: it came into being at a time when China was in the midst of the transition from one form of government to another, and it was able to gather an army and get arms, at first from Russia. Our Communist Party might have done such a thing in our Civil War, had it come into being then.

In short, nothing about China can be understood without understanding the point in history at which China was when the war broke. She needed peace desperately for another decade in order to solidify her people's government. When we consider how dictatorial the powers become in any government during war the wonder is not that the Chinese Government is so dictatorial, but that it is not more so. Certainly Chiang Kai-shek is less dictatorial, generally speaking, in his powers than Roosevelt, Churchill, or Stalin. The Chineses people have not had the time to frame modern democratic laws for their own protection. Yet the Chinese people have exercised and do exercise an enormous mass power. Individuals suffer tyrannies, but the people have always risen against tyrants.

China suffers of course from her inability to propagandize herself. She has not the tradition of propaganda. The Chinese are ashamed to boast and sell themselves. They have always felt that what they did ought to speak for itself. Nor have they the financial resources of England, so that they can pour millions into America for the purposes of propaganda. China cannot buy our brains, or shape our ideas as she likes. She is therefore quite helpless in the face of competition.

This very helplessness and the sense of indignation which accompanies it, indignation at injustice and falsity, is today alienating Chinese whom we ought not to alienate. They are fully aware of much hardship endured at our hands which they have not, out of courtesy, wanted to mention. This courtesy is traditional and they cannot bring themselves to break it down, in spite of their own desperate need. But I might list here, for our information, certain things which no Chineses is able to forget, especially now when it has become fashionable to find fault with China.

Long before the loss of the Philippines, the East Indies, Malaya, and Burma, Chinese foresaw exactly what might happen and did happen and they offered to send aid especially to the Indies and later to Burma. The first offer was declined the second neglected until too late.

The Burma Road, China's own road built at heart-break cost in Chinese lives and a pace which western engineers said was impossible, was lost. A blockade so severe that few Americans even yet have any conception of what it has meant to China was the result. Chinese know that there was much corruption connected with the Burma Road traffic. They would have been glad to eliminate it but they were fighting a war. With the corruption now going on in great cartels in the West even among our own people the less said about the corruption on the Burma Road among truck drivers and local officials the better perhaps. At least the principles of incorruptibility should be applied everywhere alike.

The blockade of China meant first a terrible inflation; second, no more war materials. President Roosevelt's sad jocularity only shocked the Chinese people when he said that more was being flown over the Himalayas than had ever gone over the Burma Road. We had never sent very much over the Burma Road.

The attitude of our American military men in China, with a few noble exceptions, has been insulting and arrogant toward the Chinese, or so the Chinese have felt. It may be only a difference in habits of courtesy but the Chinese have felt, almost without exception, that the Americans have come over as foreigners, have tended to discount everything that the Chinese have done, have overlooked the facts of Chinese inflation and blockade, circumstances for which the Chinese do not feel themselves responsible, have not considered that Chinese armies have fought without the heavy weapons and the modern equipment for which they hoped. The Americans, the Chinese say, tend to want to shove them aside and do everything in their own way, ignoring the experience China has gained in holding the Japanese for 7 years.

China has benefited little from lend-lease because of the blockade. The two Liberty ships given her have been almost useless. But China has had to feed an increasing number of American soldiers on her soil in payment for lend-lease. Aside from such payment, the very providing of the food has been a heavy burden. An egg in China today costs $3. Yet they reckon that every American man must be allowed six eggs a day, including those in the desserts which he demands. The Chinese have never been a heavy beef-eating people but our men must have an average of a pound and a half of beef alone every day. There are no beef cattle in China as such. The result is that cattle used for farm labor have had to be requisitioned to the final dismay of the people. The governors of provinces where American men are stationed have sent in protests to Chungking, asking how the land is to be plowed. But Chungking is trying to carry on.

The Chinese were given to understand by Washington they thought direct from President Roosevelt that the vast and extensive airfields in inner China which they have prepared for the use of our Air Force would be paid for. Millions of laborers have had to be paid and fed somehow. To date no money has come from America for this.

The Chinese were not prepared for the youthful irrepressibility of American young men nor were they prepared for their tendencies to get drunk often and thoroughly nor for their general behavior toward women. "We did not know how young you were" has been their polite Chinese way of expressing it publicly.

But why continue the list? It is a long one and something can be said on the other side as the Chinese are quick to see for themselves. "We know we have no electric shadows (movies) no jumping-places (dance halls) not soft ice-cream parlors (soda fountains) and so we are very dull for your soldiers to our many sorrows" one Chinese put it to me nicely not long ago.

Added to all else now is the heap of rash criticism which magazines and newspaper writers are hastening to put out as the latest thing on China. Where is our much-vaunted friendship for China that we accept this sort of thing so easily with so little search for the truth? Most of all where is our practical common sense that we do not see the danger to ourselves of alienating China from us as we fall into the well-oiled traps of propaganda for continuing the white mans' rule in Asia?

The great division between England and ourselves in Asia is that we have until now wanted a strong China and a weak Japan whereas England wants a weak China and inevitably a strong Japan.

But why not be American?

Ancient Technique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dayton Daily News:

ANCIENT TECHNIQUE

As a prosecutor of criminals Governor Dewey is familiar, of course, with the ancient technique of the hard-pressed thief. To divert attention from himself he dashes after some innocent man crying to the crowd, "stop, thief."

President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull were begging for international cooperation, open to all nations of good will, far back in the days when Thomas Dewey was saying, as he said in a speech in Milwaukee, center of isolationism, in 1940:

"We know we cannot possibly remain strong and free unless we reject every entanglement in the affairs of Europe."

That old isolationism is embarrassing in these days when the dullest mind can perceive that it was such isolationism which, first, brought on the present war and, second, opposed and delayed the efforts to be ready for the war when it came. The politician caught in such a fix has but one recourse, to attack someone else for his own offense, hoping in the ensuing confusion to make his own escape. The trick works if the people are sufficiently gullible.

In this case the trick is so obvious as to be comical. It still looks as if the coming political campaign would be comic opera, not tragedy, as the prophets have feared it might be.

Votes by Hon. Elmer Thomas, of Oklahoma, on Major Bills and Other Measures Relating to Agriculture, Labor, and National Defense, and on Vetoed Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tabulation of votes cast by me on major bills, resolutions, and amendments with respect to agriculture, labor, and national defense, and on vetoed bills.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE—H. R. 3835—FARM RELIEF BILL TO INCREASE AGRICULTURAL PURCHASING POWER

Provided for direct agricultural relief by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to force increased farm prices either through allocating production or through leasing of land for the purpose of withdrawing it from production.

Arranged for farm-mortgage relief by granting authorization for the refinancing of farm mortgages at 4½ percent interest through the issuance of not more than $2,000,000,000 in Government bonds, the interest of which—but not the principal—would be guaranteed by the Government.

Authorized the President (in the so-called Thomas amendment) to devalue the gold content of the dollar as much as 50 percent and, for 6 months from the passage of the act, to accept up to $200,000,000 of silver at a price not exceeding 50 cents an ounce in payment for war debts due from any foreign government to the United States.

[NOTE.—When this act was approved most farm prices were the lowest on record. Under the act the gold dollar was revalued. Silver certificates were expanded and additional money was placed in circulation. The effects of this act were twofold: First, a general rise in farm prices, increasing agricultural income by billions of dollars; and, second, through the devaluation of the gold dollar a profit was made for the Treasury of over $2,800,000,000.)

On passage of bill Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (April 28, 1933, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2562).

SOIL CONSERVATION AND PARITY PROGRAM—H. R. 8505

Vote on the conference report on H. R. 8505, to provide for the conservation of natural soil resources and to provide an adequate and balanced flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (February 14, 1938, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1881).

SOIL CONSERVATION

Vote on the passage of the bill to make further provision for the conservation and proper utilization of the soil resources of the Nation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (February 15, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2165).

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—S. 2255

Vote on the passage of the bill to establish a policy with respect to the disposition of agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (February 25, 1942, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1624).

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL—H. R. 2481

Vote on the committee amendment proposing to authorize the expenditure of $400,000,000 instead of $300,000,000, as proposed by the House, for Soil Conservation and the Domestic Allotment Act. (The so-called benefits payment under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.)

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (June 8, 1943, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5474).

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL—H. R. 2481

Vote on the committee amendment to the agricultural appropriations bill making appropriations for loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (June 10, 1943, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5641).

CONTINUANCE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—H. R. 3477

Vote on the passage of the bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (February 11, 1944, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1624).

FARM LABOR—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96

Vote on the conference report making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (April 16, 1943, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3467).

PRICE CONTROL—H. R. 5990

Vote on the amendment of Senator O'MAHONEY as modified, to the committee amendment, providing for a parity price on agricultural commodities.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (January 10, 1942, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 230).

PRICE CONTROL—H. R. 5990

Vote on the amendment of Senator BANKHEAD to the committee amendment, providing that no action shall be taken under this act by the Administrator with respect to any agricultural commodity without the prior approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (January 9, 1942, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 189).

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT OF 1942—SUBSIDIES—S. 1764

Vote on the committee amendment providing that after June 30, 1945, neither the Price Administrator nor the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor any other Government corporation shall make subsidy payments unless the money required for such subsidy has been appropriated by Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (June 5, 1944, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5300).

SUPPLEMENTAL PRICE CONTROL—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 161

Vote on the amendment of Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma proposing that parity prices and comparable prices for any agricultural commodity shall be determined as authorized by existing law but shall also include all farm labor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (September 29, 1942, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7594).

NEUTRALITY ACT OF 1939—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 306

Vote on the passage of the joint resolution to preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (October 27, 1939, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1024).

NATIONAL DEFENSE—H. R. 3791

Vote on the passage of the bill to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939, to the Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (March 7, 1939, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2371).

NATIONAL DEFENSE—H. R. 3791

Vote on the committee amendment to increase the number of airplanes from 5,500 to 6,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (March 6, 1939, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2285).

NATIONAL DEFENSE—H. R. 9850

Vote on the passage of the bill to expedite the strengthening of the national defense.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (June 11, 1940, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7935).

PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD—H. R. 6446

Repeal of congressional retirement pay: Vote on the amendment offered by Senator BYRD, to the committee amendment, for himself, Senator BURTON, Senator BAILEY, and Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, providing that the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, shall not apply to any elective officer.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (February 19, 1942, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1468).

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—S. 763

Vote on the passage of the bill exempting certain married men who have children, from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (October 6, 1943, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8155).

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—S. 1285

Vote on the conference report of the bill to provide a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (March 14, 1944, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2573).

NATIONAL DEFENSE—DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE—S. 729

Vote on the passage of the bill, S. 729, providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (March 17, 1943, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2129).

SECOND WAR POWERS ACT, 1942—FREE POSTAGE FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL—S. 2208

Vote on the amendment offered by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado for himself and Senator MCKELLAR, as modified, providing that any first-class-letter mail matter which is sent by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States (including the U. S. Coast Guard) while on active duty or in the active military or naval service of the United States, to any person in the United States, including the Territories and possessions thereof, shall be transmitted in the mails free of postage, subject to such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (January 28, 1942, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 778).

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION—H. R. 9995

Vote on the committee amendment increasing the appropriation for the Ordnance Department from $32,232,034 to $43,038,259.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (April 6, 1938, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4851).

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION—H. R. 9995

Vote on the committee amendment increasing the appropriation for the procurement or production of ordance matériel, machinery, and supplies from $2,900,000 to $12,900,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (April 6, 1938, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4851).

ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Vote on the passage of the bill to provide for the immediate payment of the World War adjusted certificates, for the cancelation of unpaid interest accrued on loans secured by such certificates, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (January 20, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 703).

PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD—H. R. 6446

Vote on the amendment of Senator DOWNEY, proposing to reduce the pension-age limit from 65 to 60 and to increase the amount contributed by the Federal Government for old-age assistance to $30 per month, without the necessity of matching by the State.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (February 19, 1942. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1479).

SOCIAL SECURITY

Vote on the passage of the bill (H. R. 7260) providing for old-age assistance and unemployment insurance.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (June 19, 1935, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9650).

WAGES AND HOURS FAIR LABOR STANDARDS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—S. 2475

Vote on the passage of S. 2475 providing for the establishment of fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (July 31, 1937, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7957).

RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

Vote on the passage of the bill (H. R. 8651) to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act (H. R. 8651 substituted for S. 3151).

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (August 19, 1935, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 13655).

INCREASE IN PAY FOR CERTAIN RAILWAY EMPLOYEES—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 91

Vote on the passage of the resolution to increase the pay of certain railway employees, declaring that the agreement made in Washington on August 7, 1943, by and between the carriers and railway labor organizations is in accord with the requirements of the Railway Labor Act.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (December 9, 1943, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10526).

RAILWAY LABOR ACT—S. 3266

Vote on motion of Senator DILL that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3266), to amend the Railway Labor Act approved May 20, 1926, to provide for the prompt disposition of disputes between carriers and their employees.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (June 13, 1934, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 12369).

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES

Vote on the passage of the bill (S. 1958) to promote equality of bargaining power between employers and employees, to diminish the causes of labor disputes, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (May 16, 1935, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7681).

OPPRESSIVE LABOR PRACTICES BILL—S. 1970

Vote on the passage of S. 1970, prohibiting certain oppressive labor practices against employees by employers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or producing goods for such commerce, and empowering the Secretary of Labor to invoke court action in restraint of such practices. Employment is prohibited of Communists or members of any Nazi Bund organization, or of aliens in excess of 10 percent of the total number of employees, aliens so employed are not to receive in excess of 10 percent of the total pay roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (May 27, 1940, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6904).

LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY—H. R. 2935

Vote on the amendment of Senator TRUMAN providing for the extension of the activities of the National Youth Administration until June 30, 1944.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (June 28, 1943, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6637).

WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT—S. 796

Vote on the passage of the bill, S. 796, relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (May 5, 1943, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3993).

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT OF 1942—PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE PRICE OF OIL—S. 1764

Vote on the amendment of Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma proposing that notwithstanding the provisions of law, no agent, bureau, or department of Government shall be authorized to fix, establish, or maintain any price ceiling on crude petroleum below 90 percent of the parity price per barrel; that the Director of the Office of Price Administration shall proceed immediately to adjust the ceiling price per barrel for such crude petroleum in the various grades and the refined products thereof and derivatives therefrom in harmony with the provisions of this paragraph.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (June 9, 1944, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5637).

THE POLL TAX BILL—H. R. 1024

Vote on the motion of Senator BARKLEY for cloture to close debate upon the bill, H. R. 1024.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (November 23, 1942, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9065).

POST-WAR PEACE—SENATE RESOLUTION 192

Vote on the resolution, as modified, declaring the war and peace aims of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (November 5, 1943, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9222).

REGULATION OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES—H. R. 6772

Vote on the passage of the bill to amend the Grain Futures Act to prevent and remove obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in grains and other commodities by regulating transactions therein on commodity futures exchanges, to limit or abolish short selling, to curb manipulation, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (May 29, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8293).

VOTES TO PASS BILLS OVER PRESIDENTIAL VETOES

BILL PROVIDING CERTAIN BENEFITS FOR VETERANS—H. R. 6663

A bill making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus.

Bill passed over Presidential veto.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (March 28, 1934, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5606).

SOLDIERS' BONUS BILL—H. R. 9870

A bill to provide for the immediate payment of World War No. 1 adjusted-service certificates, for the cancelation of unpaid interest accrued on loans secured by such certificates, and for other purposes.

Bill passed over Presidential veto.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (January 27, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1015).

RENEWAL OF GOVERNMENT TERM POLICIES—H. R. 5478

A bill to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period.

Bill passed over Presidential veto.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (June 1, 1937, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5146).

EXTENSION OF REDUCED RATE ON FEDERAL LAND-BANK LOANS—H. R. 6763

A bill to extend for 1 additional year the 3½-percent-interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans.

Bill passed over Presidential veto.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (July 22, 1937, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7374).

PHILIPPINE TRAVEL-PAY BILL—H. R. 289

A bill for the relief of officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States mustered into service for the War with Spain and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the Treaty of Peace, April 11, 1899.

Bill passed over Presidential veto.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (May 2, 1940, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5383).

ALTERATION OF CERTAIN BRIDGES OVER NAVIGABLE WATERS—H. R. 9381

A bill to provide for the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters of the United States.

Bill passed over Presidential veto.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "nay" (June 21, 1940, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8789).

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—S. 796

A bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war.

Bill passed over Presidential veto.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma voted "aye" (June 25, 1943, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6489).

Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD chapter XI, entitled "Full Employment," from the book Challenge to Freedom, written by Henry M. Wriston.

I have obtained an estimate from the Public Printer, who advises that the cost of publishing this article will be $124.80, which slightly exceeds the amount under the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing, but, regardless of this fact, I ask unanimous consent that this article may be published notwithstanding the rule.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER XI. FULL EMPLOYMENT

No post-war objective is mentioned more frequently than full employment. Every official statement on the subject seems to regard it as an absolute essential. For example, the President said on January 7, 1943: "The people at home and the people at the front—men and women—are wondering about the third freedom—freedom from want. To them it means that when they are mustered out, when war production is converted to the economy of peace, they will have the right to expect full employment—for themselves and for all able-bodied men and women in America who want to work."

This concept deserves far more analysis, as a primary objective, than it has yet had. The London Economist has pointed up the issue very sharply: "For if one thing has been made abundantly clear, it is that the mass of people in every country rate full employment, and the individual security it brings, higher than almost any political object. If liberal democracy is not compatible with full employment then it is liberal democracy that will go."

Within the scope of the alternative mentioned, no statement could be more lucid; the choice is defined with a blunt candor that leaves nothing to be desired. There is, however, a second alternative that is implied, but slurred over, if not concealed. If liberal democracy should go, what would take its place? Politics abhors a vacuum, so some other system of government would replace democracy. The real alternative, therefore, in this deceptively clear analysis, is between democracy and free enterprise on the one hand and totalitarianism and a managed economy on the other.

That is an issue which had best be faced. Yet it is seldom drawn into the clear light of day. In over-high-lighting economic security, political consequences are cast into a deep shadow, and virtually hidden. Even in high quarters freedom from want is stressed with no parallel emphasis upon the political freedoms to which the Bill of Rights gave such clear priority. Perhaps that is why it is currently suggested that Bill-of-Rights democracy has been "overemphasized." Language has been used which seemed to interpret freedom merely as more nourishment, better clothing and housing for the "underprivileged third," with very little accent upon the intangibles. Indeed, it has been boldly said by Vice President WALLACE that freedom could have no meaning to a hungry man: "Men and women cannot be really free until they have plenty to eat."

If a balanced diet is the indispensable preamble to liberty, the Pilgrims must have been wrong after all, for they fled from plenty to scarcity in order to secure freedom. Sentimental materialism makes mockery of all the heroes whose lives have shown the falsity of its assumption. It neglects utterly the contemporary heroism of the Chinese, who would rather abandon home and trek to western China, enduring terrible hardships, than be fed and submissive in Japan's shoddy "co-prosperity sphere."

Freedom from want is a good thing under certain circumstances—to wit, if it is earned, if it does not lead to stagnancy, if it does not deliver man into bondage. Those "ifs" are important; they are not mere rhetoric. Because of their vital importance, no great civilization ever did or ever can make full employment its predominant objective. To do so is to put the accent on material goods rather than virtue. If we encourage men to desire things before all else, they will soon discover that things do not bring the good life. No authentic prophet ever made so crass a preachment. If it is accepted now as a war aim, all hope of peace should be abandoned.

Mass unemployment constitutes an economic and social problem of great importance. It must, and can, be met. By developing mobility of skills to match technological change, by insurance payments during the change-over, by many other means the harsh impact of technological progress and cyclical sags can be cushioned. Those adjustments can and must be made. But to lurch to the utter extreme of "full employment" is not to make a realistic attack upon a serious issue; it misstates the problem in such terms that it becomes insoluble without destroying both free enterprise and democracy. We can make progress toward better situations only by more careful definitions of critical issues, not by escapist slogans that are certain to destroy the very institutions we profess to defend.

It is clear that full employment can be achieved—at a price. Mussolini proved it. Men were added to the Government pay roll as bureaucrats, fighters, munitions workers, land reclaimers—and the list may be extended indefinitely. It produced an unbalanced budget; the deficits would gratify the most ardent advocate of deficit spending. The monetary system became distorted and artificial. The "rotting carcass" of liberty was trodden underfoot; there was no overemphasis upon any bill of rights. The individual was swallowed up into the state. And the standard of living fell.

Hitler achieved full employment. In doing so he marched his nation down the same broad road. The Army and Navy grew; all the forms of industrialism which their needs stimulated were made to boom. Work camps were established under the guise of training. Thousands went to prisons—to security, since there one is assured of housing, clothing, food, and leisure. Other thousands went to concentration camps—or the security of the grave. Rugged individualism was no longer an evil; all individualism was submerged in statism. Neither labor nor learning knew freedom; the church was enchained. German money became one of the wonders of the world, a miracle in levitation. Under full employment guns were put before butter—the standard of living fell.

As for America, John Maynard Keynes, the chief exponent of political manipulation of the economy to produce full employment, insisted that deficit spending failed to produce the desired result because the spending was upon too niggardly a scale. Less than 6 months before Pearl Harbor he said, "It is, it seems, politically impossible for a capitalistic democracy to organize expenditure on the scale necessary to make the grand experiment which would prove my case—except in war conditions." War came and the "grand experiment" had its demonstration, proving what was known all along, namely that full employment is possible, at a price. But the price is the restriction of liberty and a lower standard of living. We accept those consequences in order to win the war. Do we want them permanently?

Before we accept full employment as the panacea for the ills of our economic and social order, there are questions which must be answered satisfactorily. One must ask, Full employment for what? There was full employment when the pyramids were built under the lash of the Pharaohs, but piling stone on stone for a nonproductive memorial meant no rise in the standard of living; such a result would be a contradiction in terms. Even full employment in the construction of a modern industrial city may bring a lowered standard of living. It is quite possible that under conditions of full employment nearly as many people lost their lives as a consequence of over investment and under consumption during the reconstruction of Stalingrad as a modern industrial city as lost their lives in the battles which reduced it to a heap of rubble. The builders worked in the belief that they were starving to greatness. But when the industrial plant had been completed the standard of living of many of the Russian common people had deteriorated even in comparison with the unsatisfactory economic life under the czars.

One must ask, full employment by whom? All the prescriptions for full employment ultimately end in public ownership. Indeed that is the upshot of the grand experiment, though its exponents shrink from making the point clear. If men work only for the state, liberty is gone, because the right to strike is destroyed, the right to change employers is lost, the right of initiative is impaired, and the fruitful consequences of one's labor do not return many fold. The W. P. A. workers were sternly reminded by the President that they could not strike against the Government. The employees of the city-acquired subways in New York discovered that the loss of the right to strike was part of the price of public ownership. The more public ownership expands, the more restricted the rights of labor become; if full employment is the duty of the state, the rights of labor are doomed.

Full employment by the intervention of political power is based upon defeatist assumptions about our economy. So the state must subsidize consumption, a long road indeed, and one which even bold social engineers hesitate to follow. As an alternative the state must invest in less and less productive enterprises. The political consequences are as disastrous as the economic. The Economist admits the dangers, which have already been exemplified in many nations: "Large-scale state financing of investment involves the stability of the monetary system; and a gradual spreading of state control, by way of capital investment, into every corner of the economic system puts the whole community at the mercy of any political adventurer who can capture the political machine." That means dictatorship. The descent to hell still appears to be easy.

In the third place, one must ask, full employment at what cost? It cannot be at the cost of keeping obsolete businesses or obsolete occupations or obsolete communities alive. No economy can support those burdens, and political magic is potent only for a brief period. Yet that was exactly the philosophy of full employment expressed by a resolution of a labor group in Oregon, which asserted it did not "believe in closing factories simply because they cannot be operated at lucrative profits."

Depressions weed out the weak, the inefficient, the submarginal producer. Sometimes the weeding seems cruel and haphazard, but weeding there must be; so far no

gentle method of condemning obsolescent industry to death has been found. Competition is the best method yet discovered; it is at once the greatest stimulus to efficiency and the most effective eliminator of the unfit. It is the best road to lower costs and more goods for consumption. Public ownership is the poorest instrument for weeding out obsolete plants, industries, and skills, for political pressure resists economic law. That is why without competition we shall have, as one of the most persuasive exponents of managed economy has admitted, "full employment at the cost of progress, full employment at the present unsatisfactory standard of living, full employment at the expense of welfare." These questions regarding the real meaning of full employment reveal very clearly that we are being offered a false goal. Full employment is a glittering phrase; indeed it glitters so brightly that its precise outline is difficult to define. Only under conditions of war does it actually mean what the words imply; then and then only do we try to employ youth and even children, as the Government is now urging the schools to send their children into the fields. Under war conditions alone do we seek to induce women to leave the home for the factory. Only under such tremendous stress do we call back those who have retired and urge them again to pick up the load. All these facts indicate that full employment is a political slogan rather than an economic or social program, unless we want war as our normal mode of life.

We have complete evidence that the phrase is a misnomer in the fact that its strongest advocates argue vigorously for unemployment insurance. Such forms of insurance are essential, but assuredly they would be needless if political methods could really achieve full employment. The validity of the plea for insurance lies precisely in the fact that some unemployment is unavoidable. The object of insurance is to hedge that risk. If political methods could abolish the risk, there would be no need for the hedge.

When we come to examine full employment carefully, we observe that there are people whom, on grounds of humanity, we do not wish to employ. There are the very young and the very old; how young is a matter of judgment and degree, and how old is in like manner a matter of judgment and degree. Opinion has varied greatly on these points in the past and will continue to vary in the future. Those people we do not want to employ, partly for humanitarian reasons, but also—and this must not be overlooked—for reasons of efficiency.

There are other groups whom, on grounds of efficiency alone, we do not wish to employ; the insane, the morons, the hopelessly inefficient. These we do not bar from employment for humane reasons; they must be supplied with occupations in any event as a means of therapy or just to pass the time. They are barred from employment upon the sound ground that they do not produce enough to pay the cost.

If one is thinking of producing wealth for public use, if he is looking to the welfare of society, he must consider capacity and aptitude, skill and training, industry and character, disposition and temperament, since all those qualities markedly affect the costs of production. But once that is admitted, the whole foundation for so-called full employment is gone, because it shows that the objective is production, the creation of wealth. Once it is conceded that the cost of the labor relative to its product must be brought into the picture, a different criterion has been established.

If the costs of government in the social-service state are to be borne, if the common man is to have larger wealth in usable goods, production must gain in efficiency. There is no other source of either the necessary taxes or the necessary goods. The world is familiar with more efficient tools—with the technological changes which permit an increase in product relative to investment. Equally important is more efficient work, an increase in product relative to labor; if it were not so, there could never be great advances in wages, hours could never be shortened without depriving the mass of mankind not only of comforts and conveniences but also of necessities.

In a world where too many lack necessities, and where the use of comforts and conveniences is indefinitely expansible, any effort, on behalf of "full employment," to reverse this progress toward efficiency in the use both of machines and of labor is hostile to the welfare of society. Technological change produces its own problems—especially the problem of retraining workers drawn from obsolete jobs, insuring their subsistence in the interim, and relocating them. But there is no solution in human affairs that offers escape from every problem. The impoverishment of all by blocking efficiency in the interest of stagnant stability would be a false security indeed. It would create many additional problems, and puzzles far more difficult of solution.

From still another point of view, full employment is a political fantasy rather than an economic or social goal. It assumes or requires impossible conditions. To achieve full employment it would be necessary to have demand for an industry and within an industry distributed in the precise pattern of the labor available for that industry. For example, there would have to be exactly the right amount of demand for machine tools to occupy all the machinists. That has never happened. In a world as complex as ours, it never could happen except as a momentary accident; certainly it could not be "planned that way." There is an alternative possibility, also incredible, that the skills of each individual worker would be so various that he could fit immediately into any one of a number of trades, occupations, or jobs. Because both alternatives are impossible we have simultaneous surpluses and shortages of labor. They exist right now, even with the exigent demands of war.

Geographically the pattern necessary for full employment is yet more complicated. Demand must be regionally distributed in the same pattern as the workers; again, that has never happened except by accident. The only alternative involves grave hardship, which full employment is supposed to banish: the skilled worker must become a perpetual migrant and create the kind of housing problem that now bedevils some war-production centers. The failure to achieve these incredibles is a further explanation of the fact that even today, in the midst of great demand, there is unemployment side by side with labor scarcity. The latest report of the Social Security Board reveals that 3,000,000 men and women drew some unemployment benefits, and in even this year of mounting industrial activity nearly 32,000,000 weeks of unemployment were compensated.

No peace economy could hope to fulfill all the requirements of so unreal a political slogan as full employment. To promise what cannot be performed is to invite discontent and pyramid troubles upon tomorrow. Having suffered the profound disillusionment of grandiose hopes for a new world after the last war, the Nation was plunged into cynicism and escapism. We should have learned from that bitter experience to promise attainable goals. The promise of more assures harsh reaction.

It becomes clear, therefore, that full employment is not the answer to the world's problem. Even when approximated, it brings other troubles in its train. Under present conditions there is a tremendous outcry against absenteeism, which is thought to be a new development. It is, however, an inherent characteristic of full employment. There are many people whose desires for relaxation and change are of a character that unfits them for immediate effort thereafter. Under conditions of full employment they naturally gratify those desires and absenteeism is the consequence.

When the pressure of employment is so great that it is necessary to take those low in the scale of capacity, aptitude, ambition, and energy, there is bound to be an increase in absenteeism. Others, who in periods of slack employment hesitate to take a day off when they do not feel well, are free to take better care of themselves; even if their ills are imaginary, they cause absenteeism nonetheless. We should strive toward high employment. That still leaves a stimulus to effort. But to guarantee full employment is to encourage irresponsibility; it removes any incentive to effort by transferring responsibility from the individual to the state.

Labor turn-over is a second characteristic of full employment which reduces efficiency. Like absenteeism, it is not essentially a war-time development but merely a normal concomitant of full employment. When every man is guaranteed a job, he can leave his task for any trivial reason because another is assured—perhaps a better one. The incentive to stay on the job is removed. Back in the boom days this same tendency to very heavy turn-over was manifested. Indeed the figures are astonishing.

Moreover, if we insist upon full employment even though economically costly and if, on the same humanitarian basis, we seek to provide for every contingency of every citizen—"assurance that will extend from the cradle to the grave," we may be certain that collateral troubles like absenteeism and turnover will be progressively heightened. Without hazards, there is no encouragement to caution or industry or thrift.

As we pile up burdens for industry to carry, it may be that the effort to employ everybody will increase the costs of production so greatly as to make the economy of the Nation less viable in the world market. That would mean a return to isolationism, to another sacrifice of international cooperation for a "sound internal economic system." It would mean that we had learned nothing whatever from two world wars in one generation. That would make full employment still more burdensome domestically, and result in a lowered standard of living rather than in the promised economic security. Then political security would be a farce. The program would be merely a prelude to a Third World War.

Full employment, like everything else which belongs in a secondary position, misleads us if we put it in the first place. As one of the British labor leaders, Herbert Morrison, has expressed it: "We cannot rouse ourselves and others to the heights of achievement with the slogan of minimum subsistence for all. We have got to provide it, but not regard it as an end in itself. If we make it our ideal and let it hypnotize us, not only shall we relapse into fatty degeneration of the spirit but we shall find that, by one means or another, we have lost even the security at which we aimed so exclusively." Full employment as a goal, therefore, is illusory. It lures people into the grip of the state, and they lose more than they gain; flypaper is honey sweet but it is deadly.

Full employment contains an essential incoherence which cannot be corrected. The right to a job is an individual right; it cannot be otherwise, for the job is assigned to a man, not to society. But the obligation to supply that job, under the presuppositions of this modern slogan, is a responsibility of society. Rights and duties belong together; if they are separated, chaos ensues. If responsibilities are assigned to society, then the rights of individuals inevitably wither away. That is why, when the emphasis takes this current twist, the Bill of Rights seems to have been overemphasized along with political democracy.

As a primary goal full employment is self-defeating. It starts as a manifestation of sentimental humanitarianism. In seeking to escape the realities of the world, it sacrifices human liberty for a false promise of material benefits. No country has ever achieved it by political intervention without going totalitarian and becoming warlike. Even then its success is transitory. The longest periods of relatively full employment in any nation have been under an expanding free economy. As a byproduct of ingenuity, skill, industry, thrift, courage, and faith, it becomes a rich dividend. When it is undertaken as a political program, it brings with it evils which, when experienced, are seen to be even worse than recurring periods of partial employment. It is likely, on the material side, to lower the standard of living, and on the spiritual side to destroy initiative and impair the spirit of freedom.

As full employment is a false goal economically, so also it is deficient from a psychological point of view. The men in the armed forces want something more than a job when they return to civilian life. President Roosevelt touched the point in one short sentence in his message of January 7, 1943: "They are eager to face the risks inherent in our system of free enterprise." The men want opportunity. They do not want, all of them, to be employees. They want to set up their own businesses; they want the adventure of creating something new, distinctively their own. Jobs and job security will not satisfy them, nor should they be content with such limited aims.

If they save our liberties by hazarding life they have a right to expect Government to restore the conditions of free enterprise. They have a right to tax laws that are not punitive in temper; they have a right to see bureaucratic red tape reduced, questionnaires restricted, regulations simplified. All the nagging, petty, and wearisome manifestations of the itch to meddle in legitimate business need to be curbed. Government must lay aside the fallacy of the "mature economy"; it must recover faith in the infinite potentialities of invention, development, and progress. Then its function again will be "not to interfere but to assist in the development of industry."

This idea was well expressed in the final report of T. N. E. C.: "The objective of Government should be to foster and stimulate free enterprise rather than to supersede it. In other words, democracy's task is to take those precautions which will keep both business and Government democratic. On the broad scale, therefore, this committee recommends the maintenance of free, competitive enterprise by the effective suppression of the restrictive practices which have always been recognized as evil. * * * If the opportunity for the employment of idle men and idle money is to be found in a free, private enterprise system then, obviously, we must find the way to stimulate that enterprise by encouraging the investment of private savings in new private enterprise."

Appraisement of the Chicago Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Appraisement of the Chicago Convention," delivered by the Honorable Josephus Daniels, of Raleigh, N. C., to the Kiwanis Club of Raleigh, on August 18, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Enough time has elapsed since the Chicago convention to permit a just appraisement. As the delegates gathered the barometer registered "hot and warmer" and the weather clerk asked what was in store answered: "Look out for squalls." There were evidences of Texas "northerns," tropical storms from the Gulf via Louisiana and Mississippi—portents of rough political weather. At Charleston Harbor storm signals were displayed. There were dark clouds from Harlem, cold breezes from northern big cities, blasts from farm belts due to remembrance of low prices, bugs and worms, political, that destroyed prosperity prior to 1933, pelting rain from C. I. O. politicians, typhoons from reactionaries, and like downpours from other sources, not to speak of the cyclonic hailstones from the Chicago isolationist press. A fog was reported off the New England coast from Buzzards Bay to Campobello. Delegates were told to look out for "bolts from the blue" as dissatisfied Democrats were preparing to march over to the Republican tent.

Such were the forecasts in the days before the notable deliverances by Governor Kerr and Senator JACKSON called the Democrats back to first principles, the platform with the spirit of Jefferson and Wilson lifted Democrats to the heights, the great message of President Roosevelt summoned the Democratic Party to the tragic unfinished task of organizing a warless world after winning the war, and the nomination of a true liberal for Vice President. The wind storms cleared the atmosphere. Unity and determination not to lose the war or jeopardize the peace marked the end of a convention animated by the old-time Democratic devotion to the four freedoms and a determination to save the Republic from another Harding-Coolidge-Hoover collapse. There were no minority reports, no bolting, no division, no defeatism. The Cassandras were routed. The predicted cloud storms lifted and the sun of promise shone as the cooling breezes from Lake Michigan drove away the dire prediction of squalls that had appeared on the horizon. The militant Democracy, in heart to heart exchanges, found their differences were very small and their agreements so great that with a world on fire they heeded the command: "Close ranks and attack the foe."

The outstanding lesson taught at the Chicago convention was that the national Democracy cannot be bludgeoned by threats from any quarter. By its every action it refused to let any group issue orders, write its platform, or name its candidates. That stand in Chicago and for all time is notice to one and all that the National Democratic Party cannot be driven in any direction by any special classes. By its acts it proclaimed that today, as in its past and for the future, Democracy stands free and is true to its mission to do equal and exact justice to all Americans. Some—a minority—in the deep South rendered a disservice to the South, when they gave notice of a bolt unless all their demands were granted; some Negroes from the North, who had quit the Republican Party because it had fed them nothing but sweet wind for 50 years, threatened a return to the husks they had fed upon in the Republican Party if all the planks they presented were not incorporated in the platform; some women conditioned their support upon acceptance of particular planks they presented; some reactionaries suggested going over to the Republican Party if the Democratic Party remained militantly liberal; some bosses of great cities declared they could not pile up a great majority if their advice went unheeded. These and others thought to stampede the convention to their particular pattern.

The constitutional right of petition was guaranteed to any and all who wished to be heard. It was the best evidence of democracy at work seen in our Republic. All were heard and their views received consideration. However, no section, no class, no race, no faction, dictated the platform or the candidates. Those who came, threatening to bolt or to sabotage the ticket unless their peculiar views were accepted, thought better of it and remained to accept the arbitrament of brothers of a common faith.

Some of the violent, impotent threats irritated, as for example, the declaration printed in all the papers that an ultimatum had gone out from one or more organized bodies, but not truly representative of their membership, that no southern man should be nominated for Vice President. What was the answer of the convention to that blatant declaration? The convention gave the nomination of Vice President to a southern Senator whose father was a Confederate soldier.

The impression has gone abroad that the South was discriminated against in the home of its fathers. If no southerner living east of the Mississippi had a chance of nomination for Vice President, it should be remembered that these States had so many candidates that none received more than a handful of votes. Our own North Carolina candidate lost nothing by the silly ukase that the convention ought not to nominate a southerner. There was no objection to Broughton on any ground and his record as Governor and eloquent defender of the faith made him an ideal candidate. However, he got no vote other than from his own State, except part of South Carolina on one ballot. That was not due to hostility to a southern candidate, seeing the son of a Confederate soldier was made the nominee. The same division in the South gave even a smaller vote to most of the numerous candidates from the South. And why? It was not because the convention as a whole had any sectional bias. It was entirely due to the fact that there was only one contest in the convention—and that was over the Vice Presidency, and it has no sectional appeal.

It would not have been a Democratic convention if there had not been at least one real scrap. Republicans take orders from bosses in a smoke-filled room. Not so Democrats. If, as sometimes happens, bosses seek to dictate a nomination they find that if they win at all they know they have been in a fight, and if victory come their way the minority is bloody but unbowed.

Before the convention was called to order it became apparent that a battle royal was preparing and that the only contest would be between those who paraded with banners, shouting, "We want Wallace," and those who, for one reason or another, didn't want Wallace. That opposition had several angles, none sectional. Some leaders said Wallace would weaken the ticket, some Southerners thought he was too friendly to labor and to the Negro, some city people thought he was an agrarian and a radical, and some just wanted a new name on the ticket. A plurality, as shown on the first ballot, favored Wallace because of his forthright, downright devotion to those New Deal policies which lifted the country out of the bog, and because they felt his devotion to liberal policies deserved approval. In the final result, TRUMAN owed his nomination to the vote of delegates from most Southern States, which added to his own strong support, gave him a majority. Neither TRUMAN nor any other man could have won who had not sincerely and consistently supported the forward-looking measures of the Roosevelt administration.

No tepid conservative, no timid or rash reactionary, no opponent of militant liberalism could have made first base in the race.

The convention was of one mind when it came to nominating Franklin Roosevelt as its candidate for President. His record as Chief Executive in peace and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in war has caused him to be recognized as the foremost leader in a world of great men. The people at home—from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oreg., and from Tallahassee to Tacoma—had drafted Mr. Roosevelt to stay on the job until both peace and war have been won and undergirded. The enthusiasm which greeted his nomination and the sincere applause given his radio speech of acceptance demonstrated the hold he has upon the confidence and affection of the people of America.

The platform is the chart of the voyage. It is crystal clear for navigating the country and the world into a safe harbor. It is the shortest in political history and covered every hope and aspiration of people with a forward look. Its appeal is to all who wish a country in which every man has an equal chance and all peoples enjoy the "four freedoms." It makes its appeal to all citizens who believe in the philosophy of the founder of the party, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." It is no covert for the timid, the selfish, the profiteers, the isolationists.

The Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an able article by Justice Homer Hoch of the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas. The article is entitled "Electing a President of the United States."

Justice Hoch is well qualified to discuss this important subject. He represented the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas in the House of Representatives for 12 years, and was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Since then he has served as chairman of the State Corporation Commission of Kansas, and is regarded as a strong member of the State Supreme Court.

In this article Justice Hoch points out the defects of the present system of electing President and Vice President by the electoral college, particularly the requirement that all the electoral votes of each State shall be cast for the candidates receiving the highest vote in that State, so the minority vote cast in each State is not represented at all in the electoral college.

His remedy is not to go to the length of electing the President and Vice President by popular vote. But he would require that the electors from each State cast the votes of that State in proportion to the votes received by the respective candidates, but on a fractional rather than a strictly percentage basis. I recommend the article to the Senate for consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTING A PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Justice Homer Hoch)

Few people, apparently, regard the method provided by the Constitution for electing a President as a matter of much importance. Comment on the subject consists largely of facetious reference, every 4 years, to the electoral college. And yet, in the opinion of most students of government, this part of our constitutional machinery is not only undemocratic but has very serious defects fraught with real public dangers. To these defects and potential dangers we give little or no concern, our Presidential elections having ridden along, in the main, on fairly even keel. Until some emergency arises in a time of tense public feeling which may precipitate a political crisis we just can't be bothered. It is quite like the traditional Irishman's leaky roof, which didn't need fixing while the weather was fair and couldn't be fixed when it was raining.

Briefly stated, the serious defects of the present system are: First, a President may be elected—and has been—not only without having received the most popular votes but without having received as many electoral votes as his principal opponent; second, the votes of the minority in each State are not only uncounted for the candidate for whom they are cast, but in effect are actually counted for the opposing candidate; third, the provisions for electing a President in case no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes are so defective that an impasse might easily occur, with no means provided in the Constitution for securing a President.

Debates in the Constitutional Convention related almost as much to the methods of selecting personnel as they did to the principles upon which the new Federal Government was to be established. And wisely so. Whatever the form of government, it must be administered by men, and while a government bad in substance cannot be sanctified by administration a government good in principle may be perverted into tyranny by the men who run it. It was only natural, therefore, that having drawn the outlines of a central government of limited, delegated powers, with separate and coordinate branches for lawmaking, law interpreting, and law enforcing, the Constitutional Convention should debate at great length the methods of selecting those who were to exercise the various Federal powers.

It is, of course, out of the question to attempt here a review of those debates. The principal decisions which were reached as to the legislative and judicial branches are familiar to nearly all. The National Legislature was to be bicameral—with one Chamber directly representing the people and the other representing the sovereign States. Without this major compromise between the large and small States, which gave representation in the House on the basis of population and gave each State the same representation in the Senate, the Constitution probably would not have been ratified. The principle of this compromise was carried over into the election of a President by giving to each State one electoral vote for each of its Representatives and its two Senators. Two important changes have been made as to election of Representatives and Senators. The Constitution originally provided, in effect, that in the apportionment of Representatives among the States a slave should be counted as three-fifths of a person. With the abolition of slavery this strange political and mathematical provision was formally eliminated by the fourteenth amendment. Senators were elected by the State legislatures until 1913, when the seventeenth amendment, providing for their election by popular vote, was adopted. As to the judiciary, one of the principal decisions of the framers of the Constitution was to fortify independence of judicial action by a life tenure for Federal judges. Whether this provision is a wise one has long been a question for debate. These and other interesting questions have more or less pertinent relation to our immediate subject, but permissible length of this paper prevents their discussion here.

We come to the subject of this paper—the method provided for electing the executive head of the Federal Government. Few subjects before the convention aroused such extended and acrimonious debate. At least four or five proposals were seriously considered. The so-called Virginia plan, the Pinckney plan, and the New Jersey plan all proposed that the President be elected by Congress. George Mason, of Virginia, one of the most active members of the convention, and a man with a distinguished record as a patriot and statesman, said that it was "as unnatural to refer the proper character for Chief Magistrate to the people as it would be to refer a trial of colors to a blind man." And because of his dissatisfaction with the Constitution as adopted, he became one of three framers who refused to sign it, and together with Patrick Henry led the fight against its ratification by Virginia.

The Convention first adopted a resolution providing that Congress should name electors who in turn should select a President. Two days later the Convention reversed its action and provided for election of the electors by the State legislatures. A week later it again reversed itself and passed a resolution providing for election of the President directly by Congress, with a 7-year term. Finally the electoral-college system was adopted as we now have it, except for one important change, to be presently noted, which was made by the twelfth amendment in 1804. The plan was taken from a similar provision in the Constitution of Maryland. It was designed largely for a nonpartisan government—political parties not then having fully developed. Apparently the primary principle which the framers thought they were adopting was the selection of a President by a group of men especially fitted for the task. These electors were to select a President much as a board of directors selects a manager for a corporation. Alexander Hamilton wrote in the Federalist: "It is equally desirable that the immediate election should be made by men most capable of analyzing the qualities adapted to the station and acting under circumstances favorable to deliberation, and to a judicious combination of all the reasons and inducements that were proper to govern their choice. A small number of persons, selected by their fellow citizens from the general mass, will be most likely to possess the information and discernment requisite to so complicated an investigation."

It is one of the interesting developments of our constitutional history that without any change in the law this fundamental principle soon ceased to operate. The electors became mere instruments for registering the popular vote of the States. Nevertheless the Hamilton theory was the one upon which the electoral system was based. After Washington's two terms, when Jefferson and Adams were the leading contenders, three electors who were members of the Jefferson Party voted for Adams and yet their act aroused no public resentment. But the bitter controversies and personal animosities engendered in the 4 years of John Adams' term—largely by his temper and ineptitude in dealing with those around him—brought a radical change in sentiment concerning the election of a President.

This turmoil terminated in the bitter Jefferson and Burr controversy in Congress. The Constitution provided that the electors should meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for two persons. No separate vote for President and Vice President was cast. These ballots were to be sealed and transmitted to the President of the Senate and by him opened and counted in the presence of the Senate and the House. The person receiving the highest vote was to be President and the next highest to be Vice President. At the first election Washington received 69 votes and John Adams 34, the latter thus becoming Vice President. In the election of 1796 Adams became President on a margin of only three votes over Jefferson, who became Vice President. The election of 1800 was an intense one with Adams and Pinckney on one ticket and Jefferson and Burr on another. Jefferson and Burr each had 73 electoral votes and Adams and Pinckney 65.

The Constitution provided, as heretofore noted, that each elector should vote for two persons, and it further provided that if there should be a tie vote the election should be made by the House of Representatives from among those whose votes were tied. Jefferson and Burr were tied. While there probably was not a single elector who voted for Burr with the intention that he should be President—the understanding being that he was to be Vice President if Jefferson were elected President—the constitutional provision as it then existed made it possible for the House to select either Jefferson or Burr. The feeling against Jefferson was intense among most of the Federalists, who were in full control of the House. And so a movement sprang up to name Burr instead of Jefferson. Not that the Federalists hated Burr less but that they hated Jefferson more. It was an unconscionable proposal—to which the brilliant but unprincipled Burr gave covert consent—but it would have prevailed had it not been for the opposition of a few Federalists, the most aggressive and influential one being Jefferson's arch political enemy, Alexander Hamilton. Had it not been for Hamilton, Burr probably would have been president instead of Jefferson. Hamilton wrote to Gouverneur Morris, "I trust the Federalists will not finally be so mad as to vote for Burr. I speak with intimate and accurate knowledge of character. His elevation can only promote the purposes of the desperate and the profligate. If there be a man in the world I ought to hate it is Jefferson. With Burr I have always been personally well, but the public good must be paramount to every private consideration." This service of Hamilton became an enduring monument to his high-mindedness.

As a result of this Jefferson-Burr incident the twelfth amendment was submitted and ratified in 1804. The electors now vote separately for President and Vice President, and in case there is a tie vote for President, selection is made by the House from the three highest. In case there is a tie vote for Vice President, selection must be made by the Senate from the two highest on the list.

Both under the original Constitution and under the twelfth amendment the State legislatures have power to determine the method of naming electors. Originally electors were selected by the legislatures and as late as 1824 there were still six States that so selected them. South Carolina did not provide for election of the electors by the people until after the Civil War.

In 1824, at the close of the Monroe administration, there again occurred a bitter contest in the House of Representatives over the election of a President, accompanied by personal charges and public scandal. That contest, which resulted from the unfortunate provisions of the Constitution, fomented strife and ill-will which endured for many years. Out of a total popular vote of less than 400,000 Andrew Jackson had a majority of about 50,000 over John Quincy Adams, and had 99 electoral votes as against 84 for Adams. But Henry Clay and Crawford of Georgia, who were also candidates, together had 87 electoral votes, which was sufficient to prevent Jackson having a majority of the total number. This threw the election into the House of Representatives, where Adams was elected by the vote of 13 States as against 7 for Jackson. Thus it came about that Jackson, with substantially more popular votes and with 15 more electoral votes than Adams, lost the Presidency and Adams won it. Had the times been just ripe for it such a result might well have caused serious public uprising.

It would transgress the limits of this paper to narrate at length the circumstances and political upheaval incident to the Hayes-Tilden contest in 1876. The close of the election left the result in doubt. In four States contests took place with both sides claiming the electoral vote of the State. It is generally conceded that Tilden had a popular majority of approximately a quarter of a million. The 22 electoral votes in dispute were sufficient to turn the election either way. Public feeling ran high. Finally Congress—with doubtful constitutional warrant—created a commission to decide the contests from the disputed States. The commission, consisting of 5 Members from the House, 5 Members from the Senate, and 5 Members of the Supreme Court, decided the various contests amidst the most intense excitement and bitterness, giving the election to Hayes by 1 electoral vote—185 to 184. Only wise counsel, to which Tilden patriotically contributed by his course of moderation, prevented uprising and possibly civil war. All this would have been prevented by some simple changes in the constitutional provisions for election of a president.

I have not yet spoken of the most illogical and indefensible part of the present system. I refer to its disfranchisement, in every State, of the minority voters. A plurality of 1,000, of 100, even of 1 vote in a vote of 5,000,000 in New York State swings that State's 47 electoral votes. Thus as many as 2,500,000 voters in that State may not only be denied representation in the electoral vote, but actually have their votes counted for the candidate they oppose! A like result does happen to all minority votes in every State every time we elect a president. I know of nothing in our constitutional system more illogical or undemocratic.

Not only is this disfranchisement of the minority voters in every State indefensible, in my opinion, but the provision for election by the House of Representatives in case of a tie is both illogical and inadequate for meeting contingencies. Although the apportionment of electoral votes among the States is based largely on population, the population factor is entirely disregarded when the election is thrown into the House. In that event each State has 1 vote. Nevada, with 1 Member and with 3 electoral votes, has the same 1 vote in a House election of a President as New York, with 45 Members and 47 electoral votes. And if a State delegation in Congress happens to be tied, the State loses its vote entirely. Furthermore, the Constitution requires a "majority of all the States" to elect. It is surprising that a situation has not already arisen where no candidate could get a majority of the States. With three or more parties represented in the House, it could easily happen that no eligible candidate could get a majority of all the States. It is true that if the House fails to elect a President, the Vice President is to act as President, but a like provision obtains for election of a Vice President by the Senate, and the Senate might easily be unable to elect a Vice President. If such a situation should arise, the Constitution has no answer to it. Nor is there any provision for another election. What is the answer?

In itself the answer is not difficult. But unfortunately, the obstacle of democratic inertia, of commanding the attention and convincing the understanding of the electorate to a point of action is very great. At various times in our history public-spirited men have sought to arouse public interest in the matter and to secure submission of a constitutional amendment, but to no avail. Senator Benton, of Missouri, agitated the subject in the 1820's and 1830's, and in the seventies Senator Morton of Indiana made it his legislative hobby and submitted a very able and convincing committee report and recommendation. In the nineties DeArmond, of Missouri, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, submitted another and similar report. In recent years, Congressman LEA, of California, able and public-spirited, has followed in their footsteps and has several times secured a favorable committee report. But always the deeply needed change gets lost in the maze of matters which carry a more immediate and material appeal to Members and to constituencies. We are waiting for the big rain before fixing the roof.

Space will not permit discussion of various proposals that have been made. I will therefore only briefly state the plan which seems to me to be the simplest, the fairest, and the most likely to be ratified if submitted as a constitutional amendment. The heart of the plan, which has been called the proportional plan, is to divide the electoral vote of each State in the same proportion as the popular vote of that State. For instance, if two-thirds of the Kansas voters vote for the Republican candidate and one-third for the Democratic candidate, the former would get two-thirds of our electoral votes and the latter would get one-third. Thus every voter, whether in the majority or in the minority, would have his vote registered and represented in the election of a President. No voter would be disfranchised, as millions of them virtually are now in every Presidential election. There are two reasons which appeal to me for favoring the submission of such an amendment rather than one which disregards the States entirely and determines the result on the popular vote of the country as a whole. The first reason is that it would preserve the principle of the compromise—to which reference has been made—between the large and small States in the creation of Congress—House Members according to the State population but equal representation in the Senate. This compromise tends to lessen somewhat the comparative influence of the large and rich State—a consideration which I believe has been proved fair and wholesome from the standpoint of national unity. To make the point plainer, the plan would not disturb the electoral apportionment which gives Kansas, and every other State, one elector for each Senator as well as one for each Member of the House. Election by the whole popular vote of the Nation, computed as a unit, would disregard the historic compromise between large and small States and give undue influence to the heavy population of certain States. The second reason is that there would be little hope of securing the adoption of an amendment which discarded the present allocation of electoral votes among the States and provided for election by the popular vote of the Nation as a whole.

In dividing the electoral vote of a State under the proportional plan small fractional numbers would be disregarded unless

necessary to determine the result. The technical features are simple enough, not difficult of operation, but need not here be discussed in detail. The plan would remove uncertainty, render the election of a President by the House of Representatives—with its potentialities of scandal and bitterness already demonstrated historically—forever unnecessary, and take away the serious possibility that someday we may find ourselves without a President and with no constitutional way to get one. It would wipe out the present disfranchisement of minority voters in the several States and prevent any candidate with less electoral votes than his opponent from becoming President.

An Analysis of the 1944 Republican Platform by John B. Elliott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by John B. Elliott, of Los Angeles, Calif., a prominent business and political leader, containing his analysis of the 1944 Republican platform, which I consider entirely worthy of wide consideration by our people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR CALLS FOR CANDOR—REPUBLICAN PLATFORM FAILS

(By John B. Elliott, California Democratic leader)

The present most tragic times in our history allow no place for the excesses of American political partisanship.

When American boys are giving their lives daily in nearly every part of the world for the unselfish welfare of our country, how can any of us, safe here at home, have any thought for the shallowness and hypocrisy of partisan intrigue and scheming?

With more than 5,000,000 American young men and women overseas and under arms, braving daily death and mutilation, and an equal number under the discipline of armed camps in training in this country, how can we here be so heedless and thoughtless as to countenance any of the petty and unworthy things of ordinary politics? Shame and disgrace upon us if we do.

TWO PARTIES ESSENTIAL

Under our existing form of government, it is important and most desirable that we preserve at least two political parties as a check upon unrestrained majorities. And it is also important and desirable that both parties be patriotic, honest and straightforward, unselfish in their dealings with the American people.

It is not only imperative that this be so in these hours of desperate conflict, but it is most necessary also in the days ahead when we shall have to project and reconstruct America and deal with the great problems created by war and the millions of our people affected.

It fills me with regret to have to say that I believe one cannot read the very lengthy so-called platform of principles recently adopted by the Republican party at Chicago without a sinking feeling that our people have not been anything like fairly dealt with by one of our major political parties.

FEARLESSNESS NEEDED

Yet the disastrous and historical times in which we are living call for nothing less than complete honesty and candor.

Many of the ablest and best known writers and commentators of the country have described this platform in unfavorable and deprecatory language. Many have condemned it in the strongest terms.

It is frequently, and one might also say generally, described as a new low of 40 years in political platform hypocrisy; as an effort to mislead and deceive the people into crediting its expressions and the candidates who stand upon it as being worthy of belief and support.

I hope all Americans will read it and study it. But it is too lengthy to expect more than a few to do that.

It is plainly contradictory in many parts. Ingeniously put together, it is unfair in many respects, and in places so insidiously contrived that the real meaning is hidden or omitted altogether. It has a double meaning and is capable of double interpretation in many particulars.

IT IS NOT FAIR

It is not fair. It is not clear. It, obviously, is not completely honest. It covers a long range of subjects, some large and some relatively very small, in what amounts to a plain attempt to corral the votes of Americans who may be beguiled into thinking it is being offered in their special interest and welfare.

It is often platitudinous in its declarations. Time and again it speaks resoundingly of most commonly accepted truisms. In reading it, one is brought almost to speculation why its framers did not include a studied defense and recommendation of the Ten Commandments, in their elaborate effort to enumerate everything that might help.

Political parties and candidates are supposed to stand on political platforms. Well, perhaps someone may, with great dexterity, stand temporarily on this platform of the Republican Party. But if any action is undertaken—if anyone attempts to move on it—the vibration will cause it to collapse and fall into pieces.

It is impossible to analyze this national Republican platform in this article, but one can point out at least a few of what are to me some of its many brazen faults.

OLD LINE REPUBLICANISM

This platform endorses a protective tariff that will be high enough; and yet it favors the removal of barriers to foreign trade.

It salutes the American farmers for "their magnificent job of war-time production," and in the very next paragraph says that the farmers must be free of the controls and directives under which this "magnificent job of war-time production" has been accomplished.

The platform sanctimoniously says that "international peace and security" do not depend upon the sanction of force alone, but "should prevail by virtue of reciprocal interest and spiritual values recognized (among sovereign nations) in these security agreements."

Yes, of course, they should prevail, as stated in the platform, but what if they don't prevail?

Then what? This platform is as silent as an Egyptian tomb about that.

The platform pledges "prosecution of the war to total victory." It could not pledge anything less than that.

It also promises "at the earliest possible time, after the cessation of hostilities, we will bring home all members of our armed forces who do not have unexpired enlistments and who do not volunteer for further overseas duty."

Well, rather. The platform wouldn't dare say anything different from that.

The platform strongly upholds States' rights and in another paragraph promises certain specific legislation which would positively encroach on States rights. It proposes both to reduce the public debt and reduce taxes. Meaning, of course, to collect less and pay out more, and at the same time, apparently, would do away with Federal deficit financing. Legerdemain. Prestidigitation. Get your money down; which shell hides the little pea?

Further, this remarkable document condemns the freezing of wage rates and indirectly suggests that the control of the price of farm products, and consequent control of the cost of living, should terminate. Inevitable result, inflation. But what of that; it is only another promise anyway, isn't it?

HEROIC GESTURES

It goes on further, in mock heroics, to say that the Republicans will "make and keep Axis Powers impotent to renew tyranny and attack."

And then this extraordinarily voluminous document proceeds to omit completely just how they would go about filling that rather large order, in case some serious trouble in that connection actually broke out. Sidestepping.

The platform promises to "promote world-wide economic stability" but leaves the trifling details of how to accomplish that fair-sized task to the imagination—or hoped-for lack of that quality—on the part of the reader.

The platform says, under the present administration, "American economic life is being destroyed," but a few paragraphs further on, so that the public will not readily connect the two declarations, proceeds to say nothing less than the following:

"The Republican Party accepts the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, the Wages and Hours Act, and all other Federal statutes designed to promote and protect the welfare of American working men and women, and we promise a fair and just administration of these laws."

The platform is for "vigorous development of foreign markets," and again pledges "leadership in every cooperative effort to remove unnecessary and destructive barriers to international trade," and then halfway between these two pronouncements it volubly proclaims that it will "maintain a fair protective tariff so that the standards of living of our people should not be impaired through the importation of commodities produced abroad."

ONE EASY LESSON

The job of riding various horses going in opposite directions at the same time is thus fully taught in one simple lesson for the benefit of the easygoing voter.

The platform takes a bold stand on many small or sectional issues, as when it declares rather hotly in favor of a constitutional amendment for the abolition of the poll tax, well knowing that this same course has always been open to them, and anyway it would certainly take years and probably be impossible to accomplish.

The foregoing are but a few of the loopholes, booby traps, inconsistences, contradictions, and derelictions of this Republican platform. It is all very regrettable and a sad story for today.

One Hundred and Fifty Cases of World War No. 2 Cardiovascular Disease Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, an interesting study has just been completed by Dr. A. H. Traum and Blanche B. Wilcox, Ph. D., of the Cardiovascular Research Unit of the Veterans' Administration which will no doubt prove of value in the future for both military authorities and the Veterans' Administration.

The study was based on the case folders of 150 ex-servicemen who were inducted into and discharged from the Army since the enactment of the selective-service law of 1940. The cases were unselected, being drawn at random from the files of veterans discharged because of cardiovascular disease.

The analysis of these cases as made by Dr. Traum and Mrs. Wilcox appeared in the July 1944 issue of the Military Surgeon, and was published with the permission of the Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, who, of course, under Government regulations in such matters, assumed no responsibility for the opinions expressed or the conclusions drawn by the authors.

This study, together with many other additional facts which are obtainable, causes one to raise the question, Would it not be sound Government policy to require an annual or semiannual health audit on the part of all citizens between the ages of 14 and 20 years, to the end that those responsible for the conduct of the defense program shall be far better informed on the physical condition of both male and female population than they were at the time the present defense program was placed in operation?

The article follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF 150 CASES OF CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE IN WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS

(By A. H. Traum, M. D., and Blanche B. Wilcox, Ph. D., Cardiovascular Research Unit, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.)

Every individual discharged from the armed forces and applying for compensation through the Veterans Administration becomes a potential beneficiary of the Government and a careful appraisal of all the factors concerned in the discharge are important. Material for this report was obtained from the Veterans Administration claims folders of 150 veterans who were inducted into the Army since the enactment of the Selective Service Act of 1940 and discharged from the armed forces because of some cardiovascular disease. The cases were unselected and studied in the order of arrival of the folders at the reasearch unit. In each case most of the following Selective Service and Army forms were available for review. Selective Service questionnaire, Selective Service local board examination, Army induction examination, Army hospitalization records, certificate of disability for discharge.

General considerations: The 150 cases were classified into the following etiological groups as designated by the diagnosis listed on the certificate of disability for discharge:

Rheumatic heart disease	69
Hypertension	22
Varicose veins	14
Other vascular conditions	18
Functional heart disease	6
Congenital heart disease	5
Coronary artery heart disease	3
Heart disease, other causes	13

The group consisted of 133 white and 17 colored males. All were privates with the exception of two white males who were corporals. The age range was between 18 and 37 years. Two white men were under 20 years old; 105 white and 16 colored males were listed between 20 and 29 years; and 26 white males and one colored male were 30 years or older, the oldest being 37 years. There were 104 men from urban and 46 men from rural sections of the country.

Selective Service and Army induction examinations: Army hospital records and certificate of disability for discharge: The Army induction examinations of the entire group and 128 selective service local board examinations and questionnaires were available. In most instances the records were adequate with the exception of one striking discrepancy, and that was a failure in many cases to record blood pressures. One other noteworthy observation in many of the examinations was the failure to elicit cardiac murmurs when the selectee stated that he had previous knowledge of heart trouble and in whom shortly afterward characteristic cardiac murmurs were found during periods of hospitalization. On 128 selective-service examinations in answer to the question, "Do you consider that you are now sound and well," 83 selectees gave an affirmative answer. Forty-five men stated that they were not well and added their reasons; in 36 cases the statements (which included symptoms, or references to parts of the body, or diagnoses) were remarks that could be interpreted as being definitely related to the medical condition designated in the final Army diagnosis. For instance, 8 men complained of high blood pressure and were later discharged from the Army because of arterial hypertension. Similarly, three other men stated that they had heart trouble and were later discharged because of congenital heart disease.

Complete records of Army hospitalization were available for review in all but 5 of the cases of this series. In general, the clinical examinations, laboratory studies, and treatment at the Army hospitals were well done. Unquestionably, these records will be of great value in any future study of the cases. There was a definite tendency to "read too much" into the electrocardiograms but in no case did this tendency actually affect the diagnosis. Interestingly, 25 cases of cardiovascular disease in this series were picked up by the Army examiners while the soldier was being treated for another condition.

A certificate of disability for discharge was available in each case reviewed, and the final diagnosis listed on this certificate formed the basis for all classifications noted in this report. Each record included the opinion of a medical board, composed of three medical officers, relative to the final diagnosis, blamability of the induction medical officer, and the origin of the main disability; that is, whether the disability existed prior to enlistment or was incurred in line of duty.

Rheumatic heart disease: 69 men were discharged because of the residuals of rheumatic infection, especially rheumatic valvular heart disease. Seventeen veterans admitted knowledge of heart trouble on the selective service questionnaires, or at the time of the local board physical examination before induction into the Army. (Eight selective service records were not available in the rheumatic heart disease group.) Thirty-eight, or 54 percent of this group admitted a definite knowledge of previous rheumatic infection or rheumatic valvular heart disease, at the time of Army hospitalization. The physical examinations of the selective-service boards revealed three cases with diastolic or presystolic murmurs at the mitral area which were not found by the Army induction examiners. In two other cases a systolic murmur was elicited at the mitral area but was considered by the medical examiners to be functional in type.

The Army discharge boards held the inducting medical officer blamable in 5 cases. The boards determined that 43 cases in this group existed prior to enlistment and 21 cases were the direct result of line of duty.

The diagnostic nomenclature found in this entire group was quite satisfactory and in only a few cases were there any noteworthy deviations from the diagnostic standards set up by the American Heart Association. In 10 cases with valvular heart disease, namely, mitral stenosis, the etiology was considered as unknown for the valvular lesion described; even though there was a definite history of a previous rheumatic fever or chorea. In one case a general anatomical term, endocarditis, was used instead of the name of the specific valve involved; and in the other case a general term, myocardosis, was incorrectly used.

Most of the diagnoses in the entire group were established on sound clinical evidence and will undoubtedly be substantiated in future examinations. Three diagnoses in this group could be challenged. The findings in the first case were suggestive of a neurocirculatory asthenia, rather than a valvular heart disease, and the clinical evidence in each of the other two cases suggested the possibility of a congenital rather than a rheumatic valvular lesion. Adequate reasons were given to lend support to the diagnoses made, and the nature of the lesions present probably will be determined with finality only after future examinations.

Several of the cases reviewed presented facts worthy of mention at this time. Two men were discharged from the Army because of rheumatic valvular heart disease, and judging from the correspondence in the Veterans' Administration claims folders these veterans presumably have reentered active Army service. There were no records available relative to the veterans' possible reenlistment after discharge. One man was rejected by the United States Civil Service Commission in 1939 because of heart trouble. Another man was rejected from Civilian Conservation Corps in 1936 because of heart trouble; and still another man had been drawing a pension for valvular heart disease, mitral stenosis, since his discharge from the Navy in 1937.

Arterial hypertension: Twenty-two men were discharged because of arterial hypertension. Four men gave a previous history of this disease on selective-service questionnaires, and 10 men, or 45 percent of this hypertensive group, admitted a knowledge of a previously existing hypertension when their histories were taken at the time of Army hospitalization. The Army discharge boards held the induction medical officer blamable in 2 cases and concluded that 21 cases existed prior to enlistment and 1 occurred in line of duty.

The diagnoses in all the cases agreed with the American Heart Association criteria and were established on adequate clinical evidence. In two cases, although definite elevations of blood pressure existed and justified the diagnoses made, one could suspect upon

reviewing the clinical data, the possibility of other etiological factors. One case had some clinical features of a neurocirculatory asthenia and another suggested to this reviewer the possibility of a valvular lesion.

Four cases of this group merit individual comment. The first was discharged from the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1939 because of arterial hypertension. The second case was that of a veteran classified by the inducting officer as not qualified for full military duty because of an arterial hypertension picked up at time of induction examinations, and with a history of high blood pressure; this man was hospitalized 24 days after entering the Army. The third case revealed a marked elevation of systolic and diastolic blood pressures at the time of Selective Service Local Board examination, and 2 days later, at time of Army induction examination, revealed a blood pressure within normal limits. The fourth case had a moderate elevation of blood pressure at time of the local board examination but was apparently not checked at the Army induction examination and subsequently this man was discharged from the Army because of arterial hypertension after 77 days of military service including 44 days of hospitalization.

The Selective Service and Army induction examinations revealed interesting and instructive findings relative to blood pressure readings. Thirty-eight of the 128 available local board examinations did not record blood pressure readings and of this group 5 men were later discharged because of arterial hypertension. Only 17 of the 38 cases just mentioned had their blood pressures noted on the Army induction examinations; therefore, 21 inductees of this entire series actually entered the Army without this record. Two of this group were discharged from the Army with hypertension as one of the final diagnoses.

In 23 cases where no local board examinations were available in the veterans' claims folders, only 10 had blood pressures recorded at the time of induction. Seven of these 23 cases were discharged from the Army because of arterial hypertension.

In 15 cases an elevation of either systolic or diastolic blood pressure was noted on the Selective Service Local Board physical examinations, and in 11 cases an elevated blood pressure was found to exist later during Army hospitalization; and was a definite part of the clinical picture of the condition responsible for the soldiers' discharge from the Army. It must be admitted that in most cases the initial blood pressures referred to were on border-line levels, but should have been sufficient to direct further attention to the possibility of existing abnormalities. (The American Heart Association criteria for diagnosis considers that hypertension is present when a systolic blood pressure is persistently above 140 mm. Hg. or the diastolic above 90 mm. Hg.) Nine men in whom blood pressures showed a slight elevation, above borderline levels, at time of Army induction examinations, were later discharged from the Army because of arterial hypertension.

Varicose veins: This classification included 14 cases, 11 of which were actually discharged because of varicose veins. All but one of the 11 cases were considered to have had the condition prior to induction. In 4 cases the discharge board held the inducting examiners blamable.

The group of 14 cases included 3 cases where the discharge was a transfer to the enlisted reserve group because of the then existing age limit of 28. Varicose veins were listed as one of the physical findings on the discharge certificate. Two of the three men were recalled to active duty and are again in service. The other case was also recalled to active duty but was disqualified because of an acute urethritis.

The selective service or Army induction examinations noted varicose veins in 8 of the 14 cases and considered the condition to be nondisabling at that time. One other case revealed at the time of hospitalization that he had varicose veins which had been treated by the injection method 1 year prior to his induction into active Army service.

Other vascular conditions: Eighteen soldiers were discharged because of various types of vascular conditions other than varicose veins. These could be classified as 10 cases of thrombophlebitis, 2 cases of thrombocytopenic purpura, 2 cases of thromboangiitis obliterans, and 1 each of trophedema, generalized arteriosclerosis, traumatic venous aneurysm, and hypotension possibly caused by hypoadrenalism. All of these diagnoses were established on acceptable clinical evidence. Six cases of this group were considered by the Army discharge board to have occurred in line of duty and the inducting medical officer was held blamable in one case. There were 4 instances where the men admitted knowledge of their disability on the selective-service questionnaires, and 6 additional cases at the time of Army hospitalization gave a definite history of their disability existing prior to induction. The 10 cases of thrombophlebitis all presented a definite etiological factor, 6 cases resulted as a complication of operative procedures, 2 from pneumonic processes, 2 from other infections, and 1 from an injury. Five of these cases occurred in line of duty and a similar number had their onset before military service.

Functional heart disease: Six cases were discharged from the Army with a main diagnosis of neurocirculatory asthenia. Three of these men gave a suggestive history of heart disease on the selective-service questionnaire. All were considered to have existed prior to enlistment by the Army discharge boards. The inducting medical officer was not held blamable in any of these cases.

This group was one in which most of the diagnoses could be questioned and the only group where the medical work-up during the period of Army hospitalization could be considered inadequate. In four of the cases there were no electrocardiograms, in three cases no basal metabolism tests were recorded; and in one case there were neither electrocardiograms, X-rays of the chest, nor basal metabolism tests. Since a diagnosis of neurocirculatory asthenia is made not only upon clinical symptoms but also by the method of elimination, diagnoses made without sufficient clinical data are questioned.

Congenital heart disease: Five men were discharged because of congenital heart disease. All cases were considered by the Army discharge board as existing prior to enlistment, and in none of these cases was the inducting officer held blamable. Three cases admitted knowledge of heart disease on the selective service questionnaires. Selective service examiners elicited a systolic murmur over the apex in one case, marked cardiac enlargement and an apical systolic murmur in another case; and an Army reception center medical examiner picked up a significant systolic murmur over the apex of still another case.

Coronary artery heart disease: Three soldiers were discharged from the Army with a diagnosis of coronary artery disease. In one case the discharge board decided the condition had occurred in line of duty, and in the other two instances to have existed prior to induction. The induction officers were not held blamable in any case.

The correctness of the final diagnoses was questioned by this reviewer in all cases. In one case the history, physical and laboratory findings were more suggestive of an acute rheumatic infection than a coronary thrombosis. The diagnoses given in the other two cases were considered not justifiable because of the lack of characteristic electrocardiographic findings; in addition, both cases presented a rather atypical history.

Heart disease—Other causes: 13 cases were discharged from the Army because of various types of heart disease not already discussed. The Army discharge boards concluded that 8 cases existed prior to induction and that the other 5 cases occurred in line of duty. The inducting medical officer was held blamable in 1 case. Selective service records were available for 10 men in this group; only 1 man admitted knowledge of any important illnesses before service.

Four cases of this group developed signs and symptoms of heart disease following various types of infectious processes, namely, the four cases followed pneumonia, one was complicated by an attack of measles; and six cases had cardiac arhythmias, four were due to paroxysmal auricular tachycardia, and one each of paroxysmal auricular fibrillation and partial heart block. One other case was diagnosed as myocardial insufficiency secondary to a sickle cell anemia, another case revealed an unexplained cardiac hypertrophy picked up during a physical examination of a soldier hospitalized for German measles. The last case of this group was diagnosed as valvular heart disease, pulmonic insufficiency, cause undetermined.

The diagnoses for the entire group, with the exception of one case, were established on sound clinical evidence. In the one case the data available in the Army hospital records did not support the diagnosis established. The diagnosis made was valvular heart disease, pulmonic insufficiency, cause undetermined, based only on the ausculatory findings which were described as a persistent systolic murmur over the second right interspace.

Discussion: A review of 150 cases of veterans inducted into the Army since the Selective Service Act of 1940 and discharged with a cardiovascular disease, revealed that errors may have been made in selecting some of these men for the Army. Twenty-four percent of the entire group admitted knowledge of the disability on the selective service questionnaire or at the local board examination, and 56 percent of all the cases admitted a past history of their particular disability during Army hospitalization. The Army discharge boards decided that 112, or 75 percent, of the cases existed prior to enlistment. There were 13 instances where the inducting medical officer was held blamable by the Army discharge board.

Many abnormal physical findings could be easily overlooked or misinterpreted during mass examinations such as given at large Army induction stations. An effort to secure additional medical information for the examining officers at the time of induction may result in a better evaluation of existing physical disabilities. The fact is also appreciated that perhaps thousands of inductees with physical findings similar to some of those revealed in this study, are probably taking an active and effective part in the war effort as members of the armed forces.

The necessity for recording blood pressures is emphasized in the facts revealed in 21 cases where there was no evidence whatsoever that blood-pressure readings were ever taken, and 11 other cases where the Selective Service examinations were not available, and the blood pressures were not recorded by the Army induction examiners. Some of these cases were later discharged from the Army for arterial hypertension, neurocirculatory asthenia, or valvular lesions in which abnormal blood pressure readings are an important clinical feature. Another striking finding in this review was the number of cases, where a slightly elevated blood-pressure reading was noted at local board or Army induction examinations, that were discharged with a disability in which an elevated blood pressure was a clinical feature. In this small series of cases, there were more abnormali-

ties noted on local board examinations than by the Army induction examiners, where the findings had a definite relation to the cause for discharge.

A definite trend of disease entities in this small series of cases becomes apparent. As would be expected, the greater number of cases fall into the rheumatic group. A high proportion of the cases were classified in the arterial hypertensive and various peripheral vascular diseases groups. There was a low percentage of neurocirculatory asthenia cases; this group will probably show an increase in future veterans who have experienced actual combat.

Most of the cases studied were very accurately diagnosed. The Army examinations and conclusions could be questioned in only two disease groups of this series, namely, the functional heart disease and coronary artery disease groups. In some of the former cases, the medical work-ups appeared inadequate and in the coronary artery group the evaluation of the historical and clinical findings could be questioned.

Conclusions: 150 of cardiovascular disease among veterans of World War No. 2 have been reviewed. The Army hospital records, together with Selective Service and Army induction examinations were in almost all instances very complete and accurate, and will make an important and satisfactory starting point for any future studies of these cases.

A large number of the cases admitted knowledge of their disability having existed before induction into the Army, at the time of Army hospitalization. Some of the cases might possibly have been picked up during the Army induction examination if the existence of their disabilities had been called to the attention of the medical examiners. This information may be made available to the inducting medical officers and Selective Service examiners if several additional specific questions are added to those already on the Selective Service physical examination forms. These questions could inquire directly into the past history of heart disease, rheumatism and high blood pressure and would seem justified because of the large numbers of potential cardiovascular cases that will constantly be encountered during Army induction work and belong to the rheumatic heart disease or arterial hypertension group.

The blood pressures must be recorded on the Selective Service or induction examinations for obvious reasons. A striking finding was the number of reports reviewed without this record and the apparent importance of slightly elevated blood pressures in relation to the final clinical conditions resulting in the soldier's discharge from the Army.

The Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, again humanity throughout the world has accepted in good faith the standards of civilization announced by the leaders of the world's two greatest nations, the United States and Great Britain, when these leaders announced the principles embodied in their Atlantic Charter, as follows:

ATLANTIC CHARTER

First, their countries seek no aggrandizements, territorial or other:

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forceably deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and other raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic adjustment and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the Nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea and air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wide and permanent system of security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise add and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

CAN WE AND THEY KEEP FAITH, OR MUST HUMANITY FAIL IN LATVIA'S HOUR OF SUPREME TRIAL

Mr. Speaker, no other country in history has been in such a precarious situation as that of the three small states on the northeastern shores of the Baltic Sea—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. All their well-being depends upon peace, freedom of trade and of the seas, and respect for treaties and international law. They are not military powers, but they are working parts of world progress and civilization. In their land they created their own Garden of Eden, which during the past years has been trampled under by the relentless and merciless tread of war. For these three countries the question is to be or not to be. They rest all their hopes on the Atlantic Charter and firmly believe that the democratic world will not fail them.

Latvia, like Estonia and Lithuania, during this war became an object of Bolshevik invasion in 1940 and a battlefield between Germany and Soviet Russia in 1941. In prosecuting the war with Germany, Soviet Russia's Red Army in July 1944 for the second time crossed the Latvian border, and Latvia again became a battlefield. More destruction, more sufferings, more people killed. News arriving from neutral Sweden describes renewed persecutions by the Bolsheviks in occupied Lithuania. Similar persecutions are evidently taking place in the Latvian territory occupied by the Bolsheviks, who entered Latvia without a preliminary declaration that Soviet Russia would respect Latvia's sovereignty and international laws of warfare. To the contrary, in its communiqués abroad Soviet Russia, violating international law, describes Latvia as "Soviet territory to be liberated" from Germany or simply as "Soviet Latvia." By what rights? No such rights exist.

In 1920 Soviet Russia voluntarily recognized the independence, self-subsistence, and sovereignty of Latvia and for eternity renounced all sovereign rights over the Latvian people and territory, basing its action on the principle of self-determination of nations. By the same treaty it was stipulated that the frontier between the two states should run on a line separating ethnographic majorities of both peoples. There were no border questions between Latvia and Soviet Russia. Subsequently relations were established between the two neighboring states based on noninterference and a good-neighbor policy. Other treaties were signed—sanitary, railway, commerce, and so forth. Latvia granted Soviet Russia free transit over its rail and water ways and ports, and even lowered its railway tariffs from 10 percent to 70 percent for Soviet goods. However, Soviet Russia did not make much use of these facilities. Relations, nonetheless, continued to be good and more treaties were signed—a nonaggression treaty in 1932, which was extended until 1945; a treaty of conciliation in 1933; and in the same year the convention defining aggression and the aggressor was signed. Nothing seemed to trouble the good relations between Latvia and Soviet Russia.

This went on until 1939, when war broke out between Germany on one side and Poland, England, and France on the other. Latvia declared its neutrality, having on June 7, 1939, signed a nonaggression treaty also with Germany and being a member of the League of Nations. Regardless of that, Latvia, in October 1939, had to sign a mutual-assistance treaty with Soviet Russia—after Estonia, the ally of Latvia, had already signed—under which Latvia leased for 10 years to Soviet Russia several military and naval bases on its Baltic shore in Kurzeme, at Liepaja and Ventspils, and permitted Soviet Russia for the duration of war to maintain in these bases a garrison of 30,000.

Solemn declarations were made by Soviet Russia that she had no intentions whatsoever against Latvia's sovereignty and independence. These declarations were repeated as late as March 29, 1940, by Foreign Commissar Molotov. However, on June 16, 1940, Latvia received an ultimatum to grant free passage to Soviet Russian troops in unlimited numbers and to form a pro-Soviet Government. Some absolutely unfounded accusations were made against Latvia to camouflage this demand.

Latvia being completely isolated—Lithuania already on June 14–15 had been completely occupied by the Red Army—it had to accept the ultimatum, hoping against hope that at least in this way it would preserve its existence. Estonia did the same. It must be stated that, contrary to Bolshevik expectations,

no uprisings took place, and no Soviets were proclaimed; the Latvians, except a relatively few alien fellow travelers and also a few Communists, were grim and taciturn. The pro-Soviet Government formed by a Moscow emissary, A. Vishinsky, was used as a tool for Latvia's sovietization by engineered so-called elections—only one, procommunistic ticket was permitted to run—of a stooge parliament, which decided by open vote in breach of Latvia's Constitution to beg the U. S. S. R. for admittance into the Soviet Union. During the elections Latvia was under the complete domination of the Red Army. Latvia's President, Dr. K. Ulmanis, who was compelled to yield, was already in July, before the annexation of Latvia, deported to the U. S. S. R. Also the Vice President, Gen. J. Balodis, and many other leading political persons met the same fate.

One should bear in mind that the Latvians are a nation of farmers, and that they have no aristocracy. All their intellectuals and middle class, including scientists, writers, artists, painters, financists, tradesmen, seamen, engineers, and so forth, are descendants of farmers or tenants, their farms not exceeding 132 acres. The Latvians formed a working democracy and based their economic life on cooperative associations, private property, subject to restriction by social laws, free contracts, free inheritance, and their social-political life on self-government, strong family ties, religious ethics, and equality before law and of opportunity based on the merit system. Racial minorities enjoyed cultural autonomy and all rights. Social justice reigned. Religion was free.

Already in 1920 Latvia had partitioned estates larger than 100 hectares. It had a highly developed agricultural system and local industry, shipping, and trade. It was prosperous and had no unemployment nor deficits in its budget; a favorable balance of trade and payments enhanced the welfare of the country.

Latvians were satisfied with their mode of life, based on ideals of western occidental culture, to which they always belonged. They did not live in villages like the Russians, they did not know the "mir" or collective property of land as the Russian peasants.

In the process of national awakening, creating an intellectual and middle class, the Latvians by the end of the nineteenth century became conscious of their nationhood, and a vigorous political movement culminated in the revolution of 1904–5, which was bloodily suppressed regardless of the moderate demands for self-government and social reforms.

Eventually the Latvian Provisional National Council was recognized by Great Britain as Latvia's temporary Government. On November 18, 1918, in Riga, liberated from the Germans, the Latvian State Council was organized, and the first Latvian Government under Dr. K. Ulmanis—a graduate of Nebraska Lincoln University—was elected. The primary task of the state council and of the Government was to organize Latvia's administration and national defense and to elect a Latvian constituent assembly. All these aims were attained, and Latvia became a republic with a democratic form of government. Simultaneously, it became a member of the League of Nations. Incidentally, Latvia belonged to the European family of nations since 1207, when it was accepted as a principality into the Holy Roman Empire. Latvians are neither Slavs nor Teutons, their religion is Protestant and Roman Catholic. They have inhabited their territory since the Bronze Age, and they have their own ancient civilization and culture. This nation of free farmers is basically opposed to socialism and bolshevism—as are all similar farming nations of northern, central, and southeastern Europe. The Bolshevik rulers of Latvia, which was annexed to Soviet Russia by devious processes, therefore applied to Latvians—and also to Estonians and Lithuanians—the most terroristic persecutions; thousands were killed, and scores of thousands were deported to Siberian and central Asiatic forced labor camps, mines, and so forth. Every Latvian patriot, member of the militia, and so forth, was considered anti-Soviet. Many of the persecuted were simple workmen but patriotic.

According to article 4, the "capitalistic economic system of Latvia is abolished." Private ownership, according to article 6, is annulled in Latvia on "land, its riches, waters, forests, large industrial works and factories, mines, sources of ore, means of communication, large agricultural enterprises (How large?), also communal enterprises, large buildings in cities and industrial centers, and so forth." Also the property of the cooperatives by article 7 is proclaimed to be "public socialistic property." What is left over, according to article 10, may belong to citizens: Income from their labor, the abode in which they dwell, a small piece of kitchen-garden land, farming inventory, household objects, and objects of personal use.

Article 8 permits individual private husbandries of peasants, artisans, and manual producers, but "within the limits defined by law." What limits? According to article 10, the purpose of the state plan is to increase public, not personal wealth. Article 17 provides that all laws of the U. S. S. R. are mandatory in Latvia, and everything must be determined in accordance with the laws of the U. S. S. R.

The most important economic branches, according to article 48, such as the food industry, meat and dairy industry, light industry, forest industry, agriculture, finance, and commerce are subject to the federal commissariats of the U. S. S. R.

It is a historical fact that the Latvian people and also the other progressive Baltic nations of a high material and intellectual culture had never voluntarily accepted the enslavement provided by this so-called constitution, and will never accept it. The Latvian people also never accepted the Nazi "new order," and they hate both bolshevism and nazi-ism.

The Latvians, who possess their own language, territory, and unified government, and are economically self-supporting, firmly believe that the Atlantic Charter, to which also the U. S. S. R. has subscribed several times, will be eventually respected also by the U. S. S. R.

The Latvian people, however, are willing to reestablish good neighborly relations with the U. S. S. R., but only on the basis of the treaty of 1920, provided that all deportees and arrested Latvian citizens be at once released, and reparations made for damages done, according to international law, and that the Bolshevik agents who committed atrocities in Latvia during the Bolshevik occupation be punished in the same way as the Nazi war criminals.

The Latvian people expect that after finishing military operations on Latvian soil, the Red Army will immediately leave Latvia, and that the Latvian people will regain its sovereignty and self-government.

Is Sidney Hillman to Choose Our President?—Purpose of a Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the campaign for a fourth term is a culmination of the drive to destroy our constitutional form of government; to take from the people their liberties, from coming generations the opportunity to be prosperous and happy.

Nothing is to be gained by concealment of the facts, by an evasion of the issue or the refusal to drag it out into the open, face it squarely and defeat completely those who would destroy the Republic and in its place set up a government not by law but by men.

The President is using the war and the absence of our men on foreign soil as an excuse and an oportunity to establish himself as a dictator. Now, it matters not at all whether Mr. Roosevelt is using the Communists and Sidney Hillman, ambitious labor politicians and racketeers, or whether they are using him for the accomplishment of this purpose. It is not the men nor the methods which are being used which is of first importance. The thing that matters is the result that will be brought about by what is being done.

However, some idea of what is being attempted can be gleaned from the record of the men who are active in the fourth term drive and the methods which they use. Naturally, they protest their sincerity of purpose; loudly assert that their first objective is the winning of the war and then proclaim that all who oppose their activities lack patriotism and love of country and have no interest in the welfare of the worker, or, for that matter, in what happens to anyone other than themselves.

Those now engaged in the campaign for a fourth term have over the months

and the years attempted to discredit the Congress as a whole and individual Representatives elected time and again by the people who know them best.

One method which they have used to attempt to destroy the people's faith in the legislative branch of the Government is to associate the names of individual Members of Congress with the names of individuals who have been either convicted of crime or, by New Deal administrators, charged with criminal offenses.

Not a few of those who have been engaged in this campaign of vilification, active in making false charges of a lack of patriotism, have themselves court records which show that heretofore they have had no regard for the law and have attempted by force and violence to overthrow our Government.

I do not believe in this method of condemning one individual simply because he knows, has been seen with, another individual. Because someone convicted of crime has quoted what another person said is no proof that the person quoted holds all of the same views as does the one using the quotation.

However, where you find a group using similar mehods and, after knowledge of each other's previous records, working together toward a common purpose, it is not illogical to infer that the natural result of their actions is something for which all are equally responsible.

It is a familiar principle of law, and it is no more than common sense, that where a group does work together, with full knowledge of what each has done, is doing, each is responsible for the acts of the other while engaged in the common enterprise.

The calling of names and the stating of conclusions never give the foundation for the settlement of an issue. Only by a recognition of the facts as they exist and by a realization of the logical results which flow from those facts can the real issue be made clear, the battle won.

The President, the New Dealers, and the Communists attempt to deceive the people by leading them to believe that, because by virtue of being President he is legally the Commander in Chief of the armed forces, he, as a matter of fact, determines the strategy which shall be followed, the time and the place and the manner in which the battles shall be fought. The President tries to make us think that the success or the failure of the war depends upon his good judgment, whereas, in truth and in fact, the Chiefs of Staff determine our battle policy.

The disgrace of Pearl Harbor has been thrown by the President upon Kimmel and Short. But only yesterday Kimmel denied the truth of the conclusions drawn by a Member of the other body from the Roberts report, which was supposed to give the American people the truth about the disaster at Pearl Harbor.

Up to the present time, both of those men have been charged, in the public mind at least, with being derelict in their duty; with being responsible for the loss of many of our men, many of our ships. But, contrary to the American custom and belief, neither has ever been given his day in court; neither has ever been permitted to say a word in his own defense.

Now, if the President was, as he claims, determining our foreign policy at and prior to December 7, 1941, these two men were under his orders, and if they acted under orders from him as Commander in Chief, then he—not they—is responsible for this disaster.

Mr. Roosevelt as Commander in Chief cannot dodge responsibility for the disaster at Pearl Harbor and at the same time ask the American people to reelect him because he is Commander in Chief and, as such, his judgment infallible and indispensable.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT NOT INDISPENSABLE

Long ago the President told the Congress to keep out of the Nation's foreign policy; that he had information and means of information which were unavailable to the people's Representatives and that he was best qualified to, and would, keep us out of war; that our armies would never be required to fight on foreign soil.

It is now evident that, to put it charitably, he either was ignorant of or misjudged the facts. Yet he strives to create the impression, as do his New Deal stooges and his communistic allies, that, whether the war be won or lost, the coming peace be permanent or transitory, rests in his hands.

The dumbest of us now know that we will win this war; that the terms of the peace and its probable duration will be determined by Stalin, who rightly thinks first of his own country, communistic Russia, and her interests; and Churchill, who has frankly and boldly announced that imperialistic Great Britain shall at least continue to be co-mistress of the seas and of subservient millions.

CANDIDATE ROOSEVELT PROMISES EVERYTHING

Other lures held out to what Mr. Roosevelt hopes will again be a gullible public are his promises to grant special privileges to pressure groups controlling votes.

If there is anything that Franklin Delano Roosevelt has not promised, at the expense of the hard-working American taxpayer, to give to some group, people, or nation, let someone name it. And always—yes, always—without a single exception, the cost of his giving has been, and in the future will be, paid by Americans.

He and his supporters have frightened, and they continue to attempt to frighten, the people by referring to the depression, which was brought on during Herbert Hoover's administration by the last war, and the destructiveness which comes with every war.

But the public debt and the deficits of that depression period, which the President pretended to fear, were but drops in the bucket when compared to the deluge of public indebtedness which now, and hereafter, threatens to overwhelm us.

Nor can the President, the New Dealers and his communistic allies excuse themselves by saying that the debt is the result of the war. Long before the war appeared on the horizon, the waste, the extravagance, the downright misapplication of public funds by the administration and the New Dealers were adding billions to the public debt, and that at a rate of increase more rapid than ever before.

The President promised economy. He gave us extravagance. He promised a lessening of Government agencies, bureaus, and employees, and he more than doubled their number. And this before the war. He said he would drive the money changers from the temple. He brought in a horde of profiteers and racketeers, who are still with us in ever-increasing numbers.

He told us the rights of the citizens would be respected, but through a system of orders, rules, and directives the citizen can no longer obtain equal justice under law and must bow to the will of an administrative dictator. Under the plea that added power was necessary to successfully prosecute the war, the President and his supporters have made it impossible for the average citizen to carry on his business, either of farming, manufacturing, transportation, or merchandising in accordance with the laws of supply and demand, or with common sense and good judgment. Recourse to the courts and to justice is denied them.

ROOSEVELT'S RECORD

Mr. Roosevelt, the New Dealers, and his communistic allies insist that he is the indispensable man, the only man who can save our people from chaos and destruction. They base their claim upon his record.

That record is one of broken promises, misstatements of a utopia which the President promised but knew could not be established, the creation of a mirage which gave the vision of a land of plenty and of happiness without work or effort.

It is a record which discloses a loss of liberty to the average citizen; a creation of opportunity for graft and racketeering for the unprincipled; the enslavement of the average citizen, including the industrial worker, who has been misled by the granting of temporary special privileges.

THE ADMINISTRATION DEFIES THE EXISTENCE OF ECONOMIC LAWS

The President and his advisers know, for the history of the world teaches the lesson in no unmistakable terms, that as long as human nature remains as it is, the law of supply and demand will operate; that some people will be rich, some poor, and some exist in an economic status in between.

Rationing is necessary when, and only when, there is a shortage of the necessities of life, either of food, clothing, fuel, or shelter. The purpose of rationing is to prevent those who have money from buying and hoarding, keeping from those whose existence depends upon their possession, the necessities of life. Under no other theory can it be justified as applied to a free people.

When the exigencies of war made it apparent that, to feed and to arm the

rest of the world, our people must produce more and perhaps do with less, the administration, ever ambitious for power, instead of adopting an over-all policy of limiting the percentage of increase paid or charged for both services and commodities, attempted to establish universal rationing; attempted to fix the sales price of millions of items.

The task was beyond human accomplishment and now, from yesterday's paper, we learn that, while the quantity of the necessities of life which might be purchased has been limited, while attempts have been made to fix prices, instead of there being a scarcity of food, of those things necessary to carry on the war, there is a surplus.

Yesterday's press told us that an abandoned limestone mine in Kansas is to be turned into the world's largest storage plant, to receive eggs, lard, and other food products, by September 1; that the Army and the Navy are considering the use of caves and abandoned mines to hold their food supplies; that the War Food Administration is selling between eight and ten million dollars worth of food each month, but that, in spite of such sales, its reserve is now growing; that it is now holding 2,000,000 tons of food in this country and has some sort of a claim on perhaps three times that much stock-piled abroad, and that this is in addition to what the Army and the Navy are holding and to the harvest of this year.

We all know from recent press dispatches of millions of dozens of eggs which the Government has found it impossible to use or to sell, except for fertilizer purposes.

Nevertheless, the bureaucrats continue to grasp for power and insist upon being given the opportunity to control the production and the disposal of the necessities of life.

WHY CHANGE OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT?

Intelligent individuals concede that private American business enterprise has shown itself to be the most fruitful method of production known to mankind.

Today, after more than 160 years of existence under the Constitution—so often ridiculed and slightingly referred to by the New Dealers and the Communists, except when they come in conflict with the law and ask for its protection—our Republic has grown to manhood and our armed forces are those most feared by the Japanese and the Germans.

To us every nation involved in this war against the Axis Powers has looked, and still looks, for food and clothing; for tanks, trucks, guns, ammunition, planes, and ships to carry on and to win the war, and they all look to us for funds to rebuild, rehabilitate their destroyed cities and industries. They expect us to aid in feeding and clothing them after the battle is over—yes, to reestablish them in business after the war is over, in competition with our own industrialists, our own American working men and women.

Yet, Mr. Roosevelt has the effrontery to slightingly refer to and to ridicule as the "horse-and-buggy days" those days during which our ancestors built, upon the foundation laid by the forefathers, our present might and power.

The President had the conceit to unjustly criticize the Supreme Court, which for more than 160 years had stood guard over the rights of the humblest citizen, and to attempt, without regard to legal provisions, to pack that Court and make it subservient to his will.

Neither the President, the New Dealers, nor the Communists can truthfully deny that we are the most powerful, the most resourceful, the most charitable, the most unselfish Nation in all the world; that we have shown, down through our existence, that we are more willing to extend aid to the unfortunate than any other people. Yet, notwithstanding the facts shown by the record, they insist that the Constitution is outmoded, has outlived its usefulness; that our way of government, of living together, and of creating opportunities for happiness and prosperity, should be changed.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. Roosevelt's Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, has officially characterized the Communist Party as dedicated to the overthrow of our Government by force. Mr. Roosevelt himself is familiar with the history of the Communist Party. He knows what it is. He is aware of its objectives and, in a speech at Syracuse in September 1936, he said:

> I have not sought, I do not seek, I repudiate the support of any advocate of communism. * * * That is my position. It always has been my position. It always will be my position.

But that statement was made before the malignant, consuming cancer of ambition attacked him, became his master. Today, although the Communist Party, its methods, and its objectives remain the same as they were in 1936, Mr. Roosevelt, seeking a fourth term, does not repudiate its support.

The head of the Communist Party, Earl Browder, convicted and serving time in prison, was, by Mr. Roosevelt, pardoned for the purpose, he said, of creating national unity. And straightway, from the day of his liberation down to the present moment, Earl Browder, the leader of the Communists in America, has been advocating the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt, and to date, notwithstanding his prior acknowledgment of the destructiveness of the Communist Party purpose, the President accepts the active support of Communists, Communist dollars, and the Communist organization.

In the draft of the program of the Communist Party of Michigan, among other things, it was stated:

> I. Political action is the order of the day: From the national committee resolution: "The 1944 elections are the most important Presidential and congressional elections since those of 1864. * * *"
>
> II. * * *: A primary task is the reelection of our Commander in Chief. * * *. This means: 1. Every Communist and Progressive must devote himself to organizing a crusade to draft Roosevelt.

The Communists, the Communist Party, through its leaders, its workers and its dollars, is actively campaigning for Candidate Roosevelt. They are political bedfellows. The record establishes that fact. It cannot be successfully denied.

In the August 1944 issue of Ammunition, which is the official publication of the education department of the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America—U. A. W.-C. I. O.—and which is actively and enthusiastically devoted to the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt to a fourth term, on page 8 you will find an article by Maurice Sugar, general counsel, U. A. W.-C. I. O., one of its most active members.

This is the same Maurice Sugar who, in 1917, in a United States Federal district court, entered a plea of guilty to a charge of conspiracy to induce persons to refuse to register in accordance with the Conscription Act then in force. He also entered a plea of guilty the same year to a charge of failing to comply with the Conscription Act then in force. He was sentenced to prison, and when he appealed his convictions were affirmed and the official record thereof will be found in 252 Federal 74, 252 Federal 79, and 248 United States Reports 578.

When this same Maurice Sugar, who is now so actively advocating the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt, was a candidate for city councilman in the city of Detroit, the Communist Party put out a campaign document asking the voters of that city to support him. Among other things, that document said:

> Vote for Comrade Sugar who is the friend of the foreign born and he will aid in making the revolution. Comrade Sugar has come out definitely against the church which has kept the people in darkness and ignorance for 1,900 years. His slogan is "close the churches." * * * Down with religion which is the opium which the ruling class feed you to keep you satisfied with the miserable existence which you lead.
>
> There is no God.
>
> To all the friends who hate the smug priests of the Catholic Church and the slimy hypocritical ministers of the Protestant churches.
>
> To all those who are oppressed by this damnable government we address this message. Vote for our candidate. Our candidate is Maurice Sugar, the International Labor defense attorney and member of the Communist Party.
>
> Remember the election is November 8. For further information about the Communist Party call or write to 5969 Fourteenth Street, telephone Garfield 9660.
>
> Comradely yours,
>
> _____ _____,
>
> *District Organizer, District No. 7.*

Today, Maurice Sugar and that same organization—never, so far as I know, having renounced any of its political beliefs as advocated at that time—are asking for the reelection of Candidate Roosevelt; and Candidate Roosevelt, President of the United States and Commander-in-Chief of our armed forces, has, so far as I have been able to learn, never repudiated their present support.

It is true that the Communist Party, like a convict with a long criminal record, recently sought an alias, a new name. In its program for its Michigan State con-

vention, it stated that one of the organizational and constitutional questions that would face the 1944 Communist convention was, "What is to be the new name of the Communist organization?"

At the national convention of the Communist Party, realizing that liberty-loving Americans had no use for its teachings, the Communist organization sought for and adopted a new name under which to carry on its old program. At the national convention it was voted that hereafter the organization should be known as Communist Political Association. And that is the name under which the ex-convict, the head of the Communist Party, Earl Browder, and the party itself, through its workers, its publications, and its dollars, now asks for the reelection of Candidate Roosevelt.

ANOTHER POLITICAL BEDFELLOW

Another political bedfellow of Mr. Roosevelt is the C. I. O. Committee for Political Action, with Sidney Hillman, with his foreign ideologies and his campaign slush fund, at its head. That committee has millions of dollars to spend—dollars which, with the aid of the administration, it has filched from the pockets of the workingmen.

It is working actively for the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt and it, too, in an attempt to deceive the people as to who was actually behind its campaigning, changed its name—from the "C. I. O. Political Action Committee" to the "Citizens Political Action Committee."

Still more recently, that organization, in addition to attempting to assess every worker in a war industry, every worker belonging to a C. I. O. union, a dollar to be used for campaign purposes, has caused veterans who had returned from the war and found jobs in industry to be discharged because of their failure to contribute to its campaign fund for Mr. Roosevelt's reelection, and has also attempted to collect campaign contributions from employers with which the union was dealing for the renewal of employment contracts.

Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal administration, through the War Labor Board, compels the blood relatives of men who are fighting and dying across the seas for the preservation of this Nation, if they would hold their jobs, to make contributions out of their earnings to a political fund to be used for the reelection of the Commander in Chief, or to lose their membership in the union. Think that one over, and, if you can think of a more arbitrary, unjust, despotic, Hitlerite act or procedure, name it.

NEW DEAL ASHAMED OF ITS NAME

Candidate Roosevelt himself apparently is ashamed or afraid of the implications associated with the name with which his political offspring was christened, for, like the Communist Party and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, he recently sought to get rid of the name and the unpleasant association of ideas which go with it by suggesting that it be called the Win-the-War party. His egotism is illustrated in the unexpressed thought that no one but New Dealers, Communists, and fourth-termers were fighting or contributing to the war.

BIRDS OF A FEATHER

There are two old and much-abused sayings. They are: "Birds of a feather flock together," and "Men are known by the company they keep."

You are familiar with the facts which show that Candidate Roosevelt, his backers and supporters, the New Dealers, the labor politicians and the labor racketeers, as distinguished from workers themselves, and the Communists are all working toward the same end and the same purpose. So judge for yourselves as to whether the fourth-term advocates, the New Dealers, the Communists, are birds of a feather, are all flocking together, all working for the one purpose of establishing here, before the war is over, a form of government which is not a republic.

In the early days of the New Deal there may have been some excuse for people being misled, blind to the issues to be decided at an election. The New Deal during the past 11 years has demonstrated its purpose. The Communists, the money changers who have returned to the temple, and the advocates of a fourth term, have made their purpose—the continuation in office of one man, government by bureaucrats, by directives rather than by law, the destruction of the citizen's right of appeal to the courts, the curtailment of his liberty—clear to all.

If these are the things the people want, it is their privilege to impose them upon themselves. If, on the contrary, they want to restore the Government of the forefathers, preserve the liberty and the opportunities which have made us the envy of all people, they have that privilege, come the November election.

If the people want Maurice Sugar, writing in the August issue of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. publication, convicted, as he was, of a conspiracy to violate a prior conscription law, enacted to carry on the last World War, to tell them what to do to win this war, that is their privilege.

If the people want to let Sidney Hillman, the apostle of foreign ideologies; Earl Browder, the ex-convict and head of the Communist Party, buy an election, select their President, that is their privilege.

If the people of this country want to go along with the Communist Party, whose purpose, as Attorney General Biddle said, is the overthrow of our Government by force; the Communist Party, which not so long ago, in its appeal for votes, stated "There is no God"; called for the votes of all those "who hate the smug priests of the Catholic Church and the slimy, hypocritical ministers of the Protestant churches," and who asked all those "who are oppressed by this damnable Government," to vote for their candidate, that, too, is their privilege.

It is also our prilivege to repudiate the whole crew of wreckers and once more, by our ballots, express our faith in God, the efficacy of religion, the soundness of our Republic.

Britain's Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a remarkable editorial by John S. Knight, a distinguished American publisher, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press Sunday, August 20, 1944, one of his newspapers. This editorial analyzes Anglo-American post-war problems and merits the consideration of all Americans.

The editorial, Mr. Speaker, is far more remarkable, because up to the time that Mr. Knight was sent to England by the administration's O. W. I.—Office of War Information—he was one of America's outstanding internationalists.

JOHN S. KNIGHT ANALYZES ANGLO-AMERICAN POST-WAR PROBLEMS

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

Are the British putting it over on us? I tried to answer that question as best I could in a series of friendly discussions based upon 10 months' observation of the official London scene.

In general, the answer was that the British are fearful of post-war American competition, are striving desperately to hold their world markets, and are determined to avoid going deeper into debt or to liquidate any more foreign holdings.

It is a policy based upon extreme realism and whether or not the British "put it over on us" would seem to depend upon the degree of realism that our own Government adopts in its dealings with the very able and clever British statesmen employed by Winston Churchill to prevent the "liquidation of the British Empire."

You have read much in the last few weeks about post-war lend-lease. It has been widely heralded as the means to be employed in reconversion of the world from war to peace. It has been justified as the method by which United States post-war trade will be promoted.

It is offered as a partial answer to the threat of depression and unemployment which may follow the sudden curtailment of United States exports now running at the rate of nearly a billion and a half a month.

I think all of us realize that the United States must play a large part in the rehabilitation of war-torn Europe. Both political parties are committed to that general principle.

The question is: How far should we go? To what extent are we prepared to draw upon our own resources in order to help a world economy? How large a load are United States taxpayers willing to carry?

Let's bring the situation up to date:

1. The present Lend-Lease Act permits nations entitled to lend-lease to place orders until July 1, 1945, and delivery of goods under those contracts can be continued until July 1, 1948. The only qualification is that lend-lease contracts must be in some way related to the general subject of "defense."

2. England wants lend-lease to continue after the fall of Germany and probably in the transition period following the defeat of Japan.

3. Russia has notified the United States that as soon as the war ends, she will begin paying for everything received, either in cash

or credit. At the end of last May, lend-lease goods sent to Russia totaled $5,600,000,000.

4. France estimates that $2,000,000,000 will be needed in reconstruction funds after her liberation from Germany. It is conceded that years will elapse before the French economy could be reorganized to finance reconstruction through orthodox methods.

5. China is presently in a state of runaway inflation. The billions required to modernize its transportation, industry, and agriculture are not at hand. China is likewise a candidate for extended lend-lease favors.

6. South America has no need of post-war lend-lease. United States purchases of war materials and essential commodities have given these countries ample funds with which to deal through usual trade channels.

Added to these will come requests for help from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Holland, Belgium, and Denmark.

Without question, the devastated countries of Europe are entitled to a first and compassionate consideration.

U. N. N. R. A., the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization, has already been granted $800,000,000 by Congress to aid in a work of mercy and reconstruction.

I anticipate no difficulty in dealing with Russia. For many years prior to this war, Russia purchased supplies and equipment from the United States through the Amtorg Trading Corporation and there was never any question raised about Russia as a credit risk.

I freely predict that our post-war political and commercial relations with Russia will be very close. A hint of this is found in a recent edition of the London Daily Mail which states that "as things have turned out, we (the British) have observed that Washington and Moscow have a great many interests and policies in common, enough to make Britain's offices as a middleman and interpreter between her western and eastern partners both unnecessary and unwelcome. This is a development well worth considering."

Quite naturally, Russia will press for all the lend-lease aid she can get from us. But there is likewise a disposition on Russia's part to attain a greater economic and industrial stature, to make her home front as robust and efficient as her military machine, to take her rightful place as one of the great powers of the world.

Rest assured that Russia has no intention of remaining permanently on the charity rolls.

But what about England?

We were told recently by the National Association of Manufacturers that the British are looking to the United States to support their domestic economy after the war. Their representatives are reputed to have informed our leaders that such action is absolutely necessary to stave off a serious economic situation in England.

According to the National Association of Manufacturers, the suggested program would cost the United States taxpayers two and one-half billions a year over and above all war requirements.

The National Association of Manufacturers makes the further point that because of its awkward position, "we have allowed the United Kingdom to sell billions of dollars' worth of lend-lease foodstuffs, clothing, and other civilian necessities and pocket the cash, which they, in turn, used to pay for imports from British colonies and dominions and Latin-American nations. Also, we have allowed her to sell huge quantities of lend-lease goods in the Middle East, the Far East, Africa, and Spain."

Never doubt an Englishman's ability to look after his own interests. We say this not in disparagement but with considerable admiration.

Through our help, the British have managed to keep their entire national debt, including some five and a half billions owed us from the last war, and which is still carried on their books, in the neighborhood of 75 billions, while our own debt is soaring to an estimated 300 billions.

Nor does England intend to lose her world markets. While we toss harsh words at Spain's dictator, clever Winston Churchill made a speech in Commons which inferred that good old Franco was not such a bad toff at that and why should he start kicking Spain around when after all, Franco kept the Germans out of the Iberian Peninsula, didn't he?

Or take the case of the Argentine. The British press is vigorously critical of Secretary Hull's bitter words about Argentina. Let's quote a few paragraphs:

"Mr. Hull has spoken of the Argentine in language similar to that employed by Russia about the Polish emigres.

"He has been supported by a chorus of newspaper editorials and columns whose extravagant distortions have worked up public opinion to a state of ignorant belligerency against the 'good neighbor' that won't be ordered about.

"Argentina has found herself in the same state as a small Chicago shopkeeper of the old days who refused to pay 'protection' to the local gang.

"Now if Argentina were a far-away country of which we in Britain know nothing, we could fairly sit this particular crisis out.

"But she is an old friend of Britain's—nearly 150 years of unbroken friendship between us—and she had the largest British colony outside the Empire.

"It is indeed strange that Mr. Hull, a southerner, does not better understand the Latin-American fear of Yankee 'carpet-bagging' both now and after the war."

Neither Churchill's remarks nor the quotations from the Daily Mail sound much like antifascism, do they?

But they typify top-flight official views in London. The Daily Mail, owned by Lord Rothermere, carries proudly on its masthead each day the legend, "For King and Empire." Its opinions are usually in complete accord with those of the Prime Minister.

Both Churchill and the Daily Mail are thinking in terms of post-war trade. They don't intend to lose any good customers if they can help it.

While the United States is using a justifiable moral and economic force against those of the neutrals who won't play our game up to the hilt, the British are totting it all up in terms of pounds, shillings, and pence.

When a Britisher discusses any phase of internationalism, he is actually weighing the fortunes of the British Empire. Basically, a Britisher is as nationalistic as a citizen of Moscow or a Midwest American farmer.

Considering that England's economic life is almost wholly dependent upon export and import trade, whereas ours prior to the war was something less than 10 percent, the British position is at least understandable.

I have said many times that it would be a mistake for us to think that eventually we can dominate the markets of the world.

Even as our foreign trade expands well above the prewar figures, there must be similar expansion for nations like England if we are seeking a stable world economy and peace in the years to come.

It has already been demonstrated that it is possible to reach agreements on oil and post-war aviation. Further progress can be made in international agreements without embracing the theory of cartelization. This development is all to the good.

But how are we as American citizens going to feel about underwriting England's domestic economy?

Remember, the bill will be in the neighborhood of two and one-half billions a year, equivalent to one-half the entire United States Federal Budget prior to 1932.

As of July 1, 1944, lend-lease aid by the United States to our Allies totaled more than 27 billions. Forty billions more have been authorized by Congress.

Based upon present calculations, our own post-war annual budget will probably exceed the $25,000,000,000 mark. This amount will increase in direct proportion to the length of time it takes to win the war.

Taxes will be stratospherically high for many, many years to come.

What may eventually became the popular American opinion was well expressed the other day by the Miami Herald:

"It is inconceivable that any large group of English would seriously consider asking the United States to go deeper into debt to save Britain from incurring debts that would more nearly equal our own.

"The far-flung empire—from India through Canada, Jamaica and South Africa—has populations and resources much greater than those of the United States. Unlimited credit and goods probably will be extended to Britain by the United States, but it is doubtful that we will wish to plunge on into debt by putting this assistance on a charity basis.

"Being in the empire business entails vast sacrifices and responsibilities which British populations have been willing to make for centuries. The empire has been saved from political extinction by all of the United Nations. None of the Britishers we are acquainted with would now consider asking that United States citizens undergo new privations to bolster the empire's economy."

Well, it may seem inconceivable, but that is precisely what the British Government intends to do. Its envoys are even now in Washington sounding out official and congressional reactions to the scheme.

As time runs on you will be hearing much more about it.

We respectfully suggest that it might be in order for Candidates Roosevelt and Dewey to say a few words on the subject during the campaign.

That is, if and when the campaign starts.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

The Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 18, 1944, captioned "M. V. A. goes to the Senate." The editorial deals with the proposed Missouri Valley authority which is provided for in a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. The Senate will recall that on last Friday the Senator from Montana made a very able and enlightening speech on the bill and its provisions, and the reasons for the establishment of a Missouri Valley authority.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

M. V. A. GOES TO THE SENATE

This day—Friday, August 18—may prove to be a momentous one in the history of the Missouri Valley. On this day, Senator MURRAY of Montana introduced into the Congress of the United States a bill for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority.

The sweep and grandeur of this legislative proposal is to be measured in terms of the 7,000,000 human beings it affects, and the vast territory of 530,000 square miles—more than 17 percent of the area of continental United States—that it embraces.

In his speech to the Senate today, Senator MURRAY correctly said that "the full development of resources proposed under this bill might well rank as the most important national development since the Louisiana Purchase, of which much of this territory was a part."

The purpose of the Murray bill—which, of course, was modeled after the Tennessee Valley Authority, now in its twelfth year—is to provide one unified authority over the Missouri River. It is one big plan for one big river.

The bill is designed to prevent floods, which, in the past 2 years alone, have caused damages of more than $100,000,000; to irrigate the arid upriver country and reclaim millions of acres for cultivation; to promote navigation; to foster commerce among the States; to strengthen the national defense; to conserve water, soil, and forest resources; and to promote the general welfare of the United States.

In his speech of introduction, published elsewhere in this newspaper today, Senator MURRAY made a masterful presentation of the case for an M. V. A. He told how, after generations in which rival and competing Government agencies and bureaus have futilely tried to solve the river's problems piecemeal, it has now become necessary to consider the river as a whole under the new techniques and scientific management which have proved so successful in the Tennessee Valley.

He told how floods have devastated millions of acres of farm land, how the water table has been lowered, how soil has been washed away, how lands athirst for water in the upper river have been denied it. He expressed the yearning of the people along the river's 2,470 miles when he said that they want the waters of the valley husbanded; the floods controlled; navigation for cheap transportation; the use of the river to provide electric power for homes, farms, and industry; the basic resource of soil fertility protected; the development of industry; the arid and semiarid lands of the upper river made rich and productive.

When President Roosevelt asked Congress to create the T. V. A., he said:

"If we are successful here (in the Tennessee Valley), we can march on, step by step, in a like development of other great natural territorial units within our borders."

The pilot plant that is T. V. A. has been successful beyond the dreams of the President or of the venerable Senator Norris, known as the father of T. V. A. It has redeemed a region which was crumbling to ruin and has made it one of the model territories of the country, to the point that the principles it embodies have now been given world-wide implication. What has been done for the Tennessee River can be done for the Danube, the Amazon, and the Yangtze-kiang.

And what has been done in the way of unified management of the Tennessee's waters can be done for the Missouri.

Senator Murray's bill, of course, will have its enemies. There always are obstacles to progress and reform. There always are those who stubbornly oppose new ideas and new principles. But his proposal is so sound, so good, and so promising, so majestic in its scope that sooner or later, it must prevail.

A Sensible Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which recently appeared in the Salina (Kans.) Journal. The editorial is entitled "A Sensible Farm Program."

The approval of the suggestions offered here would go a long ways toward giving us a contented and prosperous national agricultural program.

A SENSIBLE FARM PROGRAM

For more than 3 score and 10 years the Journal has been fighting for a square deal for agriculture. That is not only because of the economic value of farmers and stockmen who are financially strong, but because, by and large from this group comes the most independent, as well as some of the best informed votes in the country.

They vote for their own interests sometimes, but that often is in self defense, and not because they do not know what they are doing, or love their country so little that they are not sorry that conditions force them to do so. Recently a group of farm leaders met to discuss the farm situation, and to outline ways to "have a relatively high proportion of farms of family size operated by the owners."

Convinced, as we are, of the common sense of such a plan, we believe that most of the States of the middle west will also approve and endorse the idea of family sized farms. To further this goal, 11 recommendations have been made that should be studied by every citizen who wants to see Kansas a more prosperous State because of the greater opportunities it offers to a larger number of people. Here are the 11 planks:

"1. The way should be kept open for the majority of farm tenants to become farm owners.

"2. Continuous operation of the home farm by succeeding generations of the same family should be encouraged.

"3. Appropriate measures should be taken to discourage the inflation of land prices.

"4. Farm mortgage terms need to be so drawn as to facilitate and maintain the ownership of farms by those who operate them.

"5. Appropriate and effective steps should be taken to improve landlord-tenant relations.

"6. Tenure arrangements should be developed that will safeguard and improve our basic farm resource, the soil.

"7. Plans need to be developed for the post-war adjustment of rents and wages.

"8. Improvements should be added to many farms, both owner-operated and tenant-operated to encourage the most efficient operation.

"9. Families now living on inadequate farms should be encouraged to locate on better farms or to obtain better employment.

"10. New land programs should be developed in areas near cities where there is a merging of urban and rural economy.

"11. Post-war, back-to-the-land movements should be carefully guided and controlled."

War's Challenge—Youth's Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, all of us are extremely interested in what American youth are thinking during these critical days. I include as part of my extension of remarks today one of the most clear and well-thought-out statements on this subject by Miss Margaret Power, daughter of M. W. Power, of Salinas, Calif. These remarks were given at the commencement exercises at Salinas Union High School on June 4, 1944, and appear to me to be so much to the point that I commend them to all Members of the House.

The young Americans of today face one of the greatest challenges ever presented to the youth of our Nation. We are engaged in a death struggle on a world battle front to save our democratic way of life. The young manhood of our Nation is setting aside plans for careers, education, and families, setting aside all that they have ever learned of fair play, to fight a war in which the major rule is kill or be killed. These boys are not going into battle because an emperor god has decreed so, or because a power-mad ruler has ordered it, but rather because they wish to fight for a cause and a way of life in which they believe. The American soldiers of today are not bitter; they are not railing against a fate which has deprived them of the days of their youth and made men of boys; rather they have accepted this battle as a job which must be done.

The young Americans of today are going into service with eager, receptive minds. They are anxious and willing to learn. The thousands of United States troops on the many battle fronts of today are building a foundation for the world of tomorrow. Our boys in khaki are seeing at first hand how the people of other lands live. They are gaining a knowledge of the problems, the cultures, and the peoples of the world. They are cementing friendships which will result in closer trade and cultural relations after the war. They are gaining an understanding of nations which will help to build a new, freer world. Isolation is a word which will become obsolete with our generation. In the post-war world things are going to be considered on a world instead of a national basis. Our boys—the future leaders of America—are now gaining valuable knowledge which will help them to become not only better citizens of the United States but better citizens of the world.

American youth is having its eyes opened. We are realizing, many of us for the first time, that ours is not the only country of importance. We are learning that other nations have good ideas. We are looking at our government with eyes freed from the propaganda of party and prejudice. The returning veterans are coming home with the determination to build not only a lasting peace but a better America.

This war is presenting a challenge to the character of American youth. The boys in service are making constant readjustments. Rigorous Army supervision and discipline is not easy to accept or become accustomed to—especially for our boys who are so used to individual freedom. Each soldier must evolve his own individual philosophy. He must find the answer to the death and destruction of war and accept it within himself. It is not easy to see a buddy fall

wounded or dead, and know that your turn may be next; but this is exactly what our soldier boys at the fronts go through day after day. Only those who have experienced war can realize its horror—and they will not talk about it.

The youth of America has and is proving itself strong. Our boys have made a glorious and heroic record on the battlefields of Bataan and Guadalcanal. The boys who are coming home are strong and sure within themselves. They have lost their illusions, but they have not allowed themselves to become cynical. They have become masters of themselves.

The young women of America are fighting in this war. They are nursing our boys in the front-line trenches. They are wearing the Navy blue and the Army tans. They are working on the production lines of the Nation.

For the past 20 years, there has been a steady increase in the number of women entering the business world, but up until this war the number has been a definite minority. Now for the first time the young women of America are assuming an important place in the field of industry. They are proving their dexterity, their worth. When the boys return the young women of our country will be able to greet them proudly. They will have done their part in the fight. More important, however, they will have gained a broader perspective, a keener knowledge of the problems of labor and industry. They will be able to assume their place in the post-war world with confidence.

The young women of America are proving their character. They are facing separation, perhaps death, from their loved ones with courage. They are picking up the threads of their lives and carrying on in the face of tragedy.

American youth is answering the challenge of the war. We are answering those of the older generation who have said of us that we are weak, pleasure seeking. We have demonstrated and are demonstrating that we can not only carry on in the face of adversity but that we can learn from tragedy and plan for a happier better world.

Insurance for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, insurance for veterans is an extremely complicated subject which has been much simplified in a radio talk recently made by Capt. Kenneth C. Bradley, national insurance officer for the Disabled American Veterans.

Incidentally, Captain Bradley is an old constituent of mine, having long been a national service officer for the D. A. V. in Michigan. He is a retired wounded veteran of World War No. 1, who during the last 16 years has been devoting practically all of his time to assisting disabled veterans in their multivarious problems.

Captain Bradley's outline of the various types of insurance policies provided for our servicemen and ex-servicemen by the Veterans' Administration, I am sure, helps to make this subject much better understood by those who will take the trouble to read his excellent radio talk as here quoted in full as follows:

Life insurance, a subject concerning which most Americans are quite familiar, in time of war assumes entirely different aspects than is the case under normal conditions of life. This is particularly true with respect to the members of our armed forces and their dependents. Private insurance companies, by reason of the greatly increased risks to reserves, which participation in the grim tasks of warmaking entails, are unable to assume such risks when policy holders enter the armed forces to do battle with the enemy. As a result, most insurance policies contain a so-called war clause, which, in effect, precludes the payment of death or disability benefits where the death or disability is brought about by the hazards of military service.

To offset this inability on the part of private insurers the United States Government has, from time to time, provided insurance protection to members of its armed forces. At the present time all enlisted and commissioned personnel are permitted to carry from $1,000 to $10,000 of this protection. There are two types; namely, United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance.

Only those persons who were members of the active military forces prior to October 8, 1940, are eligible, under the law, to the former, whereas all who were in such service on that date or may have since entered such service are, or were, eligible to carry the latter, provided certain time and health requirements are met. To date upward of 12,000,000 policies have been issued by the Veterans' Administration.

All policies provide for payment of benefits to a designated beneficiary in the event of the death of the insured, provided, of course, premiums were timely paid. Premiums may be, and in most instances are, paid by deduction from the pay of the insured while he or she is in the active military service. Upon discharge therefrom, however, other arrangements must be made by the insured either by direct remittance or by deduction from disability pension, compensation, or retirement pay, if any. Provisions for payment of benefits, permitted beneficiaries, and types of permitted plans, as between Government life insurance and national service life insurance differ materially.

Military personnel engaged in the prosecution of World War No. 1 were issued Government life insurance on a yearly renewable term plan, in amounts of from $1,000 to $10,000, payable, in the event of the death of the insured, to his designated beneficiary or beneficiaries. Such beneficiaries were limited to certain specified relatives of the insured. In addition, the policy provided for the payment of monthly benefits to the insured on account of permanent and total disability. Subsequently, provisions were made for the conversion of this term insurance to other plans comparable with the commonly known plans of private insurance agencies. In all policies issued, whatever the plan, there was contained a permanent and total disability clause, together with the provision, on payment of additional premiums, for payment of monthly benefits on account of total disability (not necessarily permanent) which continues for at least 4 consecutive months. Limitations on the class of permitted beneficiaries was practically eliminated.

Until October 8, 1940, on which date the National Service Life Insurance Act became law, eligibility to Government life insurance included members of the regular military forces during peacetime. Thereafter the privilege of securing original policies of United States Government life insurance was canceled except as to those applications then pending.

The National Service Life Insurance Act, under which the great majority of present members of the armed forces are now covered, falls far short of its predecessor with respect to the benefits it provides. The outstanding difference is the lack of a provision for payment of benefits to the insured on account of permanent and total disability. The nearest approach to this is a provision for waiver of payment of premiums during the continuous total disability of the insured, which commenced subsequent to the effective date of the insurance and which has existed for 6 or more consecutive months. Persons whom the insured may name as beneficiaries are limited to the widow, widower, child, parent, brother, or sister of the insured. The term "parent" includes those who may have stood in loco parentis to the insured for at least 1 year prior to the insured's entry into active service. All national service life insurance is originally issued under the 5-year-level-premium term plan, and may be converted after 1 year to ordinary life, 20- or 30-payment life. No other plan is provided.

Time does not permit discussion of the many phases of these insurance plans, but the foregoing outline indicates that there is need for amending legislation to equalize the benefits afforded our fighting men and women.

The Disabled American Veterans in concert with other major veteran organizations has sponsored legislation, now pending before the respective committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, which is designed to correct the manifest inequalities existing between the two types of insurance authorized by existing law. The legislation when adopted would, we believe, provide for the men and women and their dependents a protection which, by and large, is comparable to that afforded the veteran of World War No. 1 and the peacetime soldier, sailor, and marine. Meanwhile, we are continuing our activities designed to assist the service men and women and their dependents in securing all such benefits to which they may now be lawfully entitled and to advise all who may wish such service through our Nation-wide service department. We have experienced paid representatives in all or most of the regional facilities of the Veterans' Administration, any one of whom is ready and willing, without fee, to assist in this work. The Washington staff is located at room 543, Munsey Building, and room 156, Veterans' Administration. Your speaker specializes on the subject of insurance and, like the other members of the staff, will be pleased to assist anyone desiring such aid on insurance problems.

Americans of Japanese Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, after Japan's sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, it was natural and understandable that many Americans in their shock and anger should conclude that all persons of the Japanese race are by nature hopelessly treacherous and that even those born and educated in America could never be trusted as true, loyal American citizens.

But in the end we Americans usually make up our minds on the basis not of snap judgments or prejudices, but on the

basis of evidence. A good deal of incontrovertible evidence has already been accumulated such as the official reports that not a single case of sabotage was carried out in Hawaii by the Americans of Japanese descent, even though they constitute 39 percent of the population and had an ideal opportunity to do incalculable damage during those first few days of confusion.

Then the most thorough examination by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of those placed in relocation camps in this country revealed that the overwhelming majority has never given the slightest evidence of being a bit less loyal to the United States than, for example, the sons of Swedish, or German, or Polish, or English immigrants to this country. Those to whom any possible suspicion could be attached were carefully weeded out and segregated. The rate of voluntary enlistment in our armed services has been higher among the remainder than in any other minority group in America.

In the last week two extraordinarily eloquent bits of evidence appeared in the press, and I include them below; the first a news item in Time magazine of August 21, 1941:

RECORD

The War Department checked deep into the combat record of its famed One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, found that the Japanese-American combat outfit had set a top mark for gallantry. Already cited as a unit by Lt. Gen. Mark Clark (Time, July 31), the One Hundredth's soldiers had also won 9 Distinguished Service Crosses, 44 Silver Stars, 31 Bronze Stars, 3 Legion of Merit Medals.

Of the One Hundredth Battalion's 1,300 men—including 500 reserves—1,000 had been wounded in action, now wore Purple Hearts. Most remarkable record of all: Since the One Hundredth had been organized it had had not a single case of desertion or absence without leave.

Editorial from the American edition of the Shanghai Evening Post and Mercury, refugeeing temporarily in New York:

GOOD ADVICE TO NISEI

Under the heading "Don't be suckers, Nisei," the Japanese-American Committee for Democracy News Letter urges its readers not to accept the Socialist Party plank calling for a peace offensive.

The editor also pays his compliments to those who seize on a period of national emergency to build resentment over racial prejudice and discrimination. While holding that it is certainly necessary to perfect our democracy in due course, the editor declares that it is "far more necessary at this time to preserve the framework itself," adding: "It is the last word in specious, fatuous theorizing to give all of our attention to discussions on perfecting democracy while its very life and structure are threatened with Fascist bombs."

Finally he points out that "we Nisei (American born of Japanese origin) must choose our friends with extreme care. We cannot afford to be seduced by anybody and everybody merely because they happen to be good at shedding tears for us."

Anbody who can write courageous, sane words like those sounds to us like a true American. He may have the Sun Goddess for a remote ancestor, but his nearest living relative is Uncle Sam.

The Dies Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

PACKING A DIES COMMITTEE

By appointing two lame-duck Congressmen whose defeat was attributed to the opposition of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee to a three-man subcommittee to investigate the activities of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, Representative MARTIN DIES has shown precisely why his Committee on Un-American Activities stirs up so much controversy and produces so little remedial action.

When a congressional committee operating under the powers of Congress launches an investigation with public funds, one would think that the purpose of its inquiry should be to ascertain the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. If that were its objective, it would employ open-minded investigators to dig up all the facts relating to the subject under investigation; and then its members would study those facts judicially in an effort to determine what action Congress should take in correcting conditions or curbing activities which are fairly held to be un-American.

That Mr. DIES does not look upon a congressional investigation in that light and does not follow that procedure has been apparent for a long, long time; but his appointment of Representatives STARNES, of Alabama, and COSTELLO, of California, to a subcommittee to investigate the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is the best proof of that fact Mr. DIES has furnished. How can anyone except these two men, victims of C. I. O. political action, to conduct a fair, impartial, objective inquiry into the very activities which led to their defeat?

Certainly Mr. DIES did not appoint them to the subcommittee for such a purpose. By providing them with congressional power and public funds to use in getting even with their political foes, he virtually admits that his committee has been operating in this fashion all along.

Relation of the Home to Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by the Reverend John Schliepsick, of Hubbard, Iowa, before a meeting of lay members of the Lutheran churches in Waterloo, Iowa:

The Christian Parent Magazine defines the home as a spiritual relation between two personalities, who feel the same way about persons or things. Strictly speaking, a home consists of two persons only. Three or more persons in a family constitute a household. It is the mutual tie binding two people together that makes a home.

This human relationship of individuals to individuals is the foundation of the social life—is society. The association of the first couple on earth, established the first society, and to this day society is built upon the home. When God created man and woman, He placed them into a garden. This place where two people lived together in harmony and mutual understanding was the ideal home. Paradise was the ideal society, because all members of society were walking with God and serving God and each other in perfect love.

Since the fall of man into sin, this perfect and ideal society has been destroyed. Hatred and selfishness has supplanted mutual love. Home is set against home, man against man. Society is in grave danger of destruction. Some years back the author of a book entitled, "The Decline of the West" made the prediction that the western civilization will utterly collapse. Why? Because the home is being destroyed. The family unit is broken up. Home is no longer a haven of security, but a place to eat and to sleep.

The true relation of the home to society is that of the heart to the body. It not only is a part of the body, but the body depends upon the heart for its life. Take the home life out of society and you have chaos. No nation will long endure without strong home ties. Build strong homes and you will have a strong nation, an enduring society. Look at China with over 4,000 years of culture. It is the close home ties that has kept that nation. China is the only society that has withstood the changes of time. China has remained a society based upon family ties.

Our Nation grew from a small colony to the strongest Nation in the world. Not by power of sword, but by the building of home life. Liberty and freedom for every family to live in and regulate their own home was the power that made us strong. American home life as it was established in the days of development was the greatest asset of the Nation. Fathers and mothers were bound together in mutual interest and spiritual devotion. Fathers and mothers considered the rearing of an upright family as the first objective. The family was united about the home altar. Daily the family would assemble for worship and on Sunday the pioneer and his family would meet in God's house. Parents were respected by the household, and children were brought up in the fear of God.

Today there is general alarm about the decline of law and order. We hear a constant cry about the delinquency of youth. We know that our society is tottering. We find that the juvenile courts cannot stem the tide of lawlessness. What is the matter? Friends, it is the decline of the home that is devitalizing our Nation. Added to the general decline of our people descends the ravages of war and its demoralizing influences. Not only the tons of bombs and blockbusters, but the disruption of the family life is destroying the heart of the Nation. Like a tidal wave, the disrupted home life is engulfing the world.

Fathers and mothers are working. Many mothers are neglecting their home, not of necessity, but for money and pleasures. It is an indictment of society if a mother must leave home to earn bread for her family. It is a disgrace if a mother neglects her children, if she sacrifices the welfare of the home by seeking employment outside of the home. It is sacrificing our youth on the altar of Baal.

In the days of Joshua, the same temptations confronted the people. God had given

Israel the land of promise. Through war and travel the people had come in contact with the heathen worship and home-destroying life. After showing the result of such worship of Baal, namely destruction of the nations, Joshua pleads with the people to weigh well the profit and loss of such idolatrous practice. Placing the great alternative before them, he challenges Israel to make the decision. Whom will you serve: God, the true God, or Baal; life or death, a strong nation or slavery?

Friends, we, too, stand before this alternative. Our Nation, society is on the balance. What will we do? Continue the path of neglected homes with its doom? Or will we as individuals and families choose the God given way of life? Back to a true home life where fathers and mothers rear their children in the fear of God? Where children love and obey their elders? There the family altar is established and where the family serves the Lord? Choose you whom you will serve. "As for me, and my house, we will serve the Lord."

Address of Hon. Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey, to Democratic Women of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at a breakfast given by the Democratic Women of Illinois on July 20 at the Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Ill., in recognition of my twentieth year in Congress:

Looking over this great audience of women from every part of the country and realizing much that is in your hearts today, I feel a great sense of responsibility lest I shall not measure up to what is expected of a woman who has served in Congress nearly 20 years. Looking back over those 20 years, I know there were many things I could have done better.

Being the first woman elected by the Democratic Party, I had no woman to guide me, no precedent established by any woman of my party. I may say in all sincerity I was frightened. When I took my oath of office I prayed that I might live up to that oath. I have tried to do so. To the people of the Thirteenth New Jersey District I owe more than I shall live long enough to repay. Their confidence and loyalty gave me courage many times to do the difficult thing. And the road has not been an easy one.

I tell you this today because we have here at our guest table six women candidates for Congress and I think I know just how they feel—the hopes and fears deep in their hearts. I sincerely hope every one will be elected for they are greatly needed in Congress. With 24 years of suffrage behind us, we are much wiser politically than we were at the time the suffrage was adopted. We have learned that everything we do, everything we have—all our hopes and fears are tied up with government and that surely should be a challenge to every woman in America to establish a basis from which to proceed.

We are meeting here today on the eve of what may well be the turning point of the future of the greatest democracy in all the world. What we do this year may decide the future of civilization itself. We must face the fact that no country can long survive the frightful devastation of war as it is fought today. This is our second great war within 25 years. We won the first war and lost the peace—forgot in the years following the war how to maintain peace—how to build for world peace and prevent future wars. Over and over again we heard the phrase, "It can't happen here" and there were those who, up to the time of that tragic December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor, refused to believe it could happen here.

Following World War No. 1, holding strictly to an honorable agreement with our European allies, we destroyed our Navy. We believed we could live peacefully as a self-contained nation, asking for nothing, wanting nothing. Those years should be known as the adolescent period of America. We have come out of that period and are now on our way to a virile manhood with matchless courage and determination to see to it that it never will happen again. We have given, and will continue to give, freely of our great resources to win this war. We have given that which is far more precious, our sons, our husbands, and our brothers. We have not complained too much, nor have we broken in our grief. The great spirit that is America is prepared for greater sorrow and much, much more sacrifice. We know we are paying the price of liberty, of freedom, that no matter how high the price, it is worth what we pay. We know that we have a world to rebuild, that we are the descendants of ancestors who fought and died generations ago to make possible the America we have enjoyed. We want that kind of an America to continue for our children and generations to follow. It has been a wonderful America and we are fighting to preserve it and to extend the blessings we have enjoyed, freedom, liberty, democracy, as we have known them, to all the world.

When we take our place in this campaign we must have a clear picture of what all this means to us. We must know the facts and be ready to explain how the present administration in Washington met its responsibility in the Second World War. The Democratic Party has nothing to fear in this campaign. Our record of 12 of the most eventful years in our history speaks for us. They were years of great trial when momentous decisions were imperative. Our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, never faltered. He has with matchless courage guided our ship of state through rough waters. When, following 12 years of Republican administration, people and business had given way to despair, his voice rang out with determination and courage, destroying pessimism, bringing to America renewed faith in ourselves and in our future. We have come a long way since then. We have come a long way since we thought we had brought peace to the world—Armistice Day, November 11, 1918. We made our great mistake then by refusing to become partners in a world tribunal for peace, the League of Nations. We cannot afford to make a second mistake. Then, as now, under the leadership of a Democrat and a great President, Woodrow Wilson, we fought a tragic war. We hoped it would be a war to end all wars. We promised the men who died to make the world safe for democracy that their sacrifice would not be in vain. But we did not reckon with a Presidential campaign or a Senate apparently controlled by a few willful men to whom the destruction of President Wilson and the League of Nations was much more important than the future of America. Will history repeat itself?

World War No. 1 came as a great surprise to peace-loving Americans because we knew little about European politics. A violent partisan strength kept us out of that war until it was realized that Germany threatened the freedom of the seas. The isolationists of that day were just as blind as are the isolationists of this day, who refused to face facts until Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. Read the records of the Republicans in Congress before we were attacked if you do not believe me. Some few there were who placed their country above political advantage, but, by and large, it was left to the Democrats to prepare for what even a blind person could see in the distance. When the blow came votes changed because then, as in 1932 when our economy collapsed, even blind partisans knew that not the future of the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party was at stake but the future of America. Ours was the responsibility and how well we have met that responsibility and discharged our obligation to this day will be told by the future historians of our Nation. We are too close to the picture now to get a true perspective. The facts are that no nation in the history of the world can compare with what has been accomplished in these United States under the administration of President Roosevelt. I am finishing my twentieth year in Congress. I served under the Republican administration when our Navy was scrapped. I heard the late Congressman Butler, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Naval Committee, confess on the floor of the House with tears in his eyes how wrong he had been in advocating the destruction of the Navy and begged the House to start building a Navy to protect our shores. His was a voice crying in the wilderness. Later, when President Roosevelt in his messages to Congress repeatedly called attention to our inadequate Navy he was called "warmonger" by the opposition. When a bill came to the floor to protect Guam it was ridiculed by the opposition, as were all his plans to strengthen the defenses in the Pacific. Through the years every effort to develop air power was hampered.

In spite of the protests from most Republicans, and some Democrats, the administration kept plodding on, utilizing millions of unemployed for the building of airfields, hangars, and runways, and the improvement of 640,000 miles of what are now military highways. While Hitler took 10 years to build his ruthless war machine, we have, in 3 years, under the courageous, able leadership of our Commander in Chief and the efforts of labor—unregimented free men and women—built an Army, Navy, and merchant marine which have won the admiration of the world, and which will, we hope and pray, bring victory and a just peace to America and to the world in the very near future.

In the years of grave emergency more than a decade ago, the Democratic Party wrote a record of achievement that will go down in history and make some of its brightest pages. Criticism we have had, and plenty of it, but no person or group or party can destroy the record of accomplishment when our country was practically in despair. When the emergency receded and we had reason to look forward with high hopes to our future, war struck its deadly blow. Again a courageous, fighting President, with faith in God and in America, became truly our Commander in Chief. He mobilized a great Army for war and victory. Industries were changed practically overnight to prepare to meet the greatest challenge to democracy the world has ever known. The result is well known but I believe will bear repeating. More than 10,500 ships of all sizes and types have gone down the ways. Our Navy is now the largest in the history of the world. We are producing twice as many planes each month as do all the Axis countries combined. We have manufactured approximately 70,000 light and medium tanks, more than a million and a quarter trucks, and billions of rounds of ammunition—and right here may I pause to pay my tribute of affection and admiration to the men and women of the assembly lines and in the factories of the Nation—the sol-

diers of industry. To them has been given the task of supplying the great armed forces fighting and dying all over the world, and, regardless of the mistakes of a few, they have done a great job.

All of this could not just happen. It happened because we have a Commander in Chief directing, organizing, planning day and night for everything and anything that can happen with a country at war. It has been a tremendous job and will continue to be until the last gun is fired and our brave men return to a grateful and glorious America. In the meantime, it is our job to see to it that all our teams working together will not be called upon to work under a new leader. That way lies confusion, great loss of time, and much delay in the return of the men who are giving all they have to bring a quick end to the war and a return to their loved ones. We must have no interruption of the plans that have been worked out so carefully and, thank God, with a minimum of the loss that was anticipated. Our job, the job of every American, but particularly the job of every Democrat, must be to reelect Franklin Delano Roosevelt and a Congress to support him until victory is achieved and later when nations will sit at the peace table to decide the future of the world. This is a big program, but one that should stir the soul of every human being who believes in freedom and liberty. To the women here who represent the responsible leaders of our great party, may I say with all my heart that never in your time will you be called on for greater service. It must be a service of the soul in you. It is for God and country, for the preservation of everything we love and hold sacred. It is a service that can be accomplished by individual effort, hard work, and great courage. But, it can and I am sure will be accomplished. Remember that when the leaders of the world sit at the council table to make their great decisions, we expect that Winston Churchill will be there, that Joseph Stalin will be there, that Gen. Chiang Kai-shek will be there—that, at least, one woman will be there—that representatives from the other great nations will be there, but we know that the most important place at that table must be occupied by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I do not believe there is an indispensable man, but common sense would indicate that when a great decision is to be considered, the man best qualified to know the facts is the best man for that particular task. We know that certain selfish political interests are at work ruthlessly trying to destroy the leadership of our great President. Their arguments are very weak. They fear a fourth term dictatorship, etc. They seem to forget that when a democracy is at war it is necessary for Congress to delegate great power to the President. Congress did provide by law for the total mobilization of all our forces, but Congress could not go out and execute the mobilization. The power to do so had to be delegated to the President. He has used this power with great discretion. How well he succeeded is evidenced by the almost unbelievable story of all that has been accomplished. Indeed, we have reason to feel great pride in the record of the Democratic administration through 12 of the most important years of our history. Brought through a frightful depression in 1932—enacting the most progressive laws ever attempted by any nation through 1933 to 1940, following which we were plunged into a tragic war—converting peacetime industry into war production, and at the same time mobilizing 9,000,000 men to fight a war—all this accomplished with a minimum of distress and dislocation.

And so, as I have said earlier in my speech, the record speaks. It cannot be challenged. It will live long after the opposition critics have passed from the scene of political strife, an example to those who come after of how the great Democratic Party, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, mobilized for peace and prosperity and within a decade converted that prosperity to win a war and bring freedom, liberty, and justice to a stricken world.

A Soldier's Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial entitled "A Soldier's Right To Vote," which appeared in the Belleville (Kans.) Telescope on April 10, 1944. This editorial was awarded the prize last month in the National Editorial Association contest which was open to daily and weekly newspapers throughout the country. The citation was what is known as the Herrick Award, and the award committee gave the Telescope second place in the Nation-wide contest. The editorial was published in the issue of April 10, 1944, and the award was a $25 Government bond. The editorial was based upon President Roosevelt's stinging message to Congress on the soldiers' absent vote bill, which message declared the vote of Congress was "a fraud upon the American people."

The editorial was written by A. Q. Miller, Sr., who, together with his sons, publishes the Belleville Telescope. I also wish to mention the fact that the Telescope has just celebrated its seventy-fifth anniversary. It was founded in 1870 and for 40 years has been under the management of the Millers.

It seems most incredible that anyone would make the picayune charge that Congress is trying to prevent the soldiers from voting. No wonder our national legislators bitterly resented the implication by President Roosevelt which stigmatized them not only before the soldiers, but before the American people as well. On the floors of Congress and in public interviews Congressmen resented the charge, which they said not only questioned their motives, but also their patriotism. The President challenged them to stand up and be counted on the soldiers' vote bill—and they did, and the vote in the House showed 215 votes for a State-rights bill as against 164 votes for the President's Federal bill. Bills which had been favorably considered by Congress gave the soldiers the right to vote, not only on President and Congressmen, but also on State and local candidates, whereas the proposed Federal bill favored by the President permitted soldiers to vote only on President, Vice President, and Members of Congress.

The exact language of the President's message to Congress, as quoted by the press was: "I consider this proposed legislation (State control) a fraud on the soldiers, sailors, and marines now training and fighting for us and for our sacred rights—and a fraud upon the American people." This is a serious charge; it impugns the motives of Congress and stigmatizes them before the American people and the soldiers in uniform, smacks too much like politics—and certainly does not promote national unity.

Honestly, how many American people over 3 years of age actually think our Congressmen would pass a law to prevent soldiers from voting—or do any other thing to deny them their full sovereign rights as American citizens? It is presuming a lot on the credulity of the people to think they would believe such a serious charge. No wonder the Congressmen got fighting mad and resented such an implication, when they were trying to pass an absent-voting law, within the limitations of the Constitution, which would permit soldiers to vote not only on Federal officers, but also on State and local candidates. It is the sworn duty of Congress to initiate and enact the laws and the sworn duty of the President to enforce the laws. One of the basic and fundamental criticisms of the New Deal by Congress and the public generally has been the tendency of the executive branch of government to usurp powers belonging to the legislative branch of government.

Commenting on this surprising attack on Congress by the President at a time when national unity is so much desired, the Kansas City Star says editorially: "The President's blast at Congress on soldier vote legislation has contributed nothing to the solution of a complicated problem—on the contrary it has stirred up resentment and may serve to delay the kind of legislation that is needed and the kind that even Mr. Roosevelt himself would desire. Why then did the President come in with his charge of fraud," says the Star, "directed at the previous Senate bill and thus arouse congressional resentment; obviously, it was to get administration credit for what might be done in an effective way, and to shift responsibility for what might be done in another way."

Government Waste of Paper Seems Boundless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, orders to cut down the use of newsprint have appeared on at least half a dozen occasions during the past year's time. Many of the Nation's leading daily papers have printed notices indicating that they have been compelled to reject many columns of paid advertising in order to comply with Government requests. There has been no evidence whatever that the Federal Government is itself prepared to comply with its own request.

In the past few days literally dozens of pounds of mail have been poured into the office of this Congressman from Government agencies of one or another group. The volume of reports, governmental information data, revisions of civil-service requirements, together with explanatory texts testifying to the great success of one or another Federal bureau, seems to be almost endless.

One A. A. A. agent has accumulated a library of mimeographed reports, surveys, instructions, and memoranda in the short space of a few months. Not only does such an overwhelming weight of written matter breed confusion worse

confounded, it also leads to the belief that there is just no sense whatever in reading or acting upon any of it.

Meanwhile, the clamor against wasting paper continues. Our people are asked to conserve every scrap of paper available, but what is paper for the goose is obviously not paper for the gander. Uncle Sam keeps right on turning the stuff out of his mammoth mimeographing plants by the ton.

Britain's White Paper Bars Rescuing of Jews of Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Regent Horthy, of Hungary, it was announced, will permit all Jews holding visas for Palestine to emigrate from Hungary. Great Britain has made no response. Her declared policy is set forth in the MacDonald White Paper promulgated in 1939, barring mass Jewish immigration in Palestine and restricting the owning of land by the Jews already there. The mounting horrors of mass executions and deportations have not moved her to deviate an inch from such policy. Now that Horthy's statement has been made public, the onus is upon Great Britain and the responsibility cannot be shifted.

The Horthy offer to permit the emigration of Jews from Hungary is at one with all the indications that Germany's doom is at hand. Before she crashes, the Jews of German-dominated territories will feel the full fury of the tumbling regime. Let there be no mistake about that. It is difficult then how in the face of such horror, Britain can stand by a policy which was one of her last acts of appeasement in 1939.

It has been learned today that despite Horthy's promise that deportation of Jews has stopped, trainloads of Hungarian Jews continue to arrive at the Oswiecin extermination camp in Poland. The moving of Jews is now being accomplished at night.

In the Roads to Foreign Policy, Gibson said there was nothing sacred about decisions made by the British Government, and that if a great moral issue were at stake we have not only the right but the duty to make our point of view prevail. Just so. Palestine, as a mandated territory, was entrusted to Great Britain by the League of Nations. By separate treaty in 1924 the United States consented to the mandate. The League of Nations and the United States specifically based their consent on the British Balfour declaration, the declaration solemnly promising that Great Britain would do all in its power to facilitate the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. In barring the Jewish people from Palestine, Britain has betrayed the sacredness of both her treaty obligations to the United States and her mandatory obligations to other signatories.

A moral issue is at stake, and we have the duty to speak up. The need for sanctuary for the Jewish people is acute. The United States has opened free ports in this country and in north Africa. Mexico will do likewise. The Pope has intervened with Hungary officials in behalf of the Jews. The Red Cross has done all it can. Secretary of State Hull, President Roosevelt has protested the Hungarian deportations and threatened retribution to all those aiding in the massacre of Jews. Both major political parties of the United States have gone on record favoring a reiteration of the congressional resolution of 1922 favoring the establishment of a national homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine.

But Great Britain is adamant. The Horthy offer is explicit. Britain cannot dodge behind a self-promulgated, self-administered white paper.

Four hundred thousand lives are at stake.

Last Thursday the official Hungarian Telegraph Bureau took issue with the statement made Friday in the House of Commons by George Hall, Under Secretary of the Foreign Office, who said that the British Government has considered the advisability of granting British nationality to Jews in occupied territories, but does not believe that merely verbal protection will help these Jews. The Hungarian News Agency said that "The British strike a very humble and unassuming note as soon as it is a question of providing real help, and not of merely broadcasting propaganda phrases."

Is it to be an attitude of "Let George do it?"

Even within the restrictive terms of the White Paper there are some available certificates of entrance, but Britain doles them out grudgingly, one by one, so that it can be said that she has not altogether barred the doors of Palestine.

On August 15, the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees will meet again in London. Functioning since 1938, it has for all these years merely paid lip service to the need for asylum and rescue. Like the Bermuda Conference of more recent date, it shrugged off the problem is insoluble. The White Paper forbade the most practical solution—Palestine.

Undoubtedly, Great Britain will point to this meeting in London and counsel patience. Between 1938 and today, thousands could have been saved. Between today and August 15, still more lives can be saved. Great Britain can open Palestine to the Jews of Hungary, either for temporary or permanent residence. This is no time for more talk, more blueprints, more exploration. This is the time to act.

It is hoped that our American representative at the Intergovernmental Committee for Refugees will speak out forcefully for the right. American public opinion has coalesced. In urging the abandonment of the White Paper, our American representative will be honestly representing the people of the United States.

Irrigation for the Republican Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have always contended that the extension of irrigation was a sound national policy and that it benefited the entire Nation. When this terrible war comes to a close the only new frontier which we can turn to for the creation of new farm homes is that which will be created by the further development of irrigation.

Floods and drought take a tremendous toll in the United States each year. Millions of acres of farm crops are destroyed every season, either by the lack of water or an overamount of water. Irrigation means a controlled water supply, consequently farming in an irrigated area adds stability to the Nation's food production. It makes possible a diversified type of farming and eliminates the problem of surpluses.

Irrigation pays its way. The farmers pay for the projects. The records show that of all the communities in the arid and semiarid West, the irrigated communities pay many times more in taxes, both State and Federal, than those which have no water projects. These irrigated sections become a permanent asset in our national economy, and are no longer a drain on the Public Treasury for various forms of drought relief. The added prosperity brought about by the extension of irrigation means a greater market for the products of our factories and more employment for American laborers. These benefits are not for just a season, but they are permanent.

Mr. Speaker, I want irrigation brought to every acre possible in the great Republican Valley and its tributaries. I wish to extend my remarks and include an address prepared for delivery by Mr. Harry W. Bashore, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. This address was to be given at the fourth annual meeting of the Republican Valley Conservation Association, held at McCook, Nebr., August 16, 1944:

Mr. Chairman and Nebraskans, having spent many years helping to bring irrigation water to farm lands in this State, it is an honor and a pleasure for me to discuss some of our mutual problems in this way.

I am going to talk to you about a river, your river. The Republican River, geographically speaking, is a tributary which, with other streams, forms the Kaw. And I am going to discuss Federal reclamation, in which I have been engaged for 38 years.

As I think what full use of the waters of the Republican could bring to the people of this valley in the way of security and prosperity, I feel more firmly convinced than ever that our country's greatness depends on the development of the little things—whether it be a little river which, joined with other waters, makes a larger river, or whether it be an individual who, through his irrigated farm or his small business, contributes his share toward making a mighty Nation.

The Republican River holds the key to the future development of this fertile valley. Both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have made plans which together will provide for the use of the waters of this stream in irrigation and for flood control. These projects in the Republican River Valley should be made ready for construction in the post-war period. They are needed; they are eminently worth while; they will provide employment, and they will provide new homes. I hope to see this river developed—its waters utilized to make more homes among you, and its floods controlled in the very near future.

I don't need to remind you that Nebraska has had a history of droughts and floods. The flood on the Republican River in 1935 caused 59 percent of the total flood damage of the last 50 years in this region. Such floods can be controlled by the construction of reservoirs in the Republican River Basin—reservoirs which will store water for the irrigation of about 188,000 acres of land in this valley.

All of you remember the droughts of 1934 and 1936 and the hardships that they brought. The same reservoirs that control the floods will store the water to irrigate the land. This is truly a multiple-purpose development which will serve the best interests of everybody.

When sufficient water is brought to these lands, the hopes and dreams of pioneer settlers will be realized. These pioneers refused to accept the verdict of explorers like Zebulon Pike and Stephen Long, who said the country was unfit for human habitation.

With the plans that you have made, cooperating with us in the Bureau of Reclamation, we shall be able to offer homes based on stabilized agriculture and to guarantee you and your children freedom from drought and floods.

Nebraska has suffered major droughts and torrential floods in her history. Shortly after the War between the States, there were tales of abundant rainfall in this part of the West. Migration to the plains rolled rapidly onward, now hesitating and now gaining momentum after years of heavy rainfall. It swept almost to within sight of the Rockies, and in 1887 a railroad settlement pamphlet said, "The rain belt has moved westward to within less than 50 miles of Denver. So much rain now falls in the eastern portion of Colorado that it is no longer fit for winter range for cattle."

Thousands of people rushed into what they thought was a new rain belt. Many of these people failed to grow enough for a bare existence. In a few years towns were deserted, whole counties were almost depopulated, and homes abandoned. Those who stayed on suffered hardships such as no one can understand who has never lived without sufficient water.

In all seriousness, we can say that the first hundred years were the hardest. Today, as we look at the comfortable homes in McCook, it is hard to realize that not so many years ago men built their homes from sod.

There was something of the idealist, as well as the realist, in those early settlers. They faced realities, but they had visions of what might come after them. It is this combination of hard-headed realism and frank idealism which has made possible the development of the West.

In the West, rainfall is uncertain. There may be unusual spells of rain, as there were back in the late eighties when they thought the rain belt had moved, and then again, there are times of terrible drought. To the west of the ninety-seventh meridian, the rainfall generally is insufficient for crops.

In the 601,000,000 acres of land in the arid and semi-arid region which are tillable, there is only enough water to irrigate about 43,000,000 acres—about 7 percent of the total area. The 43,000,000 acres are about twice the total acreage that is now served by all irrigation systems in the west, both private and Federal.

The development of the 21,000,000 acres now under irrigation has been a slow process. Early settlers diverted streams and irrigated valleys near the smaller rivers. Finally storage works were required to regulate the flow of streams and protect the water users.

By 1901, about 10,000,000 acres of land had been put under irrigation by private capital. In that year, President Theodore Roosevelt made a historic statement. He said to the Congress of the United States:

"It is as right for the National Government to make the streams and rivers of the arid region useful by engineering works for the storage of water as to make useful the rivers and harbors of the humid regions by engineering works of another character."

The Congress of the United States passed the Reclamation Act in 1902. It was designed to conserve the waters of the West and use them for the development of the vast areas of public land to which the Government had title.

More than 4,000,000 acres are now served by Bureau of Reclamation projects. Half of this area, which is in prosperous farms today, once was desert land. The remainder was originally irrigated by private capital, but had inadequate water supplies before the Federal systems came to the rescue.

Bureau of Reclamation projects have contributed greatly to the power and war-food needs of the Nation. Hydroelectric power—a byproduct of some reclamation projects—has filled a vital need in many wartime industries.

The 1943 farm crop from Bureau projects topped the pre-Pearl Harbor record by a 143 percent increase in values. Not only have these crops meant food for fighting men and food for the home front, but they have brought financial security to farmers on irrigated lands. It goes without saying that this financial security makes for better rural homes and communities.

We used to say that the cow, the sow, and the hen were mortgage lifters. But the farmers out on the Yuma project in Arizona and California can tell you how their mortgages have been lifted by lettuce—vegetable greenbacks you might call them.

I could cite many examples of mortgage-lifter crops on these reclamation projects. There is the prosperous North Platte area in Nebraska and Wyoming. This region under irrigation produces great quantities of sugar beets, alfalfa, barley, corn, potatoes, and beans. More than 300,000 acres irrigated in the North Platte Valley are served by Bureau of Reclamation facilities constructed in 1908.

The North Platte Valley development illustrates the expansion which comes with irrigation. Let's look at population trends in Scotts Bluff County, where most of the project acreage is situated, and in three adjacent wheat and grazing counties.

From 1900 to 1940 the population of Scotts Bluff County increased from 2,552 to 33,917, a gain of more than 1,200 percent. Each decade since then has shown an uninterrupted growth with 33,917 persons recorded in the census of 1940. Since the establishment of the North Platte project this county has grown in population at a rate three times as great as that of the State of Nebraska.

Even during the drought decade 1930 to 1940 the population of Scotts Bluff County increased 18.3 percent as compared with a net loss for the whole State of Nebraska of 4.7 percent.

A look at the population trend in three adjacent dry-land counties, Sioux, Box Butte, and Banner where wheat raising and dry farming predominate, tells a different story. These are typical Great Plains counties in which little if any irrigation development has taken place.

In 1900, some 9,700 people lived in these three counties. In 1940 the population had risen to 15,031, an increase of only about 54 percent in the 40-year period as compared with a gain of more than 1,200 percent for the Scotts Bluff County in that period of time. All of the growth in the dry-land counties occurred between 1900 and 1910. In the last 30 years th population of the dry counties has actually dropped from 17,457 to 15,031.

The full development of the unused water resources of the West means not only more irrigated farms but the expansion of existing cities and towns, and the creation of new communities which will provide vast home markets for the products of American factories. Over 400,000 new irrigated farms could be provided under present-day systems of farming. They would support an additional population of more than 6,000,000 people.

Such a program would create $16,000,000,000 of new property values, based on prewar prices. A domestic market would be built up for American products from factories and farms outside of the irrigated areas which would maintain pay rolls at a distance, keep transportation systems busy, and help to stabilize the business, large and small, of the entire country.

In a report which I made recently before a Senate Subcommittee on Post-war Economic Planning and Policy, I gave a preliminary inventory of 236 individual projects and small groups of miscellaneous developments that seem to be suitable for post-war construction in the 17 Western States. Thirty-nine of them or features of them have been authorized for construction, and work has gone forward under the war food or war power programs of reclamation.

The Mirage Flats project in northwestern Nebraska is one which, stopped by the War Production Board in 1942, has been authorized for completion to increase production of war food and forage products.

More than a year ago an application was filed with the War Food Administration and the War Production Board to begin construction of the Cambridge project, with Medicine Creek Reservoir, a diversion dam, and the main canal as the major features. When clearance was denied for the project as presented, a modified plan was submitted whereby the diversion dam and main canal would have been constructed so as to turn water from the natural flow of the stream onto the fertile lands in the Cambridge area. Other post-war projects in which Nebraska is interested are: Bostwick, Cedar Bluff, Frenchman-Cambridge, Kirwin, North Republican, serving Wray, Colorado, and Nebraska, and pumping units. Power transmission lines are to be built as required.

Construction of many of the projects in the inventory could be scheduled for timely widespread employment of servicemen and industrial workers after the war. Permanent settlement on new lands would be made possible, and productivity of lands now irrigated with undependable water supplies would be made secure.

Construction could be speeded up and work could be started on some of the potential projects on fairly short notice, when advance funds and authority are provided. Under such a schedule we estimate that nearly 150,000 men could be employed at sites of construction in the West within 9 months. Even a greater number could be engaged in the manufacture of equipment and other materials in sections of the country distant from the project areas.

Completion of all of the projects in the inventory would furnish employment equivalent to one and one-fourth million men working for 1 year. A total of 135,000 irrigated farms would be created for settlement by war veterans and others. Security could be

offered 150,000 additional farms where production is now threatened by lack of irrigation water. A population of two and one-half million persons, including the merchants and businessmen in cities and towns who serve the irrigation farmers, would eventually be directly benefited. These results would flow from the irrigation of 6,700,000 acres of land now unused and 9,364,000 acres now farmed with not enough water.

The multiple-purpose projects proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation would provide power installations to help balance the agricultural development of the West by industrial expansion.

Irrigation water gives stability to western purchasing power, which is threatened in areas where there is insufficient water. It has been estimated that the annual purchasing power of the West for products of the Midwest, East, and South would be increased by $1,250,000,000 at prewar prices by the full development of these new farms and the communities they would serve.

The estimated cost of all projects in the inventory would be something over $3,000,000,000, based on 1940 price levels. One-third or more of that amount would be spent in the development of the Missouri River Basin, of which the Republican River projects are a vital part.

The comprehensive plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin is given in Senate Document 191. The projects outlined by Reclamation engineers in that report would be largely complementary to those recently suggested by the Secretary of War for flood control and navigation on the Missouri River. The reservoirs proposed by the Reclamation Service and the Army would protect property from devastating floods, and distribute irrigated areas widely through seven States: Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, the Dakotas, Kansas, and Nebraska. Farmers in these areas now depending on uncertain dry farming would be given an opportunity to have a secure living from the land. Each of the projects listed in the plan is justified, I believe, by the public benefits it would yield. All of them would be part of a unified plan for using beneficially the water resources of the Missouri River and its tributaries.

These benefits would include not just flood control, not just navigation, but what is most important to those who are destitute for water, irrigation.

Droughts in the Missouri Basin States during the past decade have cost the Nation, in grants and unpaid loans, more than one and a quarter billion dollars. I believe it was Mark Twain who said, "Everybody is always talking about the weather, but nobody ever does anything about it."

Well, the Bureau of Reclamation has not been able to change the weather, but we have been able to do something about it.

As I said, droughts have cost more than one and a quarter billion dollars during the last decade. But even with that expenditure, thousands of families were forced to abandon their homes.

That same amount of money which has been spent in drought relief is, roughly, equal to the cost of the proposed development of the waters of the entire Missouri River system.

The foundation of the Reclamation plan for the Missouri River Basin is a system of 90 reservoirs to impound water during flood seasons, to serve the double purpose of reducing flood stages in the streams, and to save water for use in dry seasons.

The approximate acreages to be benefited in Nebraska by the Missouri River Basin plan are 989,445 acres of new lands and supplemental water for 19,930 more acres.

Nebraska is an outstanding example of the benefits of irrigation to a State lying partly in a humid climate and partly in a semiarid country, and having a large part of its area subject to irregular rainfall. In the central and western parts of the State 610,379 acres are now under irrigation, according to the 1939 census.

The report on the Missouri River Basin points out the possibility of irrigating about 660,000 acres along the Loup and Lower Platte Rivers, chiefly with water from the Loup; more than 100,000 acres along the Republican River; and 240,000 acres by pumping from wells after other developments replenish ground-water supplies.

Irrigation has proved its worth in Nebraska. Although the western and central parts of the State in some years receive enough rain for grain and forage crops, the maintenance of a stabilized agricultural economy, except for the eastern portion of the State, depends upon irrigation.

The North Platte project is a good example of the permanent economic and social stability afforded by artificial water supplies.

Another Nebraska project, authorized and now under construction, is the Mirage Flats, which will irrigate 12,000 acres of land in northwestern Nebraska. Construction includes a reservoir on the Niobrara River of approximately 30,000 acre-feet capacity to bring water to fertile land that is now being dry-farmed. An earth and rock-fill dam is the principal engineering feature of the project.

Crop losses in Mirage Flats, a community in Dawes and Sheridan Counties, have been heavy during dry years.

All other proposed projects in Nebraska in the post-war plans depend on the Republican River. Ultimate plans of development here will bring maximum use of its water resources and provide flood control for the entire Republican River Valley and to some degree would protect areas along the Kansas and Missouri Rivers. Irrigation development on 188,000 acres would be accomplished by a system of 18 separate units.

Because there has been some discussion on how the Reclamation plan on flood control for the upper Republican River basin differs from that of the Army plan, our engineers have prepared a table giving the comparative storage capacities of the different reservoirs proposed above the Harlan County Reservoir by both the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation. It shows the relative differences in capacities reserved for silt and irrigation and for flood control on the six tributaries. If you are interested in these details, I shall be glad to leave a few copies with you for study.

Recommending Reservoirs Above Harlan County Reservoir

Stream	Bureau				Army			
	Site	Capacity, 1,000 acre-feet			Site	Capacity, 1,000 acre-feet		
		Silt and irrigation	Flood control	Total		Silt and irrigation	Flood control	Total
Arikaree River	Pioneer	1.6	32.4	34.0	Beecher Island	30.2	42.0	72.2
South Fork	Bonny	50.0	68.0	118.0	Hale	31.4	65.0	96.4
Frenchman Creek	Harvey	35.0	.....	35.0	Enders	63.2	30.0	93.2
Red Willow Creek	None	.....	.....	.....	Red Willow	21.8	25.0	46.8
Medicine Creek	Medicine Creek	5.0	27.0	32.0	Medicine Creek	25.9	32.0	57.9
Republican River	Culbertson	75.0	95.0	170.0	None	.....	.....	.....

To make a start on the development of the Republican River, the Bureau of Reclamation has listed the following projects for first consideration in the post-war period:

The North Republican project on the Republican River is under study for irrigation and flood control. Two thousand eighty acres of new lands would be irrigated by the project and supplemental waters brought to 3,340 acres.

The Frenchman-Cambridge project on the Republican River, under study for irrigation and flood control, would irrigate 36,130 acres of new land and supply water for 17,015 acres.

Irrigation for 14,200 acres of new lands and supplemental water for 9,300 acres could be provided by the construction of five well units.

The Bostwick project on the Republican River, under study for irrigation and flood control, would irrigate 24,170 acres and supply water to 830 acres. Construction features are an earth dam, canal, and power plant with estimated 1,000 kilowatts. The Bostwick would also serve 65,000 acres of new lands in Kansas with an additional 2,000 kilowatts to be installed.

This list is subject to revision, additions, or substitutions, as the people of the Republican Valley make their wishes known.

I have attempted to tell you some of the things that the Bureau of Reclamation has accomplished in the West in 42 years and to outline certain post-war projects which we believe will be of the most service to the people.

In 42 years the Bureau of Reclamation has been able to bring prosperity to people on millions of acres of land in the West. There are great days ahead. The post-war plans I have outlined for the Republican River can be achieved with your help.

The Republican River compact providing for the equitable apportionment of the waters of this river and its drainage area among the three States—Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska—laid the groundwork for the development of water resources of the river basin. It is an evidence of your ability to work together on this stream. Under it we can plan projects with assurance.

You and your association are to be congratulated on the cooperation that you have shown. It will take cooperation in the future as well and I am confident that it will be given. We can look forward to the sound development of the Republican River Basin for the use of its waters to the benefit of all.

I Support Soil Conservation As One Constructive Program to Help Missouri Farmers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the amendment proposed here to permit soil-conservation districts to have a priority for purchase of surplus dirt-moving equipment was defeated. Only about 9 inches of topsoil stand between us and starvation. That soil is being rapidly destroyed. It

is washing down the furrows, the ditches, the creeks and rivers, and into the oceans. Vast areas of the world which once supported great empires are now barren and the civilizations which grew upon them have disappeared. While we are concerned with a fight for survival against enemies from without we must not neglect those dangers which face us at home. Soil erosion is one of these enemies. What are we doing to combat this enemy? I am glad to say that my work in Congress in support of soil conservation is my answer to that question. I would like to make special reference here to what part Missouri is playing in this struggle by way of showing not only what has been done but what must be done under leadership of Members of Congress and others who understand the problems of agriculture and the broader influence these problems have upon the welfare of all the Nation.

Today, Missouri is mobilizing its forces for an intelligent, cooperative attack on the erosion problems affecting its wealth of farm land. With passage of a soil-conservation districts law, Missouri is building a locally initiated soil-conservation program on a firm basis of experience. State agronomists and conservationists have prepared the way for the farmer-initiated, farmer-organized district program of practical soil conservation.

In Missouri, the role of soil conservation is twofold. Not only must the land damaged by erosion be brought back to usefulness, but the richness of good Missouri soil must be safeguarded against impoverishment by wind and rain.

A little less than 2,000,000 acres of Missouri land has already been ruined by erosion. This is 15 percent of the total area of the State. Another 35,000,000 acres show evidence of moderate erosion.

However, Missouri faces the big soil-conservation job ahead with understanding with experience and facts as a basis for future work.

THE SOIL-CONSERVATION JOB AHEAD

For the first time in its history, the United States has a factual inventory of its basic soil resources. Recently completed by the Soil Conservation Service, this inventory presents a picture of the Nation's capital stock of farm land, classified according to its capabilities for various uses and according to its conservation needs. The estimate of these needs is based on 10 years of conservation experience by farmers in all parts of the country and on all appropriate technical information produced by research and agricultural experiment stations.

In this inventory the soil assets of the country are set forth, together with a clear outline of the work that needs to be done to keep this capital stock of soil usable in the immediate years ahead and for the long future.

The inventory shows that Missouri's lands are not now being used as wisely as they should be from the standpoint of protection against erosion and/or maximum efficiency. Of almost 14,000,000 acres now in cultivation, more than 2,000,000 should be retired to grass or trees to save them from serious erosion and to prevent waste of seed, fertilizer, and labor. On the other hand, there are more than 6,000,000 acres not now in cultivation that are suitable for this purpose—more than an adequate supply to replace lands now being unwisely cultivated.

The inventory also shows that more than 9,000,000 acres of Missouri cropland need carefully planned, improved crop rotations adapted to the farmers' economic needs and to the individual needs and capabilities of each specific acre.

More than 4,000,000 acres of Missouri land need contour planting, and about half a million acres need to be strip cropped. More than 15,000,000 acres of Missouri grazing land need seeding.

There are still other soil and water conserving measures needed to maintain and build Missouri's important farm-land resources.

WORK IS UNDER WAY

During the past decade a flexible, practical system of soil-conservation farming has been evolved in the United States from the combined knowledge and experience of farmers and technicians working on the land under widely varying conditions of climate, erosion, soils, crops, and slopes in all parts of the country.

The first concerted soil-conservation action on a Nation-wide scale began in 1933, when the Soil Erosion Service was set up as an emergency agency in the Department of the Interior to help farmers protect their soil against erosion. The new organization, gathering information on soil-erosion conditions and soil conservation farming methods, established demonstration projects in the principal agricultural regions and principal erosion areas of the country.

Among the early demonstration projects were areas in the vicinity of Bethany and Westboro, in Missouri.

When the temporary Erosion Service was renamed the Soil Conservation Service and established by act of Congress as a regular agency of the Department of Agriculture early in 1935 these demonstration projects were increased in answer to local demands and increasing concern about the damage being caused by erosion.

Thus, the demonstration project at Bethany and others that were subsequently established in Missouri were pioneer contributors to the program that has scientifically adapted soil and water conserving farming measures to fit the individual needs of every locality.

SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

By the end of 1937 the Soil Conservation Service was working in 504 soil conservation demonstration areas, covering nearly 12,000,000 acres in different parts of the country. These demonstrations led directly to the development of soil-conservation districts. Farmers and ranchers had decided they wanted conservation work on their lands, and they had come to recognize that this required the cooperation of neighbor with neighbor in a very practical way. During the years of the demonstration projects they discovered that much more could be accomplished by working together than by working independently. Further, there was a growing desire in many parts of the country to make certain that soil-conservation work would be continued, with the same high technical standards, until the job was done. In short, there was a demand for a permanent, new type of farmer organization on a community basis, with legal status, to insure soil-conservation progress.

Thus it was that soil-conservation demonstrations were succeeded by soil-conservation districts. In the former, the Soil Conservation Service supplied much of the initiative as well as the technical aid in carrying out the actual work on the land. With the formation of districts, however, soil-conservation initiative rightfully passed over to district organization, and the Soil Conservation Service was able to devote its full energies to the task of helping farmers and ranchers in districts with their soil and water conservation work—especially with those soil and water problems requiring a technical knowledge and experience over and above what the farmer himself might be expected to provide.

Soil-conservation districts are formed under State laws which are permissive in nature. That is, the laws permit farmers to organize districts and they mark out the manner and means whereby this may be done. They also point out the status and scope of a soil-conservation district, once it is organized. But the laws do not require organization of districts. That is left to the volition of the landowners themselves. Farmers may or may not organize soil-conservation districts, as they see fit. The State laws merely provide a method and framework of organization to be used, if and when needed.

Soil-conservation districts can be initiated only on the petition of farmers and established only by the will of the majority, as expressed in referenda. Every landowner has a voice in shaping the policies of the district in which he lives. The aims of the district, its cooperating policies, and the soil and water conservation measures it decides upon, are set forth in a district program and a work plan. These are drawn up by the district supervisors, with the help of the landowners.

Soil-conservation districts are legally constituted units of local government. They owe no allegiance to any Federal office, bureau, or agency, or to any local organization.

The first soil-conservation districts law was enacted by Arkansas on March 3, 1937, but it did not become effective until July of that year. Meanwhile North Carolina passed a districts law and on August 4, 1937, chartered the Brown Creek District—the first to be formed in the country.

In Missouri, though soil-conservation work has been under way for some time, a districts enabling law was passed only last year. Since then, 13 counties have organized soil-conservation districts covering more than 4,000,000 acres and including over 30,000 farms. Johnson County in the Sixth Congressional District is one of these 13 leading Missouri

counties. Additional districts are in the process of organization in other counties.

Thus, Missouri is ready to participate actively in the growing soil-conservation movement which today includes 1,122 soil-conservation districts in the 45 States that have passed districts enabling legislation. These districts cover almost 628,000,000 acres and include more than 2,924,000 farms.

BETTER LAND USE

The basic, guiding principle of soil conservation is the treatment of every acre according to its individual needs, and the use of every acre according to its indidivual capabilities. In furtherance of this principle, a wide range of soil and water conservation practices has been developed—adaptable to the differing amounts of rainfall and the wide variety of erosion conditions, soils, crops, and slopes in a country where no two farms are exactly alike.

Among the principal measures encouraged by the Soil Conservation Service, however, are:

Contouring: The plowing, planting, cultivation, and harvesting of sloping fields on the level, around the hillside, with bending furrows to fit the curvature of the land in order to retain and store rainfall in the soil and thereby to prevent soil waste and other damages of concentrated run-off.

Terracing: The building up of moderate embankment barriers across sloping fields to slow down run-off water and guide it safely to protected outlets.

Strip cropping: The planting of alternating bands of close-growing vegetation and clean-tilled row crops, on the contour, so that the strips of close-growing plants form a protective belt against erosion between the cultivated strips.

Close-growing cover crops: To protect the soil against wind and rain after harvest or during the season of the year when no other vegetation covers and protects the ground.

These and dozens of other carefully worked out soil-conservation farming measures together form the basis of a complete farm conservation plan. This is a plan of land use and land protection, made up specifically for the individual farm or other land unit, and based on the physical analysis of each acre to determine its capabilities and its needs in order to put it to the most productive use.

In Missouri, at the beginning of this year, 5,998 farms had been planned in this manner with the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. A total of 801,976 acres of Missouri farm land had thus been blueprinted for physical security, with the planned treatment applied to 680,127 acres.

More than 128,000 acres of Missouri farm land are now protected by contour cultivation; protective grass plantings and woody plantings have been applied to a total of more than 90,000 acres; 36,942 acres have been terraced and strip crops are established on 17,731 acres.

These figures represent soil-conservation treatment accomplished by Missouri farmers with the cooperation of the Soil Conservation Service. Research studies undertaken by Missouri agronomists and technicians in cooperation with the service are constantly adding to the store of soil-conservation farming knowledge and techniques. By working out a good pasture system especially adapted to the impervious Putnam soils of north central Missouri, these technicians have been able to help farmers protect and improve millions of acres in that part of the State.

Missouri's long history of soil-conservation research and experiment includes the early establishment at Bethany of one of the first experiment stations devoted to the study of erosion and its control. In the past decade, the State's contribution to an understanding use of such soil-conservation farming methods as contouring, terracing, and crop residue management is reflected in the increasing amount of soil-conservation work done on Missouri farms.

Original research by Missouri scientists is providing sound practical guidance for the district's program in the State.

Dean M. F. Miller of the university's college of agriculture, is a pioneer in the study of erosion. W. C. Etheridge, professor of field crops at the university, with his work on grassland and ponds, has helped bring Missouri to second place among the States in total area of farmland grazed. And Dr. W. A. Albrecht, chairman of the university's soils department, is opening up a new frontier for soil-conservation work in his investigations into the direct influence of soil health on human health and nutrition.

The 1-year rotation of small grain and lespedeza developed by Missouri scientists has been widely used in soil-conservation farm plans developed under the guidance of Soil Conservation Service technicians.

INCREASED PRODUCTION

Conservation farming on thousands of farms throughout the country, producing all kinds of crops, has resulted in an average per-acre increase in yields of at least 20 percent—with little or no additional labor, fuel, time, money, or machinery.

In Missouri, farmers on 128 typical farms, totaling 22,693 acres recently submitted actual figures on production before and after their adoption of soil-conservation practices. The average annual yields of all major crops were a little more than 31 percent greater on the 128 farms after soil and water conservation methods were applied—an increase equivalent to the total production from 7,247 additional acres without soil-conservation treatment.

Average yield of corn went up 39 percent after soil-conservation measures were adopted. Average yield of wheat went up 26 percent. Average yield of oats was increased almost 21 percent and a 10 percent increase in the average yield of soybeans permitted the raising of 1,437 more bushels on 89 less acres than were devoted to that soil-depleting crop before the farm plans were put into effect. These 128 Missouri farmers increased their dairy herds by 22 percent and their beef cattle by more than 46 percent. An increase of 18 percent in hay and pasture acreage helped make possible the increases in livestock.

From these farms where soil-conservation measures were applied to the land, the practices are spreading in widening circles. According to 95 of the Missouri farmers interviewed, more than 300 others adopted one or more soil-conservation practices as a result of seeing them in successful operation on their farms. Fifty-seven of the original 128 soil-conservation farmers helped 225 neighbors and friends install soil and water conserving practices.

POST-WAR

With the fund of information and experience developed by farmers in recent years, many soil-conservation districts are preparing careful post-war work programs of soil conservation. Specific tasks are being outlined, the cost and labor requirements estimated, and priorities established.

The Soil Conservation Service estimates it could efficiently put some 100,000 men to work within 6 to 8 months after the war, protecting and improving basic soil resources in soil-conservation districts. Need for this work and its value to farmers and States have been established by the farmers themselves, for they have tested the efficiency of conservation farming and are asking for more technical assistance in applying conservation measures to more and more land.

Here are some of the types of work that urgently need doing, and which men demobilized from the armed forces or released from war industries could do under qualified technical supervision:

First. Drainage of wet farm lands.

Second. Development of stable outlets for farm terraces and diversion ditches.

Third. Planning of steep eroding slopes with trees, shrubs, vines, legumes, and grasses.

Fourth. Planting gullies and worn-out fields—for protection and to put every acre to useful work.

Fifth. Development and improvement of water resources for livestock and for use in gardens and fields, including construction of stock-water reservoirs, farm ponds, and development of springs for livestock use.

Sixth. Flood-control work on agricultural lands.

Seventh. Quarrying and crushing limestone for use on acid lands.

Eighth. Productive development of submarginal lands, with a view to restoring their usefulness.

Ninth. Planting of protective windbreaks on farms and ranches.

Tenth. Dune-erosion control.

Eleventh. Stream-bank erosion control.

Twelfth. Highway-erosion control.

Thirteenth. Production of shrubs, tree seedlings, and new grasses and legumes for control of erosion, when such plants are not otherwise available.

Fourteenth. Construction of terraces and diversion ditches.

The number of men who can be put to work building up and protecting the soil resources of America is limited mainly by the availability of proficient conservation technicians to guide and supervise the work. By the second year after the war is over, probably 3,000 qualified technicians could be recruited and trained, in addition to the present technical staff of the Soil Conservation Service, to direct soil-conservation work in a post-war program. These technicians could utilize efficiently the labor power of at least 500,000 man-years during the first 3 to 4 post-war years.

Some of the results that could be expected from such a program are:

First. Approximately 1,200,000 farms safeguarded against erosion and made more productive.

Second. Improvement and permanent protection against erosion on about 200,000,000 acres of farm land.

Third. Drainage of from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 acres of wet lands.

Fourth. Virtually complete flood control on some of the lesser streams.

Fifth. Protection against the effects of drought on millions of acres.

Sixth. Substantial social and economic advantages that cannot be tangibly measured.

FLOOD CONTROL

Soil and water conservation work on the land has proved effective in reducing the hazards of floods. Water is slowed in its rush to the rivers because conservation methods tend to hold raindrops where they fall and because the soil itself provides the greatest water reservoir in the world with the exception of the oceans. Conservation work on the land can in this way reduce the frequency and minimize the hazards of floods. On many small streams it is entirely possible that floods can be prevented altogether by conservation treatments on land making up the contributing watershed.

Especially important to Missouri's flood-control program is the growing interest in farm ponds. This water-conserving measure has been included in many soil-conservation farm plans. And work of Soil Conservation Service technicians in designing ponds to suit the needs of the individual farm has helped encourage the use of this flood-controlling farm improvement.

Conservation measures can be an effective insurance against results of prolonged and damaging periods of scant rainfall. By storing water in the soil, conservation measures avoid needless waste of water that might better be utilized by crops. And the enormous reservoir of the soil is able to retain vast amounts of moisture, collected in rainy seasons, against later days of heat and little rain.

A CONSTRUCTIVE AND SENSIBLE PROGRAM

In conclusion, I want to point out that farmers who organize themselves into soil-conservation districts are entitled to the free technical aid of specialists in engineering, irrigation, drainage, and wildlife management, to loans of labor and equipment where available, and to certain seeds and nursery stock. The details of this program are too numerous for me to discuss here. The Federal Soil Conservation Service, in the Department of Agriculture, has many helpful and illustrated booklets showing how to organize these districts and giving concrete examples of how soil-conservation practices mean more dollars in the farmer's pocket and increased national wealth for all of us to share. This information is available upon request from the Service or from Members of Congress who will be happy to send it to their constituents.

In recent years we have seen many crackpot schemes advanced to solve the woes of the farm. Soil conservation is not a crackpot idea and neither is it a cure-all for the farm problem. But it is a practical, proved, and necessary approach to a sounder agriculture. I urge farmers who are not organized into soil-conservation districts to take steps now to reap the benefits of this worthy program. Our wealth and prosperity are rooted in the soil. Let us protect at home this soil we fight for abroad. We must work out our own post-war salvation with the old-fashioned American initiative and willingness to work and save, which is so typified by the American farmer.

Freedom Can Own the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Morgan from the Boston Sunday Globe of August 20, 1944:

FREEDOM CAN OWN THE FUTURE—FREE NATIONS ARE WINNING A COOPERATIVE WAR BUT MUST YET WIN A COOPERATIVE PEACE TO THWART WORLD WAR NO. 3 BY THE SLAVE STATES

(By James Morgan)

If we are to have any peace in this perverse world, it will not be enough to have the angels on our side. It will be necessary also to have some cooperation from the devil, the devil of human selfishness. That is what we are trying to obtain by these preliminary give-and-take agreements about food, money, and oil, with still others to come on such subjects as rubber, shipping, airways, and communications.

Virtue is its own reward, but happily it is also the best policy. There be some who object that this is a too sordid calculation. Nevertheless, it is well that we can justify and prove the soundness of our ideals and morals on the lowest grounds. The Ten Commandments themselves find their secular validation in the general belief that the way of the transgressors of them is hard. We should, as Emerson bids us, hitch our wagon to a star; but we earth-bound mortals must be careful to keep the wheels on the ground and our heads out of the clouds.

ALL AGAINST WAR, BUT NOT ALL FOR PEACE

Like Calvin Coolidge's preacher in his sermon on sin, we are all "agin" war. It doesn't pay, as multitudes have learned only within recent times. Even the head hunters in the jungles of the South Pacific, those dreaded cannibals of yesterday, are become today the gentle, trustful befrienders of our lost soldiers and castaway sailors. The boiled missionary joke is outdated.

In the spread of the knowledge that war does not pay, mankind has made a truly astonishing progress. It still remains to be convinced that peace does pay. The peace of Versailles certainly did not. If it had paid, we should have been spared this war.

In that armed truce from 1918 to 1939, the peoples drifted from bad to worse, from unrestrained boom to complete collapse. Demagogues in Italy, Japan, and Germany, nations with little accumulated wealth to cushion the great depression, easily aroused the jealousy of their unemployed youth and the envy of their bankrupt industrialists by blaming it all on the foreigners—and the Jews—and the Treaty of Versailles.

If we ourselves could have had such a convenient alibi for our sins we, too, would have been more ready to listen to our Coughlins, Gerald L. K. Smiths and to the Ku Kluxers in their various guises. But all we could do was to vent our rage on one another and turn out the party in power at Washington.

CAN WE MAKE PEACE THAT PAYS?

We made a paper peace after the other war and it did not pay even its makers. That is why Mussolini, Hirohito, and Hitler could tear it up and throw it in our faces. If we can make a bread-and-butter peace this time it may pay us so well that we will enforce it.

Peace is not a positive force. It is only an absence of war. Once it is ended war has a fatal facility for receding into forgetfulness with amazing quicknes. Its madness becomes unimaginable directly the guns are silent. Military alliances begin to go to pieces within the hour of the armistice. They depend solely on the cohesive power of fear, and fear is about the most transient of our emotions. Remove that pressure and wartime allies fall apart.

We talk bravely of making a hard peace with Germany and Japan. That would take years and years of patient enforcement and therefore as many years of unity among the enforcers. But great nations cannot long remain united by hatred and fear of foes that have been reduced to helplessness. Unless the victors in this war can be bound together by strong, selfish interests, inevitably they will become rivals for the markets of their former enemies and for the political support of defeated Germany and Japan in a balance of power. These compacts on economic subjects could become alliances for peace.

REMEMBER THE GENEVA LEAGUE

An international organization for security against war, such as the planners will begin planning this week in Washington, cannot survive in vigor a long period of pease unless it is tied up with other international agencies whose business it will be to justify that peace with positive benefits. A municipal government with nothing else to do than provide a police force and a fire department would become an object of indifference and neglect among its citizens. This would leave it ineffective even in its negative functions of preventing disorder and putting out fires.

To keep alive and hold the support of the community, a city government must have constructive departments charged with the positive functions of giving day by day service. It must provide streets and regulate their traffic; it must provide water, sewers,

schools, libraries, parks, hospitals, and care for the public health and the poor. Thus it makes itself indispensable to the homes and businesses of the population.

PEACE HAS NO SELFISH PRESSURE GROUPS

We must have international cooperation for peace if we are to have international cooperation against war. If Nations should organize only to prevent war, their organization would go stale and fall asleep after a few years of peace while it was left with nothing to do but play checkers.

We must provide services for peace, else any machinery set up merely to prevent war will be useless. It will not earn the good will and the prestige necessary to give it effective authority. We cannot expect it to stand alone. We shall have to evolve and build up around it a group of international commissions or institutions ,operating every day in the week on questions that get down to the lives of the peoples and their bread and butter.

This advance across the no-man's land between old stubborn frontiers, both on the map and in our heads, will not be easy going. It will have to cut a way through the wire entanglements of special interests and pressure lobbies enrolled on the side of jealous and exclusive nationalisms, with their flag-wrapped votaries crying aloud, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians."

To enlist selfish interest and lobbies on the side of international cooperation will be a slow process. But unless and until nationalistic bickering and haggling over lesser economic risks or sacrifices can be subordinated to the greater, universal interest, governments will be unable to cooperate in curbing the conflicts of trade. These are the sources of war, which burns up in a few years all the profits of a generation of peace.

SHALL THE FUTURE BELONG TO FREEDOM?

The Fascists and the Nazis contend that the free peoples cannot take this next step forward. They parrot Karl Marx's argument that our economic system, based on individualism and the profit motive, breeds a blind greed incapable of the common sacrifices necessary to save itself.

While Hitler sat in jail 20 years ago this year writing Mein Kampf, he admitted that his program for the conquest of Germany, then of Europe, and ultimately of the earth might not succeed at the first attempt. In that event, his Nazis would go underground, or back to the beer cellar where he plotted the putsch that caused his arrest. They would bide their time until the free nations had failed again, as they failed after World War No. 1, to make a peace that would pay.

Confidently the imprisoned prophet predicted that we would be too stupid, too short-sighted in our class and nationalistic selfishness to make a peace that paid. With our failure, World War No. 3 would come, when we would be eager to exchange our liberties for his "new order" and throw open our gates to the German conquerors.

That is the taunt and the challenge the totalitarians have flung at us. Now the time approaches for us to answer and show how dumb or how enlightened we are in our selfishness. We have fooled them by our ability to unite in war and achieve an international command of our naval, land, and air forces such as had not been seen before since the rise of nations.

The agreements negotiated and yet to be negotiated are a promise of a post-war cooperation among the free nations in a new order of their own. To paraphrase Lincoln at the outset of the Civil War, we shall meanly lose or nobly meet a great opportunity, possibly the last opportunity, to save our form of civilization. If we can unite in peace to disprove the dogma of the slave States, as we have united to overthrow them in war, the future will belong to freedom.

Did You Get Those Black-Market Nylons?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover's F. B. I. has just broken up one of the most lucrative black-market rackets unearthed in the whole war period. The arrest of several manufacturers alleged to have diverted nylon threads from the manufacture of parachutes and glider tow-ropes to the production of nylon stockings discloses the magnitude of a despicable fraud perpetrated upon the boys whom we have sent overseas to fight and die for our liberties.

It appears that raw nylon, received in a factory for conversion into thread was occasionally shipped out in lesser quantities with the discrepancy explained as "spoiled products." Then the "spoiled" material was shipped out to hosiery factories for processing. In some cities, the price of these black-market nylons ranged upward to and beyond $10 per pair, and those who purchased such hose were buying the lifesaving parachutes meant for our airmen and were contributing to a vast fraud on the people of the entire Nation.

Black-market transactions cannot be justified by any elastic conscience. Mr. Hoover has scored again. More power to his elbow.

Disposal of Government Property and Liquidation of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of more than $60,000,000,000 of surplus Government property, plant, and land, has been materially improved by amendments adopted in the committee. The terms of the legislation, if finally approved and administered, according to the intent of Congress, will give the small-business man an opportunity to purchase for resale whatever surplus goods are available in small lots and at reasonable prices. This is the way it should be, instead of the original proposal that would only permit a few large operators to buy large quantities of goods at bargain prices.

The intent of the legislation also provides for the disposal of surplus goods through regularly established and legitimate business channels. Such intent is written into the bill to stop a few fly-by-night speculators from buying up tremendous quantities of property at 5 or 10 cents on the dollar to be resold at fabulous profits. This is what happened after the last war and we will not tolerate it again.

I urge the Senate and conference committee to retain the provisions for small business, as well as the intent to distribute surplus property through regularly established and legitimate business channels.

LIQUIDATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few remarks in regard to the plight of the small-business man in this country. On September 28, 1942, in a speech delivered in this House, I predicted that administration policies would force the liquidation of thousands of small-business men. I feel it timely to quote from that speech to show what has happened in the past 2 years. On September 28, 1942, I said:

LIQUIDATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Tens of thousands of small-business men in retail, wholesale, industrial, and service establishments are being forced out of business because of the growing scarcity of goods for civilian needs and other restrictions imposed by Federal agencies. Amongst these are automobile and tire dealers, gasoline stations, electricians, plumbers, lumber dealers, jobbers, traveling salesmen, all types of small manufacturers who cannot convert to war production, country daily and weekly newspapers, retail merchants and professional men, and many others engaged in supplying civilian goods and services to the public.

I have registered many vigorous protests against unnecessary liquidation of this great American middle class. They, together with farmers and laborers, have been, and still are, the backbone of our democracy. Liquidate them and you destroy the factors which have given stability to our system of government and way of life. These groups are making tremendous sacrifices to win the war in being forced to give up their business, trade, and profession. In spite of this, they still continue to buy bonds, pay taxes, and give patriotic service to their country and community. They must be kept alive and in business, for when they pass out of the community picture big business, which does not possess a community soul, steps in solely for the sake of profit. I strongly urge that no effort be spared by the administration and Congress to keep this group in the economic picture. If this is not promptly done, our smaller cities and villages will become ghost towns, with the unemployed walking the streets and in distress.

ONE MILLION AND SEVENTY-THREE THOUSAND SMALL-BUSINESS ESTABLISHMENTS CLOSED THEIR DOORS IN 1942–43

To bear out the prediction which I made in my 1942 speech I want to quote figures from the Department of Commerce on the closing up of small American business. These statistics show that 1,073,000 business enterprises or over 30 percent of American businessmen were forced out of business in 1942–43. At least 90 percent of the business places closed or liquidated were small-business enterprises, as such establishments employed 4 or less people. In the 1940–41 period 914,000 small-business men were forced to discontinue business—largely as a result of administration policies. This makes a grand total of nearly 2,000,000 small-business places being liquidated during the past 4 years.

This liquidation of small business is a tragedy to American economy. For 11 years the Roosevelt administration has given lip service to small-business men and promised aid for survival, but little or nothing has been done. Congress has repeatedly legislated to assist small business in its fight for survival, but New Deal policy makers have refused or failed to carry out congressional enactments in this respect.

The hope of our great American middle class of people, which includes small business, profession, labor, and agriculture, can only be realized in a change of administration to run the affairs of the Federal Government, and in the selection of a Congress that will fight to recover American freedom and opportunity for all citizens under our system of representative government.

Resolutions Adopted at the Reunion of the Second Oregon Volunteers of the Spanish-American War and Philippine Insurrection of 1898–99 Held at Portland, Oreg., August 13, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, at the reunion of the Second Oregon Volunteers of the Spanish American War and Philippine Insurrection of 1898–99, which was held in Portland, Oreg., August 13, 1944, some important resolutions were adopted worthy of consideration by all Members of the Congress, as well as all American citizens. I therefore include these resolutions as a part of my remarks. They are as follows:

Whereas the Second World War has demonstrated that the United States was woefully unprepared for war when it came; and

Whereas our Army and Navy were small in size and lacked trained men to fill the regiments in the Army and to man the ships of the Navy; and

Whereas our enemies were fully aware of this state of unpreparedness for war that existed in the United States at that time; and

Whereas if the United States had possessed in 1940 a large and powerful Army and Navy, such as we have now, and a large and powerful reserve force of young men who had already been trained for war, our enemies would never have provoked a war with the United States; and

Whereas millions of our young men were rejected for military and naval service on account of physical and mental disqualifications, which a proper training period would probably have removed: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Veterans of the Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry of the Spanish War and Philippine Insurrection at their annual reunion in Laurelhurst Park, Portland, Oreg., August 13, 1944, commemorating the capture of Manila, Philippine Islands, August 13, 1898, That the Congress of the United States of America should now enact a law providing that every young man of the United States on reaching the age of 18 years shall be enrolled in the Army or Navy of the United States and shall undergo, for a period of 1 year, a system of physical, mental, and moral training which will best fit him for the patriotic duty of defending his country and maintaining its sacred principles of liberty, justice, and fraternity which are set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

PERCY WILLIS,
Chairman.
RICHARD DEICH,
Secretary.

SECOND OREGON VOLUNTEER INFANTRY POST-WAR AIMS

Whereas it seems to be fashionable now, with certain people, to predict what our post-war aims shall be; and

Whereas war veterans should be heard when a post-war settlement is effected: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the veterans of the Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry of the Spanish War and Philippine Insurrection, at their annual reunion, held in Laurelhurst Park, Portland, Oreg., August 13, 1944, commemorating the capture of Manila, Philippine Islands, on August 13, 1898, That in their opinion the Allied Nations should firmly insist upon the following:

(a) Complete evacuation by Germany of all the occupied countries under her control.

(b) All German war factories, including plants for the manufacture of war planes, submarines, war ships, cannons, small arms, machine guns, and ammunition, be totally destroyed.

(c) German schools be placed under control of the Allied Nations for many years.

(d) Allied garrisons to be maintained in all large German cities for many years, to enforce the terms of the peace treaty.

(e) Complete destruction of all German war equipment, including war ships, submarines, war planes, cannon, machine guns, small arms, and ammunition, and tanks.

(f) The German General Staff to be abolished and prevented from reorganizing.

(g) Germany to be divided into separate states, including Prussia, Saxony, Bavaria, Hanover, Württemberg, and others, and prevented from combining again into one nation, these separate states to be organized under supervision of the Allied Nations.

(h) The German press to be under control and supervision of the Allied Nations for many years.

(i) German assemblies of all kinds to be strictly controlled by the Allied Nations for many years.

(j) Freedom of religion to be established and maintained. Rights of the Masonic fraternity and the Christian Science Church to be reestablished. And be it further

Resolved, That in addition to the foregoing, Japan should be required to evacuate and relinquish all control over China, Manchuria, Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, Indochina, Malaya, Burma, the Dutch East Indies, Guam, Wake Island, the Aleutian Islands, and all other islands which she has unlawfully acquired; and be it further

Resolved, That the Allied Nations should firmly insist upon for Japan all the demands made upon Germany in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) as heretofore outlined, substituting the names Japan and Japanese where required and excepting that it may not be necessary to divide Japan into separate states; and be it further

Resolved, That Italy should be required to undergo similar treatment as Japan; and be it further

Resolved, That the responsible heads of the Governments of Germany, Japan, and Italy, and a certain number of their most important leaders, will be tried by military commissions of the Allied Nations and duly punished.

PERCY WILLIS,
Chairman.
RICHARD DEICH,
Secretary.

Celler Urges Upon Halifax New Declaration on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE EARL OF HALIFAX,
British Embassy, Washington, D. C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: At the recent political conventions in the United States, both the Democratic and Republican Parties incorporated specific planks into their platforms calling upon Great Britain to permit unrestricted Jewish immigration and land ownership in the mandated territory of Palestine and for its establishment as a democratic Jewish commonwealth.

Such unanimity on a single issue should make crystal clear to the government of your honored country that there is strongest bipartisan support in the United States for the abrogation of the Malcolm MacDonald white paper, which, in so many words, precluded immigration and land ownership in Palestine on the grounds of race and religion. As you know, this so-called white paper was violative of three solemn pledges:

1. The Balfour Declaration, accepted by the United States.

2. The concurrent resolution adopted by the Congress of the United States in 1922.

3. The Anglo-American Treaty signed in 1924.

Contrary to the trend of general public opinion in this country, action on the bipartisan Wright-Compton resolution, introduced into the House of Representatives, was held in abeyance in deference to the wishes of your government.

Announcement was made recently of the resignation of Sir Harold MacMichael as High Commissioner of Palestine and of his replacement by Lord Gort, formerly military governor of the island of Malta. It is earnestly hoped and desired that this change will usher in an era of good will, friendship, and understanding between the British Colonial Office and all the inhabitants of Palestine.

In view of the formal statements made by the two great political parties in the United States, coinciding with the appointment of a new High Commissioner, an excellent opportunity is now presented to the new administration in Palestine and to the British Colonial Office to eliminate the heart-breaking restrictions against Jews which resulted from the so-called Malcolm MacDonald white paper. Coming at this time, such a declaration of a change in policy would revive the hope and the courage of any living Jews now trapped in Hitler's Festung Europa. It would likewise have a salutary effect on the future of Anglo-American relations.

Respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

I sent the same letter to His Majesty's Minister for Colonies in London and to His Excellency, Lord Gort, at the Government House, Jerusalem.

Russian-Trained Sidney Hillman Directs Political Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, money is now being solicited from laboring men and women to swell the slush fund of the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. Millions of dollars are being taken from the pockets of working people for term No. 4 and to smear and purge every candidate for Congress—Democrats or Republicans—who will not surrender to left-wing radicals and Communists. Sidney Hillman, Russian-born and Russian-trained, is the czar of this C. I. O. Communist front. With the aid of Browder, leader of the Communist (dissolved?) Party, this alien-minded group seeks complete control of the political and economic life of 132,000,000 American people. It was Hillman who was elated over the Red control in sit-down strikes. If the subversive elements in this country can rise to power by wringing dollars from the sweat of loyal Americans by Communist technique, then free elections have come to an end in the Republic of the United States.

I offer for the RECORD a clear and concise statement by the noted columnist, Frank R. Kent, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press of August 11, 1944, entitled "Hillman as an Issue":

HILLMAN AS AN ISSUE

(By Frank R. Kent)

WASHINGTON.—As the weeks go by it becomes clearer that the Russian-born Mr. Sidney Hillman, with his communistic background and affiliations, his C. I. O. Political Action Committee, his Communist-controlled American Labor Party and his $6,000,000 fourth-term fund, is the outstanding figure in this campaign, and that he and what he represents are likely to become an outstanding issue.

And they should be. For this is their fight. It has been from the start; it will be to the end. And success will put the forces lined up behind Mr. Hillman in a position of dominance and power such as no one dreamed they could achieve.

For the first time the radical and subversive elements are not only lined up solidly behind a Presidential candidate but, taking practical possession of his party, are making the fight for him. That is not exaggeration; it is a simple statement of the facts.

And when you link them with a Federal machine of three and one-half million jobholders, plus the weight of the Kelly-Hague type of city bosses, the formidable nature of the fourth-term combination can be realized.

That this situation is distasteful and offensive to the great bulk of the American people there can be little doubt. Nor, once clearly comprehended, can there be much question that the reaction would be strong and unfavorable.

The difficulty is to get the facts home to them. This will be the big test of Governor Dewey's ability as a candidate. For, it is accepted that he is going to meet the C. I. O.-Communist combination head-on. Not to do so would be stupid as well as cravan and Governor Dewey is neither. As every vote the C. I. O. can influence and every Communist in the country is pro-Roosevelt anyhow, it is clear he can lose no votes by a bold challenge.

On the contrary, if his challenge is strong enough and his attack skillful enough, there is no other way in which he can gain as many votes.

Ghosts at the Oaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, August 21, 1944:

GHOSTS AT THE OAKS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Dumbarton Oaks, the great mansion that takes up a long, long block out on R Street in Georgetown, is one of the most beautiful houses in the world. Robert Woods Bliss, former United States Ambassador to the Argentine, and his wife, spent most of their leisure time during 30 years in the diplomatic service collecting rare things to adorn it. Then they gave the whole works to Harvard University as a combined art school and museum.

Scholars have come long distances to study in rich quietude at Dumbarton Oaks, hidden behind its high brick walls and the forest of trees that muffle vulgar sounds from the streets.

Today, Undersecretary Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Britain's Sir Alexander Cadogan, Russia's Ambassador Andrei A. Gromyko, China's Ambassador Dr. Wei Tao-Ming and numerous other officials are gathering at Dumbarton Oaks to sketch out what they claim will be an international system of enforcing peace. The news columns are full of details about what they say they will do.

But as they meet, they will be troubled by ghosts. Big old houses like Dumbarton Oaks are all supposed to have ghosts, anyhow, according to the books we have been reading late at night recently in a last desperate search for a way of cooling off.

Such ghosts usually are members of the immediate family, and may even be called by their first names after a proper introduction.

The ghosts at Dumbarton Oaks are different in that they number several million and are all strangers, and what is worse, foreigners. They are, in fact, Poles.

Of course they won't disturb Communist Ambassador Gromyko with their groans and chain-rattling for he is by long years of training accustomed to the ghosts of murdered millions. But it will be interesting to see how Mr. Stettinius gets along with them.

These Polish ghosts are haunting Dumbarton Oaks because they want to see what Mr. Stettinius does about the test case of sincerity for all the four-freedom shouters. To wit, Poland.

You may well have forgotten it by now, but the war in Europe started on September 1, 1939, because Poland told Hitler to go to hell on several other counts.

The Poles were put up to it by England and France. On March 31, 1939, Prime Minister Chamberlain told the British House of Commons: "In the event of any action which clearly threatened Polish independence and which the Polish Government, accordingly, considered as vital to resist with their national forces, His Majesty's Government would feel themselves bound at once to lend the Polish Government all support in their power.

"They have given the Polish Government an assurance to that effect. I may add that the French Government have authorized me to make it plain that they stand in the same position as do His Majesty's Government."

The Poles thought that promise meant something, so they tangled with Hitler in September 1939 while Britain and France waged their famous sitzkrieg.

But not Mr. Gromyko's Russia. Stalin had just engineered a deal with Hitler in late August for Germany and Russia to partition Poland for the fourth time.

Hitler explained it all to the Germans after the fact on October 6, 1939, in a speech to the Reichstag:

"Poland of the Versailles Treaty will never rise again. This is guaranteed by two of the largest states in the world. Final reorganization of this territory and the question of reestablishment of the Polish state are problems which will not be solved by a war in the west but exclusively by Russia on the one hand and Germany on the other."

In Moscow, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov echoed almost Hitler's exact words in a speech to the supreme council of the U. S. S. R. on October 31, 1939:

"One swift blow to Poland, first by the German Army and then by the Red Army, and nothing was left of this ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty."

And at the end, for you to remember and think about these days, he added:

"We have always held that a strong Germany is an indispensable condition for a durable peace in Europe."

Stalin, who has never yet demanded "unconditional surrender" of Germany, has repeated that declaration in favor of a "strong Germany" time and again, these past 2 years.

Between them Hitler and Stalin have killed millions of Poles. We have just seen pictures of the German murder factories in which the Gestapo have gassed and burned Poles by the thousands.

The world is properly disgusted and horrified by what the Nazis have done. But what about the equally bloody work of the Reds?

The ghosts at Dumbarton Oaks today will be a trouble to Mr. Stettinius. Because Poland is the test case.

And what chance does he have of giving the Poles a square deal, with Mr. Gromyko of Russia looking Mr. Stettinius coldly in the eye—and Pal Joey's armies ripping through Poland again for the fourth invasion of that country since 1939?

The F. E. P. C. and the P. A. C. of C. I. O.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, in a radio speech on June 29 during my recent campaign, I condemned the policies and actions of the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. and the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee. Many people have written me for copies of this address. Because of the general interest in these two organizations, and because

the American people should be fully informed concerning these threats to our democracy, I am now including it in my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is the third of a series of six 15-minute speeches over this radio station delivered by way of report to you folks who have honored me by election to the Congress. In these short talks only a few problems can be briefly discussed. In talk No. 1 I discussed the growing menace of bureaucracy and what we should do about it. In talk No. 2 I discussed the work I have done and expect to do in our fight against discriminatory freight rates and against trusts and monopolies, especially the gigantic farm machinery trust.

This talk will be devoted to an attack upon two other evils which threaten our domestic peace and security. Only by recognizing and understanding evils can we defend ourselves against them. By understanding the cause of disease we can eliminate disease by removing the causes. There are two new cancerous growths in American life which, if unabated, will bring us to grief. We'll discuss in order named the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee, which could more properly be called the Unfair Employment Practice Committee, and the so-called Political Action Committee of the C. I. O., a radical, communistic group who are seeking to defeat public officials unfriendly to their program of state socialism. The principles and objectives of both committees are obnoxious to the American way of life, and constitute threats to our free institutions. The responsibility for these two committees does not rest particularly upon either Democrats or Republicans. In fact, an appropriation for the F. E. P. C. was recently saved in the House of Representatives by the votes of Republican Congressmen. The Fair Employment Practice Committee was created by Presidential decree for the alleged purpose of promoting fair employment practices throughout the country. From the beginning, however, it has meddled in the legitimate practices of legitimate business and has now grown into an arrogant, obnoxious bureau which seeks permanent status and authority. While only 10 percent of our population is Negro, 65 percent of the personnel of this committee is Negro and much of the white personnel has a communistic tinge, many of them being notorious radicals with Communist affiliations.

One of the first acts of this Committee was to attack 22 railroads and 4 rail brotherhoods for alleged discrimination against Negroes. When 12 southern railroads refused to employ Negroes as conductors and engineers they were cited for contempt. Many of you are familiar with the recent order of the F. E. P. C. directing the Dallas News to delete any mention of color in advertisements. A News ad stating, "Wanted, colored man to work at night as paper handler" was held to be discrimination against white labor. The paper was ordered to disregard race and color in both advertisements and employment.

Another case in the Western Electric plant at Baltimore further illustrates the nature of this Committee. When partitions were torn out between white and colored toilets the company sought to rebuild them. The F. E. P. C. immediately stepped in and decreed that no separate toilet facilities should be maintained in the plant, stating that to maintain these separate facilities was an act of discrimination.

The purposes and objectives of this Committee are to break down all forms of racial segregation. This Committee would force upon the country complete social equality, the indiscriminate commingling of races. As your Congressman I spoke against this Committee on the floor of Congress and sought to eliminate its appropriation. This attack was not an attack upon the Negro, for whom I have great sympathy. Segregation is not discrimination. These vicious and misguided individuals have no more right to force whites into Negro society than to force Negroes into white society.

The Lord made the different races and colors of people. Race purity is a virtue, not a vice. The quail and the turtledove do not cohabit. The catfish and the bass live in the same waters but do not unite. I feel sure many Negroes are proud of their race and wish to keep it relatively pure.

Prior to 1940 pictures were required on civil-service applications and a designation of the race to which one belonged. In 1940 a civil-service bill provided that pictures should no longer appear on civil-service applications, and that race should not be disclosed thereby. At that time I successfully offered an amendment to strike this provision from the bill, contending that prospective employers should at least have the right to see the picture of the person to be hired, and to know the race to which such person belonged. I contended that if a Negro were sought for a certain job, a Negro should be secured, and vice versa. Although I was successful in the Congress, the Civil Service Commission, as a result of pressure from certain groups in the Capital, and from certain politicians seeking Negro votes, deleted these distinguishing marks from their records. This was a first step in the campaign that has led to the F. E. P. C.

Your Congressman is one of a small group who has pledged himself to defeat proposed plans and legislation for the continuance of this un-American agency which, through bureaucratic coercion and intimidation, would completely revolutionize the American system of free enterprise and would eventually destroy the social and economic standards of all races.

Now for the second part of this talk, my attack upon the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. First, let me say, like many other southern Democrats who fear and distrust this Committee, I am a friend of labor, organized or unorganized. My ancestors on both sides of the house have been from the beginning of time farmers and laborers who earned their living by the sweat of their brows. The folks who toil have always been the backbone and bulwark of democracy and are entitled to protection from radical, communistic leadership that would destroy them.

In my 1938 race for Congress the first line of my platform was this: "I believe in democracy. I hate communism and fascism." In May of 1940 I succeeded in attaching the following amendment to a National Defense War Department Appropriation bill: "Provided further, That none of the money authorized under this legislation shall be used to pay the salaries of any Communist or Fascist." That was among the first efforts made in the Congress to purge our Government of Communists and those who have contempt for the Constitution.

A few months ago, for the avowed purpose of defeating Members of Congress unfriendly to their program, the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. was created, headed by Russian-born Sidney Hillman, long the President of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, C. I. O. Mr. Hillman came from Russia in 1907 and is said to have objected to military service during the first World War. His Political Action Committee has been condemned by William Green, President of the A. F. or L. as being Communist inspired and dominated. Even radical John L. Lewis, who I at one time, perhaps in error, called Public Enemy No. 1, has labeled this Committee a Communist organization. Nevertheless this Committee has boasted of some $4,000,000 in its political pot to spend in electing friendly candidates and defeating unfriendly candidates, and has opened 14 regional offices throughout the United States, including one in Dallas. I consider it a compliment to be on the blacklist of this Committee. If I am defeated, they will take full credit for it.

Among the Committee's avowed friends at this time is Earl Browder, long president of the Communist Party of America, and recently released from the penitentiary. This organization has strongly supported the Fair Employment Practice Committee, and is advocating its creation as a permanent agency of Government with increased power. It has opposed parity prices to farmers, has advocated Federal antilynch laws, and Federal laws abolishing poll taxes. It would destroy all States' rights. It has condemned all forms of segregation as discrimination, and has at all times placed so-called social gains, group privileges, ahead of the country's war program.

I wish I had time to tell you the complete story of Thomas de Lorenzo, who is typical of those whom the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. defends. When the war broke out the Navy gave millions of dollars in airplane contracts to the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation. About the time the war program began Thomas de Lorenzo became president of the C. I. O. union which controlled the Brewster plant and its 20,000 employees. From the beginning the Brewster plant had labor troubles. Numerous strikes, slow downs, and failures to meet schedules cost the Government millions of dollars and many airplanes, and finally resulted in the cancellation of the Brewster contract. In exhaustive hearings before a congressional committee it developed that Thomas de Lorenzo, president and dictator of the C. I. O. at Brewster, had gone under six different names. He admitted having lied about his age, name, and former employment at the time he was hired by Brewster. He admitted having sworn falsely in court when he secured a change in his name. Although at one time he swore he had never been arrested, he later admitted 15 charges and convictions of misdemeanors and two indictments for felonies. He admitted filing several false income-tax returns, of having lied on a civil-service application, and of having sworn falsely to his draft board. After admitting all these numerous cases of perjury and false swearing, Mr. de Lorenzo stated that he had no intention of changing his way of life, and expected to lie whenever it was necessary.

Mr. de Lorenzo admitted causing a slowdown in the Brewster plant at one time because three women, not members of his union, were found asleep in the fuselage of a plane, and discharged by the foreman. After admitting responsibility for strikes and slow-downs and a loss in airplane production Mr. de Lorenzo made this statement, "Our policy is not to win the war at any cost. The policy of our local union is to win the war without sacrificing too much of the rights which we have at the present time." He repeated, confirmed, and verified this statement subsequent to its making. At another time he confirmed and admitted having stated, when it was pointed out that a loss of airplane production might cost the lives of American soldiers, that "If I had brothers at the front who needed the 10 or 12 planes that were sacrificed I would let them die." In other words, this reprehensible president of C. I. O. Local No. 365, U. A. W., C. I. O., who completely dominated the labor in one of our large airplane plants, was more concerned with imaginary grievances and selfish gains than with the blood of his own brothers.

In a speech on the floor of Congress on February 26, 1942, I read the following report from the Washington Post:

"Alex Blaint, who was reported by the Associated Press yesterday as having led Congress of Industrial Organizations workers out of the Monarch Aluminum Manufacturing Co. plant at Cleveland, figured last year in hearings before the Dies Committee Investigating Un-American Activities. On June 10 he was

pictured before the committee as a Communist, an alien, and a former convict. He denied testimony of two witnesses who said he had told them he was a Communist, but admitted he was a Hungarian whose final citizenship papers had been held up, and that he had served 11 months in a reformatory on a charge of automobile theft."

I then added: "An alien and an admitted ex-convict stops production on vital airplane parts. This is an insult to patriotic labor throughout America."

There are many Alex Blaints and Thomas de Lorenzos within the folds of the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. They cast an ugly shadow upon the marvelous production record of American industry and American labor. They cast an ugly shadow, too, across the years immediately ahead.

Such groups as the F. E. P. C. and the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. are threats to the security, happiness, and prosperity of the American people, particularly the people of the South and Southwest.

As your Congressman I shall continue to fight against these baneful influences in American life. Their weapons are false propaganda, fear, threats, coercion, intimidation, and political action against those who thwart their designs. America must not be dominated by any selfish-interest pressure groups. To expose and defeat them shall be my constant aim and effort.

Commander in Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News of August 16, 1944:

COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Technically the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of all the armed forces of the country.

In actual practice, however, this title is a nominal one. Military duties are left to military men who by reason of careful training and long experience are qualified to assume the responsibility of directing our armed forces during time of war.

So, Presidents as a rule have ignored the fact that, by virtue of their office, they are heads of the country's armed forces. They have been content to be known as the Chief Executive of this great Republic.

Not until Mr. Roosevelt came upon the scene; in fact, not until he became a candidate for a fourth term as President was use made of the more or less honorary title of Commander in Chief.

Now, though, the New Deal publicists are making full use of it—for political purposes. Mr. Roosevelt is being referred to more often in these sources as Commander in Chief than he is as President of the country.

The reason is obvious.

The big appeal for reelecting Mr. Roosevelt to a fourth term is based upon the theory that a change should not be made in the office of Commander in Chief while the war is in progress.

The theory that Mr. Roosevelt is the military genius that is directing our effort does not hold water.

Mr. Roosevelt is a civilian and always has been. All of his efforts have been devoted to politics. In politics he has had plenty of experience and plenty of training, and has come to be recognized as one of the smartest, if not the smartest, politician in American history.

However, experience, training, and skill in politics do not qualify a man for military position, even a minor one.

All of our top-notch military men, all those of England, Russia, Japan, and Germany, are men who have devoted their lives to study of military problems. They are graduates of the finest military schools in the world, and most of them have had wide experience in actual combat.

There is one notable exception—Adolf Hitler, the German fuehrer who takes a hand in the development of German military strategy. And Hitler has had military experience, as a corporal in the German Army in World War No. 1.

But this experience was not sufficient to qualify Hitler for military leadership, judging by the disastrous results that have attended his interference with the grand war plan developed by the German high command.

German military leaders are blaming Hitler's blunders for costly defeats suffered by German arms; they are accusing him of having arbitrarily overruled the high command in matters of such tremendous importance that they have brought Germany to the verge of defeat.

It thus may be seen what happens when a civilian attempts to give military decisions, when politics and military matters are scrambled.

There is no danger of the United States suffering military defeats through civilian management or political complications. Mr. Roosevelt is too wise for that.

He leaves military matters to military men. General Marshall, Admiral King, General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz and all the other crack military men plan the campaigns and execute them.

Our part of the war is being directed by men well qualified through long years of training and study, through experience and natural aptitude. The results of this practice are a succession of great victories.

Any attempt to place credit elsewhere is misleading and takes credit away from those who have toiled long years to prepare themselves for the task of leading American forces to victory.

The plain truth of the matter is that Mr. Roosevelt is not the military genius behind American successes in battle. He is Commander in Chief of our armed forces in name only.

The New Dealers' attempt to promote him as such is a political trick designed to remove objections to a fourth term and keep Mr. Roosevelt in an office that is civilian and political, pure and simple.

It is taking unfair advantage of the war emergency by mixing politics and the war effort.

Process of Elimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today an editorial from the Daily Washingtonian, of Hoquiam, Wash., published by my able friend, Mr. Russell V. Mack.

The editorial points out that the Republican Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates have disowned and denounced political and racial bigots seeking to fasten themselves on the G. O. P., and it asks the pointed question of whether the Democratic Party should not have the same courage and disown and denounce the political bigots who are obviously hoping to take over this party and, with it, the whole country.

Detailing how Mr. Dewey and Mr. Bricker "lopped off the America Firsters from the fringe of the Republican Party," Mr. Mack wonders why the Democrats do not cut out from the heart of their party "other elements which are foreign to American principles and policies?"

He refers to the American Communists and their fellow travelers who, he says, "have merged with the American Labor Party and are making their presence felt in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee."

Mr. Mack ends the editorial with a very clear and pointed question which I think can well be studied by not only Democrats—the real Democrats—but by every American who has the great responsibility of making the right selections when he marks his ballot this fall. This question, as phrased by Mr. Mack, is as follows: "So wouldn't it be well if the Democratic candidates followed the Republican example now and repudiated, once and for all, these other elements which are foreign to American principles and policies?"

I am glad to insert here the entire editorial for the information of my colleagues:

PROCESS OF ELIMINATION

Inevitably in our two-party system of government each party collects some embarrassingly bigoted groups who, though small in number, still command enough votes to make the professional politician think twice before reaching for the ax. This year the Republicans collected Gerald L. K. Smith and the America Firsters; the Democrats, Earl Browder and the Communists.

The other day, however, Thomas E. Dewey and John W. Bricker lopped off the America Firsters from the fringe of the Republican Party. In strongest terms of denunciation and repudiation, they scorched Smith for his attempt to put Governor Bricker's name on an America First ticket.

This repudiation is commendable and necessary. It gives notice that we have no existing political haven for racial bigotry, just as the two party platforms make it clear (though they may differ in detail) that there is no room for isolationism in either party's post-war policy.

The repudiation certainly cost some votes. Smith claims 3,000,000. True or not, he does control a substantial number. If an America First ticket can be put in the field it might cost the Republicans one or more States. In the Midwest the America Firsters' stronghold, the Republicans carried Michigan by less than 5,000, Indiana by only 25,000, and lost Illinois in 1940.

Nevertheless, the great majority of Americans will applaud this denunciation, and the candidates' refusal to accept organized support from a group whose beliefs are associated with racial bigotry. For certainly such bigotry is repugnant to the spirit and tradition of a nation founded on the principle that all men are created equal.

So too is political bigotry. It may not be so distasteful at the moment, since the

American Communists—for whom the war began with the invasion of Russia, and international collaboration with the Teheran Conference—are currently starry-eyed champions of democracy. Only the most naive, however, can imagine that their conversion is anything more than momentary and expedient, or that it is not subject to change without notice.

The American Communists have embraced, if not the Democratic Party, at least its national ticket. They have merged with the American Labor Party and are making their presence felt in the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. Their organizational ability—smooth, seasoned, zealous, and tireless—can win votes.

So wouldn't it be well if the Democratic candidates followed the Republican example now and repudiated, once and for all, these other elements which are foreign to American principles and policies?

What Shall We Do With Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZEBULON WEAVER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH GERMANY?

As the end of fighting approaches we find throughout our Nation a baffling confusion about what, and how, to do with Germany when this end comes. If we are not careful we may find ourselves in the position of the Negro who caught the bear, and then hollered for someone to come and help him turn it loose.

Recently, in a Town Hall meeting, the subject of what best to do with Germany was debated by four very distinguished men, mostly German-born, and all well enlightened on Germany's traditional behavior, yet, they did not agree. This clearly tells us that this most important subject should not be left wholly to those supposed to know internal Germany, but should have the attention of every thinking citizen in the land. For, whatever course is finally decided upon, the staggering cost of carrying it out must come from the Allied taxpayers' pockets. There can be but little hope of ever recovering this enormous sum from a financially destitute Germany.

Whatever we do must be founded on the prevention of another war. To accomplish this, we must first smother out completely the Nazi form of government. But, how can we best accomplish this? Experience has taught us that destitution, and internal turmoil, inevitably brings about government destruction in a more lasting manner than any other agency. This desired destruction of nazi-ism will come about much faster if we do not occupy Germany for any prolonged period. To speed its destruction we must not, in any sense, play Santa Claus for them. For, should we occupy Germany for the purpose of creating and establishing a new government to regulate those stubborn bull-headed people, we must first refuse to recognize the entire Nazi regime. And, the minute we do this, we shall have assumed the responsibility of a German government. This immediately invites the German populace to lean on us for protection from want. In this manner we would have upon our shoulders the burden of the after-effects of their war of which they, the German people, should justly bear the brunt.

The more we study the impending situation the clearer it becomes that the destitute will demand that we supply their needs. If we refuse this, we shall be blamed for years to come for causing all the hardships in Germany, when, in truth, our presence would have no relation whatever to the cause of it all. Better judgment here dictates that we do not allow the spirit of vengeance to lead us into this position. But, rather that we allow them to look to themselves for adjustment of their own grievances. We need have no thought of inflicting punishment upon them; they will do it themselves. Then why should we remain there and ameliorate their own self-inflicted punishment? Besides, since we are going to be heavily taxed with our own readjustment and that of the devastated, occupied countries—which most certainly should be put before Germany—how can we justify ourselves in the expenditure necessary to govern the rehabilitation of Germany?

Occupy Germany; yes, by all means, every inch of it, but temporarily for the following purposes only:

A. Release and return to their respective countries all prisoners and captive labor now being held in Germany.

B. The demobilization of Germany's entire military structure, including the Gestapo. The surrender to us of all weapons of war and the machinery for its manufacture, all to be melted down as salvaged junk.

C. Arrest all known war criminals and send them to the several countries in which their atrocities were committed, to be dealt with according to the laws of justice in these countries. Also, round up and try those whose war crimes were committed on German soil.

D. Return to each occupied country all that can be found of which they have been robbed by the Germans. This to include the gold and securities that were plundered from their vaults. Germany must be made to pay back to these countries, in value, for what she stole that cannot be found.

E. Return, at once, to Germany, from all the occupied countries, Germany's disabled whose care is now being forced upon these countries.

F. Drive back into Germany all German settlers of Nazi extraction that Germany has placed upon seized lands of the occupied countries.

G. Return to Germany all war prisoners, sick and well, that they too may share with the German people the hardships brought on by their own brutal war activities. (Reduce our load and increase theirs.)

All this in order that the German people have the fullest load of their responsibility in facing the effects of the brutal war they have conducted. The cost, to us, of all this the German people must eventually pay.

With this, and whatever else may be found necessary, accomplished, we then withdraw our troops from German soil, bring most of them home, and inform the German people that they have 2 years, or such time as may be deemed necessary, to reorganize and form a new government. No former Nazi officer, or official, or school teacher, is to be eligible for office or position. Then, there must be the destruction of all Nazi insignia. The wearing of other than civilian clothes by any former officer, or official of the Nazi party must be forbidden.

(This latter is important, for the German people, traditionally, are natural worshipers of bombastic display, and worship of German officers, whose continued strutting in public in uniform would only keep alive the Nazi military spirit that we wish to help the decent German people to destroy.)

The German people must be given to understand that they are to have perfect freedom in the selection of their leaders and school teachers, so long as none of them have had any affiliation with the Nazi regime. This new government must provide, and protect, a free press and radio communications.

An alert border guard must be maintained, at their expense, to prevent any of them escaping their own self-inflicted after-war hardships. The German people alone must combat the natural reaction from training their citizens to rob, plunder, rape, and slaughter helpless and inoffensive people. They themselves must fight their gangsters whom they have trained to do these things. No American life should be jeopardized in this inevitable turmoil.

From time to time, and at the expiration of the allotted time for their reorganization, they must submit to a complete and thorough investigation throughout the entire structure of their new government, for approval or disapproval, of their activities in bringing about a better and freer Germany. It shall be the duty of the Allied Council making these investigations, to search out, and order the removal of any traces of nazi-ism from office, and, more particularly, from the schools.

It cannot be repeated too often that the German people must be made to understand that expected help from any of the Allied nations will depend entirely upon their own manner and principle of reorganization in obedience to the terms given by the Allied Council. The Germans, as a nation, must be completely ignored until they have founded a new and acceptable government.

Germany must be denied all financial help. In this connection it must be seen that from a permanent army of occupation she would reap the benefits in many, many millions of dollars from sales to our soldiers, billet rent, any many other Army expenditures. From their vision of these benefits we could justify them in begging for our occupancy, or attempting to bring it about by treachery. It must be clear to all that prolonged occupancy of Germany will only alleviate their grievances. For the harder time they have amongst themselves, the more and sooner will be their reaction against nazi-ism that brought it upon them. In this, and in no other manner, can they be forced to create their own hatred for nazi-ism and war. It is true that the prevailing spirit for revenge demands that we occupy Germany, and make them, by force of arms, do as we want, but intelligence here dictates that the more we leave them alone the more they will punish themselves. And, as we have seen, occupancy would only alleviate the hardships that would naturally come upon them.

The Hitler youth, thousands upon thousands of them, schooled and trained into an obsession of finding joy in murderous brutality, are not going to be easily, if ever at all, tamed. So let the German people who approved of, and aided in distorting these minds, tame the wild beasts themselves. Let these brutishly inclined people, for once, get enough of themselves and the effects of their fanatical faith in nazi-ism.

Based on an intimate knowledge of the behavior of these people and their deceptive mannerisms I venture that, beyond the obsessed and arrogant youth, when the Army enters Germany for occupancy it will be almost impossible to find any civilian that will admit that he ever believed in nazi-ism. They will plead that they have been cruelly oppressed, which is true in some cases, and they will hold out their hands for pity and help. But behind this veil they are, in majority, what they are, Nazis to the core. How, otherwise, then are such people to be dealt with?

HERRMAN M. KNATH,

OTEEN, N. C.

The Pearl Harbor Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the American people have not, cannot, and will not forget Pearl Harbor.

Though nearly 3 years have elapsed since that unparalleled catastrophe happened, this administration has persistently refused to tell the American people the whole story and the full truth about this tragedy.

Pearl Harbor is not a political football to be kicked around all over the field, but is a sad and tragic event in our history about which the American people want to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

The Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States in this week's Collier's magazine, by inference and innuendo, has leveled serious charges against Admiral Kimmel and General Short, who were in command of our armed services at Pearl Harbor when the Japs attacked.

Admiral Kimmel, in his letter addressed to Senator TRUMAN and released yesterday to the press, branded the charges of the Vice Presidential candidate as false. Said Admiral Kimmel:

> The real story of the Pearl Harbor attack and the events preceding it has never been publicly told. This has not been my decision. For more than 2½ years I have been anxious to have the American people know all the facts.

Mr. Speaker, following Pearl Harbor I demanded publicly both in and out of Congress an immediate court martial of these two commanders. I wanted neither to attack them nor to defend them, but simply give them their day in court. They have been denied by this administration an opportunity to defend themselves in public. If they are guilty, they should be properly punished and relieved not only of their commands, but also of their retirement salary of $6,000 a year. If they are innocent, they should be exonerated of all blame.

Instead of a regular court martial—the natural, normal, and logical procedure invariably followed—this administration chose to send a commission to Hawaii to investigate. And instead of being told the full facts surrounding this lamentable event we got the garbled Roberts report. Admiral Kimmel in his letter to Senator TRUMAN truthfully states:

> The Roberts report upon which you rely does not contain the basic truths of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe. * * * Until I am afforded a hearing in open court it is grossly unjust to repeat false charges against me when by official action I have been persistently denied an opportunity to defend myself publicly.
>
> I suggest that until such time as complete disclosure is made of the facts about Pearl Harbor, you refrain from repeating charges based on evidence that has never met the test of public scrutiny.

I ask for nothing more than an end to untruths and half-truths about this matter until the entire story is given the people, who I am convinced will be amazed at the truth.

Mr. Speaker, repeatedly, I have stated that the true story of Pearl Harbor would rock this Nation and shock the American people when they once hear it.

Last December I succeeded in getting a resolution through both houses of Congress extending the statute of limitations for 6 months for the court martial of Admiral Kimmel and General Short. Three weeks before this extension expired in June, I introduced another resolution making it mandatory that courts martial be held within the next 3 months. That resolution passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 305 to 35. But this administration, not wanting to face the issue before the general election this November, succeeded in getting the resolution modified, calling simply for an investigation by the War and Navy Departments, and extending the time to 6 months, or until December 7, following the election this fall.

Why the attempt is now made by one of the candidates on the national Democratic ticket to make Admiral Kimmel and General Short the scapegoats for the Pearl Harbor disaster, I cannot understand unless it is to protect the Commander in Chief of our armed forces at that time, and to prevent the revelation of the real truth that might prove most embarrassing to if not destructive of fourth-term ambitions.

Certainly Admiral Kimmel and General Short, like every other American, are entitled to their day in court, and they should not be blamed for this worst military defeat in our history until they are given a free, open, public, and impartial trial. Perhaps the American people will act as a jury on this case when they go to the polls on November 7.

Unless the War and Navy Departments now investigating Pearl Harbor report soon to the Congress, it is the duty and responsibility of this democratic House to have brought before the appropriate committees of the House both Admiral Kimmel and General Short to tell their full story.

Great Britain Must Act To Save Hungarian Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, with the announcement that Regent Nicholas Horthy of Hungary has consented to permit emigration of Jewish children under 10 who can obtain visas and of adults who have visas to Palestine, Great Britain can no longer deny her responsibility and hide behind the MacDonald White Paper.

Every excuse for barring Jewish immigration in Palestine is gone. Certificates of entrance to Palestine can no longer be withheld on the ground that the Jews cannot, anyway, escape from Germany or German-held territory. No military necessity precludes the transfer of Hungarian Jews to Palestine. The offer is clear. The Jews of Hungary can escape death. The only passport to freedom is a visa to Palestine for the hunted and helpless Jews of Hungary. Surely, Britain cannot now betray the humanitarian instincts of mankind. Surely, the British Government will not permit the Horthy Government to say that since nobody is really interested in saving the Jewish people of Hungary, he might just as well let the Germans have them to do with them as they will.

Up to 3 weeks ago, Hungary deported 10,000 Jews daily to the Polish camps Berkinau and Oswiacien. It is estimated that 400,000 Jews still survive in Hungary.

These precious bits of paper, the certificates of entrance to Palestine, mean salvation to the Jews in Hungary. In the tussle between politics and human values, must not human values prevail?

All Allied Nations must act in concert to aid the remnants of Hungarian Jews before it is too late and they too disappear as did the 4,000,000 victims of Hitler's fury. It will be to Britain's everlasting shame if to Horthy's offer she gives no answer but silence.

If Great Britain does not unbar the door of Palestine to the escaping Jews, she will have then abandoned these people to the Nazi will. What that will is, we have seen. As defeat comes closer to the Reich, she will vent all her fury on the driven Jew.

It must be remembered at all times that Palestine is a mandated territory, that in administering the territory Britain is administering a trust. The interest of the United States in Palestine has been manifested through its congressional resolution of 1922, in the Anglo-American treaty of 1924, and, more recently, in the platform planks of both American political parties. The Anglo-American treaty was a joint act of the United States and Great Britain, wherein it was agreed that no one shall be excluded from Palestine on the ground of race or religion. That treaty was violated with the promulgation of the MacDonald White Paper, which closed the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration and restricted land owning. If the sanctity of treaties is one of the pillars of civilization, and we so regard it, why must this treaty of 1924 be regarded as a scrap of paper?

In the meantime, what is the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, now functioning in London and of which Great Britain is a member, doing? Its chief obstacle, it has always complained, is the inability of the refugees to escape.

Now the exit has been provided. Will it act so that Britain can provide the only practical entrance? Or will the committee embrace the terms of the MacDonald White Paper as it has previously done and as did the conferees at the Bermuda conference? The issue can no longer be hidden. No white paper must stand in the way now. No diplomatic niceties can obscure the choice. Once again it is human lives against the Chamberlain appeasement policy of the MacDonald White Paper.

San Francisco's Manpower Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on August 17, 1944, the San Francisco Examiner published an editorial headed "West coast manpower."

The article sets forth conditions facing San Francisco's Bay area. Under permission granted me, I ask that the editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Government agencies may be informed of our problem in the far West:

WEST COAST MANPOWER

War workers of the San Francisco Bay area are entitled to official assurance, now, that they will not be penalized for remaining on the job here until the last shot is fired.

Responsibility for giving such assurance, and for backing it up with tangible evidence, rests upon every military and civilian agency of the United States Government which is concerned with bringing the war to a successful conclusion—not only in Europe, but in the Pacific as well.

What we face here in the bay area is a war manpower crisis that has suddenly developed because of the general belief that X-Day, when Germany surrenders, cannot be many months away.

Included in the working population of the Bay area are 225,000 in-migrants—men and women who came here from other States and who have done and are doing a magnificent war job.

Their roots are not here, however, and to the sense of insecurity that comes from being away from home, there is now added the disquieting belief that other parts of the country will be swiftly reconverted in part to civilian production when Germany collapses, while the west coast is forced to remain on a strict, all-out war basis until Japan yields to Allied might.

Thousands of these in-migrant war workers, determined to be ready for peacetime employment when Germany is crushed, already have departed for their homes in other States. Other thousands are making ready to leave.

Yet X-Day will not see a slackening of the war effort in the bay area and on the coast as a whole. On the contrary, it is then that the full fury of America's striking power will be unleashed against Japan, with a consequent need in this region for even more production, more ship loading, more services, and more manpower.

Lack of manpower in the bay region will hamstring this final effort as effectually as the loss of fighting men and fighting ships.

It cannot be allowed to occur, and the Labor Management Committee of the War Manpower Commission, northern California area, has presented a solution that is both simple and equitable.

The Commission proposes as a necessary first step that there be equality in conversion between the coast area and the balance of the United States, to the end that there be no economic premium held out to those who leave this vital area.

It would achieve this by immediate announcement by appropriate Federal agencies that as of X-Day, employers on the coast may reconvert to civilian production a proportion of their war work, this diverted proportion to be performed elsewhere in the United States.

The program further calls for immediate implementing by employers in the form of paper work such as planning and blueprints; the limited accumulation of stock piles; such provision for retooling as the exigencies of war permitted, and actual production of civilian goods at once in industries where manpower and materials are currently available.

Such implementing would provide instant, tangible, visual evidence to war workers that reconversion in the West offers as many post-war job opportunities as will be found elsewhere in the United States—that no economic penalties will be imposed on loyal war workers who stay to finish the job.

This is a program not only for the bay area and the Pacific coast.

It is a program for America—a just and broad-gauge plan for winning the war abroad, and winning the peace at home.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege during my brief service in the House to participate as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation in the formulation of legislation to provide a program for the readjustment of our returning service men and women and for their reestablishment in civilian life.

I want to take this occasion to summarize, for these servicemen and their families, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, generally referred to as the G. I. bill of rights, which provides:

WAR AGENCY

This law makes the Veterans' Administration a war agency, second only to the Army and Navy, placing it high in priority for employees, equipment, and material; especially for new hospitals, for the construction of which an appropriation of $500,000,000 is authorized.

RECORDS AND ADVICE

Records of all disabilities will be completely assembled before the degree of disability is passed upon, and prior to discharge the serviceman (this includes women, too) may consult with representatives of veterans' organizations, located at hospitals, about making claim for post-war benefits. A serviceman cannot be compelled to sign any statement relative to the cause of injury or disability, and if such a statement, though signed, is against his interest, it will be null and void.

REVIEW OF DISCHARGES

In the event a discharge is other than honorable, unless it is the result of a general court martial, the veteran may have all facts reviewed by a board in the War or the Navy Department, as the case may be, and, if justified, a new discharge can be issued. Officers retired for disability, not in line of duty, may also call for a review of the action of the retiring boards.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Upon discharge, other than dishonorable, after 90 days' service subsequent to September 16, 1940, or upon discharge for an actual service-incurred disability, veterans, regardless of rank, will be entitled to—

EDUCATION

One year's education, and a further period of education equal to the time in service not to exceed, in all, 4 years, if war service interfered with, interrupted, or delayed the veteran's education. If the veteran was not over 25 years of age when he entered service it is provided that his education shall be automatically held to have been delayed or interfered with. If he was over 25 he must make a reasonable showing of these facts.

Uncle Sam pays for all books, tuition up to $500 per year, and a monthly subsistence allowance of $50 if without dependents—$75 with dependents. This will not afford regal fare, but it will get him through school.

A veteran can choose his own course, or courses, in any approved school wherever located, but he must pay his own transportation to such school.

Continuance of training, of course, depends on maintaining records satisfactory to school authorities as to grades and conduct.

For older men, primarily, or younger men if they need it, a year's retraining or refresher course is provided so they can bring themselves in line with improved and up-to-date practices in their trade or profession.

LOANS

A guaranty by the Government of 50 percent of a loan, or loans, to be made by a private financial institution in his home community or elsewhere, or by a governmental lending agency, the aggregate amount guaranteed not to exceed a total of $2,000. Interest shall not exceed 4 percent, and the Government will pay the first year's interest on the amount guaranteed. Proceeds of such loans must be used in the construction, purchase, or improvement of a home; purchase or improvement of a farm; or establishment of a business.

This section is expected to become operative in October.

EMPLOYMENT

Under supervision of the Veterans' Administration the utmost assistance in obtaining employment is offered veterans through existing agencies, and in every State a veteran's placement officer (himself a veteran) will be on the job to help see these opportunities are given.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCE

A weekly readjustment allowance of $20 per week during unemployment—by compliance with State laws relative to unemployment compensation, that is, if unemployed, he applies for work, cannot obtain suitable work, and keeps his file alive—for a period of not more than 52 weeks (based on length of service—24 weeks for 90 days' service and 4 weeks for each month of additional service) during a period of 2 years after discharge. Requirements are rigid enough to discourage "goldbricking" and to prevent duplication of benefits.

In the case of a self-employed veteran in business or a profession, or operating a farm, whose net income is less than $100 per month, there will be granted the difference to bring his monthly net income up to $100 for not more than 12 monthly payments.

This section takes effect Sunday, September 3.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

For all these benefits the Veterans' Administration is the single agency to which the veteran need apply, and the application should be made to the regional office of the Veterans' Administration for the area in which he resides. Applications for benefits must be made within the following periods after discharge:

Review of discharge: Within 15 years after discharge, or effective date of this act, whichever is later.

Education: Within 2 years after discharge or end of war, whichever is later. Education benefits end 7 years after the war.

Loans: Within 2 years after discharge or end of war, whichever is later, but in any event within 5 years after the war.

Readjustment allowance: Within 2 years after discharge or end of war, whichever is later.

Future bonus: If later legislation provides for adjusted compensation—bonus—the amounts paid hereunder will probably be deducted from such bonus payments.

These benefits are in addition to those already provided under existing laws relating to disability compensation, pensions, hospitalization, and vocational rehabilitation, which for the most part are the same as those provided for veterans of World War No. 1. There are a number of details not included here, but this gives in general terms the high points of the law. If you have any questions regarding details, get in touch with any veterans' organization—American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Purple Heart, and so forth—or, if you prefer, write ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, House Office Building, Washington, D. C. We here are at the service of veterans and their dependents at all times to answer questions or to assist in the presentation of claims under this act or any other statute granting benefits to veterans.

Weekly Papers Have Great Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, at this critical era of American history it is imperative that the people be intelligently informed, so that they may be fortified in approaching crucial problems. More than half of our citizenry resides on farms or in small communities which are served by weekly newspapers. Therefore it is timely to observe the comment made by Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, in pointing out that weekly newspapers have a greater influence over farmers than any other media.

I am personally acquainted with the country editors of Idaho, and I am in accord with the conclusions of Mr. Goss to the extent that our Idaho weekly papers are doing an outstanding job in serving their readers, our State, and the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following statement by Mr. Goss, which appeared in the American Press in July 1944:

Weekly newspapers go into nearly every farm home in America. They are more closely read by the farmer than any other publication which he receives. Unquestionably the effect they have on formulating rural opinion is tremendous. In this way they are possessed of a great privilege and a great responsibility. They are in a position to influence the American farmer for good or ill as is no other instrument in our land.

Over 53.6 percent of our people are either farming or directly dependent on farm trade for a livelihood. Here is the place where the most of the new wealth of the Nation is created. National prosperity is dependent on the production of this wealth.

The foundation of this prosperity lies among these 53.6 percent—the very people who are served by most of the weekly press.

Anything which fosters the production of this wealth and the prosperity of this segment of our people is in the national interest, while that which retards its production will not only destroy the prosperity of 53.6 percent but will also bring disaster upon the whole Nation.

As obvious as this is, and as simple as it sounds, many in our urban centers fail to recognize these basic truths and contend that our prosperity depends on cheap food, often priced below cost, without regard to the effect on the 53.6 percent who are the very foundation of prosperity. These people are the last stronghold of our free enterprise system. Here is found our strongest opposition to centralization of Government, to regimentation, and to subsidies, even though they may be the immediate beneficiaries of such a system.

Unfortunately, more often than not the great metropolitan papers and national news magazines have not understood the problems and the difficulties which our farmers are facing. Radio commentators with a city background also have failed to appreciate what American agriculture has done to maintain our American way of life.

As a result, the thousands of weekly newspapers throughout the Nation must carry the burden of telling the truth about the problems of our basic industry: Agriculture.

During these war years the threat to constitutional government is growing day by day. The stresses and strains of war are heavy, but the danger from external foes has served to weld us together in our struggle toward victory. However, once that victory is attained, the dangers of national disunity will be multiplied one-hundred-fold. No longer faced by exterior danger, and with enormous economic problems to be solved, it will be the task of responsible leaders of agriculture, labor, management, industry, the press, and the radio to work together to preserve all that is best in our social and political system. In this post-war era, the country weekly and agriculture, by developing a closer relationship, can and will lead the fight to preserve our democratic society.

Weekly papers should make it a point to keep in close touch with local farm organizations, and they, in turn, should use the papers as a means of keeping themselves informed on the problems and the thinking of the entire community.

Truly the weekly press and the farmers working together have a large part to play in maintaining the American system of free enterprise.

Foreign-Trade Zones—Ocean Gateways to Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Thomas E. Lyons, executive secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, before the thirty-first annual conference of the Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities at Portland, Oreg., July 19–21, 1944:

Foreign trade for the post-war year of 1948 (assuming the war then will be over) will total more than $13,500,000,000 of which our imports will account for nearly $6,500,000,000. These estimates, based on 1942 values, are contained in the publication Foreign Trade After the War released last October by the Department of Commerce. An estimate of post-war imports of $8,000,000,000 by a New York banker published in the 1943 National Foreign Trade Convention Proceedings evidenced the fact that the Department of Commerce figures may be conservative.

Foreign Commerce Weekly recently published a study setting out our exports for the years of 1929 and 1937 as 29,100,000 and 28,800,000 cargo tons, respectively. Our imports for these identical years total 25,000,000 and 24,800,000 tons, respectively. Post-war tonnage estimates are set out as 34,000,000 tons exports, and 33,000,000 tons, imports. In other words, according to the Commerce Department study, post-war export tonnage will be 17½ percent over 1929 and 40 percent greater than in 1937. Import tonnage estimates for the post-war period run ap-

proximately 33⅓ percent higher than either 1929 or 1937.

The foregoing figures all refer to dry cargoes—the traffic in which you gentlemen, as port officials and terminal operators are particularly interested.

At first blush one pauses to wonder where sufficient bottoms will be available to transport this great volume of material. War requirements for a bridge of ships to span the seven seas has supplied the answer. By the end of this year we will have a cargo fleet of approximately 50 million tons—equal to two-thirds of the entire world's merchant marine at the outbreak of the war. Although substantial units of the cargo fleet will be required to maintain essential post-war military and relief activities, sufficient tonnage should be immediately available for resuming and extending essential trade routes.

War requirements prompted the Maritime Commission to accelerate the initial program for the construction of the highly efficient C type cargo ships and the Commission's recent change over from "Libertys" to "Victorys" assures ample high-speed merchant tonnage to inaugurate this new era of foreign trade. With an adequate supply of ships and sufficient available cargo, what else might be needed? The answer is obvious—ample marine terminals immediately available for efficiently handling these ships and their cargoes. For the present practically every pier, wharf, quay and transit shed in our major ports and in some instances, in the smaller ports too, capable of serving ocean-going vessels, is being employed in the war effort. What part of these facilities can we expect to be immediately available for commercial shipping? Let us review briefly the situation after the last war for it may supply the answer and help us set a clearer course for our post-war activities.

When World War No. 1 broke on us in 1917 our military leaders were confronted with the job of embarking and supplying a huge expeditionary army from piers and docks which had already proved inadequate for normal commerce.

To meet this situation, the most ambitious terminal-warehouse construction on record was carried out by the United States Army in 1918. Under the guiding genius of Gen. George W. Goethals, the builder of the Panama Canal, a series of terminals was erected at a cost of more than $150,000,000. These bases were located at Boston, Brooklyn, Newark, Philadelphia, Norfolk, Charleston, and New Orleans. It was first proposed that the terminals be of a temporary nature but General Goethals expressed his feelings that with American ports backward in modern terminal equipment, these bases for a comparatively small additional cost for permanent construction could become a useful addition to the Nation's port facilities.

During the period between the two World Wars limited new port facilities were erected by municipal and State agencies, such as the State docks at Mobile and the Smith Cove Terminal at Seattle. Except in the case of the excellent railroad-owned Harborside Terminal on the New Jersey side of the New York harbor, private construction of public terminals during the past two and one-half decades was practically nil. Following the First World War substantially all the Army terminals were made available for commercial operations and contributed substantially to the sum total of port facilities. Before our entry into the present global conflict most of the Government-owned terminals had been withdrawn from commercial use, and when our ship construction and acquisition program was fully under way many municipal and private facilities, both piers and complete terminals, were requisitioned or leased for military operations.

As war requirements taper off, both public and privately owned harbor facilities will be turned back to their former operators. This is especially true where the Government has acquired marginal piers either individually or in groups. Terminal properties which incorporate both waterside facilities and adjacent storage warehouses will not be released so readily, and federally owned facilities such as the well-coordinated Army bases, and prior to the war leased for commercial uses, will be the last to be mustered out. In fact, some of us feel that defense needs for these terminals will remain long after the war is over.

An inventory of these marine terminals shows that a substantial part—and what is more important, some of our most efficient harbor units—will not be standing by to resume vital international trade functions immediately following termination of hostilities. These facilities include 30 or more piers and wharves, 80 to 100 berthing spaces, and nearly 20,000,000 square feet of shedded and warehouse space.

So we have the anomaly of (1) a vast new merchant fleet, and (2) an anticipated increase in foreign trade over any previous period, while at the same time a substantial reduction of avialable port facilities so essential to both. Despite this possible handicap, foreign trade will continue for our products will be in demand not only in the home market but also abroad. While basic commodity prices often determine buying habits, transportation and handling charges may appear unimportant in the early periods of post-war rehabilitation. However, lets not deceive ourselves, unless these service costs are held in check our shipping interests and our industrial plants will find foreign buyers turning to other sources of supply the moment new marts are opened. In short, it seems clear that our post-war foreign trade must be resumed under conditions which indicate that our port facilities will not only be limited but outmoded as well.

That we face a serious problem is conceded by eminent shipping and port authorities including Walter P. Hedden, director of port development of the New York Port Authority. Mr. Hedden, who is also president of the American Association of Port Authorities, recently reminded the Post-War Reconstruction Institute at New York University that "Transportation is as good as its terminals" and that "Port facilities for handling ocean freight and passengers include not only the steamship piers themselves but supporting warehouses, channels, railroad switching, tracks, and classification yards * * * and all sorts of handling equipment."

Mr. Hedden pointed out that old-type piers, well known to all of us on many water fronts, were not adaptable to the use of modern cargo-handling equipment. Among other suggestions he indicated that programs of modernization, redesign, and enlargement of piers will become necessary to meet changing conditions. Although Mr. Hedden was referring specifically to the port of New York, his description fits many of our other harbors.

It seems to me that our future foreign trade—and our merchant marine too—will depend on the creation of modern port terminals rather than on modernization of existing piers. Rehabilitation of existing structures or even the erection of new piers offers little in the way of a solution of the problem of holding commodity handling costs at levels which will assure the free flow of commerce.

While my primary interest concerns our foreign commerce of the future, the needs of post-war shipping are just as important. Our merchant marine of the future will have a sea speed of at least 50 and possibly 100 percent greater than our pre-war fleet. Much of this advantage of speed will be lost if merchant ships dissipate valuable time in port and terminal operations. Because of greater investment in propelling equipment, vessel port costs are relatively higher as the indicated speed is increased. While ships in all trades must of necessity spend idle time in port, this is particularly true in the nearby trades where vessels normally complete more voyages during a specific period.

Shipping men express concern that piers, built 20, 30, or 50 years ago are capable of taking care of the modern cargo ship which will constitute our post-war merchant marine. Increased size of vessels and improvements in handling gear prompts the question of the ability of these pier structures to provide adequate transit sheds to temporarily hold and sort cargo. These same officials point out that the hatch openings on the modern ship are much larger than on earlier vessels.

A spokesman of the Maritime Commission pointed out to the American Association of Port Authorities last October that the typical post-war cargo ship will have seven or eight sets of cargo gear as against five in the vessels of 1920 design, and that the amount of freight which can be discharged in a working day of 8 hours is 60 percent greater. He recommended wider and longer cargo piers, pointing also to the increasing quantity of freight delivered to shipside in large tractor-trailer highway units, which have difficulty in maneuvering on the old type piers.

This same official stated that port time is a necessary evil and it must be minimized. Up to 40 or 50 percent of a ship's active life is spent in port and this must be reduced. This can only be accomplished by the availability of the most modern of dock plants.

Current press articles on post-war plans of some of our ports indicate that substantial funds will be expended for future repairs and extensions. An official of one of our prominent Pacific-coast ports recently reported that between six and ten million dollars will be required for its post-war port program. Even when measured by present-day high construction costs, this sum would represent a substantial part of the expense of erecting a modern port terminal with all essential facilities, including shipside storage warehouses.

Officials of a number of Atlantic ports are at present surveying their respective harbor facilities to determine additions which might be needed to meet changed traffic conditions after the war. In several instances questionnaires have been sent to shippers and steamship lines to elicit their views on the types of commodities, shipping services, and port facilities necessary to handle future trade. These officials know that the economic fabric of many nations will be altered as a result of this global war, and some countries which heretofore were substantial importers of specific commodities may later produce substantial quantities of the same commodities for export.

Let me give you an illustration: Prior to the war, we imported from the Orient 500,000 long tons of rubber or enough to fill 100 ships of 5,000 tons capacity. Since Pearl Harbor our imports including those from Latin-America, have been negligible when compared to our needs. In the meantime we have developed a synthetic rubber industry capable of meeting not only our war requirements but essential civilian needs as well. Should this synthetic-rubber industry be continued after the war (determination of policy will be up to the Congress) some of our ports specializing in this trade might be forced to find other use for facilities provided for handling this commodity. On the other hand, many new articles can and will be developed from synthetic rubber and plastics. These new items will offer an immeasurable export tonnage for which our ports must be prepared to handle.

Congress on several occasions has recognized the importance of efficient harbor terminals as an aid to shipping and foreign trade. A definite policy with respect to water terminals was declared in the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1919, in the following language:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that water terminals are essential at all cities and towns located upon harbors or navigable waterways, and that at least one public terminal should exist, constructed, owned, and regulated by the municipality or other public agency of the State and open to the use of all on equal terms."

So concerned was the Congress to insure the construction of shipside facilities that it vested the Secretary of War with full discretion to withhold funds appropriated by the act for harbor projects if in his opinion no water terminals existed or were definitely planned adequate for traffic needs.

FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES

In 1934 Congress took another forward step to encourage construction of efficient ocean terminals at our ports when it enacted the foreign-trade zones law, designed to encourage and promote our foreign commerce. The act sets out the essential requisites for a modern ocean freight terminal, including shipside warehouses and connections with adequate inland transportation facilities. In return for providing these facilities and operating them as a public utility, the operator of the zone, which may be either a public or private corporation, is granted special privileges for handling foreign merchandise not intended or not ready to enter customs territory.

The following list sets out many of the advantages and economies which the foreign-trade zone offers to importers:

1. There is no expense for bonds or customs inspectors when imports are stored or manipulated, whether dutiable or nondutiable.

2. Buyers may examine and samples of merchandise may be withdrawn at any time.

3. Imports may remain in storage with no time limit.

4. Substandard foreign products are reconditioned before customs appraisal and liquidation. Goods not meeting standards of Government inspection agencies may be destroyed or reexported.

5. Ships, lighters, railroads, motortrucks, or parcel post make direct delivery to or from zone, insuring efficient and frequent carrier service.

6. Foreign products may be held on consignment for spot delivery without being subject to customs regulations.

7. Domestic products may be assembled, repacked, or combined with foreign products for exports. Draw-back formalities are unnecessary.

8. Imports arriving improperly marked are remarked to meet customs requirements, and heavy penalties are thus avoided.

9. Imports under "quota" restrictions may be received in any quantity in excess of quota and held without customs liquidation awaiting the next quota period, thereby enabling owners to obtain loans on warehouse receipts.

10. Alcoholic beverages and other liquids imported in bulk may be bottled, labeled, and packed prior to customs entry and without being subject to State or Federal licensing agencies.

11. Inland importers may arrange to examine foreign merchandise here and save costly transportation expense to interior points on defective merchandise that would be later returned. Examination prior to customs entry precludes the possibility of payment of duties on damaged or unsalable merchandise.

12. Importers may erect their own structures within the zone to perform manipulating operations adapted to their needs.

When I last reported to this convention at San Diego in 1942, I indicated that the New York Foreign Trade Zone was the only such facility operating under the Celler Act. Since then no new zones have been established, although the ports of New Orleans, Houston, and San Francisco have applications pending with the Board for the establishment of foreign-trade zones in their respective ports as soon as war conditions permit.

Two years ago I also reported that a substantial part of the area of the New York foreign-trade zone had been acquired for war purposes. In 1943 war demands again forced the New York foreign-trade zone to release one of the spacious piers which it occupied temporarily on North River and to move to more restricted quarters. Despite these two wound stripes, the New York foreign-trade zone continues to do a substantial business. While many commodities formerly handled through the zone have been withdrawn from international trade, other products from other world areas have replaced them. One interesting item which utilizes considerable covered storage and manipulating space, and, believe it or not, outside storage areas as well, is Latin-American liquor. Scarcity of alcoholic beverages in this country has opened up a lucrative market for our pan-American neighbors. So essential is the foreign-trade zone for the handling of foreign spirits that importers who are unable to secure covered storage gladly pay identical rates for all-weather open storage to secure foreign-trade zone privileges.

In concluding, may I remind you that our ports are vestibules to world trade. The traffic which flows through them directly affects the economy of every part of the Nation. It is your responsibility to see that these harbors are kept open and that they are provided with every essential facility which will expedite commerce and promote our merchant marine. Foreign-trade zones, if established in our gateway ports, will provide a type of integrated terminal service which will not only attract new traffic to the port itself but will also tend to increase commerce and coastal shipping in adjacent ports.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this morning the colorful mayor of the city of New York, Mr. LaGuardia, appeared before our committee and gave some most interesting testimony concerning the disposal of surplus war commodities. I find that on the 13th of August the mayor made a broadcast to the people of New York concerning post-war problems. As usual, Mayor LaGuardia discusses this most important subject with understanding and patriotism. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Wednesday, August 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday I stated to the Senate that the colorful mayor of New York City, Mr. LaGuardia, had appeared in the morning before the committee formerly headed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and now headed by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. Mr. LaGuardia gave some very interesting testimony before the committee on the very subject which is now under discussion; namely, the disposal of surplus war commodities.

On yesterday I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a radio address made by the mayor of New York City on the 13th of August concerning the problems to which reference has been made. This morning I have been informed that the matter which I requested to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and no estimate of the cost having at that time been given—the estimate is that it will cover approximately three pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $156—it is now necessary, in order that the address may be printed in the Appendix, that I renew the request which I made on yesterday. Therefore, in accordance with the rule I ask unanimous consent that the radio address made by Mayor LaGuardia on August 13, 1944, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST-WAR PROBLEMS

Patience and fortitude.

I want to talk today about our post-war problems. As of today, we are not prepared for peace. It took a long time to prepare for war. It will take a long time to prepare for peace. To date, precious time has been wasted. There should not be another minute lost. Congress will have to speed up. We all want the war to end at the earliest possible moment. We are all hopeful that it will end in Europe before long. Yet we are not ready to meet the situation at home when it does. Nothing short of a miracle will save us from a great deal of trouble and anxiety. It is just taking too long to get the post-war program settled and the necessary legislation enacted in order to prepare and be ready. Failure to be ready will be extremely costly, perhaps 10 times more than a constructive program, besides the trouble, the hardship, the suffering, and the anguish that will be caused. Relief is always costly and does not settle anything.

Those of us who were close to the unemployment situation know what relief costs, and we know that it is not a final solution. We must provide work and opportunity and security. Relief, idleness, and sympathy will not do.

Let us look at the situation. Over 10,000,000 men and women are now in the armed forces; about 30,000,000 men and women are now employed in war industries, including transportation, agriculture, and mining; 75 to 80 percent of our factories, shops, plants, and yards are now engaged solely in war production. The problem then is to get the demobilized veterans into jobs, to keep war industry workers in employment, and to transform war plants back to peacetime production. In addition, we must keep agriculture going to its maximum production. We know that all 10,000,000 men in the armed forces will not be discharged at one time. The first impact, though, will be felt for several months after demobilization starts. We must be prepared to give these men jobs, to keep them in jobs, and to absorb veterans in gainful employment after they are discharged.

Many mistakes have been made here at home. Mistakes are bound to happen in a great emergency and in such a gigantic task. Many of the mistakes were pardonable because of inexperience. Some of the mistakes were unpardonable because of past experience.

To meet this gigantic problem, everyone must do his share. The responsibility may be divided into four parts:

1. The Government.
2. Industry and commerce.
3. Agriculture.
4. Wage earners.

What should each do?

THE GOVERNMENT

1. The Government: The House of Representatives should proceed without delay to enact into legislation the remaining part of the Baruch recommendations not yet written into law or contained in the George bill. Congress should perfect the contract termination law and proceed at once to provide for aid and assistance in converting industry back to peacetime production.

It should, insofar as is possible and practical, define its taxing policy for 1945–46. This, of course, is always subject to the act of a subsequent Congress. However, a declaration of a tax policy, while not binding on a subsequent Congress, would be reassuring to industry and commerce and at the same time would have great force and would be considered with great respect by the new Congress.

Congress should approve a Federal-State-municipal public-works program, with immediate appropriations made available to Federal, State, and local governments for the preparation of engineering and architectural plans and specifications, and definite commitments as to the amounts of grants to State and local subdivisions of government. Congress should pass the Federal highway bill with authorization for increased appropriation. It does not provide enough as it now stands.

A careful study of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 should be made to obtain timely, perfecting, and clarifying amendments if they should be deemed necessary. Nothing should be left in doubt. The rehabilitation and educational features of this law are excellent. Here the mistakes and experience of the last world war have been helpful.

The reemployment provisions, of course, are necessary, but providing an employment agency does not create jobs by and of itself. In this instance, as in every other, it will be seen that a comprehensive plan is absolutely necessary. The Veterans' Reemployment Agency will be of great value if industry and commerce are able to give jobs. It will be useless if there are no jobs.

Provision should be made in the guaranty of veterans' loans to permit the pooling of individual loans among veterans who desire to join in an approved business venture.

The Government should now provide a guaranty of loan to industry and business for the purpose of deferred maintenance, expansion, replacement of equipment and machinery of any company or individual who has been or was solvently engaged in industry or business prior to or during the war.

Provisions for displaced war workers must also be made. We must be realistic. We cannot talk about the consumption of consumers goods and purchasing power and remain silent as to what is to happen to millions of war workers who will necessarily lose their jobs. The provisions in the Kilgore bill were not at all excessive or exaggerated. A large number of workers unemployed, with barely a subsistence allowance, will only prolong the period of resumption of peacetime production.

As the George bill goes from the Senate to the House, careful consideration should be given by the members to many excellent provisions in the Kilgore bill. Out of it all should come a well-balanced, easily administered, effective plan for part of our post-war problems. Both bills provide too much machinery for administration. Any attempt to mix, to mingle, or to merge any administrative duty, direct or indirect, with the legislative branch of the Government would only create a governmental melange, not in keeping with our philosophy of government, and will cause trouble. It has never and will never work. When congressional committees want information they have the power to get it. For a congressional committee to sit with an advisory committee in the administration of any law is not only impracticable but dangerous. The administration of all provisions of law, I repeat again, should be streamlined and decision and responsibility definitely fixed in as few individuals as is possible. Both bills contain the weakness of divided authority, too many committees, very unwieldy and cumbersome administrative machinery.

A great deal of our trouble has been caused by disparity of labor conditions in various States. This condition is now sought to be perpetuated in the George bill. Every post-war problem is a national problem. The displacement of war workers and the rehabilitation of industry is not a State problem but a national problem. Unemployment allowance should be uniform. True, there might be a slight differential in the cost of living in the various sections of the country. In the main though it necessarily must be uniform in amount, in administration, and in terms and conditions. To separate this into 48 administrations is not only costly but unscientific. It may create patronage and pap but it will not be as efficient as a national system. Imagine 10,000,000 workers shopping around for the States having the highest unemployment insurance. Imagine an administration allowing travel expense without a complete coordinated national plan of knowing just how, where, and why money is spent for travel and expense of families of war workers. Some may have a right to return home, others may want to go where work is available, but all of this has to be coordinated and brought under the supervision and control of one administration. Provision for 48 State administrations of unemployment insurance may be good politics. It is bad, very bad socially and economically.

The delay in obtaining necessary post-war legislation, the duplication and legislative confusion created by two bills on the same subject in the Senate, each reported out by committee, the need of one comprehensive plan, all indicate the necessity of an over-all study and consideration of these problems by Congress. To those not familiar with parliamentary procedure, the difficulty may not be apparent. Under the present rules, with different committees considering the various parts of the entire program, delay, duplication, omission are all bound to happen. The House of Representatives has seen this in the appointment of a Special Post-war Study Committee. The weakness of this committee, though, is that it has not been given the necessary power to report definite legislation. It can only make recommendations. That means delay, more hearings, more study, more investigations, more reports. It would be very helpful if each House of Congress appointed its own special legislative committee on post-war problems. This committee should consist of the chairman, ranking majority and minority members of the Ways and Means, Appropriations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Agriculture, Labor, and, if necessary, Army and Navy Committees, with full power to prepare and report legislation to their respective bodies. This will bring under one consideration, at one time, the entire picture and will enable proper approach and treatment of the various problems, the necessary tying in of all post-war activities, coordination and cooperation, and eliminate a great deal of bureaucracy and personnel.

The Government in Washington must be streamlined. The greater number of war agencies should be terminated. All duplication and overlapping must be eliminated. Each department of Government should absorb the functions of the various agencies which pertain to its particular field. This subject alone could be discussed at length. I may do so at another time.

It is absolutely necessary that insofar as is prudently possible, without impairing the post-war program, which will be very costly, the Government should estimate its post-war expenses for a period of 5 years. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, disappointment or irritation, a definite policy on lend-lease must be proclaimed now before it is too late. We may have to give some aid to the unhappy invaded countries. It should be restricted to such countries. Lend-lease, though restricted, after the termination of hostilities, must be limited to goods and commodities. All of the countries will need building materials, machinery, clothes, food, and medical supplies. This all can be supplied under the provisions of lend-lease with easy terms of payment or exchange later in commodities. There should be no cash loans except for a critical or emergency situation. I am talking about Government money. Reestablished governments or new governments, of course, would be permitted to float bond issues on such terms as they are able to negotiate.

A system of universal military training will have to be established for all boys between the ages of 18 and 21, giving choice to the individual as to when he will serve within that age period, or compulsory at 21. Suitable arrangements, of course, can and must be made for college students without interruption of their college or post-graduate courses. This is very easy to accomplish. Alongside of this, States must strengthen their compulsory educational laws in order to take from the competitive labor market children of tender years and immature youth.

On the other end of the pool, a more uniform system of old-age pensions should be established throughout the country. No old age pensions should be allowed where the beneficiary continues employment in any competitive field. Unemployment insurance should be more uniform throughout the country. This, of course, is only palliative and not a cure. Let us give more thought as to how to keep people at work rather than how to keep them out of work. Labor wants work with decent pay, not idleness with relief. We must establish security of employment to such an extent that the cost of unemployment insurance would be greatly reduced and the benefits to seasonal workers greatly increased.

We have learned that a great deal of destitution, which is very costly to local and State governments, comes from the disability of the head of the family to work owing to illness. At this date little need be said as to the need of a health insurance system throughout the country. It is past the study stage. Sufficient information, knowledge and even experience, have been obtained to put such a plan into operation.

We have heard too much of surpluses. Paradoxically, it has caused hunger in our country. It is almost unbelievable that when we had the greatest unemployment, we had the greatest food surplus. The same is true as between nations. Some countries had surpluses and did not know what to do with them, other countries were in want. That is one of the main causes of war. It must be removed. Just talking about it will not solve the problem. We must act and we must be prepared to go into operation to care for surplus the moment the war ends. Oh,

for the first few months there will be such need of food and material in Europe, Africa, and Asia that the laissez-faire, the happy-go-lucky, the unthinking, the day-by-day businessman, the pawn-banker, will say—"Oh, everything is fine now, why worry?" I tell you that there is cause to worry. No people within a country from now on will go hungry and no country in the world will go hungry. Our Government should provide at once a surplus commodity export corporation operating on a hemispheric basis in concert with like organizations of Central and South America. A like government corporation should be established for the European-African territory, and the third for the Pacific-Asiatic area. Heretofore we have talked about surpluses but we do not really know if we ever had a real surplus of anything. A surplus is that amount of any given commodity over and above the needs of all the people. What we have called surplus was the amount over and above the purchasing power of the people. Do I make myself clear? As an illustration: We had great trouble in the past with surpluses of dairy products, milk, butter and cheese. I say we have never had a real surplus of dairy products in this country. If every infant and child in the United States had sufficient and the proper quantity of milk every day, if every family had sufficient and the proper quantity of butter every day, ignoring cheese entirely, we would not have had a surplus of dairy products. Therefore, to balance the world's surpluses, it is necessary that a definite formula be established.

Roughly stated, it means that the daily needs of the people of the entire country should be taken as the normal required amount of any commodity. The amount over that requirement is then declared a surplus. That surplus then is taken with the surplus of the same commodity of other countries in the hemisphere, and placed in the pool. It is disposed of by sale or exchange to countries needing that particular commodity. The European or Asiatic countries do the same, and provide for sale or exchanges between the three world surplus commodity corporations. When the commodity arrives in the country requiring it, it is then distributed through the regular channels of trade in accordance with the economy of that particular country. It is not difficult. We have the food; we have the raw materials; we have the demand; and soon it will be learned that a perfect balance can be maintained. Of course, this would eliminate speculation. This would eliminate monopoly. This would prevent excess profits and excess suffering. By the establishment of the hemispheric surplus pool, a market is assured to the farmers of each nation for all that they produce. No more economy of want, no more curtailing production, but encouraging production. There is no originality in this idea. It has been talked about and studied for years. Selfish interests have always been able to oppose it in this and other countries.

Now let us consider another kind of surplus, temporary but quite important—that is surplus war supplies. Let us get right to the point. Congress is giving a great deal of attention to legislation regulating sale of surplus war supplies. The amount of surplus supplies will not only be gigantic, but fantastic. Now right here let us remember that the Army and the Navy should be praised and not criticized for having such enormous amounts of every kind of supplies on hand. It is their job to fight and win the war. They dare not take any risk as to when and how the war will end. It is their responsibility to have ammunition and weapons and food and materials and supplies of every kind everywhere—when and where it may be needed—in sufficient quantities. Therefore, the American people should know that the enormous supplies which we will find after the war is the result of a fine and thorough job on the part of the Army and the Navy.

More thought and study has been given to the disposal of war-surplus supplies now than had been given before the end of the last war. A superagency of government has been established with a splendid personnel, which is intended to cover all the procurement agencies of the Government that will have surplus supplies on hand. Every detail has been worked out as to cataloging, pricing, advertising, financing, and, as I stated, Congress is now considering definite legislation.

I make this prediction—that if the selling agency is perfect, that if the laws enacted by Congress provide for the efficient and speedy disposition by sale of all war-surplus material, that within 90 days after the same will go into operation, the Congress will hastily repeal its own legislation and stop the sale of 99 percent of the surplus supplies. Sounds strange, doesn't it? Well, it is a fact. Just look. Are we not bending every effort to get industry back to peacetime production? Do we not want to employ every man that it is absolutely possible? Well, then, if we want to do that, do you not see how the sale of the surplus supplies through the regular channels of trade will retard peacetime production? Yes; there are some articles on the list which will be helpful in restoring peacetime production; tools and dies, and machinery may be needed at once, but no machine should be sold unless it is needed to restore peacetime production and not if another machine could be made in the time that it is required. Some raw material, such as copper and lumber, and other materials, should be sold, but only so much as will get peacetime production going up to the time that same material can be produced. If all the reserve aluminum on hand were sold as surplus supplies now, it would close down the production of aluminum for a long time. That in turn will cause the unemployment of thousands of workers. Take, for instance, planes and motors for airplanes. Why there will be an enormous quantity on hand. If all of the surplus were to be sold here and abroad, I predict that there would not be an airplane motor constructed in our country in 5 years. That would cause unemployment to hundreds of thousands of workers. Airplanes that may be used for commercial purposes should be loaned to commercial air lines as replacements for present worn equipment on condition that an order for a new plane with new motors is placed for each plane and motor loaned which will be returned on delivery of the new plane and new motor. The same is true in trucks and cars, in paint, and bolts and nuts, and in the thousands and tens of thousands of different articles and goods that the Government will have on hand.

The Government, of course, should use materials and goods for its own establishments. It should give to state and municipal government replacements of materials and supplies that it may need, but only on condition that the State or municipality authorize the appropriation for the succeeding year of its normal requirements for such material and supplies. There is a great need now of blankets and sheets and medicial supplies in our hospitals. But how about the mills, how about raw wool and cotton? If all the shoes and clothes that the Government will have on hand are to be sold through regular channels of trade, it sure will retard resumption of leather and textile production in this and other countries.

Someone will ask, "Well, isn't it wasteful not to sell all of those surplus supplies?" The answer is "Yes," of course it is wasteful. War is wasteful and destructive and this enormous amount of surplus supply is just part of the waste and destruction of war. So let us not fool ourselves. I have told committees of Congress just what I am telling you now. We must be realistic and practical. It is less costly to pay wages to produce new goods than pay insurance for unemployment.

INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

2. Industry and commerce: Everybody is talking about free enterprise today. When I say everybody, it seems from the member of a local of organized labor, to the President of the United States. It seems to be the will of the majority of the American people. That being so, then we must face this big problem honestly, frankly and realistically. Free enterprise means business for profit. If that is the will of the people, then business and industry must be given a chance to operate. Given good wages and wholesome working conditions, an opportunity of profit commensurate with the capital and risk involved must be made possible. Talking about profits, taxes tantamount to almost complete requisition and free enterprise at one and the same time, simply does not mix. Hog-tying legislation likewise interferes with free enterprise and the profit system and the creation of permanent employment under this system. Now mark you, I am not giving my views. I am stating what must be realistically faced if those who talk about free enterprise want to bring it about successfully. In the modern, scientific, industrial age in which we are living, we must not be frightened at big undertakings. Many of the consumers' goods and desirable goods cannot be produced today unless they are produced in maximum quantities and the manufacturer is permitted to avail himself of every possible economy in the purchase and processing of raw materials, the manufacture and distribution of the ultimate goods.

Industry and business, as I said before, has a responsibility. Granted that it should know exactly how it stands in legislation and insofar as is possible taxation, it must reconcile itself to fair and reasonable profits, to new conditions pertaining to labor, to close cooperation with its employees, and the recognition that the employees come to have a vested interest in something that they have contributed in building and creating. The time may not be distant that a certain percentage of profits beyond a fair and reasonable return may be shared by management and labor. Security of employment is necessary and in the long run economical to the employer himself. Therefore, production should be systematized in such way as to avoid seasonal work. There is no reason why the automobile or the petticoat manufacturer should produce only in a certain season of the year. Given its model or style, production may well be spread during the 12 months of the year.

Business and industry should now be ready with its post-war plans for deferred maintenance, expansion, replacements, and enlargement or new enterprise. There is plenty of money available, and, as I stated, the Government may provide some sort of partial loan guaranty. There is nothing more discouraging, and I am sorry to say I have heard many important, yes, even big bankers and businessmen, tell me, "Oh, wait, let's win the war first." This type of mind will not fit in the post-war period. This is the pawnbrokers' and pushcart peddlers' mentality. All the shenanigans and questionable promotional schemes which flourished in the early days of railroads and right down into the late twenties must be forgotten. If business or industry sells bonds, the in-

vestors must know that they are absolutely good with sufficient property back of them. In exchange, the investor takes a lower rate of interest. Watered stock and overcapitalization must likewise be avoided; the stockholder must be assured that he is in a business and not a lottery. More labor and owner representation will have to be given on the directory boards. Existing restraint of trade and antitrust laws must be brought up to date to meet the technology of mass production, changed labor conditions, and magnitude of modern industry. The Department of Commerce must be vested with the authority and power to protect honest business and industry. An opportunity should be given to business and industry to apply for approval of contracts, agreements, or any undertaking before same is put into operation, in order to ascertain if it conflicts with any existing restraining or trust law. When industry and business want to do the right thing, they should not be placed in jeopardy or tempted to violate the law when it is not their intention to do so.

I want to state again now, that I am simply stating what should be done if a system of free enterprise is to be the policy of our Nation.

AGRICULTURE

3. Agriculture: With the exception of perhaps the last few years in this country, agriculture has never had a chance in this or any other country of the world. For centuries, countries of the older world thrived on the exploitation of the peasants. In this country, industry profited, in the past, by misery of the farmers. That day should be gone and gone forever. Unless we are very careful, we may again depress agriculture to the depths of bankruptcy and poverty as was done after the last World War in this country. Wonder how many realize that the job of a shirtmaker in a shop in New York, or a mechanic in a plant in Detroit may depend upon the wheat crop in the Argentine or in Australia, to say nothing of the economic condition of the farmers of this country.

Our agriculture economy must be based on a policy of plenty. Everything that the soil can produce must be encouraged. Parity, not parity-plus, but real parity prices must be assured to the farmer, and what is more, that he will find a market for his crops. This is only possible with the world surplus pool I talked about a moment ago. The American farmer is entitled to fair and just compensation for his labor, the labor of his family, and for fair, just and reasonable returns for his investment. That is all he wants, that is all he ever asked. If he gets that, he is prosperous. If the American farmer is prosperous, he buys clothes and furniture and household goods, machinery and all sorts of things that we make in the city. That means employment in the cities—wages—and in turn a good market for his products. Now when you put this circle in reverse, it is just too bad. The farmer is broke and he cannot buy, and because he cannot buy, the fellow in the city does not have a job and he cannot buy sufficient food. It is just as easy to keep the gear forward as to let it slip into reverse.

If the nations of the world are really desirous of maintaining peace, nothing is more important than that all of the people of the world should have enough to eat. God Almighty has placed sufficient food on earth for all the people. It has not all been equally distributed; but the balance is there. While one country may produce one crop in surplus quantities, it does not have another commodity it needs and which another country produces. To think of people starving with a surplus of food of any kind is not only stupid, but sinful.

LABOR

4. Labor: We now come to the wage earners. Labor has an opportunity to make a great contribution to our post-war adjustment. It has the greatest opportunity in the entire history of industry. Labor has gained a position, its rights have been recognized. This brings with it responsibility. Granted a policy of a decent living wage, security and provision against unemployment, it necessarily follows that labor must produce sufficient to create such wages and working conditions. Wages must necessarily be maintained by production. Slow-down, limited production, idle stand-bys, are costly to labor and to industry.

Speaking very frankly, in the period of adjustment following the war, with the huge number of discharged war workers and demobilized soldiers, full and complete cooperation will be necessary. Unless ample, equitable distribution of work is provided between the discharged war workers and the demobilized veterans, there is great danger of irritation, friction, and serious trouble between these 2 groups. There are some 30,000,000 men and women, as I said before, now employed in war industries. Let us assume that there will be about 10,000,000 who will not be required in war industry and 10,000,000 who eventually will be demobilized from the armed forces. Here we have a pool of 20,000,000 men and women for whom work must be provided. As I see it, in all governmental post-war public improvement, the employment should be distributed on a 50–50 basis between demobilized veterans and unemployed war workers. The same ratio of one-half veterans and one-half war workers should be followed as closely as conditions will permit in all post-war new industry, and in continuing industry and business insofar as is possible. Women who have homes and are not self-supporting, as well as overtime and dual employment will all have to give way in order to provide a greater spread of employment. Organized labor should be the one to present this plan and to see it enforced. That in and of itself is sufficient to avoid the danger of friction between veterans and organized labor.

In order to maintain the purchasing power necessary to provide permanent employment, it is essential that production increase. I repeat, the whole situation depends upon the wage earner producing. Everything should be based on that. The greater the production, the greater the stability of employment. The greater the production, the better the wages.

I have felt for a long time that a fixed, fair, and just annual pay with steady work is better than a fictitious hourly rate with little or no work. I have always felt that full-time jobs for all is better than jobs for some with overtime. I am quite aware that the old-line labor leader disagrees with that. However, this is something that all trades should consider. An annual pay with steady work will bring more return to the individual and his family than an hourly rate, uncertain, indefinite, and seasonal. I have heard from both employers and union leaders that it is impossible to fix an annual pay for seasonal work. That is not so. It is quite possible to provide greater income to the worker on an annual basis and yet reduce the cost of production to the employer. This is something which should receive the prompt attention of labor.

Labor should see to it that the standards of wages are more uniform throughout the country. The wage-and-hour law has helped considerably. That is not enough. Working conditions, rules imposed by labor, if good in one section of the country should be good in all sections of the country. Often it is not wages, but working conditions that drive an industry out of one section into another section of the country. That is not good for industry and in the long run it is not good for labor. Fair employers who want to do the right thing for labor, who pay good wages, who recognize the right of labor, should be protected by labor itself against unfair competition caused by inferior working conditions in other parts of the country.

Jurisdictional strikes must be avoided. Surely labor can provide the genius and the good will to prevent a stoppage of work often involving hundreds of innocent workers on a job because of some jurisdictional dispute. The employer or the contractor is helpless. Government mediation or conciliation agencies are helpless.

A great deal of thought should be given to this. The art of construction, improvement in machinery, plastics, and new materials will come into use rapidly after the war. These are often the causes of jurisdictional disputes as to who will do the job. This is labor's problem. The employer, the contractor, is not concerned. The cost is the same to him. Therefore it is labor's responsibility to provide the machinery for the adjustments of such disputes within its own rank without the interruption, the delay, or losses to the contractor or employer and to labor itself. I know that people unfamiliar with labor conditions will believe that a suggestion of this kind is wholly unnecessary, but those who have experience know how costly a jurisdictional strike is to both labor and employer. Assurance of the elimination of this evil should be complete.

Labor organizations have sought honorably to maintain the terms and conditions of agreements. Recently a bad practice has been creeping in of mass "sickness" and stoppage of work, which, of course, is nothing but an unlawful strike. In such instances the labor organization concerned should assume the responsibility of filling the vacant ranks in order to continue service and production in accordance with the terms of the agreement that labor itself has signed and pledged to maintain.

Labor can be most helpful in maintaining standards of living as well as in the social well-being of the people of this country. It can also serve very helpfully in establishing relations with labor of other countries in aiding to establish proper standards of living, and the end of systems of starvation wages detrimental to countries where decent standards exist. Labor must also police its own ranks and drive from within its midst crooked leaders and anyone who would racketeer or who would betray the cause of labor. And, finally, labor must not only open its doors but its books to the returning veterans without excessive initiation or admission dues. In fact, it would be smart to give membership to men and women in labor organizations on the presentation of an honorable discharge. We must not forget thousands of boys have been instructed and trained in skilled trades. The Seabees of the Navy, the Engineer Corps of the Army, the Signal Corps, the Air Corps, yes, and tanks, and all the mechanized branches of the armed forces, have instructed and trained thousands and thousands in skilled trades.

These boys must have a chance to work. These boys are entitled to a job. I strongly advise labor to take these veterans into their organizations and to adopt the system of sharing the work—one worker and one veteran for every two new jobs available.

In conclusion, I say that I know a great deal of all this sounds visionary, but I can assure you it is not only necessary but practical. To slip up on any one of the various factors necessary for a post-war prosperous, peaceful world is courting disaster. I hate to say this, but unless we are sure that the economy of our own country will be well-balanced, that there will be work for all and

social security, we are in for very serious trouble. Is it not better to plan ahead and to deliberately prepare for the situation, constructively and in an orderly manner? If we fail, it will be disorderly and troublesome. It will lead to serious conditions, even more serious than we dare to contemplate. And it will be so much less costly to arrange our post-war national system intelligently than to be caught unprepared, to be met with trouble, and costly palliatives and makeshift solutions.

Will the post-war period be costly? Yes; because it is part of the war and it is just impossible to snap back into peace and normal peacetime conditions in one instant. With provisons already made by Congress or now under consideration, the fiscal year following the end of the war will require about 70 percent of the last war fiscal year. The second year perhaps 50 percent of the average yearly cost of the war. The third year 25 percent and from that point tapering off. This, of course, assumes a complete, well-coordinated post-war program.

Some will say, "But some of the suggestions will be costly." No; not at all. Social security will not be costly if our economy is based on a huge production and people are employed. There is one complaint that the plan for disposing of surplus food and other natural resources will increase the cost of living. No; not at all. Much cheaper than providing relief for the unemployed, much cheaper than subsidizing reduced production or killing of livestock. Much cheaper when it will bring into the country goods and commodities that we cannot grow or produce.

It will be pointed out that not disposing for cash surplus war materials will entail a great loss. Not at all, when you consider the loss in employment and production awaiting the consumption and use of the surplus war material. Some employers will say that the annual pay will increase the cost of production, and labor leaders will say that it is not practical and that the workers will get less. Both are wrong. It can be mathematically demonstrated that it will increase the pay of the worker, reduce the cost of production.

I feel that we are the most fortunate people in the whole world. Our task is so much easier than the post-war task of Great Britain, France, or China. We cannot even compare the ease of our post-war task with that of the invaded countries or of Germany and Japan by the time we are through with them. To start with, we have the resources. Our country has not and in all likelihood will not suffer any devastation. Would it therefore not be an unpardonable failure and a blemish on our generation if we fumble at this time? The disastrous effect, the failure of a plan to provide for a sound economic post-war society in our country, will bring havoc and ruin to us in this day and make it extremely difficult for the next and the generation after that. The problems that we must consider and solve are not political. Our problems are economic and social. We cannot delay. We must work out, not a democratic economy or a republican economy; it must not be teutonic or slavic or Latin—we must evolve a purely American economy to meet our needs, our habits, our customs, and our system of government. It will require generosity in politics, particularly in this year; it will require good will on the part of all men. It will require unselfishness to the greatest degree on the part of all the groups: Capital, labor, social, and political. It will require unselfish, patriotic teamwork. It will require courage, the like of which no statesman in the entire history of our country has been called upon to display. It can be done—it should be done. With God's help, we will do it.

Editorial Comment on Resignation of James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix two editorials and an article dealing with the subject of the resignation of Hon. James A. Farley as chairman of the Democratic committee of the State of New York.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Sun of June 9, 1944]

FARLEY'S RESIGNATION

Pressure of business is James A. Farley's announced reason for resigning as chairman of the Democratic State committee after 14 years of effective service to his party organization. Mr. Farley declined to go beyond his own formal statement, but the mere fact of his resignation is bound to stimulate speculation, first, that it is a sure sign that Mr. Roosevelt is a candidate for a fourth term; and second, that it is as sure an indication that Mr. Farley is as strongly opposed to a fourth term as he was to a third term.

In fact, some will be tempted to link Mr. Farley's resignation, effective on July 11, with the revolt of old-line Democrats in Texas and South Carolina and Mississippi. Many Democrats have discovered that their only rôle in the national convention this year will be to second a nomination already made by the radicals and left-wingers. The alliance of Democrats and new dealers that was a source of strength to the Roosevelt candidacy in 1936 and again in 1940 may be a source of weakness this year. Politeness and a sense of the past may forbid Mr. Farley to say more at this time than is covered by his formal statement that he has submitted his resignation for business reasons. He is as candid as he is polite, however, and his attendance at the Democratic National Convention as a delegate from New York will provide him with an opportunity for blunt speech.

[From the New York Telegram of June 9, 1944]

THE FARLEY RESIGNATION

A host of Democrats in this city and State, we think, will sincerely and deeply regret the resignation of James A. Farley from the State Democratic chairmanship he has held since 1930. There will be few to disagree with him when he doubts that "any man in my position has ever enjoyed the friendship of the leaders and the party workers as I have." The genial Farley personality has time and again transcended political or tactical differences. He was born for friendship.

Though Mr. Farley makes business duties and obligations his reason for resigning, it will seem to many that the Democratic leader who so vigorously fought a third term for President Roosevelt in 1940 can see scant consistent scope for his leadership in the prospect of a fourth-term campaign in 1944. His position therein would be, to say the least, both uncongenial and embarrassing.

Naturally, anti-Roosevelt Democrats whose hostility to a fourth term has already developed even to the point of urging a third party may now turn hopeful eyes toward Mr. Farley, recalling that only 4 years ago he was ready to accept a Democratic nomination for President and make his break with Mr. Roosevelt complete and final.

With fourth-term provocation, a new party is not inconceivable. Stranger things have happened. But Mr. Farley quietly announces his intention of attending the coming Democratic National Convention as a delegate, and Jim Farley is far too experienced and astute to commit himself faster than events.

Business may call him away from present party office. But we bet it won't take him permanently out of front-line politics.

THE MORALS OF JIM FARLEY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Few men in the United States have paid as high a price for principle as Jim Farley. All the stories that small men concoct to belittle him fall by the wayside in the face of what is these days an astonishing adherence to moral principle, namely, that even in party politics conscience must be the guide. Jim Farley put himself and his party second to his country. Jim Farley loves the United States, its baseball sand lots, its clubhouse politics, its machines for the control of the votes of the people—but even more, the Constitution of the United States, which made it possible for his Irish forebears to settle here in freedom and opportunity. And feeling that way, he could not join in an act of political opportunism which he believed would let his country down.

And so Jim, a man of inherent loyalties to the essential, could not go along with a third term. To him a third term was a betrayal of the traditions of constitutional America. It renounced the principle of limited tenure in office; it encouraged the despotism of irremovable bureaucracy. It reduced the Presidency to the position of a king surrounded by mayors of the palace.

So Jim Farley broke with the man whom he had made President of the United States. Men have short memories these days and, of course, the children are not taught contemporary history. Yet the fact is that by 1930 Franklin D. Roosevelt was not an extraordinarily notable figure either in the United States or in Democratic politics. He had been rescued from what seemed an inevitable and tragic oblivion by Al Smith and John Raskob, who had made him Governor of the State of New York because Al Smith desired a worthy successor to himself—worthy from the standpoint of Democratic Party politics. He had made a fair to middling good Governor—but Jim Farley, the original inventor of the convention blitz—set out to make his friend the Democratic candidate for the Presidency. No one in those years nor in the years when Jim was chairman of the Democratic National Committee, questioned the value of his services in getting that first nomination, and if Mr. Roosevelt permits his smearing jackals to belittle Jim now, he condones something cheap and vulgar. Jim's contribution to the Roosevelt career commands a gratitude that can know no turning among decent men.

To this Irishman from Rockland County then came honors and dignities and power. Yet when he left the Postmaster-Generalship to adhere to his principle of no third term, Jim Farley was sorely in debt, as every one in New York knew, and he went to work selling Coca-Cola. Farley remained chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, a position which became decreasingly important as Sidney Hillman and MARCANTONIO developed increasing power. In a word, even in the State committee, Jim

Farley was pursued by the relentless forces of the Communist allies of the mayors of the palace in the White House. He might have returned to power did he but court their good will. That was too high a price for Jim to pay.

Some weeks ago some newspapermen devoted space to belittling the morals of Jim Farley by announcing that he was selling his soul to be mayor of New York or United States Senator from New York. Their object was to give the impression of an abject Jim Farley, crawling on his hands and knees, to beg the forgiveness of David Niles, manipulator of the President Forever Movement and Sidney Hillman, the current national boss of the New Deal operations for a fourth term.

Jim's answer is to resign his chairmanship of the New York State committee. He is now a free lance, free to devote his skill and services to his country, to fight against a fourth term unhampered by commitments and the votes of the Hillman Democrats. And the consequence of this resignation will be that no history will be able to record that at the Democratic Convention of 1944 there were no daring men, no self-respecting men, no patriots who put country above personal advantage. Jim Farley resigned to be free to pursue the truth as he sees it.

Soviet Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Foote from the Bay City (Mich.) Times of Monday, August 21, 1944:

SOVIET STAND

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—Genesis of Governor Dewey's warning against power politics and a Big Four military alliance to control the world undoubtedly was an article in Izvestia, a magazine published in Leningrad by the union of Soviet writers. The New York Governor also is known to have been disturbed by reports of what happened at the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin conference at Tehran.

Since in Russia expression of thought is rigidly controlled by the Government, it was natural to surmise that this article in all likelihood reflected the Soviet's views in respect to an international security organization. This suspicion was emphasized by the fact that the article bore the signature of one N. Malinin, whose name means nothing to most Washington diplomats. It may have been a pseudonymn for some high Russian official, possibly Maxim Litvinov, former Ambassador to the United States.

Irrespective of the motivation of Governor Dewey's warning and regardless of whether or not the newspaper article was officially inspired, the two documents have served a worthy purpose. They elicited from John Foster Dulles, Governor Dewey's spokesman on foreign affairs, a declaration that international affairs should be and would be a subject of discussion during the Presidential campaign. This is in all respects desirable.

It is no secret that Woodrow Wilson's idea of open covenants, openly arrived at, has been thrown into the discard. It was disregarded at the food conferences at White Sulphur Springs, at Bretton Woods, and again at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference which opened Monday. Newspapermen were admitted to the first session, but henceforth will be barred, while American delegates were given specific instructions not to reveal anything to the press. Marine guards were posted about Dumbarton Oaks to keep the newsmen out.

Communiqués will be released at regular intervals apprising the press and the people of the country of the progress made in the negotiations. No one would contend that conferences of such far-reaching importance should be conducted in a glass house. But there should be a fair balance between Old World methods of "secret diplomacy" under which so many shady alliances and understandings have been fashioned in the past, and the sort of premature publicity which might ruin the negotiations.

Without the shadow of a doubt the Malinin article goes counter to the expressed views of both Secretary Hull and Governor Dewey in respect to the voice of the "small nations" in the organization to maintain world peace. And if it does represent the views of the Soviet, it is well to have it aired and discussed during the preliminary sessions of the conference. Such discussion may avoid misunderstandings and possible disunity and for such a doctrine becoming a part of an international agreement—to be announced full-blown in a communique a month or so hence.

Malinin says that the new organization must turn away from this principle of "false equality (of nations) which was the basis of the old League." He continues: "After all, it is only the great powers which are able to act effectively against a big aggressor. Therefore, it automatically follows that the future world agency, if it is to avoid the failure of the League, must be based upon the firm active leadership of the great powers which have demonstrated their might in the present war."

"These powers which will form the directive organ of the new organization must assume responsibility for organizing resistance to any aggression, if necessary, by their own forces alone, irrespective of the position of the remaining members. The responsibility for guarding peace must not be divided among 60 or more states." The Russian writer then says that it is important that the great powers seal their obligations by entering into treaties."

Military alliances, spheres of influence and balances of power systems are anathema to the American people, as has been emphasized by Secretary Hull, Governor Dewey, and Wendell Willkie. The time to guard against them is now.

The Workingman: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Workingman: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," written by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and published in the June-July issue of the Democratic Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORKINGMAN: YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW

(By Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah)

The war and post-war problems are of such vital interest to us all that we are prone to be thoughtless of the past. That is especially true for those of us who have steady jobs, good wages, and healthful working conditions. But, after all, the present and the future can be but a promise. It is from the past that we must get our assurances and from which we must plan our accomplishments. When people are thoughtless of the past and not worried about the future, they are generally content with the present. That contentment may cause us to forget. What I shall say, therefore, is said "lest we forget."

THE WORKINGMAN IN 1933

Contentment among workers was completely lacking in 1933. There was unemployment. There was the kick-back. There were long hours and low wages. Industry, agriculture, and mining were, in the sight of the law, of purely local concern, and the Federal Government seemed to have no interest in the problems of workers in any fields excepting those of foreign and interstate commerce.

A legalistic attitude had tied our minds to such an extent that we thought it more important to have respect for a legal fiction which had no basis in fact than to provide for the general welfare of the people. Then, with a change in our national leadership, there came, in rapid succession, a change in attitudes. The kick-back was prohibited. The National Labor Relations Act, which gave workers the right to bargain collectively, and the Wage and Hour Act, which put a floor under wages and a ceiling on hours, came into existence. Social-security laws were enacted. All were sustained by the Supreme Court. The theory, therefore, that something could be done to provide better attitudes, better wages and hours, better working conditions and security for collective bargaining became a reality. Sentiment was brought to focus against company-controlled unions and civil liberties were made a fact in our national life instead of an oft-forgotten theory. The worker was "freed," if I may use that expression, by having his labor and tools recognized as capital which should be protected.

It is a far cry back to the day when the 8-hour law for miners was contested on the score that not to allow a miner to work 12 or 15 hours a day, if he chose, was destructive of his liberties. Other persons' liberties were forgotten. Freedom for one is only proper and possible in society so long as such freedom does not interfere with the freedom of others. It is now recognized by the State and by society that a tired worker is a hazard to his fellow workers. Society believes, too, that it is well to measure labor by its results, production, and accomplishments.

LABOR AS A WAR ASSET

It is in the light of those accomplishments that I want to measure labor as an asset to our great country in this time of stress. Never has a country produced as America has done in getting ready for and in fighting this war. Never has a country responded as the 130,000,000 Americans have responded to a unified endeavor to destroy the wrongdoers among nations and the aggressive leaders in those nations. No one can, therefore, doubt the ultimate outcome of this great war.

When President Roosevelt called the industry-labor conference following Pearl Harbor and my motion in the conference that

there should be no strikes or lockouts and that all disputes should be settled by peaceful means became the order of the day, a new type of unity came into our land—a unity which can only be recognized by a deep student of history who knows its great lack in times before the present, even during war times.

I can hear someone say, "But the promise not to strike has not prevented strikes." Of course it hasn't. There have been "quickies," there have been the equivalents of the sitdowns, and there have been some major strikes. Human nature, our economic life, the complexities of industrial labor relations and advantage taking among leaders can never be overcome by a promise. But certain ideals were set, and those ideals have been respected by the large majority of the workers.

The strikes that have occurred have made headlines, and some people in this country have tried to make political capital out of them.

Everyone agrees there should be no strikes in wartime. But when we consider strikes, let us consider them against the whole picture of labor's record in wartime. When we do that, we find that man-hours lost on account of strikes, taken all together, are a very small fraction of the total man-hours worked in war industries. We find that less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the manpower actually used in war production has been lost by strikes in this war. And at the same time we find that labor has increased its productive hours by more than 75 percent.

Few people realize how well the machinery for settling wartime labor disputes without strikes or lockouts has been working. The National War Labor Board, created by the President after the Pearl Harbor Industry-Labor Conference, and entrusted by Congress in the War Labor Disputes Act with the administration of the program for settling disagreements between labor and management, has quietly settled more than 6,700 dispute cases since it was established.

But these are not figures for headlines.

I think it can be said—and said unhesitatingly—that labor has made a tremendous contribution to the success of this war. To the workingman—together with the men of industry and of government—goes the credit for the magnificent number of planes and tanks and guns that are flowing out to all battlefronts to the soldiers of all of our allies as well as our own.

I think it can be said, too, that the Roosevelt administration helped unite the worker with his employer in this tremendously great war effort, and thus helped to make the production record possible.

LABOR'S RIGHTS ARE SECURE

Labor's problems no longer concern the gaining of certain rights. Those rights are with us in law, and now, thank goodness, in custom. It was interesting to note how a great gathering like the International Labor Conference at Philadelphia said so little about the problems of collective bargaining, and wages and hours, and the rights of labor; yet said so much, in contrast, about the welfare of the laborer, about his education, housing, social security, his leisure time and vocational guidance, health and general welfare.

The year 1944, when compared with 1933, viewed in the light of attitudes as far as the worker is concerned, is as different as day is from night. All of the problems are not settled, but the 50,000,000 American workers know what they did not know in 1933. They know that under the Roosevelt administration their rights have been made secure. They know that their welfare is of vital concern to their Government. They know, too, that the welfare of labor is a concern of most of the other governments of the world. And because of all this, they know that such an objective as full employment, for example, is no longer considered an idle dream; it is now in the definite realm of possibility for the future.

LABOR HAS COME THROUGH

When this war came on, labor, like every other group of patriotic Americans, put aside many of its peace-time standards. They have stayed long hours at jobs that have been hard, have been nerve-wracking, have been back-breaking. They've done it without complaining. And they've done it not without sacrifice.

Have you ever consulted anyone who knows about the hazards of industry under war pressure when untrained employees come into industrial life? If you have, I think you discovered that since the war began there have already been over 30,000 persons who have lost their lives in war industry and over 200,000 who have been permanently injured. Those persons represent quite a sacrifice in the war effort. Let us give credit where credit is due. Without those sacrifices the tremendous production which has assured victory for us could not have been accomplished.

We have used the term "total war," and every speaker who advocates the sale of War bonds points out to us, who are potential bond buyers, that our money is needed to support the boys at the front. Just how long would those boys at the front last if they didn't have the home support? What good is an army without its reserves? What good is a navy without its home-manufactured supplies?

Where can we draw the line between the person who is giving his all in the war effort and the person who is holding back? The line must be drawn between individuals. It is the only one that should separate a slacker from one who is willingly doing his duty.

WHAT OF TOMORROW?

There are going to be many problems for the worker to face after this war is over—big problems. The question, of course, which is uppermost in the minds of everyone who is now in a war plant is "what about my job when we stop making planes and tanks and guns?"

The administration has done a great deal of thinking and planning for the days after the war. The Baruch plan, for instance, draws up a full demobilization blueprint for the change-over of both men and machines from war to peace.

Any plan which provides for the speedy reconversion of industry from war to peacetime production provides for the speedy making of jobs.

As war plants shut down, of course, there are bound to be lags in employment as we tool up for peace. For this period there is already one big accomplished fact for the workers—unemployment insurance.

Under which philosophy of government do you think a working man and woman would be safer in post-war America—the philosophy of the Roosevelt administration which made possible the unemployment insurance which is going to tide him over the reconversion period ahead, or the philosophy of the Republican Party which demonstrated in 1931 and 1932 that its solution for a problem of this kind was to turn the worker over to community charity—to the breadlines and the soup kitchen?

In the last 12 years the people of America have gained back confidence in their Government. It has accomplished much for their welfare, and they have faith that it can accomplish more. Particularly does the working man have faith in his government today. He remembers that in 1933 the cries of the unemployed and distressed were not uttered in vain. He remembers that when they asked for bread they were not given a stone. He knows that under this administration the working man has gone forward to new horizons and to greater self-respect.

The Roosevelt administration has remained constant in its endeavor to expand the people's welfare. The people, I believe, will remain constant in support of that administration.

Strikes in War Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Why They Struck," by Frank C. Waldrop, published in the Washington Times-Herald of August 23, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THEY STRUCK

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

As peace with Germany approaches, prepare for something else on the labor front in America. Soon after our Normandy beachhead of June 6 showed itself secure, strikes began to pop in and around war industries in record fashion.

The various labor conciliation agencies in Washington, to which have come an average of one new strike each day since D-day, are now handling about 25 cases a day, a new high for this year, and expect the figures to keep climbing.

Tempers are short, the strain of war is hard on employers and employees alike, and union discipline is increasingly hard to maintain, they report.

By far the most serious strike this year was the August 1 walkout of 6,000 transit workers in Philadelphia because the streetcar company upgraded eight Negroes to the rank of trolley operators, on order of the War Manpower Commission.

That one was settled after 7 days of violence only when Mr. Roosevelt sent the Army in to suppress rioting. Various civilian officials of Philadelphia are still working on the cause and cure of the potential high explosive that bred the strike itself.

But by far the most of the strikes this year seem to generate from minor grievances that in other days would not have caused a good 2 hours' grumbling.

There has just come to hand a review of petty strikes in 1944 from January to date, as reported in the official complaints. A fair sampling of these tells its own story:

DETROIT, MICH., January 31.—The rolling mill at the Ford River Rouge plant was closed when 110 men walked out because they were docked 15 minutes' pay for allegedly quitting ahead of time.

DETROIT, February 15.—Thirty employees of the Chrysler tank arsenal went on a sitdown strike because they had to walk 25 feet to pick up coveralls.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., March 6.—A walkout of 1,000 employees in the Diesel equipment division of General Motors occurred because a woman worker was sent home when she refused to take off gloves worn in violation of safety regulations.

ALTOONA, PA., March 29.—Coal production slumped because 150 men refused to be paid by check any longer at one mine, 411 others walked out in protest against transfer of night mine motormen to the day shift.

PITTSBURGH, April 4.—Grease dripped on an American flag hanging under a crane runway, so the foreman ordered it taken down, whereupon 859 steelworkers walked out of the seamless tubing mills of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation.

BOSTON, MASS., April 8.—The Bethlehem Steel Co. changed the time of day for cashing checks, so 3,000 workers quit work for 2 hours.

DETROIT, April 21.—The tank assembly line at Chrysler shut down and 1,000 employees were idle, because of a dispute with the management concerning a shift of the lunch hour for 350 employees from 7: 15 p. m. to 8.

FLINT, MICH., May 15.—About 2,200 employees of the Clayton & Lambert Manufacturing Co. walked out because they were refused a 5-minute wash-up period on company time just before the end of the days' work.

ATLANTA, GA., May 21.—Between 200 and 300 employees of the National Traffic Guard Co., makers of ships' parts, walked out in support of a worker who objected to an order that he quit shoveling sand and start heaving iron scrap into a furnace.

PITTSBURGH, May 24.—Because the drinking water in the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. plant was too warm, 400 men and women walked out. The company said the water-cooling system had been undergoing repairs for a week.

PASSAIC, N. J., June 3 (D-day was June 6).—Deliveries of cloth for the Army and Navy stopped when 600 employees of the Botany Worsted Mills went on a sit-down strike (ending work for the plant's total of 5,000 employees) because the War Labor Board in Washington had failed to act on a petition by the company for approval of incentive bonuses.

After D-day, June seemed to become a month of heat lightning all along the labor front.

For instance, 117 tool grinders stopped work at the Dodge plant in Chicago where they were making parts for B-29 Superfortresses, because an apprentice demanded journeyman wages when he was fired. The Graham-Paige Motor Corporation at Detroit disciplined 6 material handlers for leaving their jobs before the end of their regular shifts without permission, and nearly 4,000 workmen on amphibious tanks threw down their tools.

The same things continued on through July—in Ashland, Ky., the American Rolling Mills suspended operations in a walk-out of galvanizing department workers because one man's hours were changed.

In Cleveland, 2 inspectors for the Ohio Crankshaft Co., producers of parts for military vehicles, refused to accept transfers to new jobs and were fired, so 1,500 other workers threw down their tools.

In Newark, N. J., 500 war production employees of the McKiernan-Terry Corporation went out on strike because the War Labor Board in Washington reclassified their jobs.

August opened with not only light strikes but heavy ones, such as the walk-out of "over the road" truck drivers at Omaha, closing 35 truck terminals, to force their employers to accept a W. L. B. wage increase order.

And in Detroit, August's biggest development so far was the 12-day upheaval at General Motors, involving 5 factories and 7,000 workers making gears and axles, because 6 employees were laid off who said they couldn't maintain the production schedule.

But all that, say the Government officials, is just preliminary.

Discharged War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Unwanted Battalion," dealing with discharged war veterans, published in the Los Angeles Examiner of December 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNWANTED BATTALION

For 600,000 young Americans the post-war period has begun. They are the men already discharged by the armed forces. For 2,000 other young Americans the post-war period begins each week.

Every hour of the day 12 men are returned to civilian life.

Many of them find families, friends, and jobs awaiting them.

But many—far too many—enjoy no such good fortune.

There are the thousands discharged on psychoneurotic grounds.

There are the thousands discharged for physical unfitness.

There are the thousands discharged for incapability.

There are the thousands discharged for having lost legs, arms, eyes, and stamina.

Only a few months ago these hopeful young men were the flower of American youth.

Through exhaustive physical and mental examinations, which only the best could pass, they were selected for military duty.

Now they are the unwanted battalion.

They are shunted out of hospitals.

They are shunted back to their families.

The Congress says these men ought to have their jobs back in private industry.

Employers generally agree.

But rigid labor standards imposed by safety legislation, insurance regulations, and measures calculated to reduce industrial accidents are an insurmountable barrier to disabled men's reemployment.

Consequently the infirmities which remove soldiers from battle lines also remove them from production lines.

As days become weeks and weeks extend into months, the plight of these veterans is increasingly worse.

Under the Federal law they are entitled to disability compensation. But to get it they must go through voluminous and often costly red tape and then wait from 2 to 4 months for the first payment.

Moreover, military regulations compel discharged men to be out of uniform in 90 days.

Unlike even convicts freed from penitentiaries, the soldiers, sailors, and marines who served their country honorably and heroically at home and abroad are not given a suit of clothes at the expiration of their terms. They must obtain their own.

So deplorable is the condition of returning servicemen that patriotic voices everywhere are raised in righteous protest. In Massachusetts John J. Sawtelle, only Democratic member of the Governor's executive council and the father of a soldier, recently castigated the national Democratic administration for its mistreatment of Second World War veterans.

Mr. Sawtelle said:

"More than 1,500 Massachusetts boys have been discharged from the armed forces as insane and sent home to their families with no real provision having been made for their medical care.

"The national administration is doing nothing for these new war victims.

"I took up the matter of returning boys being discharged as insane with Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader in the House of Representatives.

"Mr. MCCORMACK said he was shocked at the number. But he was not shocked into doing anything about it.

"Beyond promises and empty words, nothing has as yet been done for these unfortunate lads.

"It is about time the Government of the Nation stopped spending $15,000,000,000 on housing projects of questionable value and transformed those housing units into veterans' hospitals."

In Washington, speaking on an Armistice Day program, Representative WALTER C. PLOESER, of Missouri, said:

"The political record of the President of these United States in regard to the war veterans is a shame in the eyes of the Nation.

"The political record of the majority Members of Congress to provide aid and sustenance for the men and women returning from this bloody war is a shame.

"The procrastination of the Democratic leaders of the military affairs committee of the House of Representatives is a shame."

Then Mr. PLOESER cited a specific case.

He told of a young man who had lost his right leg in the battle of Tunisia. After a period of hospitalization in the Army's Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, D. C., this young man was discharged. For him the post-war period was grim indeed.

The young man lacked money for food and shelter. He lacked money for railroad fare to his home. He lacked money for the civilian clothes which military regulations forced him to obtain.

Before this young man went to war he had worked on a farm in Kentucky.

But now he could no longer walk behind a plow because he had lost a leg in the service of his country.

At various times, before his enlistment in the Army, he had worked for a building contractor.

But never again could he climb ladders or move about roofs. The young man was truly hapless and helpless.

Finally, a kind-hearted woman in Washington gave him a temporary place to stay in her home.

She took him to the Veterans' Bureau where he received assurance that his case would be adjudicated as rapidly as possible, which meant 60 days and perhaps 120 days.

The woman then took the disabled soldier to various Members of Congress and demanded action.

Not all the veterans of this war will find good Samaritans to mother them and sponsor their cases.

Veterans, and particularly disabled veterans, must have the protection and benefits of adequate laws passed by their Congress and approved by their President.

Promises will not rehabilitate veterans sick in body and mind or fill their empty stomach.

America, which does not hesitate to give billions to foreign governments, should not hesitate to give something to her own disabled sons.

Message of Governor Dempsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of New Mexico, the Honorable John J. Dempsey, was my predecessor in this House and was for 6 years a Member of it. During that time he became an influential member of the important Committee on Rules as well as a member of the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities.

For the past 2 years he has been Governor of the State of New Mexico and in that time important financial gains have been registered by the State. He recently called a special session of the legislature to pass a bill validating the use of Federal ballots for members of the armed forces in the coming elections. At that time he took occasion to review some of the legislation enacted during his administration and to analyze the financial condition of the State. His many friends in the House will be interested in that report of his stewardship and I therefore insert it in full at this point:

Mr. President and members of the sixteenth legislature, at the outset I want to express my sincere appreciation that so large a proportion of your membership has found it possible to accept the call for service in this special session of the legislature.

These are busy times and it is difficult to leave businesses and professions for even a few days.

That so many of you have been able to answer this call is recognition of your desire to be of additional service to our fighting men.

Only the extreme importance of the legislation needed has prompted me to call this special session. Under our present constitutional restrictions, as you well understand, we can extend the privilege of absentee voting to cover balloting for Presidential electors and Members of Congress only.

With our men in service risking their lives to preserve our right to select public officials by ballot, it is our sacred obligation to extend to these servicemen the fullest opportunity to participate in the elections, insofar as our Constitution will permit.

The legislation proposed here will grant to our men and women in service, the right to vote for Presidential electors and Members of Congress.

My only regret is that, under present Constitutional limitations, we cannot extend the voting privilege to cover all State and county candidates.

I have long advocated a practicable and workable absentee law. As the record will show, I favored the constitutional amendment submitted to the people at a special election held in 1937.

This amendment, if adopted, would have permitted the legislature to enact laws making it possible for residents, absent from the State, to vote by absentee ballot.

This year, with more than 40,000 citizens of our State absent in the armed forces, it is unfortunate that the proposed constitutional amendment was not passed by the required majority.

It has been many months since we have met together in this chamber. The measures which you passed at the regular session of the legislature last year have produced excellent results.

I would like to take this opportunity, therefore, to discuss the benefits which the people of the State have derived from some of those measures.

You will be interested to know that the fiscal year reports, now being completed, show that our State is in the best financial condition in its history. All departments have made excellent records. Economy has not been a catch phrase. It has been an actuality.

The result is that we have the largest cash balance on hand today that New Mexico has ever enjoyed.

A part of this balance was made possible by the law you passed at the regular session of the legislature, providing that savings in the administrative funds of various tax-collecting agencies may be transferred to the general fund at the close of the fiscal year.

This law has been a great inducement to reduce administrative costs, and to encourage savings wherever possible.

This is especially so because of the fact that all savings revert to the general fund to be used for projects which will provide employment for our boys returning from the armed services. The cooperation that has been given in this respect is a tribute to the patriotic spirit of the directors of State departments and their employees.

A post-war construction program is now being drafted, not only by the State planning board but by committees in every community in the State.

We are providing not only the blueprints for peacetime employment, immediately following the war, but we are making savings to put those blueprints into operation.

Only those projects of a permanent and beneficial nature will be undertaken. These are not made jobs, the results of which will cease when the job is finished. They are permanent and necessary projects which will be timed to give employment during that period following demobilization when employment is most needed.

You will recall that during the regular session in 1943, I requested a two and one-half million dollar issue of refunding debentures be authorized:

At that time I assured you that the debentures were being authorized solely as insurance against a possible decrease in revenues to the highway department, and in order to safeguard the State's credit.

I advised you that the debentures would not be used unless it became necessary to use proceeds of this issue to retire debentures already outstanding.

None of the authorized issues has been sold, and I can now assure you that none will be sold.

By reducing activities of the highway department to the minimium necessary to protect the investment in our highway system, and by curtailing expenditures wherever possible, we have been able to establish the highway department on a solid financial basis.

We have retired $2,250,000 of outstanding debentures from current income, and no new debentures have been issued. In addition, we have paid during this same period nearly $1,000,000 in interest.

Although the income to the highway department from the gasoline tax and motor vehicle license fees has been reduced more than $2,000,000 a year under normal times, the highway department today has a cash balance of nearly $3,000,000.

I would like to point out here that there has been some misunderstanding as to how savings have been made in the highway department.

Some newspapers have contended that since virtually no construction work is being carried on at the present time, savings would naturally result. This is far from true. The construction and maintenance funds are separate and distinct. The Federal Government participates in construction work. It does not participate in maintenance. The savings to which I refer have been made in the funds earmarked for maintenance and have no relation to construction.

We have cut the cost of maintenance in every possible way. To cite one example: During most of the year, maintenance is carried on at a normal level; but for 2 or 3 months of the year, maintenance work reaches a high peak which would require increasing the maintenance crew nearly 100 percent if the work were done, as in the past, by State highway forces. We have discontinued this practice.

We are now letting part of this peak load to contract by competitive bids. This method not only avoids doubling our maintenance force for a short time, but it results in the highway department needing from 40 to 50 percent less equipment—equipment which would be used only during the peak period and would deteriorate while idle. By avoiding this purchase of equipment, the highway department is able to reflect savings amounting to several hundred thousand dollars annually.

The cash balance in the highway department is sufficient to guarantee that the State of New Mexico can match any possible Federal-aid road program during at least the first year of the post-war period, without issuance of any new debentures.

This is an excellent condition. It enables us to continue our program of retiring debentures as they fall due. We are not only cutting down on the principal of outstanding debentures, but by reducing the principal, the interest payments will have been cut by $80,000 annually at the close of the present administration on December 31.

At the regular session of the legislature you passed a bill for the benefit of the needy aged of this State.

This bill was passed in the name of humanity, for a humanitarian purpose.

Developments since this measure took effect have proved conclusively that the bill was vitally necessary to prevent hunger and suffering among the fathers and mothers of this State. In most cases these men and women have grown old in the service of their communities. They were the ones who by their toil laid the foundation for the great State we have today.

The average monthly check for old-age assistance is now a little more than $32. If it had not been for the tobacco tax, which this legislature authorized, that average payment today would be only $14.64 per month, as reflected by the records in the office of the director of public welfare.

I want, therefore, to express again to your membership my sincere thanks for your foresightedness and your humanity which prompted an early solution to a serious problem.

Today, they are not erecting tombstones in New Mexico bearing the epitaph, "He Died of Hunger and Neglect."

This legislature passed a bill at the regular session authorizing the transfer of all funds derived from the mineral leasing act from the State general fund to the school equalization fund.

This was done in order to increase the revenue available to our public-school system. This one act took from the general fund this year some $306,000.

At the time, many people objected to this transfer on the grounds that it would deprive the general fund of revenues needed to meet the appropriations made by the legislature.

The point was well taken, since no new revenue was earmarked for the general fund to offset this loss.

I felt then that we would make sufficient savings in administrative costs of the various State departments to more than offset the amount we had previously received from the mineral leasing act.

When the books for the fiscal year just ended are finally closed, the record will prove that we were right.

We have made savings, not only sufficient to offset this loss of more than $300,000 to the general fund, but we have built up a balance sufficient to bring our total accumulated savings for the last 2 fiscal years to more than $1,250,000. Of this sum we have invested $1,200,000 in war bonds, which not only brings interest to the State, but also assists the Federal Government in financing the war effort.

This and other measures have enabled us to place our public-school system in a strong financial position.

For many years the salaries paid to the educators of this State have been so low as to constitute an actual disgrace.

Our educators have one of the greatest responsibilities of any profession, but their salaries were in no way in keeping with this responsibility.

I am happy to be able to report to you that the two school budgets which have been made under this administration have added 28 percent to the amount allocated for public-school maintenance.

Teachers' salaries have been greatly increased. Next year, for instance, the budget provides an increase of approximately $1,000,000 in the salary item alone.

We do not want to give only to take away. For that reason we have built up reserves in the school funds which are sufficient to protect the salary increases already made, even should we suffer a temporary decrease in revenues for school purposes in the immediate post-war period.

In order to further protect the gains made by our educational system legislation is being prepared which, if acted upon favorably by the legislature at the next regular session, will prevent diversion of school funds to any other purpose whatsoever.

The office of the State purchasing agent, which you created by legislative action, has been instrumental in effecting numerous savings and has operated efficiently and with benefit to all State departments.

There has been some confusion caused in the minds of many because of published reports that the purchasing department is costing some $18,000 annually. It is true that this figure is the approximate cost of operating the purchasing department.

But creation of this department has not added 1 cent to the appropriation account nor to the cost of government. The actual cost of operation is less than it was under the old system.

Previously, each large department incurred expense in making its own purchases. The highway department, as an example, spent some $11,500 annually for its purchasing division. Such expenses have been eliminated, and, in addition, departments and institutions have profited by quantity buying, discounts, and in other ways made possible by centralized purchasing.

We have made savings in numerous other ways. Travel by State-owned and private cars used for State business decreased more than 40 percent last year under the normal year of 1941.

The State has had many problems to overcome as a result of wartime conditions.

There has been increased activity in some departments, but these increased activities have been carried on with less manpower and with a reduction in the over-all cost of operation, even though it has been necessary to raise salaries in order to retain trained personnel.

Savings which this administration have made have not interfered with the effective functioning of the departments, nor with the high standard of service rendered the people.

In conclusion, in order to present a clear picture of the results obtained by our economy program during the past 18 months, I would like to make this brief review:

We now have a balance of more than $1,250,000 in the general fund. We have paid off the State's highway debenture debt in the amount of $2,250,000. We have in the highway department, in cash and bonds, $1,500,000 more than we had on December 31, 1942.

In other words, we are $5,000,000 better off financially than we were 18 months ago.

The legislation which you have under consideration is of the utmost importance. It is necessary that we certify to the United States War Ballot Commission before July 15 that use of the Federal ballot by service men and women is authorized by the laws of our State. I am sure that you are familiar with the urgency of the occasion.

If I can be of help to you in any way, during the period of your deliberations, you have only to call on me.

Thank you.

Cashing of War Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following editorial from the Jacksonville (Ill.) Journal-Courier:

WHY BUY THEM, ONLY TO CASH THEM?

Disclosure that bond redemptions almost equaled sales during the first 12 days of August will prove disquieting to thoughtful Americans. The duty of citizens is not limited to buying all of the bonds possible. There is the further obligation to hold on to bonds already purchased. If the purchaser intends to cash his bonds quickly, it would be better that he not purchase them at all.

Citizens who have the welfare of the Nation at heart will keep their bonds well into the post-war readjustment, not just for the duration. If the Treasury in addition to having to provide for post-war requirements must at the same time arrange for redemption of large quantities of bonds, the financial problem it will face will be aggravated and post-war inflation will be a possibility.

Buy bonds to the limit of your ability, but hold them to maturity. They are one of the best investments you can make. They are your protection against the proverbial "rainy day" as well as visible evidence of your support of the war effort.

Woe in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dayton News:

WOE IN CHICAGO

Colonel McCormick and his Tribune were in blue Monday mood this week as witness this comment on the Washington Conference:

"The conference to be held in Washington this week between Cordell Hull and John Foster Dulles presages nothing beneficial for America. Mr. Hull, according to the evidence he has adduced, represents the views of the British Foreign Office. Mr. Dulles is the impersonation of the big dough of Wall Street. We can expect to emerge from this conference some plan to perpetuate all the evils and brutalities of the British Empire with Wall Street getting a cut on the profits of imperialism and nothing to provide for the future security of America, as has been the case for the last 40 years. American interests will have to depend on the Senate."

At each past revolution of the Dewey mind on foreign policy, Colonel McCormick has been off and on. When Dewey, a year ago, came out for an alliance with Great Britain, the Colonel cast him to the dogs. By the June convention time Dewey had sufficiently convinced the Colonel that he hadn't meant it to gain the Tribune's support for President, though Governor Bricker was its outspoken isolationist preference. Now the Dewey course takes another twist. He has sent Mr. Dulles to Washington to plot with the enemy. McCormick is double-crossed, and what is he to do?

Note the final sentence of the Colonel's Monday morning blues: "American interests will have to depend on the Senate." One-third of the Senate plus one can block the plan for peace now as it did 25 years ago. The Colonel counts on the one-third rule to save his isolationism.

Senator Jim Watson said to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge: "Senator, I don't see how we are ever going to defeat this proposition (the League of Nations). It appears to me that 80 percent of the people are for it."

"Ah, my dear James," said Lodge, "I do not promise to try to beat it by direct frontal attack, but by the indirect method of reservations."

Just so the Senator did. He fomented grief about article 10, about Shantung, about Britain's six votes, and so the one-third rule prevailed; and so now we are in a war; and so still our plans to prevent more wars are met by plays of politics and plays upon the Senate, and the one-third rule.

Now, as Senator Jim Watson said to Henry Cabot Lodge, the people are for it. How can it be beaten? We hope it can't be; but look out for the Lodges with their indirect method, their reservations, their politics. The people, in 1920, with eyes wide open, had their pockets picked by indirect method, by reservations, by the one-third rule. It could happen again.

Kimmel Case Needs Hearing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SINCLAIR WEEKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Kimmel Case Needs Hearing,"

by Bill Cunningham, published in the Boston Herald of August 22, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KIMMEL CASE NEEDS HEARING—"AMERICAN DREYFUS CASE" NOT THE DEMOCRATIC WAY

(By Bill Cunningham)

NANTUCKET, August 21.—Admiral Kimmel of Pearl Harbor evidently has a story to tell, and the American people should see that he gets the chance to tell it. The principal, and only important, reason is that, under the straight rules of American fair play, not to mention the provisions of the Constitution, a man has the right to try to clear his name. It's doubtful that the public, at this late date, would be interested in any political nuisances involved, but if any politician lacks the moral courage necessary to see the Admiral take the stand, tell his story and leave the decision to his fellow citizens, the public ought to know who that politician is.

To date, although writers and commentators tiptoe as delicately around the subject as if it were a nest of sleeping rattlesnakes, the issue is as obvious as a boil on a beauty's chin. Antiadministrationists have plumped for the courts martial of the disgraced admiral and general, believing undoubtedly, or perhaps hoping desperately, that a full revelation of the facts would condemn, not the officers, but the administration, and condemn it to such a shocking extent that it would be repudiated by the public at the next election.

PREFERS TO DO HIS THINKING ALONE

Just as stubbornly, and with full success to date, the proadministration forces have been able to block all proposals to hold the formal trials. They haven't been able to still the admiral's demand, and he's freshly in the news with what amounts to be a new one. Democratic Vice Presidential nominee Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, not, until now, exactly an author of note, has a piece about the tragedy at Pearl Harbor in the current issue of one of the weekly magazines, and Admiral Kimmel has served a letter on the Senator, saying the article is unfair, much of it untrue, and requesting him in the interests of fair play and accuracy to leave the subject alone until a trial can be held.

The log of Kimmel's conduct, and an examination of his public statements since he was relieved of his command seem to paint him a man at ease with his conscience, and fearless of the future, if he can only get his chance to tell his story. People who know him say he has been deeply hurt. Neighbors in the New York City suburb where he resided, after accepting a post with a New York engineering firm, said they saw him leave his home frequently after dinner and take long walks alone. He looked neither bowed nor broken, they said, and he made no effort to conceal his identity, but he looked as if he had a lot of thinking to do, and that he preferred to do it alone, out under the stars.

The official reasons given for postponing the trials have been "security," and the fact that it would be dangerous, if not impossible, to withdraw from their war stations enough officers of sufficient rank to constitute the courts in courts martial. An officer must be tried by his equals or better. These trials would require a lot of gold braid and shining stars, and we've got other uses for such gentlemen at the moment. They're good excuses and hard to dissolve, but the "security" objection must be weaker than it was, for the Pearl Harbor of '41, even the Pacific of '41, and the same properties now must have about as much in common as a popgun and the battleship *Idaho*.

So far as massing the gold braid goes, why a trial, anyhow, before an indictment? Why not examine the evidence as a grand jury does, see who, if anybody, appears to be guilty under either the civil or the military codes and then proceed to prosecute before the proper authority? This would be a proper proceeding for a congressional committee. What the public would like to see is the testimony and that's what Admiral Kimmel evidently would like to give. General Short, last reported working for the Ford Motor Co. in Texas, has kept his opinion and his wishes to himself.

SHUTTING THE BOOK IS WHAT VETERAN WANTS

Those trying to press the trials hope to bag "somebody higher up" There weren't many of these. The full list would include a few over-all admirals and generals, the Secretaries of War and the Navy, possibly the State Department, and at the top the President. The President, of course, is really their target, although none has been quite bold enough to say so.

The charge against him, in rumor, is that he gave the Japs what amounted to an ultimatum in those tense and highly confidential days just before the attack, and that he forgot to, or somebody failed to, notify the Pearl Harbor commanders. Regardless of whether the Messrs. Kimmel and Short took tea or threw rocks at each other when they chanced to meet, say the nurturers of this particular legend, they would instantly have ordered "battle stations" for their men if they had known an ultimatum had been flung into Hirohito's buck teeth. That's simply elementary in the soldiering of a frontier post. But they didn't know, or at least this version says they didn't know. The Japs struck and the world knows the rest. Or maybe it doesn't. The stories differ there, too.

More powerful than vital statistics, however, is the natural psychology of a nation at war—and after war. With peace, the powerful impulse is to forget the whole business. As a veteran general expressed himself privately the other day, "War is like a drunken orgy in which an otherwise decent man forgets every decent thing he knows and wallows in filth like a pig. When it's over, what he wants to do is forget it, to forget that he could do the things he did, say the things he said, sink as low as he did. He wants a good bath, some clean clothes, and the book shut on the whole business."

POLITICS OR NO POLITICS, HEARING IS IN ORDER

Whether that tells it, the psychology undoubtedly will be to get on with new business, charge off the losses and mishaps as things that couldn't be avoided for one reason or another, to consider that we all make mistakes, that war isn't our principal business, and what the etc. of it, anyhow, since we won and that's principally what matters.

But that doesn't clear the name of a man who publicly charges he's been cruelly wronged, and who is consistently refused the right of his day in court. It gives us an American Dreyfus case. It muzzles a man, who on the record, dedicated his career to the service of his country, and lets any self-starting, and probably spook-riding, author such as Senator Truman earn a few hundred dollars by throwing mud into the closet at the uniform he once wore with dignity and honor.

With or without the reputed ultimatum, with or without Kimmel and Short, with or without politics, the tragedy of Pearl Harbor already stands, and always will stand, as a terrible charge against all those whose primary responsibility was the safety of the Nation at that particular hour. If the Admiral can place the blame more exactly, he should be given fair opportunity, not for the benefit of politics, but for the information of posterity. He should be given the chance to clear his name, that being every American's constitutional right, and until he is given that chance, his fellow-citizens should remain silent. That includes Senators writing for pay.

If they want to do something constructive and fair about the general subject, let them really go after it with a congressional investigation. If they lack that courage, let them leave it alone.

Address to the Republican Fourth District Convention at Greenwich, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on August 9, 1944:

Two years ago, when I decided to stand, as a Republican, for election to the House of Representatives from this Fourth District of Connecticut, I did so with some doubts. You will remember that I was frank with you about those doubts. I told you then in complete candor, that I was not as familiar with our purely district problems as I was with the problems which might arise in Congress out of the battle fronts. This was necessarily true, because much of my time in the previous 3 years had been spent reporting and studying events in the grim and troubled lands of those who had become our enemies and our allies. You listened, then you resolved the doubts in my favor. In the year 1942, Allied armies were still reeling under the blows of the Axis. You seemed to feel that was a year to choose a Representative who would understand and put battle-front needs above home-front needs, and certainly above party needs. You felt that a Representative who best served America at war, would best serve Fairfield County. And in the end, the people of this district felt as you did, because they elected me.

Today, my worst enemy could not charge that during these past 2 years, any vote of mine has denied to our fighting men, or our allies anything which they needed to conquer our enemies. I challenge my opponents to find in my record a single word or vote to which any returning G. I. Joe could point, saying, "That vote made it tougher for me to get out of my fox hole—that word denied me the tools of victory."

But this is not the year 1942. This is the year 1944. And while there is still a long and grim fight ahead in Asia and in Europe, victory is in sight. Already post-war problems begin to loom large for all Americans, and for the people of Fairfield County. In the early months of victory, only the rapid and orderly post-war conversion of our war factories to peacetime production will prevent this from becoming a severe depression area. We must insure jobs for our returning veterans. We must guarantee unemployment compensation and insurance, not only for them, but for our men and women veterans of the home front. If we fail in Washington, in the great task of human and economic demobilization, thousands upon thousands of people in this district will be trampled into impoverishment in the stampede for jobs. These and many other human problems which will arise out of re-

conversion will require the services of a legislator who has a detailed knowledge of these matters, and some experience in the legislative processes by which we can achieve them.

In these past 2 years, I believe I have come to understand a good deal about those problems. And while I prefer to wait until later in the campaign to analyze them in detail, this is the time to make a general observation or two about our chances of solving them.

My first observation is that the present administration is just as incapable of preventing a new depression as it was incapable of curing the last one.

There is not a single thoughtful man in Washington today who does not tremble for the economic welfare of this country, if the present administration stays in power. For after 3 long years of war this administration still lacks an adequate program for demobilization. There are hard and tumultuous days ahead of us indeed, if, when peace comes, the demobilization of our home front is handled in the same "slapdash," off-the-cuff fashion that the mobilization of our home front was handled when war came.

Take our manpower problem. Is it any secret that the W. M. C. has fumbled and finagled it from the beginning? The only consistent features of Mr. McNutt's manpower policy were his consistent determination to stay in power, and his consistently contradictory orders. Did ever a bureaucrat give tongue to more confusing and confused fiats, ultimatums, directives, proscriptions, injunctions, ukases, and bulls—mostly bulls? And all these long and noisy decrees resulted in the hoarding of labor, colossal turn-over percentages and inflexibility in the matter of procurement. There was a pitiful want of imagination in the shifting of contracts to the places where workers were. Instead workers were shifted by the millions to already overcrowded war production centers. There bad housing, high rents, and lack of transportation facilities made life a cruel human strain. Within the past 2 weeks, there has come from the W. M. C. a new edict called the "Ceiling plan." Donald Nelson, head of the W. P. B. characterizes it as "practically a national service act." As the workers of America will soon learn to their sorrow it is an edict which will result in the erratic, severe, and often unjust regimentation of labor. It contains all the most evil features of a national service act, and none of the good ones.

What our manpower crisis always needed, and still needs, is a little judicious firing of surplus manpower in the most overcrowded war center on earth—bureaucratic Washington. This, the present administration was always too weak to do in the past. It will be just as weak in handling future manpower demobilization problems.

Or take our labor problems. Is it a secret that labor's relations with America at war have been handled abominably?

Our labor problems cannot be laid at the door of the patriotic, unorganized laboring man, or the decent and loyal union man and his leaders. They can be laid right smack bang on the doorstep of a weak administration. In 12 long years this administration has failed to appoint and vest with authority a competent Secretary of Labor. Both as a woman, and an American, I blush with shame when I read that the Washington press corps voted Madame Perkins, Secretary of Labor of the greatest industrial Nation on earth, the most useless person in Washington. Does anyone deny that this administration has made pets of certain labor leaders, to the exclusion of many patriotic labor leaders, in order to secure political control of their organizations? Individual labor organizations should not be used as political clubs over the electorate. Individual labor leaders should not be used as political agents to win an election. All labor unions, and all labor leaders should be used as economic allies, to win a war and a peace for all Americans. Our weak administration's confused labor policy was further confused by Mr. Roosevelt's amazing notion that he could personally settle all strikes by last-minute bluffs and bargains. Does anyone deny that this has been an invitation to strikes? As you all know, I voted against the Smith-Connally Act, because it was plain to me from the beginning that this act would promote the very thing it was framed to prevent—more strikes in wartime. But that jaundiced act was the natural spawn of Mr. Roosevelt's febrile and bilious labor policy.

I pledge myself, insofar as this pledge can be carried out in Congress, to work for a clear-cut, definite labor policy. That means a policy which will not change with every labor incident on the home front, and will not force labor leaders, on pain of liquidation, to compete with one another as vote getters. To be sure, I see no real hope of any policy that will guarantee harmonious labor relations among unions, and between unions and the American people, until Mr. Roosevelt leaves office. But I have great hopes of achieving such a policy because I have great hopes that Mr. Roosevelt will leave office after November. Such a policy we will achieve under a Republican President. Mr. Dewey has no vested political interests in old labor feuds and disputes, or in creating new ones.

I have mentioned the administration's feeble and spiteful labor policy at some length tonight because the strikes engendered by it have been the one thing on the home front which our fighting men could least understand or forgive and which therefore have most seriously affected their morale.

But there are many other problems besides those of manpower and labor relations which were badly bungled in the mobilization of our home front between the years 1939 and 1941. The mistakes and delays made in mobilizing the home front before Pearl Harbor were paid for in the blood of our allies. After Pearl Harbor, they began to be paid for in American blood.

Does anyone deny that a real war cabinet would have helped to achieve victory faster? Yet we have never had a real war cabinet. In charge of agriculture, war production, and labor, we have had instead a vast collection of diffuse and overlapping agencies and authorities. The administration created agencies which became bodies without heads, and appointed agents who became heads without bodies.

When the war is over, the mistakes made in Washington will be paid for in the lowering of the American living standards, and in widespread unemployment.

Mr. Churchill once said: "I was not appointed to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." There are some who say that this position is not consistent with the provisions of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." But none can fail to applaud Churchill for his honest and bold statement concerning his stewardship. Many Americans have wondered if there is any American equivalent of such a statement which will not be in conflict with either the Atlantic Charter or the "four freedoms." I believe there is. The next President of the United States must be able to say: "I was not elected to preside over the liquidation of the American standard of living." On the record, Mr. Roosevelt is not the man who will ever be able to say that, and make it stick.

The American standard of living must be maintained and raised in the post-war years, for all sections of our population, for the farmer, and commuter, the small-business man and the workingman, for the professional man and woman in every field, and for our vast Negro population. Only then can we hope to stay a strong power, capable of cooperating with other nations to keep the peace of the world, and bring back prosperity. It is my most ardent belief that our best hope of maintaining and raising living standards for all Americans lies in the hands of a Republican President and Congress.

And now I come to the most important thing I have to say to you tonight. I want to tell you, why at this hour of the world's history, I am glad to be called a Republican. It is because I believe that the Republican Party is the true party of liberal progressivism in this country. The Democratic Party has slowly become, in its 12 turbulent and frenzied years, the party of revolutionary reaction. Behind the New Deal mask of political humanitarianism there skulk most of the potential mass regimenters, mass slave drivers, mass demagogues, the race haters, and the class haters in our Nation. Their lust for power over other men welds them together. Their technique is to corrupt the people at the polls with vast, vague unrealizable hopes: Shangri-la is just around the corner. But each and every hope is held forth on condition that the people will vote away a few more of their individual liberties. I am not talking of the ramsquaddled do-gooding New Deal bureaucrats, nor of the bumbling BARKLEYS of the party, nor of the high New Deal officials whose hearts bleed publicly for everyone in the world—except of course everyone who wants their jobs. They are just the front men—often innocent ones. I am talking of the men who manipulate them behind the Washington scenes, the icy-minded men who are bent on Balkanizing America politically, in order to convert it piecemeal to European totalitarian ideologies. In the very name of a war against dictatorship and totalitarianism, these flinty minded men have made much progress in preparing the American political soil for the growth of a dictatorship.

Now, I do not for a moment believe that Mr. Roosevelt is a real dictator. Rather, he is a sort of "super-duper," highly cultured political boss. There is nothing more typical of American politics than the shrewd, smiling, open-handed, warm-hearted, and flexible big-boss type. Mr. Roosevelt is, perhaps, just what Mayor Hague or Ed Kelly might have been if they had been born with money and had the benefits of travel abroad and a Groton education. I hope the Democrats will not feel that Mr. Roosevelt has been insulted by being compared with two of his most trusted and favored lieutenants. After all, there is no one more welcome at the White House than these two loyal and successful Americans. But the fact remains that political bosses, even the most patriotic ones, are primarily interested in wielding personal power. Mr. Roosevelt, in view of his fourth term desires, seems no exception. And power corrupts not only the man who acquires a gnawing hunger for it but in the end it corrupts all those who feed his appetite. In this corruption, which never fails to spread to the electorate which tolerates it, evil alien forces soon breed, like maggots.

The very bloodstream of this power-sick administration has been infected and has caused the whole body politic to be infected by the germs of philosophies totally alien to a healthy republic. If Mr. Roosevelt is reelected, they will thrive and grow. And when Mr. Roosevelt's tired hands relinquish office 4 years hence it may well be snatched by some budding dictator nurtured in his own corrupted party.

What was the danger that brought this war upon us? The danger we faced as a nation from Europe and Asia? It was twofold. First, it was physical. The German and Japanese nations were seeking militarily and economically to dominate the Pacific and Atlantic. Until they were totally

crushed, there was always a physical danger to America, to its soil and its wealth. We have met that danger, and we will triumph over it.

The second danger we faced, and which our Christian civilization faced, was a spiritual danger. This was the danger to us of totalitarian philosophy which long before the war broke in Europe, had begun to spread over the world. Today, we see quite clearly that Nazi Germany is a criminal state, because Fascism is a criminal philosophy of government. It violated not only all principles of morality between nations, but all the principles of morality between men.

Nevertheless, in their early days, the German and Italian National Socialists made many noises that sounded suspiciously like "new dealism." In the trips I took to Germany and Italy long before the war, the people of those countries were infatuated with the benefits that were accruing to them in matters of housing and wages, and social insurance and all sorts of economic equalities which seemed then to be the direct result of their willingness to abandon democratic procedures. What a happy and prosperous thing said the majority of Germans and Italians, was a one-party state, and a one-man government. How content they seemed with their Duce principle and their Fuehrer principle—the principle of the leader, who was indispensable, who could do no wrong, who was always to be trusted and obeyed, because he was so utterly dedicated to the "social welfare of the people." We have seen how this principle that one man and one party knows what is best for millions of people has led Germany to defeat and despair and to ruin. In this belief, lies the withering away of parliaments and the death of human liberties.

Do not think I do not hear the question you are silently asking me. And what about communism? Is that not also a danger to us?

Let me answer that as honestly as I know how. I said the danger to us from abroad was twofold. Physical and spiritual. The Communist state is certainly not a physical danger to our Nation. On the contrary the Communist state has been our great ally in this war, on a physical level. It has played a major military part in beating our European enemies. At a physical and material level, we can feel, and the nations of Europe can feel, nothing but deep gratitude to the Communists. Nor do I see that tomorrow Soviet Russia will present any physical or material threat to our Nation. In helping to keep the peace in Europe and in helping to restore world trade, Russia can continue to be a most valuable physical ally.

The threat of communism to us, as to all civilized nations on earth today, lies at a spiritual level. The danger is not that the Communist state will seek physically to spread upon Europe and Asia, but that the Communist state of mind will spread over the whole world including America.

And now I shall say to you what has been said in other days by Churchill, and many other European statesmen, and all the world's greatest philosophers, educators, ministers and students of history, though unhappily our President has not dared to say it since the war broke. Next to fascism, communism is the most deadly blight that has ever hit the spirit of man. For, there has never been a period in all the history of civilized nations, when their peoples and their rulers have not admitted that their rights and their powers derived from a higher being or beings. I challenge anyone to tell me the name of one great nation since the dawn of history, whose peoples and rulers have not worshipped at some divine altar. The Communists alone have sunk so low that they think there is nothing higher than man. For a nation and its rulers to embrace this belief, is in the end to make of man himself an idol. And that is to renounce religion forever. It were far better that man should worship a golden calf than that he should worship the flesh-and-blood ass he has too often proven himself to be in history.

Over a hundred years ago, that great historian, De Tocqueville wrote of our western civilization: "Christianity has been the companion of liberty in all its conflicts, the cradle of its infancy, and the divine source of all its claims." Where the people lose God, be it in Germany or Russia, there all individual liberties must at last perish. And there will follow, as night follows sunset, espionage, concentration camps, defamations, frauds, brutalities, trials without jury, secret imprisonments, secret deaths, and the creation of a ruling caste of phony supermen. I say phony supermen because on the record they can keep power only by conspiracy, and stabilize order only by blood purges. Let me make myself quite plain. I do not deny for a moment that if communism came to America, its ruthless regimentation could quite possibly put a refrigerator in every man's home, and a car in every man's garage, be he black or white. Yet I say, in the end it would destroy our liberties and deny to us all self-expression, self-growth, and self-realization.

Come, you say, the American Communists have now officially disbanded as a political party. That is true. Since Mr. Roosevelt's fourth-term announcement, 50,000 of them, the zealots and fanatics have gone underground. Underground into the Democratic Party. Mr. Roosevelt knows this quite as well as you and I do. And yet, he seems content to accept their services whether they manifest themselves secretly, in the Political Action Committee, in branches of his Government, or at the polls.

The time has come for the American people to warn Mr. Roosevelt most earnestly that in doing so he may seriously compromise his place in history. It will not be enough to have it said of him that as Commander in Chief he saved the body of the Nation, if it is also said of him that as President of the United States he stood by while its spirit began to perish. It is because I see a distinct trend toward communistic subhuman standardization in certain sections of the Democratic Party, it is because I see that all—all the strong and fanatical Communists and fellow travelers in America have rooted themselves firmly in the weak and vacillating body of the Democratic Party today, and are working in it, and with it, and on it—it is because I see this, that win or lose in November, I am glad to be a Republican.

You have asked me to go back to Congress for another 2 years. I accept the honor and the responsibility you have placed upon me gladly and proudly. No vote of mine will deny the masses of the people of this country a richer share in their country's wealth or a larger stake in its noble future. There is nothing of my own I seek to protect there, except the right to speak up in behalf of our liberties.

I thank you all for the help you have given me in the past 2 years, and for the trust you place in me again tonight. With you, I face the coming elections with confidence that we shall win, and that in winning here in Connecticut, and in the Nation, our victory will awaken again the true image of America in the hearts of Americans. That victory, in constellation with our victory on the battle fronts, would be a happy augury, not only for our own people, but for all the peoples of the world, who still believe in the American dream, which is that man can both prosper in body and be free in spirit.

Editorial Comment on the Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who recently introduced a bill to create the Missouri Valley Authority, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials commenting upon the proposed M. V. A., one from the Chicago Sun of August 21, and the other from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 11, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun of August 21, 1944]

TOWARD AN M. V. A.

Senator MURRAY'S bill to set up a Missouri Valley Authority offers the only real solution to the problems of that valley. Most people in the region agree today that the river should be controlled. But irrigation interests in the West want to control it for their purposes, navigation interests for theirs, flood control and power interests for theirs. To complicate the situation, some strong agencies have their own purely negative fish to fry—the railroads don't want improved navigation, and private utilities don't want public development of water power.

A regional authority, created necessarily by the Federal Government but operating under decentralized management, is the best way to get unified control of the river for all purposes. The same structures can control floods, irrigate arid soil, generate power, and provide a water highway for heavy freight—and to neglect any one of these functions would constitute a gross waste of natural resources. The T. V. A. has shown the way for an M. V. A.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 11, 1944]

THE URGENCY OF M. V. A.

It is with an informed sense of urgency that Senator MURRAY, of Montana, discusses his bill for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority.

There are good reasons why the development is urgent. In the long run it is essential for what it will do for this region and for the enrichment and strengthening of the Nation. In the short run, in the immediate future, it is essential for the contribution it can make to averting ruinous post-war unemployment.

The M. V. A. project will require the services of many thousands of workers and will, therefore, perform a direct service to the cause of full employment after the war. It will, what is more, create new opportunities for self-support which will contribute to employment even better and more lastingly.

Among these will be the opportunities for returning servicemen to settle on farms in the irrigable upper plains and to obtain irrigation through M. V. A. Many veterans turned to farming on irrigated land in the Missouri Valley after the First World War; many more are writing home these days saying that they

are interested in building the same sort of future for themselves when they come marching home.

"Time," says Senator MURRAY, "is of the essence. * * * The fight for what is now still a mere dream—the creation of the M. V. A.—is just commencing. Much educational work will have to be done. Sectionalism will have to be overcome; selfish interests must be exposed and combated."

When the war is over, and when public works must be set in motion at once to take up the slack in private employment, the Missouri Valley needs to be ready with a plan—at that very moment. The fact that the Army Engineers have a plan and the Reclamation Bureau has a plan may mislead some of our people into thinking that the Missouri Valley is so ready. It is not.

The extremity of our unreadiness may be glimpsed in, for example, the status of a program of soil-erosion control, which will be one of the most important parts of any comprehensive plan for the development of the Missouri Valley. The Department of Agriculture has reported that it still does not have the appropriation to make the survey to find out what should be done.

M. V. A. is essential. It is urgent. For the future of this great valley, there is no time to be lost.

President Roosevelt's Address at Opening of Dumbarton Oaks Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRANT FURLONG
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of informal remarks of President Roosevelt on receiving the delegates to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference:

Gentlemen, this is an informal occasion. I have not prepared any speech. This is merely a feeling on my part that I would like to shake hands with you. I should like to be able to go out to Dumbarton Oaks, to take a part in your discussions.

A conference of this kind always reminds me of an old saying of a gentleman called Alfred E. Smith, who used to be Governor of New York. He was very, very successful in settling any problem between capital and labor, or anything that had to do with the State government in which there was a controversy.

He said if you can get the parties into one room with a big table and make them take their coats off and put their feet up on the table, and give each one of them a good cigar you can always make them agree. Well, there was something in the idea.

You have a great responsibility. In a way, it is a preliminary responsibility. But, after all, we learn from experience, and what I hope is that in planning for the peace that is to come we will arrive at the same good cooperation and unity of action as we have in the carrying on of the war. It is a very remarkable fact that we have carried on this war with such great unanimity.

DID NOT KNOW CHURCHILL WELL

I think that often it comes down to personalities. When, back in 1941, at the time of the Atlantic Charter, just for example, I did not know Mr. Churchill at all well. I had met him once or twice very informally during the First World War. I did not know Mr. Eden. But up there in the North Atlantic—3 or 4 days together, with our two ships lying close together—we got awfully fond of each other. I got to know him, and he got to know me. In other words, we met, and you cannot hate a man that you know well.

Later on Mr. Molotoff came here, and we had a grand time together. Then during the following year, at Teheran, the Marshal (Stalin) and I got to know each other. We got on beautifully. We cracked the ice, if there ever was any ice; and since then there has been no ice. And that's the spirit in which I know you are going about your work.

I was just talking with the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson. He was saying that one of the tasks we face is making this conference of ours—and the successor conferences—something that will last a long time. He said that, unfortunately, in Germany the young people, the young Nazis, favor an idea which will be dangerous to the peace of the world, just as long as they have anything to say about it.

The prisoners of 17, 18, 20 that we are capturing now—both on the French front and Soviet front—these German prisoners of that age, are even worse in their nazi-ism than the prisoners of 40 or 45. And, therefore, as long as these young men have anything to say about it, the peril of nazi-ism will always be before us.

CALLS FOR PEACE THAT WILL LAST

And we have got to make, not merely a peace but a peace that will last, and a peace in which the larger nations will work absolutely in unison in preventing war by force. But the four of us have to be friends, conferring all the time—the basis of getting to know each other—"putting their feet on the table."

And so I am very hopeful that it can be done, because of the spirit that has been shown in the past in getting together for the winning of the war. But that is the spirit that we have learned so well in the last few years. It is something new, this close relationship, between the British Empire and the United States. This great friendship between the Russian people and the American people—that is new. Let's hang on to both friendships, and by spreading that spirit around the world, we may have a peaceful period for our grandchildren to grow up in.

All I can do is to wish you every possible success in this great task that you have undertaken. It will not be a final task, but at least it gives us something to build on, so that we can accomplish the one thing that humanity has been looking forward to for a great many hundreds of years.

It is good to see you. Good luck.

H. R. 5227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to include a letter from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, in support of H. R. 5227 and an analysis of the provisions of that bill made by that organization:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1944.

Hon. CHARLES LaFOLLETTE,
House of Representatives,
United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I transmit herewith an analysis of H. R. 5227.

This bill was introduced by Mr. DINGELL at the request of the American Federation of Labor and has the full support of the railroad brotherhoods.

It embodies the amendments to the George bill, S. 2051, which I suggested to members of the Ways and Means Committee on August 17, 1944. The American Federation of Labor urges adoption of the bill in order to provide the consumers' buying power necessary for industries which will be reconverting during a period of increasing unemployment. The change-over of thirty millions of income-earning persons will lead to a serious depression unless emergency compensation payments are increased by the adoption of the A. F. of L. bill, which in conjunction with the efforts of industry should lead to real recovery.

The Congress of the United States cannot afford to leave any effort untried to escape a depression worse than that which followed the last war.

The American Federation of Labor bill provides the machinery necessary to lead us into a recovery and make possible full employment—the only goal that can compensate workers and soldiers for the war we are now waging.

Your careful consideration and support is earnestly requested.

Sincerely,

WM. GREEN,
President, American
Federation of Labor.

[Enclosure.]

SUMMARY OF H. R. 5227

Section 101 declares the objectives of the act.

Section 102 establishes the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, to be headed by a director at a salary of $15,000 a year. Included in the office would be the Office of Contract Settlement, the Surplus War Property Administration, and the Retraining and Reemployment Administration.

The Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion is authorized to formulate such plans as are necessary to meet the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace; to issue directives to other agencies; to make appropriate studies, reports, and recommendations to Congress; to consult and cooperate with governmental and private groups; and to employ personnel to carry out these activities. Reports are to be submitted to Congress quarterly, summarizing the work of the office and appraising the activities of the various executive agencies in the field of demobilization and post-war adjustment.

Section 103 creates an advisory board, appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, consisting of three representatives of industry, three representatives of labor, three representatives of agriculture, and one public representative who is to be chairman. The board is to advise with the Director with respect to war mobilization and reconversion and make recommendations to him relating to legislation, policies, and procedures.

Section 104 establishes a special joint committee of the Senate and House on post-war adjustment. It is to be composed of four Members from each House, not more than two from each House being members of the

majority party. The committee is to make a full and complete study with regard to legislation, demobilization, and post-war adjustment, consult with the President, the Director, and appropriate standing congressional committees, and study and review the report submitted by the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Section 201 directs Government contracting agencies to terminate prime contracts for war production whenever performance under such contracts will not be needed for the prosecution of the war. Such contracts are not to be continued merely for the purpose of providing business and employment unless continuance in whole or in part is necessary to avoid substantial injury to a plant or property.

Section 202 provides that curtailment of war production or termination of war contracts are to be managed so as to be integrated and synchronized with the expansion or resumption of other war or nonwar production. In order to effectuate this policy, Government contracting agencies are to report current and anticipated changes in requirements to the Chairman of the War Production Board. Government control agencies are to permit the expansion, resumption, or initiation of nonwar production whenever the war effort is not adversely affected; and the Chairman of the War Production Board is authorized to establish policies to be followed by Government contracting agencies in selecting individual contracts, or classes of contracts, for curtailment, nonrenewal, or termination.

Section 203 creates in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion a Board of Appeals, to consist of three members to be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, each of whom is to receive $8,000 annually and serve 2 years. Persons aggrieved by the action of a Government control agency in allocating available materials may apply for a hearing before the Board of Appeals. If the Board of Appeals is satisfied that the action of the Government control agency substantially interferes with, or curtails the operations of, the appellant and that, as a result, serious unemployment of the appellant's employees will come about, or that the interests of the consumers of the appellant's products will be substantially impaired, the Board of Appeals will so report to the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, who will thereupon allocate sufficient of the short material to the appellant as will be necessary to prevent hardship to the appellant's employees, or to the consumers of his product.

Section 204 instructs the Attorney General to make surveys to determine whether any factor exists which may tend to eliminate competition, create a strengthened monopoly, injure small business, and otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power, either during the war or in the period of post-war transition. The Attorney General is to report to Congress on the results of his suveys and recommend such legislation as he deems desirable.

Section 301 sets out the objectives of title III, which are, basically, to facilitate the maximum utilization of the national manpower, both during the war and during the transition from war to peacetime production.

Section 302 creates a retraining and reemployment administration, to be headed by an administrator appointed by the President for 2 years, subject to Senate confirmation, who is to receive $12,000 annually. The administrator, under the direction of the director, is to establish a unified reemployment program, to maintain full information on declining and increasing employment opportunities, provide for placement of workers in employment and to oversee the financing of workers during such times as employment is not available. The issuance of regulations by the administrator to govern the activities of Federal agencies in these fields is authorized.

Section 303 creates an advisory committee for retraining and re-employment, consisting of representatives from 10 Government agencies mentioned by name, and such others as the administrator may designate.

Section 304 directs the War Production Board and other agencies in possession of such data to furnish to the administrator full information on current and projected schedules of production. The War and Navy Departments are instructed, insofar as military security permits, to keep the administrator informed on current and projected rates of discharge of servicemen. The policy is enunciated that the armed forces are to discharge servicemen as rapidly as war and defense needs permit. The retention of personnel in the armed forces merely for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment is prohibited.

Section 305 instructs the administrator to perform his duties through the facilities and personnel of other Government agencies and through appropriate State agencies.

Section 306 authorizes the Administrator to facilitate recruitment, transfer, and placement of workers by payment of transportation expenses to new jobs, or to bona fide residences (within the United States), or to both. The traveling allowance is limited to the amount provided by the Federal Government for its employees. The United States Employment Service will be continued as a nationally operated Service for a period of 2 years after the termination of hostilities.

Section 307 gives the Administrator general supervision and direction of the activities of Government agencies relating to the training and retraining of personnel released from war work. In consultation with appropriate Government agencies, he is to develop plans relating to training and retraining.

Section 308 provides that there is to be no amendment or modifications of powers now vested in the Veterans' Administration, or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Section 401 (a) and (b) fix the principle that a person for whom suitable employment cannot be secured is to be entitled, within the limits hereafter set forth, to interim placement benefits. Beginning with the fourth month after the enactment of the act, benefits would be paid to unemployed qualified employees in the amount of 75 percent of weekly wages, but such benefits are not to be less than $8 per week nor more than $20 per week for a single person, or $25 per week for a person with dependents. Benefits would be limited to 52 weeks in any 2 consecutive years.

Section 401 (c) provides that a person is not unemployed if he does not maintain an active application for employment at a public employment office; a man is not counted as being unemployed on Sunday unless it is in a continuous period of unemployment. Persons receiving annuities or pensions, unemployment allowances, vocational educational allowances, or similar benefits are not counted as unemployed, but if the interim placement benefit exceeds such other benefits, the amount of the excess may be paid to the individual.

Section 401 (d) provides that the employee is to be disqualified for the receipt of benefits if he fails without good cause to accept suitable work, or to report for work if he is so directed; if he is discharged or suspended for misconduct related to his employment; if he left work voluntarily without good cause; if his unemployment was due to stoppage of work because of a labor dispute other than lockout; or if he made or helped to make any false or fraudulent statement in order to cause benefits to be paid. The labor dispute disqualification does not apply if the employee who is unemployed is not directly interested in the dispute which causes the stoppage.

Section 401 (f) and (g) sets forth the standards of suitable employment in terms copied from the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Section 401 (h) provides that a person may not be compelled to apply for or accept transportation away from his present location, as provided in section 306.

Section 401 (i) provides penalties for making or causing to be made, or aiding in making false or fraudulent statements.

Section 402 (a) provides that a qualified employee is to be one who in the calendar year next preceding the beginning of the benefit year earned $150 or more in wages. This provision is identical with that of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Section 402 (b) requires the administrator to offer to each State unemployment compensation agency opportunity to participate in the administration of interim placement benefits. The administrator must permit such participation if the State agrees to receive claims for benefits, to adjudicate and pay them or forward them to the Treasury for payment and to furnish funds to the extent that benefits would be payable under the State law. The administrator may terminate on agreement with a State upon a finding by the Social Security Board, affirmed, if the State requests, by a court, that the State is failing substantially to comply with the agreement.

Section 402 (c) provides that the Railroad Retirement Board and the Unemployment Compensation Board of the District of Columbia are to participate in the administration of interim placement benefits.

Section 402 (d) authorizes the Administrator to use Federal agencies in the administration of interim placement benefits to whatever extent is necessary after the services of the State agencies and the Railroad Retirement Board have been used to the maximum practicable extent.

Section 402 (e) gives the claimants for benefits the right to be heard before a State appellate tribunal, where a State administers the benefits, or before a tribunal of a Federal agency, in cases where the Railroad Retirement Board or some other Federal agency administers the benefits.

Section 402 (f) authorizes Federal court review decisions of the agencies administering interim placement benefits.

Section 402 (g) limits review to the procedure prescribed in the bill.

Section 402 (h) provides for court review of a finding by the Social Security Board that the State is not complying with the terms of its agreement with the Administrator.

Section 402 (i) provides for the determination of the respective obligations of the Federal Government and the State agencies. The Federal Government is to pay for the cost of the benefits over and above the amounts payable under the State laws.

Section 402 (j) provides for the determination of the respective obligations of the District of Columbia, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Federal Government.

Section 402 (k) provides for the payment by the Administrator of the extra expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board incurred by reason of its participation in the administration of interim placement benefits.

Section 403 authorizes the Administrator to delegate his authority to appropriate persons or agencies. So long as an agreement with a State agency is in effect, delegation of such authority to such agency may not be revoked or modified.

Section 404 confers general administrative powers on the Administrator, authorizes employment of personnel, authorizes securing of necessary information, and provides procedures if necessary information is refused by the persons having possession of it.

Section 405 amends the G. I. bill of rights by adding to the readjustment allowance under title V, an additional weekly allowance of $5 for each of not more than three dependents. Thus, the maximum weekly amount payable under Title V of the G. I. bill of rights would be $35. Dependents would include unmarried children under 18 or children of any age if because of mental defects they are incapable of self-support, wives, and parents incapable of self-support and dependent on the veteran. The limitation on readjustment allowances of 52 weeks is changed to an amount, in any 2 consecutive years, equal to 52 times the weekly benefit.

Section 501 authorizes the Federal Works Administrator to make, from funds appropriated for that purpose, loans or advances to the States and their subdivisions, to aid in the making of investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, specifications, or the like preliminary to the construction of public works funds appropriated for this purpose are to be allotted, 90 percent in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and 10 percent in accordance with the discretion of the Federal Works Administrator, except that no State may be allotted less than one-half of 1 percent of the total available funds. Advances are to be repaid if and when the construction of the public works so planned is undertaken.

Section 601 contains definitions. Most of these are routine. The following are important:

A week of unemployment is any 7 consecutive calendar days in which a person has remuneration of less than $3.

Dependents include unmarried children under 18 dependent on an individual, the wife of an individual dependent on him, and dependent parents incapable of self-support.

Employment means any service performed as a civilian after December 31, 1940, by an employee for his employer and includes civilian service outside of the United States for a United States war contractor by a person who was on September 16 a citizen of or resident in the United States. Governmental service and maritime service is also included. Excluded is service for a foreign government, domestic service, or service for a member of the person's family.

Weekly wages are defined as one-thirteenth of the wages in that quarter of the calendar year preceding the beginning of the benefit year in which wages were highest. This is the usual wage base under State compensation laws.

Section 602 authorizes the necessary appropriations.

Section 603 provides that the act except as otherwise specified becomes effective immediately and terminates 24 months after the termination of hostilities. Termination of hostilities means termination of hostilities of the wars in which the United States is now engaged as declared by a Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Section 604 specifies that if any provision of the act is held invalid the remainder of the act is not to be affected.

Section 605 terminates the present Office of War Mobilization when the Director created by the act takes office, and transfers the records, property, and unexpended appropriations from the present Office of War Mobilization to the new Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Section 606 continues the orders, policies, procedures, and directives prescribed by the present Director of War Mobilization until superseded by the new Director.

Section 607 specifies that no alien shall be employed in any capacity in the administration of this act unless he has served honorably in the armed forces of the United States.

Section 608 titles the act as the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944.

Recognition of Italy as a Full and Equal Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a statement by Mr. Joseph Salerno, New England regional director of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, in support of the recognition of Italy as a full and equal ally:

The working people of Italian descent in America urge our country's recognition of Italy as a full and equal ally among the United Nations for total victory against the evil forces of Hitler and Mussolini.

Full recognition would inspire and encourage millions of Italians to take their proper place among the foes of nazi-ism, fascism, and reaction. The present policy of hit-and-miss support has caused disillusionment and humiliation, which hamper the destruction of fascism, and give comfort and aid to our common enemy.

We believe that Italy's status should be made clear by the United Nations, so there can be a real start toward reconstruction. Are we or are we not friends of the Italian people? For 2 years they have shown their friendship for us.

We suggested that Mussolini should be kicked out. He was kicked out. We advised breaking relations with the Nazis. Relations were broken. We hoped Italian troops would fight with our troops against the Axis.

Not only the troops, but the Italian people at home have been fighting on our side. Long before our troops arrived, the anti-Fascists of Milan, Turin, Bari, Genoa and other industrial cities in the north of Italy were fighting in the streets against the Nazis and Fascists. They are our real friends. What are we waiting for?

The Italians have been in a no-man's land—not knowing whether they were considered friends or enemies by our country. First, the rate of exchange for the Italian lire has been set at 100 to the $1. That makes the lire almost valueless. In contrast, the French franc was set at 50 francs to the $1. Why this difference in treatment?

The low rate of exchange for Italy has resulted in skyrocketing prices, which the workers have to pay for food and other necessities of life. Inflation has brought on black markets, which are forcing the cost of food even higher. Food is a weapon during the period of reconstruction to wipe out the last vestiges of fascism.

Recognition will help the Italian people to do their full share in the war of liberation to free the soil of Italy from Nazi tyranny. It will be a source of inspiration and encouragement for the Italian people to fight harder against the common enemy, and thereby spare the lives of thousands of United Nations soldiers who are now fighting on Italian soil.

A resolution introduced to Congress by Congressman VITO MARCANTONIO is now before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, requesting the President to establish friendly diplomatic relations with Italy.

In his resolution Congressman MARCANTONIO points out that the President has pledged the Italian people the right to a free and democratic government of their own choosing. The present Bonomi Government is composed of anti-Fascist and democratic forces, reflecting the will of the majority of the American people.

The resolution requests our President to recognize the present Italian Government and make Italy a full and equal ally, entitled to lend-lease and a proper role among the United Nations, as the means of releasing untold energies of both liberated and occupied areas of Italy, to give their fullest support to crushing the Axis.

Action is imperative. Delay works in favor of the enemies of democracy.

Congressional Review of Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the trans-Atlantic edition of the London Daily Mail, of August 9, 1944, apropos a subject which we debated in the House on August 17:

THE NEGATION OF DEMOCRACY

Somebody forgot to lay three groups of regulations relating to the N. F. S. before Parliament. So they were printed, issued, and brought into force.

As Mr. Herbert Morrison explained, it was all a mistake, and, of course, it is accepted as such. It may well be that no individual has suffered and no harm been done.

But here is a first-class illustration of the dangers of delegated legislation.

It shows how easy it is for the people to be shackled by new laws without anybody being the wiser.

In such conditions the civil servant becomes the lawmaker and the lawgiver, and there is no check upon him. This is the negation of democracy.

Delegated legislation is defended on the score that the minister may always be called to account. What does that amount to?

In this case Mr. Morrison takes nominal responsibility but it is passed to the department, which has had a shake-up.

Tacoma and the Power Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Senator HOMER T. BONE is an excellent history of the public power fight in the State of Washington. Senator BONE points out the invaluable aid rendered by my colleague, Congressman MAGNUSON, in this long struggle:

TACOMA AND THE POWER FIGHT
(By Senator HOMER T. BONE)

Up to 1908 Tacoma had for many years—in fact, practically from the beginning—in 1889 owned the city distribution system. It did not produce its own power, but bought power from the Baker outfit which had built and

owned the Snoqualmie Falls hydro development. Subsequently the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. bought out the Baker-Snoqualmie plant. For several years prior to 1908 there had been agitation in Tacoma for the city to build its own generating plant. Stone and Webster interests fought this proposal bitterly, and the two leading papers in the city of Tacoma, the News and the Ledger, owned by Sam Perkins, were the most bitter enemies of this proposal. George Wright had been mayor of Tacoma about this time and was very active in promoting the building of a municipal generating plant on the Nisqually River, about 35 miles east of Tacoma. Many prominent citizens joined with Mayor Wright in urging this. Some of these men were prominent in the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce, which was badly split on the issue. Tacoma had never given Stone and Webster interests a franchise to serve domestic customers in Tacoma, and the city at all times maintained a monopoly of the domestic and commercial power load, the latter covering store lighting and the like. The private company, however, did have a franchise to serve industrial customers within the city limits.

In 1926 a charter revision commission was elected by the people of Tacoma for the purpose of revising the city charter. I was elected to that commission, receiving many thousands more votes than anyone else who had been a candidate, and without objection was made chairman of the charter revision commission. Naturally, I made every effort to see that the revised (and present) city charter which was the outgrowth of the work of this commission, contained suitable provisions respecting franchises for private utilities. I wrote, and had incorporated into the new charter, a provision authorizing a referendum on any franchise which might be granted a private utility. Shortly after the adoption of this charter, by vote of the people, the franchise of Stone and Webster to serve industrial customers expired and the city council refused to renew it. At that time the private company was only serving something like 30 customers in the city, and it surrendered these to the city. I recall that one big mill, which had a 10-year power contract with the private company, cut over to the city lines about this time, and saved $1,200 a month on its power bill, or $14,400 per year. One of the officers of the company told me this was more than the taxes they paid on their big plant. So much for that angle.

Proponents of the idea of the city generating its own power were successful in having the issue presented to the people in the November election in 1908. When this issue was squarely presented to the people of Tacoma for their vote, the News and the Ledger opened fire on the proposal, which was supported by the Tacoma Times (Scripps). As a youngster, I participated in this fight, making many speeches which, fortunately, have not been preserved, since they were examples of immaturity which would not have been of much use to students of oratory. What they lacked in polish and persuasiveness, they probably made up in vigor. At that time I saved every statement appearing in the Tacoma papers, and I have enshrined these in huge scrap books.

One of the arguments was that if the city built the Nisqually, 32,000-horsepower plant, it would prove to be a white elephant and the city would be glad to sell it for 50 cents on the dollar in a few years. Every friend of the Nisqually project was assailed in the papers as an enemy of decency and good government, and it was the bitterness of the attack, and the unfairness of the arguments, that there and then tied me to the power fight. Many of the articles opposing the project assailed the patriotism of those promoting it. A great number of the men who were fighting for this little Nisqually plant were sons of Union veterans, who had offered their lives in the struggle to preserve the Union, and it seemed to me a lousy and vicious argument to assail men of this type, especially since the arguments were in behalf of a private company whose only concern was to gouge all the profit it could out of the people. As a side light—and I would not care to be quoted on it, although you can make such use of it as you desire—you are free to call attention to the fact that I probably would never have been in the power fight if it had not been for these bitter and nasty arguments directed against the patriotism, honor, and decency of men who merely wanted to have Tacoma own its own generating system.

Tacoma built the little Nisqually plant and it was finished by 1912. Its transmission lines ran through the intervening countryside, which was dotted with many farms. These farmers figured they should have some of this cheap power that Tacoma was going to enjoy, so they came to the city council and said they wanted to form some farmer mutual power companies and build their own baby transmission lines to serve themselves, and asked for permission to put transformers on this high-tension line and to step down the current so it could be used on their farm systems. In 1911, 1 year before the Nisqually plant was finished, some of us went to the legislature of that year and secured the introduction of a bill which authorized cities owning their own power plants to sell surplus power outside their corporate limits. In the meantime, two or three communities of farmers south and east of Tacoma had organized cooperative mutual power companies, and they stood ready to buy power off the Tacoma heavy transmission lines. The Stone and Webster outfit, keenly aware of what this might mean, tried to block this bill in the legislature, but it passed.

The next session of the legislature, in 1913, witnessed a piece of manipulation which really started the State-wide power fight. A member of the house of representatives by the name of Heinly, a Tacoma lawyer, introduced a bill dealing with irrigation, and tucked away in this bill was a provision consisting of two lines which repealed a section of law, which happened to be the law allowing cities to sell surplus power outside. I talked with many members of the legislature subsequently to the passage of this irrigation act and found that all of them thought this repealer sentence had to do with irrigation law.

In the meantime, the former companies had organized, and were ready to do business, but when the Nisqually plant was finished, they found the right of Tacoma to sell off its transmission lines had been denied by repeal of the authorizing statute. Now the reason for this situation, in a legal sense, arose out of the fact that cities operate under express grants of law, and may not exercise any power unless it is specifically granted. In the absence of a specific grant of power to sell outside, the city attorney of Tacoma and the city council believed they could not lawfully put transformers on this Nisqually heavy-duty line and sell power off the line outside the corporate limits of Tacoma. So the farmer companies were compelled to bring their baby lines to the edge of the city limits under great expense and buy power within the corporate limits of Tacoma. It is interesting to note that at this time the private company was not serving this area at all, and would only agree to serve it in case the farmers were willing to pay up to 20 cents per kilowatt hour for current—an outrageous figure. The city of Tacoma was generous, and allowed at least one of these companies to put cross arms on the heavy transmission poles and string its wires underneath the heavy transmission cables to the city, so that it would bring its wires into the city limits. The city, which bought material at wholesale, was willing to sell these farmer companies wire and hardware at wholesale to help them get started. Within a few years, 7 or 8 of these farmer mutual companies were organized and doing business within Pierce County, a record not duplicated anywhere in the United States. The latest of these companies, and probably the largest of them, was the Peninsula Light Co., operating on the Gig Harbor Peninsula. I organized this company and represented it for a number of years before coming to the Senate. It started business in 1925. The rates of these farm companies were fixed by mutual members at prices as low, and sometimes lower, than those prevailing in the city of Tacoma. Tacoma was proving herself to be a good neighbor to the farmers who were purchasing a lot of stuff in Tacoma.

The Stone & Webster outfit threatened to enjoin the city against selling to the Peninsula Light Co. at Gig Harbor for the reasons I have noted. I assured the representatives of the private company that I would welcome a suit of that kind, and that if they brought such a suit I intended to organize all the farmers in Pierce County and march them to Olympia in a great demonstration, to inquire of the State authorities as to who owned the State of Washington—its people, or a Boston corporation. The private company refrained from filing an injunction suit, and the city of Tacoma put in a transformer at Springfield and proceeded to sell to the Peninsula Light Co.

As I recall it, the first of the bills to again reinstate the provision of the 1911 act authorizing the sales outside was introduced in the legislature about 1915. It failed. Such a proposal again failed in 1917, in 1919, and in 1921. In 1923 I determined to make one real fight of it in the legislature, and so I filed for the legislature in what was known as the "silk stocking" district of Tacoma, and was elected by an enormous majority to the house. In the session of 1923, I introduced what was known as the "Bone bill," which authorized cities to sell surplus power outside their corporate limits. By this time, and after many speeches by me and others on the question of power, the public power forces were pretty well organized. J. D. Ross, Kenneth Harlan, a relative of the late Justice Harlan of the Supreme Court; J. C. Unger, Charles Heighton, Fred Chamberlain, and others too numerous to mention, all banded together to force the issue. The bill was whipped in the legislature. Dissatisfied with this, I rewrote the provisions of the bill and prepared an initiative measure (No. 52) on which we secured, as I recall, around 80,000 signatures. It went on the ballot and was the subject of a bitter political fight in the general election of 1924. The power companies, according to most careful observations, spent an estimated $1,000,000 in the State fighting that bill.

In our State that became the era of the "canned editorial." All the power companies combined to fight the bill, and set up a propaganda bureau and prepared these canned editorials for the editors of weekly newspapers who were each given a full-page ad, which they could run at political rates, if they ran the editorial and the cartoon which accompanied it. I used a clipping service then, as I do now, and I recall clipping 100 editorials appearing on the same day in weekly newspapers, which were identical. Many editors told me personally that they had to eat regularly, and these full-page ads at political rates helped provide sustenance for the family of the editor and keep his youngsters in school.

The Bone bill was defeated by a 75,000 majority. In that campaign Charles Heighton accompanied me in a State-wide speaking tour with some very colorful experiences,

which I have described to you in my looser moments. Arthur Cross, prominent lawyer of Aberdeen, joined in the fight, and many more prominent Grangers in the State took part. It was this fight which lined up the Grange solidly behind public power—a position from which it has never retreated.

It is interesting to go back to the prophecy made about Tacoma's Nisqually plant. From 1914 on, Tacoma provided the cheapest light and power rates in the United States as a result of its venture into the generating business. Today it stands No. 1 in the Union.

Seattle faced this problem in the step-by-step building of the great Skagit enterprise. When that great development is finished, it will be one of the outstanding producers of the country. When these plants are paid off, they will be an enormous asset of incalculable value to the cities owning them. Tacoma has long since paid off all the bonds of the Nisqually plant, and it has been an enormous producer of revenue. It laid the financial foundation for the great Cushman development and the later development of the Nisqually River which will raise the capacity of that river to 90,000 kilowatts.

After the defeat in 1924, the public power forces did not abandon the fight, but continued it. My own personal contribution was to leave my law business in Tacoma in 1925–26 and in subsequent years, and go about the State at frequent intervals, making speeches on the power question in order to solidify public power sentiment. In 1932, when the Democrats carried the State, I decided the time had come to settle this issue, and so I rewrote the old Bone bill, and took it down to Olympia, in December of 1932. This time, and in light of the New Deal victory, I decided we should abandon the stupid subterfuge raised in the proposal to allow the sale of surplus power, and make sales of power outside a public use. Cities engaged in the power business are regarded by repeated decisions of our Supreme Court as enterprisers engaged in a private business. Since the legislature can give cities such powers as it pleases, it was my view that the legislature could authorize cities to engage in public business outside their corporate limits. This meant that if a city was exhausting its potential power, it could condemn other power sites on the basis that they were for a public use. Otherwise, they would sometime have had to cut off outside users who were merely getting surplus power.

This principle of law is well understood by any lawyer familiar with municipal corporation law. The fight in the legislature was handled by a few stanch friends of public power—in the house, largely by WARREN MAGNUSON, a young lawyer who later became prosecuting attorney of King County, and subsequently a Member of the Congress of the United States, now candidate for the post of United States Senator.

Nearly every friend of public power went to Olympia to support the then Bone bill in its new dress. With the aid of the friends of public power, this bill passed, and the power companies promptly got out a referendum on it and held up its execution until 1934, when the people adopted it by a large majority.

In the meantime, and in 1929, the Washington State Grange officials came to me and asked me to prepare a power bill which would authorize farm communities to go into the power business. Three lawyers joined in this effort, i. e., Jim Bradford, former corporation counsel of Seattle, a very brilliant and able lawyer, and a judge who subsequently became a member of the State public service commission. The three of us prepared this bill, now known as the Grange Power Law. It was submitted to the legislature in the 1929 session by an initiative to the legislature. The terms of this bill are too well known to require comment. The legislature refused to pass it, and it went on the ballot in the general election of 1930 and was adopted and is now a law of the State. It was this bill which was amended by Paul Coughlin, Jack Cluck, Ed Henry, and others, into the form of a legal proposal now known as Referendum No. 25. Referendum No. 25 simply allows all utility districts to unite under certain conditions and acquire an entire power system.

In these early fights the Grange played a prominent part. Such old war horses as Fred Chamberlain, and the Nelson brothers, J. C. Unger, Kenneth Harlan, Arthur Cross, J. D. Ross, and many others participated. Senator Dill took part in the fight for the Bone bill in 1924, the Grange power fight of 1930, and the Bone bill fight of 1934. Senator Dill never backed away from any of these fights, but went headlong into them and the people of the State owe a debt of gratitude to him.

There was an organized body, small and determined, in Spokane, Walla Walla, and Yakima. "The Lady from Yakima"—Ina Williams, served in the legislature and poured her energies into these power fights up to the time of her unfortunate death. Ned Blythe, now postmaster at Vancouver, was another soldier. Cotterill of Kent led the fight in his section. The forces of public power were scattered, but determined. After 1932, the fight was out in the open, and many new faces and new forces have come into the picture. Public utility districts became a great factor and sent representatives to Washington to aid in securing passage of a northwest power bill, creating a new Columbia River Authority. You are familiar with the names of these enegetic workers.

This, in brief, is a sketchy outline of the long power fight in the State of Washington. All the pioneers in this fight cannot be mentioned for lack of space and lapse of memory.

I helped to frame the first direct primary law of our State back in 1907. I also participated in drafting the initiative and referendum laws of the State, and in these operations Fred Chamberlain took an active part. In 1919 the progressives of the State organized what was known as the Triple Alliance, made up of railway brotherhoods, American Federation of Labor and the Grange. Lucy Case and others were very active. These pioneers laid the foundation of the democratic system of our State. Some day someone will write a history of this period. The Triple Alliance was created to bring organized political support to progressive candidates on all tickets. It was not a political party.

No Alien Patents Sold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion of the surplus property bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] offered an amendment concerning patents.

In the colloquy that followed I stated the Alien Property Custodian had already disposed of some of the patents and Mr. VOORHIS agreed he had. This morning I received a letter from the Chief of the Patents Division of the Office of the Alien Property Custodian. It shows both Mr. VOORHIS and myself were wrong when we agreed some patents had been sold. The letter as well as part of the report referred to follows:

OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN,
Washington, August 23, 1944.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 22, 1944, on pages 7201 and 7202, a discussion between you and Mr. VOORHIS concerning disposition of patents by the Alien Property Custodian. I was particularly interested in your statement, with which Mr. VOORHIS agreed, that the Alien Property Custodian has "already sold a lot of patents."

I am enclosing a copy of the annual report of this Office for the period from March 11, 1942, to June 30, 1943. I call your attention particularly to the discussion of the disposition of patents beginning at the bottom of page 73 of this report and to the statement on page 74 that "no patents are sold." This was a statement of the policy of the Office of Alien Property Custodian at the time of the annual report, and it continues to be the policy of this Office. The present policy for administration of patents on a basis of licensing rather than sale by this Office was outlined in general terms shortly after the appointment of Leo T. Crowley as Custodian. On April 27, 1942, Mr. Crowley testified before the Senate Committee on Patents:

"In order to secure the maximum utilization of patents which may come into our possession, we propose to make them freely available to American industry. We cannot, at this time, state exactly the terms under which they will be available. * * * In general, however, no patents will be sold at this time." (Hearings before the Committee on Patents, U. S. Senate, 77th Cong., 2d sess., on S. 2303 and S. 2491.)

We have followed a policy of issuing nonexclusive licenses to American citizens under seized enemy patents, and have now licensed more than 8,000 patents for use by American industry. In every case, title to the patent is retained by the Custodian.

Up to this time, except in rare instances, the Custodian has not even sold the stock of corporations which hold patents. One corporation which we sold has a few patents. Another American company, of which we sold 50 percent of the stock, owned certain patents, which, however, were already exclusively licensed to the American owner of the other 50 percent of the stock. The only disposition of patents actually vested by the Alien Property Custodian has been the transfer to an American individual of certain patents formerly owned by French nationals which he had a valid and outstanding option to buy, and the purchase price of which he paid to the Custodian.

I am sure that your statement in the RECORD was based on a misunderstanding of the facts, and I wish to give you a correct statement.

Sincerely yours,

HOWLAND H. SARGEANT,
Chief, Division of Patent Administration.

The treatment of patents by the Custodian differs markedly from the policies adopted with respect to other types of vested properties. The objectives to be accomplished, however, are the same. In the case of patents, as with other productive resources, the program adopted is designed to make the most effective utilization of these resources during the period of war and in the postwar economy within our system of private enterprise. The program is designed to bring into industrial use as quickly as possible those inventions and processes covered by vested patents and patent applications which

will promote the prosecution of the war or contribute to the maintenance of our essential civilian economy, and to assure the widest possible use of the inventions and processes in the post-war economy. For reasons outlined below, it has been determined that these objectives can best be achieved by retaining title to all vested patents at least for the duration of the war. Hence, no patents are sold.

Patent rights unlike most other properties vested by the Custodian confer certain monopoly privileges on their owners. Moreover, in a great many instances the vested patents relate to basic techniques which have an important bearing on the current efficiency of production of a wide range of industries and a significant influence on the future development of new inventions. The widest possible use of inventions and processes covered by vested patents can be obtained by making them generally available to all American producers without charge. Exceptions are necessary in those instances in which existing rights of American citizens must be recognized and to protect the interest of nationals of enemy-occupied countries. Unrestricted use of patented processes by all who may wish to employ them does not create the problem of allocation which would arise if physical properties were to be made freely available.

Mission to China Is Getting Routine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that President Roosevelt is not interested in any legislative plan of reconversion that does not provide explicitly for the retention by him, through his bureaucratic agencies, of all the war powers heretofore delegated to him by the Congress.

What the President is now seeking is amendments to existing laws that will be susceptible of a statutory construction that will enable the President to exercise powers at variance with the purposes of the original legislation.

Whenever any official of the Government evolves a plan of reconversion that does not insure the perpetration of executive power over business, large and small, through his bureaucratic agencies, that official is shipped abroad or politically decapitated.

Under leave to extend, I include as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., under date of August 22, 1944:

MISSION TO CHINA IS GETTING ROUTINE

The President's action in uprooting Donald Nelson from his climactic labors of planning for reconversion and dispatching him to the limbo of China with what amounts to sealed orders stands today as one of the most baffling and disturbing of many recent baffling manifestations of administration policy. We are reminded inevitably that it was a vaguely grandiose mission to China to which HENRY WALLACE also was assigned just before the dubious activities that ended with his elimination at the Chicago convention, and we are led perforce to inquire whether China has not become a kind of handy cooling chamber for hot potatoes.

The fact remains that Mr. Nelson had become a hot number, standing as he did—and standing all but alone—for a program of reconversion that looked to systematic anticipation of cut-backs in war orders and gradual resumption of civilian production, beginning now. He set upon this, rather than to await the sudden sharp and dislocating wrench of change from war to peace and the unemployment and economic havoc that would result, even though more or less temporarily, from lack of preparation.

Opposed by procurement chiefs of Army and Navy and the War Manpower Commission, opposed within his own W. P. B. family by Vice Chairman Charles E. WHson, Mr. Nelson had just succeeded in establishing a series of orders which would permit use of surplus materials for manufacture of peacetime goods. The advantage which this plan would give to small operators, who as fabricators of parts and supplies for the large primary war contractors would be the first to be hit by sudden cut-backs, was obvious. Mr. Nelson had at least expressed a policy, enunciated a principle in which little business had begun to take hope for survival against post-war competition from the well heeled.

All at once with the ink hardly dry on the last of his orders Mr. Nelson is directed to go to China with Gen. Patrick J. Hurley to discuss "for several months" military and economic problems with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. Significantly the control of W. P. B. policy and action passes into the hands of Vice Chairman Wilson who had sided all along with the Army, Navy, and W. M. C. in the controversy; and we read that emerging from a White House conference Mr. Wilson let it be known that the President instructed him to bring "certain programs" up to schedule and to have no let-downs anywhere in war production.

The natural question arises whether the President has not once again undertaken to resolve a controversy by shifting the central figure of debate to another theater and thus to seek appeasement with fair words all around.

It is noteworthy that Democratic leaders in Congress generally so far have maintained a sort of bewildered silence, while on the other hand Republican Senators have moved in alertly to ask whether the shift will not cripple reconversion plans. With only half an eye it is easy to see the political implications of the affair and the likelihood that a campaign talking point has become available, which may be more than a minor one.

To be sure, we may hear the explanation that the President has been looking ahead to several things: (1) to impress upon the public the necessity of keeping its nose to the grindstone of war production; (2) to suggest the global implications of reconversion, something which Congress with its eye on mechanical details of the job has not considered; (3) to dally with prospects that an office of demobilization will be created, which will take over the entire job from W. P. B., anyhow; and perhaps (4) to strike the attitude that this is a matter of policy and method for congressional determination, which may have certain advantages in an hour when bureaucracy is a campaign battle cry.

We shall have to wait and listen for the answers, if any. However, the surface facts are unmistakable. For more than 2 years Mr. Nelson competently and effectively has marshalled and organized the Nation's materials for war production; and it seems that for the logical next step of reversing the process, there is nobody else quite so well fitted by experience, temperament, and a feeling for all the factors and interests involved. His job seems to lie here, not in China.

The New Civil Aeronautics Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 22, 1944, the President concurrently announced the resignation of Charles I. Stanton as Civil Aeronautics Administrator and the appointment of Theodore P. Wright to succeed Mr. Stanton. It has also been announced that Mr. Stanton will remain with the Civil Aeronautics Administration as Chief Deputy Administrator and that he will devote the chief amount of his time to technical and operational problems, a field in which he already has extensive familiarity. Mr. Stanton is a career man. He has served the Civil Aeronautics Administration and preceding agencies with great distinction for 20 years. It is gratifying to all interested in aviation matters that Mr. Stanton will remain with the Civil Aeronautics Administration for they have an especial appreciation of and respect for his competence.

Mr. Theodore P. Wright, up to the time of his new appointment, was Director of the Aircraft Resources Control Office. I have received some inquiries concerning the experience and qualifications of the new administrator. I am not acquainted with him, personally, yet I know that he is a leading figure in American civil aviation and that he has had a broad experience in the international aspects of aviation.

As one member of the committee that handles appropriations for the Department of Commerce and its several agencies including the Civil Aeronautics Administration, I wish to acknowledge approval of the selection of Mr. Wright. I believe that it will contribute much of value to the critical future of aviation.

For the information of Members, I include in my remarks a brief biography of Theodore P. Wright, the new Administrator of Civil Aeronautics:

THEODORE PAUL WRIGHT

Theodore Paul Wright, born at Galesburg, Ill., May 25, 1895. Bachelor of science degree from Lombard College, Galesburg, Ill., 1915. Bachelor of science degree in architectural engineering from Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1918. Honorary doctor of science degree from Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., in recognition of his "distinguished services to aeronautics."

He was commissioned as ensign in the United States Naval Reserve Flying Corps in 1918, being promoted to lieutenant (junior grade) in 1919, and lieutenant in 1920. He was later appointed as an inspector of naval aircraft, and during his last year of service in 1921 was appointed superintendent of construction of naval aircraft for the New York district.

After leaving the Navy Mr. Wright entered the organization known at that time as the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Co., Inc., as executive engineer. He progressively held the positions of assistant factory manager, assistant chief engineer, and in 1925 was made chief engineer of the airplane division of the company. Under his supervision as

chief engineer many famous designs were turned out. Among them were the prize-winning Pulitzer and Snyder cup racers and such famous military aircraft as the Hawk, Falcon, Helldiver, Shrike, and Condor; also such commercial types as the Robin, Fledgling, Kingbird, and Commercial Condor. These were followed by the sensational Tanager airplane, which won the Guggenheim safe aircraft competition for the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Co. Mr. Wright's paper, The Tanager—A Safe Airplane, won for him the Society of Automotive Engineers' coveted Wright Bros. medal.

During this time he inaugurated the "project engineer" system of aircraft design, development, and manufacture which has since become standard practice among practically all major aircraft manufacturers.

In 1931, after the merger which created the Curtiss-Wright Corporation, the Curtiss-Wright Corporation and the Curtiss experimental manufacturing and research activities at Garden City were consolidated with production plant at Buffalo. Mr. Wright was placed in charge of the combined operations as vice president and general manager. In 1937 he was elected a vice president of the parent Curtiss-Wright Corporation, to fill that post in addition to his duties as director of engineering.

In June 1940 Mr. Wright was called to Washington to serve with the Advisory Committee for the Council of National Defense in laying out a program which had in view the acceleration of the American aircraft industry. After some 6 months he returned to his duties with Curtiss-Wright. However, in February 1941 he was recalled at the request of Mr. Knudsen, now Lieutenant General Knudsen, to act as Assistant Chief of the Aircraft Branch of the Office of Production Management, later W. P. B. In March 1943 the former Aircraft Branch of the W. P. B. was reorganized and became the Aircraft Resources Control Office of the Aircraft Production Board, with Mr. Wright as Director.

AIRCRAFT RESOURCES CONTROL OFFICE

On December 9, 1942, the Aircraft Production Board was established within the War Production Board by order of Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, W. P. B. This Board consists of the Executive Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, who acts as Chairman of the Aircraft Production Board, the lieutenant general in charge of War Department production, the Assistant Chief of Air Staff for Matériel and Services, the Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, and the recorder of the Board. The Chairman, with the advice and assistance of the Board, is responsible for the central direction of aircraft production.

By order of the Aircraft Production Board, which order was signed by C. E. Wilson, Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen, Maj. Gen. O. P. Echols, Rear Admiral Ralph E. Davison, and T. P. Wright, the Aircraft Resources Control Office (A. R. C. O.) was established on March 3, 1943. The functions of A. R. C. O. as listed in this order are: (a) to serve as executive agency of the Aircraft Production Board on all matters pertaining to manpower, materials, and machine tools for aircraft; (b) coordinate and publish joint schedules for the production of air frames, aircraft engines, and propellers; (c) prepare manpower, materials, and machine tools requirements for the aircraft program and serve as claimant agency under the controlled materials plan; (d) direct and supervise activities of the Aircraft Scheduling Unit, Dayton, Ohio, in the scheduling and allocating of materials, machine tools, and components; (e) coordinate aircraft materials conservation activities of A. A. F., Navy, and W. P. B.; (f) direct coordination of standardization; (g) prepare and furnish all statistics on the aircraft program.

Mr. Wright was appointed as Director of A. R. C. O. and recorder of the Aircraft Production Board and as such has responsibility for the direction of the entire United States aircraft production program. This job was referred to in an editorial in the Washington Times-Herald of April 6, 1942, as follows: "The most difficult and intricate job of procurement in all our war program is the airplane one. No group of men in human history ever had a greater responsibility than those who have undertaken it. They have the confidence of the aviation industry and of the soldiers and sailors who use the planes." This is the group which in 1941 was called on by the President to direct the procurement of 50,000 planes per year, a figure which many people referred to as a pipe dream or wishful thinking. Under Mr. Wright's direction this wishful thinking not only became a reality, but the original figure has now been far exceeded, in fact doubled.

Today the offices of A. R. C. O. are located in the Pentagon Building. There are approximately 75 civilian employees equally divided between the A. A. F. and Navy Bureau of Aeronautics. Mr. Wright's name appears on the A. A. F. organization chart as one of its two civilian division directors. He, however, is employed by the Navy Department. To complicate matters further, his orders are received from the Aircraft Production Board which is organizationally located in the War Production Board. It is particularly to his credit that Mr. Wright has made this arrangement work and has the confidence of all organizations involved, i. e., the A. A. F., Navy BuAer, and W. P. B.

As recorder of the Aircraft Production Board Mr. Wright also has supervision over the Aircraft Production Board staff which consists of some 20 W. P. B. employees and which will administer any new orders that may be issued to permit construction of civil aircraft.

Mr. Wright has contributed widely to the literature of aircraft manufacturing, engineering and design, including:

Factors Affecting the Cost of Airplanes, published in February 1936 in the Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences, in which the famous "80 percent production curve" principle was first expounded.

Speed—and Airplane Possibilities, a paper presented at the Aeronautical Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and published in the Journal of the Aeronautical Sciences in January 1937.

American Methods of Aircraft Production, a lecture delivered before the Royal Aeronautical Society in London during November 1938 and subsequently printed in the Journal of the Royal Aeronautical Society.

America's Answer—Gearing Our Aviation Industry to National Defense, published in Aviation magazine for June 1939.

Air Power, published in Aero Digest for December 1939.

Wings for Transportation, a lecture presented at the Franklin Institute in December 1939 and subsequently printed in its Journal and reprinted for the Archives of the Smithsonian Institute.

Winged Victory, published in Aviation magazine for April 1940.

The Truth About the National Defense Program, published in Aviation magazine for January 1941.

It should be noted that Mr. Wright's article, "The Truth About the National Defense Program" published in the January 1941 issue of "Aviation" won for that magazine the Industrial Marketing Award of Merit for the best article or editorial published in a business publication during the period of August 1, 1940, to July 31, 1941.

In addition to his writing he has earned high praise for his lectures, one of which was read before the Royal Aeronautical Society of London, and received this comment from the British press: "Is one of the most outstanding contributions the society has ever had the privilege of placing before its members."

In 1942, and again in 1943, Mr. Wright headed important missions to England in connection with aircraft affairs. Each trip to and from England was made by air. On both occasions he was received by King George, who, according to Mr. Wright, expressed keen interest in United States aircraft production, a subject upon which he was extremely well informed.

A partial list of organizations to which Mr. Wright belongs includes:

Member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Founder and charter member of the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, serving as president in 1936.

Honorary fellow of the Royal Aeronautical Society of England.

Member of the Society of Automotive Engineers.

Member of the United States National Commission of the Permanent American Aeronautical Commission. (CAPA).

Member of the National Research Council.

Member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Past president and chairman of the board of awards of the Guggenheim Medal Fund, Inc.

Treasury Department States Why It Is Opposed to Freezing Money Collected From Sale of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the surplus property bill the House adopted an amendment submitted by Mr. HERTER, of Massachusetts, which provided all money received from the sale of surplus property should be used only to reduce the national debt. I discussed the amendment and agreed if that could be done it would be fine but warned it would be a mistake to place such a provision in the bill.

I learned the Treasury Department had written a letter on this subject to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Under the permission granted me I include the letter written by the Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

It follows:

AUGUST 9, 1944.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of May 25, 1944, requesting the views of the Treasury Department concerning H. R. 4822, a bill "to provide that all sums received by the United States from the liquidation of Government property be applied to the reduction of the public debt."

The proposed legislation would require that all sums received from the liquidation of Government property by any department,

agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government or by any corporation owned or controlled by the United States "shall be covered and deposited in the Treasury to the credit of a special fund which shall be used exclusively for the reduction of the public debt and which shall not be considered in any manner as current income of the Government."

The Treasury Department recommends that the bill be not enacted.

The fundamental objection to the bill is that it would not and could not accomplish its apparent objective, i. e., to reduce the public debt below what it would be in the absence of its enactment. Except for variations in the amount of the balance in the general fund (which, in any event, is kept as low as is consistent with prudent finance), the public debt of the United States can be increased only by an excess of expenditures over receipts, and decreased only by an excess of receipts over expenditures. Receipts and expenditures, in turn, are determined by congressional legislation, including appropriation legislation, and (in the case of receipts) by economic conditions. Any action designed to reduce the amount of the public debt must, therefore, operate upon these fundamental factors.

Without such earmarking as the proposed legislation would require, the proceeds from the sale of surplus property will be covered into the Treasury, and will, therefore, result in a lesser increase in, or a greater reduction of, the public debt than would have occurred in their absence. During a period of debt reduction, therefore, the proposed legislation would not change the amount of reduction which would have occurred in any event, but would merely result in earmarking a portion of it—perhaps more than the whole amount—as arising from the disposition of surplus property. During a period of debt increase, on the other hand, the amount of any reduction in the debt effected by the fund would have to be reborrowed, in addition to borrowing a sufficient amount to finance the current deficit. Such a procedure would complicate and render more expensive the borrowing operations of the Treasury and might result in unnecessary disturbance to the money market.

The present accounting system of the United States is adequate to render such reports as Congress may desire with respect to the proceeds from the sale of surplus property and, consequently, of the debt reduction effected—or increase averted—by such means. The proposed legislation, therefore, would add nothing to the information now available with respect to the proceeds from surplus property sales, but would merely require an earmarking operation which would complicate, rather than simplify, the financial operations of the Government.

It should also be noted that the Treasury has extensive authority under existing provisions of law to enable it to make reductions in the public debt to the extent that funds are available for such purpose. Under the act of March 3, 1881, the Secretary of the Treasury may at any time apply the surplus money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or so much thereof as he may consider proper, to the purchase or redemption of United States bonds. Under the provisions of the Victory Liberty Loan Act, as amended, and as supplemented by the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 and the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, there was established a cumulative sinking fund for the retirement of the public debt issued under the First Liberty Bond Act and subsequent legislation. There is authorized to be appropriated each fiscal year out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the purpose of the cumulative sinking fund an amount equal to the sum (1) of 2½ percent of the aggregate amount of bonds and notes outstanding on July 1, 1920, less an amount equal to the par amount of any obligations of foreign governments held by the United States on July 1, 1920, and (2) the interest which would have been payable during the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made on the bonds and notes purchased, redeemed, or paid out of the sinking fund during such year or any previous years. These amounts are supplemented by certain additional amounts appropriated under the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 and the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933.

The annual appropriation now amounts to about $600,000,000 and the unexpended balance of appropriations now available in the cumulative sinking fund is nearly $5,000,000,000. In addition, funds received from repayments of loans made by the Public Works Administrator under the National Industrial Recovery Act, repayments on account of obligations of foreign governments held on July 1, 1920, and franchise taxes paid to the United States by Federal intermediate credit banks are available for the reduction of outstanding indebtedness. During the fiscal years 1920 to 1930, inclusive, the gross public debt was reduced from its peak of $26,597,000,000 on August 31, 1919, following the First World War, to $16,026,000,000 on December 31, 1930, under these provisions of the sinking fund and from amounts received from the other sources mentioned above.

In light of the growth in the amount of the outstanding public debt during recent years, especially the growth as a result of our current war activities, the Treasury anticipates that it will be desirable after the termination of the war to adopt an over-all policy with respect to debt reduction.

It is recommended, therefore, that no special legislation, such as that embodied in H. R. 4822, be enacted at this time and that consideration of plans for debt reduction be postponed for the time being. Later the Treasury will be prepared to recommend to the Congress general legislation with respect to this subject.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Treatment of Italian Military Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

There has been much criticism lately of the manner in which the War Department is handling Italian military prisoners who have been formed into Italian service units. The Department has been criticized for "coddling" these units and accused of treating their members better than our own servicemen. I hold in my hand an editorial appearing in the Daily Press of Newport News, Va., concerning an investigation undertaken by the Braxton-Perkins Post of the American Legion. Not satisfied to seize upon idle gossip and rumor, this American Legion Post performed a commendable civic service in visiting the Italian service units in the Hampton Roads port of embarkation to determine the facts for themselves. Their findings, as outlined in the editorial, show these criticisms to be without foundation.

I am assured by the War Department that this is not an exceptional case but typical of conditions to be found in similiar units throughout the country.

ON CODDLING AND FACTS

The report of a committee from the Braxton-Perkins Post, American Legion, declaring without foundation reports that Italians held in this vicinity as prisoners of war have been coddled, should ease the public mind. The report is worthy of consideration as being the more conclusive because as a veterans' organization dedicated to the preservation of the national dignity, the American Legion might have been assumed, with good logic but with no reflection on its character, to have held some comprehensible bias.

The report was compiled after an investigation of Italian service units in the Hampton Roads port of embarkation. The fullest cooperation was accorded by the port of embarkation command. It reveals the Italian service unit members as volunteer workers in the American war effort. It found that some even sought to fight under the American flag, but that this is banned by international pacts so long as peace has not been concluded with Italy. And port of embarkation officers commented that since this area is in a group 1 manpower shortage status, the Italians are performing a real service to the American war effort by expediting the shipment of supplies to the combat zone.

The committee found that no special entertainment has been given these prisoners, and added that certain minor liberties contributed to their morale.

Insofar as the local sector is concerned, therefore, rumors of superlative or luxurious treatment for men who may have killed Americans in the fighting before Italy's surrender would seem to be fully rebutted by the Legion's investigation. It is laudable that the Legion was not content to take rumor at face value, but demanded the facts before acting. The fact that the Army command cooperated fully is indicative that the Army has nothing to conceal.

This, too, is another example of what may happen if one goes off half cocked regarding matters of policy. One or more organizations of good standing in this community openly condemned the alleged coddling of the Italian prisoners, but did so, apparently, without knowledge of all the facts. Criticism has been leveled also in other parts of the country. It is not unlikely an honest investigation there also would allay some groundless apprehensions. At all events, it is a wise policy to collect—and collate—evidence before sweeping charges are preferred.

The Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. President, the recent Democratic National Convention

at Chicago presents an interesting study in American politics. Mr. J. R. Bahne, of Eldora, Iowa, a life-long Democrat in Iowa and honored by his party by election as an alternate delegate at large from the State, viewed the convention from a ring-side seat and took part in the deliberations. Upon his return home he published his impressions and reviewed the proceedings. His analysis is crystal clear and highly interesting and entertaining to members of both parties.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Bahne's entire story as it appeared in the Eldora (Iowa) Herald-Ledger of July 27, 1944:

COUNTRY EDITOR AT POLITICAL CONVENTION TELLS OF BOSS RULE

Just a few hodge-podge observations on the Democratic National Convention as observed by the publisher:

The Chicago Democratic Convention last week which resulted in the crucifixion of HENRY A. WALLACE on the altar of political expediency was definitely a boss-ruled proposition from the very first—but the bosses came very nearly being defeated in their determination to shelve WALLACE and nominate TRUMAN. Thursday evening, Chairman Hannegan and Boss Flynn were really scared and both of 'em looked the part. They looked like two whipped school kids—but it didn't take them long to recover.

The convention was adjourned that night against the vote of the delegates—those who were on the radio could clearly tell that, and someone didn't get much sleep that night, for on Friday the deal was settled.

NO FAVORS FOR IOWA

The Iowa delegation had a hard time getting enough tickets from the national committee to even have guest tickets for the few Iowans who wanted to attend. On Thursday the bosses were a little more secure in their position and gave out a few more tickets, but not until Friday could the Iowa managers get all the tickets they wanted.

An attempt to get music for the WALLACE demonstration Thursday evening was not granted for many minutes and then only because delegates from all parts of the floor demanded it. Yes, it was boss ruled, and WALLACE was clearly not supposed to get any of the breaks—and didn't.

It has been reported that the South was opposed to WALLACE, but many southern delegates would have been delighted with the chance to support him at even the slightest hint of a swing to his direction. Jim Farley could have turned the trick, but he did not seem inclined to do it.

DEMONSTRATION A FLOP

Mayor Kelly's demonstration for LUCAS on Friday morning was about the silliest procedure one could imagine. It was clearly staged, with all bands blaring out even before the demonstration got a start. Then came the parade of ward heelers—all entering through the back door—none of them delegates. They got as far as the speaker's rostrum and evidently got their signals mixed and the demonstration bogged down.

BOSSES' SMOOTH WORK

It was a smooth piece of boss strategy to have 13 candidates nominated for Vice President. Many of them had never been heard of outside their home States, and a large majority of the rest were not candidates. It was a move to keep WALLACE from getting the popular vote on the first ballot, and give the bosses time to get the thing fixed. Before the first ballot was finished this delegate got the word that if the swing to TRUMAN didn't get started before the second ballot was over, it was slated to come on the third.

It would appear certain that the President gave the bosses the go-ahead sign for TRUMAN, for the bosses moved ahead with a positiveness that bespoke Presidential approval.

COURAGEOUS SPEECH

The Vice President possibly didn't help his cause any in his seconding speech of Roosevelt, when he said, "the poll tax must go," but he made friends by his courageous expression. C. I. O. Labor Leader Hillman was not too popular a speaker before the convention. Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, threw the accusation of boss rule into the teeth of the leaders in his seconding speech for WALLACE and the delegates shouted their approval. Senator PEPPER spoke from the convention floor.

IOWA DELEGATION LOYAL

Justice Richard Mitchell, of Fort Dodge, nominated Mr. WALLACE in one of his finest and most eloquent speeches. Jake More did a good job as WALLACE's manager but from the first the cards were stacked against him. The Iowa delegation vote remained 20 for WALLACE. The Iowa delegation moved that the rules be suspended and the nomination be declared unanimous, but that motion was ruled out of order by Chairman Jackson. Chairman Jackson made an excellent chairman and kept things running in accordance with orders received. His job was to run the convention according to orders and from that angle he was a good boy.

WON FRIENDS

The consensus of opinion as expressed by commentators is that WALLACE came out of the convention a greater liberal and a more popular figure than when he entered the fight. One Ohio delegate told the writer that Iowans had little face to ask support for WALLACE when his own State failed to vote for him in 1940. What could be said except that he had done more for agriculture than any other living American?

Of course most conventions are boss ruled. Republicans need not take this admission of boss control as indicating that the Democratic Party is smeared by it. We can recall of but one Republican convention that was not boss run and that was in 1940 when Willkie defeated the bosses. That was what this writer hoped, and thought could be done, Thursday evening—but the hope died aborning.

WILL SUPPORT TICKET

Sure, we're supporting the Roosevelt-Truman ticket. Possibly it's a stronger ticket politically than had WALLACE been nominated; but we are still the kind of Democrat who believes that honest, faithful service deserves more than a kick in the pants.

TEXAS AIRED FIGHT

Two Texas delegations were seated by the convention with half the vote of the State, each. The anti-Roosevelt group had gained control of the State convention and had named an anti delegation. The pro-Roosevelt group held a rump State convention and named delegates to the national convention. Both delegations were in attendance and were heard by the credentials and resolutions committees before the fight was brought to the convention floor.

The antis demanded that a certain racial plank be inserted or they would bolt; the pros said they were going home to carry the State for the ticket no matter what happened to them. They accused the anti group of trying to wreck the party in Texas. When the pro group was seated, by voting down amendments to both the credential and resolutions committee reports by the convention, the antis bolted—for a day—and nothing was heard of them until the balloting for Vice President. The Texas delegation split its vote between TRUMAN and WALLACE.

Communist Drive in Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Star of August 23, 1944:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—KENT URGES INDEPENDENT VOTER TO STUDY COMMUNIST DRIVE IN DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(By Frank R. Kent)

One extraordinary phase of the fourth-term campaign is the intense solidity and earnestness of the Communist Party—or rather, what used to be the Communist Party.

It ought to concern American citizens generally to know the facts behind this earnestness. Because, as a result, already the complexion of one of the great parties of the country, the Democratic, has begun to change. The purpose is to make the change complete.

It will be recalled that, a good many months back, the Communist Party, as a party, deliberately went underground. Shaking off its party label, it emerged as the Communist Association, professing devotion to the American way of life.

That, of course, changed really nothing. It was so obvious a maneuver as to make the pretense absurd. It changed neither its leaders nor its line, its purposes nor its basic plans. It retained all these and, in addition, its party organ, the Daily Worker, through which party doctrine is channeled to the members.

COMMUNIST SENSE

No real secret of the reasons for the change was made. The Communist leaders in Moscow and in the United States very simply believe that Communist goals can be best promoted through the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt, and that Communists can promote his reelection better by working inside the so-called Democratic Party than outside as a separate party.

This is good sense from the Communist standpoint. Already, they control the American Labor Party in New York. The Communist leaders are in closest alliance with the Russian-born Sidney Hillman, who heads the powerful C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and Communists hold key positions on the executive committee of the C. I. O. which is closely linked with the White House and the most conspicuous sponsor and supporter of the fourth term.

Under the circumstances, abandonment of the separate Communist Party and wholesale Communist infiltration into the Democratic Party, from the Communist angle, is logical, desirable, and effective. For if their side wins in this election so entrenched will they have become that the Communists and the communistic C. I. O. not only will have acquired a real dominance in the Democratic Party but will have achieved a very great influence in the Government of the United States.

That such is the prospect will be strongly denied because frank acknowledgment would sit very badly, indeed, upon the collective stomach of the American people. Yet the Communists, the C. I. O. leaders and the administration strategists, individually and collectively, know these assertions to be true. Nor will they be doubted by anyone who does not deliberately shove realities aside.

Today the cold truth is that there is not a Communist in the country who is not lined up behind Mr. Roosevelt. But that is not the whole story. The Communists, en masse, have calculatingly moved into the Democratic Party with the purpose of taking it over. No one who reads current Communist literature in this country can possibly deny the truth of this statement.

Inside the Democratic Party, into which they have moved, these Communists do not operate as Democrats but as Communists. They maintain inside the Democratic camp their communistic solidarity, discipline, spirit, and purpose. They take ther gospel and their instructions, not from the Democratic National Committee, but from the Daily Worker, the Communist organ.

In brief, though, for campaign purposes this year, they now call themselves Democrats, for their own purposes they remain Communists as always.

This is made crystal clear in the "special election supplement" of the Daily Worker, issued about a month ago and now in the hands of every Communist in the country. This supplement is worth the perusal of every American citizen. Though nowhere in this remarkable document is the word Communist used; it establishes fully the truth of the charge that the Communists have gone into the Democratic Party with the idea of taking it over.

INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN

Detailed instructions are given to the members as to their conduct during the campaign. "The Democratic Party," they are told, "is not yet, as a whole, a people's party. It is a bourgeois party—albeit a liberal bourgeois party."

The clear inference is, that given time, this "liberal-bourgeois party will become wholly a party of the proletarians," and there follow minute instructions to the Communist members, now enrolled and registered as Democrats, as to how to bring this about.

They are told of the great desirability of becoming precinct captains within the Democratic organization; of the importance of capturing the "shop stewards" for practical political purposes; of the necessity for registration; of how to organize the women in trade-union circles into Democratic circles; and, particularly, of the necessity of nurturing the Negro vote, which, it is declared, easily may be decisive in Middle Western and Eastern States and which is now somewhat disaffected because of the Democratic platform.

Two things are heavily emphasized in this "special election supplement." One is that everything about the Republican Party is reactionary and wicked, but its particular wickedness is that it is not in accord with the Teheran agreement. The other is that the Teheran agreement is vitally connected with the Roosevelt reelection.

Though the Teheran agreement is mentioned a dozen times in this document, nowhere is there any elucidation as to what the Teheran agreement really is.

One cannot help but gather from the constant reiteration that, beyond any agreement made public after the conference, there was some "Teheran agreement" between the Messrs. Stalin and Roosevelt, with Mr. Churchill unenthusiastically acquiescing, that makes the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt, from the Stalin angle—and thus for the American Communists, now turned Democrats—very important indeed. And that the Republicans are not in accord with this Teheran agreement.

None of this makes Mr. Roosevelt exactly a Communist, but the facts ought to be interesting reading for independent voters, if any, nevertheless.

Congressman D. Lane Powers, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Army and Navy Journal concerning the splendid record on military appropriations earned by my good friend, the able Representative from New Jersey, Mr. POWERS.

Those of us in the House who have long recognized the excellent work on the Appropriations Committee which LANE POWERS did in preparing for the prosecution of the war, are delighted to see that recognition has been given Mr. POWERS by the official magazine of the armed services. The editorial which appeared in the August 12 issue of the Army and Navy Journal follows:

If the Republicans elect a majority in the House of Representatives in the general elections this November, Representative D. LANE POWERS, Fourth District, New Jersey, will be chairman of the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations. In the person of Congressman POWERS the Army has one of its best friends on Capitol Hill. A former World War No. 1 officer who came up from the ranks, Mr. POWERS understands thoroughly the Army and the Army's needs. He graduated from Pennsylvania Military College back in 1915 and because of his efforts for modernization of the Army during his period of service in Congress, Mr. POWERS was awarded, by his alma mater, the degree of Doctor of Military Science. When Mr. POWERS was elected to the House in 1932 he was appointed immediately, after Congress convened, to a post on the War Department Appropriations Committee. During the years served on the committee Mr. POWERS has fought consistently for modernization of the Army. In 1933–34 when Hitler's forces first started concentrating on mobility and fire-power, Mr. POWERS pioneered for the same concentration on behalf of the United States armed forces. The New Jerseyman's district includes Burlington County, in which Fort Dix is located. When Mr. POWERS first took office Dix was a practically abandoned World War No. 1 camp. Mr. POWERS recognized the strategic advantage of Dix for reception and staging work in event of an emergency. Due to his efforts with the Appropriations Committee, Dix was enlarged into a fort and was prepared for the important part it is now playing in the war effort. Many high ranking Army officers have publicly expressed their appreciation of the Representative's service to the Army through his work on the Appropriations Committee. He is known in Washington as a leading civilian expert on Army requirements and is called, by some of his colleagues, "the sponsor of our modern Army." Mr. POWERS' efforts in national defense have been recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike. They consider him so valuable that everyone is anxious for his continuance in office, irrespective of politics. As chairman of the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. POWERS would bring to the office a wealth of knowledge and experience in military appropriations matters that is surpassed by no one in either civilian or military service in the entire county. His constituents should reelect him.

Reconversion and Employment in the Post-war Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] I ask that an editorial and an article published in the August 19, 1944, issue of America be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO PEA SHOOTER WANTED

What kind of reconversion bill will eventually come from the Senate, we do not venture to predict. As we go to press, the parliamentary position of the original George and Kilgore-Truman-Murray bills has become so tangled that many of the Senators are probably as confused as the newspaper-reading public and the reporters covering the debate. As America's Washington correspondent, Charles Lucey, reports elsewhere in this issue, the liberal approach sponsored by Senators MURRAY and KILGORE seems to be losing ground to the conservative approach advanced by Senator GEORGE and favored by a Republican-Southern Democrat coalition. Probably a compromise will be effected.

On the surface, the issue seems very simple; it boils down to a fundamental difference of opinion over the merits of a State unemployment-insurance system to handle industrial demobilization following the war as opposed to a combined Federal-State set-up. Senator GEORGE proposes to deal with the situation by adding two amendments to the Social Security Act. The first would provide for dismissed Federal civilian workers by granting them coverage under the present State unemployment systems, the cost to be borne by the Federal Government. The second would establish a Federal fund from which the States might borrow when their unemployment reserves prove inadequate for the post-war job.

The Kilgore-Truman-Murray bill advocates an entirely new program which establishes uniform standards of unemployment-insurance benefits for the whole country and a special retraining program for demobilized workers and soldiers. Under the provisions of the bill, unemployment benefits would range from $20 a week to a maximum of $35, depending on the worker's pay in a base year and the number of his dependents. The difference between the State rates and the uniform Federal rates would come from the Federal Treasury. The States, however, would administer the program with their existing machinery.

While some of the Senators opposing this plan in the names of States' rights are undoubtedly sincere, the suspicion exists, and is well founded, that the States' rights issue has been raised to cloak political and eco-

nomic objections to the Murray-Kilgore approach to the post-war problem. On the political side, uniform unemployment benefits might seriously disturb a social order which most southern Senators are sworn to uphold. As for the Republicans, they now control 26 States and stand to gain politically if recipients of unemployment insurance are beholden solely to them and not to the Federal Government as well.

The economic issue is also uppermost in their minds. The southern Democrat-Republican coalition works under the assumption that the best way to solve the post-war employment problem is to give private enterprise a free hand. Senators KILGORE and MURRAY, on the other hand, accept the thesis that the crisis will be of such magnitude that it cannot be handled without special emergency assistance from the Government. This difference in aproach is evident from the language of the bills themselves. The announced purpose of the George bill is simply "to amend the Social Security Act." The objective of the Kilgore-Truman-Murray bill is, among other things, "to insure the fullest possible employment in private industry during the period of transition to civilian production after the cessation of hostilities and thereafter." Hence the relative high unemployment benefits, which are designed not merely to provide something more than bare subsistence to the industrially demobilized and their families, but to sustain purchasing power and provide a market which will be an incentive to private industry to produce at capacity and as soon as possible.

No doubt some of the provisions of the Kilgore-Truman-Murray bill need to be carefully scrutinized and perhaps rewritten. In the main, however, the bill is sound and realistic. In comparison, the George bill is an attempt to stop a panzer attack with a pea shooter.

FULL EMPLOYMENT: THE POST-WAR SCENE

(By Joseph P. McMurray)

We have seen that by harnessing the power of our growing labor force and utilizing the technical advances that are being made, we can easily produce a national income in 1950 of $125,000,000,000, measured in 1939 prices; or, if measured in 1943 prices, a national income surpassing the phenomenal production record of last year by approximately $9,000,000,000. This offers a basis for both optimism and pessimist. The optimists see in it an opportunity finally to achieve freedom from want without in any way interfering with, or diminishing, the income of the more prosperous sections of our population. The pessimists, realizing that much higher levels of production can be achieved after the war with the same number or fewer workers than before the war, fear lest the increased supply of workers will be added to those formerly unemployed, creating a volume of unemployment far beyond that we eve experienced.

Because our democratic society cannot survive another period of deep depression, and because high production and full employment offer opportunity for the fuller development of the human personality, we must not look backward longingly to what we believed were the golden days of the twenties, or with fear to the depression days of the thirties. Instead we must look forward with determination and become pioneers—this time to open the new economic frontier of full employment.

But a real national income of $125,000,000,000 (in 1939 prices) must not be thought of as a ceiling to income, nor is 1950 presumed to be a peak year in our post-war economy. In a dynamic economy such as ours, national output must rise several billions each year to provide continued full employment.

ROLES OF GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS

Full employment is not maintained except by constant vigilance on the part of government. Private enterprise, no matter how virile, cannot by itself maintain the rather sensitive balance between savings and investment by which full employment without speculative excess is maintained. For this is not a function of business. Business enterprise serves the high function of bringing the productive resources of the country into coordinated activity to meet demand for goods and services.

In the process, business firms expend their own and borrowed funds for new plant and equipment in ever-varying amounts. One new product or one new method may require a large volume of new construction; another may actually decrease the existing volume by replacing a unit which wears out—or becomes obsolete—with a more efficient but simpler one. The development of a network of railroads, or of a spiderweb of roads dotted with filling stations and tourist camps, may bring a swell of construction activity lasting for a decade or for a generation, but between such spurts there may be quiescent periods when technical progress goes steadily on without great increase in the volume of material equipment.

Private enterprise must construct new equipment when and as it is needed to improve the processes of production and to meet demand. If the businessman has organized production efficiently to meet demand as it faces him, and if he has refrained from monopolistic practices which would give him an undue return for that production, he has done his part.

Certainly, if our enterprise system is to continue to exist, investment by private business must furnish, year by year, decade by decade, a large volume of expenditures, thereby putting savings to use and maintaining the level of employment. That this investment shall of itself be just large enough at all times but never too large to maintain full employment is too much to hope for or to demand. In any given year, or even throughout any given decade, the flow of private investment may be too large or too small in relation to savings. To maintain full employment, public policy must act as a compensating factor.

In the past, governments have neglected this function. In the same year that every farmer was building a new barn, when private residential and commercial construction was straining our productive capacities—at just these times of high demand, our Federal, State, and local governments instituted their own public-works programs. They were optimistic when the public was optimistic, and pessimistic when business was at a standstill. In the long run, by influencing the volume of savings of individuals and of businesses, by providing conditions which will stimulate business expansion, by furnishing public outlets for idle private funds, government may help to be a stabilizer. Business, even though it performs efficiently its own productive function, must cooperate with government to preserve the balance which assures business prosperity.

TECHNOLOGY NOT ENOUGH

Technological progress alone will not guarantee prosperity. Inventions have made possible the ever-increasing potential of our national output, but neither in the short run nor in the long run do they guarantee that this potential will be realized. A new invention may make whole industries obsolete and render useless the skills of 100,000 laborers, while the new method itself may employ only a fraction of this number. Or—like the automobile industry, which displaced the carriage and harness industries—it may give rise both directly and indirectly to employment many times these previous levels.

Theorists of an older generation believed that purchasing power destroyed in one sector by technological change sprang up inevitably in another and thus preserved the level of employment. We know now that new processes may have the net effect of increasing or of decreasing employment. There is no single force guaranteeing that an invention will create a demand for labor equal to that which it destroys. The Government must assume the responsibility of seeing to it that productive employment is made available to all displaced workers. Only then will the technological advance have its fruition in an increased output of goods and services, matched by increased purchasing power.

But it cannot be assumed that higher public expenditures alone will eliminate unemployment. Those expenditures must, for example, be applied so as to complement and not curtail private investment; and public policy must insure that added demand, as it is created, will swell employment. Unless an effective antimonopoly policy is pursued, added demand may be absorbed by higher prices and by higher income for small groups in especially advantageous positions, and unemployment may continue.

Even the maintenance of full employment does not assure attainment of the level of living which we might achieve. For full employment is not identical with fullest use of our productive energies. Even though we maintain what we call full employment, real national income in 1950 will be the smaller by some $4,000,000,000 because of time lost through accidents, illness, strikes, transitional unemployment, and the like. Much of this loss could be prevented by wise social policy. Every year we waste productive ability through "under employment"—the use of only part of a man's abilities, because he cannot find the more productive job for which he is trained. Perhaps he cannot risk moving to search for it, or is kept from it by discriminatory hiring practices whch have nothing to do with ability.

An even more important source of loss is our failure to develop the potential abilities of some of the Nation's present and future workers. On our small farms live perhaps 2,000,000 persons, working with inadequate information and equipment, who could produce more effectively if the excellent work of the Farm Security Administration could be expanded so as to give these underprivileged farmers the same chance to rise from poverty by production as it has to others. Negroes suffer from underemployment and lack of opportunity for training. When a person who might be a salesman works as a messenger, or when a man whose capacities would fit him to be an accountant or a lawyer works as a clerk, not only is his income held down, but society at large suffers the loss of a valuable human resource.

In other ways, too, we bar ourselves from higher levels of living. By restricting our imports, we prevent other countries from buying the products of our special industrial talents and thereby lessen the output of our most efficient industries, which pay the highest incomes.

SOCIAL WELFARE FACTORS

Maintaining full and efficient employment solves many problems, but by itself it does not solve all social problems. It does not, for example, lead automatically to conservation of our natural resources, and to their development for the benefit of future generations. It will not in itself chasten monopoly. It will not bring education or medical care within the grasp of all people, or provide security for the aged or the unfortunate. Because the training and development which make for economic success are not equally available to all, it will not result in the most desirable distribution among the population of the material comforts of life.

We are often reminded: "Ye have the poor always with you." Perhaps we must always have the poor in the sense that some of the population—cripples, orphans, the [illegible]nd—will have to be supported; but this does not mean we must always have poverty, want, and destitution. Poor health, low productive ability, and poverty are all part of the same vicious circle. A glance at the history of the last three centuries tells us that this circle can be broken.

In a full-employment post-war economy, the national income will be great enough so that without unduly burdening anyone a share may be diverted to enlarged social-welfare services—including public expenditures for needed medical services, improved housing, and extended education. The cost to society of any program attacking the problem of poverty at its roots will be more than offset by the eventual increase in productivity on the part of those aided, not to mention the savings in dollars and tears which will accrue to society from a reduction in the evils created by poverty.

Promoting a more equal distribution of welfare does not mean destroying a system which encourages initiative and enterprise by a system of rewards. Quite the opposite. The provision of health and education does not check initiative, nor induce satisfaction with minimum levels. Nor need the provision of a system of social security for all dull incentive, if properly administered. It is not the person with health and education who lacks ambition. Rather it is the man without training and physical well being who lives without hope and ambition.

Measures of social welfare would serve the dual purpose of increasing our future productivity and bolstering employment when private investment is inadequate.

CONCLUSIONS

Attaining the high income for which we have the manpower, the resources, and the skills will not solve these social problems, but it will facilitate their solution. Prosperity in itself lessens the problems of poverty and of social insecurity. It provides a high national income out of which a share may be devoted to caring for the unfortunate, and to conserving and developing our natural resources, reconstructing our transportation system and rebuilding our cities. High demand for labor draws individuals from unproductive occupations to others which use their capacities to a fuller extent. When income is high and employment is secure, there is less temptation for one State to erect barriers against the trade of another, for labor organizations to adopt restrictive practices. There is less pressure for the Nation to adopt trade barriers which, by reducing our imports, curtail our exports and lower our level of living. Moreover, a prosperous America buys from the rest of the world large quantities of goods supplementary to those she produces. Prosperity in the United States, therefore, will stimulate prosperity elsewhere and make easier the task of world reconstruction. We need not choose between our responsibilities to the world and to ourselves. International and domestic reconstruction go hand in hand, each bolstering the other.

Achieving and maintaining full employment and high production is not merely an economic problem. It has become largely a political one of altering our institutional machinery in such a way as not to hinder, but to facilitate, high production and consumption without sacrificing our freedoms in the process. Ability to establish full employment may well be the final test for democracy.

The Victory Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article on the Victory ship from the American Marine News of August 17, 1944, No. 13, entitled "Victory Ship Wins High Praise After 26,000-Mile Trip."

This ship has been built with an eye directed to post-war competitive commerce in the post-war world, and was subjected to thorough inspection and given high praise by Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger and his staff when the vessel reached Hollandia.

The article is as follows:

VICTORY SHIP WINS HIGH PRAISE AFTER 26,000 MILE TRIP—GENERAL LAUDS VESSEL AT NEW GUINEA CALL; SHIP EXCEEDS PLANS

Voyage reports from the first Victory ship to complete a lengthy trip show conclusively that this new class of fast wartime cargo vessels built with an eye for post-war competitive commerce will live up to and surpass highest expectations, according to the American Merchant Marine Institute.

The *Poland Victory* recently completed a 26,000-mile odyssey. She was the first Victory ship to pass through the Panama Canal and first to reach the Atlantic seaboard.

Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, in command of United States troops in the New Guinea sector, boarded the vessel with his staff when she reached Hollandia. He made a thorough inspection and was high in his praise for the vessel's design and accomplishments. The *Poland Victory* took 3½ months for her voyage which was equivalent to encircling the globe.

Capt. Leonard Duks, the *Poland Victory's* master, echoed General Eichelberger's praise for the new ship. Captain Duks, of San Francisco, is a veteran of 28 years at sea, having sailed on every type of vessel, including square-riggers. Of his new command's performance, he said:

"The *Poland Victory* fulfills every promise that was made for this type of ship even when it was in the blueprint state. If ever a ship was suitable for post-war cargo-carrying operations that is equal to this one, which is second to none and equal to the finest, I have yet to hear of or see it.

"This vessel is not only speedy but economical of operation. Even now I can see how satisfying it will be in post-war days to be able to guarantee quick delivery of our bills of lading. If this Victory ship is a forerunner of what is to come there never need be any cause for worry about the future of the American merchant marine."

To date 520 Victory ships have been contracted for in comparison to the 2,680 Liberty ships scheduled to be built. In order to have greater speed and still transport the same cargo tonnage as the older Liberty, the new Victory was given more than twice the horsepower as well as slightly greater beam and length. The Victory ship's increased speed makes for a vessel of much superior quality for both wartime service and post-war operations.

Captain Duks' praise was seconded by members of the engine room and by deck officers on the *Poland Victory*. Although the vessel encountered bad storms and heavy weather in the wake of a hurricane, her flared hull knifed through the waves and let only spray come aboard. She pitched considerably, they reported, but vibration and rolling were negligible.

The first 33 Victory ships have been named after the various United Nations. The next 100 bear the names of representative American communities.

The Truth About the Political Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a signed article by Mr. Sidney Hillman on the Political Action Committee which appeared in the New Republic of August 21, 1944:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

So many statements concerning the C. I. O. political action committee and the National Citizens' political action committee have recently appeared in print—some correct and some incorrect, some friendly and some hostile—that it may not be amiss to set down some of the fundamental facts about these two organizations.

The C. I. O.-P. A. C. was organized in July 1943 by the Congress of Industrial Organizations for the primary purpose of arousing the working men and women of America to a sense of their own responsibility as citizens of this Nation and, in a broader sense, as citizens of a free world. What really started the C. I. O.-P. A. C. happened the year before the organization came into being. The congressional elections held in November 1942 gave clear evidence that a powerful reactionary trend had set in, which, if it continued through 1944 might well reverse all the progress of recent years and render this Nation incapable of making its indispensable contribution toward the eventual establishment of lasting peace. One could not help but recall the congressional elections of 1918, in which Woodrow Wilson lost control of both Houses of Congress, and with it a large measure of his prestige. One could not help but remember the dire consequences both at home and abroad.

Whereas Woodrow Wilson actually lost majority control to the Republican opposition in 1918, the 1942 elections left President Roosevelt with a reduced but still substantial Democratic majority in the Senate and a bare majority in the House. But this distinction was illusory. Actually, through the unholy alliance of obstructionist Republicans and reactionary Democrats, a coalition had come into power which was determined not merely to block any further progressive legislation, but to undermine where possible the whole structure of New Deal reform.

Did this mean that the American people had changed its mind? Did the dramatic change in Congress reflect a conservative trend on the part of a majority of the population? We thought not. We thought not, because an analysis of the vote cast in the 1942 election clearly showed what had happened.

Only a little more than 28,000,000 American citizens had cast their ballots in these elections, as against 49,800,000 in 1940. Almost 22,000,000 Americans who had voted in the Presidential year had failed to go to the polls 2 years later. The percentage of those who failed to vote was highest among the normally progressive groups of the population and lowest among those population groups which are normally conservative. The inference was clear. The forces of reaction were organized for political action; the progressive forces were not organized.

That is why the C. I. O.-P. A. C. was born 1 year later.

The funds for the C. I. O.-P. A. C. were supplied by the C. I. O. and a number of its major affiliated unions. To be exact, the sum of $669,764.11 was contributed. Of this amount approximately $400,000 was spent up to the time of the Democratic National Convention. No disbursements have been made from these funds since the Democratic convention, except in local primary elections, and none will be made until after the election. This decision was reached in order to eliminate any possible question of violating the Smith-Connally Act.

What did the C. I. O.-P. A. C. do up to the time of the Democratic convention, and what will it do during and after the campaign?

First of all, the C. I. O.-P. A. C. put on a Nation-wide drive to register the vote; it embarked upon an educational campaign among the workers to show them why they had a duty as citizens to exercise their franchise; why this year it was more than ever important for them to do so; and how they could help to organize themselves and other progressives outside of the labor movement for effective political action. This campaign was carried on in the labor press, by means of pamphlets distributed in large quantities, and—when it was possible to obtain time—over the radio.

Second, the C. I. O.-P. A. C. endeavored to mobilize the progressive vote in certain important primary elections throughout the Nation, in order to help unseat outstanding reactionary incumbents seeking renomination and to assist outstanding progressive candidates to obtain their party's nomination. Such activity is permissible under the law, since the Smith-Connally Act does not apply to primary contests. The C. I. O.-P. A. C. was active in the primary contests for nomination in both parties. It does not claim to have brought about the nomination or the defeat of a single candidate. It does claim to have contributed important support to the already existinging progressive forces in many States—perhaps decisive support in a few instances. By and large, these efforts were more successful in the Democratic primaries than in those of the Republican Party. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that in the Democratic primaries the C. I. O.-P. A. C. was working with the prevailing trend, which has already taken a considerable toll of outstanding reactionaries and isolationists, whereas in the Republican primaries it was working against the pronounced nationalist and reactionary trend which fully manifested itself in the repudiation of Willkie and in the recapture of the Republican leadership by Herbert Hoover and the Old Guard.

Actual money contributions played but a small part in this undertaking. Under the Hatch Act, $5,000 is the maximum amount which any individual or group may contribute to any one candidate's campaign. There were not many instances where even that amount was contributed. But there were many instances where the voluntary organized efforts of P. A. C. workers were able to accomplish wonders in bringing out the vote. In most parts of the country that is all we have to do in order to insure a progressive victory. The majority of American citizens—and certainly the vast majority of industrial workers—are progressive voters by nature. They do not as a rule need to be told to vote for progressive candidates; they do need to be provided with the facts and the records of the candidates; and they do need to be provided with channels of organization by means of which to make their opinions effective. They need also to be reassured that it actually lies within their power to elect the cindidates whom they prefer, and that it is their own responsibility to see that the latent progressive majority becomes an articulate majority.

That is the job the C. I. O.-P. A. C. set out to do among the industrial workers; and that is the job which the N. C.-P. A. C. has now undertaken to do among the population as a whole.

Since the decision was reached not to use union funds in the electoral campaign itself, once the party candidates were nominated, the C. I. O.-P. A. C. is now putting on a drive for voluntary contributions from individual members of labor organizations throughout the country. Similarly, the N. C.-P. A. C. is putting on a drive for voluntary contributions from individuals in every rank of life and in every section of the country. These funds will be used to carry on the effort to bring out the vote, to reelect President Roosevelt and to elect a progressive Congress.

It is too early to say what measure of success will attend these two fund-raising campaigns. But it is not too early to say that a great deal of nonsense has been written about the "gigantic slush funds" which are said to be at the disposal of these two organizations. Quite frequently a figure of $6,000,000 has been mentioned. The only element of reality about this figure is that the law would not permit the two organizations to spend more than $3,000,000 each or $6,000,000 together. Our goal is not nearly so ambitious as that. We hope the N. C. P. A. C. will raise $1,500,000. I wish I could say that the drive had already produced half that amount. Actually, the effort has only just begun.

We shall undoubtedly fall far short of raising the amount of money which will be spent by the organized forces of reaction. There is no doubt that they have the dollars, but I believe that events will prove that we have the votes. In 1940, $16,000,000 of Republican money was not enough to elect a moderately progressive Republican candidate, because the people instinctively recognized that, in spite of Wendell Willkie, the reactionary "old guard" still controlled the party. In 1944 no instinctual intelligence is required; normal eyesight is all anyone needs to recognize the starched Hoover collar on the Republican candidate.

The response we have had so far to the membership drive in the National Citizens' Political Action Committee is most encouraging. Already it is clear that, so far at least as this election is concerned, farmers, publishers, educators, writers, and progressives from every part of the country and from every occupation are ready and eager to unite with the industrial workers in order to reelect the President and to elect a Congress which will responsibly and loyally support progressive policies at home and abroad.

The N. C.-P. A. C. is committed to Roosevelt and Truman against Dewey and Bricker. Beyond that it has no partisan commitments whatsoever. It will support for election to Congress those men and women who, irrespective of party affiliation, seem best qualified to represent this Nation in the critical times which lie ahead. It will support those candidates who have shown that they believe in the principles set forth in President Roosevelt's economic bill of rights, who have shown that they understand that our domestic problems and our foreign problems are opposite sides of the same coin, and that neither can be solved at the expense of the other. It will support those candidates who, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "have confidence in the people, cherish them and consider them the wise repository of the public interest." It will oppose those candidates who openly repudiate these ideals, or who render lip service to them in order to conceal their opposition.

At first some of the conservative newspapers made fun of us. It was alleged that our support actually hurt the candidates whom we were endeavoring to help. Then suddenly it was claimed that we were the dominant influence in the Democratic Party. And after HENRY WALLACE was defeated for renomination it was said that we were finished. Two weeks later we were again supposed to be very much alive and to have been responsible for the defeat of an outstanding isolationist. We are supposed to be at the same time trying to capture the Democratic Party and starting a third party. We are described as the President's greatest asset one day, and as his greatest liability the next. Most of all, the ultraconservative commentators have worried about what they call the P. A. C. ideology.

This ideology is neither a mystery nor a closely guarded secret. It is clearly stated in the P. A. C. program, which was adopted last May and which was officially presented to the resolutions committees of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. This program is both a statement of principles and a concrete plan of action. It rests upon the belief that we can and must find a way so to utilize the vast spiritual and material resources of this Nation that every American who is reasonably industrious and prudent may enjoy at least the minimum elements of a good life—that is, adequate housing, food, clothing, medical care, education, recreation, and an opportunity for advancement. It rests upon the belief that too many Americans have died and are dying in foreign lands in defense of democracy for us any longer to permit democracy to be betrayed here at home by social or economic barriers erected against anyone by reason of his race, religion, or national origin.

There are people—and they are by no means all Republicans—who do not agree with these principles, and who do not wish to see the progressive forces unite for the purpose of putting them into effect. Some of them have told us that we are unwise to organize for political action, because by doing so we might stimulate the forces of reaction to take similar action. The forces of reaction have taken this action long ago. They are entrenched and fortified on every rise of ground on the economic contour map of the world. They are fighting grimly behind their Maginot lines to perpetuate their privileged position.

But the united progressive forces of the world are on the march and will not be denied. They are fighting not for special privilege, but for equality of opportunity for all men everywhere, of every race, of every nationality, and of every religious faith.

The fight for human dignity and freedom will not end when we shall have achieved victory at the polls on November 7, any more than it will end when we shall have achieved military victory over Germany and Japan. All that we shall have gained by these victories is survival, survival to fight for freedom, to vote for freedom and to work for freedom, until finally freedom shall have been gained for all men who inhabit this earth.

SIDNEY HILLMAN.

Information for Servicemen, Veterans, and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, this Nation owes a debt to the veterans of this war. It is not possible for this obligation to be measured in dollars and cents but the duty to evidence the Nation's grateful appreciation to the 11,000,000 men and women of the armed forces still exists.

After the last war proper provision was not made for the veterans and their dependents. But this time the story will be different. This time the returning veteran will not have to stand in bread lines nor ask for a dole, nor stand on the street corner with a tin cup.

The Congress of the United States, fully aware of its obligations and responsibilities, has enacted the G. I. bill of rights and I am glad to have had a part in its passage. One can see at a glance that the Government of the United States is liberal with those who are wearing and have worn the uniform of their country; our servicemen are the best paid and the best equipped in the world; our veterans and their dependents receive more adequate care than any others in the world. Because of the different kind of warfare which has developed, the needs will change and many future requirements will have to be met, but our immediate duty is to help them readjust their lives to the new conditions that have been imposed upon them.

READJUSTMENT TO CIVIL LIFE—EDUCATION

One of the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights offers an education to any man who served for a period of 90 days, on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition and books, and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if without dependents and $75 if he has dependents. In no event shall the total period of education exceed 4 years. There is also a provision for part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

A veteran also has the right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities, extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Application for education and training should be made to the Director, Servicemen's Education and Training, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

HOSPITALIZATION AND PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

Adequate hospital facilities are provided for the care and treatment of veterans for nonservice disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

The veteran has the right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

RIGHT OF MEDICAL REVIEW OF IRREGULAR DISCHARGE OR RELEASE FROM ACTIVE SERVICE

A veteran has the right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service, (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (b) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (c) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

Loans provided for the above-mentioned purposes or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000. Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions. The interest rate must not exceed 4 percent. The loan must be practicable and suitable to veterans' circumstances. The loan must be repaid in 20 years. Application must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

A veteran of any war, honorably discharged from any one of the services, has the right to register for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service. He should contact his local United States employment office in his home town or county.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

There is also a provision for unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed. To be eligible, the person must reside in the United States, be completely unemployed, or, if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week, be registered with and report to a public employment office, be able to work, and available for suitable work.

Any person will be disqualified if he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; if he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work offered; if he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; if he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS AS A RESULT OF LOSS OF SON, DAUGHTER, HUSBAND, OR FATHER

There are four money benefits provided for the dependents of a deceased veteran: 6 months' gratuity payment, monthly insurance payments—if the serviceman applied for insurance—monthly pension, and back pay.

GRATUITY

The gratuity is a lump-sum payment equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received at the date of death. In addition, the dependents of any private or seaman who dies in foreign service receive 20 percent of his base pay, and the dependents of any officer who dies in foreign service receive 10 percent of his base pay. If the serviceman was in either the flying service or submarine service, his dependents receive, in addition, 50 percent of his base pay. There is also a longevity provision in addition to the above amounts.

The gratuity is automatically paid to a wife of a deceased veteran, or if there is no wife, it is automatically paid to the surviving child or children. It is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters of an unmarried serviceman. The serviceman should designate someone of this latter class to receive it; however, if he does not, they may apply for it. If two parents survive, the amount is divided between them. A grandparent must show an insurable interest in order to receive it.

Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to Gratuity Pay Branch, Finance Office, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington, D. C., by the surviving relative of a seaman to Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

MONTHLY INSURANCE PAYMENTS

This insurance is not paid in a lump sum; it is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary—the older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy, if the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is under 30 years of age at the date of death of the insured, payments shall be made in 240 equal monthly installments, at the rate of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance. If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is 30 or more years of age at the date of death of the insured payment shall be made in equal monthly installments for 120 months certain, with such payment in installments continuing during the remaining lifetime of such beneficiary. For instance, under a $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

It would be well to have parents and next of kin check with the men and

women in service to see that all insurance policies are in order and in the hands of the beneficiaries. An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of half blood. There is nothing to prevent a parent or brother or sister from being the beneficiary of more than one serviceman.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check their insurance policy now. See that everything is in order now. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A little care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen. I would suggest that you send your serviceman this pamphlet so that he may check all matters pertaining to his beneficiaries.

MONTHLY PENSION

This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, they are not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased serviceman can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month. Two parents, $25 each. Widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child. No widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38; no widow but two children, $38 equally divided, with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100.

The fact that a widow, a child, or parents gets the insurance does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect both insurance and a pension.

BACK PAY DUE THE SERVICEMAN

When a casualty occurs, that service man or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. All this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. Application should be made by the surviving relative to a soldier to—Finance Officer, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

HEADSTONE FOR GRAVE

Any person may make application for a headstone for the grave of any veteran of any one of the Army or Navy services whose service was honorable, to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE FOR ANY WAR VETERAN

After honorable service, reimbursement for burial may be allowed, not exceeding $100, on burial, funeral, and transportation expenses. Application should be made to Director, Dependent Claims Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, his minor children or adult unmarried daughters.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

Dependents of all grades of enlisted men and aviation cadets of the Army and Navy are eligible to receive a dependent's allowance from the Government in addition to the serviceman's allotment. Those men and women serving as officers come under another system. The allowances provided by the Government are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife and one child, $72, and $20 for each additional child. Note: If the divorce or separation order of the court does not call for alimony or separate maintenance, the wife will not receive any allotment, and in case of a court order providing alimony or separate maintenance, she will get no more than the amount fixed by the court.

Class B dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is substantially but not completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37.

Class B–1 dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $50 plus $11 for each brother or sister; two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $68 plus $11 for each brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

It is important that men and women with dependents make application through their commanding officers for allotment and allowance, as these benefits will begin the date application is filed. Allotments are compulsory only for class A dependents. If the service man or woman for some reason or other fails to make application or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out; the Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children and dates of birth. In case a man is reported missing in action, the allotment and allowance continue to be paid for a period of a year, unless in the meantime his status is definitely determined.

Parents and brothers and sisters who can prove dependency can receive an allowance at the same time as wife and children. Parents can get an allowance from more than one son or daughter in the service. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son or daughter in the service, they get $68 per month. Now, if another son or daughter in the service helped support these same parents, they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

The agency for the Navy having jurisdiction over allotments and allowances is: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.; the agency for the Army is: Office of Dependency Benefits, War Department, 213 Washington Street, Newark, N. J. If you experience any difficulty contact your Congressman.

TEMPORARY AID FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Sometimes cases of extreme hardship arise involving dependents of servicemen. Many dependents, and even members of the armed forces themselves, are not fully acquainted with the two emergency agencies set up for the express purpose of helping such persons in need. These two agencies have branches all over the country. They are the Army Emergency Relief Fund, whose functions have recently been assigned to the Red Cross, and the Navy Relief Society, which also can be reached through the Red Cross.

ARMY RELIEF FUND

Any member of the armed forces in the Army can appeal to the Army Relief Fund, represented in all camps, or through the Red Cross if the soldier is not at camp, for needed immediate financial assistance. He will receive courteous and willing assistance at all times. The fund is also open to all dependents of men and women in the Army, and anyone needing relief should get in touch at once with this fund through the local Red Cross.

NAVY RELIEF SOCIETY

Any serviceman or servicewoman in our naval forces or his dependents can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. To get immediate action, it is advisable to take the case up through the Red Cross.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

This benefit is payable to all honorably discharged personnel of our services whose rank is below captain in the Army, and lieutenant senior grade in the Navy. Payments are made in the following sums: Personnel with less than 60 days' active service, $100; personnel with 60 days' or more active service, none of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $200; personnel with 60 days' or more active service, any part of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $300. Whenever mustering-out payments amount to more than $100, payments are made in monthly intervals of $100 each. Servicemen who are discharged at their own request are not entitled to mustering-out pay.

FREE MEDICAL AND NURSING CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF MEN IN ARMED FORCES

In most States through cooperation with the Federal Government, a wife of any man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity

care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service if it is provided in that State. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2. In the case of emergency, be sure that the doctor makes application for you within 48 hours after service is rendered. If the application is not made within 48 hours, no bills for medical or hospital service will be paid. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse; no money is given to the wife. This service is extended to wives and infants of servicemen in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, but not to any other foreign country.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY PENSIONS

Our honorably discharged veterans of all wars are entitled to a pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by their service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10-percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as a hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month.

The disability claim is filed by the veteran for benefits payable to him as the result of injury or disease resulting from military service. The award of compensation is based on the degree of disability which is determined according to the Veterans' Administration schedule provisions. Any disability, except misconduct, is compensable if it is as much as 10-percent disabling. This application is known as Form 526. It is simple to execute and seldom does one have any trouble answering the questions. Additional evidence is seldom required. This is particularly true on the adjudication of the initial claim. No subsequent formal claim need be filed. If the veteran is dissatisfied with his present rating, he can submit medical evidence to this effect.

However, it should be borne in mind that the doctor's statement must state not only his diagnosis but sufficient findings to warrant it. It is essential that this evidence show, or at least indicate, a higher degree of disability than the present evaluation. Upon receipt of competent medical evidence, the Veterans' Claim Service will authorize an official physical examination for rating purposes, thereby reopening the case for further consideration.

Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred from one Veterans' Administration facility to another, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for settlement, veterans should file claim on proper form which will be supplied them by any Veterans' Administration facility, or the local representative of the American Red Cross. If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

WRITE FOR OTHER INFORMATION

It is practically impossible to cover briefly all the details of benefits available to veterans of this and previous wars. I have tried to outline the benefits relating primarily to World War No. 2 veterans, as many pamphlets are available covering the provisions for veterans of other wars. I offer this digest mainly as a helpful guide to servicemen and their dependents. If anyone has special questions or individual problems not covered in this summary, I shall be glad for you to write to me personally at the following address: Congressman HENRY M. JACKSON, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Sam Gompers Versus Sidney Hillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Robert J. Watt, international representative of the A. F. of L., does not believe a labor organization should become "the tail to any political party kite." He says:

The primary function of a labor union is to act as the collective bargaining agency for the American wage earners in their economic relationships with their employers.

Watt then says that if a labor union hitches itself to one political party, it must rise and fall with that party. He urges the A. F. of L. to continue to follow the advice of Samuel Gompers—keep the trade union movement a labor movement of, by, and for the working people. This is sound advice but directly contrary to the attitude, the activities, and the advice of Sidney Hillman and Philip Murray. Whose advice will the American wage earner follow in the coming weeks, Sam Gompers' or Sidney Hillman's? Will the independent-minded American worker take orders from leaders like Hillman?

Following up this line of thought I include in my remarks an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Wednesday, August 23, 1944, entitled, "Sidney Hillman's Program."

SIDNEY HILLMAN'S PROGRAM

A local of C. I. O. steel workers in Gary has rebelled against the operations of the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee, headed by Sidney Hillman. The members tabled a motion to assess themselves a dollar each for the slush fund that Hillman is dispensing to promote the fourth term.

It is certain that a good many of the 1,500 members of this local had voted for Roosevelt in the past and may vote for him again, yet the action to table the slush fund resolution is reported to have been unanimous. The reason why it was was explained by Chester F. Midgett, a member of the union.

"We decided to keep politics out of the local," he said. "We decided that we are running a union local, not a political party. It is a man's own business how he votes, not the business of the union."

The Gary action follows that of two C. I. O. locals in Utah, who quit the P. A. C. when they discovered that they were supposed to back Democratic candidates without listening to the pleas for support by Republican candidates. The Utah unionists, who are smelter workers, said that they didnt believe in being told how to vote by anyone.

Their stand, and that of the C. I. O. members in Gary, runs exactly counter to the philosophy on which Hillman is basing the P. A. C. Under his plan of operation political policies are to be "democratically" determined by the representatives of the unions participating in the organization, based upon their per capita tax (slush fund) payments.

This isn't a new policy. It is the policy of the Communists, with whose aid Hillman took over the American Labor Party in New York. The slush fund payments, thanks to maintenance of membership and the check-off, which Roosevelt's War Labor Board has assisted the C. I. O. in fastening on hundreds of thousands of war workers, will present few difficulties. Delivering the votes is a trifle more difficult. By Hillman's theory, a union member is bound to vote as his union decides he should vote. At least two C. I. O. leaders in Chicago have hinted to the members of their union that it will be too bad for them if they don't.

A member of the C. I. O. newspaper guild in Boston, analyzing this process in the current Reader's Digest, points out that it requires union members, as a duty to their union, to vote for candidates on the basis of issues which have not the slightest relation to the welfare of their union. In Massachusetts, this writer says, one of the tests by which C. I. O. members are bidden to judge State candidates is whether the candidate in question favors amendment of the law which at present makes the death sentence mandatory upon conviction of first degree murder. As he says, the amendment may be desirable, but it is certainly not one on which a voter's opinion should be formed on the basis of his union membership. The writer objects that instead of the members of the C. I. O. determining whom they shall support, they are being told from above whom they must support.

Mr. Hillman cannot quarrel with this. It is the basis of the Communist Party discipline which he is attempting to enforce on the C. I. O. unions. It is not for the Communist to reason why. He gets his orders, and if he does not execute them he is expelled from the party. If Hillman puts over his plan, the C. I. O. unionist who fails to carry out his orders from on high will be expelled from the union. He will be denied the right to earn a living if he asserts his political independence.

Allied Advances in France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the liberation of Paris and the fall of Marseille was brought about through the wholehearted collaboration of the French patriots. The French Forces of the Interior are hitting telling blows against the enemy, in cooperation with the advancing

Allies. German morale has reached a new low because in France victory is in the air.

Typical of the support given the Allies by the French patriots was their action in delaying for some 20 days the German armored division, Das Reich, from reaching the fighting front at the time of the Allied landings in Normandy. In Brittany French patriots, organized and equipped in units by French paratroopers, fought successfully against superior numbers of German troops.

Action of the patriots in liberating the capital of France from 4 years of bondage will spur the forces of liberation everywhere. And President Roosevelt's words of encouragement on France's freedom day have more meaning now than ever:

With full confidence—

The President said—

I look forward that the French people on July 14, 1945, will celebrate their great national fete on French soil, liberated alike from the invader and from the puppets of Vichy.

Polish Boundary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, winning the war and a permanent peace are the desires of the Allied Nations at this time. The peoples of the world are hoping for the success of negotiations arranged to bring about and secure such a peace. Representatives of the three great Allied Nations are meeting in the Capital to begin these negotiations. These representatives in their introductory remarks spoke of the desire for a permanent peace and of justice to all nations, large and small. They expressed confidence of success.

However, to make peace a reality, many of the causes which have developed distrust and a sense of injustice among nations must be removed. There must be confidence that agreements and treaties have meaning. Whatever comes from the conversations of the Allied Powers and in whatever form their agreements are expressed, the world will not accept the published statements unless in some manner there is established a confidence that the terms agreed upon will be scrupulously kept.

The proposal to transfer Polish territory to our Russian ally is not based upon agreements made between these two countries respecting their eastern boundary. It is contrary to agreements they have made. The proposal will not allay distrust. It will create doubt and suspicion.

For almost 5 years now Poland has felt the weight of the aggressors. First to resist, her people have continued the struggle. They have been on all the European fronts. They always acquit themselves well. They ask that the lofty principles that have been proclaimed apply to them as well as to all nations. They will be content with no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. This and other principles have been endorsed by the Allied Nations as has the principle of a just and enduring peace. But unfolding events are causing concern not only in Poland itself but among Polish kinsmen overseas, as evidenced by resolutions adopted by assembled delegates from societies, clubs, and veterans' posts making up the council of the Polish societies and clubs in the State of Delaware, as follows:

We, Americans of Polish descent, assembled at the Polish National Hall, at Wilmington, Del., on Friday evening, July 28, 1944, at a quarterly meeting of the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware. After dispensing with our regular business we took up the question of Soviet Russia's announcement of incorporating the eastern part of Poland into the Soviet Union and creating a Polish Committee of National Liberation as the sole civil authority in territory west of the Bug River.

Further, we as Americans of Polish descent with over twelve hundred sons in this war for democracy, are greatly distressed to see them shed blood for this cause and to have Soviet Russia disregard completely the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms."

Whereas Poland, the first and most sacrificing ally in this struggle with Hitler, is now being partitioned by one of the United Nations, the Soviet Russia. Its only legal government in London is being bypassed for a group of so-called Polish patriots, a creation of Soviet Russia to govern the Polish Nation. This group of so-called Polish patriots are unknown to the Polish Nation and represent only a small group of Communists who do not have any influence on the Polish Nation.

Whereas the world knows that the present leaders of Soviet Russia have entered into an agreement with the Polish government in London in December 1941, repudiating its treaty of 1939 with Hitler concerning territorial changes in Poland. In 1943 they broke this agreement, proving to the world that treaties, agreements, declarations, the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" are nothing more than scraps of paper, same as such meant to Hitler.

Whereas our President of the United States announced many times to the world that this war is being fought for the purpose of establishing fundamental freedoms in all parts of the world—the freedom of worship, the freedom of expression, the freedom from want and the freedom from fear. For the establishment of these freedoms, our sons are dying. We gave materials and food valued at billions of dollars to Soviet Russia who would still be fighting for bare existence without this aid.

Whereas if the aggressive plans of Soviet Russia toward Poland and other nations in Europe are realized, it would not only constitute a dangerous situation toward the security of our United States of America, but it would also create a situation that would not necessitate a post-war peace conference. If the United States would agree to such a situation then such a post-war peace conference would be a mockery for any future lasting peace, since millions of people and their nations would be ruled by Soviet Russia totalitarianism.

Whereas the endorsement of the Soviet Russia actions toward Poland and other occupied nations in Europe would mean the endorsement of Soviet Russia and German treaties of 1939 with territorial changes in Poland. This would be a betrayal of everything that was declared to the world as a reason to fight this war. It would mean that this war in Europe is being waged in vain, the outcome of which will be Soviet Russia totalitarianism for all nations in Europe. Distrust and condemnation from all people loving freedom, liberty, and independence would be fostered.

We, the patriotic Americans of Polish descent, appeal to you, Mr. President—in consideration of the high ideals of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms for which our sons and brothers are fighting and giving their lives on all battlefields—in consideration of the future security of our beloved United States of America—in consideration of the future of Poland with its constitutional and legal government in London—in consideration of the future of other occupied small nations in Europe, to use all your great authority and influence to defend the most sacred ideals of justice, liberty, and freedom toward Poland, whose ultimate fate will either prove to be glorious victory for freedom and lasting peace or a complete defeat of those guaranteed by our American principles and your declarations made to the world.

Furthermore, we here assembled declare that endorsement of the present criminal actions of the predatory powers of more than a century ago in this fifth partitioning of Poland, renewing the slavery of the peace-loving Polish Nation, will endanger victory and be ignoble, dishonorable, and contrary to right and justice.

VINCENT J. KOWALEWSKI,
President,

ADAM J. ROSIAK,
Secretary.

Is It Planned to Make Sidney Hillman the Fourth Term's New Secretary of Labor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, an article by Frank Waldrop, in the Washington Times-Herald, provides some interesting information relative to Sidney Hillman in the August 24 issue of that newspaper. Under leave granted me by the House, I am including Mr. Waldrop's article as a part of these remarks.

Inasmuch as some of the usually well-informed insiders in New Deal circles are now giving the impression that if President Roosevelt is elected to a fourth term, Sidney Hillman is to replace Frances Perkins as Secretary of Labor, the American public has a rightful interest in Mr. Hillman and some of his associates and ambitions. Mr. Waldrop's article sheds some light on these subjects.

Citizens both in and out of the ranks of labor who desire to make a more thorough and detailed study of Mr. Hillman's record will find it in House Report No. 1311, recently issued by the Dies committee. This report deals with the subversive background of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee and in it Mr. Hillman is referred to on 27 different occasions. Chapter 21 of that report is devoted exclusively to the same Sidney Hillman who is being groomed for Secretary of Labor and whose blatant support of the fourth-term drive is even

more vigorous and better financed than that of the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. In fact it appears that Hillman is about to replace Hannegan as the actual—if not the titular—head of the fourth-term strategists, just as the city machines have replaced the Old South as the controlling influence in the Democratic Party.

It is worth noting here, Mr. Speaker, that while House Report No. 1311 of the Dies committee levels one of the most devastating attacks against subversive activities ever prepared by our committee, it is nevertheless one of the few Dies committee reports which presents evidence so conclusive and so completely damning that nobody on the committee prepared or signed a minority report. It is also significant that the House had to order over 50,000 additional copies of this report to satisfy even partially the widespread demand for them.

Every leader of public opinion in America regardless of party affiliation should read this report because any effort by a so-called nonpolitical group to take over the reins of government and dominate the national political picture without assuming the responsibilities of management transcends all party lines in its significance. If it succeeds, it will plague and confound the Democrats of Dixie fully as much or more than it will agonize the Republicans of the Middle West and New England.

In fact, in view of the approach suggested by the Hillman group to the Negro question, it will very likely do much more to dismantle and disrupt social and economic standards in Democratic Dixie than it will in any other section of this Republic. Southerners who vote for the Hillman-Hannegan-Hopkins political axis, however, have no one to blame but themselves if they find themselves caught in the toils of big-city political machines, subversive organizations, and selfish C. I. O. labor racketeers seeking personal aggrandizement and political power.

SIDNEY HILLMAN, THE RASPUTIN OF AMERICAN LABOR

Every man in America who labors, whether he works as a member of a union or as an unorganized laborer, might well pause to ponder why it was that a spokesman for the great American Federation of Labor only yesterday denounced Sidney Hillman and his Political Action Committee in terms even more harsh and far more devastating than those used by either Mr. Waldrop or by the Dies committee. Any daily paper for August 23, carrying Associated Press dispatches, will report the denunciation which the American Federation of Labor leveled against the political manipulations of Sidney Hillman, who now strides the American scene as the Rasputin of organized labor and who boasts about the political scalps which his tribe has already taken in Alabama, in Texas, in Missouri, in California, and elsewhere. Should his crowd succeed in making him Secretary of Labor—and this would be little enough reward to him for the millions of dollars and the myriads of words he is devoting to the support of Mr. Roosevelt's bid for further power—it will be a sorry day for this Republic and an even sadder occasion for members of the railroad brotherhoods, the American Federation of Labor, and all other workers who do not fawn before the political power of Sidney Hillman.

The Congressman from your own district can supply you with a copy of House Report 1311 and all who will can read the following article by Mr. Waldrop which sketches in a few brief details of the ambitions, associations, and activities of the man who will do much to determine the labor policies of this Republic if the New Deal is projected to its sixteenth year, and who in all probability will either become the new Secretary of Labor or dominate the decisions of the Labor Department should the fourth-term drive succeed.

Sidney Hillman, the new American political boss, has just come up with a statement that he is not a Communist, never has been a Communist, and so forth. Here are the quotes:

"I have consistently fought the Communists, in and out of season, and I have said consistently that the Communists should not interfere with us, nor we with them.

"It isn't a matter of guess work, either; it is a matter of record. I have always opposed totalitarian politics, and the record does not show that a single officer of the Amalgamated (Hillman's union, the C. I. O. Amalgamated Clothing Workers) has ever been accused of being a Communist."

Well, friends, it may be so, but that ain't the way we heard it, so just for fun we'll set forth here a few facts about Sidney's past and see what he does to deny them.

First, this handsome gent was born at Zagare, Lithuania (then, as now, a part of Russia), on March 23, 1887. In 1905, there was a Communist-inspired revolution in that part of Russia and two Communist writers, Bruce Minton and John Stuart, have hosannaed Sidney in their writings as "one of the workers who seized Zagare in the name of the people and was a member of the proletarian committee that governed the town."

On the other hand, Benjamin Stolberg, a famous labor historian who looks on Sidney as a trimmer without the nerve to be a card-carrying Communist, ridicules this picture of the young hero as a tale made up by the local Commies to glorify Sidney among their rank and file during one of his numerous little "footie-footie" games with them in New York politics—of which more later.

However that may be, the 1905 Russian revolution was a flop, and as many of its sympathizers as could caught the fast mail away from there. Young Hillman arrived in the United States of America on August 10, 1907.

Right away he went into the needle trades in New York, and in a few years had his union, the aforementioned Amalgamated. Then came the first World War and the successful Communist seizure of power in Russia. So Sidney turned up with a book, The Reconstruction of Russia and the Task of Labor, and then beat it for Moscow.

He went there to tie up a deal with Nicolai Lenin, then commanding the Communist works, for the formation of a Russian-American Industrial Corporation which was to monopolize the Russian textile business.

In the United States of America this outfit started attempts to float $1,000,000 worth of stock sales, and, to boost interest, Hillman cabled back the big news that he "had long conferences with Lenin, who guaranteed Soviet support."

And when the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (S. Hillman, president) met in Chicago in May 1922, there was read to them a message from Moscow by William Z. Foster, for many years the head of the Communists in America and their perennial candidate for United States President:

"The defeat of the employers is the natural result of the splendid spirit of the Amalgamated. Many times in my recent speaking tour, speaking to your unions, I marveled at this glowing spirit.

"But since coming to this country (Russia) I marvel no longer. It is the spirit of the Russian revolution, the spirit that will lead the workers to emancipation."

For the record, let it be noted that the $1,000,000 Russian-American Industrial Corporation stock flotation flopped, and so did the trading plan itself, even though Hillman gave $3,000 to help start a Communist paper in New York.

So Sidney's next step was to get onto the self-perpetuating board of directors of the American Fund for Public Service, set up by one Charles Garland, a parlor pink from Harvard, with money he had inherited from his father.

It has been used to finance the New York Daily Worker, official Communist trade paper, the New Masses, official Communist weekly trade journal, and such like things with Anti-Communist Sidney Hillman a happy member of the board of directors.

But after the flop of the Industrial Corporation above mentioned, Hillman fell out with the Commies—wonder why?—and had several bad public rows with them. In brief, he switched.

Then in 1937, he switched again when the Commies moved in on the C. I. O., of which Hillman was John L. Lewis' chief of staff at that time.

Such firm friends of the Red Society as Harry Bridges, Ben Gold, Joseph Curran, Michael Quill, Abraham Flaxer, and Morris Muster, were Anti-Communist Hillman's friends, too.

The time came when John L. Lewis was not so popular with the Communists as he had been. So Hillman pulled out on him, and in a while switched on the Communists, again, too, until he found out how things were going after the German invasion of Russia—which brought the Reds back into popularity with the New Dealers.

Eventually, in hot collaboration with New Dealers and/or Communists, Hillman last year put together the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. When the P. A. C. held its national conference in New York City on January 14, 1944, the American Labor Party bought space in the newspapers to say that Hillman had made a "complete surrender to the Communists."

But in spite of the public record from which all this comes, Sidney is no Communist. He says so.

Apparently, to be a real anti-Communist you have to hang out with Commies, trade and play with them for 20 years. Anyhow, that's how Sidney has worked it. He says.

Alaska and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as time passes, we are learning more of the great contribution Alaska has made and is making toward the winning of the war.

For military reasons it has not been permissible to disclose the activities of this strategic area as a part of our military operations. However, we now know that the great airway over the roof of the world connecting continental United States with Asia and European war zones was a most important factor in the progress toward victory we have made.

While in Alaska last year in connection with my services on the House Committee on Territories, I had occasion to meet Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, who at that time was aide-de-camp to General O'Connor, in charge of the Northwest Command.

Captain Neuberger has recently returned from the northland and wrote a most interesting article which appeared in the Washington Post on August 17, under the caption "The Federal Diary." Under leave heretofore granted, I include this article as a part of my remarks, as it contains much factual and interesting information with reference to Alaska. The article follows:

THE FEDERAL DIARY

(Jerry Kluttz is vacationing. The Federal Diary today is written by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, of the U. S. Army.)

As a recent arrival from the Arctic, after 20 months of military service in Alaska and the Canadian Northwest, I think I can truthfully say that I have experienced nearly the ultimate in contrasts.

Ours was the coldest post at which American soldiers were stationed. The thermometer slid to 68° below zero. For 3 weeks in a row it never rose above 50 below. Washington—well, Washington is about 145° warmer than the Yukon Valley. I told my friend, Constable Bolger, of the Royal Mounted, at Caribou Crossing, that in Washington on a summer's day you could lie under a tree and sweat enough moisture to float an Eskimo kayak. He still thinks I am a liar.

When Jack London was in the Klondike almost half a century ago, he deplored the dearth of white women. We shared his distress. Without going into details, it can be said that no such shortage is evident in our Nation's Capital.

Last June, in the tiny settlement of Whitehorse, on the upper reaches of the Yukon, I spent $11.30 during the entire month. My principal expenditure was a new toothbrush; price, 35 cents, at the Army post exchange. You can get rid of $11.30 in Washington between sundown and bedtime any evening and still not be close enough to the heavy spenders to communicate with them by smoke signals.

Tanana Crossing is Alaska's coldest spot. In 1913 the temperature there dropped to 76 below zero. We saw it touch nearly 70 below. That was cold enough for Scotch whisky to turn to slush. Shaving lotion froze solid. So did the antifreeze solution for bulldozer and truck radiators. The manufacturers of the antifreeze wouldn't credit this at first. They sent up a technical expert. He came to scoff but remained to believe—and freeze.

Whenever you feel like complaining about Washington's heat, remember that at the winter camps along Alaska Highway the food in an America soldier's mess kit will freeze while he is carrying it from the mess hall to his hut.

When it is 70 below zero, you wear fur mittens and you wear them on a lanyard. If you have to take off your mittens to strike a match for a fire, you don't dare lay them down. When 100° of frost prevail, fingers stiffen into immobility in less than 2 minutes. Many a cheechako (which is Thlingit Indian for newcomer) has lost his hands or died on the trail because he couldn't get back into his mittens.

We learned most about the cold and how to resist it from the Canadian Mounties. In the southern part of Canada the Mounties use cars and motorcycles and airplanes. They are mechanized and there the glamour is gone. The entire force has only 115 horses left. But in the Arctic they are still the dashing redcoats dramatized by James Oliver Curwood and a score of other writers.

Washington often figures in conversations north of the sixth parallel, and usually in wistful tones. We saw a good deal of Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska, who owns a home in Washington. One night in a chilly C. C. C. barracks at Whitehorse, he longed for an old-fashioned political bullfest with such friends as Attorney General Biddle, Marquis Childs, and Justice Douglas. And I remember the day at Kluane Lake, where not a white woman had been seen during 14 lonely months of wilderness duty, that a technical sergeant of engineers asked, "Is it really true, lieutenant, that there's four gals for every guy down there in Washington, D. C.?"

I nodded in mournful assent.

He thought for a moment. "Golly," he said, "things sure are distributed bad, ain't they, lieutenant?"

In Whitehorse our soldiers drank beer in the saloon which was the model for the famous Malemute Saloon in Robert W. Service's immortal Shooting of Dan McGrew. The first night in Whitehorse some of us rolled up on the floor of Service's old cabin in our sleeping bags. Service is in Vancouver, British Columbia. An old man now, he told us he had no desire to return to the wilderness scenes where, as a young goldweigher in 1898, he wrote the poems which were to make him world famous.

How many of us will want to return to Alaska after the war? In a few weeks here in Washington I have met many officers who are ready to go back now. Why? Who can account for the perversity of the human spirit? In the Arctic we longed for the girls, the good food, the creature comforts, the bright sunshine of Washington. Now, in Washington we yearn for the lofty peaks, the white silences, the sizzling moose steaks, the frozen rivers of Alaska.

The old Indian trapper at Burwash Landing said it all: "Strange are the ways of the white man."

Voting by Servicemen From New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dewey's Costly Victory Over New York Soldiers," published in the Philadelphia Record of August 25, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEWEY'S COSTLY VICTORY OVER NEW YORK'S SOLDIERS

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has won his first campaign victory—over the servicemen of his own State.

The Nation's soldier vote machinery is getting under way. Its operation so far makes quite clear that Dewey has accomplished what he set out to do with his own "soldier-vote law":

Prevent most servicemen of New York State from voting in November.

New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania all have Republican administrations. New Jersey and Pennsylvania have model soldier vote laws. New York has the Dewey law.

Under the Pennsylvania and New Jersey laws every serviceman eligible to vote gets a ballot. No strings. No red tape.

Under the Dewey law every New York State serviceman must first send in an application for a ballot. Then the application must be "screened" by election boards for errors and insufficient information. Then, if approved, the soldier will be sent a ballot. If he gets the ballot in time to return it to New York 4 days before election, his vote will count. Otherwise it won't.

Now see the picture to date:

New Jersey already has mailed out ballots to its 308,000 eligible servicemen.

Pennsylvania has mailed, or is in process of mailing, ballots to its 563,000 eligible servicemen.

New York State, so far, has not mailed out a single ballot. Of its 1,000,000 eligible servicemen, only 212,465 so far have been able even to apply for ballots.

The top estimate of applications by the deadline is 400,000. And how many of those applications will be disqualified in the "screening" process time alone can tell.

It takes no crystal ball to see what's ahead.

In New Jersey and Pennsylvania virtually every serviceman will have a chance to vote.

In New York considerably less than half of its servicemen will apply for a ballot, let alone vote.

Bear in mind that it was Governor Dewey himself who insisted on this law which is going to disfranchise from 60 to 75 percent of New York State's G. I. voters.

Many Republicans opposed it. They felt, as did Republicans in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, that it was shoddy politics to cheat soldiers of their votes, good politics to see they got a chance to vote. Those opposing Dewey on this issue realized that every serviceman's family is going to resent any effort by any political group to play politics with the serviceman's vote.

But Dewey had his way. He got his law. Now he's won his point.

Victories of this kind in August do not, however, portend victory in November.

A candidate whose hope for winning depends on keeping people away from the polls is not a candidate to command the respect of the vast majority of independent voters who think for themselves—the voters who are going to decide this election.

Perhaps Governor Dewey senses this after looking at the current Gallup poll. Fortune poll, and Bulletin poll in Philadelphia—all forecasting a Roosevelt triumph.

Address by Hon. Robert F. Wagner, of New York, Before New York State Federation of Labor Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the New York State Federation of Labor Convention at Syracuse, N. Y., on August 22, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, during the 40 years that I have been in public service—years of war and peace, depression and prosperity—I have known the record of the New York State Federation of Labor. And you have known mine.

This is not an occasion for you to express your opinion of my record. I am here today to pay tribute to yours.

Whenever I hear those dangerous voices, casting aspersions on labor's patriotism in time of war, I answer them by citing the record of the New York State Federation of Labor.

Whenever I hear those foolish voices, which fail to recognize that labor is a sane and constructive influence in our economy, a conservative influence in the true sense, I answer them by citing the record of the New York State Federation of Labor.

Whenever I hear those malicious voices, seeking for personal or partisan gain to make the American people believe that labor's interest is a selfish or narrow one, I answer them by citing the record of the New York State Federation of Labor.

When I entered the State legislature as an assemblyman in 1905, I did not represent any one group or section of the people of my district. I was deeply imbued then—even as I am today—with the American concept that a lawmaker should follow his own conscience and attempt to serve the people as a whole. If labor and I have seen eye to eye on so many issues through all these years; if we have made common cause on so many occasions, it is only because I have been convinced that labor has fought for decent things, for progressive measures, for forward-looking policies.

Neither you nor I have always been right. We have both made mistakes. But over the long pull, I have discovered that what you have stood for has been good for America. And that is why I have stood with you.

We could not have made the gains of the past 40 years alone. We have needed the help—and we have received the help—of people in all walks of life, who have wanted to improve the conditions of the average citizen. But nonetheless, laboring men and women, in State and Nation, have been the nucleus for the forces of progress.

My own experience proves this to be a fact. Between 1911 and 1915, I was chairman of the now historic factory commission, here in the State of New York. The investigations, conducted by this commission, laid the foundation for the whole code of enlightened social legislation which became a beacon light to the world. This beacon light could never have been kindled, were it not for your aid.

In 1913, I proposed a State industrial board, to regulate the working conditions and to safeguard the lives of men and women in industry. This proposal was the springboard from which we jumped to the present State industrial commission act. This instrumentality for focusing attention upon human rights could not have been created without your assistance.

In 1913, the Workmen's Compensation Act, upon which I had worked during 4 years, became law and withstood the test of the courts. This pioneer of social-security legislation was your achievement no less than mine.

In a reminiscent mood recently, I was looking through the labor laws of this State and traced the genesis of many of them back to bills which I initiated during my years in the State legislature. Some of the measures which I sponsored included the earliest minimum-wage laws, the earliest successful efforts to keep children out of factories and away from dangerous machinery, to prevent night work by women in factories, to declare that labor is not a commodity of commerce, to limit the use of the injunction in labor disputes, and to protect peaceful picketing. These things which you and I accomplished in those early days may not seem much in view of all that has happened since until we remember that the acorn is always smaller than the tree.

We had to contend in those early days, it is true, with the people who said that this humane code would ruin our industries, would set up a bureaucracy, would impair our credit. But every one of these laws proved to be a stepping stone to the unmatched prosperity and wealth and leadership of the Empire State. Our business system thrived and benefited by the standards that we set.

In 1919 I left the New York State Senate and became a judge. During 8 years on the bench I watched with concern and then with alarm the change that was taking place in America. The end of the last World War had brought a dreadful reaction in its wake. We got caught up in a boom and mistook it for prosperity. Our industrial system became more productive, but we neglected to distribute its benefits wisely. We watched the stock market go up, but we were blind to the fact that unemployment was going up at the same time. In our thinking we forgot the human element. At home and abroad we lost the peace just as surely as we had won the war.

When I entered the United States Senate in 1927, I carried with me the experience which you and I had gained together. And how that experience was needed. Unemployment was going up, up, up. Our capacity to deal with it intelligently was going down, down, down.

The first important task was to get the facts—and toward that end I initiated and obtained action on a bill for a comprehensive count of the unemployed. The revelations of this count made it impossible to ignore any longer the millions of hunger-driven and fear-haunted men and women being pressed toward demoralization by the hopelessness of their plight.

The next step was my sponsorship of an unemployment stabilization board, of various relief and construction acts, and of broad programs of public works—with which you are all familiar—to revive business and to provide employment.

By 1934 these lifesaving measures had become rounded into a systematic and comprehensive program, which was equally beneficial to industry, agriculture, and labor.

Between then and the commencement of the present war we were attaining a reasonable measure of sound prosperity. This afforded me an opportunity to sponsor certain measures, to make our economic security and our economic freedom keep pace with our economic wealth.

I introduced and guided to enactment the present Social Security Act—with its Nation-wide provisions for unemployment insurance, old-age insurance and pensions, and aid for dependent children and for public health.

I initiated, and the Congress approved, various housing measures, to make it possible for middle-income groups to own their homes on better terms and at lower costs—along with measures for slum clearance and low-rent housing.

I sponsored the Railroad Retirement Act for transportation workers.

After a terrific struggle, and with your unstinting aid, the National Labor Relations Act—generally called the Wagner Act—was enacted. This act transformed the right to organize and bargain collectively from a hollow promise to a living reality.

Before the war broke out, I commenced the fight for the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. This bill is intended to liberalize the old-age insurance system, to improve unemployment insurance and the whole system of public employment offices, to establish social-security rights for men and women in the armed services adjusted to their needs, and to establish a national system of health insurance.

You know all about the efforts to defeat health insurance. The opposition has employed every trick and device that was used against workmen's compensation 30 years ago. They have resorted to misrepresentation, fear, and threat. But we shall persist and push forward until adequate medical care at a cost within his means, becomes the birthright of every American—to the great mutual benefit of the patient and the doctor.

The war has held in suspension, by common consent, some of the programs conceived in peace. But as victory draws near, we must not dwarf or minimize the tremendous economic problems that face us in the immediate months and years ahead.

I hope that you will bear with me, while I cite the stark reality of a few figures.

We have now appropriated for war purposes about $350,000,000,000, or about nine times our whole national income during the last year of the depression. We are now spending money on the war at the rate of more than $90,000,000,000 a year, or more than our total national income in the peak year of prosperity before the depression. This will give you some idea of the impact upon our economy when war spending tapers off or stops.

Largely because of the war program, our national income, which was less than $40,000,000,000 in 1932, and about $78,000,000,000 in 1940, was more than $145,000,000,000 in 1943 and will probably approach $155,000,000,000 in 1944. Employment in the working population and the armed forces, which stood at about 48,000,000 in the middle of 1940 has now risen to about 65,000,000.

What do these figures mean? They mean that, if we take no preventive steps, our annual national income after the war could fall off by as much as $50,000,000,000. They mean that unemployment could increase by ten to twenty million, not counting those women and minors in war industry who may not continue at work after the war. These figures present the possibility—if we do not act realistically to prevent it—of a depression such as this country has never seen before.

That is the dark side of the picture. But there is a bright side—and we can make the bright side come true. These same figures of high production and high employment during the war, show what America can do when it puts its shoulder to the wheel and organizes its vast resources effectively. These figures show that we can eliminate poverty and have higher standards of living than ever before. We can have a national income at least 50 percent higher than it was in 1929, with all that this means for the health, prosperity, and welfare of 140,000,000 people.

We are now, today, at the crossroads of decision on this momentous issue. Shall we go backward or forward? Shall we face peril or prosperity after the war, for ourselves and for the boys and girls who will be coming back with the laurels of victory?

My friends, this problem cannot be solved by kissing the flag, or by quoting the Constitution, or by uttering confident platitudes about faith in the future of America. The old wishing ring has been tried before, and it has never worked. What a pity it is, after all our tragic experience in the past, that there should be some who still rub the wishing ring and close their eyes.

The problems of demobilization, of reconversion, of post-war adjustment, and of the peace years thereafter, will be bigger so-

cial and economic problems than we have ever had before. We cannot solve these bigger problems by having narrower minds, shorter vision, or colder hearts. There is a kind of faith that we must have, but it must be faith in action—faith in the realization that the history of America has always been a history of growth—and that growth always means bigger tasks accompanied by a bigger capacity to meet them successfully.

Several years ago I introduced in the Senate the first bill for comprehensive post-war planning. During the present session I have worked for the indispensable requirements for satisfactory post-war legislation—the kind of program outlined in the Kilgore-Murray bill. On this issue, we have neither won nor lost—we have just begun to fight.

Such legislation should establish permanent machinery to deal with post-war problems.

It should establish a permanent policy board, including representation of labor, industry, agriculture, and the consumer.

It should set up and maintain some device for a continuing inventory of employment and business conditions. There should be held in readiness, for immediate commencement where needed, such programs of encouragement to enterprise, public works, housing, and social security benefits as may be necessary to maintain the highest possible levels of employment;

It should establish a retraining and reemployment system, to concentrate upon the placement of returning servicemen and war workers. Along with this, it should provide free vocational training for veterans, and it should provide adequate maintenance during this period of training for those who need it;

It should liberalize and improve the whole system of unemployment benefits;

It should organize all these efforts under a single top direction, to secure maximum efficiency of operations and speed of decision.

You know as well as I do that the Congress has not yet passed legislation measuring up to these standards. No one has a greater right or duty than you have, to insist that such legislation shall be passed.

The arguments against this legislation are ghost-like apparitions of the arguments against all those measures which brought us out of the depression 10 years ago, against the very philosophy of government which enables us to act. Now as before we hear the argument of "States' rights," presented in one form or another. I yield to no one in my respect for that degree of State sovereignty which our Federal system contemplates. But I am not aware of any time when social or economic legislation enacted in Washington invaded any right or privilege of any State in the Union. This legislation was enacted because the States were the first to realize that large-scale industry knows no State lines, that unemployment knows no State lines, that neither prosperity nor depression stops at State boundaries, and that America's economic destiny is to perish as a divided nation or to live as a united nation.

Imagine our fate if, when the Japs bombed Pearl Harbor, the President had asked the Governors of the 48 States to handle plans for national defense, and to organize 48 armies to win the war. What would have happened to our war production if, instead of creating the War Production Board to marshal our resources, we had turned the job over entirely to a little W. P. B. in each State capital?

Are we not as determined to win the peace as we are to win the war? The States alone were completely helpless to provide jobs for any of the 15,000,000 who were unemployed in 1932. How are the States alone going to provide jobs for the 15,000,000 men and women who will be demobilized by our armed forces when victory comes? Let me not be misunderstood. We need the cooperation of the States and the communities, of industry, and of individuals—but we need a strong and responsive Federal Government as well.

The issue of permanent peace also turns on this question: For how can we take the leadership toward international security unless we demonstrate our capacity to provide security at home? And how can we have vision enough to see the problems of the world as a whole unless we have vision enough to see the problems of our own Nation as a whole?

The plain truth is that the overworked State rights argument is a mask to hide the true designs of those who want to cripple or contract all the things that we have worked for, over the long, hard years. The argument has both an isolationist and a reactionary flavor.

We shall not permit reaction to succeed. Too much hangs in the balance—all the work that we have done, the whole future of America, the lives and welfare of our children and their children after them.

Men and women of the New York State Federation of Labor, hew to the line that you have always set, and I promise to be by your side as long as my strength remains.

Address by Hon. Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania, Before United Automobile Workers' Union, Bristol, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered yesterday at Green Gardens, Bristol, Pa., before Local Union No. 130, United Automobile Workers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here at Green Gardens, just across the road from Republican Joe Grundy's high tariff estate, is a good place for us New Dealers to open fire. We can see the whites of their eyes, so let 'em have it.

My interest in labor goes back to my boyhood when I saw miners and their families driven out of Possum Hollow, in Sewickley Township, and forced to camp out on the bar in the river because nobody dared risk the anger of the coal barons by leasing them land on which to erect their flimsy tents. When I was in my teens I saw Henry C. Frick crush the Knights of Labor in the Connellsville coke region and smash the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers in the Homestead strike. Those were the days when the lords of coal and steel ruled this State through their coal and iron police, their judges, and their government at Harrisburg. It was worth a workman's life to have it known he was trying to organize labor in western Pennsylvania. He was put on the black list and that meant starvation for himself and his family.

During the years that followed I fought, as well as I could, for liberal leaders and liberal principles. My liberalism did not begin with Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It began with my father and his friends. It matured under William Jennings Bryan. It became effective under Woodrow Wilson, with whom I had studied at Princeton University. Yet I was to live to see Wilson's great life work and America's victory in the First World War wrecked by the same Henry C. Frick who had crushed labor in the 1890's, and who had never forgiven Wilson for the passage of the Adamson law which established the 8-hour day for railroad workers. Frick, combined with another reactionary Pennsylvania Republican, Senator Knox, who was Frick's personal attorney, with Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, and Senator Penrose, to defeat the Treaty of Versailles and destroy the League of Nations.

We all know today what that foul deed has meant. Wilson foresaw what would happen—even to the flying bombs which are today pounding the city of London—and he warned us. In his speech at Denver, Colo., on September 25, 1919, President Wilson issued this solemn prophecy which has cruelly come true in every detail:

"Stop for a moment to think about the next war, if there should be one. I do not hesitate to say that the war we have just been through, though it was shot through with terror of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we should have to face next time. There were destructive gases, there were methods of explosive destruction unheard of even during this war, which were just ready for use when the war ended—great projectiles that guided themselves and, shot into the heavens, went for a hundred miles and more and then burst tons of explosives upon helpless cities, something to which the guns with which the Germans bombarded Paris from a distance were not comparable. What the Germans used were toys as compared with what would be used in the next war." That was Woodrow Wilson's prophecy.

But Frick and the high-tariff reactionary Republicans were willing to risk that. Today your husbands, brothers, and sons are paying the cost of these men's guilty gamble in blood. Why—because of something else that Wilson believed in—labor. In the same speech Wilson said:

"There is another matter which I am sure will interest a great many in sound of my voice. If we do not have this treaty of peace, labor will continue to be regarded, not as it ought to be regarded, a human function, but as a purchasable commodity throughout the world. There is inserted in this great treaty a magna carta of labor."

That is the last thing these reactionary Republicans wanted—and the last thing they want today. They elected their man Harding and the Ohio gang. They had their high tariff. The result was economic chaos and social catastrophe when Joe Grundy, of Pennsylvania, put over the Smoot-Hawley high-tariff law which Herbert Hoover signed, despite the protest of more than 1,000 American economists on the ground that it would destroy American prosperity and create mass unemployment.

Now we are back in the same war, with the same sort of reactionary Republicans trying to sneak back into power by default, with the soldiers not allowed to vote, with industrial labor shifted all over the country in new war industries, with another "return to normalcy"—a snap-back to isolation, with another panic and another war already in the making as the price we, the people, would have to pay for the privilege of having an ersatz Hoover and streamlined Harding in the White House.

There is only one thing we can do about it, and that is not to let it happen. It must not happen and it will not happen if labor lives up to its rights and its responsibilities.

The reactionary, high-tariff Republicans are moving heaven and earth to stop labor from defending its rights and interests. Just now they are making a great fuss over the

simple proposal to obtain a dollar contribution from every member of organized labor as a fund with which to support Roosevelt and TRUMAN. They believe that we have forgotten how in 1936 members of the du Pont family alone contributed $600,000 to the Republican campaign fund. They believe that we have forgotten how in 1940 members of the Pew family acknowledged contributions of $380,000 to the Republican campaign fund. What is the difference between a few millionaires contributing $600,000 and 600,000 men contributing a dollar apiece? What is the difference between Joe Pew's family giving $380,000 and 380,000 workmen chipping in a dollar apiece? There have been dark charges that the labor groups which favor Roosevelt and TRUMAN may raise as much as $5,000,000. To the Republicans, this is almost chicken feed.

Some years ago, when the late Charles Schwab, of Bethlehem Steel was down in Washington seeing me on some business he had with the Government, he told me that when Boies Penrose was Senator from Pennsylvania, Penrose, sent for him from time to time. Whenever Penrose called, Schwab dropped everything and hastened to Washington for his orders. Schwab told me that Penrose never wanted less than a quarter of a million dollars and that in one Presidential election Penrose has told him to go out and raise a fund of $6,000,000 for the Republican Party. Schwab raised that amount of money, according to his own statement.

And here's one thing more, while I'm on the subject of Penrose. At the end of the last war, Wilson's administration made an honest effort to taper off war contracts so that labor would not be sacrificed to war profits and so as to ease the reemployment of returning veterans. This was not what the Republican reactionaries wanted. Acting on Government assurances, the Eddystone Rifle Plant in this State promised its workers in December 1918, that none would be laid off until July; but after Boies Penrose publicly lashed the Wilson administration for letting Eddystone run to produce what Penrose called "post-war nonessentials," the Contract Board canceled all contracts with that factory as of January 11, 1919, and thousands of deceived workers jammed the cashier's windows for their last pay checks. Cutting pay rolls still seems to many Republicans the road to what they call prosperity.

Here, however, is where you have your power and your chance to act. You know that a Republican victory would sweep away any and every safeguard which you have won during the last 12 years. Your hours of labor, your rates of pay, your very right to organize would go down like a house of cards before the avalanche of graft and greed, of reaction and revenge.

So I tell you very frankly that your only assurance of a decent and peaceful future lies on the road to political action. Organize, organize, organize, register, register, register, vote, vote, vote. Vote for your friends and against your enemies. Make your votes count and see that your votes are counted.

Your right to do this is unquestioned. Your right to contribute money for that purpose is unquestioned. So long as this is in any way a free country, no man, no group, no party can take away from you the basic American right—the right of free association and united action for any legitimate purpose.

As most of you know, I led the fight at the National Democratic Convention for the renomination of HENRY AGARD WALLACE, as Vice President of the United States. I lost that fight. HENRY WALLACE is a great liberal, a great American, and a leader with a great future. But if he could not be renominated, I am glad that the convention chose HARRY TRUMAN, of Missouri, to be President Roosevelt's running mate. I have sat beside HARRY TRUMAN in the United States Senate for the last 9 years, and we have always voted together on every issue affecting the rights and dignity of labor and the rights and dignity of our service men and women. The cause of liberalism and the cause of labor—and they are the same cause—will be in safe hands with President Roosevelt and Vice President TRUMAN. We can win with Roosevelt and TRUMAN, and we will win with them in November and thus make it possible for America to win the peace after America has won the war.

Speaking as a lifelong and loyal member of the Democratic Party, the Democratic Party must and will take labor into partnership throughout the Nation. Too many old-line politicians regard labor as mere political cannon fodder, to be marched to the polls on election day and butchered on every roll call in the Congress of the United States. I call for a full, fair, and free partnership between all of labor—organized and unorganized—and the Democratic Party, a party which is Nation-wide and not the property of any sectional group. That is what has begun to happen, even in the South, where labor has recently won important elections and removed from the national scene certain elderly or loud-mouthed politicians who curried favor with the northern absentee owners of southern wealth by labor baiting and abusive investigations. "Cotton Ed" SMITH, of South Carolina, will no longer be with us in Washington, and neither will JOE STARNES, of Alabama, or MARTIN DIES, of Texas. But LISTER HILL, of Alabama, is coming back and so is CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, after battles in which floods of Republican money were unable to halt the march of labor and of liberalism in the new South.

This is possible because labor is organizing politically and is taking the road of political action nationally. The fight will not be over quickly, nor will it be easy. The Republican Party still contains plenty of men like Sewell Avery, of Montgomery Ward, who hate labor, and plenty of men like Joe Grundy, over there, who wish to plunge us into high-tariff bankruptcy. The party that stole the election of 1876 from Tilden and gave it to Hayes, the party that counted out Bryan in the election of 1896, the party that gave us Harding and the Ohio gang in 1920, is still doing business at the same old stand and will stop at nothing to win the election.

So again I say to you: Organize, organize, organize; register, register, register; vote, vote, vote!

Vote for your friends and against your enemies. Make your votes count and see that your votes are counted.

Fourth of July Address by Hon. Francis Maloney, of Connecticut, at Faneuil Hall, Boston

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Faneuil Hall in Boston, Mass., on July 4, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No son of New England could remain unmoved after an invitation to join in the commemorative ceremonies at this noble shrine of New England's decisive role in the struggle for American liberty. No American could be other than thrilled by the opportunity to join that long line of distinguished speakers who have annually come upon this rostrum since before the birth of the republic. No son of Connecticut could conceal his pride for the privilege to speak in Faneuil Hall.

This is the place where the courageous spokesmen of our forefathers sounded the keynote of a new nation. This is the tribune from which stanch patriots dared to utter the challenge of free men in a new world. Here in this very hall the men of New England gathered to hear the words, and to learn the principles of freedom, for which they were prepared to fight and to die. We from the outer parts of New England envy the citizens of Boston in their possession of the historic places which mean so much to all Americans. A city is indeed fair, which holds within its precincts the sacred monuments of a nation's glory. But we would remind you that these treasures of our history belong in a larger sense to all New Englanders, and, indeed, to all Americans. The shots from the muskets at Lexington and Concord may have been "heard round the world," but they were heard first by the men of New England. From Connecticut, from Rhode Island, from the upper regions of New England's mountains, as well as from the farms of Massachusetts, sturdy patriots assembled on the fields of Cambridge, and in their wake, came, no less sturdy and no less courageous, the sons of New York, New Jersey, Virginia, and the others of the Thirteen Colonies. Thus, on the banks of the River Charles, in the old Colony, and in New England, was the first American Army formed, and a common struggle joined, out of which was born the Republic we celebrate today. And so, I say to you that in preserving and cherishing these places where our history was made the citizens of Boston and of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts are in fact custodians for all the people of America.

I have referred to the gathering of patriots in Cambridge in 1775, out of which the first American Army came into being. Consider for a moment what that army was, and compare it with the mighty legions of America today. In the beginning it consisted of no more than a few thousand men, who literally had left their plows in the field and their shops unclosed, to bring aid to the embattled men of Massachusetts. They were untrained and unorganized. They had neither uniforms nor equipment save what each patriot himself could supply. They lingered for months without plan or strategy, save the undying spirit to fight for freedom.

Yet, out of that motley array was molded under the genius of Washington and his able officers, many of them from New England, an army which was able to wage 7 years of relentless war, to the final victory at Yorktown. What was the key to that miracle? Certainly it was not previous training, or a warlike disposition of the settlers in America. They were men of peace. They braved the hardships of a new and unexplored land in search of peace. They were men of peaceful pursuits. Their muskets were weapons for home defense and implements for securing food from the forests. How, then, could they have been transformed into a disciplined military organization capable of outmaneuvering, outmarching, and outfighting the best trained professional soldiers of Europe?

There is only one answer. The first American Army, established on the fields of Cambridge, Mass., like the great American Army of today, was the product of the American spirit. Then, as now, it was an army of citizens; then, as now, it was an army of freemen; then, as now, it was an army of men who knew why they fought, and who knew the awful consequences if they failed. It was their resolute purpose to maintain their new country as a free country that compelled them to go about the business of creating an army and waging victorious war.

That same continental army marches on today with the millions of Americans in Europe and in Asia and through the enemy-infested islands of the Pacific. Those who then sailed the seas with Barry and Jones sail again with the lads of our Navy and Coast Guard on all of the perilous seven seas. New weapons are at hand. The scale of warfare is broader and the fields of battle are more far flung, but it is the same American spirit, the same will to win, and the same understanding of what is at stake that gives to our men in battle today the strength and the courage to vanquish the hordes of Nazis and Japs who until lately believed themselves unconquerable.

It is well, on this day of independence, that we celebrate the immortal quality of this spirit of America. It is well, too, that we whose racial heritage may not reach back to the colonial days on this side of the water join in that celebration. We also are partakers of the American spirit. We love the rocks and rills of this, our country, because we, too, have sought and found our freedom here. Our sons fight for that freedom with the same purpose and the same resolve as the direct descendants of the minutemen of the old colony.

The Yankee Division today is no less patriotic, no less American, no less dedicated to a final victory for freedom in this great country, than was the Continenal Army that camped on the Charles in 1775.

It is right, therefore, that we pay tribute not only to the patriots of the Revolution, who in this setting struck the first blow for America, but also to our own sons, the flesh and blood of this generation, who fight all over the world for the same free country.

The Continental Army achieved its first great victory in the liberation of Boston. The American Army today is also the liberator of cities. The world was amazed when the proud regiments of George the Third evacuated this prize port of the New World, rather than endure a siege laid by the farmers of New England. The world today is equally thrilled by the liberation of Rome—the first city of all Christendom—through the triumphant marches of an American Army in Italy.

It must have been with fervent prayers of thanksgiving that the people of the Eternal City watched the banners of the New World, many of them carried by Italian-American doughboys, as they passed through the historic arches of that ancient citadel. The liberation of Rome by American troops this year means what the winning of Boston meant in the Revolution. It means that American freedom is on the march, carrying with it the blessings of liberty. It means that other great cities now in the hands of agressors shall also fall. It means that victory and peace for all liberty-loving peoples are near at hand.

But Independence Day is not a day for the celebration only of victories in battle. On this day in 1776 our forefathers, while in the midst of battle, proclaimed to the world the basic principles of political freedom as conceived by men who had undertaken to hew a new nation out of the forests of an unexplored continent. The Declaration of Independence was an inevitable proclamation because it gave expression to the very hearts of the colonists. It was also a timely document, because while war was still waged and the outcome still in doubt it gave direction and inspiration to the men on the battle line. They knew why they fought, but they needed to know that all the people of the Colonies were dedicated to the same high purpose.

And so when the couriers galloped away from Philadelphia bringing news to all the Colonies, North and South, of the final, irrevocable, and unanimous decision that the fight was for a new nation—based upon the eternal principles of freedom—national unity in the New World was born. In this respect and at this hour we present-day Americans might well give renewed strength to our men in arms by evidence of a greater unity here behind the lines.

Today we still hold firmly to the doctrines of that eighteenth century declaration. As our forefathers arraigned George the Third for his indefensible acts of aggression in America—so do we charge our enemies with crimes against freedom. As our forefathers—for the right to be self-governed, and free from the aggression of tyrants—pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honors, so do we, today, dedicate all that we are, and all that we have, for triumph of the just cause we defend.

Total war is thought to be a new concept. No one who reads the Declaration of Independence, and who knows of the unqualified and unanimous support which that declaration received from the patriots in every colony, can doubt that total war, total effort, and total sacrifice, was pledged by the people of America as they created and sought to defend a new nation on this continent.

Today the world marvels at the speed, the efficiency, and the success with which the United States has been mobilized and transformed into the most powerful war machine on earth. But I say to you, that the totality of our war effort today is no more remarkable than the totality of the war effort of those patriots who, surrounded by the institutions, the garrisons, and the vested interests of a despotic royal system, dared to rebel and to fight up and down this Atlantic seaboard until victory was theirs.

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, these are the inalienable God-given rights for which this Nation was made and for which it still fights. When we recite this hallowed phrase we dwell most often upon liberty, and too little upon pursuit of happiness. We are ever vigilent for the protection of that institutional liberty which is based upon a democratic form of government. Let us not be forgetful of the God-given right to pursue happiness under any form of government.

Happiness as visualized by the authors of the Declaration was that sublime state in which individuals would be at peace with their God and at peace with their neighbors. It did not imply reckless mirth, or license on any of the outward signs of earthly pleasure. Men may know happiness in hardship, privation and suffering, if they are good and charitable men, and true sons of God.

But oppression by a tyrant is the denial of the right to happiness, because it is a challenge to the dignity of one who is created in the image of God—and that, in essence, was the charge made against George the Third.

If we are true to the Declaration of Independence, we are obliged, as patriotic Americans, to insist upon the observance of the inalienable rights of man from all quarters—both within and without our country. And if we fight today to preserve a system of free government that is based upon the dignity of man, as we do, we must be careful that our own actions, within our own country, are consistent with our war aims.

It is lamentable indeed, in this hour of great national crisis, that we should have to admit that the pursuit of happiness seems threatened even within our borders. While we send our sons beyond the seas, to wage war against the aggressor of mankind, we permit to thrive among our own citizenry the cancerous growth of intolerance. While we proclaim to the world our national adherence to the inalienable rights of man, and our irrevocable dedication to the civil and religious guarantees of our own American constitution, we are blind to the insidious spread of racial and religious persecutions—even in neighborhoods where the initial battles for American freedom were fought.

No nation, however strong, however clothed with the outword symbol of liberty, can survive the internal persecution of its own citizens—even though the persecution be aimed at a small minority. The greatness of America might quickly be dissolved if this became a land where the deserving humble people of other parts of the world might no longer find protection. The proud banner of our Republic will be forever sullied if we allow rampant intolerance to strike down defenseless persons because of their race or creed.

There are those of us who still believe that the blessings which have been showered upon this land flow from a God who gives His grace to those who observe the basic virtues of good men. By and large the American people have been a charitable people. In the past, waves of ignorance and intolerance have beaten in vain against the strong and open heart of America. Let us in this hour, by our individual and collective rededication to the principles of our Declaration of Independence, resolve that the heart of America shall once more take unto her protection and care all those of our fellow citizens who are threatened with the cursed affliction of persecution.

It was 168 years ago today that a group of heroic Americans affixed their names to the Declaration of Independence. Among the charges which they made against George the Third was that he had excited domestic insurrection among the colonists. The signers representing the Massachusetts Bay Colony were Samuel and John Adams and Robert Treat Paine and Elbridge Gerry. They were not unmindful of the dangers to follow. They knew, oh so well, the consequences of failure. They were, as well, confident in "the protection of Divine Providence," as they pledged to each other their "lives, * * * fortunes, and [their] sacred honor."

By this great declaration they set forth on a great adventure—an adventure resulting finally in the establishment of the richest and most powerful nation in the world. Down through the years since that time, from generation to generation, has come the heritage which is now in our hands—and which is now being defended by our sons—our sons who are fighting on land and sea, and under the sea and in the air, all over the world. Largely through them we shall preserve the heritage, untarnished, for those generations yet to come.

Many of our sons will die—as men died in this neighborhood a long time ago—and to fully keep faith with them we must this time be certain of the role in which we are cast. They have met the enemy. They have suffered the weight and fullness of his brutality. They have seen the whites of his eyes and have felt his steel, and they now know, as we do, that in God's good time victory on the battlefield will be ours. When that victory comes—and God speed the day—and our enemies lay down their arms, our task is not yet finished. We must insist, under God's further guidance, upon a peace that will be lasting. We must stay at that task, and it may be a difficult task, until confident that tyrants cannot again rise to torment and torture men and nations.

The world leadership established by the courage and the vision and the blood of the

founders must be maintained and exercised. We must renew our love for our neighbor, and our confidence in each other here at home.

Those who lighted the flame so many years ago, just yonder at Concord Bridge, showed us the way, and we must keep that torch aglow and held so high as to give light to the world.

On occasions during the passing years there have been mistakes, but there must not be a mistake this time.

Our loyal legions press forward, building battle monuments all over the globe—monuments in the form of restored freedom and peace—and we here at home, whose hearts beat with theirs, ask God's help as we seek to make certain that that peace shall endure.

Investigation of Record of Hon. Harry S. Truman, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I presume that every Senator is more or less familiar with the record made by Mr. Maurice Milligan, United States district attorney in Missouri. Mr. Milligan is the United States district attorney who successfully prosecuted the cases against the so-called Pendergast machine. Recently I learned that in response to an inquiry from a newspaperman, Mr. Milligan had written a letter concerning our colleague the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I heard about it and wrote to Mr. Milligan asking if it were true that he had so responded to this inquiry from a newspaperman. I suggested that if it were true, I should like to have a copy of the letter.

Today I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Milligan in reply to my question. I ask unanimous consent that that part of the letter which refers to the investigation and record of the Senator from Missouri in this connection be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 23, 1944.

Senator CARL A. HATCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 15, 1944, in regard to a letter or written statement that I made to a newspaperman concerning Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri.

My delay in answering was due to the fact that I was out of the city when your letter arrived and have only returned today.

In an interview with Mr. Ray Murphy, of Washington, D. C., in answer to an inquiry concerning Senator TRUMAN, I made the following statement in writing:

"JULY 27, 1944.

"DEAR SIR: In the long series of investigations conducted by my office involving vote frauds and other matters of corruption in Kansas City, the finger of suspicion was never at any time pointed in the direction of Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN.

"His record as a citizen and as a public official is above reproach."

MAURICE M. MILLIGAN,
United States Attorney.

An Independent R. E. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at the third annual convention of the Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives at Springfield, Ill., on August 17, 1944, by Harry Slattery, the Administrator of the R. E. A., and also an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of August 21, 1944, entitled "For an Independent R. E. A."

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the first public address I have made to an R. E. A. audience since the affairs of R. E. A. and of the national association came under review by the Senate of the United States.

I have deliberately kept silent and not because I had nothing to say. I have had, and very definite and positive things. But I have considered it wise, out of respect for the Senate investigation, and in consideration of the whole situation, to hold my tongue until an appropriate time arrived. I am sure you will appreciate that this has not been an easy thing for an Irishman to do, in the light of what has taken place. Now, however, I feel that I am free, and it is time that I should speak.

I am glad to be here for several reasons. It is always an encouragement to me to meet face to face men and women who take R. E. A. seriously, and so demonstrate that they realize the deep meaning of our movement for the restoration of American agriculture to its proper place in the national economy, and therefore for the security of the Nation. Without flattery, I regard Illinois as one of the leaders among the States in this rural electrification crusade. That judgment rests upon personal observation, and from scanning the cold figures of the statistical tables. You have made active use of the opportunity R. E. A. offered to bring to the farm homes the blessings of electricity, which Edison said flowed from the hand of God.

It was considerate of your chairman, in extending an invitation to address your third annual convention, to permit me to select my own subject. It is related directly to the most prominent topic of your meeting—post-war planning and post-war execution. As to that subject, you may remember that I early had a live interest. In October 1942 I appointed the first R. E. A. committee to consider post-war problems and have given much attention to it since. I congratulate you upon your interest in this matter, and I am glad that Senator LUCAS, who is here tonight, and other Senators and Congressmen on both sides of the political party fence are likewise taking a keen interest.

I am sincere in saying that the topic I have chosen to present to you, the independence of R. E. A. is, in my judgment, of crucial importance to the welfare of this great agency, not only for this fall, or for the immediate post-war period, but for the next 25 years, at least, by which time or before, you will have discharged your obligation to Uncle Sam and be on your own.

As to the text for this talk, I desire to read to you and refresh your memories concerning the ninth section of the R. E. A. Act of 1936.

"SEC. 9. This act shall be administered entirely on a nonpartisan basis, and in the appointment of officials, the selection of employees, and in the promotion of any such officials or employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency. If the Administrator herein provided for is found by the President of the United States to be guilty of a violation of this section, he shall be removed from office by the President, and any appointee or selection of officials or employees made by the Administrator who is found guilty of a violation of this act shall be removed by the Administrator."

This language, written by Senator Norris, and inserted in the Norris-Rayburn Act, was taken verbatim from the T. V. A. Act of 1933, and the whole Nation knows that its observance has been one of the greatest factors in making T. V. A. the success that it is today—a success of which all Americans are proud.

The prohibition this section contains rests upon a fundamental principle which is emphatically approved as sound and necessary by a vast majority of the superintendents, managers, directors, and consumer members of our eight-hundred-and-odd R. E. A. cooperatives. And also by the ablest and most disinterested authorities on business management by Government agencies administering economic undertakings like public power and rural electrification projects.

The crystal-clear intent of this section is to prohibit the management and employees of R. E. A.—some 600 when the war broke, and certain to exceed a thousand in the near post-war future—from being converted into a political machine for the benefit of any political party in any election, State or National. In calling your attention to this provision as a broad principle of Government and an efficient administration, as well as the subject of independence, I am certain you will agree that I am not violating the spirit or text of the section I have just read.

It will be no news to you that a Senate inquiry has been in progress; that one of its objectives was to consider whether or not R. E. A. should be made independent again; nor that the subcommittee conducting the inquiry, consisting of two Democrats and two Republicans, has made a unanimous interim report recommending this restoration.

It is unfortunate that a series of events took place that made this investigation inevitable. I shall not recount them here. They are known to you. One thing, however, is certain. It is better to have had the inquiry made, not by opponents of Rural Electrification Administration, but by its friends and supporters of rural electrification.

The most important feature of the report is the recommendation for the restoration of the independence of Rural Electrification Administration at the earliest possible date. I approve that recommendation because it supports a principle for the permanent welfare of Rural Electrification Administration, far above the personal interest of myself or any other man or set of men.

This question is being discusssed in every cooperative in the Nation today. It is in the

mind of every person here tonight. It is being considered by thousands of interested friends outside the Rural Electrification Administration fold. You have a right to know where I stand, and why, and I shall tell you.

The act of 1936 provides that "All of the powers of Rural Electrification Administration shall be exercised by an administrator." Further, the exercise of these powers was preserved to the Administrator in the Reorganization Act of 1939. Listen carefully to this language:

"It direct that the 'functions and activities of Rural Electrification Administration shall be administered in that department by the Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.'"

Let us ask, Why was R. E. A. and its Administrator thus made independent, just as was the three-man board of T. V. A.? And why was it, like T. V. A., in the words of the President, "clothed with the power of government but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise?" Plainly because it was a business enterprise in behalf of the people which needed business management. To get things done it must have freedom of action, and be protected from the ancient routine, red tape methods of the old bureaus as well as from politicians.

It was a constructive job that required first-class initiative. But it also was a defensive job, and still is, despite the notion of those misguided souls who seem to think we can now safely cooperate and drink pink tea with men who would rejoice to see every co-op in the United States in bankruptcy, and many of whom will do their sly best to put them there.

I repeat. It was a brand new enterprise, unfitted for men of fixed viewpoints and habits. "Area service"—which meant making electricity available to every last farmer in a given feasible area at a price he could afford to pay, had never been tried before. The private companies derided and rejected it because their experience showed it unsound from their profit-making viewpoint. Their engineering precedents were of almost no value to us. They were accustomed to build lines to serve city people. We had to build lines to serve farmers over wide areas.

In this unknown field we had to find our way. We had to pioneer in law. We had to pioneer in engineering. We had to pioneer in finance. We had to pioneer in management. We had to pioneer in education and information, especially to convince official America, the press, the engineering world, the public, and some farmers, that the thing could be done. We had to convince doubting Thomases that the farmers had enough business sense and cohesiveness to own and manage electric cooperatives. I congratulate you in Illinois, and the cooperatives in every State on having given them the surprise of their lives.

All these divisions of our work were intertwined and interrelated. Team play was necessary. The divisions and sections of R. E. A. had to work and learn together, and the men to know each other. This close team play is still necessary for the days ahead.

Above all, they needed and they acquired in the school of experience understanding of the character and importance of this great undertaking, and that, over the first 6 years, is what happened. Save for one or two deplorable exceptions, there was harmony, as the committee found. But just about the time we had learned our job and gotten our gait, we were dismembered, shoved around, moved out, and lost a large number of our most experienced and loyal men and women. Worst of all, we have lost the old esprit de corps.

But let John Carmody tell it. When he was before the committee he was questioned as to his experience, and his advice was asked. He said: "We had a small, flexible organization which could turn around fast and meet its obligations. We had the statutes of Congress that were our guide. That is all we needed. We had our appropriations, and we had to live within the appropriations and within the statutes. It was all very simple and effective."

Asked if he felt that he could not efficiently conduct the affairs of R. E. A. if, whenever it was necessary to do something he had to go through Agriculture and get approval over in another department, he replied:

"Well, it just put five or six more layers on top of us, and it wasn't a question of Department of Agriculture with me, it was just the question of going from an independent agency that knew what it was doing and knew how to do it and was getting the job done, going into another agency where we would have to educate a great many people, chiefly clerks, because the business of a bureau finally gets turned over to a few clerks, not to the people who really know the total administrative job, but to clerks irrespective of their titles, that is what it is."

Asked why he resigned, he replied:

"When the reorganization plan was announced in the newspapers, and it was clear that R. E. A. would lose its independence and become a bureau in a very large organization, I determined instantly to resign, and I so advised the President."

And now let us see what Senator Norris, who more than any other one man is known as the father of R. E. A., has to say. On June 5, 1939, just before the transfer was effected, he wrote a letter to the President which, by his permission, was placed in the record of the hearings. He said in part:

"MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am very much worried about the Rural Electrification Administration. The recent order transferring this organization to the Department of Agriculture, I fear, is going to result in great damage to that Administration. I have had a conference with Mr. Carmody and have gone over the situation with him and I am afraid the transfer as proposed is going to mean his resignation. * * * He has built up a wonderful organization. It commands the respect of the farmers of the Nation. He is of the opinion that if this order is carried out, much of the work of this organization, accomplished under great difficulties, will to a great extent be frustrated and destroyed. I cannot help but share with him this belief."

And what does the Senator think today? I quote from a recent letter:

"In the act setting up the R. E. A. it is provided it shall be nonpartisan and independent of politics. It is conceded I think by every friend of the R. E. A. the Nation over that it is necessary for its success, that it be freed from partisan politics and that it shall not become a partisan political football of any political party."

And again:

"I would be glad to let every man and woman in the United States know, if they care anything about my opinion, that I am opposed and always have been to having R. E. A. transferred to any Department of Government. It ought to be an independent organization, and it must, if it is going to succeed. * * * I am in favor of any bill that Congress can enact into law that will restore R. E. A. to its independence."

Permit me to envision my hopes for the future administration of R. E. A. I trust that in 1960, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth birthday dinner of R. E. A., some speaker will be able truthfully to say:

"The wisdom of the founders of the Rural Electrification Administration in making it an independent business-like enterprise; in protecting it from partisan political influences; and in basing the selection and promotion of its employees solely upon merit and efficiency has been amply demonstrated.

"It was a happy circumstance for the farmers and people of the United States that the Seventy-fourth Congress which met in 1936 recognized that there are no such things as Democratic, Republican, Progressive, Socialist, or any other kind of political kilowatt hours—only, in this case, rural kilowatt hours.

"For 25 years, with one interim now happily forgotten, the Administrator, the division chiefs, the technical staffs, and the employees of R. E. A. down to the last messenger boy, have been undisturbed in the discharge of their duties by the ups and downs of politics and of campaigns. It has made little difference to them, as public servants, which party was 'in' or 'out' or how many changes in Cabinet officers occurred.

"The once tremendous task of electrifying rural America has now been accomplished. The fact that rural rates today are below levels once thought impossible, that there have been so few failures, that the vast majority of the older co-ops are now out of debt, and that the institution is an honor to the Nation is in no small degree due to the observance of the law written to prevent R. E. A. becoming a patronage dump. And further to the fact that the cooperatives have kept themselves free from self-seekers, political henchmen, and racketeers."

In conclusion, let me read the last paragraph of my little book, once in circulation, titled "Rural America Lights Up."

"R. E. A. is a fine example of the functioning of the democratic process. The very method by which electric cooperatives are organized and managed manifests true democracy at work and stimulates the courage to make it work. Millions of men, women and young people are being educated and trained in the application of democratic principles to industry and finance. R. E. A. has its part to play in arresting rural decline and restoring farm life to the vigor it possessed when the Nation was young."

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of August 21, 1944]

FOR AN INDEPENDENT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Breaking a silence which he stated he had maintained out of deference to a Senate investigation of his custodianship of the Rural Electrification Administration, Harry Slattery at last challenged his foes to open combat with the watchword, "I stand for an independent R. E. A."

The sordid plot of power-grasping interests, spearheaded by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and its president, Clyde T. Ellis, which for more than a year have embarrassed and impeded the R. E. A. with an insurance project, is better known than he, perhaps, realizes. Only in cabalistic Washington could a man like Slattery, who made an important contribution to such conservation projects as Boulder Dam, the Federal Power Act, the investigation of the Teapot Dome scandal, be kicked around for insisting that R. E. A., like T. V. A., "be administered entirely on the nonpartisan basis," as the charter of both agencies reads. It was time that he break his silence and live up to the nomen, bestowed upon him by Teddy Roosevelt, of "the Irish rebel."

Although former Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, had repeatedly come to Slattery's defense, his vindication was not effected until a Senate investigation gave him a clean bill of health and recommended that the agency be restored to independence at the "earliest possible time." Simultaneously this recommendation directs a well-deserved slap at Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, for the committee which is investigating R. E. A. is an Agricultural Subcommittee. It is a matter of record that from the day 5 years ago when

R. E. A. became an adjunct of the Department of Agriculture it has been shot through with red tape and obnoxious influences.

Will the Senate make an end of this political horseplay and restore R. E. A.'s independence? Will it do so "at the earliest possible time"? That time is now if R. E. A. is to play its useful role in post-war rehabilitation.

Rescue and Recognition of Hebrew People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Tuesday, the 8th of August, by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, pressing reconversion measures with which the Senate Military Affairs Committee are busy have prevented me from speaking to you tonight as I originally planned from the platform of the Second Emergency Conference to Save the Jewish People of Europe.

This second emergency conference, which ended tonight in New York City, had before it—as its name suggests—a most important and urgent task, the task of formulating concrete claims and proposals to effectuate the rescue of the several million Jews surviving in Europe today.

The fact that a Second Emergency Conference to Save the Jewish People of Europe was necessary, following the first one, held just over a year ago, is sad in itself. For, despite the able planning of the first conference and despite the very active work of the crusading emergency committee to save the Jewish people of Europe during the elapsed year, this most tragic problem is still before us awaiting determined and large-scale action by the governments of the United Nations.

We all know well enough the magnitude of the disaster which has befallen the Jewish people of Europe; nearly 35 percent of their total have been murdered. Proportionately this would mean 18,000,000 British casualties, 62,000,000 Russian casualties or 46,000,000 American casualties.

The disaster has not come suddenly. It is the culmination of long decades of persecution and confusion in which nothing is definite and clear, not even the meaning of the term "Jew."

And it is the confusion about their status which has made the wholesale murder of the Jews of Europe possible and has hampered intervention on their behalf.

I believe, therefore, that it is of the utmost importance to the rescue efforts that their position be clarified, at least as to terminology and definition.

There are Jews in Russia and there are Jews in England. Millions of my fellow Americans are Jews. What is their relation to, and what differentiates them from, the Jews of Axis Rumania and Hungary or from the Jews of Poland? Spiritually they are all Jews. But, practically speaking, American Jews are members of a great and mighty free Nation—the United States of America; the Jews of England are Englishmen; the Jews of Russia are Russians; but the Jews of Warsaw and Bucharest, like the Jews of Jerusalem, are—what?

This "what" is the stumbling block of all efforts to rescue the Jews who live under that great question mark. The Axis maintain that they are nationals of the country in which they live and that their slaughter is a purely internal affair.

The fact, however, is that these people, together with those of their kinsmen who were fortunate enough to make their way back to Palestine, constitute a nation whose national life was suspended for 1,800 years and which is now reborn.

Thus, these people of Europe and Palestine factually constitute the renascent Hebrew Nation. Consequently, Hebrew nationality does not mean Englishmen who practice the Jewish religion; it most certainly does not mean the millions of Americans, commonly referred to as Jews, who are actually Americans of Hebrew descent and of the Jewish religion. They do not belong to the Hebrew Nation, no more than President Roosevelt belongs to the Dutch Nation or Mr. Wendell Willkie belongs to the German Nation. They are Americans first, last, and always. Their ancestors way back, 2,000 years ago, were Hebrews.

Justice Frankfurter, for example, is not a Hebrew. He is an American of Hebrew descent, practicing the Jewish religion, exactly as Justice Murphy is an American of Irish descent, practicing the Catholic religion.

This might be an abstract and academic problem as far as Justice Frankfurter and the other millions of Americans of Hebrew descent are concerned. To the Hebrew Nation in Europe it is a problem of the gravest urgency and reality. Indeed, it is a problem of life and death.

Now, if we understand the true status of the Hebrew in Europe we are in a position to take immediate action to check, at last, the continued slaughter of millions more of innocent men, women, and children.

Up to several weeks ago in Hungary, thousands of Hebrews were daily packed into cattle trains which took them to the extermination camp of Poland. The International Red Cross in Geneva has made it known on the authority of the Hungarian Government that all Hebrews in Hungary "holding entrance visas to Palestine will receive permission from the authorities to leave for that country."

This creates an entirely new situation in which the responsibility is thrown on our shoulders and, more particularly, on the shoulders of the British Government.

As an American and as a Christian, I venture to suggest to the British Government, as the mandatory for Palestine, that it is their inescapable moral duty to answer the Hungarian Government—through the International Red Cross—that every Hebrew will be admitted into Palestine.

I am, of course, aware of the unfortunate disagreements regarding the political status of Palestine which have forced this land to play such a tragically small and passive part at a time when its sons and daughters have undergone the greatest ordeal of their martyred history.

I was happy to learn, therefore, of a proposal made in this direction by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation which separates the rescue question from the complexity of the Palestine problem.

The Hebrew committee proposes that there be established in Palestine emergency rescue shelters—free ports—into which all Hebrews fleeing their German tormentors should be admitted and kept in a manner similar to the emergency refugee shelter which the President has established at Oswego, N. Y.

At the recent conventions of both the Republican and Democratic Parties, resolutions were passed and planks inserted in both platforms to the effect that the gates of Palestine be thrown wide open to all escaping Hebrews. This represents the will of practically the entire American Nation. Certainly we are all, therefore, for the immediate establishment in Palestine of emergency rescue shelters.

It is creditable that the Hebrew committee, moved by the horrible plight of its people, should concentrate all its efforts to obtain the establishment of emergency rescue shelters. But I venture to suggest that is not enough; that the time is overdue when we of the United Nations must extend to the tormented Hebrew people our brotherly hand of solace and that this should be done with the dignity due an ancient and honorable nation which, in the time of its sovereign existence, gave us the greatest book of all, the Bible.

It was more than 2 years ago that I first urged that we recognize the Hebrew nation as one of the United Nations—and a fellow partner in the common war against Axis tyranny.

Let it be made clear that the 3,000,000 Hebrew men, women, and children who have died in this war have not died in vain as useless victims of German mass murder but that they have died as honored casualties in a world struggle for decent humanity.

Let us recognize the surviving 5,000,000 Hebrews as a renascent nation whose banner waves among those of the other United Nations.

Let the Hebrew guerrilla bands who are fighting the enemy in Europe and the 30,000 Hebrews in the Palestinian Regiment be given the chance to fight in their own name and under their own banner in a Hebrew Army.

Let us permit their own statesmen and representatives to participate in the councils of the United Nations where their interests are involved, such as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees, and, above all, on the Inter-Allied Commission on War Crimes in London, for it is against the Hebrews that 80 percent of the atrocities in this war have been committed.

And finally, let their statesmen as representatives of a people who have lost more than one-third of their population in this war participate in the settlement of the peace and in the planning of a better world in which their nation too can live in freedom and with honor, in a world free from the fear of aggression and war.

Newdealand, My Newdealand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, though I feel quite certain that my good friend, Mr. F. J. McCollum, editor of one of California's most influential dailies, the Coalinga Record, would modestly disclaim the title of "poet laureate," even of his own home town, least of all, of that mystic realm of Newdealia, a recent production of his, one which was inspired by recent political trends, is well worthy of incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a most timely contribution to the gayety of the Nation, if not to the comfort of those whose administrative activities he so gently chides.

Mr. Speaker, McCollum's poetical pronouncement to which I have just referred is the following:

NEWDEALAND, MY NEWDEALAND

(Tune: My Maryland)

With humble hearts to thee we bow,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.
No power but thine shall rule us now,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.
Where once Old Glory floated free
Waves now the banner of F. D.,
And prostrate in the dust are we,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.

Can e'er a fairer name be found?
Newdealand, My Newdealand.
There's music in the lilting sound—
Newdealand, My Newdealand.
Thy radio words that sear and burn
Let those who question swiftly learn
From coast to coast and then return,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.

Our every need thy favor fills,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.
Except to meet our income bills,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.
Beneath thy dictates so benign
That daily greet us, line by line,
Our very garbage cans are thine,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.

Thou dost protect us from all care,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.
No voice but thine shall fill the air,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.
We can but follow, thou shalt lead,
Direct our very thought and deed,
Thou tellest what to plant and feed,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.

Thy agents clutter every town,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.
Thy spoken wrath shall crush us down,
Newdealand, My Newdealand.
Thy will be done, oh, Mighty One.
The earth, the air, the stars, the sun,
The whole shebang is thine to run,
Newdealand, Oh Newdealand.

—*F. J. McCollum.*

Suffrage for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask that a sound and timely editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star be printed in the RECORD. I am heartily in accord with the suggestion made by the Star that the Congress should take favorable action on the joint resolution introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Representative SUMNERS, and myself proposing an amendment to the Constitution which will give the people of the District of Columbia a vote for President and Vice President, and will also make it possible for them to elect a Representative in Congress.

As I see it, the argument made by the Star is unanswerable. No sound reason can be given why the people of the District of Columbia should not be given the vote, the same as all other American citizens. This is particularly true so far as the soldiers now defending our Government are concerned. They are fighting for their country the same as all other American soldiers, and are making a great sacrifice. They are paying taxes to support the Government, the same as the people of all other cities, but they are wrongfully deprived of the rights of American citizens, so far as a part in their Government is concerned.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER FROM A SOLDIER

"If we Washingtonians now serving in the armed forces, or those at home, are capable of fighting, or running the war front at home, why are we not as capable of casting a vote as any other American?"

The soldier who asks that question of The Star—his letter is printed elsewhere on this page today—has every reason to be puzzled over a condition that is a shameful contradiction of many of the things he is told he is fighting for. He and his comrades and their families here at home are, of course, "as capable" of casting a vote as other Americans, if capability in that respect is measured in terms of intelligence, loyalty, and other marks of good citizenship.

They cannot vote because the men who wrote the Constitution, without knowing where or when the Capital they provided for would be founded, failed to provide a method of voting for the people who some day might live there. They may have taken it for granted that the States which ceded the land for a Capital would take care of the voting rights of their citizens.

But that failure, or oversight, then is subject to remedy now. The remedy lies in the joint resolution by Representative SUMNERS, of Texas, and Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, proposing an amendment of the Constitution as follows:

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

A Summary and Explanation of the Provisions of the So-called Dingell-Celler Bill (H. R. 5227) To Provide a National Program for War Mobilization and Reconversion, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in order that the membership of the House may have an opportunity to understand in as few words as possible the purpose and intent of the Dingell-Celler bill—H. R. 5227—I have requested unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a summary and explanation of the several provisions of this bill.

This bill was drawn by a nonpartisan unofficial committee of the membership of the House. In drawing the bill the committee has considered all of the legislation that has been offered in connection with the subject of providing a national program for war mobilization and reconversion.

We contacted and had the benefit of the advice and counsel of representatives of the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods. I am informed, and believe my information is correct, that the above bill has the approval and support of each of the above-named labor unions.

It is a compromise bill. It has been carefully drawn. It deserves the favorable consideration of the membership of this House.

A summary of the provisions of the bill is as follows:

Section 11 declares the objectives of the act.

Section 102 establishes the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, to be headed by a director at a salary of $15,000 a year. Included in the office would be the Office of Contract Settlement, the Surplus War Property Administration, and the Retraining and Reemployment Administration.

The Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion is authorized to formulate such plans as are necessary to meet the problems arising out of the transition from war to peace; to issue directives to other agencies; to make appropriate studies, reports, and recommendations to Congress; to consult and cooperate with governmental and private groups; and to employ personnel to carry out these activities. Reports are to be submitted to Congress quarterly, summarizing the work of the office and appraising the activities of the various executive agencies in the field of demobilization and post-war adjustment.

Section 103 creates an advisory board, appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, consisting of three representatives of industry, three representatives of labor, three representatives of agriculture, and one public representative who is to be chairman. The Board is to advise with the Director with respect to war mobilization and reconversion and make recommendations to him relating to legislation, policies, and procedures.

Section 104 establishes a special joint committee of the Senate and House on post-war adjustment. It is to be composed of four Members from each House, not more than two from each House being members of the majority party. The committee is to make a full and complete study with regard to legislation, demobilization and post-war adjustment, consult with the President, the Director and appropriate standing Congressional committees, and study and review the report submitted by the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Section 201 directs Government contracting agencies to terminate prime contracts for war production whenever performance under such contracts will not be needed for the prosecution of the war. Such contracts are not to be continued merely for the purpose of providing business and employment unless continuance in whole or in part is necessary to avoid substantial injury to a plant or property.

Section 202 provides that curtailment of war production or termination of war contracts are to be managed so as to be integrated and synchronized with the expansion or resumption of other war or nonwar production. In order to effectuate this policy, Government contracting agencies are to report current and anticipated changes in requirements to the Chairman of the War Production Board. Government control

agencies are to permit the expansion, resumption, or initiation of nonwar production whenever the war the war effort is not adversely affected; and the Chairman of the War Production Board is authorized to establish policies to be followed by Government contracting agencies in selecting individual contracts, or classes of contracts, for curtailment, nonrenewal, or termination.

Section 203 creates in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion a board of appeals, to consist of three members to be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, each of whom is to receive $8,000 annually and serve 2 years. Persons aggrieved by the action of a Government control agency in allocating available materials may apply for a hearing before the board of appeals. If the board of appeals is satisfied that the action of the Government control agency substantially interferes with, or curtails the operations of, the appellant and that, as a result, serious unemployment of the appellant's employees will come about, or that the interests of the consumers of the appellant's products will be substantially impaired, the board of appeals will so report to the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, who will thereupon allocate sufficient of the short material to the appellant as will be necessary to prevent hardship to the appellant's employees, or to the consumers of his product.

Section 204 instructs the Attorney General to make surveys to determine whether any factor exists which may tend to eliminate competition, create a strengthened monopoly, injure small business, and otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power, either during the war or in the period of post-war transition. The Attorney General is to report to Congress on the results of his surveys and recommend such legislation as he deems desirable.

Section 301 sets out the objectives of title III, which are, basically, to facilitate the maximum utilization of the national manpower, both during the war and during the transition from war to peacetime production.

Section 302 creates a retraining and reemployment administration, to be headed by an administrator appointed by the President for 2 years, subject to Senate confirmation, who is to receive $12,000 annually. The administrator, under the direction of the Director, is to establish a unified reemployment program, to maintain full information on declining and increasing employment opportunities, provide for placement of workers in employment and to oversee the financing of workers during such times as employment is not available. The issuance of regulations by the Administrator to govern the activities of Federal agencies in these fields is authorized.

Section 303 creates an advisory committee for retraining and reemployment, consisting of representatives from 10 Government agencies mentioned by name, and such others as the Administrator may designate.

Section 304 directs the War Production Board and other agencies in possession of such data to furnish to the Administrator full information on current and projected schedules of production. The War and Navy Departments are instructed, insofar as military security permits, to keep the Administrator informed on current and projected rates of discharge of servicemen. The policy is enunciated that the armed forces are to discharge servicemen as rapidly as war and defense needs permit. The retention of personnel in the armed forces merely for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment is prohibited.

Section 305 instructs the Administrator to perform his duties through the facilities and personnel of other Government agencies and through appropriate State agencies.

Section 306 authorizes the Administrator to facilitate recruitment, transfer, and placement of workers by payment of transportation expenses to new jobs, or to bona fide residences (within the United States), or to both. The traveling allowance is limited to the amount provided by the Federal Government for its employees. The United States Employment Service will be continued as a nationally operated service for a period of 2 years after the termination of hostilities.

Section 307 gives the Administrator general supervision and direction of the activities of Government agencies relating to the training and retraining of personnel released from war work. In consultation with appropriate Government agencies, he is to develop plans relating to training and retraining.

Section 308 provides that there is to be no amendment or modifications of powers now vested in the Veterans Administration, or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Section 401 (a) and (b) fix the principle that a person for whom suitable employment cannot be secured is to be entitled, within the limits hereafter set forth, to interim placement benefits. Beginning with the fourth month after the enactment of the act, benefits would be paid to unemployed qualified employees in the amount of 75 percent of weekly wages, but such benefits are not to be less than $8 per week, nor more than $20 per week for a single person, or $25 per week for a person with dependents. Benefits would be limited to 52 weeks in any 2 consecutive years.

Section 401 (c) provides that a person is not unemployed if he does not maintain an active application for employment at a public employment office; a man is not counted as being unemployed on Sunday unless it is in a continuous period of unemployment. Persons receiving annuities or pensions, unemployment allowances, vocational educational allowances, or similar benefits are not counted as unemployed; but if the interim placement benefit exceeds such other benefits, the amount of the excess may be paid to the individual.

Section 401 (d) provides that the employee is to be disqualified for the receipt of benefits if he fails without good cause to accept suitable work, or to report for work if he is so directed; if he is discharged or suspended for misconduct related to his employment; if he left work voluntarily without good cause; if his unemployment was due to stoppage of work because of a labor dispute other than lock-out; or if he made or helped to make any false or fraudulent statement in order to cause benefits to be paid. The labor-dispute disqualification does not apply if the employee who is unemployed is not directly interested in the dispute which causes the stoppage.

Section 401 (f) and (g) sets forth the standards of suitable employment in terms copied from the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Section 401 (h) provides that a person may not be compelled to apply for or accept transportation away from his present location, as provided in section 306.

Section 401 (i) provides penalties for making or causing to be made or aiding in making false or fraudulent statements.

Section 402 (a) provides that a qualified employee is to be one who in the calendar year next preceding the beginning of the benefit year earned $150 or more in wages. This provision is identical with that of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Section 402 (b) requires the Administrator to offer to each State unemployment compensation agency opportunity to participate in the administration of interim placement benefits. The Administrator must permit such participation if the State agrees to receive claims for benefits, to adjudicate and pay them or forward them to the Treasury for payment and to furnish funds to the extent that benefits would be payable under the State law. The Administrator may terminate an agreement with a State upon a finding by the Social Security Board, affirmed, if the State requests, by a court, that the State is failing substantially to comply with the agreement.

Section 402 (c) provides that the Railroad Retirement Board and the Unemployment Compensation Board of the District of Columbia are to participate in the administration of interim placement benefits.

Section 402 (d) authorizes the Administrator to use Federal agencies in the administration of interim placement benefits to whatever extent is necessary after the services of the State agencies and the Railroad Retirement Board have been used to the maximum practicable extent.

Section 402 (e) gives the claimants for benefits the right to be heard before a State appellate tribunal, where a State administers the benefits, or before a tribunal of a Federal agency, in cases where the Railroad Retirement Board or some other Federal agency administers the benefits.

Section 402 (f) authorizes Federal court review decisions of the agencies administering interim placement benefits.

Section 402 (g) limits review to the procedure prescribed in the bill.

Section 402 (h) provides for court review of a finding by the Social Security Board that the State is not complying with the terms of its agreement with the Administrator.

Section 402 (i) provides for the determination of the respective obligations of the Federal Government and the State agencies. The Federal Government is to pay for the cost of the benefits over and above the amounts payable under the State laws.

Section 402 (j) provides for the determination of the respective obligations of the District of Columbia, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Federal Government.

Section 402 (k) provides for the payment by the Administrator of the extra expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board incurred by reason of its participation in the administration of interim placement benefits.

Section 403 authorizes the Administrator to delegate his authority to appropriate persons or agencies. So long as an agreement with a State agency is in effect, delegation of such authority to such agency may not be revoked or modified.

Section 404 confers general administrative powers on the Administrator, authorizes employment of personnel, authorizes securing of necessary information, and provides procedures if necessary information is refused by the persons having possession of it.

Section 405 amends the G. I. bill of rights by adding to the readjustment allowance under title V an additional weekly allowance of $5 for each of not more than 3 dependents. Thus, the maximum weekly amount payable under title V of the G. I. bill of rights would be $35. Dependents would include unmarried children under 18 or children of any age if because of mental defects they are incapable of self-support, wives, and parents incapable of self-support and dependent on the veteran. The limitation on readjustment allowances of 52 weeks is changed to an amount, in any 2 consecutive years, equal to 52 times the weekly benefit.

Section 501 authorizes the Federal Works Administrator to make, from funds appropriated for that purpose, loans or advances to the States and their subdivisions, to aid in the making of investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, specifications, or the like preliminary to the construction of public works. Funds appropriated for this purpose are to be allotted, 90 percent in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and

10 percent in accordance with the discretion of the Federal Works Administrator, except that no State may be allotted less than one-half of 1 percent of the total available funds. Advances are to be repaid if and when the construction of the public works so planned is undertaken.

Section 601 contains definitions. Most of these are routine. The following are important:

A week of unemployment is any 7 consecutive calendar days in which a person has remuneration of less than $3.

Dependents include unmarried children under 18 dependent on an individual; the wife of an individual dependent on him; and dependent parents incapable of self-support.

Employment means any service performed as a civilian after December 31, 1940, by an employee for his employer and includes civilian service outside of the United States for a United States war contractor by a person who was on September 16 a citizen of or resident in the United States. Governmental service and maritime service is also included. Excluded is service for a foreign government, domestic service, or service for a member of the person's family.

Weekly wages are defined as one-thirteenth of the wages in that quarter of the calendar year preceding the beginning of the benefit year in which wages were highest. This is the usual wage base under State compensation laws.

Section 602 authorizes the necessary appropriations.

Section 603 provides that the act except as otherwise specified becomes effective immediately and terminates 24 months after the termination of hostilities. Termination of hostilities means termination of hostilities of the wars in which the United States is now engaged as declared by a Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Section 604 specifies that if any provision of the act is held invalid the remainder of the act is not to be affected.

Section 605 terminates the present Office of War Mobilization when the Director created by the act takes office, and transfers the records, property, and unexpended appropriations from the present Office of War Mobilization to the new Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Section 606 continues the orders, policies, procedures, and directives prescribed by the present Director of War Mobilization until superseded by the new Director.

Section 607 specifies that no alien shall be employed in any capacity in the administration of this act unless he has served honorably in the armed forces of the United States.

Section 608 titles the act as the "War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944."

"The Veterans Have a Right to Expect That the Realities to Which They Return Will Conform To the Ideals for Which They Fought"—Gov. Earl Warren

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege just extended to me by the membership of the House, I hand to the Public Printer for incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address which was delivered by the Honorable Earl Warren, Governor of the State of California, at the American Legion, Department of California, convention, a conclave which convened at Los Angeles on August 15 last.

As that which this great Governor of a great State then had to say will influence greatly the trend of contemporaneous events, his remarks are deserving of a far wider audience than the one that crowded to overflowing the Philharmonic Auditorium on that memorable occasion. Its reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will contribute much toward that end so devoutly to be wished for.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the address of Governor Warren to which I have just referred is the following:

Commander Haughton, comrades, and friends of the Legion, when we met at San Francisco on August 17, just 1 year ago, the state of the war was very different than it is today.

At that time the armed forces of our country were just beginning to reveal the fullness of their power.

Our boys had taken the island of Vella la Vella in the Solomons. With the British they had invaded Sicily; Messina was ours, but the battle for Italy had not yet begun. The Russians were battling for Kharkov and, although they had taken Bryansk, they found the Nazis still strong in counterattack.

In full possession of Europe, the Germans were boasting a new secret weapon to launch against our gathering forces in England.

On the Pacific coast aircraft plants were calling urgently for 150,000 additional workers within 30 days.

A year ago we had taken the initiative on all fronts, but the day of victory seemed far away.

Today that initiative has assumed the proportions of a world-wide offensive against the Axis, with coordination and striking power never witnessed before in the history of warfare.

Americans have jumped from the Solomons to the Marshalls and the Gilberts; have passed the Carolines to strike the Marianas, and Guam is once more an American island. Tojo has gone. Kioso, his successor, warns the Japanese people that a direct thrust against their homeland is imminent.

We are steadily completing our struggle for Italy, and the battle is on as far north as the classic city of Florence. The Russians have liberated their country, are pounding Warsaw in Poland, and are poised for the invasion of East Prussia.

Doughboys and Tommies have extended the D-day beachhead through Normandy and Brittany, and now move forward on a complete front of 130 miles to within a few miles of Paris.

The secret weapon is known, and its dangers can be reckoned with. The Nazi, no longer boasting, is fearful of his own army. On the Pacific coast we begin to hear more of cut-backs and less of manpower.

The change that has taken place within the year has brought new hope to the fathers, mothers, wives, and loved ones of our men and women in the armed forces, and calm joy to every American.

But it is also bringing closer, month by month, week by week, and day by day, new problems for our people, new responsibilities for leadership, not only in Nation and State, but in every county, every city, every community.

Foremost among the challenging adjustments that must be made will be the readjustment to civilian life of the greater part of 11,000,000 men and women whose lives have been disrupted by the stern requirement for service with the armed forces. Certainly, nothing ahead of us will be charged with greater moral obligation on the part of the Nation.

Those who have served with our Army and Navy, our Marine Corps, our Coast Guard, have made the greatest sacrifice. In a certain sense, they have made the only sacrifice. They have made it under conditions taking them suddenly and entirely out of their normal environment—rendering them helpless for the time being to manage their own affairs or provide for their own future.

War will affect some of them physically, many of them psychologically, all of them conomically and socially. They will return s out of a nightmare, uncertain of themelves, still vibrating with the excitement of the things they have seen and done. There will be the strangeness of civilian clothes, the eeling of sudden let-down, the struggle to link the joy of return with the job of making a living.

They will soon come to appraise the ideals for which they have endured rigorous training, risked dangerous combat. That appraisal will be influenced largely by conditions as they find them at home.

The veterans of this war have a particular right to expect that the reality to which they return will conform to the ideals for which they have fought.

They would be the first to disclaim any desire to constitute themselves a special class; they realize that what is best for our country as a whole will be best for them as veterans.

Nevertheless, we at home must realize that we are trustees for those in the armed forces of our country. It is up to us to prepare, in their absence and for their benefit, conditions wherein they will find the abstract of freedom translated into real opportunity for development of useful, satisfying lives.

Failure to discharge our obligations would be to risk tragic consequences. The hearts of these strong and willing men and women would become embittered, their minds disillusioned, and their hands turned, perhaps, to unsound expedients—bad for the Nation and bad for the veterans too.

We are fortunate to have within our country men of the last generation, veterans of World War No. 1, men who have known war, who have not forgotten what it means, who understand the strangeness of changing a uniform for civilian clothes, men who have had to tackle the problem of readjustment.

One of the few compensations for all the loss and suffering of the last war is that out of it have come the men best fitted to understand, most willing to help, a new generation, the men most determined that we shall not fail in our obligation to the veterans of World War No. 2.

Today, with World War No. 2 forming another great band of veterans, the work of the American Legion and its kindred organizations becomes the real job of constructively aiding to overcome the difficulties that will confront these new veterans.

To this job the American Legion has already devoted itself; for its accomplishment you have brought and will continue to bring your insistent and just demands to every level of government.

Californians are justly proud that during the last year this important work of the American Legion has been carried on under the leadership of a Californian * * * our own Warren Atherton. He has been able in leadership and tireless in his activity to bring the American Legion closely and helpfully to our boys in the fields of battle.

His service as national commander will long stand as a tribute to our California department.

Largely as a result of the foresight and interest of our veterans, the State of California laid the foundation for its veterans' program nearly a year and a half ago.

With the cooperation of all branches of State government, a constitutional amendment, the Veterans' Farm and Home Purchase Act, was passed by the legislature. It will come before the people for their approval at the November general election and, when approved, will authorize a $30,000,000 bond issue to provide loans to California veterans for the purchase of homes and farms.

To avoid the delay involved in the submission of this bond issue to the people, I was pleased to sign a Legion-sponsored bill passed at the 1943 legislative session to give our first returning veterans the benefits of a home- and farm-purchase program as soon as they were ready for it. We are, therefore, in a position today to give our veterans the tremendous advantages, the independence, and self-reliance, that come from settling in their own home or working their own farm.

A further sum of $300,000 was made available to our veterans' welfare board for a program of educational assistance to California veterans. Under that program they may resume their education with tuition, books, and supplies paid for by the State, and an allowance to the veteran for living expense while so engaged.

Educational aids were also provided for the children of California veterans killed in action or dying as a result of war service.

Our State department of education has been making timely preparation to meet the demands for education, both general and vocational, that will be made upon our school system by thousands of young people whose education was interrupted by the war or who stand in need of further education to retrain themselves for civilian life.

A further sum of $150,000 was appropriated to the veterans' welfare board to carry out a program for assisting our veterans to obtain the benefits to which they are entitled. In this work we have had the complete cooperation of our veteran organizations and their service officers.

Action was also taken to freeze the unemployment-compensation rights of those entering the armed forces until after their discharge from service. Civil-service employees of the State entering the armed forces were given an absolute right to be restored to their former positions, and other veterans seeking to qualify under civil-service examinations have been accorded preferential rights.

All of these programs are American Legion programs.

These programs, established mainly for Californians in the service, were not designed to meet, nor could our State alone assume, entire responsibility for service to all the veterans we will have in California as a direct result of the war effort.

Readjustment and retraining of veterans for civilian life will be just as much a part of the cost of the war as their training for war itself. Upon the Federal Government, therefore, rests the primary obligation to provide basic funds and programs. The reason for this can be demonstrated by a few simple facts.

In addition to the 600,000 Californians who entered the service, a further 200,000 residents of other States came to California after 1940 in connection with national defense and war programs and were inducted into the armed forces from California. Presumably, many of them will return to California when the war is over.

Furthermore, California stands high on the list of States in the number of its training camps and debarkation points. With increasing intensity of action in the Pacific, our State has become a main street to battle, down which approximately 5,000,000 service men and women will have traveled before this war is over. Many of them have come to like California as much as we do, and plan to settle here when their tour of duty is over.

This demonstrates the national scope of the veterans' readjustment that must be made in California and in other States similarly affected. It proves that the American Legion was right in bringing to the Congress its demand for those basic programs and appropriations that are now part of the Federal Servicemen's Readjustment Act, signed by the President June 1944—familiarly known as the G. I. bill of rights.

That national legislation is the supplement for measures already taken in California and other States in the Union. Its Federal programs for hospitalization, for unemployment allowances, for educational assistance, and for loans to servicemen recognize the national responsibility. They should be used as a bulwark of support for the States and local communities in their efforts to minister to the needs of our veterans.

Whether we are going to really help returning veterans to solve the practical and personal problems that will confront them depends upon how these programs are administered.

To make appropriations, to set up programs, no matter how well conceived, is not enough.

These things have a tendency to develop into machines operating with routines and red tape. Their size and complexity make for delay, and tend to confuse the very persons they were designed to serve.

Unless we translate them into human terms, and reduce them to proportions of simplified service the individual veteran can understand, they will not succeed. We must remember that each veteran will eventually return to his own community—his own home; that his problems will be as numerous and varied as the veterans themselves—so essentially human, so clearly individual—that they cannot be cataloged or classified by any governmental machine.

It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that the State, with its counties, cities, and towns, be given full opportunity to participate in, and that they be ready and willing to participate in, the administration of Federal programs. Into the work must be brought not only the public agencies involved but also the organized effort of all groups in California life—our veteran posts, our chambers of commerce, our labor unions, our farm bureaus, our professional societies, our social welfare organizations, our service clubs. Only in this way can the full resources of our State be drawn upon to make sure that California does not fail—to make sure that California receives, welcomes, and helps its veterans in the way they have every right to expect.

Our larger cities, where the adjustment will be most difficult, are aware of their responsibility. They are already organizing themselves accordingly. I have no doubt that all of our communities will respond.

Some idea of the great need for centralizing all veterans' services in one place in each community can be obtained from surveys showing over 50 available aids and benefits for veterans distributed among 30 Federal, State, local, or semipublic agencies.

Our veterans must not have to hunt down these services through any such maze as that. The services must be brought together into one place—one information and service center in each community—where the veteran can find them—and where they can find the veteran.

More than a year ago we set up in California a reconstruction and reemployment commission. Through this agency we have been working to mobilize the resources of our State—public and private—business, labor, and agriculture—for California's transition from war to peace; to prepare the way for jobs and opportunities for 600,000 California veterans and for the 1,500,000 civilians who have come to California to participate in the war effort.

The commission has assigned to one of its nine advisory committees the job of dealing specifically with demobilized service men and women. That committee is tied in closely with our veteran organizations. It has kept abreast of all developments in the field of veterans' welfare. It stands ready to cooperate fully with the Federal Government, our counties, and our cities, to make sure that every step has been taken—or will be taken by legislation, if necessary—to assure that readjustment of veterans in California is accomplished with promptness, efficiency, and consideration for the veteran and with credit to our great State.

To you, Department Commander Haughton, your successor, your officers, posts, and members, I am privileged to express gratitude for the cooperation and the inspiration you have given to our State and to me as Governor.

I am proud to be a Legionnaire—more proud than I have ever been in the past 25 years—proud because the Legion has devoted itself so completely to the cause of our newest veterans. That cause is America's greatest task—America's greatest opportunity. Our job has just commenced. I am sure that we will do it well.

So, let us strive together in California to make sure that the return of our young men and women from the battle fronts of the war may be, not a so-called veterans' problem, but a joyful homecoming to share the happiness, the prosperity, of which our State is capable and which, by intelligence, courage, and vision—and with God's help—we will attain.

Correspondence in Connection With Testimonial Dinner to Hon. John A. Danaher, of Connecticut

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I would wish to be acquitted of any suspicion that I would ever forget Meriden, Conn. If I had any such disposition, however, the two present Senators from Connecticut, who grew up together in Meriden, would not permit me to do so. Actually my recollection of Meriden is probably longer lived than theirs. It is nearly 45 years since I came to Washington officially as secretary to my grandfather, the late United States Senator William P. Frye, from Maine. At that time Connecticut was represented in the Senate by United States Senator Joseph R. Hawley and United States Senator Orville H. Platt. It was early impressed upon me that Senator Platt came from Meriden. I later learned that associated in the practice of law with Senator Platt was Mr. Cornelius J. Danaher, of Meriden, who is the father of the present Republican junior Senator from Connecticut, JOHN A. DANAHER.

It was with very real pleasure that I learned some weeks ago from Mr. Eliot B. Stretch, chairman of the Meriden Republican Town Committee, that a testimonial dinner was to be tendered by Meridenites to Senator DANAHER, and I sent to Mr. Stretch a message of felicitation. I have since received from Mr. Stretch a letter of thanks which enclosed copies of various messages from our colleagues which were read at the dinner meeting. That the RECORD may show this evidence of the high esteem in which Senator DANAHER is held by all of us here in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence referred to may be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN TOWN AND CITY COMMITTEE,
Meriden, Conn., August 15, 1944.

Senator WALLACE H. WHITE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Meriden Republican Town Committee is deeply grateful to you for the splendid letter you sent to me on the occasion of our testimonial to our friend, Senator JOHN A. DANAHER. The event was a huge success, and was attended by Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin, our complete Republican State ticket, our Congressman at Large, B. J. MONKIEWICZ, and our Congressman from the Third Connecticut District, Maj. RANULF COMPTON. When I invited you and a few other Senators to send me a word of greeting to our guest of honor, I did not anticipate so complete a response, but the estimates and appraisals you gentlemen submitted were most enthusiastically received. Then, when CLARE BOOTH LUCE in her own splendid style introduced Senator DANAHER, it was perfect.

Senator DANAHER announced his intention to seek reelection, and the following week was unanimously renominated by the Republican convention. After 6 years of the grueling intensive work confronting you gentlemen in the Senate, it struck me as a fine tribute to my long-time friend that the result should be so complete. I would not wish to appear presumptuous, but if you believe it fitting, I would very greatly like to ask you to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the letters which you Senators sent to me. I think a very great many people would like to know of the esteem in which Senator DANAHER is held by so many of the really great leaders of the Republican Party.

Please believe me with my thanks and very real esteem,

Sincerely yours,

ELIOT B. STRETCH.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE,
July 25, 1944.

ELIOT B. STRETCH,
Chairman, Republican Town Committee,
Meriden, Conn.

MY DEAR MR. STRETCH: I have just learned of the dinner to be given in honor of Senator DANAHER on July 31.

I wish I might be with you on this occasion, for I would welcome the opportunity to tell his home people how greatly I esteem Senator DANAHER. He is an indefatigable worker, of high intelligence, of most agreeable personality, and no Senator is held in higher esteem by the membership of the Senate than is he. If the people of Connecticut knew of his work and of him as his associates in the Senate do, he would be reelected by an overwhelming majority. Give him my cordial regards.

Believe me,

Sincerely yours,

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Minority Floor Leader.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
July 26, 1944.

ELIOT B. STRETCH,
Chairman, Republican Town Committee,
Meriden, Conn.

DEAR MR. STRETCH: I received your notification that the Meriden Republican Town Committee is holding a testimonial preconvention dinner for Senator JOHN A. DANAHER on Monday, July 31. JOHN DANAHER and I entered the Senate the same day. It has been a continuous pleasure to serve with him and to enjoy his unfailing good humor. No Senator could have worked harder than he has worked at the legislative job. His legislative ability and keen judgment have promoted and improved constructive laws and blocked many which ought not be enacted. You have an exceptional representative, who should certainly be renominated and reelected.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. TAFT.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
July 28, 1944.

ELIOT B. STRETCH,
Chairman, Republican Town Committee,
Meriden, Conn.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish I could personally attend your testimonial dinner honoring Senator JOHN A. DANAHER. I should like to be able to tell you at first hand how much Senator DANAHER means to us in the Senate. In my 16 years of Senate experience no Senator has made more friends or registered a more definite influence or assumed a more effective place of authority than has Senator DANAHER in his comparatively brief career among us. He has displayed indefatigable energy. He has been tireless in his attention to duty. He has taken a commanding position in Senate proceedings. He is a tower of strength to good government. He is one of our truly great Republican Senators. I cannot too emphatically express my hope and my deep desire that Senator DANAHER will be reelected by a majority which will reflect the confidence which he has richly earned and deserves.

Cordially and faithfully,

A. H. VANDENBERG.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
July 26, 1944.

ELIOT B. STRETCH,
Chairman, Town Committee,
Meriden, Conn.

DEAR MR. STRETCH: Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER is one of the most industrious, efficient, and capable of our Senators. I worked with him in Judiciary Committee of the Senate until very recently, when I was obliged to retire from that committee to take up other work.

He succeeded me as the ranking member on the minority side of the committee.

My confidence in him made it more easy for me to retire from that important committee.

I have a strong personal regard for him and I wish you would convey to him publicly, my greetings and best wishes for his return to the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN R. AUSTIN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1944.

MY DEAR MR. STRETCH: Please extend my cordial greetings and best wishes to Senator JOHN DANAHER. He has rendered outstanding and highly patriotic service in the Senate which I hope may long continue.

The Connecticut Western Reserve in Ohio takes pride in the good Republican record of the folks "back East."

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD H. BURTON,
United States Senator, Ohio.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
July 27, 1944.

ELIOT B. STRETCH, Esq.,
Chairman, Republican Town Committee
Meriden, Conn.

DEAR MR. STRETCH: I have been advised of the testimonial dinner to be given to my friend and colleague, your Senator JOHN DANAHER, on the eve of your State convention, and, because of my friendship for him, I want to add my tribute to the others.

JOHN DANAHER and I entered the Senate together in January 1939. We have been intimately associated in the work of the Senate in the last 6 years. He has made a place for himself in the Senate that is unique. Beyond question, in my opinion, he is the best debater on either side of the aisle. His forensic ability is commented upon frequently by both Democrats and Republicans. He has an analytical mind which is evidenced in his conclusions. He is an indefatigable worker, constantly on the job and he has the happy gifts of wit and humor which crop out frequently and which have endeared him to every one of his colleagues

The State of Connecticut and New England are most fortunate in having JOHN DANAHER in the Senate, but beyond all this, the common people of our country have in him a friend, one who has an understanding heart for their problems.

It would be unthinkable that he would not be continued in the Senate where he would have increasing influence and prestige as the years go by.

This tribute comes from my heart for one whom I delight to call friend.

With good wishes for a happy gathering on the 31st and thanking you for transmitting this communication thereto, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. TOBEY.

Servicemen's Rights and Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, I am inserting an article which is being issued by the United States Government as a handy guide for the veterans of our armed forces.

The purpose of it is to give the veterans a correct picture of the rights and benefits available to them and their dependents. Without attempting to answer all the questions anyone could ask, it simply gives the high spots and tells them where the answers can be found.

On the whole, it is a most valuable document and one that should be placed in the hands of every serviceman.

It reads as follows:

THINGS TO DO AFTER DISCHARGE

Four things are mentioned below that should be given your immediate attention:

REPORT TO SELECTIVE SERVICE BOARD

Every man discharged from the armed forces should report to his selective-service board in person or by letter, within 5 days of his discharge. This is required by law. Ex-servicewomen are not required to report but should do so if they desire aid in securing reemployment.

APPLY FOR OLD JOB WITHIN 40 DAYS

If you want to get back the job you had before you entered the armed forces, you must apply for it within 40 days after the date of your discharge.

PAY GOVERNMENT INSURANCE PREMIUMS DIRECT

Most ex-service men and women will want to keep their national service life insurance in force. To do this it is necessary to pay the premiums direct to the Veterans' Administration; otherwise the insurance will lapse.

PUT YOUR RECORDS IN ORDER

Every ex-member of the armed forces has a serial, service, or file number. It is most important that you keep a record of it and of other such records—such as originals or legal copies of necessary papers—in a safe place where they can always be found.

The reason is simple. Claims and requests for benefits will usually require certain information, such as a man's Army or Marine Corps serial number, Navy file or service number, details of his discharge and, in some cases, proof of the relationship of dependents. The most important records are the following:

Army or Marine Corps serial number.
Navy service or file number.
Coast Guard service number.
Discharge papers.
Disability claim "C" number.
Insurance policies.
Social Security card.
Birth certificate (self).
Birth certificate (wife).
Birth certificate (children).
Marriage certificate.
Any divorce decrees.
Last will and testament.
Selective-service registration card.

Get these records in order now—even though you may not need them immediately. Some day you may be saved great inconvenience and delay by having them all together where you can find them easily.

BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

As a veteran discharged under honorable conditions, you automatically receive mustering-out pay of from $100 to $300 to help tide you over the immediate period after your discharge and to aid you in your necessary readjustment to civilian life.

Those who served less than 60 days receive $100; 60 days or more, but no foreign service, $200; 60 days or more, and foreign service, $300. Certain groups are excluded, such as those receiving base pay (not counting fogies) of more than $200 a month at the time of their discharge. Any eligible veteran discharged before this law was passed may obtain payment by applying to his own branch of the service.

INSURANCE—GOVERNMENT

Your national service life insurance will be one of your most valuable assets after your discharge. If you let it lapse, you will not be able to buy similar protection for yourself and your family for the same cost. To keep it in force you must do two things:

1. Pay the premiums direct. Make your check or money order payable to the Treasurer of the United States and mail it to the Collections Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C. You may arrange to pay your premiums monthly, quarterly, semiannually or annually.

2. Your insurance was originally issued on what is called the 5-year-level-premium-term plan. Any time after it has been in force a year, and before the 5 years are up, you may convert it into ordinary life, 20-payment life or 30-payment life. Your new policy will have regular cash values after the first year from which you can borrow if necessary.

If you wish to change your beneficiary, write the Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

INSURANCE—PRIVATE

If, when you went into the service, you had private life insurance, you may have arranged to have the Government protect this for you by guaranteeing the premiums. If so, remember that payments must be brought up to date, with interest, within 2 years after your discharge. Your insurance company or the Veterans' Administration will answer any questions.

GETTING YOUR OLD JOB BACK

If you worked for a private employer or for the Federal Government before the war, and want your job back, the qualifications are brief and simple: the position you left must have been other than temporary, you must have completed your military service satisfactorily, you must still be qualified to perform the duties of the position, and you must apply for reemployment within 40 days of your discharge. If you cannot call upon your employer immediately, write and tell him when you can return to work, and keep a copy of your letter.

If you have any difficulty, go to your reemployment committeeman—a man assigned by your local selective-service board to be your personal adviser on reemployment. If necessary, he can obtain the assistance of the United States district courts and the Federal district attorney. This service is free.

GETTING A NEW JOB

The United States Employment Service has 1,500 offices throughout the country and extends service to 2,200 other communities. All are ready and anxious to help you. In each of these local offices, there is a special veterans' employment representative to assist war veterans in finding suitable jobs. They also advise and assist members of veterans' families seeking work. If you want a job, register at the United States Employment Service office nearest you as soon after your discharge as possible.

GETTING A GOVERNMENT JOB

If you were a Federal Civil Service employee (other than temporary) when you entered the war, you should apply to the agency where last employed within 40 days of your discharge or to the Civil Service Commission in the event you experience difficulty in being reinstated. If you satisfy the requirements (see "Getting your old job back" above), you are entitled to your former position or one "of like seniority, status, and pay."

If you didn't have a civil-service job before, but want to get one after you are discharged, you will get special consideration and preference in civil-service examinations. This preference also applies to wives or widows of veterans under certain circumstances.

All wartime veterans discharged under honorable conditions are entitled to preference in United States Civil Service examinations. The entitlement to 5 or 10 points will be determined by the Civil Service Commission upon application to the Commission.

Other privileges for veterans are:

1. Examination for positions of guard, elevator operator, messenger, and custodian, will be restricted to veterans as long as veteran applicants are available.

2. Time spent in military service will be credited toward experience required for a position of the kind you left.

3. Age, height, and weight requirements are waived for veterans in most instances. Other physical requirements may be waived.

4. Veterans are exempted from provisions of law prohibiting Government employment to more than two members of a family.

5. If an appointing officer passes over a veteran and selects a non-veteran, he must submit his reasons in writing to the Civil Service Commission.

6. In personnel reductions in any Federal agency, preference in retention will be given to veterans.

There are approximately 4,500 local Civil Service Secretaries located in all first- and second-class post offices, who will advise you concerning Government employment, or such information may be secured from your reemployment committeeman or the United States Employment Service, who will put you in touch with a representative of the Civil Service Commission.

APPRENTICE TRAINING

Virtually all of the 30,207 apprentice-training programs in the United States extend opportunities to returning veterans. Veterans may be employed as apprentices and be paid as they learn, getting not only a steady job but training which prepares them for skilled jobs. Age restrictions and other limitations are lifted for them in many cases. Information may be obtained through your nearest United States Employment Service office or the nearest facility of the Veterans' Administration.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

If you have a service-connected disability, which results in an occupational handicap, you can probably be taught a new type of work in which your disability will not hinder you. Through the Veterans' Administration you may be trained in a college, business, or trade school, or on the job with a business firm. Tuition, books, supplies, and equipment are provided at Government expense. During training, if the pension being received is less than $80 per month, it will be increased to the rate of $80 per month, if you are single; $90, if married, with an added allowance of $5 a month for each child, and $10 for each dependent parent.

If your disability is not service connected, or occurs after you have left the service, and constitutes a vocational handicap, you may apply to your State board of vocational education for guidance, special training, and placement. If in financial need, other services available include medical treatment, hospitalization, maintenance, and transportation during training, educational supplies, occupational tools, and equipment. This is a Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation and operates in each State. Apply to your local superintendent of schools or the nearest United States Employment Service office for the address of the nearest vocational rehabilitation officer.

TRAINING FOR WAR WORK

During the war you may acquire the skill necessary for war-production jobs under the vocational training for war workers program. Information concerning this program is available from your local superintendent of schools or the United States Employment Service.

IF UNEMPLOYED

To cover temporary periods of unemployment following discharge, financial help is available to you, either through State or Federal sources.

State programs

State unemployment-compensation programs provide weekly payments to unemployed workers based on their previous work

in covered jobs—that is, most jobs in private firms in business and industry; factories, shops, mines, mills, stores, offices, banks, etc. Types of jobs not covered are farm work, household service, Government and self-employment, and work for many small firms. Almost all the States have frozen any unemployment-insurance rights you may have earned before going into service. You may be able to draw upon them in case you are unemployed after your return.

Full information on job opportunities and unemployment compensation can be obtained at your nearest United States Employment Service office.

Federal provisions

Weekly allowances of unemployment compensation are available through a Federal program if you are not eligible under a State program. If you qualify under both, money received under a State plan is subtracted from the Federal allowance. Under the Federal plan, you may receive 4 weeks of allowance for each calendar month of active service after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, up to a total limit of 52 weeks.

If you are completely unemployed, your allowance is $20 a week. If you are partially unemployed, you receive the difference between your wage and the weekly allowance plus $3. If you are self-employed, you may still be eligible if your net earnings in the previous calendar month were less than $100. Allowances remaining unpaid at your death do not become part of your estate.

Eligibility requirements: You must have served after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, and have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after 90 days' active service, or because of injury or disability incurred in line of duty. Unemployment must have started within 2 years of discharge or the end of the war. When you file a claim, you must be residing in the United States, be completely unemployed or (if partially employed) be receiving weekly wages of less than $23; you must register and continue to report to a public employment office, be able to work and be available for suitable work. Illness or disability which occurs during a period of unemployment for which allowances have already started will not disqualify you.

Disqualifications: You will be disqualified from receiving such allowances if you leave suitable work voluntarily and without good cause, if you are suspended or discharged for misconduct, if you fail without good cause to apply for suitable work to which you have been referred by a public employment office, or to accept suitable work when offered, or if you fail without good cause to attend an available free training course. A job is not considered suitable if (a) the wages, hours, or conditions of work are substantially less favorable than those prevailing for similar work in the locality, or (b) the position offered is vacant because of a strike, lock-out, or labor disputes.

Such disqualifications begin the week in which the cause of the disqualification occurs and continue for not more than 4 weeks immediately following. Under special circumstances the Administrator of Veterans Affairs may extend the period of your disqualification.

You will also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week in which your unemployment is due to a "stoppage of work" existing because of a labor dispute in which you are participating or directly interested.

Fuller information concerning these Federal benefits may be obtained at your nearest United States Employment Service office.

LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, BUSINESS

These three types of loans including farm and business equipment, are available to veterans who served on or after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, and who are discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable, after active service of 90 days or more, or because of service-incurred injury or disability. Applications must be made within 2 years after discharge or separation, or 2 years after the end of the war (whichever is later), but in no event more than 5 years after the end of the war.

The Administrator of Veterans Affairs will guarantee up to 50 percent of any such loan or loans, provided the amount guaranteed does not exceed $2,000. Loans guaranteed by the Administrator bear interest of not more than 4 percent per year and must be paid up within 20 years. The Administrator will pay the interest on the guaranteed amount for the first year.

Although the conditions vary somewhat for each type of loan, the general requirements are that the loan must be used for the purpose specified, that the terms of payment bear proper relationship to the veteran's anticipated income and expense, that the purchase price not exceed a reasonable normal value, that the property be useful and reasonably necessary, and for farms or business loans, that the veteran have such ability and experience as to provide a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful.

Detailed information concerning these loans is available at any facility of the Veterans' Administration.

Information concerning other opportunities in farming, including kinds of farms, cost of farms, sound farming methods and sources of credit can be obtained from your county agricultural agent. A booklet on this subject is also available upon request to the United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C. Ask for "Shall I Be a Farmer?" (AWI-105).

If you had a business of your own before you went into service and had to close it up or turn it over to someone else when you left, you may be able to get a loan to reestablish your business or a similar one, through the small-business loan program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

You must show prior business experience and have some capital to put into the business yourself, and there must be sound economic need for the business. Apply through a bank or other financial institution; if the bank cannot make the loan, file your application directly with the R. F. C. through its loan agencies.

EDUCATION

Educational aid for veterans is available from the Veterans' Administration provided: (1) You were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable; (2) you were not over 25 at the time you entered service, or can demonstrate that your education or training was interrupted or interfered with by your service; or if you desire a refresher or retraining course; (3) you served 90 days or more (not counting the time in Army specialized training program or Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of a civilian course and which was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman in a service academy) or were discharged or released from service because of an actual service-incurred injury or disability; and (4) you start such education not later than 2 years after discharge or end of war (whichever date is later).

Length of training: One year (or its equivalent in part-time study). If you complete these courses (except refresher or retraining courses) satisfactorily, you will be entitled to additional education or training not to exceed the length of time you spent in active service after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war (not including Army specialized training program or Navy college program). No course of education or training shall exceed 4 years.

Types of courses: You may select your own course at any educational or training institution which accepts you as qualified to undertake them, provided the institution is on the list approved by the Veterans' Administration.

Types of educational institution: Public or private, elementary, secondary, and other schools furnishing education for adults; business schools and colleges; scientific and technical institutions; colleges, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers' colleges, normal schools, professional schools, universities, and other educational and training institutions, including industrial establishments providing apprentice or other training on the job.

Expenses paid: The Veterans' Administration will pay to the educational or training institution the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, infirmary, and similar payments as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and such other necessary expenses (exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses and travel) as are required. Such payments shall not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

Living allowance: The Veterans' Administration will also provide a subsistence allowance of $50 a month if you have no dependents, $75 if you have. (This may be reduced, however, if you attend on a part-time basis or receive compensation for work done as part of your training.)

You may also want to apply for school or college credit for what you learned in the service or a record of it to show your prospective employer. For information on this subject and application blank, write to:

Army: United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison 3, Wis.

Navy: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Marine Corps: Marine Corps Institute, Marine Barracks, Washington 25, D. C.

Coast Guard: United States Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington 25, D. C.

HOSPITAL CARE

If you should ever need hospital care for a disability incurred in line of duty in the service, it will be provided upon request to the Veterans' Administration. You may also be given free transportation to the hospital.

If your illness is not due to service, you may still get hospitalization if a bed is available and you are financially unable to pay the cost yourself.

MEDICAL ATTENTION

If you need medical service or dental care not requiring hospitalization, it will be provided by the Veterans' Administration if the condition was caused or aggravated in line of duty by your service. Medicine, appliances, bridgework, and so forth, are included.

DISABILITY PENSIONS

If you are discharged from the armed forces with a disability due to service, you may be entitled to disability benefits including a pension. The amount payable runs from $11.50 a month for 10 percent disability up to $115 a month for 100 percent disability. In addition there are special rates and allowances for specific injuries and more seriously disabling conditions. Apply through the Veterans' Administration.

CARE IN NATIONAL SOLDIERS' HOME

A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may apply for admission to one of the numerous National Soldiers' Homes for disabled, located throughout the country, where former members of the armed forces may live and receive care.

LEGAL PROTECTION

In general, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act protects service men and women

up to 6 months after their discharge by making it possible for the courts to suspend enforcement of certain civil liabilities during that time, such as:

Lawsuits for collection of debts.
Contracts.
Repossession of property.
Collection of certain taxes.
Sale of property for taxes.
Eviction of dependents for nonpayment of rent.
Insurance premiums.
Rights in public lands.

Legal counsel, without charge, is available to service personnel through State chairmen of the American Bar Association, or you may consult your local selective service board, Red Cross, or Legal Aid Society.

INCOME TAX

In some cases Federal and State laws provide for deferment or adjustment of tax payments by veterans. For information on Federal income tax and other Federal taxes, go to the nearest office of the collector of internal revenue. Your own State tax commission at the State capital will answer questions about State income tax and other State taxes.

ASSISTANCE WITH SPECIAL PROBLEMS

There are in most communities agencies organized to meet special needs which arise from time to time for financial assistance, medical care, legal aid, or other personal problems. For advice in such situations apply to your county welfare office, the local chapter of the Red Cross, or the Veterans' information service center. Information and advice may also be obtained at military installations from the Army's personal affairs officers, the Navy's civil readjustment officers, and the Marine Corps' rehabilitation officers.

CLAIMS FOR BACK PAY

Army inquiries should be addressed to the finance officer of the camp in the United States from which discharged or transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps. Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard inquiries should be addressed to the Claims Division, General Accounting Office, Washington 25, D. C. Be sure to print full name and serial or service number.

REVIEW OF DISCHARGE

If you feel that your military service justified a more favorable discharge or dismissal than you received, you may at any time within 15 years request and receive a review of it, unless you were discharged or dismissed by general court-martial sentence. Subject to approval by the Secretary of War or of the Navy, the reviewing board may change or modify a discharge, or issue a new one, if evidence warrants. Apply to your own branch of the service.

REVIEW OF RETIREMENT

Any offier retired or released to inactive service without pay because of physical disability has the right (within 15 years) to request review of the retiring board's decision. Apply to your own branch of service.

LAPEL BUTTONS

All those who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States on or after September 8, 1939, are entitled to wear the lapel button that signifies such service. If you did not get this button when discharged, it will be issued to you, free, upon presentation of your discharge certificate or other certificate of service at most military and naval installations.

WEARING UNIFORM AFTER DISCHARGE

You are entitled to wear your uniform from the place where you receive your discharge to your home, provided that the distinctive mark required by certain branches of the service to designate ex-servicemen be worn as directed and provided that you go there within 3 months of the discharge date. You may also wear your uniform on ceremonial occasions. In such cases you wear the uniform in the highest rank or grade that you held during the war.

BURIAL

A sum not exceeding $100 may be allowed on the burial, funeral, and transportation expenses of any honorably discharged veteran of any war, a veteran discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, or a veteran receiving pension for service-connected disability. Application should be made to the Veterans' Administration.

Men and women dying in the service of the United States in the armed forces and veterans whose last discharge was honorable are eligible for burial in a national cemetery. Apply to the superintendent of the national cemetery.

Headstones are supplied for veterans, without charge, upon application to the Quartermaster General, United States Army, War Department, Washington 25, D. C. In most cases, an American flag for draping the casket may be obtained from the Veterans' Administration or any county seat postmaster.

JOBS FOR DEPENDENTS

Special attention and assistance will be given by the local offices of the United States Employment Service and local veterans' employment representatives to members of veterans' families seeking suitable employment.

Wives and widows of disabled veterans are given certain preferences for positions in the United States civil service.

PENSIONS FOR DEPENDENTS

When a member or former member of the armed forces dies of a service-connected disability, his widow, children, and dependent parents may file a claim for pension with the Veterans' Administration. A veteran's own pension for disability is not continued after his death.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

In the event of the death of a member or former member of the armed forces who had had civilian employment in private business or industry, survivors' insurance benefits may be payable on his social-security account. The next of kin should inquire immediately at the nearest Social Security Board office.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE

When a veteran dies, the Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, should be notified immediately so that all questions of insurance can be settled promptly.

Upon the death of a person who carried Government insurance, the Veterans' Administration, when notified, will forward the necessary blanks to the beneficiary. In the case of National Service life insurance, payments will be made by the Veterans' Administration, not in one lump sum but in 240 equal monthly payments, if the beneficiary is under 30 years of age, or in equal monthly installments for life if beneficiary is 30 or over.

DEPENDENTS OF VETERANS RECEIVING VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The pension of a disabled veteran who is receiving vocational training may, in some cases, be increased on account of a wife, husband, children, or dependent parents.

DISABLED DEPENDENTS

Any disabled dependent of employable age with a vocational handicap may secure through the State rehabilitation agency special training and other services necessary to prepare him for a job. Apply to your State Board of Vocational Education, or inquire at the nearest United States Employment Service office as to the location of the State Rehabilitation Agency.

SIX MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY

When a member of the armed forces dies while in service, and not as a result of own misconduct, the widow receives a cash payment equal to 6 months' pay; if no widow, payment is made to the children; if no widow or children, payment is made to the dependent relative named. If no beneficiary has been named a claim blank is mailed only upon request from a qualified relative. Inquiries should be addressed to the particular service of which the service man or woman was a member; Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. Recipients of this benefit are not eligible to receive muster-out pay.

BACK PAY

The balance of any pay account remaining due a person who dies while in service will be paid to the next of kin. Proper forms for filing this claim can be secured from the service involved, but actual payment is handled by the Claims Division, General Accounting Office, Washington 25, D. C., to whom any further inquiry should be made after claim is filed.

Unpaid portions of muster-out pay may be claimed by a surviving spouse; if none, by surviving children; if no surviving children, by a surviving parent or parents.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES

All allotments and family allowances are discontinued upon report of death of men or women in the armed services.

PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION

As long as a serviceman or woman is a prisoner of war or is interned in a neutral country or is listed as missing or missing in action, dependents will continue to receive family allowances as previously, and any allotments that are for their support and have been so designated.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

See similar topic under Assistance With Special Problems.

BURIAL

Where an enlisted man or officer is eligible for burial in a national cemetery (see page 15), arrangements may be made under certain circumstances for the burial with him of his wife or widow, and in some of these cemeteries, for the burial of minor children and unmarried adult daughters.

SOME HELPFUL SUGGESTIONS

In correspondence with any branch of the service or with the Veterans' Administration or other organizations, the veteran's full name, birth date, rank or rating, and serial, service or file number should be given. Also, any other information that will be helpful, such as the number of his insurance policy if the correspondence concerns insurance, and so on. This will result in faster action for all concerned.

Social Security: If you had a social security card before entering the service, locate it now so you will have it ready to show your employer upon return to work. You will need it if your job is in private business or industry. If you had a card but cannot find it now, apply for a duplicate so that the new card will have the same social security number as the card originally issued to you. Apply to the nearest Social Security Board office or to the Social Security Board, Candler Building, Baltimore, Md. If you can supply the number which was on your original card, a duplicate can be issued to you more quickly.

Records: Gather together all the important records that you may need and have them in a safe place where you can get them quickly when needed.

Your discharge certificate is a valuable document, so you will be wise to have it recorded. To do this you should take it to the county clerk, county recorder or other

appropriate official at your local county court house. In most States, it will be recorded without charge. The original will be returned to you and then, if you ever need a copy, you can get a certified one from this source. In the meantime, keep the original in a safe place. (If you lose it, write to your own branch of the service.) A small photostat copy can be carried in your wallet.

War ration books can be obtained when you get back by applying at the War Price and Rationing Board for the place in which you live. Apply in person, with evidence of your discharge.

Every veteran should keep the following personal record:

PERSONAL RECORD

Name _____
Service No. _____ (rank, grade, or rate) _____
(Army or Marine Corps serial number, Navy service or file number, Coast Guard service number.)
Entry into service:
Place _____
Date _____
Branch _____
Separation from service:
Place _____
Date of discharge _____
Number _____
Selective-service information:
Local board _____
Local board address _____
Induction order number _____
Date of report after separation _____
National service life insurance:
Number of policy _____
Date of policy _____
Amount _____
Premiums due _____
Amount of premium _____
Convert policy before _____ (Date)
Social-security number _____
Addresses:
Veterans' Administration _____
Red Cross _____
United States Employment Service Office _____
State department of education _____
Legal Aid Society _____
Local bar association _____
My own lawyer _____
My own doctor _____
In an emergency:
Notify _____
Where my records can be found _____

Selective service: Your local selective-service board.

Government insurance: Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Reemployment: Your former employer or reemployment committeeman of your local selective-service board.

Employment: United States Employment Service; United States Civil Service Commission.

Education: Veterans' Administration.

Vocational training: Veterans' Administration; also (if disability not due to service) your State department of education.

Loans for homes, farms, business: Veterans' Administration.

Veterans' benefits (disability pensions, hospital care, medical attention, Government insurance, national soldiers' homes, burial allowance): Veterans' Administration.

Legal aid: Your State bar association; Red Cross, legal aid society.

Financial aid, personal problems: Red Cross or county welfare office.

Income tax (Federal): Nearest internal revenue office.

Income tax (State): State tax commission at State capital.

Social security benefits: Nearest Social Security Board field office.

Unemployment benefits: Nearest United States Employment Service office.

Mustering-out pay: Apply to appropriate service—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard.

To find the local address of any of the above organizations consult your local telephone directory, local post office, or ask the Red Cross or a selective service board.

There may be a veterans' information service center in your community. Information may also be obtained at military installations from the Army's personal affairs officers, the Navy's civil readjustment officers, and the Marine Corps' rehabilitation officers.

Letter From Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark Concerning Chaplain's Prayer on June 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on June 6, D-day, when the Allied forces landed on the coast of France, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, our chaplain, opened the session of the Senate with an inspiring prayer. By a mutual friend a copy of the prayer was sent to Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark, commanding the American Fifth Army in Italy. General Clark, under date of August 3, addressed a letter to Dr. Harris thanking him for the prayer. I think it quite worth while to have printed in the RECORD this letter, written by one of the great generals of the United States Army, who is prosecuting with such skill, vigor, and success the campaign against the enemy in Italy. General Clark's letter is indicative of the appreciation felt by the officers and men fighting for their country on the battlefields of the world for the thoughts and prayers of those who must remain at home. I ask unanimous consent that General Clark's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS FIFTH ARMY,
A. P. O. 6464, UNITED STATES ARMY,
August 3, 1944.

DEAR REVEREND HARRIS: I have received your inspiring prayer which you offered in the United States Senate on June 6. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for sending it. It is one of the most impressive prayers I have ever received.

These past weeks have seen some great work accomplished by the United States armed forces and our allies. We of the Fifth Army are still driving forward against stiff resistance. We shall continue to drive the enemy before us until the day of final victory. The wonderful support and prayers of those at home is a constant source of inspiration and strength to us in the accomplishment of our purpose.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

MARK W. CLARK,
Lieutenant General,
United States Army, Commanding.

Rehabilitation of Service Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABE MURDOCK
OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the American Journal of Nursing for August 1944 by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REHABILITATING OUR SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, Ph. D.)

As the war in Europe draws to a climax, our thoughts turn to what will happen to our service men and women after it is won. Fortunately, a great deal of planning has already been done, designed to help them over their difficult adjustments to civilian life.

These plans and the legislation necessary to carry them out have been made none too soon. There is always the possibility that one or both wars may end quickly. If Germany should collapse suddenly, some 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 men and women would be discharged as soon thereafter as practicable.

The blueprints for demobilization have not been completely drawn up even yet. So far as they have been filled in, the Army intends to release first those enlisted men and officers, with certain exceptions, who have had longest service or have been much under fire. After them will go fathers over 30, married men of 30 and over without children, and unmarried men with and without dependents. In all likelihood, few, if any, Navy or Marine Corps personnel will be released before the end of the Asiatic war.

Women in the armed forces will receive the same treatment as men. Members of the Army Nurse Corps will probably be discharged in direct ratio to the number of soldiers, sailors, and marines who are released from service.

Because of this, it is well to consider the plans made by the Government for the rehabilitation of service men and women. In all the planning, there has been but one basic thought in regard to the veteran's welfare after the war or after his period of training. That thought was made a part of the Selective Service Act when it first became law. Stated very simply, it is a guaranty that every soldier, sailor, or marine will be restored to his old job if he wants it. In other words, before the American citizen was called into service at all, it was contemplated that that service would disrupt his ordinary life to such an extent that it might very well upset his entire economic well-being.

All of the thinking on the welfare of the returned soldier, be such soldier man or woman, has been based on the premise that what is done for the soldier is not solely for his own good and that of his family. It is actually for the good of the whole body politic and the national economy. That fact should be stressed because it is, in a sense, unique that a government should think of its own welfare in terms of care for those whom it has called into service.

INSURANCE, REHABILITATION, AND MUSTERING-OUT PAY

No nation, of course, can ever do what it ought to do for those who give their lives in war. The man and woman who sacrifice their

lives for their country have given their all. There is nothing that can be done for them excepting to enshrine them in a place of honor. There is one thing, however, that can be done for those who are left behind. That is insurance. This was President Wilson's great contribution to an attempt to take some of the sting out of war as far as individual sacrifice is concerned.

During the past 25 years it has become a national policy to do much for veterans. From the beginning of this war, we have planned better than ever before and more logically. We have planned from the standpoint of the veteran's welfare and that of the Nation. Many bills have already been enacted into law, among them the veterans' rehabilitation law, the mustering-out pay bill, and the so-called GI bill of rights.

Under a law passed by Congress on March 17, 1943, the veteran of this war, if sick or disabled, is entitled to care in a veteran hospital for the rest of his life even though he has served but one day in uniform. Not only that, his disability or injury need not be a result of his war service. It is enough that he is a veteran.

Consequently, the Veterans' Administration is enlarging its facilities to accommodate some 300,000 veterans of all wars by 1975. At that time, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs believes, the peak will be reached.

According to recent information from the Veterans' Administration, in order to provide adequate care for patients, the present ratio of 1 nurse to 25 psychiatric cases will be maintained; for general medical, surgical, and tuberculosis patients, the ratio is 1 nurse to 6.5–7.5 patients. Army and Navy nurses wishing such duty are assured first preference by the Veterans' Administration following their release from the service.

The mustering-out-pay bill is designed to give veterans some allowance during the period of their adjustment to civilian life. This bill, passed by Congress on February 3, 1944, within certain limitations provides cash payments of $300 to service men and women who, having performed active service for 60 days or more, have served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska; $200 for persons who have been in active service more than 60 days, but who have not served outside the continental limits of the United States or Alaska; and $100 for persons who have performed active service for less than 60 days. A down payment will be made at the time of discharge from active duty in the first two instances, with the balance to be paid at later stated intervals. Those who receive the $100 payment will receive it in one lump sum.

THE G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

The G. I. bill of rights, as passed by Congress on June 13 of this year, provides for Government-financed education, Government-guaranteed loans, job-finding assistance, hospitalization, and unemployment compensation for veterans of this war.

To help veterans purchase homes, farms, or small businesses the legislation provides for Government-guaranteed 20-year loans by private or public lending agencies at a maximum of 4 percent interest, with the Veterans' Administration absorbing the interest charges for the first year. The guaranty may not exceed 50 percent of the principal of a loan and no guaranty may exceed $2,000.

The unemployment section insures a maximum of 52 weeks unemployment compensation of $20 a week during the first 2 years after discharge. A job-finding agency will be established for registration for employment and for placement in employment by the veterans' Employment Service through (*a*) the United States Employment Service, and (*b*) any State agency cooperating with the United States Employment Service. While the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is made responsible for veterans' employment, this is not a function of the Veterans' Administration, but is retained in the United States Employment Service.

Under provisions of the bill, any man or woman that has served 90 days and whose education has been interrupted by his war service may return to the school of his choice after his discharge. Maximum schooling is limited to 4 years, depending upon the length of service. The Government will pay not more than $500 annually for tuition and fees, and subsistence allowances of $50 or $75 a month, depending upon whether the students have dependents. Service men and women who were over 25 at the time of their induction must prove that their education was interrupted, while it will be presumed that the education of all under 25 was interfered with by their induction.

Since this law operates entirely on a voluntary basis—that is, the Government makes the offer and the returning soldier may accept it if he wishes—no one knows how many will apply for this education and training. It is known, however, that the task will tax the ability of the Nation's teaching institutions. The more diverse the training, the greater will be the benefit to America economically and socially. The whole aim of the bill is to replace the soldier in that type of life from which he came or help him reach that to which he aspires.

If the men and women of our Army and Navy have been fighting to preserve the American way of life, surely the Government should plan that that way will not be lost in the adjustment after the war. President Roosevelt tells us that we must not only win the war—we must see that it stays won. By that he implies a proper international organization for the preservation of peace. That is only half the job. The preservation of a decent domestic life is just as essential as the preservation of the peace for our Nation internationally.

For a country to be defeated by poverty, disease, and unemployment is quite as disastrous as to be defeated by a military enemy. War is the supreme extravagance, but a loss of health, wealth, and happiness through shiftless inertia on the part of the Government is the next greatest waste. One brings death by murder, the other by suicide.

There are many who say the United States cannot afford such laws. Cannot afford good health. Cannot afford economic stability. If America can afford $300,000,000 a day to destroy, surely it can afford a few thousands of dollars to create. The Nation's economic well-being demands it. The people's social sensibilities demand it. The logic of the situation demands it. This country can no longer say it cannot afford to do some good for its citizens when these citizens have done so much for it.

Today, more than ever before, the Government is recognizing that great areas in the country have low health standards. Babies die, mothers are permanently weakened through lack of proper care before and after childbirth; children are weakened and handicapped in their normal growth by poor nutrition and bad sanitation. Adults in some areas live in conditions which sap their interest in living, prevent their being useful workers and members of society.

NURSES WILL BE NEEDED

Here is the place—the need—for the nurse, and every nurse should think of herself as a guardian of public health. Post-war plans have been drawn up to increase public health services all over the country, especially in these substandard areas. Nurses, in ever increasing numbers, will be needed to man these clinics and health centers.

Thus it can be seen that the Nation has a vital stake in the expansion of nurse education. The Bolton Act, creating the United States Cadet Nurse Corps under the sponsorship of the United States Public Health Service, was designed as a wartime measure, pure and simple. It is my belief, however, that Federal assistance to nurse education must not be allowed to die with the coming of peace. The results it has achieved in a year more than justify its continued existence.

After this war we are going to need more and better nurses than ever before in the history of this country. Recruiting and educating these young women can never again be the duty of the schools of nursing alone. It is a duty which must be shared by the Government, the voluntary nursing organizations, and the schools, if we are to have an adequate supply of properly educated nurses to meet the evolving health needs of our land.

Universal education and alert health measures in peacetime actually pay dividends in time of war. An Army personnel officer, testifying before a Senate committee, declared that 5 out of every 10 men called by the draft are rejected for one reason or another. In those States where educational standards are low, public health nurses few, and health regulations just average, 7 men out of 10 are not taken. But in those States whose educational requirements are high, who provide public health nurses, and where health administration is on a State-wide basis, only 2 out of 10 are turned down. In States with excellent health and educational standards, the acceptance ratio is very much higher.

Did the States who paid well for the education of their youth and for the improvement of health waste money? There is no greater waste, in war or peace, than the man who cannot take some share in the protection of his country because of poor health conditions, which could be easily remedied, or because he does not know how to read as write Progress in peacetime too demands that every citizen be able to meet its challenges with optimum health.

The world has been put back countless years as a result of this global war. The creative energies of an entire generation have been devoted to but one purpose—destruction. Those same energies, directed to peaceful pursuits, might have done much to solve the riddles of the ages—the causes and cure of cancer, the virus diseases, and arthritis, the control of tuberculosis and venereal disease, the mysteries of the atom and the electron.

The men and women who are called to fight have made sacrifices, all great and some ultimate. What little is done for them by the Government through these rehabilitation bills will be a healing influence for them and for the communities to which they will return. These laws are the only means by which the Nation can show its gratitude for the invaluable services of soldier and sailor, nurse and marine.

Dumbarton Oaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the conference which commenced at Dumbarton Oaks Monday, and which I am delighted to say has apparently gotten off to such an excellent beginning as to justify optimism, accomplishes what we all so ardently hope and pray for, this old residence, already an institution in

Washington, will become an incomparable international shrine. Hence, I consider it desirable that readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD become more familiar with it and, therefore, quote an editorial from the Washington Star of August 23:

DUMBARTON OAKS

One of the constructive effects of the present international conference in Washington will be to make Dumbarton Oaks famous throughout the world. The beauty of the house, its furnishings, decorations, and grounds is certain to remain in the memory of all participants in the meetings. For the information of Americans as well as visitors from abroad, a few words of explanation of the history of the property may be offered.

The land, it seems, was acquired from Thomas Beall by William H. Dorsey, first judge of the local Orphans' Court, in the administration of Thomas Jefferson in 1800. His house was constructed between 1800 and 1804. It was sold then to Robert Beverly, of Essex County, Va., whose wife was Jane, a sister of Colonel John Tayloe, the builder of the celebrated Octagon House. The Beverlys owned the place until 1822, when it passed to James E. Calhoun, of South Carolina, and thus became the residence of his brother, John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War under James Monroe and Vice President with John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson. Called Acrolophos and Monterey at different periods, the whole establishment was bought by Edward M. Linthicum in 1846. The next proprietor was Colonel Henry M. Blount, from whom the mansion and its immediate surroundings received its present name. Much more important, however, were the costly improvements added by Robert Woods Bliss, former Ambassador to the Argentine Republic, and his wife during their tenancy beginning about a decade ago. Harvard University is the actual holder of the deed, but the people of Washington especially and their guests are the beneficiaries of their exquisite taste, discrimination, and generosity.

Manpower and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial was published in the Hartford (Conn.) Daily Courant on August 22.

This editorial expresses the sentiments of a large number of men and women who have written to me protesting the high-handed administration of the War Manpower Commission.

The mere fact that Congress refused to pass a labor-drafting bill means nothing to this administration. A directive by "Assistant President" James F. Byrnes is as good as a law for Mr. McNutt.

Watch the election returns in the labor precincts on November 7.

MANPOWER AND POLITICS

Area directors of the War Manpower Commission have been meeting in Chicago recently to discuss methods by which sanctions may be applied against employers who violate W. M. C. rulings. Since these rules are of bureaucratic rather than legislative origin, it is only fitting that the guilt of the offenders shall be decided by the same authorities who make the rules and who fix the penalties. These penalties are boycott and blackball. Through O. P. A., gasoline and tire rations are cut off. Through W. P. B. the Manpower Commission will seek to withhold materials and will doubtless seek the diversion of contracts from offenders. The W. M. C. itself will refrain from referring workers to the erring manufacturer.

The serious doubts about the legality of these procedures may explain the furtive, undercover manner in which the instructions are being transmitted to the lord high executioners in the field. The instructions were issued early this week and are supposedly currently effective, but the W. M. C. in Washington has thus far declined to make the details public, saying that there may be some changes made as a result of current discussions with regional directors.

Although it is wholly incidental to this problem, it may be fervently wished that the manpower directors have on their agenda some discussion designed to clarify the situation with regard to the steady transition of Government employees to the pay roll of Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee. Although a worker in a Hartford factory finds himself frozen to his job, the freezing process apparently does not apply to employees of the W. M. C. and other Government agencies. Only recently W. M. C. released two of its highly paid officials to become director and women's director of the Political Action Committee. These are only two of a large group of Government employees who seem to have no difficulty whatever in giving up their Government work to engage in Mr. Hillman's campaign. Doubtless this latter work is considered by many New Dealers as being of a highly essential nature, if not to the war, then to their own political fortunes.

From the outset the activities of the W. M. C. on the national level have been dogged by this same political point of view. Even such a master politician as Paul V. McNutt is not adept enough to keep his political balls in the air while at the same time doing a workmanlike job of manpower control. Hence, the series of ineptitudes and inconsistencies that have characterized the handling of manpower in the United States. Unfortunately, the end, even now, is not in sight.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, veterans of World War No. 2 have been given wonderful opportunities by a friendly and generous Congress. This is as it should be, since these brave men were willing to give the supreme sacrifice for their country. Many of these brave veterans saw their buddies drop in action.

They can buy or repair a home, buy and stock up a farm, start a new business, get a high-school or college education, draw special unemployment benefits if unable to find work, be assured of free and adequate hospitalization.

Benefits extend to men and women of the armed services who have other than dishonorable discharges and who have served 90 days since September 15, 1940, or less than 90 days if they have service-connected disabilities.

It is important to know exactly what the Government now offers, what the terms, the conditions, the opportunities are in each field.

FIRST, TAKE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR HOME BUYING OR FOR BUYING A FARM

A qualified veteran will be able to get the Veterans' Administration to arrange for a Government-guaranteed loan for buying or building a home or for making repairs, alterations, and improvements on a home. Such loans also may be obtained by a veteran to pay off back taxes or delinquent debts on homes. The Government will guarantee 50 percent of the loan up to $2,000 and will pay the first year's interest on the part of the loan that it guarantees. Thus, a veteran can borrow up to $4,000, with the Government standing behind half of it.

These loans can be made by a bank, loan association, or any other lending agency, including an individual or friend of the veteran. If you are a veteran who obtains such a loan, you would have to satisfy the lender as to collateral on your share. But in case of buying a home, the home could be used as collateral. Interest on these loans cannot exceed 4 percent, and they must be repaid in full within 20 years.

In addition, the Government will guarantee fully a secondary loan up to 20 percent of the cost of the property. But the total amount guaranteed by the Government in both loans cannot exceed $2,000. This provision makes it possible for veterans to get cash for original down payments on homes. Interest on such secondary loans can run up to 5 percent. Veterans have until 2 years after the war or 2 years after their discharge, whichever is later, to take advantage of the loan opportunities.

Loans on the same basis are available for veterans who want to buy farms. Money from the loans may be used to purchase land, buildings, livestock, machinery, or other equipment or for making repairs and improvements. But if you are a veteran and want to buy a farm, you must show that you know something about farming and are likely to make a success of the undertaking.

SUPPOSE A VETERAN WANTS TO SET UP HIS OWN BUSINESS

Here the procedure and conditions for getting loans are about the same as those for buying homes or farms. The money may be used to buy an established business or land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, and so forth. Secondary loans are also available for down payments. But if you are getting a loan for this purpose, the Veterans' Administration will want to know something about your background and experience in this business. In other words, you will have to show that there is a reasonable likelihood that you will make a success of it. Even so, it is expected that many veterans will want to start their own business and will be helped.

IF IT IS A MATTER OF EDUCATION OR TRAINING

When a veteran qualifies for a college, school, or training course, the Government will pay up to $500 a year to cover

tuition, laboratory fees, cost of books, and so forth. The student also will get $50 a month living allowance, plus $25 a month if he has a wife or other dependents. He may choose his school, but he must keep up with the work or he will be dropped.

If a veteran was under 25 when he entered the service, he may return to school even though his education was not interrupted. That is, he may have left school and been working when he entered service. But anyone who was 25 or over when he went into service must show, in order to qualify, that his education was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with. However, any veteran who desires a refresher or retraining course may take such a course for 1 year.

A veteran who qualifies for college or other schooling will be able to remain at Government expense for 1 year. Then, if he qualifies for further education, he can remain for the length of time, up to a total of 4 years, that he served between September 15, 1940, and the end of the war. He has until 2 years after his discharge or after the war ends to return to school. This Government-paid education program stops 7 years after the war ends.

NEXT, AS TO UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Ex-service men and women will be able to claim unemployment benefits of $20 a week for up to 52 weeks if they cannot find jobs. They will be entitled to 4 weeks of unemployment benefits for each month of service, plus additional time allowance for the first 90 days of service. But they are supposed to register with a public employment agency, such as the United States Employment Service, and accept suitable work if offered. Furthermore, they will be disqualified from unemployment benefits if they give up suitable jobs without reason, are fired for misconduct, or, in certain cases, go out on strike. Unemployment benefits will be available to a veteran until 2 years after his discharge or 2 years after the war, whichever is later.

Cash benefits also are provided for self-employed veterans who make less than $100 a month. They can have the Government make up the difference between their net earnings and $100 a month. Like the unemployment payment, this benefit is allowed up to 52 weeks, according to length of service.

If veterans have any questions about these aids, see your Red Cross, veteran service officer, or local American Legion head. If you have any further questions or need any more help, write to Congressman JIMMY MORRISON, Washington, D. C.

Two Divergent Views of the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

TWO DIVERGENT VIEWS OF THE PEACE

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Two books on international affairs have recently appeared. One is by former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, the other by the columnist, Walter Lippmann. Both contain plans for the future world. But here the resemblance ends.

Mr. Welles' book, The Time for Decision, is the most important book on foreign policy to appear in this country in the last 20 years. No one else in the administration could have written it, and, unfortunately, only a handful of Americans are competent to criticize the solutions it offers.

But what Mr. Welles says about world organization concerns every American.

Mr. Welles believes that the world can be organized for permanent peace, not in some vague future time—now. He knows that the foundation of such peace cannot possibly be anything less than an organization representing all nations, large and small, and with the power and the obligation to suppress aggression everywhere. (He quotes with satisfaction Maxim Litvinov's dictum, "Peace is indivisible.") He would put the immediate responsibility for this in the hands of a provisional executive council, heavily weighted in favor of the great powers.

As one of the authors of the doctrine of voluntary inter-American solidarity (good-neighbor policy), Mr. Welles trusts this can be maintained and leans (too) heavily on regionalism. He wishes to eschew the creation of an international police force, overlooking the utility of the latter as a "trigger" to set off combined action by the major powers. He further concedes to the big countries a veto power on action by the executive council, which to this writer is unacceptable.

In fact, many aspects of this plan are unacceptable.

Nonetheless, it is a real plan, not a shoddy imitation of one. Its faults—excessive nationalism and concentration of power in a few hands—are such as could be eliminated without upsetting the general structure.

Moreover, Mr. Welles understands that unless the international organization is set up now, while hostilities are still going on, it risks never being set up at all. Therefore he urges the governments, and Washington in particular, to go about setting up the provisional executive council, a security and armaments commission, a world court, and a world council right away, as the "four bodies indispensable to any permanent world organization."

Mr. Lippmann, on the other hand, has produced the most astonishing mixture of fatalism, specious reasoning, and quaint illusions about international affairs that has appeared in many a day.

His book, United States War Aims, seems to me an engraved invitation to World War No. 3.

Mr. Lippmann sees the world dividing into great communities—an Atlantic community; a Soviet orbit; a Chinese orbit; eventually an Indian orbit and a Moslem orbit; united in a vague association and a pallid world organization without political authority. And instead of calling out the fire department pronto, he urges us to recognize and perpetuate this division.

Mr. Lippmann hopes that somehow these great communities will be unable to fight each other. In the new wonderland: "Continental Europeans will not mind being separated into two camps and subordinated, part to Anglo-Saxons, part to the Soviets; Germans can be induced to accept disarmament in a fully armed world; Russians will permit a disarmed Germany to enter the Atlantic community; two of the three great blocs will never be tempted to gang-up on the third; the impingement of the overseas possessions of members of the Atlantic community on the Soviet and Chinese orbits will never cause friction; countries will never seek to change community—i. e., France or Spain will not wish to enter the Soviet orbit; Poland and Czechoslovakia never aspire to the Atlantic community;" therefore, security can continue to be entrusted to alliances of fully soverign nations and national armies and navies.

It is a lovely, neat world—if you can believe in it—and I suspect Mr. Lippmann does not. He has merely convinced himself that a really international organization is impossible. The new world cannot be planned; it grows like a tree. No one, insists Mr. Lippmann, can sit in his study and invent a workable peace.

Obviously Mr. Lippmann can't. But in 1789 the American founding fathers did. At that time, according to the historian Roland Greene Usher, there was among the Thirteen Colonies "no geographical or economic basis for a single nation or a single government." The Revolution against the British had been made in the name of States' right. The "radicals" of the day considered Virginia, Massachusetts, etc., to be just as fundamentally sovereign as Lippmann would have the national states remain today. And just as willful men in Philadelphia sat down and invented the United States, so, if given a chance, men like Sumner Welles could sit down with our allies and invent the United Nations of the world.

Always provided they could hush the croakers who say it cannot be done.

Emergency Assistance for Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the House of Representatives H. R. 2849. This is a bill which has for its purpose the authorization of an appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elemental and secondary schools.

There was also pending in the Senate a bill known as S. 637. That bill was to the same import as the House bill, to which I have just referred. That Senate bill failed to pass the Senate.

I find that there is very much interest in the country with reference to the legislation suggested in these bills. The people of the Nation are always interested in educational matters. They are also very proud of the public schools. They want to keep the public schools as near to the people as possible. They have been skeptical of Federal aid and they are opposed to Federal control of public schools. They are, therefore, opposed to any Federal legislation that will jeopardize State control or that will tend to encourage Federal control.

Teachers in Ohio are very much interested in the proposed legislation and most of them seem to favor it.

Dr. T. C. McCracken, who is the Dean of the College of Education at Ohio University at Athens, has studied this subject very extensively and exhaustively. He is a thoroughly qualified school man, both from the standpoint of the philosophy of education and also from the standpoint of the technique of successful teaching. Dr. McCracken has prepared a short history of legislation of this kind, passed by Congress in the past 75 years. He has embodied in a letter that I received from him recently. I think this letter is very informative and this history should be considered especially by the Committee on Education of the House and Senate and also by all Congressmen interested in this legislation. I can recommend Dr. McCracken as being thoroughly American and thoroughly qualified to write about the subject involved.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have Dr. McCracken's letter presented to Congress and presented to the people of the country through the reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

OHIO UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION,
Athens, Ohio, August 3, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Ironton, Ohio.

MY DEAR MR. JENKINS: Following my promise to write to you relative to Federal aid for general education, I am forwarding with this letter some materials and data in which you may be interested.

I am enclosing one page on which I have listed acts which bring aid to general education beginning 1802, when the saline grants were made to 1920 when the Federal reserve income grant on minerals was made. At the present time approximately $2,000,000 a year are received by States from these enactments. On the same page you will find a list of defeated bills, beginning with the Hoar bill of 1870 and continuing to the bill which is at present before Congress under date of 1943, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, the Thomas-Hill-Ramspeck bill (S. 637; H. R. 2849). On at least two occasions these bills have been reported out of committee, but in all other cases they have been killed in committee. The Thomas-Hill S. 637 was killed by the rider which was put on it by the Senator from North Dakota last year. The Ramspeck bill, H. R. 2849, is the one which is still lodged in the House of Representatives committee. As indicated in my previous letter, the attempt is being made to bring it to the floor over the head of the committee. The educational people of the country are behind this bill quite unanimously and believe that there are enough votes to make it a law, providing it can be gotten to a vote in the House of Representatives. This would probably reopen the case on S. 637 in the Senate.

The point which I am wishing to make in this connection, however, is that through all these years, 1870–1943, practically all proposed legislation for aid to the States for general education has been killed. In the meantime, however, there has been liberal aid on the part of the Federal Government for special types of education. I refer to the following acts which are the most important of the acts in this area of support. These are listed on the enclosed sheet among which are the first Morrill Act of 1862 and additional acts to 1936 when the George-Deen Act was passed. They bring relatively large support for special types of education. There are other subordinate acts which from time to time have increased the amount of money given in connection with all of the acts mentioned in my list. For example, the Smith-Hughes Act provided for a much smaller amount of money at the beginning, but by 1925 it had risen to $7,200,000 annually. Other acts of less direct importance have been passed for aid to special education, thus increasing the volume of moneys made available for special types of education.

There is one special feature which has been included in these acts beginning with the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. For the first time, this act called for a matching of the money by the State on the dollar-for-dollar basis. This meant that the State's money which otherwise might have been spent within the State for various kinds of education was put into matching funds. This left the other kinds of education in the State with much less support than they had had before. In other words, the State has robbed its treasury for the support of special types of education at the expense of general education. Practically all of the important acts from 1914 have carried the matching provision. When the George-Deen bill was presented in 1936, they were evidently a little frightened lest the States might not be willing to match on the dollar-for-dollar basis. The bill provided, therefore, that in the first year, the States should match 50 cents for $1. The States' amount, however, was to be increased each year to 60, 70, 80, 90 cents, and finally $1 at the end of 5 years when it reached the dollar-for-dollar basis. General education, therefore, is being robbed within the States in order that the States may get additional support from the Federal Government for special types of education. There is, therefore, considerable danger in the matching plan.

The total amounts received by the Federal Government for each year under aid for special types of education runs well toward $50,000,000 a year. This is in contrast to the $2,000,000 to general education.

I have not included in the above the very liberal, and from many points of view unwise, Federal aid to education during the past dozen years. Most of this aid has been given directly by the Federal Government to Federal agents in the States. Regularly organized State programs have often been greatly handicapped by the types of aid which I have just mentioned. For example, no certification by the Federal Government was required. State and local plans for education were often greatly disturbed by such political aid from the Federal Government. The amounts of money spent under these plans have been much in excess of the aid which the Federal Government has given through regular State channels for general and special types of education.

The Ramspeck bill is probably on your desk. I am, however, enclosing a copy of it in order that you may have it at hand. I am enclosing a pamphlet issued by the National Education Association entitled "The Federal Government Must Aid Public Schools." This was put out by N. E. A. in support of S. 637. I am forwarding with this letter a copy of a manuscript which I have used on three or four occasions in various parts of the State of Ohio as I talked to educational and lay groups about the place of the Federal Government in education. There are nine pages of this manuscript. I am enclosing it for your assistance as you prepare for discussion in the House. I shall be pleased to have it returned when you are through with it, although if you need to keep it please feel free to do so, since I do have a second copy.

I hope that this presentation has not been too long. I have given in pages 1 and 2 of the outlines enclosed a list of bills and acts. You may wish to have one of your secretaries gather more information for you about them.

With best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

T. C. MCCRACKEN,
Dean, College of Education.

[Enclosures.]

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AID FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

1802: Saline grants.
1802: The 5-percent fund.
1836: The Surplus Revenue Act.
1841: The Internal Improvement Act.
1849: Swamp land grants.
1908: Forest reserve income grant (25 percent of income).
1920: Federal Reserve income grant—on minerals.

DEFEATED BILLS

1870: Hoar bill.
1881–87: Blair bills.
1918 (65th Cong.): Smith-Towner.
1919 (66th Cong.): Smith-Towner.
1921 (67th Cong.): Sterling-Towner.
1923 (68th Cong.): Sterling-Reed.
1936 (74th Cong., 2d sess.): Harrison-Fletcher (S. 4793; H. R. 13021).
1937 (75th Cong.): Harrison-Black-Fletcher (S. 419; H. R. 2288).
1938 (75th Cong., 2d sess.): Harrison-Thomas-Fletcher (S. 419; H. R. 10340).
1939 (76th Cong., 1st sess.): Harrison-Thomas-Larrabee (S. 1305; H. R. 3517).
1941: Thomas (S. 1313).
1942 (77th Cong., 2d sess.): Thomas.
1943 (78th Cong., 82d sess.): Thomas-Hill-Ramspeck (S. 637; H. R. 2849).

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AID FOR SPECIAL TYPES OF EDUCATION

1862: First Morrill Act.
1887: Hatch Act—Agricultural Experiment Station Act (in 1920 brought $90,000 to each State through Purnell Act).
1892: Second Morrill Act (in 1907—$50,000 for each State).
1914: Smith-Lever Act—Agricultural extension (4,100,000 by 1923), $1 for $1 matching began (in ed.).
1917: Smith-Hughes Act (by 1925—$7,200,000 annually).
1936: George-Deen Act (approved June 8, 1936, operative July 1, 1937), ($12,000,000 annually), (match 50 cents for $1, etc.).

Why Is the W. R. A. Allowed To Spend Money This Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of August 19, 1944, dealing with the ridiculous expenditure of public funds by the W. R. A. to propagandize the American people on the virtues of the Japanese in the relocation centers:

WHY IS W. R. A. ALLOWED TO SPEND MONEY THIS WAY?

During the period when the Japanese were being evacuated from the west coast—a matter of vital concern both to the residents of California and the areas where they would be relocated—the War Relocation Authority assumed an attitude of studious silence.

In fact, it was the opinion of Dillon S. Myer, the national director of the W. R. A., that if little enough were said about the evacuated Japanese the public soon might forget they even existed.

Indeed, this end might have been accomplished if it were not that the peculiar ineptness of the W. R. A. itself constantly made the public painfully aware of the presence of the Japanese. The point is, however, that when it was to the advantage of the Americans to be informed of the evacuation, the W. R. A. was singularly tongue-tied.

Now the public relations department of the W. R. A. has come suddenly to life.

Fat envelopes, sent under Government frank, are pouring from the W. R. A. offices stuffed with out-and-out propaganda in behalf of the Japanese. The purpose of the propaganda is to extol the virtues of the Japanese in the relocation centers; the obvious intent is to soften up the public for their release.

Included in the latest batch is a copy of an address delivered by a Japanese, a 12-page sheaf of photostats of favorable newspaper items, and a reprint of an article in Fortune, with illustrations. The last was reprinted by the American Council of Public Affairs and mailed in Government postage free envelopes.

The extraordinary thing about this is that it establishes some sort of a precedent in the use of Government funds to propagandize in behalf of any group of persons.

The same principle would be involved if the efforts were being extended in behalf of people named Smith.

Thousands of dollars in salaries are paid to the W. R. A.'s propagandists annually, in addition to the cost of printing, mimeographing, photostating and mailing.

Most persons will regard these expenditures as a decidedly improper use of Government funds. Also, how does Myer explain the silence of his press relations department on one occasion and its extreme verbosity on another?

Officers' Service Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, by permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the magnificent work being done by the Officers Service Committee, located in the Hotel Commodore in New York City. The operations of this organization are carried on by volunteers in rooms provided free of charge by the generous cooperation of Mr. Martin Sweeny, president of the Hotel Commodore, which is a real and practical contribution to the war effort.

These volunteers, who give freely of their time without thought of reward or publicity, are prominent residents in New York City and whatever expenses are incurred, such as telephone service, and so forth, are paid for out of funds supplied by the National War Fund, through the New York City Defense Recreation Committee.

Army and Navy officers and their wives from every State in the Union, as well as from foreign lands, have called on the O. S. C. and no effort has been spared to make their stay in New York pleasant and comfortable. The Officers Service Committee is conducting a necessary and much appreciated service, quietly and efficiently, and deserves the gratitude and thanks of a grateful people everywhere.

The following article by Cecile Hamilton, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on August 27, well describes their activities:

OFFICERS SERVICE COMMITTEE FINDS HOUSING A BIG PROBLEM—800,000 IN UNITED NATIONS FORCES GET AID FROM VOLUNTEER GROUP HERE; RECREATION DEMANDS RANK HIGH AMONG ACTIVITIES

(By Cecile Hamilton)

Enlisted men have no monopoly on need for morale-building recreation, family housing, and help with the personal problems of war-time living. Equally human and in need are the officers of the armed forces. No greater proof of this can be found than in the fact that, since its inception in 1941, the Officers Service Committee has given assistance to more than 800,000 officers of the United Nations.

To meet this demand the O. S. C. has expanded by leaps and bounds until today its activities require the work of 138 volunteers at headquarters in the Commodore.

Family housing is, of course, one of the biggest problems. As one lieutenant put it, "My dog and my wife are my only worries. What am I going to do with them?"

His was only one of hundreds of requests received that day for apartments. Many New Yorkers list available apartments and furnished rooms at O. S. C., but this summer the prevailing type has been the eight-room $350 affair, and few if any officers can touch them. Nevertheless, the O. S. C. manages to find housing for an average of 600 officers a month.

Even more popular is the hotel reservation desk. With the cooperation of hotel managers, O. S. C. is allotted several rooms each day at reduced rates. Demands for reservations are filled at the rate of 5,000 a month, which includes an occasional emergency call from the port director to obtain rooms for naval disaster survivors.

Recreation is understandably high on the list of service. Through the entertainment world's generosity theater, opera, concert and athletic event tickets are available to junior officers at half price and to senior officers at full price, less broker's fee. Cocktail parties and dances given by other organizations are listed and cards of introduction presented to officers who wish them.

New York is just as glamorous and exciting to officers as it is to many enlisted men. One young officer from Montana, with no friends in the city, asked to attend a cocktail party. As one was scheduled on Fifth Avenue, he received a card to present to the hostess. "Gee, lady," he grinned, "could I keep the card to send home to the folks? They'd be tickled to know I'd been to a party on Fifth Avenue."

As more and more men return from the combat areas and are discharged from hospitals, the organization has found it necessary to establish an extensive resort and travel bureau. Men back from 50 combat missions over Germany are not always in a mood for parties and gay times, but would rather find some quiet spot in the mountains or by the shore.

With the assistance of private beach clubs, country clubs, many small resorts, and private estates, the O. S. C. has been able to find suitable and happy surroundings for these men. Recently they sent a group of British and Canadian combat pilots to a private club and were delighted when they returned some time later saying: "Wait till we get home and tell the folks about American hospitality. They wouldn't let us spend a cent out there."

Conducting a large mail-order business is another necessary O. S. C. activity, most requests for shopping service coming from officers overseas. Flowers for mothers, rings for fiancees, birthday gifts for wives and presents for children are all handled by expert women shoppers. Typical of such requests was a letter from a lieutenant in the Pacific area asking the O. S. C. to buy a bottle warmer for his new-born son.

Adult Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

ADULT DELINQUENCY

The concise, meaningful 150-word address delivered by Richard N. M. Snyder, president of the board of directors at the Easton school district, to the 1944 graduating class of Easton High School has been reprinted in the New York Sun, New York's PM, and other newspapers and is on the way to becoming a newspaper classic of the time.

Jane Cowl broadcast Mr. Snyder's pithy, pungent apology to the rising generation for the delinquency of his own adult generation this week over a national radio network.

Mr. Snyder's speech, which is winning a place in the field of letters for its brevity and clarity and in the field of logic for its reasoning, follows:

"As president of the board of directors of the Easton school district I congratulate you upon the completion of your studies and the awarding of the diplomas here tonight.

"What I have to say will necessarily be brief. I have no message or advice to offer. Rather, I want to apologize to you. After 2,000 years of Christianity my generation has dragged you through the worst depression the world has ever seen, and now to prove our unfitness we are immersing you in the most horrible blood bath civilization has ever known.

"This mess that we are handing you is a flagrant case of adult delinquency. We now look to you for a better world. Despite your teen age, I believe that your jitterbugging, boogie-woogie and bobby socks represent a more mature mentality than our slot machines, politics, and radio singing commercials.

"We have given you the tools so that you might justify yourselves in the eyes of your children. Don't fail them as we have. Good luck and God bless you!"

That is a heartfelt message older men and women could repeat to their sons as they march off to fight and win a war they did not make themselves.

Tribute to Judge Carr, California Civic and Political Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to record the pass-

ing of a distinguished Californian. The friends of Judge Francis Carr in all parts of California and of this country were shocked to learn of his death following a brief illness on Monday August 21, 1944. Judge Carr lived in Redding and spent his lifetime in Shasta County, Calif. That lifetime was one well spent in rearing five sons and two daughters, all splendid and outstanding American citizens; in civic and community leadership, much of which was of State-wide importance; in becoming one of California's ablest and best-known attorneys; and in being one of its greatest Democratic leaders. Judge Carr fought long and skillfully for the Central Valley project in California and the Shasta Dam which has just been completed and has barely begun to deliver its vast benefits to the people of California and of this Nation. For over 25 years he championed the cause of good roads as a leader in the California State Automobile Association and the Good Roads Commission. He was active in county, State, and national Democratic politics since 1896 and helped to provide the sinew and the bone of Democratic organization in California during the long lean years when there was little to encourage party loyalty and 40 years passed without the election of a Democratic Governor. He was truly a great leader whose courage, enthusiasm and fortitude were never shaken; his passing will be deeply mourned and his place will be difficult if not impossible to fill.

Study of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to call attention of the House membership to the editorial published in the August 28 issue of the Washington Post regarding the resolution for a study of congressional machinery and proposals for improvement in the functioning of our organization:

STUDY OF CONGRESS

Not much attention was given to the Maloney-Monroney resolution authorizing a study of Congress when it slipped through the Senate by unanimous consent on Wednesday. It was wholly overshadowed by the uprising in Paris, the fall of Marseille, the withdrawal of Rumania from the war and the international peace conference at Dumbarton Oaks. Nevertheless, this resolution may have a profound effect upon the future government in the United States. If it is promptly accepted by the House the resulting study will be the most promising undertaking of recent years to bring our national legislature abreast of its colossal responsibilities.

The resolution authorizes a joint Senate-House committee to "make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States" and to recommend improvements with the object of "strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution." No doubt the committee would be composed of such men as Senators MALONEY and LA FOLLETTE, Representatives DIRKSEN and MONRONEY, who have already given much time and thought to the problem of modernizing Congress. It would probably call upon experts in and out of Congress for a full expression of views as to how our legislative body can be made to function more effectively. If the House acts promptly, the committee could begin work at once and it might have a program of preliminary reforms ready for approval by the time the new Congress meets in January.

It is true that the resolution as passed by the Senate contains a restrictive amendment informing the proposed committee that its duties would not include any recommendation for changes in the parliamentary rules of either house. Apparently this is a gesture intended to avoid the appearance of stepping on the toes of the Rules Committees. Some sponsors of the resolution believe that this amendment would have no effect upon the proposed committee's work. It appears to us, however, to be a needless and possibly dangerous restriction, and we hope that the House will strike it out.

In some measure the war has temporarily obscured the urgency of congressional reorganization, for under its pressures impediments to prompt action have frequently been overcome. The necessities of war have also held rein on the antagonism between the executive and legislative branches. With the stimuli of war relaxed, and the country confronted with staggering problems of reconstruction, world organization, etc., the need for a smoother working organization within Congress and for better coordination of executive and legislative policies will be especially acute. In our opinion, this is one of the most important tasks demanding prompt congressional attention, and the Maloney-Monroney resolution, stripped of crippling amendments, is undoubtedly the most practical approach that can be made to it.

Virginia Should Repeal the Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, eight States in the Union still cling to the payment of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. In my judgment the time has arrived when the Legislature of Virginia should at the very earliest possible time take suitable action that will repeal the requirement of poll-tax payment to the right to vote. I am sure this matter has given much concern to our State political leaders. Personally, I have discussed it with many of them. The time for action is at hand.

In the last, and again in this session of Congress, there has been passed in the House a repeal act. I, of course, have voted each time against this attempted Federal usurpation of the rights of the States. I am frank to say, however, that the persistent reluctance of the States to take action on this matter leaves its Representatives in Congress in a most uncomfortable position. We may expect in the next Congress a renewed drive that will probably put the law on the statute books. In all probability it would be held constitutional by the Supreme Court. That would be a tragedy indeed.

Whatever may have been said in justification of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting when it was written into our State law, so far as I can observe it serves no useful purpose now. It is, on the other hand, a definite cause of political irritation. It is outmoded and in disrepute, and we might as well be realistic about it. Virginia will either take the action or the Federal Government will repeal it.

If we force the Federal Government to take this action, we will have set a precedent of ominous and far-reaching effect. The precedent established would be that the voting qualifications in the States can be changed by the Federal Government at Washington. There are many who would like to see this step taken—a step toward a further centralization of power at Washington. Let us face the facts and act accordingly, on our own initiative and not at the mandate of Federal authority. I commend this most important matter to the earnest consideration of the distinguished and able members of our State legislature.

Approval of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I dislike placing editorials or noncongressional comment in the RECORD. However, an editorial appearing in the Washington Post yesterday is of such importance that it should be reproduced here.

The imperative need for a change in the treaty-ratification provision in the Constitution will become more and more obvious in the days immediately ahead. Treaties should be ratified by simple majorities of the House and the Senate. The present requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify a treaty has always been and will continue to be a stumbling block in the path of our international affairs. It is hoped the Congress will soon submit to the people a constitutional amendment changing our method of treaty ratification.

APPROVAL OF TREATIES

Secretary Hull's action in submitting the British-American oil pact to the Senate for approval probably came as a shock to those who have been advocating greater use of Executive agreements in the conduct of our international affairs. Yet it was the logical course to take. The agreement touches the domestic interests of the country at several points. To leave policies of such far-reaching import solely to Executive discretion would certainly not be compatible with our democratic system.

Apparently the decision of the State Department to handle the pact as a treaty rather than an agreement was largely influenced by the intense interest which it

aroused in the Senate. Both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a special committee investigating oil shortages analyzed the pact. Presumably to make their concern more apparent they held a joint meeting last week. Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS pointed out that, while the agreement ostensibly deals with only international aspects of the oil problem, domestic interests will be inevitably affected by regulation of the flow of foreign oil. There developed in both committees a strong demand for full information about the treaty and its possible effect upon the oil industry as well as upon our future national defense. This does not seem to imply antagonism toward the pact, but a determination to see that it is properly safeguarded.

Failure to submit the agreement to the Senate under these circumstances might have led to its undoing, for legislation to carry out recommendations of the proposed International Petroleum Commission is certain to be needed. An antagonistic Senate could defeat such legislation or deny funds to meet our share of the Commission's expenses. There is no way of bypassing Congress on major questions of national policy, even if that could be considered desirable, without incurring even greater risks than are incurred in the submission of treaties to the Senate.

Precedent as well as good judgment confirms the course that has been taken. Both the sugar and coffee treaties were ratified by the Senate. Now it may be assumed that when the administration gets around to negotiating international accords on rubber, tin, and probably other commodities, these will also go to the Senate for approval. There is no direct analogy between these commodity agreements and the past for joint action to preserve the peace now taking shape at Dumbarton Oaks. Yet this latest precedent will strengthen the demand for submission of whatever peace treaties may be negotiated for approval by the Senate before ratification. Indeed, that course is implicit in the long consultations between Secretary Hull and a select group of Senators from the Foreign Relations Committee.

This renewed emphasis upon "the advice and counsel of the Senate" makes it the more imperative to hasten amendment of the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds vote for approval of treaties. The post-war period is almost certain to become an era of international pacts of many kinds. To leave control over this process to one-third plus one of the Senate might lead to a reckless frittering away of our victory. It is a risk that a great world power cannot afford to take. As a sequence to the current reaffirmation of the Senate's role in international affairs, administration and Senate leaders cannot move too quickly to abolish the undemocratic arrangement inherited from the dead days of our isolation from world affairs.

Like a Great Cloud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Omaha World-Herald entitled "Like a Great Cloud":

LIKE A GREAT CLOUD

The story of meat as it is daily unfolding has come to resemble a nightmare. There is no thread of reason running through it. It simply is what it is, beyond understanding or explanation. Even the bureaucracy responsible for the preposterous condition can't explain, much less begin to understand.

Here in Omaha, as everywhere else, there is the problem of what to do with utility beef. There are just oodles of it, but nobody wants it. It's tough. And it doesn't taste very good.

"I bought one side of the stuff," says Charles Holm, "and it was so green and flavorless I had to grind it up as hamburger."

Yet it is about the only kind of beef to be had—in a year when meat production promises to go to an all-time high. Utility beef is beef that hasn't been fed and conditioned in the feed lots, where good beef is produced.

And why hasn't it been? Not for lack of feed. But because the bright boys of the bureaucracy in Washington had decided that meat is a wasteful and expensive food. Better than feed grain to cattle and hogs, to eat it ourselves. Lots more food value that way. And by converting ourselves into a Nation of vegetarians a food famine might be averted.

And so they vigorously discouraged the feeding of livestock. Accordingly beef—more beef than we know what to do with—comes to us green and tough and unpalatable. Distressed housewives don't want it, and it gluts the market. But with a good result, they say. Famine is averted. The answer to that is only another part of the foolish story.

From Washington the Des Moines Register and Tribune tells the fact about that.

"The war surplus problem"—in the words of a W. F. A. official—"has grown to commanding proportions." Agricultural "planners" are "faced with a huge threatening surplus." In this country "2,000,000 tons of surplus food are piled up." In England "there is thought to be nearly three times that much."

The surplus in England alone is "far more than the highest estimates of European requirements in the first year of the relief period." And "these huge stores of food have begun to hang over W. F. A. like a great cloud." The use of caves and stone quarries and abandoned mines for storage purposes is part of the recent hurried planning.

Here are but two aspects of the many-faceted food story. Figure the rest out—if you can—for yourself.

Resolution of Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution of protest sent to me by the representative of a group of Christian citizens of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as follows:

Inasmuch as food is still rationed and farmers and poultry raisers cannot obtain sufficient grain to feed their stock, we, a group of Christian citizens from Delaware and Pennsylvania, assembled in Brandywine Summit camp meeting, protest the holiday granted to distillers to manufacture beverage alcohol during month of August 1944.

If there is sufficient synthetic rubber on hand, why cannot civilians get tires? Why has W. P. B. granted this privilege to distillers? We cannot understand there being any shortage of distilled liquors, when, according to the Government's own figures, there were 362,000,000 gallons of distilled liquors in bonded warehouses on May 1 of this year, and then the large quantities of Scotch whisky being sent from England under lend-lease, also huge quantities of distilled liquors being imported from Canada and Mexico. Since we want to win the war speedily, we protest against this waste of food materials and manpower in manufacturing 25,000,000 additional gallons of beverage alcohol, also the waste of tin by the brewers.

We cannot understand the order of W. P. B. in releasing tin for 1,000,000 cans to be filled with beer for shipment overseas. This is not only a waste of valuable tin but of shipping space.

We know that all kinds of alcoholic drinks are harmful and not essential to winning the war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a copy of this protest be sent to Mr. Donald Nelson, of W. P. B., and to both United States Senators for Delaware and Pennsylvania and to Congressmen from the State of Delaware and Congressman for Delaware County, Pa.

Limitation of the Presidential Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on America's Town Meeting of the Air, August 24, 1944:

The two-term limitation on the Presidency has become a basic part of our republican system of government, and any departure from this time-honored custom is fraught with peril to our free institutions. Some will say this is partisanship, aimed against the fourth-term candidate. But I did not frame the charge. When some people feared that Coolidge might seek a third term, the Senate by overwhelming majority enacted a resolution which declared that more than two terms for any man is "unpatriotic, unwise, and fraught with peril to our free institutions." Every Democratic Senator voted for that resolution, among them Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, who just a month ago made the speech nominating Mr. Roosevelt for twice two terms.

Here in this incident is the whole argument. Men of both parties who voted for that resolution acted without partisanship. The Democrats followed a 150-year philosophy of their party, fathered by Jefferson, who strongly urged limitation. Jackson said, "It would be advisable to limit the Chief Executive to a single term of 4 or 6 years." The first resolution ever adopted by Congress was introduced by a Democrat, Springer, of Illinois, in 1875. Grover Cleveland uttered one of his most famous paragraphs against a President's exceeding two terms. The Democratic candidates of 1896, 1900, and 1908, pledged themselves not to seek reelection.

The Democratic platform of 1912 carried this plank: "We favor a single Presidential term and to that end urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making the President of the United States in-

eligible to reelection." And the Democratic Senate, redeeming that pledge in 1913, adopted a constitutional amendment for a single term by a vote of 46 to 23.

Now see the position of the man, and the party which clamored for 150 years to make even two terms—to say nothing of three or four—impossible. They are the first to betray their own historic position, the first to seek perpetuation in office.

Study and grasp this inescapable lesson. The very men who so bitterly opposed long tenure for Presidents have tasted the heady wine of power and become drunk with it. They have become corrupted by that power, corrupted intellectually by it to the extent that they are willing to sell their convictions and the philosophy of a century and a half to hang on to that power.

Here is complete proof of the wisdom of the great tradition which began with Washington and has been endorsed by both political parties for so many generations. Man—little man—is not fitted to have too much power over his fellows. Our founding fathers knew that. Every man who reads history knows it. Give an individual a little power, and he wants more. Give him more, and he schemes to hold onto it and increase it. Power corrupts the minds of the holder and those who share it with him. They do not voluntarily relinquish it but will, if given half a chance, hold it forever.

The President remembered this before power had gained its victory over him. He knew that the curse of Latin-American politics for a century had been Presidents who managed by chicanery or force to get themselves elected for three, four, and more terms. Up until the Roosevelt administration, we had steadfastly adhered to our two-term precedent and custom and had encouraged Latin-American countries to do likewise. What must our Latin-American neighbors think now as they see this great free Republic, which has kept its faith for so many generations, throwing aside this principle?

Of course, the excuse is that we are at war and dare not trust our affairs in other hands. But we were not at war 4 years ago. Then, other reasons had to be invented, among them, to keep us out of war.

I assert that it insults our people, our system of government, and our whole political philosophy to say that among 135,000,000 citizens there is only one man who can be entrusted with the management of our affairs. I say to you, "There is no indispensable man." Don't take my word for that. Listen to the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who said, "A great man left a watchword which we can well repeat: 'There is no indispensable man.'"

Actually, the need for limiting Presidential tenure is vastly greater now than when Washington and Jefferson established the tradition. Then Government exercised only the most limited authority. But in the past dozen years Federal Government has alarmingly gobbled up the powers of the States, and the Executive has rapidly invaded the powers of the courts and of Congress. If we believe in our political system, we dare not permit any man—the present incumbent or any other—to hold such immeasurable power, to command the obedience of such a vast bureaucracy and to administer such fabulous sums of money unless we say to him, "When 8 years have passed, you must hand over these powers to another, who will also be limited."

If you do not impose such limitation, then the Chief Executive will use the tremendous authority of his office, as the present incumbent has, to accumulate arbitrary and autocratic power, and to hold onto it until finally our Presidents, like the dictators we are fighting, can be dislodged only by force.

Protection of the American Shoe Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, in the approaching of this national campaign there will be attempts made to defeat some of the Congressmen for political purposes and in most instances those charges will be made that he voted unfavorably on some labor bill. For that reason I want to refer to my record in behalf of the shoe workers.

The shoe business in America is a tremendous business, employing over a million men and women and in speaking of post-war preparation to keep laboring men employed and to have conditions so that the returning soldiers will find employment I want to make a suggestion with reference to keeping the shoe workers of America steadily employed after this war is over.

Mr. Speaker, my suggestion is that we will need to have an adequate protective tariff placed against shoes made in other countries at lower standard of wages which flooded our markets from 1932 to 1938 which, because of being made by men and women working at very low wages could be imported into this country and sold for about half the cost of production of American shoes.

People were employed in Europe while our men and women shoemakers were idle about half the time. We can prevent this condition after the war by the application of a reasonable tariff and that should be one of the plans in the post-war to help keep our shoe workers employed at good wages.

There are many of us here who have rendered a fine service for labor and sometimes do not get the credit we deserve. Many of we Members had an opportunity to render a splendid service to the shoe workers of America back in April 1943.

I think I shall point out what I did in my district, like many of you did in yours, so that the shoe workers may know the interest some of we Congressmen have taken in their problems.

When there was grave danger in April 1943 of taking military and industrial shoes off of the essential list, I received letters and telegrams from the shoe companies, businessmen, and citizens in my district, located in Vandalia, Salem, Olney, and Carlyle, Ill., urging that I use my influence to prevent this being done. Many of you received the same sort of a request from your districts and enthusiastically complied with it, the results being that after many of us met with the heads of the great shoe companies over the Nation in conference here we prevailed upon them not to take industrial and military shoes off of the essential list, which meant that the manpower so employed was classified as being engaged in essential war work and allowed the companies to retain their employees, rather than losing thousands more of these experienced shoemakers to the military service.

As an evidence of my interest in protecting this industry and its workers, in addition to presenting its case to the committee referred to, I want to insert at this time a copy of my letter written to Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman, War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C., expressing my interest in the matter:

APRIL 12, 1943.

Hon. PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman, War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am writing to urge you, in the interest of the many shoe factories in my district in Illinois employing thousands of men, that in your deliberation scheduled for Wednesday you give most serious consideration to placing the entire shoe industry on the essential list.

Many shoe workers have already been taken into the service as indicated by an advertisement appearing in the Carlyle Union Banner, Carlyle, Ill., by the Moran Shoe Co., and which is herewith enclosed. It requires years to develop the more technical men in the manufacture of shoes and it is extremely important that the manpower of the shoe industry be given serious consideration.

I earnestly hope that the committee may find it wise to include, in the order, not only shoes for military and industrial purposes but that those for civilian wear be listed as essential.

Respectfully,

C. W. VURSELL,
Member of Congress.

Showing my further interest I want to insert two telegrams:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 12, 1943.*

OLNEY DAILY MAIL,
Olney, Ill.:

For the information of Olney citizens interested in shoe industry being declared an essential industry will suggest I am exerting all efforts to that end. Conference of representatives of shoe industry and four Government departments will be held here Wednesday and early decision is expected.

C. W. VURSELL,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 12, 1943.*

THE VANDALIA UNION,
Vandalia, Ill.:

For the information of Vandalia citizens interested in shoe industry being declared an essential industry will suggest I am exerting all efforts to that end. Conference of representatives of shoe industry and four Government department will be held here Wednesday and early decision is expected.

C. W. VURSELL,
Member of Congress.

I think when the shoe workers of my district give consideration to the selection of their Representative in Congress on November 7 they should have the record of their Congressman representing them and their interests. I have great faith in the good judgment of the laboring men and women of this Nation and am willing to trust their judgment when they have the facts.

Unfortunately, there are often those who color the facts or attempt to deceive the laboring man to suit their own best interest.

We have not only protected the shoe worker during the wartime, but we must begin to prepare now to keep them steadily employed after the war is over.

Washington Army Orders Resented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser, August 25, 1944, Montgomery, Ala., sets out the feeling of the people of Alabama toward the recent order of the War Department made concerning the two races in Army camps. The Montgomery Advertiser is a progressive paper and stands for the fair treatment of all races. No one can find fault with this resentment.

It is indeed strange that while the Army takes great precaution to drill into soldiers the fact that when overseas that the customs and manners of the country in which they are located must be respected, but here in our own country, where things have gone so well for the duration that now that victory is in sight the customs and traditions must be abrogated.

All of the members of the Alabama delegation have strenuously protested this unwise order.

WASHINGTON ARMY ORDERS RESENTED

Montgomery, a tolerant, liberal, and intensely patriotic city, is profoundly disturbed by reports of high Army efforts to impose race customs and habits on the local military reservations that are in conflict with relationships growing out of generations of experience.

Montgomery quickly, firmly, and advisedly wants to let it be known that any efforts designed, directly or indirectly, to impose any form of social equality, is something that neither this community nor any other southern community can tolerate. This represents the thought of the better elements of both white and colored races on the subject.

If it be said that Army orders are something from which there is no recourse, the people of this community would have it understood that even Army orders, even armies, even bayonets, cannot force impossible and unnatural social race relationships upon us. It has been tried before and failed. It will fail if tried again.

Orders from Army headquarters seeking at this late date in the war to make whites and blacks mingle on a basis of social equality at the restaurant tables on the military posts or camps of this State can have no other effect than to cause friction which has been happily absent during the 3 years of the war up to this time. Heretofore, there has been commonsense recognition of nature's dividing lines. Any other policy can be interpreted only as due to ignorance of conditions. Certainly such orders could not come from anyone seeking the real welfare of the Negro race and the relationship between the races that all men of good will would like to see.

If troublemakers are responsible for this new situation, then troublemakers must be dealt with as such, because these troublemakers are a puny minority which must be shown that majorities rule here.

Since the establishment of our great airfields in this city, Montgomery's relationship has been most cordial with them and with the personnel they have brought among us. The officers and men of the fields have been the type that we were glad and proud to claim as friends and as participants in our social life. The fact that many of them were from the North or from communities where the race issue is not pronounced made no difference in the relationships, because the visitors recognized local conditions, had confidence in local judgment, and had respect for customs and traditions that have grown out of many years of trial and experience in the South. Furthermore, they were on the ground. They saw the conditions and the necessity for them. They were not deskmen, seated in some far away place, acting on some academic or idealistic impulse.

In Montgomery and in other Alabama and southern communities race relationships are a condition and not a theory. This is said kindly and firmly and in the utmost friendship for the members of the Negro race. We want the Negro soldiers to have the same food, the same pay, the same uniform, the same courts, and the same kind of justice, and the same protection as is given the white race. But political and economic and military equality are entirely different from the social equality that is implied in the new order for serving and seating of restaurant customers on the military reservations.

Our insistence upon this is in the interest not only of the white race but of the Negro race. We all know that we are to live side by side in the South, and each race is in a measure dependent upon the other. But domination by the race which is best qualified to dominate will be maintained at all costs. Efforts, even in a small way, to introduce any other practice bring only the deepest kind of resentment and encourage serious trouble.

These are facts which we cannot too firmly impress upon Army officials, our representatives in Washington, and all men everywhere.

The Political Action Committee—Sidney Hillman and the New Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the current August 21 issue of the New Republic there appears an article by Sidney Hillman entitled "The Truth About the P. A. C."

This article reads like a bedtime story. It pictures Hillman's P. A. C. as something of a shining knight engaged in rescuing progressive government from the hands of villainous reactionaries.

Although the title is otherwise, the article succeeds very well in covering up the real truth of the P. A. C., which is of enormous danger to the interests of honest American labor.

In hope of having both sides of an important issue presented, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] wrote to the editor of the New Republic requesting a chance to reply to Mr. Hillman. Not only did the editor deny the Senator from Nebraska this opportunity, but he did so with the emphatic assertion that he was not interested in the other side of Hillman's views. Somehow, the Senator from Nebraska had always supposed the New Republic to be a liberal journal, jealous of its integrity, and devoted to the democratic principle of presenting all sides of important controversial issues. I see now I was mistaken.

Since the New Republic is quite frequently cited by Members of Congress as an independent journal of integrity, I think Members should take notice that it is not of that character. By its own admission it is an ex parte sheet, entitled only to that weight which we accord a special pleader.

I, therefore, showing all fairness, ask unanimous consent, first, to have inserted in the RECORD the article as it appeared in the New Republic, written by Sidney Hillman and entitled "The Truth About the P. A. C." Following that I ask to have printed in the RECORD the letter addressed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] to Bruce Bliven, editor of the New Republic, asking that he be allowed to have printed in the New Republic a reply to the Hillman article. A copy of the letter written by Bruce Bliven denying the Senator from Nebraska that privilege, and the response of the Senator from Nebraska to Mr. Bliven's letter. Then I ask to have inserted in the RECORD the article which the Senator from Nebraska desired to have published in the New Republic in reply to the article by Sidney Hillman. Finally, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Reader's Digest entitled "I Object to My Union in Politics," written by William E. Mullins, a discourse on Sidney Hillman's political action committee. I point out to the Senate that I have been very fair in that I have put into the RECORD both sides of the matter. I desire the people to have the whole picture.

I have from the Government Printing Office an estimate which indicates that the cost of printing the material herewith submitted will be $231.

There being no objection, the articles and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Republic of August 21, 1944]

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

So many statements concerning the C. I. O. Political Action Committee and the National Citizens' Political Action Committee have recently appeared in print—some correct and some incorrect, some friendly and some hostile—that it may not be amiss to set down some of the fundamental facts about these two organizations.

The C. I. O.-P. A. C. was organized in July 1943 by the Congress of Industrial Organizations for the primary purpose of arousing the working men and women of America to a sense of their own responsibility as citizens of this Nation and, in a broader sense, as citizens of a free world. What really started the C. I. O.-P. A. C. happened the year before the organization came into being. The congressional elections held in November 1942 gave clear evidence that a powerful reactionary trend had set in, which, if it continued through 1944, might well reverse all the progress of recent years and render this Nation incapable of making its indispensable contribution toward the eventual establishment of lasting peace. One could not help but recall the congressional elections of 1918, in which Woodrow Wilson lost control of both Houses of Congress, and with it a large measure of his prestige. One could not help but remember the dire consequences both at home and abroad.

Whereas Woodrow Wilson actually lost majority control to the Republican opposition in 1918, the 1942 elections left President Roose-

velt with a reduced but still substantial Democratic majority in the Senate and a bare majority in the House. But this distinction was illusory. Actually, through the unholy alliance of obstructionist Republicans and reactionary Democrats, a coalition had come into power which was determined not merely to block any further progressive legislation, but to undermine where possible the whole structure of New Deal reform.

Did this mean that the American people had changed its mind? Did the dramatic change in Congress reflect a conservative trend on the part of a majority of the population? We thought not. We thought not, because an analysis of the vote cast in the 1942 election clearly showed what had happened. Only a little more than 28,000,000 American citizens had cast their ballots in these elections, as against 49,800,000 in 1940. Almost 22,000,000 Americans who had voted in the Presidential year had failed to go to the polls 2 years later. The percentage of those who failed to vote was highest among the normally progressive groups of the population and lowest among those population groups which are normally conservative. The inference was clear. The forces of reaction were organized for political action; the progressive forces were not organized.

That is why the C. I. O.-P. A. C. was born 1 year later.

The funds for the C. I. O.-P. A. C. were supplied by the C. I. O. and a number of its major affiliated unions. To be exact, the sum of $669,764.11 was contributed. Of this amount approximatey $400,000 was spent up to the time of the Democratic National Convention. No disbursements have been made from these funds since the Democratic Convention, except in local primary elections, and none will be made until after the election. This decision was reached in order to eliminate any possible question of violating the Smith-Connally Act.

What did the C. I. O.-P. A. C. do up to the time of the Democratic Convention, and what will it do during and after the campaign?

First of all, the C. I. O.-P. A. C. put on a Nation-wide drive to register the vote. It embarked upon an educational campaign among the workers to show them why they had a duty as citizens to exercise their franchise; why this year it was more than ever important for them to do so; and how they could help to organize themselves and other progessives outside of the labor movement for effective political action. This campaign was carried on in the labor press by means of pamphlets distributed in large quantities, and when it was possible to obtain time, over the radio.

Second. The C. I. O.-P. A. C. endeavored to mobilize the progressive vote in certain important primary elections throughout the Nation in order to help unseat outstanding reactionary incumbents seeking renomination and to assist outstanding progressive candidates to obtain their party's nomination. Such activity is permissible under the law, since the Smith-Connally Act does not apply to primary contests. The C. I. O.-P. A. C. was active in the primary contests for nomination in both parties. It does not claim to have brought about the nomination or the defeat of a single candidate. It does claim to have contributed important support to the already existing progressive forces in many States—perhaps decisive support in a few instances. By and large, these efforts were more successful in the Democratic primaries than in those of the Republican Party. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that in the Democratic primaries the C. I. O.-P. A. C. was working with the prevailing trend, which has already taken a considerable toll of outstanding reactionaries and isolationists, whereas in the Republican primaries it was working against the pronounced nationalist and reactionary trend which fully manifested itself in the repudiation of Willkie and in the recapture of the Republican leadership by Herbert Hoover and the Old Guard.

Actual money contributions played but a small part in this undertaking. Under the Hatch Act, $5,000 is the maximum amount which any individual or group may contribute to any one candidate's campaign. There were not many instances where even that amount was contributed. But there were many instances where the voluntary organized efforts of P. A. C. workers were able to accomplish wonders in bringing out the vote. In most parts of the country that is all we have to do in order to insure a progressive victory. The majority of American citizens—and certainly the vast majority of industrial workers—are progressive voters by nature. They do not as a rule need to be told to vote for progressive candidates; they do need to be provided with the facts and the records of the candidates; and they do need to be provided with channels of organization by means of which to make their opinions effective. They need also to be reassured that it actually lies within their power to elect the candidates whom they prefer, and that it is their own responsibility to see that the latent progressive majority becomes an articulate majority.

That is the job the C. I. O.-P. A. C. set out to do among the industrial workers; and that is the job which the N. C.-P. A. C. has now undertaken to do among the population as a whole.

Since the decision was reached not to use union funds in the electoral campaign itself, once the party candidates were nominated, the C. I. O.-P. A. C. is now putting on a drive for voluntary contributions from individual members of labor organizations throughout the country. Similarly, the N. C.-P. A. C. is putting on a drive for voluntary contributions from individuals in every rank of life and in every section of the country. These funds will be used to carry on the effort to bring out the vote, to reelect President Roosevelt and to elect a progressive Congress.

It is too early to say what measure of success will attend these two fund-raising campaigns. But it is not too early to say that a great deal of nonsense has been written about the gigantic slush funds which are said to be at the disposal of these two organizations. Quite frequently a figure of $6,000,000 has been mentioned. The only element of reality about this figure is that the law would not permit the two organizations to spend more than $3,000,000 each or $6,000,000 together. Our goal is not nearly so ambitious as that. We hope the N. C.-P. A. C. will raise $1,500,000. I wish I could say that the drive had already produced half that amount. Actually, the effort has only just begun.

We shall undoubtedly fall far short of raising the amount of money which will be spent by the organized forces of reaction. There is no doubt that they have the dollars, but I believe that events will prove that we have the votes. In 1940, $16,000,000 of Republican money was not enough to elect a moderately progressive Republican candidate, because the people instinctively recognized that, in spite of Wendell Willkie, the reactionary Old Guard still controlled the party. In 1944 no instinctual intelligence is required; normal eyesight is all anyone needs to recognize the starched Hoover collar on the Republican candidate.

The response we have had so far to the membership drive in the National Citizens' Political Action Committee is most encouraging. Already it is clear that, so far at least as this election is concerned, farmers, publishers, educators, writers, and progressives from every part of the country and from every occupation are ready and eager to unite with the industrial workers in order to reelect the President and to elect a Congress which will responsibly and loyally support progressive policies at home and abroad.

The N. C. P. A. C. is committed to Roosevelt and Truman against Dewey and Bricker. Beyond that it has no partisan commitments whatsoever. It will support for election to Congress those men and women who, irrespective of party affiliation, seem best qualified to represent this Nation in the critical times which lie ahead. It will support those candidates who have shown that they believe in the principles set forth in President Roosevelt's economic bill of rights, who have shown that they understand that our domestic problems and our foreign problems are opposite sides of the same coin, and that neither can be solved at the expense of the other. It will support those candidates who, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "have confidence in the people, cherish them, and consider them the wise repository of the public interest." It will oppose those candidates who openly repudiate these ideals, or who render lip-service to them in order to conceal their opposition.

At first some of the conservative newspapers made fun of us. It was alleged that our support actually hurt the candidates whom we were endeavoring to help. Then suddenly it was claimed that we were the dominant influence in the Democratic Party. And after HENRY WALLACE was defeated for renomination it was said that we were finished. Two weeks later we were again supposed to be very much alive and to have been responsible for the defeat of an outstanding isolationist. We are supposed to be at the same time trying to capture the Democratic Party and starting a third party. We are described as the President's greatest asset one day and as his greatest liability the next. Most of all, the ultra-conservative commentators have worried about what they call the P. A. C. ideology.

This "ideology" is neither a mystery nor a closely guarded secret. It is clearly stated in the P. A. C. program, which was adopted last May and which was officially presented to the resolutions committees of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. This program is both a statement of principles and a concrete plan of action. It rests upon the belief that we can and must find a way so to utilize the vast spiritual and material resources of this Nation that every American who is reasonably industrious and prudent may enjoy at least the minimum elements of a good life—that is, adequate housing, food, clothing, medical care, education, recreation, and an opportunity for advancement. It rests upon the belief that too many Americans have died and are dying in foreign lands in defense of democracy for us any longer to permit democracy to be betrayed here at home by social or economic barriers erected against anyone by reason of his race, religion, or national origin.

There are people—and they are by no means all Republicans—who do not agree with these principles, and who do not wish to see the progressive forces unite for the purpose of putting them into effect. Some of them have told us that we are unwise to organize for political action, because by doing so we might stimulate the forces of reaction to take similar action. The forces of reaction have taken this action long ago. They are entrenched and fortified on every rise of ground on the economic contour map of the world. They are fighting grimly behind their Maginot lines to perpetuate their privileged position.

But the united progressive forces of the world are on the march and will not be denied. They are fighting not for special privilege, but for equality of opportunity for all men everywhere, of every race, of every nationality, and of every religious faith.

The fight for human dignity and freedom will not end when we shall have achieved victory at the polls on November 7, any more than it will end when we shall have achieved military victory over Germany and Japan.

All that we shall have gained by these victories is survival—survival to fight for freedom, to vote for freedom, and to work for freedom—until finally freedom shall have been gained for all men who inhabit this earth.

SIDNEY HILLMAN.

AUGUST 17, 1944.

Mr. BRUCE BLIVEN,
Editor, The New Republic,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BLIVEN: In your issue of August 21, you feature an article by Sidney Hillman entitled, "The Truth About the P. A. C."

Those of us who are a little uneasy about the P. A. C., even aside from political considerations, see the truth about the P. A. C. in a different light than does Mr. Hillman. I know your journal to be courageous in its desire to present differing opinions; and since the P. A. C. has become so controversial an issue, it occurs to me that you might be willing to have someone who believes otherwise than Mr. Hillman present another point of view.

Would you be willing to take an article of the same length as Mr. Hillman's, presenting the truth about the P. A. C. as someone else sees it? I make this inquiry in advance because I hesitate to take the time to write an article of this kind without some prior understanding that it would be acceptable. I could have the article ready within a few days' notice, and, of course, I am not interested in the matter of payment.

Very truly yours,

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE NEW REPUBLIC,
New York, August 22, 1944.

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: This is answering your letter of August 17. We most decidedly would not print an article by you on the subject of the P. A. C. We don't print any article with which we do not in general agree, and we strongly doubt whether you would give a fair presentation of the facts about the P. A. C.

We are willing to print a communication from you on this subject if you care to write one. We assume no editorial responsibility for the contents of a communication, except that it must be reasonable in tone and not libelous. The normal length of a communication is 1,000 words, but in this case we would be willing to let you have a little more space, say 1,200 words, or about four double-spaced typewritten pages of pica type.

Faithfully,

BRUCE BLIVEN.

OMAHA, NEBR., *August 25, 1944.*

Mr. BRUCE BLIVEN,
The New Republic, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. BLIVEN: I am happy to have your letter of August 22, even though it so emphatically denies me an opportunity of answering Sidney Hillman's article, The Truth About the P. A. C., in the August 21 issue.

Your right to print only what you please is indisputable. That is the prerogative of a free press. But I am somewhat shocked over your emphatic unwillingness to present both sides of a controversial issue as important as Hillman's which arbitrarily hazards the workers' interests in a political crusade.

I do not know where I got the notion that the New Republic was a liberal journal, devoted to the democratic principle of presenting all sides of important controversial issues in a spirit of fair play in uncovering the truth. But I see now that I was mistaken. In future, I shall bear in mind that the New Republic is an ex parte sheet.

Your offer to give me the privilege of a "communication" is of little use because it is limited in space to less than half of the Hillman article. A subject of such profound significance to labor's interest can scarcely be presented within the confines of so limited a communication.

Yours very truly,

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator.

A BEDTIME STORY ANALYZED

(By Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska)

Sidney Hillman's bedtime story for naive liberals entitled "The Truth About the P. A. C." is one reason for the fog in the public mind about which he complains. In whimsical brevity his story runs like this: "For many long, long years a kind progressive Government lived in Washington. It did all sorts of good things for people at home and all over the world. One day in November 1942 it took a little nap and along came a certain bad, bad reactionary party and stole some of the chairs right out of the congressional parlor. Then up jumped Sir Sidney, the shining knight of labor, and vowed that he would fetch the stolen chairs. Mounting his trusty steed C. I. O.-P. A. C. and snatching his shield N. C. N. A. C., he dashed off with little "voluntary" dollars jingling in his pockets. After holding an "educational" pow-wow with his fellow travelers, they all rode out to the hustings where they encountered the bad reactionaries. Several primary battles were fought with legal dollars and Sir Biddle, who was there to enforce the Queensberry rules, gave the decision to Sir Sidney. In a final battle at the polls, Sir Sidney captured all of the stolen chairs and a few extra, whereupon he came back to the Commander in Chief for his reward. And the progressive government lived happily ever after in Washington because Sir Sidney saw to it that the good government was elected again, and again, and again."

All good bedtime story tellers will recognize that this is the point where the questions, and the real story, begin. Tell us more about C. I. O.-P. A. C. and N. C. P. A. C. Where and how did Sir Sidney get the little "legal" dollars that won the primary battles? What reward did Sir Sidney want for his great deeds?

If there is any fog in the public mind about the P. A. C., it is because Mr. Hillman has been generating much of the smoke. If the truth is to be told, Mr Hillman will have to be helped a little, particularly on some aspects of the P. A. C. he has carefully refrained from discussing. He and a self-perpetuating clique of fellow travelers on the C. I. O. executive council decided in private conclave on July 7, 1943 to form the P. A. C. and take the labor movement on a political crusade. Appearing before a Senate subcommittee in June 1944, Mr. Hillman stated that heads of the C. I. O. unions had the power to commit their unions to take political action and to write big checks for that purpose without consulting the rank and file; and this may very well be so because the wide executive powers in many union charters drawn by C. I. O. leaders mock the democracy Mr. Hillman shouts for so loudly in public.

Hillman planned the setup of the original organization in two parts: The top committee of the C. I. O.-P. A. C. which was to form the basic structure through 14 regional offices, and a large and indefinite number of subordinate P. A. C.'s There was shrewd wisdom in this scheme. The top P. A. C. provides the policy-making backbone, the initial financing, the motive force of the movement, and distributes innocent educational literature. This enabled Mr. Hillman to come to Washington and say that he was conducting a benevolent civic educational society. The little P. A. C.'s, formed by the international, national and local unions up and down the land, are to do the actual political work in the States and localities. This gets around the Federal Corrupt Practices Act which cannot affect State primaries and elections, except in an indirect way.

But Mr. Hillman remained uneasy over his crusading charger C. I. O.-P. A. C. It aroused resentment among farmers, other unions, and in many other quarters. It violated the spirit, if not the letter, of the Corrupt Practices Acts. It was heavily tarred with the communistic brush, as John L. Lewis, congressional investigations, and the split in the New York American Labor Party showed.

Considerations such as these and his old love for "front" organizations persuaded Mr. Hillman to find a suitable shield for the charger, C. I. O.-P. A. C. Rounding up as many good citizens as would not be too inquisitive about the contents in packages marked "liberal" and "progressive," Sir Sidney formed the National Citizens Political Action Committee in June 1944. This organization paralleled C. I. O.-P. A. C., in the broad field outside the C. I. O. All people who are not already corraled in some other organization, who will allow candidates to be picked for them with Hillman yardsticks, and who might contribute a dollar or more, are eligible to join N. C. P. A. C.

In offering the truth about the P. A. C., Mr. Hillman avoids discussion of the implications of his activities. They are essential parts of the truth and they show the evils which Mr. Hillman would bring down on the heads of honest labor.

First, as to organization. In forming the C. I. O.-P. A. C., a handful of the C. I. O. union leaders arbitrarily committed 5,000,000 workers to a major change in the labor movement. No referendum of all the C. I. O. workers was taken. The decision was dictated to the carefully selected delegates at the C. I. O. convention. Such a change is of the highest importance because it hazards the economic interest of the workers in the dangerous game of politics.

With wisdom born of historical experience, other labor unions were careful about riding two horses at the same time. The early labor movement had its fingers badly burned in politics. The Knights of Labor was shipwrecked in political storms. Samuel Gompers wisely kept the A. F. of L. away from political rocks. Abroad, labor organizations in politics first became the tools of dictators who afterward smashed them.

What will be the effect of Hillman's disregard of the workers' interests? The commitment of the C. I. O. to political action brings the storms of politics right down to the workbench in every factory. Every worker will become a political agent and the shop steward an American counterpart of the political commissar. Every relationship between management and labor will be tainted by union politics carried from the public arena into the private operation of industrial enterprises. C. I. O. leaders will carry political pressure and Government favor into every act of collective bargaining on a scale that will make small change of the little partisan actions of N. L. R. B. and W. L. B. Government agencies will hesitate to act upon the merits of labor disputes when the club of political reprisal hangs over them.

Does Mr. Hillman think that such conditions will make for social peace? Does he believe that farmers, professional men, manufacturers, tradesmen, and other union groups will sit by and permit a small executive clique of the C. I. O. to corner the large industrial vote and turn it into questionable channels? To regiment the voting population on these lines would soon produce a class society which has been the plague of Europe, and from which America has been free up to this time.

Union stewards occupy key positions in the factories. If they engage in political activities, as they certainly will as the C. I. O. gets deeper into politics, the worker is no longer a free man. If he doesn't "chuck in the buck for Roosevelt" and wear the political buttons, he can be the victim of a hundred harassing actions at the hands of his shop steward. A majority of 51 percent can use the whole power of a union to work against the minority of 49 percent. Would this be conductive to union peace? The union voter is at a disadvantage no matter how he moves. His free vote either goes to waste because his money is taken from him and employed to elect a candidate he may not favor; or, if he refuses to pay his dues, his job and livelihood are endangered. No regular political party has ever had such power over the voter as the C. I. O.-P. A. C. plans to exert.

And what of the financing? There was first of all the arbitrary appropriation of $670,000 direct from union treasuries—money collected as union dues and turned to political action. To date $400,000 of this has been spent to set up a Nation-wide political organization and to influence the primaries. Mr. Hillman says he will freeze the balance of this money to comply with the law, but the organization paid for with this money (which is the foundation of political campaigns) will continue functioning. In reality, therefore, the $400,000 spent before the conventions carries on and plays its part in the elections.

Perhaps the most insidious element in the original C. I. O. political fund was the spectacle of having high Government agencies like the W. L. B. support C. I. O. unionism and enforce the collection of dues as a condition of employment, and then have those unions in turn appropriate large sums from dues to support the President and the Government agencies.

It is naive to believe that the C. I. O. will not expect a quid pro quo for its money and political operations. Mr. Hillman says they are working for a progressive government, but you can be sure he will be hard-boiled when it comes to demanding concrete favors. Simple logic as well as past experience points to the danger that C. I. O. interests will be favored over employers, over the A. F. of L., above the independent railroad brotherhoods, and above all other interests of the country when it comes to the many favors a government has to bestow.

How the Attorney General got around the illegality of the original C. I. O.-P. A. C. fund of $670,000 presents a masterpiece of foggy understatement. His interests as a party man, rather than the high responsibilities of public trust, persuaded him to pick his way among the technicalities of the law.

The spirit, if not the letter, of the Hatch Act is certainly clear as to every union leader who checked out more than $5,000 to the C. I. O.-P. A. C. What Mr. Hillman and his self-styled "progressives" are trying to say in their befogged way is that they do not care about the spirit of the law if only they can squeeze between its technicalities.

No bedtime story about the C. I. O.-P. A. C., such as Hillman's, should fool the intelligent voter. Anyone who has watched Hillman's tactics can see the brass knuckles beneath the velvet glove. They came through scarcely a week ago when Mr. Hillman's own union, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, started soliciting their employers for political action funds. It is all "voluntary," but if employers do not kick in, they can expect labor troubles in the same way that the racketeers made them pay for labor peace. The workers will have to knuckle under in the same way if they fail to come through with "the buck for Roosevelt."

At the same time Mr. Hillman will attempt to dictate the way a worker shall vote. This now seems clear from resolutions of C. I. O. locals 65 and 72, in Salt Lake City, which protested against being forced to sponsor an "instructed vote."

How will the individual States of the Nation like it when the C. I. O.-P. A. C. moves in on them with its regional directors, propaganda literature, and money to influence State elections in favor of a special group? The Democratic Party has already been given a foretaste of the power Hillman has acquired by the well-known subversive tactics of "infiltration and boring from within." The A. F. of L. knows that the C. I. O. will not hesitate to use any political power it gains as an instrument to undermine all other unions. This is the plain handwriting on the wall.

What ideas will Hillman foster if the power of the C. I. O. P. A. C. becomes sufficient to influence government? Well, he is for the "good life"—for "democracy" (except when it comes to the dictatorial use of workers' dues)—for "adequate housing, food, clothing, medical care, education, and an opportunity for advancement." Who is not for democracy and the good life? The test does not rest upon contracting promises of heaven, but on how we go about making good upon them.

And here, we think that Mr. Hillman has some queer ideas about equality, of human dignity and of freedom. With the promise of attaining these ideals, the New Deal administration has centralized and regulated American life to the point where a dictatorship is the only remaining step. It has loaded us with a mountain of debt on which we shall pay heavy taxes for generations. It has set class against class, race against race, farmers against workers—all in the name of the good life. How can this be called progressive? It is more likely to end in bankruptcy and chaos and the workers, as European history shows, will be the first victims.

The 1942 elections which Mr. Hillman deplores, were the healthy assertion of the common sense of the people. It was an election of men pledged to stem the tide toward irresponsible government which has been rampant for 10 years. The restoration of the people's government to the people's Congress has already been too long delayed. By holding differently and working for the extension of dictatorial trends, Mr. Hillman is the reactionary in the cloak of the progressive. And as for unholy alliances, Hillman should hold his peace; at least until he gets a divorce from his marriage of convenience with Hague, Kelly, and Flynn.

[From the Reader's Digest of September 1944]

I OBJECT TO MY UNION IN POLITICS

(By William E. Mullins)

I am a working newspaperman, holding membership in the Newspaper Guild of Boston, which is a unit of the American Newspaper Guild, which is affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations. I joined this union to help improve working conditions and to provide job protection for newspapermen.

Now, through my union's affiliation with the C. I. O., I find myself represented in politics, without my consent and against my will, by the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee. I find myself in political company which frequently I do not like and pledged to political principles which frequently I do not share. I find myself committed, through no choice of my own, to one Presidential candidate, the Democratic, against the other Presidential candidate, the Republican, in this campaign. I also find myself committed on many other candidacies—and on many new, strange issues. I object.

I object as an American citizen and I object as a labor man. In my many years of observation of politics I have seen unions go into politics and come out on the losing side on election day. Then I have seen them fail to get from the winning side the things that they truly and legitimately wanted as unions. Unions do not need partisan politics. Unions were operating long before the National Labor Relations Act. A union is not a political proposition. It is an economic and human proposition. It must survive whether the party in power is Democratic or Republican or Socialist or anything else. It risks its life when it plays party politics. And if unions fail, democracy fails.

I hold to the view taken by Samuel Gompers, who first made the American labor movement a sound success. Study the records of legislators, he said. Study their votes on labor laws. Know your friends, and know your enemies, as individual legislators who make the laws. But stop there. Governors and Presidents do not make laws; they only enforce them. Leave them alone. They are more than individuals; they represent whole parties, local and national. Do not antagonize whole parties.

That is what Gompers taught. The opposite teaching will shake the whole American labor movement to its foundations.

I know the lengths to which men in politics will go in order to get even with elements which have opposed their party. I know what happens eventually to elements which break into politics and oppose a party which then wins. And each party some day wins. The pendulum always swings.

I would question the wisdom of the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee if it had endorsed the Republican Party's national candidate. I question its wisdom in endorsing the Democratic Party's national candidate. We labor people are now in for endless trouble, nationally and locally.

There are Republican administrations today in 26 States. Many of these States—Massachusetts, for instance, and Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California—are among the most important industrial labor States in the Union. Many of the Republican governors of these States and hundreds of the Republican legislators have been labor's friends. What are they going to say and do next year when the C. I. O. approaches them and says:

"We have fought your party. We have tried to ruin it. But now please protect us against antilabor legislation."

Even if Roosevelt is reelected, labor is going to lose.

In the Massachusetts primaries in July the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee gave its endorsement to five candidates. Three of these candidates were badly beaten. Two of them were beaten by candidates who are sure to be elected to the next Congress: JAMES M. CURLEY and PHILIP J. PHILBIN. What will be the attitude of these two Democrats—who have been buffeted around by the C. I. O.—toward my union?

And another thing. In my State the Political Action Committee has hired as its legislative agent one Sidney S. Grant, who but recently was a legislative representative for the Massachusetts Communist Party. Nationally, the C. I. O. unions which originally pledged $700,000 to the Political Action Committee included quite a few which are known to everybody in the labor movement to be Communist controlled. The first 1944 organization meeting of the Political Action Committee was addressed by numerous Communists and fellow-traveler union leaders, such as Henderson of the Cannery Workers, Robinson of the Smelter Workers, Emspak of the United Electrical Workers, Quill of the Transport Workers, Curran and Smith of the Maritime Workers, and Merrill of the Office Workers. Last May the Communist Party of America officially dissolved itself as a political party. To what end? Only to transfer its whole driving force into the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O.

We labor people are forfeiting the good will of multitudes of our fellow citizens because the Political Action Committee is involving us in issues that have nothing to do with labor as labor. Here is an example. In Massachusetts the law said that first-degree murder must be punished by death. On came a bill to change that law and leave it to the judge to order death or life imprisonment. The C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee in Massachusetts has made that bill one of the tests of a legislator's labor record. If a legislator voted against that bill, then I, as a C. I. O. man, must be against that legislator. So the labor movement is to get tangled into all the quarrels between people who favor capital punishment and people who do not. Maybe the law should have been changed, but I object to a labor organization becoming involved in extraneous issues.

Nationally I see the same ridiculous and suicidal process. Through the top subcommittee of the Political Action Committee, I find myself committed to a national planning board and to price guaranties to farmers and to the farm tenancy purchase program and to international machinery to make long-term credits available to industrially backward nations. These are all controversial questions. Men of great intellect differ about them. Do the leaders of the Political Action Committee really think that men and women in our Massachusetts mills and factories have given them a mandate on these questions? Of course not. These leaders are not listening to their followers. They are telling their followers what to think. Which is regular Communist totalitarian practice.

Mr. Sidney Hillman, president of Amalgamated Clothing Workers, is the chairman of the Political Action Committee. He is also the dominating leader of the American Labor Party of New York State. He captured that leadership through an open alliance with admittedly Communist-controlled unions in New York City. At once there was a large secession of non-Communist unions out of the American Labor Party into the new Liberal Party. The Communists, however, are now able, with Mr. Hillman's cooperation, to work toward their ultimate aims in the American Labor Party and the Political Action Committee both.

I concede to the Political Action Committee an immense skill in its political organization work. Its little leaflets and booklets telling how to get people to register and vote are the best I have ever seen. They contain splendid political education for the voters as to primaries and elections and as to the powers and duties of city councils, of State legislatures, of the Congress, of the President. Everything is explained in language simple, clear, complete. From an educational point of view the publications of the Political Action Committee strike a new high level in campaign literature. The Republican and Democratic parties have nothing to equal them; they would be well advised to try to catch up.

I also concede to the Political Action Committee certain successes in the recent primaries. The committee frightened Congressman DIES, of Texas, into not running for reelection. It had much to do with defeating Congressmen NEWSOME and STARNES in Alabama, Congressman COSTELLO in California, and Senator HOLMAN in Oregon.

Its true great success, however, is in its elaborate and comprehensive machinery, throughout this whole country for getting people on its own side to register and to vote. The Political Action Committee is probably the most efficient "Get out the vote" endeavor that was ever organized in the whole history of American politics. This effort, unless there is a corresponding effort on the other side, may be decisive in November. I do not underestimate the Political Action Committee. It is energetic, intelligent, formidable. I all the more object to it from the labor point of view.

Having joined a union for economic purposes, I object to contributions out of union treasuries to funds spent for political purposes. During the rest of this campaign the Political Action Committee, now disguised as the National Citizens' Political Action Committee, will seek a personal contribution of $1 from each C. I. O. union member. I know the intimidations and coercions that can be practiced to get that dollar. But it is not that dollar that is my main point. My main point is the effort of the Political Action Committee to transform my union affiliations into political opinions.

The American labor movement has been for better economic relations between employers and employees. It has not sought quarrels with its fellow citizens on other issues. Now the Political Action Committee is trying to make the American labor movement into a political movement with opinions on every kind of issue, domestic and foreign. It is headed toward accomplishing just two things. One is to split the American labor movement even more than it is split now. The other is to raise up new enemies for the labor movement on utterly nonlabor issues and to confront the labor movement with more opposition than it ever before has faced.

I object; and I think that millions of my fellow unionists will object as soon as they see what is being done to them. The Political Action Committee is setting up a conflict between the labor movement and the free, independent political American spirit. The mass of unionists will in the end repudiate it. They are unionists, but, first, they are Americans.

War Success Nonpartisan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Des Moines Sunday Register of August 20, 1944:

WAR SUCCESS NONPARTISAN, MAJORITY OF IOWANS BELIEVE

A majority of Iowans disagree with a Democratic national platform claim of administration credit for building up our fighting power.

The Iowa poll found 66 percent of persons questioned in a survey attributed successful prosecution of the war to nonpolitical cooperation of all Americans; only 21 percent assented to the Democratic partisan boast; and the other 13 percent were noncommittal.

The poll found more Iowans approve than disapprove the Republican national platform plank on world organization against war, although there was not a clear majority in the voting.

Those who approved constituted 47 percent; those who disapproved totaled 19 percent. But 34 percent expressed no opinion.

PARTY LINE-UP

Republicans cast an 82-percent vote against the claimed Democratic credit for successful prosecution of the war, while only 8 percent voted to accord it. Democrats voted 49 percent against their national party plank, and 36 percent favored it.

On the Republican peace plank, Republicans registered a vote of 64-percent approval and 14-percent disapproval, while 28 percent of the Democrats agreed with it and 27 percent disagreed.

THE QUESTION

The question on the Democratic war plank was worded:

"A plank in the Democratic platform says: 'It (the Democratic administration) succeeded in building, in time, the best-trained and equipped army in the world, the most powerful navy in the world, the greatest air force in the world, and the largest merchant marine in the world.' Do you agree with this plank, or do you feel that our success in building up our fighting power is due to nonpolitical cooperation?"

The responses, by sex, were:

		(*Percent*)	
	Total	Men	Women
Agree	21	20	21
Nonpolitical cooperation	64	73	66
Don't know	13	10	15

The answers, by residence, were:

		(*Percent*)	
	City	Town	Farm
Agree	24	15	19
Nonpolitical cooperation	64	73	66
Don't know	12	12	15

The question on the Republican post-war plank was phrased:

"The Republican platform contains this plank on future peace: 'We shall seek to achieve such aims through organized international cooperation and not by joining a world state.' Do you approve or disapprove of this plank in the Republican platform?"

The replies by sex, were:

		(*Percent*)	
	Total	Men	Women
Approve	47	48	47
Disapprove	19	24	16
No opinions	34	28	37

The answers by residence, were:

		(*Percent*)	
	City	Town	Farm
Approve	48	47	47
Disapprove	21	22	16
No opinion	31	31	37

The poll revealed that only 27 percent of those interviewed had read the platform adopted by the Republican convention, and only 20 percent the platform adopted by the Democratic national convention.

The Iowa poll is conducted throughout Iowa by 60 field reporters who interview a representative cross section of the total population of the State. The Iowans to be polled are selected to provide proportionate representation to men and women, age groups, place of residence, income brackets, and party affiliation.

The Cheap Jeep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Midland (Mich.) Daily News of August 22, 1944:

THE CHEAP JEEP

The question of surplus property disposal is now up in Congress and mentioned today is the proposal for a cheap jeep for those in the armed forces. It is said the reason for this is that many of those now in service like the idea of owning a jeep after the war. We're all for it. And we hope this section will be added to the bill.

We also hope that disposal of surplus property will be handled in such a way that the public can benefit from some of the bargains to be offered and so that all benefits will not fall into the hands of the speculators as they did after the last war. The net result was that the Government lost millions of dollars and the public paid a long price.

While there will be many items not wanted at all by civilians, there will also be many articles which can be used—many more articles than after the last war. It would seem to us that regularly established retail outlets would buy and sell many of these items and that they could be sold wholesale by the armed services. This in turn would give employment to a lot of returning soldiers until such time as they could locate jobs.

Fulton Lewis, Jr., Gives Facts About Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching a national campaign in which the best interests of our country demand a fair and impartial presentation of the issues. It is unfortunate that efforts are being made to confuse the American people by inaccurate references to the island of Guam in order to divert attention from the Pearl Harbor disaster of December 7, 1941.

Administration spokesmen have frequently sought to embarrass opponents by alleging that Guam would have been fortified in 1939 if it had not been for the opposition of the minority party. Recently the President injected this same issue into the political campaign by declaring that "they did not permit us to fortify Guam." Such implications have a sinister meaning, and apparently this alleged issue is being revived to becloud developments which may present the truth about Pearl Harbor.

Those persons who persist in referring to Guam surely are acquainted with the factual background, and it must be assumed that they are deliberately deceiving the American people. Senate Document No. 202 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, contains a pertinent statement by Senator DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee. This publication effectually refutes unfounded charges which may create the impression that this administration at any time during the past decade sought to fortify the island of Guam.

In January 1939 a bill was presented to the House of Representatives including an item of $5,000,000 to build a breakwater, to dredge the harbor, and to build seaplane ramps on Guam. When hearings were held on the bill by the Naval Affairs Committee in the House, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Charles Edison, stated:

It is the present policy of the Navy Department now to ask for development only to the extent stated in the bill before this committee.

When the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs later held hearings on the House bill, Admiral Leahy referred to the assumption that it was intended to fortify Guam and then declared: "This is not the case; the only improvements contemplated at the present time are the building of a breakwater, dredging to improve the seaplane take-off area, and minor preparations for handling planes." The final conclusion of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, according to Senate Document No. 202, was as follows:

In view of the action of the State Department and in view of the fact that the item of $5,000,000 for Guam had been defeated by such a decisive vote in the House of Representatives, after consulting with the President on this item, the House action was not changed by the Senate.

Fulton Lewis, Jr., nationally prominent radio commentator, on April 10, 1944, referred to the misrepresentation concerning Guam, and presented some timely information, so that the American people may know the facts. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the statement made by Mr. Lewis on this subject:

The simple factual record is—and I'm sure that Speaker RAYBURN will agree, on mature reconsideration and research, that what I'm going to tell you now is absolutely correct, in detail:

In article 19 of the Washington naval treaty at the close of the last war, we, Great Britain, and Japan, agreed to maintain the status quo in the Pacific, with a few exceptions such as Hawaii. In other words, we agreed not to fortify the island of Guam.

Japan renounced the treaty in December of 1934, which meant that it expired for all of us, at the end of December 1936. Prior to that date, we couldn't fortify Guam if we wanted to, and no representative of the administration ever proposed such a thing, but after that date, we could do as we pleased.

In 1937, the House Naval Affairs Committee asked the Navy Department for a general and complete plan of fortifications, which the Navy would consider to be adequate for the protection of the United States.

That report was known as the Hepburn report, after Admiral Hepburn who headed the commission which drew it up, and it proposed two alternative plans for fortifying Guam—as part of the whole vast program. And this was in no wise a current Navy Department recommendation. It was merely one of many items, in an ultimate conception of what should be done, to make the United States completely impregnable, regardless of cost or foreign policy, or anything else.

One of those plans called for an expenditure of about $30,000,000, which the Hepburn report said would provide Guam with some outer breastwork fortifications. The other called for expenditure of about $150,000,000, which, the board said, would completely fortify the island and turn it into a major naval operating base.

Neither the President, nor the Secretary of the Navy, nor the War Department, nor the State Department, nor any other responsible official of the administration actively supported either of these proposals, and the record actually shows that in 1938, the Navy Department actually recommended to the Bureau of the Budget the authorization of a considerable expenditure toward fortification of the island, but the bureau of the budget reduced that to an authorization for $5,000,000, for mere dredging of the harbor.

It came up for consideration on the floor of the House of Representatives on February 23, 1939, on which occasion Chairman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, of the House Naval Affairs Committee, and Representative MELVIN MAAS, of Minnesota, the ranking Republican on that same committee, were the leading proponents of it.

About 5 weeks prior to that time—on January 20, to be exact—the President was asked about this proposed $5,000,000 item. I was present at that press conference, and I remember it very clearly, but let me quote to you the Associated Press news report story on that press and radio conference, which is corroborated by my own files of my broadcasts of that day, over this microphone. Here is the Associated Press account:

"The President said that the Guam project was one of many proposed by a Navy board to be carried out over a course of years. He said he personally was not taking sides on the long range program but was concerned only about appropriations necessary for the coming year.

"The pending bill was an authorization only—and the President said that many authorized projects are abandoned, that one Congress could not commit another to a project, and in passing authorization it merely means that one Congress hoped some future Congress would appropriate money for the authorization. In other words, he said, it was an expression of a pious hope, or a New Year's resolution."

Now, getting back to the debate in the House of Representatives, it was flatly stated by all representatives of the administration who spoke on that occasion, that the authorization was not for the fortification of Guam, but merely to dredge the harbor. It was stated that the then Secretary of the Navy, Charles Edison, had written to the Naval Affairs Committee, stating that fact unequivocally, and—well take this quote from Representative VINSON:

"Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The bill in the first place, does not call for any fortification whatsoever."

The Congressman who led the fight to strike the item out of the bill was not an opponent of the administration, but was a Democrat from New Jersey, Representative SUTPHIN, and under his leadership, the item was stricken out of the bill by the House. Not an item for the fortification of Guam—the greatest possible emphasis was placed, time and again, on the fact that there were no fortifications involved—but, rather, an authorization of $5,000,000 to simply dredge the harbor.

The following year another attempt was made, in 1940. And this time it was an effort to get an appropriation of $5,000,000, as part of the Navy Department appropriation bill. Again, the set-up in the House of Representatives was the same: The Republican Representative MAAS, of Minnesota, and the Democratic chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, Representative VINSON of Georgia, led the fight in favor of it. And again, all administration leaders, including Secretary of the Navy Edison, said it was strictly a matter of dredging the harbor. They were not asking for any fortifications. That time it was again defeated.

Finally, in March of 1941, it was passed—an appropriation of $5,000,000 to dredge that harbor at Guam—and all administration leaders, including Admiral Stark, who was then Chief of Naval Operations, and Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, insisted flatly and vehemently that they still did not propose to fortify Guam and were not asking to fortify it, they had no plans to fortify it. They

merely wanted this money to deepen the harbor.

That is the record. I'm very sure that Speaker RAYBURN, if he will look back, will find that to be accurate to the last detail. So there really is no question of opponents of the administration having prevented the fortification of Guam because the administration, as the record shows, never made the slightest attempt or proposal to fortify Guam, and was very loud in its insistence at the time that it was not proposing any such thing.

The American Badge of Freedom Is the Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Howard Fast, the author of Citizen Tom Paine, has written an appeal urging people to exercise their right of franchise. It is a very timely article, and in my judgment should have the thoughtful attention of every voter in America. I place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks, so that it may receive the wide distribution it deserves:

THE AMERICAN BADGE OF FREEDOM

(An appeal)

It used to be that election day was a day of shouting, bonfires, and foolish bets, but this coming election day is like a day of prayer, a day of thanksgiving.

It used to be that we took the ballot for granted, as we took the fresh air and the sunshine and the bread we ate for granted; but the enemy showed us that we can take nothing for granted.

We had the right to vote; we had always possessed that right, and we felt we would always possess it. For all of that, it was a casual act, and if we had nothing better to do, we voted; otherwise, we didn't.

And then we learned that there are no rights but those for which we pay in blood. And in blood we paid.

The price was high, but all good things come dearly; and if we never knew before what the ballot meant, surely we know now. Surely we were taught what the right to vote means. Surely, in all the history of this earth, there was never such a bitter, such a cruel and pointed lesson.

Let us not talk any more of the right to vote or the privilege. It is a duty. It is the first and foremost duty of a citizen of a democracy.

Only by use of the ballot can he justify the very word democracy. Only by use of the ballot can he exercise the freedom for which Americans are dying.

There are no excuses, neither forgetfulness nor slothfulness nor indifference. Each of us, as an individual, has it in his power to influence the future of this Nation and the course of history. Each of us may cast but one vote. With the ballot we are equal in the truest sense of the word. Each of us, on election day, no matter how he votes, stands forth as the protagonist and justification of democracy.

The future is in our hands. What is asked of us? Only the small matter of casting a secret ballot on that Tuesday in November * * * the small matter which is the best and proudest possession of freemen.

Let no one be absent from the polls. When that day comes, no cause is a greater cause than this. No need is a greater need. No duty is a higher duty.

We vote only because brave men have died for that right; but this democracy of ours, for which they fought, cannot endure unless we go forth to the polls on election day, fully conscious of our duty, our responsibility, and our necessity.

Above all things, the ballot is the badge of freedom Americans wear.

Government Agencies Versus Meat Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I insert into the RECORD a letter sent to Chester Bowles, the Director of the O. P. A., and to Marvin Jones, the Director of W. F. A.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the country have been anxious to get an answer to a $64 question, which is, "What will the price of hogs be on October 1?"

The O. P. A. and the W. F. A. have caused an unholy mess in the handling of not only pork but beef. The Government agencies have put into effect directives which have caused a forced liquidation of our meat supplies. There will be a famine of all types of good meat because of their unnecessary attempts to regulate the livestock industry.

The hog industry has been protected by extreme scarcity. The Government agencies have found it necessary to have the so-called set-aside orders for pork. Several months ago the agencies announced that there would be a reduction in the price of hogs on October 1. Unless this order is immediately changed it will cause a liquidation of the hogs of the country. It will mean a further scarcity of pork.

The cattle feeder has already been barred from feeding by O. P. A. ceilings and other Government regulations. We see the agencies trying to stampede the range cattle producers into liquidating their herds. We find much of the better beef going to the black markets.

The subsidy and roll-back program for beef cattle did not help the producer or the feeder. The Government agencies are penalizing quantity production of meat. There has been a gradual strangulation of the hog, cattle, and sheep markets. The policies adopted by the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. will not produce more meat or better meat. They do encourage the black market racketeers. Their policies break down and destroy the business of producing good meat.

AUGUST 25, 1944.

CHESTER BOWLES,

Director, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: There is a $64 question which the producers of hogs are asking. The question is, "What will the price of hogs be on October 1?" Your office made a statement some time ago that it would be $12.50 per hundred, Chicago basis. This would be a reduction of $1.25 from the present price. There now seems to be some doubt about your order going into effect.

In all fairness to the farmers and the producers of hogs they should know now what the several Government agencies intend to do about the price of hogs. It is impossible for the farmers to plan with any satisfaction when he does not know what to expect or can hardly venture a guess regarding the plans of either the Office of Price or the War Food Administration. If the price of hogs is to be reduced $1.25 it will mean a loss of approximately $200 a carload. This would be something over $200,000,000 on the year's crop of hogs.

Unless a decision can be made at once it is almost certain that there will be a widespread liquidation of light hogs and pigs before October 1. I believe the hog raisers are as much interested in the ceiling as they are in the floor, perhaps more so, because with a shortage of meat it is almost certain that good hogs will sell up to or through the ceiling.

In the past few weeks there has been the wildest upswing in the price of hogs. This is because there is not enough pork to fill the requirements. A few weeks ago there was a feast of hogs and now there is a famine. There has been too much confusion and a constant turmoil and one of the worst chaotic conditions which has ever existed all because the Government organizations have been so uncertain as to which way to move. This has caused extreme confusion. I believe it is caused by the ignorance of those assigned to the problem. Not only the packers but the farmers have had to look to Washington to ascertain if they were doing something which might eventually put them in jail. They have been forbidden to do many things which they have always done under the business of free enterprise. A few men in the Price Control Section have been directing the economy of this country. By artificial means a few men have had the power to destroy most any business they attempt to regulate. It has been only a few short weeks since the market was swamped by a record supply of hogs. Storage was bulging. The Government at the same time froze all the corn supply and forced the farmers to dump more hogs on a market already burdened with more than it could handle.

Government agencies have refused to take the advice of practical men who know the hog business. Individuals in your agencies have imposed rules and regulations upon the trade to which, if they adhered to, meant absolute ruin. There is no sense of making rules and regulations which cannot be enforced.

It would seem to me that if we must have floors and ceilings on hogs that there should be a floor under all hogs between 180 and 270 pounds. This floor should not be less than $14.75 per hundred Chicago base. The price should not be less than $14.50 for all weights. If we must have ceilings, then in fairness to the farmers it should be on all classes and weights of hogs and adjusted to meet the increased cost of production.

The farmers have been forced to take many losses on their hogs because a few might have been under weight, which caused the entire lot to be sold far below the floor. There must be strict enforcement of floor prices. I believe all subsidies to the packers should be withheld unless the packer buys the hogs within the floor and the ceiling price. When the subsidy is reduced it should reflect an increased price to the producers of pork. The $1.30 subsidy being paid the packers on all classes of hogs should go to the producers. The packer waxes fat at the expense of the producer and all because of your crazy subsidy idea.

I wish to call your attention to the Price Control Extension Act in which Congress made it mandatory that the prices to the producers be kept at parity or the highest level obtained during the first 9 months of 1943. A reduction of the hog support price to $12.50 which you have suggested would be a violation of this law.

Again I say it is imperative that you take prompt action relative to the price of hogs in order that the producers might have a clear idea of what to expect from their Government. This should be done now and not a few hours before the dead line of October 1. Unless it is done immediately there will be a further liquidation of light hogs which will mean additional shortages of pork next year. The farmers have a right to know what the Government intends to do.

Can you give me and the hog producers of the country an answer to the $64 question; namely, What will the price of hogs be October 1?

Very truly yours,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
Fourth District, Nebraska.

Care of Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administration; James F. Byrnes, Director, Office of War Mobilization.

Our Post-war Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement from War Food Administrator, Judge Marvin Jones, before a subcommittee of the House on August 25. Several members of the committee remarked at the hearing that it was one of the best statements they had ever heard in their long careers in Congress. I feel that it should be carefully read by every Member having the future of our agriculture at heart.

We remember the work of Congressman Marvin Jones when he was chairman of the Agriculture Committee of this body and that he was one of the most eloquent supporters of agricultural progress and one of the stanchest defenders of the farmers' interests to be found among our Membership. He has always believed in an economy of abundance and is working for full production on the farm as well as in the factory all over our country. He wants the wartime program of cooperation to continue after the war as it has during the war. No man appreciates more than he the interdependency of agriculture and industry in bringing about a united prosperity to contribute to the best welfare of our country.

As a westerner, I have been particularly interested in the stress that Marvin Jones lays upon conserving our soil and utilizing our water resources. He knows the vast possibilities of the West and he would not permit a drop of water to go to waste. He appreciates that full utilization of the water resources throughout the West not only conserves the soil in that section of the country, but keeps up the food production while enabling needed conservation to be practiced in the East. This statement is a vision of what our country may be after the war if we have but the wisdom to materialize it. The statement is as follows:

It is impossible to separate the problem of production, storage, and disposition of food from the problem of the land on which it is produced and the prices and income which farmers receive, or from the machinery, tools, and labor with which it is produced, or from the processing, storing, and handling as well as transportation. The basic problems of soil, price, and income will remain in peace as well as in war time.

The War Food Administration, while an independent agency reporting directly to the President, utilizes and has control of the action agencies of the Department of Agriculture as well as its own personal staff. In this way it is far less expensive than if it operated altogether with a complete new personnel of its own. In addition, it has the advantage of the experience of those who have heretofore been engaged in the same line of work.

We are therefore directly interested not only in guiding production and supporting prices, but also in the disposal of food as such, and in the disposition and handling of the land now owned by the Government, in rebuilding and maintaining the soil, in the use of water, in the disposition of equipment, machinery, and supplies owned by the Government that may be useful in connection with farming or with the soil, and with other questions that are intimately linked with the future of the farm and ranch.

The American farmers and ranchmen have done a magnificent production job since the beginning of the war. In spite of wartime handicaps they have produced more food than any nation in history ever produced in the same time. They have not only made it possible for us to have the best fed Army and Navy in the world, but have supplied all essential civilian needs and, at the same time, have made it possible for us to ship vast quantities of food to our fighting allies. The War Food Administration for the last year has purchased an average of more than $8,000,000 worth of food per day for shipment abroad for these purposes. Every pound of this food has brought results. It has made it possible for our fighting allies to continue their all-out war effort. The Allied Nations owe the American farmer a debt of gratitude. They have so expressed themselves.

This production is what we want. There is no place in America for a philosophy of scarcity. Ours is the heritage of abundance. It is our goal today and will continue to be our goal when the war is over. Out of the great resources with which nature has endowed our land, we have built a great nation. Abundance is the soundest of national policies. It is plain common sense to produce all that we can consume and export without injury to our soil and natural resources and at a reasonable profit to the producers.

This production can be continued only if we have all-out industrial production as well. There cannot be curtailment of industrial production and, at the same time, abundant agricultural production. The two furnish a market for each other and assure employment to labor. This abundant agricultural production was made possible by the support prices which Congress wisely provided. You are aware, of course, that to carry out this support program in accordance with the commitment, necessary funds and authority will have to be supplied by the Congress.

This problem involves disposition of Government-owned stocks of agricultural products which must be held in reserve for war needs. We will have surplus stocks of food just as we will have surplus airplanes, guns, and tanks. The only way to have assurance against a shortage of these essential needs of our armed forces is to have some reserve supplies. Some of these supplies will, of course, be needed for temporary relief abroad, but we will also need authority to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities and the products abroad at competitive world prices.

One of the most interesting movies I have seen recently portrayed the part that industry will play in the Nation's post-war rebuilding and development, and in furnishing jobs after the war has ended.

The picture was well done and in every way worthy of praise. However, it left out one great wing of development; that is, the rural areas, the Nation's farms, ranches, and natural resources.

I hope some enterprising producer will make another movie depicting the possibilities of rebuilding, the opportunities for development, and furnishing of employment in the rural sections of this country.

Agriculture and industry are the twin evangels of modern civilization. Neither can prosper without the other. If one languishes, sooner or later the other will feel the effect. The farmer and livestock producer furnish the raw material, and in turn, if prosperous, help furnish a wider market for the finished article. At the same time, if the factory wheels are turning, they afford a market for the products of agriculture. Labor is vitally affected by any adverse effects that touch either wing of our national effort.

I was thrilled at the screen picture that I saw of the vast new efforts of industry: The busy spindles, the blazing furnaces, the new products made possible by man's inventive genius, the great wealth of useful things that industry can produce for the happiness of mankind.

But after all, the vital spark is lit back in the far stretches of this broad, big country.

We grow accustomed to the precious things of life, and they seem commonplace. We take them for granted—the air we breathe, the water we drink, and, in this very fortunate and productive country, the food we eat. We sometimes lose sight of the hard work that is involved in the production of that food, as well as the fiber which goes into the clothing and shelter of our people.

The opportunities we shall have after the war for developing our vast resources of land and water could be fashioned into a story more thrilling and romantic than any that has yet been shown on the screen—one by which the imagination of the people can be stirred along practical lines and one that can set our entire country athrill. If I were a movie producer, I would tell a screen story that would make the following points:

1. The first point would be soil conservation. The capital stock of the Nation is its soil resources. No business can stand a continual drain on its capital; likewise, no nation can endure for long, excessive drains on its capital resources.

What are soil resources? They are food and clothing locked up in nature's warehouses against the time when man, through his efforts, takes them out and uses them. Our great soil resources in this country have enabled us to develop a great race of people. History shows that the character and strength of a nation always go up and down with its soil.

H. H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, who has spent more than an average lifetime in a study of the soils, is authority for the statement that we have ruined more land in less time than any other nation in history, and that more than 50,000,000 acres of land in the United States, once cultivated and fertile, no longer produce crops. That was nearly as much as our entire wheat acreage last year. And the best topsoil has been washed away from an additional acreage more than twice as large as that. Fortunately, we are learning of this growing danger before it is too late. The soil-conservation and soil-building practices

of the last few years have increased the acreage yields of our major crops by more than 20 percent.

There are now more than 1,100 soil-conservation districts organized under the laws of various States receiving Federal assistance. Track-type tractors, bulldozers, ditching and other machinery and equipment would greatly increase the effectiveness of personnel already available and serving farms in the conservation of soil resources. Such surplus war equipment as is suitable for the purpose should be made available for these programs to expand the work of constructing terraces, drainage and irrigation ditches, stock-watering ponds, and other conservation developments.

Once made available, farmers themselves would pay for the operation and maintenance of the equipment. Because of the shortage of equipment, farmers have been unable to go ahead with the work planned. Additional equipment will result in greater efficiency and more work.

I have mentioned soil conservation first, but starting with the soil, other developments naturally flow from and become part and parcel of the undertaking. These include the proper use of water; the construction of large and small dams; rural electrification; decentralized industrial development; highways, and other forms of transportation; and individual home ownership. They are all closely linked.

2. I mentioned water use. Rainfall should be used on the plains and hillsides where it falls, through soil treatment, contour plowing, cover cropping, and strip planting, instead of letting it run off in waste to the sea, taking the soil with it. The building of ponds, check dams, and other small dams on the tributaries and small streams and in pastures and fields are all closely related to the conservation and rebuilding of the soil and furnish a vast field for adding to the wealth of our country and to the full employment of our people.

What is known as the Mississippi Valley, and I mean by that the whole great area between the Alleghenies and the Rockies, is the greatest food-producing area on earth. It all forms one great integrated river system. Properly used, it can for centuries to come not only supply our own people, but can help supply others with its products and bring back in trade additional goods for us to use and enjoy.

In dealing with nature's resources in any land and in any country, there is always a conserving use and a wasteful use. The choice lies with the people who control those resources. In the past we have exploited our good earth with a prodigal disregard of its value to our enduring life as a nation. We have sent the export crops down to the sea in ships and the soil down to the sea in mud. When the Mississippi overflowed toward its mouth we built levees. We tried to reverse nature and when nature fought back, as she always does under those conditions, we built even higher levees. Instead of using the water all along the line we tried to get it into the sea as fast as we could.

We are learning at last that the path of wisdom is to go back where the water falls as rain and work with nature instead of against her to utilize water at the source, thus treating it as a blessing instead of a curse. The development of a system of use that will retain that water and soil is worth any national effort however great. Far out in our great dry land areas not a single gallon of unused water should be permitted to reach the sea. All should be used on the land.

In other areas where it is abundant, it can be channeled and utilized for power, for additional wealth.

What has been said about the Mississippi Valley is true of our numerous other valleys and river systems throughout our great land.

After the war our people will turn eagerly from destruction in war to the constructive activities of peace. Our engineering and technical genius will gladly turn from its prodigious feats in jungle and desert areas to the worth-while and useful challenge that awaits them here at home.

The Congress, with farsighted vision, has established a Soil Conservation Service and made provisions for carrying out an extended program of preserving our greatest natural source of wealth. It has also made provision for a wiser use of water. Millions of acres of land are being protected and rebuilt under programs that have been vast. These efforts and provisions will need to be greatly enlarged.

3. This leads to the construction of large dams for irrigation, flood control, and hydroelectric power. The value of these great projects does not need to be argued. A visit to any one of them is visual and confirming evidence of their great worth. Nearly every great country on earth has natural wealth that only needs the touch of the genius and industry of man to be harnessed for human use.

4. Closely related to this is rural electrification. One of the great advantages of the construction of large dams is the possibility of using them for the production of electric power not only for the cities but flowing out to the countryside to the millions of farm homes that need it to lift the drudgery and burdens that are connected with the production of food. Produced and distributed in volume, electricity is one of the cheapest of commodities. It is one of the most useful. It affords an opportunity not only for making life easier and less burdensome, but also for bringing about a better balanced condition for making our entire country a productive commonwealth. Some of our surplus war materials could well be used for expanding the rural-electrification program.

5. I mentioned decentralized industrial developments. If we develop a vast network of soil treatment, check damming, and hydroelectric power dams on the various streams flowing through every nook and corner of the United States, it will naturally make possible, in fact will make inevitable, a decentralized development of industry in all parts of the country. This will bring our raw materials close to the heart of the business community and the interests of agriculture and industry can be thus dovetailed together.

Bringing the products of the farm as well as articles of industry closer to the markets of each will bring about a better understanding between agriculture and industry, which are natural partners, and will help solve many of the problems of both capital and labor.

6. Highways are another part of this chain of development. There should be a greatly expanded and suitable network of highways in order to facilitate the exchange of the products of factory and farm. This should not stop with highways. We will need all forms of transportation: Railway, air line and newer forms that may be developed when the war is over. I have no doubt that through the use of airplane transportation, and with the advantages of improved forms of refrigeration, fresh vegetables can be carried in a few hours from the point of production to any market in this country. The same is true of many other perishable commodities. If in this way an expanded production for expanded use can be developed, not only will both agriculture and industry gain advantages therefrom, but every form of transportation in its fullest development will be needed, and any man who is willing to work will be able to find a place in it. This possibility is a challenge to the best minds and the best thought that this Nation can produce.

All discrimination in freight rates as between different sections or areas of the country should be eliminated as to all forms of transportation.

7. Home ownership fits squarely into this picture. The financing of home purchase of family-sized farms, with special provision for returning soldiers who may desire to purchase and live on a farm, can contribute much to the stability of our country. The same is true of the financing of home purchasing in the towns and cities. Our laws, both State and national, should be so fashioned as to encourage the ownership and maintenance of family-sized farms in the country and comfortable homes in the towns and cities. It will be difficult for any "ism" or wild scheme or movement to gain any appreciable foothold among a home-owning people.

A great variety of agricultural land, ranging all the way from submarginal to some of our very best farm land, was acquired for various war purposes. We believe that this land should be disposed of in accordance with agricultural policies which have been established by Congress over a period of years. The agricultural land which is declared surplus should be surveyed to determine its proper use on a long-time basis. Following this, the submarginal land should be assigned to the proper State or Federal Government agency depending upon location and the use to which it might be put. For example, some of the land might be included in soil conservation, erosion control, and forestry programs of the Department of Agriculture or appropriate programs of other Government agencies. Such disposition of submarginal land not only would be wise from the standpoint of good land use, but would be economical in the long run. In our judgment it would be unfair to sell submarginal land to individuals for farming purposes.

The land which is determined to be suitable for farming should be divided into family-size units and sold to persons who intend to live on the unit and operate it for a livelihood.

Lands that are suitable only for range purpose should, of course, be sold in larger tracts consistent with that use.

The former owners should be given a reasonable period of about 90 days in which to repurchase the land formerly owned by them at a price not exceeding the price which the Government paid for the land, after taking into consideration any damage to the property, and also the usable advantage, if any, of any improvements that may have been placed thereon by the Government. Subject only to the former owner's right to purchase, war veterans, who have had experience in farming and who desire to do so, should first be given an opportunity to secure a farming unit. In our opinion it would be inconsistent with sound public policy to permit this land to fall into the hands of those who do not need it for homes when so many former owners and servicemen will find it impossible to get a farm at reasonable prices and terms.

It is our earnest hope that Congress will make sure that the good farm land to be released by the Government is used for encouraging the family-sized, family-operated farm ideal of America, which has been the foundation rock not only of our agriculture but our entire Nation.

But whatever is done, whatever plans we may make, or whatever genius we may possess, our Nation must perish unless we take care of the soil. The soil is our natural heritage. Wisely used, its value, its life-giving strength, its productivity are ageless.

The children of the future have a stake in this our greatest natural resource. We have a right to use the soil and other natural resources. We have no right to abuse them. They can be made to grow stronger and more productive and be left to coming generations in richer and better form than when they came to us.

We want to keep this Nation a land of abundance and opportunity.

Philadelphia Bulletin Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. MURPHY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Bulletin of August 22, 1944:

THE BULLETIN POLL—53 PERCENT OF VOTERS IN THIS CITY PREFER ROOSEVELT NOW—24 SUPPORT DEWEY, AND 20 PERCENT SAY THEY HAVEN'T MADE UP MINDS YET

(By Paul Trescott)

If the Presidential election were being held today, President Roosevelt would get 53 percent of Philadelphia's vote.

That is the result of interviews with a carefully selected cross section of Philadelphia adults by representatives of the Bulletin poll. Twenty-four percent of the voters expressed a preference for Governor Dewey, and 20 percent declared they hadn't made up their minds.

In the 1940 Presidential election, President Roosevelt polled approximately 60 percent of the city vote, and Philadelphia supplied about two-thirds of the margin by which he carried Pennsylvania. Since then many thousands of Philadelphians have entered the armed services, and how they will vote—if they do—is anybody's guess.

Eighteen percent of those interviewed reported they were too young to vote 4 years ago, and most of the group said they hadn't made up their minds how to vote this year. Among those who did vote 4 years ago, 7 percent of those who voted Democratic said they intended to vote for Governor Dewey this time. On the other hand, 13 percent of those who voted Republican in 1940 expressed the intention of voting for Mr. Roosevelt this year.

SHIFTS ARE A FACTOR

Such shifts take place in every election and at times completely upset forecasters. Incidentally, the results of this poll are not a forecast but a report of sentiment as it exists today.

The undecided vote is abnormally large and is a completely unpredictable factor. It may include a considerable number of those who do not vote, as well as those who fully intend to visit the polls but are awaiting clarification of some campaign issue before making up their minds.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS IN ELECTION POLL

Interviewers for the Bulletin poll asked Philadelphia adults this question:

"If the Presidential election were being held today, for whom would you vote—Dewey or Roosevelt?"

The result:

	Percent
Roosevelt	53
Dewey	24
Others	1
Undecided	20
Declined to answer	2

As between men and women, the result was—

	Percent	
	Men	*Women*
Roosevelt	50	55
Dewey	29	21
Others	1	--
Undecided	17	23
Declined to answer	3	1

As between white and Negro voters, the result was—

	Percent	
	White	*Negro*
Roosevelt	49	83
Dewey	27	4
Undecided	21	12
Others	1	--
Declined to answer	2	1

Union and nonunion members showed this preference:

	Percent	
	Union	*Nonunion*
Roosevelt	54	53
Dewey	21	24
Undecided	23	20
Others	--	1
Declined to answer	2	2

Peace Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RANULF COMPTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a brief and comprehensive outline of several important phases of an international peace plan, just made public by Mr. R. Walter Bishop, of Guilford, Conn.:

A PROPOSAL FOR PERMANENT WORLD SECURITY WITH SUGGESTED METHODS FOR ITS APPLICATION

A PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Thoughtful people everywhere recognize the fact that the world cannot continue to live in a state of anarchy. If there is to be international security and peace, there must be law and order.

To enable mankind to live in security and peace, under a condition of law and order, there must be some form of international organization such as a continuation of the present functioning United Nations. The name of such international organization is immaterial—it is the substance of effective world organization that is essential.

This world organization will necessarily require executive authority to carry into effect the recommendations decided upon by all sovereign nations assembled at regular or special sessions. A world court will decide disputes of international character. And united world military power, operating under, and directed by the world executive authority and the world general staff, will be prepared to use force if necessary to uphold law and order in the world community.

The following plan for permanent world security, to be developed in two stages, is definitely not intended to take the place of a world organization having executive, policy-making, and judicial branches. Obviously a practical use of force, if necessary, must support the peaceful purposes of a world organization. It is entirely possible that the success or failure of world organization—and the issue of future peace or war—may depend to a large extent on how the military force of the world is organized to implement and support the peaceful purposes of a united world.

The united military power of the world will consist of air, naval, and land forces, each sharing in the responsibility of keeping order and upholding justice under the executive authority of the world organization and operating through a general staff somewhat expanded. These divisions of military power will be coordinated to work together in the enforcement of law and order throughout the world.

Because the average citizen at the present time is likely to understand the strategic location of world naval bases better than the location of land and air bases, and because the united control of naval bases will necessarily play a large part in any coordinated military support of world peace, on account of the use of oceans as highways for much of the world's heavy trade, this proposal will deal with the organization of world naval power as an illustration of the formula, but the formula proposed for the organization of naval power can be and should be applied to both air and land forces in a coordinated system of military power, operating under the executive authority and general staff of a world organization.

THE IMPORTANCE OF AIR POWER UNDER THIS FORMULA

World air power, under stage No. 2 of this proposal, would be organized under exactly the same formula as world naval power, with bases located at other strategic points throughout the world. If both air and naval power were organized under the proposed formula, it is probable that it would not be necessary to maintain extensive armies under stage No. 2, but such land forces as may be considered essential could be organized under the same formula—all three branches coordinated in one integrated system of military power under the executive authority and general staff, carrying out the policies of the community of sovereign nations.

Because of the highly competitive nature of the aircraft industries of the three leading world powers, it is particularly important that this impartial formula for permanent world security be adopted as soon as possible in order to protect each of these nations, as well as all nations, from the insecurity that would result from unrestrained competition of these powers for the world military control of the air.

PERMANENT WORLD SECURITY IN TWO STAGES

In order to be successful any plan for permanent world security must be practical and realistic. One cannot expect to jump from a world organized for war to one organized for peace and security without months of planning and adjustment during this transitionary stage. By keeping our feet on the ground of practical reality under the preliminary stage of the plan, and by keeping our eyes on the goal of permanent world security under stage No. 2, the problems of transition from one stage to the other can be solved successfully.

These two stages are part of the same plan. If only the first stage of this plan were carried out, the world would very likely degenerate into several competing imperialisms, with only an armed peace to stave off the inevitable clash of rival interests. By preparing for permanent stage No. 2 during preliminary stage No. 1, the transition could be made smoothly, safely, and successfully.

STAGE NO. 1. PRELIMINARY OR TRANSITION STAGE

(Lasting from 2 to 5 years after end of war)

The first need of the world immediately following the cessation of hostilities will be stability in order to give the forces of reconstruction the best chance to get started. Obviously, the security of the world, during this unsettled period, depends on the continued employment of as much existing military power as may be needed to maintain stability and order, under the General Staff of the United Nations. The advantages would be as follows:

1. There would not be time to organize anything different. Stability must be maintained with the forces at hand.

2. The existing United Nations power would be large enough for immediate world security. The United States would be strong on land, air, and sea; Russia in land and air power; Great Britain in air and sea power, and China (possibly) in land forces, and other nations as during the war. Surplus power not needed for maintaining stability could be demobilized.

3. The General Staff as now organized could continue, with perhaps some additions, during the transition period from stage 1 to stage 2. This would be the logical directing military staff, under World Executive Authority of stage No. 2.

4. Naval and air bases throughout the world acquired during the war should be held in trust by the continuing United Nations General Staff while the rotary-command system of stage No. 2 was being organized. All nations would be more willing to cede these bases to the United Nations than to any individual nation, bebecause all nations would use these bases jointly for their mutual security during stage No. 2.

5. There would be time, under stage No. 1 to adjust the military power of the world to actual requirements. During stage No. 1 it is probable that land power, as an occupying force in world trouble spots, would play the major part. But during stage No. 2 air and sea power would be the chief needs, since—aside from domestic police in each country—it should be possible for a combination of air and sea power, integrated in one system, to maintain world security on a permanent basis.

6. The large amount of existing equipment produced by a few of the major powers would be more useful for the stage No. 2, since each of the nations, under Stage No. 2 could take over and maintain its share of this equipment, thus reducing the cost, providing a use, and resulting in greater uniformity of a united world military power. This would make stage No. 2 easier to organise than if the equipment varied too much in design and operation.

STAGE NO. 2. PERMANENT WORLD SECURITY

(Commencing at end of Stage No. 1)

A practical formula is the basis of success in solving the problem of permanent world security

It is obvious that in order to succeed in solving the knotty problems of permanent world security, a formula must be found that commends itself to all mankind for—

1. Its absolute fairness and impartiality to every nation.
2. Its practicability.
3. Its economy.

A study of international conferences has shown the difficulty of finding a formula that would satisfy every nation. In order to succeed, a formula must be found this time that does command the respect of mankind because it is manifestly just and impartial to every nation. The formula proposed here does seem to have the above qualifications and is offered in the hope that it may help a little in bringing peace and security to mankind.

A brief outline of the plan or formula

This plan is designed to give to every nation in the world equal security, without the risk that any one nation can or will threaten the security of the others. (This illustration applies to naval power but the same formula would be used for air and land power, particularly air power which will share equal importance with naval power in maintaining world order and security.)

1. This purpose is accomplished by the establishment of 12 world naval bases at strategic points on the highways of the world's ocean trade. Each of these naval bases shall be manned by 12 "units of power." These units of power shall be defined, as explained in another paragraph, by a body of naval experts representing all 12 nations, and shall be suitable for the needs of keeping order in any given area.

2. Each naval base shall be in command of a supreme commander, operating under, and upholding the policies of a world organization of sovereign nations. Operating under the supreme commander at each base shall be 12 subcommanders, one for each nation to command the unit of power furnished by that nation.

3. The office of supreme commander at each world naval base shall be rotated from year to year, and the new supreme commander each year (or each 2 years if a biennial method is considered more feasible) shall be chosen by one of the nations furnishing a unit of naval power for that base. If the term of office of the supreme commander was 1 year, it would take 12 years for the command of the base to rotate among the 12 nations manning the base. If the term of office was 2 years, then it would take 24 years for each of the 12 nations to have its turn at furnishing the supreme commander for each of the world naval bases.

4. This plan of rotating supreme commanders, annually or biennially, at any given naval base shall apply to all of the 12 naval bases located in all parts of the world with the following important provision: That the permanent schedule adopted for the whole world shall be so devised that no single nation will furnish supreme commanders for more than one of the 12 world naval bases during the same period of time.

A suggested schedule accompanies this proposal which may help to explain with greater clarity just how the rotation of commands would work out in actual operation.

5. For practical purposes, the 12 larger nations are assigned places at each world naval base, mainly because the larger nations should be better able to assume the financial responsibility of furnishing more units of power than the smaller nations, but if the smaller nations wish to join together and furnish between them 1 unit of power for each base, these smaller nations can rotate the command of their own units and when it becomes the turn of this composite unit to furnish the supreme commander for the naval base, one of their own number can be chosen for the honor. But if the number of units of power at each naval base is increased from 12 to 13, then there should be 13 world naval bases in all parts of the world in order to have the rotation plan work successfully.

Advantages of the permanent plan (known as stage No. 2)

Any plan for a coordinated world military power must necessarily have many unquestionable advantages if it is to command the attention and respect of mankind, and if it is to secure the widespread approval of all nations to make it a definite success. The chief advantages of this proposed plan are as follows:

1. It would be just and impartial to all nations. An impartial system with short-term rotation of commands would make it less possible, if not altogether impossible, for nationalistic rivalries to develop within the system.

2. Because it is plainly a just plan, it would eliminate the opportunity for selfish armament interests in any or all countries to arouse national jealousies and rivalries by false propaganda and chicanery.

3. By a system of checks and balances, this plan insures absolute security to all peoples. The rotation of all commanders each year, or each 2 years, with no more than one base in the world under the command of any one nation at the same time would protect the interests of each nation equally.

Even nations considered present enemy countries, after they are reconstituted could be admitted to such military system without undue risk, and it would be psychologically sound to admit them to the system as soon as possible after the conclusion of the present conflict. The automatic system of checks and balances would protect every nation. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for any one nation to stir up international trouble within the world system.

4. The successful operation of this plan would result in great economies in the amount of money spent by all nations for naval armament. Such economy would be an important consideration after the present conflict when most if not all nations will carry a heavy load of debt which must be liquidated in due time. The money saved on new naval armament could go into steel and other products for the general reconstruction of the world.

5. It would help lay the basis for wide development of international trade freely moving between nations without fear of disturbance. A coordinated naval power, as proposed, would contribute to the freedom of the seas—safeguarding the interests of all nations and peoples equally.

6. It would be a practical plan for administrative purposes. Since naval craft are, for the most part, designed to operate within limited areas not too far from regular naval bases, this plan of having the naval power of the world operating in 12 defined zones adjacent to the 12 world naval bases would be practical from the administrative standpoint.

7. The plan would be psychologically sound because it would be recognized as a just plan that would treat all nations fairly. It would help to give mankind the sense of security that is the basis for international stability and peace.

8. Because the military power of the world, organized under this formula, would be in actual balance at all times, the question of progressive disarmament would be solved automatically and safely by reducing, periodically, the size of the units of power at each or any world base in accordance with the growing security and stability of that particular area.

TECHNICAL PROBLEMS MADE EASIER BY AN IMPARTIAL PLAN

One of the chief difficulties at previous peace and arms limitations conferences has been the intrusion of conflicting national interests in deciding technical questions. There have been so many national, geographic, economic, and political considerations to be introduced, that it has been most difficult in the past to bring to all nations the security which each one desired. The use of an impartial formula would eliminate at once the conflicting interests, since it would be to the mutual advantage of every nation to cooperate in making the united military power of the world one of the greatest efficiency. Because all nations are treated equally, it would not be difficult for a body of naval experts to decide just what types of naval craft are necessary for each strategically located naval base for the purposes of giving adequate protection to the interests of all nations served by that area.

Among the technical problems to be decided would be—

1. The location of 12 world naval bases on the highways of the world's ocean trade, strategically located to give the greatest protection to the interests of all nations.

2. The composition of each unit of power provided by the different nations for each base. Each unit of power would probably be measured by weight, by cost, by gun power, by speed, and by its general efficiency for the purposes of policing the ocean highways. Some nations would probably furnish a unit

of power composed of craft of a certain category. Other nations, furnishing units of equivalent value, might furnish from a different type. The purpose would be to have there units of power fairly balance each other so that each nation would bear its fair share of the responsibility and cost of naval duty. However, the requirements may not be the same for each of the 12 nations on account of geographical or political considerations in any area. Consequently, the unit value may be raised or lowered for any particular base in order to secure the greatest efficiency and economy. But since each of the 12 nations furnishes one unit of power for each base, the whole system would be maintained in practical balance, and it should not be difficult for a group of the world's ablest technicians to devise an arrangement that would be fair to all nations.

3. The coordination of the different units of power at each base would constitute the most difficult problem, but since it is inevitable that mankind must learn to work together, if there is to be any security for anyone anywhere in the world, nations might just as well get down to the business of working together now as to defer this manifest duty to an indefinite future. After all, the problems of peaceful organization are no greater than the tremendous problems of organization required in any war on a world scale. A difference in language, in type of equipment, and methods might cause some difficulties in the first years, with 12 units of power at each base, but these problems would be overcome in due time.

4. The efficient use of naval power at the conclusion of stage No. 7 would make it advisable for some of the nations without sufficient naval equipment of the right sort to man their 12 units of power to purchase such naval equipment from nations that will be oversupplied at the end of stage No. 1, thereby reducing the total amount of any additional equipment necessary to put a permanent world security system (stage No. 2) into efficient operation.

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Since there is a growing desire and recognition throughout the world that all peoples must work together if there is to be continuing advance of civilization, the foregoing plan is devised to give to all nations and peoples a sound basis for cooperation. There should develop at each world naval base an esprit de corps. Each Supreme Commander, as it became his turn to command the naval base for a period of 1 or 2 years, would naturally do his best to give his station the most efficient service. It would be a matter of personal satisfaction and national honor to serve well the common purposes of mankind.

The growth of international sports at each naval base would contribute to international sportsmanship.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing proposal is submitted for consideration at the present time, in memory of those who have struggled for the freedom of the world and in the hope that it may help in bringing peace and security to all nations.

SCHEDULE NO. 1. A SUGGESTED SCHEDULE FOR THE ROTATION OF SUPREME COMMANDERS AT WORLD NAVAL BASES

(A) A 1- or 2-year rotation. The schedule is made out for a 1-year rotation, but this could be changed to a 2-year rotation by changing the dates accordingly at the top of each column.

(B) No more than one Supreme Commander at any time furnished by one nation anywhere in the world.

(C) If there are several smaller nations that desire to have a part in helping to maintain world order, they can combine to supply one unit of power for each of the naval bases, but if there are 13 units of power at each naval base there should be 13 naval bases to make the rotation of commands possible.

Year	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
Base No. 1	England	Netherlands.	Japan [1]	Argentina	Russia	Chile	Germany [1]	China	United States.	Brazil	Italy [1]	France.
Base No. 2	Netherlands.	Japan [1]	Argentina	Russia	Chile	Germany [1]	China	United States.	Brazil	Italy [1]	France	England.
Base No. 3	Japan [1]	Argentina	Russia	Chile	Germany [1]	China	United States.	Brazil	Italy [1]	France	England	Netherlands.
Base No. 4	Argentina	Russia	Chile	Germany [1]	China	United States.	Brazil	Italy [1]	France	England	Netherlands.	Japan.[1]
Base No. 5	Russia	Chile	Germany [1]	China	United States.	Brazil	Italy [1]	France	England	Netherlands.	Japan [1]	Argentina.
Base No. 6	Chile	Germany [1]	China	United States.	Brazil	Italy [1]	France	England	Netherlands.	Japan [1]	Argentina	Russia.
Base No. 7	Germany [1]	China	United States.	Brazil	Italy [1]	France	England	Netherlands.	Japan [1]	Argentina	Russia	Chile.
Base No. 8	China	United States.	Brazil	Italy [1]	France	England	Netherlands.	Japan [1]	Argentina	Russia	Chile	Germany.[1]
Base No. 9	United States.	Brazil	Italy [1]	France	England	Netherlands.	Japan [1]	Argentina	Russia	Chile	Germany [1]	China.
Base No. 10	Brazil	Italy [1]	France	England	Netherlands.	Japan [1]	Argentina	Russia	Chile	Germany [1]	China	United States.
Base No. 11	Italy [1]	France	England	Netherlands.	Japan [1]	Argentina	Russia	Chile	Germany [1]	China	United States.	Brazil.
Base No 12	France	England	Netherlands.	Japan [1]	Argentina	Russia	Chile	Germany [1]	China	United States.	Brazil	Italy.[1]

[1] Taken by United States, England, and Russia until reconstituted.

NOTE.—Repeat rotation after 1961.

SCHEDULE NO. 2. SUGGESTED ORGANIZATION OF EACH WORLD NAVAL BASE—BASED ON 12 UNITS OF POWER FOR EACH BASE

The component parts of each unit (which are noncompetitive) can be decided upon by naval experts of all nations. Each unit of power shall be of relative value for any base. But some naval bases may require a greater amount of power for naval duty than other naval bases, in which case, each of the 12 units of power shall be relatively stronger than the units of power for bases which require less power.

If a number of smaller nations desired to have a part of this responsibility, they could furnish a total of one unit of power for each of the naval bases, with the expense divided between them. In case this is done, there should be 13 world naval bases instead of the proposed 12, to make the rotation plan work.

If Germany, Italy, and Japan were not to be admitted at the end of stage No. 1 on account of the unsettled international mind as an aftermath of the conflict, then England, the United States and Russia should each accept the added obligation of one extra unit each until such time as they can be taken care of by the former enemy countries. However, since it would not be conducive to the future peace and unity of mankind to have any large nation ignored in setting up a permanent world security system, and since the restrictions which this type of organization places upon any nation to cause trouble, it would be psychologically sound and conducive to international solidarity and progress to have each nation capable of helping to support this united world military power to have their fair share in it from the beginning of stage No. 2.

A proposed list of units of power for each world naval base is as follows:

	Units
England	1
United States	1
Russia	1
France	1
China	1
Netherlands	1
Germany [1]	1
Italy [1]	1
Japan [1]	1
Brazil	1
Argentina	1
Chile	1
Total	12

[1] See note at foot of previous table.

SCHEDULE NO. 3. 12 SUGGESTED WORLD NAVAL BASES

(To be finally decided by international political and naval experts)

These are not arranged, necessarily, in the order from No. 1 to No. 12, but may be arranged by experts in any order which will then become permanent, to secure the most practical operation of the rotating plan from the beginning.

Panama Canal (or some point in Caribbean such as Cuba or Puerto Rico).

San Francisco, Calif. (or Dutch Harbor, Alaska).

Santiago, Chile.

Belem, Brazil.

Dakar, West Africa.

Gibraltar.

Cape Town, South Africa (or Madagascar).

Suez.

Southampton, England (or Scapa Flow).

Singapore.

Some base in the Solomon or Marianas Group of southwest Pacific.

Pearl Harbor.

Total, 12 bases.

RUFUS WALTER BISHOP.

The Recall of Mr. Phillips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of August 28, 1944:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

United States and foreign diplomats have been in a backstage ferment over the ousting of Ambassador William Phillips from London as political adviser to General Eisenhower.

Officially, Phillips came home for personal reasons. Actually, however, he was asked to leave London because, last year, he wrote a letter to President Roosevelt criticizing British policy in India and recommending Indian independence.

The Phillips letter, published in this column on July 25, has caused the cables to burn up between Washington and London ever since. The British first demanded an official explanation from the State Department. Later, Foreign Minister Eden personally demanded Phillips recall.

In addition, the British demanded the recall of George Merrell from New Delhi. Merrell, a career man of long standing, has been acting chief of the United States mission in India during Phillips absence, and was sympathetic toward Indian independence. He has resigned and will return home shortly.

Phillips technically is still the President's special Ambassador to India, though for the last few months he has been attached to Eisenhower's personal staff in London to advise on French, Belgian, and other European problems. Since Phillips was on Eisenhower's staff, not accredited to the British Government, his recall is considered highly unusual, almost without precedent.

In effect, the British objected to the fact that Phillips made a report to his chief, the President of the United States, regarding India. Members of the Diplomatic Corps point out that, in 1888, the United States asked British Ambassador Lionel Sackville-West to leave Washington because he wrote to a private United States citizen advocating the election of Grover Cleveland. However, in this case, Ambassador Phillips expressed his views, not to a private citizen, but to his chief in the White House. President Roosevelt had asked him to report on India, and Phillips carried out instructions.

BRITISH OBJECTIONS

What the British are reported to have objected to in the Phillips report was his argument that India was of great concern to us on account of the Japanese war. He told F. D. R. that we could not "accept the British point of view that conditions in India are none of our business."

"It is not right for the British to say this is none of your business when we alone presumably will have the major part to play in the struggle with Japan," Phillips said.

He also used plain, hard-boiled language regarding the failure of the Indian Army to fight.

"The present Indian Army," he told F. D. R., "is purely mercenary. General Stilwell has expressed his concern over the situation and in particular over the poor morale of the Indian officers. The attitude of the general public toward the war is even worse."

He concluded, "It is time for the British to act. This they can do by a solemn declaration from the King-Emperor that India will achieve her independence at a specific date after the war."

PROTEST TO STATE DEPARTMENT

Following Washington Merry-Go-Round publication of the Phillips letter, Foreign Minister Anthony Eden cabled Sir Ronald Campbell, British Chargé d'Affaires in Washington, stating that he and Prime Minister Churchill were greatly perturbed and instructing the British Embassy to approach the State Department with a formal demand for an investigation. Sir Ronald then called on Secretary Hull and informed him that the British Government viewed the matter seriously and wanted a full explanation.

Secretary Hull informed Sir Ronald that the Phillips letter had undoubtedly leaked out through former Under Secretary Sumner Welles—which the British, of course, knew was not the case.

Secretary Hull then went on his vacation, and Eden cabled the British Embassy ordering Sir Ronald Campbell to approach the State Department again and demand a public statement disassociating the Roosevelt administration from the views expressed by Ambassador Phillips.

Sir Ronald saw both Acting Secretary Stettinius and Assistant Secretary Berle, both of whom stalled, offering no encouragement. Berle said they had a suspicion regarding the news leak but were not prepared to reveal it at that time.

In London, meanwhile, both Churchill and Eden had put the heat on United States Ambassador John Winant, telling him how bitterly they resented Phillips' views. They also had a Foreign Office official ask Phillips if he still held the same views he had expressed to the President.

Phillips replied that he most certainly did and was more convinced than ever that he was right. However, he added that he was sorry his letter had been published, and said:

"I hope that my other reports, which were even stronger, will not leak out."

At this point Foreign Minister Eden cabled the British Embassy to inform the State Department that Phillips was persona non grata in London. In the cable he said: "India is more important than a thousand Phillips."

Simultaneously, the Embassy was instructed to tell the State Department that Phillips could never go back to India as Ambassador.

(NOTE.—Phillips has been Under Secretary of State, Assistant Secretary, Minister to Canada, Ambassador to Belgium and Italy. George Merrell, now recalled from New Delhi, has held posts in Peiping, Amoy, Calcutta, Harbin, and many other places in the Orient.)

Washington Conversations on International Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of August 29, 1944, by the heads of the American, British, and Soviet delegations at the informal conversations at Dumbarton Oaks:

After a week of discussion, the three heads of delegations are happy to announce that there is general agreement among them to recommend that the proposed international organization for peace and security should provide for:

1. An assembly composed of representatives of all peace-loving nations based on the principle of sovereign equality.

2. A council composed of a smaller number of members in which the principal states will be joined by a number of other states to be elected periodically.

3. Effective means for the peaceful settlement of disputes, including an international court of justice for the adjudication of justiciable questions, and also the application of such other means as may be necessary for maintenance of peace and security.

The delegations are continuing to discuss the structure and jurisdiction of the various organs and methods of procedure. These topics require a great deal of consideration, and a number of proposals are now being submitted to examination. Different proposals from the different countries do not necessarily indicate disagreement or conflicting points of view but stem from varied approaches to the common objective. After our work has advanced to a stage at which our fully considered recommendations have been formulated and our conclusions have been presented, our respective Governments will decide the appropriate moment for publication.

This Is Poor Sportsmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 28, 1944:

THIS IS POOR SPORTSMANSHIP

It was a close shave.

For a few hours on Friday it looked as though the cherished New Deal strategy giving President Roosevelt unlimited facilities for delivering campaign speeches to the men overseas, while depriving his opponents of equal opportunities, had been wrecked.

Making the blow even harder to take was the fact that it came from within the family circle—from the War Department—in a memorandum agreeing that the Roosevelt address at the Puget Sound Navy Yard on August 12 was political and granting the Socialist Party's request for equal radio time for an overseas broadcast. This to apply, presumably, to the Republican and other parties also.

If that order had stood, the consequences would have been too ghastly for the Democrats to contemplate. It would have meant that the camouflage picturing the President's campaign talks and actions as piously nonpartisan, permitting him to make use of War and Navy Department facilities at will to "report" to the men and women in uniform, would be ripped off, and that those running against Mr. Roosevelt for the Presidency would not be forced to continue at an unfair and un-American disadvantage.

The perturbation that must have filled the heaving breasts of the New Dealers when the order was issued was, however, quickly abated. General Headquarters went into high gear. There could have been no speedier action on the part of the higher-ups if the Germans had been at the Potomac.

To the ramparts rushed the Acting Secretary of War, John J. McCloy, fortified, one may imagine, by word from the White House. He countermanded the ruling in tones of lofty arrogance that only a New Deal stooge could be expected to muster.

"It has just been called to my attention," he stated, "that a decision was made by an Army agency to grant time to the Socialist Party for an overseas rebroadcast to troops on the basis of that party's contention the President's report at Bremerton was a 'political address' within the meaning of title V of Public Law 277. I have reconsidered this decision."

Note that perpendicular pronoun. Not the War Department, but "I," Mr. Roosevelt's man temporarily occupying the Secretary's seat, reverses the decision. Note also that the President's speech at the Navy Yard is carefully termed a report and not a speech at all.

The McCloy statement is typical New Deal mailed-fist stuff, delivered in characteristically arrogant New Deal fashion.

The Commander in Chief, in effect, has ruled that his own speech was not political. How convenient.

As the Bremerton speech, with its carefully prepared stage setting, is now officially held to be nonpolitical, all future addresses delivered by Mr. Roosevelt of a similar nature—and with the same trappings of warships, naval guns, military escorts, and so on—presumably, can be considered nonpolitical.

If his opponents are to be denied equal use of broadcast facilities, there seems very little chance for the troops oversea to hear any voice but the President's—as Commander in Chief, of course.

This seems to us the worst kind of poor sportsmanship. Mr. Roosevelt as a candidate can talk where and when he pleases and drum up votes to his heart's content. But it is not fair to cloak his campaign speech making in the official garment of nonpartisanship, while those opposing him are deprived of equal facilities to reach our service people.

The New Dealers may be rubbing their hands in glee at the reversed ruling, but it is one—if they would only consider for a moment the devotion of the American people to fair play—that is likely to plague them to the end of this campaign.

The Bob-Tailed Ballot and Pensions for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the question involved in discussing the bob-tailed ballot and the State ballot is whether one believes that the servicemen are entitled to vote for the county, State, and National tickets or whether the servicemen are to be allowed to vote only for Federal officers; that is, President and Members of Congress.

When the so-called Congressman's pension bill, which was sponsored by the same administration and slipped through the House by the present administration, became law after the President's signature, the people justly rose up and objected to the congressional pension plan because it was legislation for the few at the expense of the many. The people would not accept this legislation and compelled the Congress to repeal it. If the New Deal congressional-pension plan had included State and county officeholders, and the general public, including the aged, getting from $9 to $12 per month at the present time, it might not have received quite as much public disapproval. Although the President was to get some $37,000 per year for life and although many Members of Congress had not been Members long enough to even come under the bill, many Members of the New Deal smear brigade tried to use this legislation against Congressmen even after the New Deal bigwigs had put it through in the first place. This New Deal cunning did not fool the people in 1942. This same group are trying to criticize Members of Congress for not supporting the bob-tailed ballot.

The opposition to the bob-tailed Federal vote ballot was based on position that a serviceman not only had a right to vote for Federal office seekers but also for the State and county office seekers as well. He was and is entitled to a full voting franchise—and not one-third of a voting privilege or only the opportunity to vote for the Federal office seekers. The congressional pension New Deal plan was for Federal officers the same as the bob-tailed ballot was for the benefit of Federal office seekers.

No fair minded man would or should expect anyone to support a bill that would give the serviceman or any other group the opportunity to vote only for himself. The State legislatures have had special sessions and made arrangements so that the servicemen cannot only vote for Federal offices but also State and county offices. The P. A. C.'ers will not deceive the people on this subject any more than they are going to deceive them on many other subjects.

This administration can praise the bob-tailed ballot all they may desire, but when the servicemen find they are paying 4 percent on loans, and the New Deal darlings are paying only 3 percent on more generous loans, they may figure the bob-tailed ballot approach was not entirely supported for the benefit of the servicemen. With all this talk about the bob-tailed ballot, just ask a New Dealer why this administration charges the veteran one-third more interest than the nonveteran pays on a less sound loan. Let them explain why the veteran will pay $240 annually on his loan and the New Deal darlings pay only $180 on a loan of the same amount that is less sound besides.

Oklahoma Agriculture Faces the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following talk given by Dr. Henry G. Bennett, president, Oklahoma A. and M. College, on the WKY farm program, Tuesday, August 8, 1944, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

Oklahoma is honored to have as its guest on this occasion the distinguished Assistant Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and we are deeply appreciative of the thoughtful and stimulating address which he has given us today. I am glad to be here and to have a small part in this significant inauguration of a public-service program by this great radio outlet. All citizens of Oklahoma should appreciate this new venture of WKY for the benefit of Oklahoma farmers.

As one whose privilege it has been to serve Oklahoma agriculture for many years, I should like to discuss with you for a few minutes the subject Oklahoma Agriculture Faces the Future.

Before attempting to sketch the broad outlines of what the future can be for agriculture in Oklahoma as I visualize it, I deem it essential that we take stock of the present—to find in the living accomplishments of agriculture today the pattern of things we may reasonably expect to fashion together in the years which are ahead.

Oklahoma farmers have met the challenge of world conflict and national emergency in a magnificent manner. In spite of hardships, in spite of manpower shortages and critical scarcity of vital machinery and materials, and notwithstanding gloomy prophecies of failure, Oklahoma agriculture has not only met but exceeded every quota and goal set for it. The war on the Oklahoma farm front from the days of Pearl Harbor until now has gone well and will continue to go well until complete victory is achieved.

Let us look at the record of achievement written by Oklahoma farmers and their families in the year 1943.

In beef production the record shows that the total weight of cattle marketed was in excess of 946,000,000 pounds. Exclusive of requirements of Oklahoma's two and a quarter million civilians, we produced a surplus sufficient to feed more than 4,000,000 soldiers, allowing 130 pounds per soldier.

A like study of pork production shows that Oklahoma produced a pork surplus sufficient to feed 6,457,000 soldiers for a year.

Oklahoma's poultry flocks in 1943 produced nearly 126,000,000 dozens of eggs, a quantity large enough to supply the needs of our civilian population, and in addition, sufficient to supply the needs of 1,880,000 soldiers for a year at a rate of 35 dozen for each soldier.

Poultry production in Oklahoma for the same period provided a surplus of meat sufficient to feed 391,000 soldiers for a year, at a rate of 60 pounds per soldier.

In the matter of wheat I have the estimated figures for 1944 which disclose that we may reasonably expect to provide enough wheat flour to care for our two and a quarter million civilian population, and in addition have a surplus sufficient to provide a loaf of bread per day for 365 days for 8,984,000 soldiers.

Our State cotton acreage reported July 1 this year was 1,600,000 acres. Indications are that our production will be 750,000 bales. It has been calculated that we may expect 285,000 bales of cotton above State needs. This surplus cotton will supply 2,856,000 soldiers at a rate of 50 pounds per man.

In dairy production the records disclose that in 1943 the total production of milk on Oklahoma farms was 2,693,000,000 pounds. The surplus for the State above civilian requirements was 1,012,000,000 pounds, or 128,500,000 gallons. This surplus was sufficient to supply 1,713,000 soldiers for a year at a rate of 75 gallons per man.

I think these figures amply attest the wartime achievements of our Oklahoma farmers.

Never in history has the civilized world been so dependent on American food. Only hard, unremitting toil produces food. There is no other way. The record of American agricultural production in the war years is a magnificent tribute to the American farmer and livestock producer and in this winning effort Oklahoma has played its full and proud part. We can never discharge the debt of gratitude we owe to the farmers of America and of Oklahoma and their families. I think no one will dispute that they have worked longer hours, in fair weather and foul, than any other group of our citizens.

So much for the present and its accomplishment. What of the future and its promise? What policies can we reasonably and confidently set up for agriculture in Oklahoma in the post-war years? What goals are desirable and possible of attainment?

We hear a great deal these days of post-war planning. The uppermost thought in the minds of all thinking persons is the victory we shall surely achieve in the great conflict in which we are now engaged and then what is going to happen when war ends.

I am of the belief that in planning the future of agriculture we cannot limit ourselves to a consideration alone of agriculture's specific problems but we must embrace the larger issues as well. The troubles of agriculture must be attacked in relation to our total national and international economy. The future prosperity and progress of agriculture depends on how successfully we resolve broad national and international problems.

More specifically, I do not believe that agriculture can prosper unless we see to it that in post-war America and in post-war Oklahoma there shall be work at fair wages for all who want it. It is estimated that between fifty-five and sixty million employable men and women will want jobs after the war. This is a tremendous challenge to our economy, our form of government, and our way of life, but I have complete faith that we will successfully meet the challenge. The problem of employment will not be a temporary one—for a year or 2 years following the cessation of hostilities. Our plan must be to keep our people employed at progressively higher levels of living.

We have seen demonstrated, and the figures I have earlier quoted, attest what Oklahoma can do in an economy geared for war. We have likewise seen demonstrated what our people will purchase and consume when purchasing power is present. Full production and full purchasing power must be our uncomprising determination and goal for post-war achievement.

War has demonstrated that it is physically possible to employ all of our employables in this country and in this State. In commenting on this fact, Stuart Chase says: "If it is physically possible it's financially possible." In this opinion I concur, and I believe it can be done within the present framework of our economy and under our form of government.

How can we in Oklahoma guarantee a continuance of our wartime purchasing power by all our people when the war ends? Agencies of the Federal Government will no doubt take steps to aid in universal employment, but there are certain things which we can and must do in Oklahoma if we are to maintain our present population and provide for future expansion.

It is within the knowledge of all of us that Oklahoma in past years has been a producer of raw products largely for export. Cotton, which has been our major crop, is almost entirely exported from the State. The same has been true of wheat, beef cattle, and most of our agricultural products. In the main the profit-taking from the fruits of our labor and soil has not been taken by Oklahomans.

Our raw cotton, for example, has been shipped to the southeastern and New England mills, there to be fabricated into usable goods and shipped back to the Oklahoma retail market to be sold at a price which contains a handsome profit for the enterprisers of other States and which pays the wages of laborers of other States. Unquestionably these benefits should inure to Oklahoma citizens.

With the exception of the products of one Oklahoma cotton mill, not a towel, not a yard of shirting, domestic linens, or even the coarsest type of denim for work garments comes from Oklahoma spindles or looms. Yet, this one cotton mill located at Sand Springs, Okla., has been an outstanding success.

The same is true with the wood produced in Oklahoma, and with hides and the like. We ship our leather to St. Louis in the form of raw hides at the lowest price and import them as finished products. The profit from Oklahoma hides is taken in the main by the manufacturers of leather goods in Missouri, Illinois, and other States. The employment created by the manufacture of these goods is made available, not to employable citizens of Oklahoma, but to those of other States.

Oklahoma has a favorable climate for manufacturing. It has available raw products. It has vast reserves of power—oil, gas, coal, and water. It has capital. It will have in the post-war years an ample reserve of labor at all levels of essential skills.

Let us plan to bring to Oklahoma an industrial expansion which will balance and go hand in hand with our great basic industry, agriculture. This balance between agriculture and industry will guarantee a market for our raw products, employment of our labor, profitable use of our capital and will give us a healthy and prosperous economy. The solution of our economic problems is largely in our own hands.

Much of our thought and work for the future in Oklahoma agriculture must of necessity be concerned with Oklahoma problems, Oklahoma farms, and Oklahoma citizens. But we cannot afford to be disinterested in the relation between international economy and agriculture.

I believe there should be international cooperation in matters economic for the mutual benefit of all. I believe there should be more international trade. This would entail a diminution of trade barriers and tariff walls. It would entail a conception of strong, economically self-sufficient nations, producing the things and rendering the services inherent in their lands, their locations, their climates, their resources, and their peoples. It would comprehend a trade in surpluses among the neighbors of the world community. Let us not forget that if we wish to export our surpluses we must be willing to accept imports of other commodities to pay for them. Our policies on international trade will affect our acreages of cotton, wheat, and tobacco as we produce more of these than we can consume. The effect of expanded international trade will stimulate industry, and this has a direct impact on what happens on our farms—by the increase in employment and other factors supporting and strengthening the farmers' market.

With a sound and prosperous national and international economy we can view the future of Oklahoma agriculture with confidence. Before concluding my remarks here I would like to make a few suggestions for Oklahoma agriculture in the future.

First is the matter of the conservation of our soil. Oklahoma, in common with all American States, has permitted her soils to be depleted somewhat by an unwise land-use program and cropping system. But an intelligent citizenship has discovered this evil in time and set about plans for correcting the mistakes of the past. Oklahoma farmers and those who work with them now have the deep conviction that our agricultural lands are not properties to be mined but are priceless resources to be cherished and protected into perpetuity.

Some people who should know better have advertised the State unfavorably and intimated that the fertility of Oklahoma soil has gone forevermore. The record of production in Oklahoma in the current year 1944 is the best answer to such detractors. More than 85,000,000 bushels of wheat of the highest quality, an all-time record for the State; the best corn crop and forage crop in 10 years now awaits the harvest; a cotton crop which bids fair to be a new record for production per acre is now beginning to mature. You can't speak of production this year in Oklahoma without speaking in superlatives. Will Rogers once said that you could be safe in exaggerating about Oklahoma because if anything wasn't true today it would be tomorrow.

The citizens of no State in the Union are taking the problems of soil conservation more seriously than in Oklahoma. The greatest soil-conservation clinic ever held in America was held in Oklahoma City this spring. Its results are being felt in every nook and corner of the State. Soil-conservation meetings are being held in practically every county and are being attended by farmers, businessmen, and landowners in large numbers. More than 60 soil-conservation districts are now in operation and others are in process of organization. Hundreds of thousands of acres of land are being put under the best-known soil-conservation practices.

I think that within less than 25 years from today Oklahoma will be a model for the United States and the world of what citizens cooperating can do to build up, conserve, and properly use the lands of the State. We are on the way. Bankers, businessmen, newspapermen, the radio stations, everybody working together have made this progress possible.

An editorial in the Oklahoma City Times a few days ago told of an Oklahoma editor who had bought a poor farm in his county with the plan of bringing it back to fertility and use. I wonder if 10 men in every county in Oklahoma would band themselves together for the purpose of each buying a farm consisting of approximately 160 acres of the poorest and most eroded land that can be found in their respective counties. The purpose would be to rebuild and restore them to use through the best-known conservation measures. A joint farm manager could be employed, and I am making bold to pledge to any such group of patriotic Oklahomans the wholehearted cooperation of every farm agency at our disposal. A relatively small investment would not only bring good dividends but in the long run restore to use land for future generations untold.

In our plan for Oklahoma agriculture we must see to it that farm income is brought to a level where the rural standard of living will more nearly be equivalent to that enjoyed by persons living in town and engaged in other occupations. The real goal of a farm family should be not a parity of prices only but a parity of income as well.

Our plan should be designed to remove many of the unnecessary discomforts of farm life. Agriculture which is, year by year, being made more attractive to the young people of our State through the Future Farmers of America, the Future Home Makers of America, and 4-H Club activities must be made more attractive still so that farming as a way of life will appeal to more and more of the farm youth of our State.

The movement for bringing the benefits of electricity to the farms of Oklahoma must be encouraged until the most isolated farm has been reached.

The development of rural schools in Oklahoma has been marvelous, but they must be made better still. There must be no discrim-

mation in rural grade and high schools. We must work for a continuing improvement until the children of rural Oklahoma have real equity of chance with their neighbors in the cities.

We must see that medical and hospital service for the rural citizens of Oklahoma shall be as adequate as it is at present for our largest cities. The domestic form of government finds any other arrangement intolerable.

Year-round roads must be provided for every farm community making day-to-day farm-to-market travel possible. Much has been done in this direction and much can be done in the near future.

Building codes for farm housing and sanitation are as necessary as for our largest cities and must be encouraged. The rural and city slums alike must be eliminated.

The cooperative marketing of all crops and products should be encouraged in the years ahead because this means a better character of product at a fairer price to consumer and producer alike.

Mechanized machinery in the years ahead will banish from the farms the exploitation of family labor and grant to farmers and their families more educational, social, and recreational activities.

Farming is a way of life and the family-size farm must continue to be in the majority. No nation can long continue to be great which has made it impossible for ambitious young men and women to own and operate their own farms. A nation is no greater than its agrarian policy and we must have a contented and prosperous farm people, and they cannot be contented unless they see a possibility of home ownership for themselves and their children.

We must seek a continuing improvement of land-tenure conditions and a strengthening of the position of agricultural laborers.

The Social Security Act should be amended so that the benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance and all social-security benefits will be made available to all agricultural people, including the self-employed.

The war has demonstrated to America anew that agriculture can increase production in almost any category. In the past the vast production from the farms of America has been used almost entirely for food, feed, and clothing. The problem of the future is to find new uses for agricultural products, surpluses, and wastes. This problem has been attacked by the farm chemists of America and already modern miracles have been performed. To enumerate some of these is but to suggest what is within the knowledge of everyone. Alcohol from citrus waste and small grains; rubber from grain alcohol; plastics of unbelievable varieties and strengths from agricultural residues; starch and carotene from sweetpotatoes; the replacing of imported oils with modified domestic oils from peanuts and soybeans; industrial products from milk proteins; the development of penicillin. This is to mention but a few of the recent and current achievements of agricultural science. This is only the beginning. Those who attended the farm chemurgic clinic for the Southwestern States held in Oklahoma City this year saw first hand many of these miracles and saw ahead a vision of things that are yet to be.

One of the most recent discoveries of chemurgy, and one of the most significant for Oklahoma agriculture is by a group of scientists who predict that sugar shortages in the future will be no longer possible in America because of the feasibility of crystallizing sugar from the juices of the sweet sorghum which is grown all over the country south of Illinois.

In the realization of our plan for the future all groups and agencies, institutions, and organizations must work together. The farm hour inaugurated here today by WKY will be of incalculable value in the campaign. Its function will be to challenge, to encourage, and to inform. All Oklahoma should be grateful to this great facility for the conception and effectuation of this splendid public service.

When Labor Does It, They Call It a Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the August 17, 1944, Washington Post indicates several facts:

SENATOR BANKHEAD URGES COTTON SALE HOLIDAY

In one of a series of moves intended to force cotton prices upward, Senator BANKHEAD (Democrat, Alabama) urged producers yesterday to hold their crop off the market until parity had been reached.

Telegrams to governors, commissioners, and farm bureau presidents, enlisting their aid, followed a call by BANKHEAD and cotton manufacturers on War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes.

"Justice Byrnes assured the full cooperation of his office in carrying out the directive in the so-called Bankhead-Brown cotton amendment that cotton prices and other farm prices be raised to parity," BANKHEAD said in a statement.

At an earlier conference with a group of cotton manufacturers, BANKHEAD said a number of specific steps intended to raise cotton prices were considered, including the use of 97½ to 100 percent of parity loans in the event that other action contemplated does not accomplish the result.

It was agreed, he said, that the O. P. A. should finish the task of revising and establishing adequate textile ceilings under the Bankhead-Brown amendment as soon as possible. There is no question that this would remove a factor which has had a depressing effect upon the cotton market.

BANKHEAD added he would meet next week with representatives of the cotton merchants looking to their cooperation in an over-all program.

He said he was requesting the Governors and other southern leaders to urge producers to keep their cotton off the market "until prices approximate parity, which is from $6 to $8 per bale above the new 1944 loan rates."

BANKHEAD said the mill representatives were "in full accord" with the proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the first fact brought to mind is that if the cotton farmers follow the advice to hold their crop off the market they will be doing exactly what they have been criticizing the labor groups for doing.

The second fact is that after all the vociferous outbursts at the National Democratic Convention, at which the Republicans were accused of ruining the Price Control Act, it is apparent that the only concession made in the name of agriculture was to the cotton block. This is one more sop to the South. The American people are to pay one hundred and fifty to two hundred and fifty million dollars more a year for cotton clothes due to this amendment.

Third, it was heartening to read that Justice Byrnes assured the full cooperation of his office in carrying out the directive in the so-called Bankhead-Brown cotton amendment. This is more than Mr. Byrnes has done so far as pork products are concerned as he has allowed the porkers to sell at 50 to 60 percent of parity even though the same act has provided a 90 percent parity floor. The fact that eggs sold day after day for 10 cents per dozen below the legal price evidently did not receive his personal attention either.

Fourth, the Wisconsin dairyman continues to milk his cows and maintain his milk production although his southern friends get a 50 percent to 80 percent greater subsidy than the Wisconsin farmer. The Wisconsin dairyman maintains his milk production even though the Plymouth-plus provides 2 cents per pound less for his cheese than given Texas and California farmers. In fact he has a 5 cents per pound lower price due to 3 cents less on subsidy and 2 cents per pound less on the freight set-up, than that provided in some other States, and yet no one in Wisconsin, in or out of Congress, has asked them to keep their products off the market. The fact is the cheese men have been given orders as to just how much of their product is to be turned over for Government uses and is 70 percent of the make.

The fixed price of cheese is 21¼ cents per pound, though some of these other States with over a 5 cents per pound advantage, do not keep those Wisconsin dairymen from making every effort to furnish the food needed for the war.

No one has yet answered the question as to why more feed subsidy is paid in one State than is paid in another. No one will be deceived by the P. A. C.'ers into believing that the Republicans ever tried to ruin the Price Control Act. Many members of both parties have tried to get the O. P. A. and W. F. A. to follow the printed word of the law, and the spirit of the legislation in order that the war effort would be benefited. If these agencies would have followed this course, they would have made a greater contribution to the war.

In the meantime figure out why cotton is provided a 97½ to 100 percent of parity loans when wheat and corn and other so-called basic commodities are entitled to only a 90 percent parity loan. Incidentally explain why the production of cotton is being subsidized at the same time the administration is selling cotton so that the makers of insulating material buy it in 1944 for over $6,000,000 less than it is worth on the market.

Figure out or find out why under the guise of a drought, Virginia farmers in 1943 received two milk subsidies, and in addition received over $1,100,000 worth of free hay. This hay was given to the greedy as well as to the needy and the War Food Administration doesn't know whose cows ate the hay. Western and central United States farmers are still being pounded on the back for payments for the feed distributed on the basis of need during the drought years of 1932 to 1939.

While we may hear ranting against the New Deal, you can be assured that so long as these southern groups can ride the gravy train they will continue to do so. It is hoped that this gravy train hits an open switch on November 7. They may talk against the New Deal but patronage and pap keep them pretty well in line.

Many of these groups must figure that Governor Dewey is going to be elected President or they wouldn't be figuring out scheme after scheme during wartime to make more and bigger extractions from the United States Treasury.

The George Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter to me and a letter to the editor of the Burlington Free Press written by Mr. Harris W. Soule, of Burlington, Vt., relative to the so-called George bill:

BURLINGTON, VT., *August 24, 1944.*

Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PLUMLEY: I noticed on page A3649 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that you have caused to have printed Senator AUSTIN'S views on the so-called George bill.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter which I sent to the Burlington Free Press and which was printed in the Monday, August 21, issue, expressing a viewpoint contrary to Senator AUSTIN'S and yet one which is subscribed to by a large number of Vermont farm and labor leaders.

Very truly yours,

HARRIS SOULE.

BURLINGTON, VT., *August 17, 1944.*

To the EDITOR OF THE BURLINGTON FREE PRESS:

In Wednesday's Burlington Free Press an article quoted Senator AUSTIN as saying that the George bill (S. 2051) was a victory over the forces which would throw this country into national socialism.

One of the objectives of the bill is "to achieve full employment, rising standards of living, and effective utilization of the Nation's resources during the period of transition from war to peace and thereafter." After stating this worthy objective, most of the bill is set up to deal with the problem of unemployment on a State basis. There is very little in the bill which would indicate that the authors had any idea of promoting full employment at adequate wages. Shouldn't we concentrate our efforts to bring about full employment rather than to be planning on unemployment and trying to set up a more efficient W. P. A.? If there is any one factor which will throw our country into national socialism or some other "ism," it will be widespread unemployment resulting in a depression which will make the last one look like a Sunday-school picnic.

In discussing the bill before passage, Senator DOWNEY, of California, made a significant statement. I quote: "We are tremendously worried here at the idea of paying out $20 or $25 or $30 or $35 unemployment compensation. We had better accustom ourselves to paying the incomes in this Nation to all classes by which the aggregate income will be sufficient to take off the market the total products of employment." If the Senate had concentrated on ways and means of doing this, the result of their efforts would have been much more constructive.

In rushing through the passage of the George bill, the Senate did not consider the reconversion of agriculture. The production of food has been expanded to meet wartime demands just the same as iron and steel. If this country is going on a program of scarcity rather than full production, we'd better be making our plans to kill some more pretty little white pigs.

It would seem that certain special interests were in the saddle and riding hell-bent for passage of the bill before it could be thoroughly considered. Several Senators considered the bill inadequate and inadvisable and tried to get it recommitted in order that a more acceptable bill could be drawn, but evidently the "big boys" had ordered passage and so we see an important piece of legislation, which will vitally affect our post-war economic policies, railroaded through the Senate.

The bill is now before the House and unless freely amended, it will be totally inadequate to provide for reconversion from war to peace with abundance the goal, rather than scarcity.

Very truly yours,

HARRIS W. SOULE.

There's a New Deal Joker in This Set-up, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 29, 1944:

THERE'S A NEW DEAL JOKER IN THIS SET-UP, TOO

That the War Department's reverse play of last week, depriving President Roosevelt's opponents of equal facilities for addressing overseas troops during the campaign, would live to plague the New Deal crowd that instigated it, was predicted by this newspaper.

Quick confirmation of that view has been given by further War Department moves that indicate frenzied week-end attempts to cover up Friday's bad boner.

More of the same harassment is in prospect for the New Dealers, torn between their intention to give their candidate every advantage possible in his appeals for votes, and their fear that such an unsportsmanlike policy might react against them.

The latest ruling—always subject to reversal by the higher-ups—purports to grant equal radio time for political broadcasts to the forces abroad to the five major parties, including, of course, the Democrats.

The joker in the deal is the prior decision, made by Acting Secretary of War McCloy in his letter-perfect role of New Deal stooge, that Mr. Roosevelt's address at Bremerton on August 12 was not political.

On the basis of that edict, similar broadcasts by the President may be held nonpolitical and thus beyond the scope of the new regulation. Each of the parties may deliver their addresses to the servicemen once a week, but, in addition, the President in his cherished role of Commander in Chief, may make broadcasts of his own as often as he sees fit and with no similar oppportunity given the Republicans, Socialists, or others.

Obviously such a set-up does not dispel the present disadvantages afflicting those who are campaigning against Mr. Roosevelt.

It is contrary to all American concepts of fair play. No War Department cover-ups can make it anything else.

American Workers Can Neither Be Bought Nor Sold—It Has Been Tried Before

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, years ago some employers tried to tell those who worked for them how to vote. The result was a demonstration of American independence that wrecked the political future of many a candidate who was backed by the boss. When the boss went through the shop and told the men to vote for Jim White, they voted, if they voted at all, for Jim Black—sometimes not because they knew or supported him, but because they did not propose to have anyone tell them for whom they should vote.

Today, Sidney Hillman, still clinging to his foreign "isms" and his P. A. C., with a huge campaign fund at their command, which they have collected from workers through the check-off and other means, propose to buy an election by selling the votes of American workers to the New Deal.

By false statements as to their purpose, by false charges against candidates, Hillman and his outfit seek control of the Government. They never gave anyone a job in industry; they never met a factory pay roll. Yet, they propose to tell every man or corporation operating a factory, a business, just what he or it shall do, although they never have even suggested where the money to meet their demands is to be found.

Many good union men and women are getting onto Sidney and his schemes and will not be led around by the nose. That such is the fact is shown in one instance by an article from the August 1944 issue of the official publication of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc., which is as follows:

SOLD, BUT CAN'T BE DELIVERED

Now that the national political campaign is well under way, it may be well for all of us to face the facts, and one of these facts is that the American workman, particularly the union workman, is not an ignoramus. He is a man with a mind of his own, capable of looking out for himself. He does not need nor desire anyone, including labor leaders, to treat him as being just one of a herd. He resents the propaganda that the labor leader is going to deliver his vote. This is especially

true today because the American workman is a far different citizen and voter than he was even 4 years ago. At that time it didn't make much difference to him who was President of the United States, Governor of his State, or even mayor of his city. Generally speaking he was out of work, which placed him in an irresponsible position. He was more or less socialistically inclined. He had nothing and, like all socialistically minded people, was willing to share it with everyone.

Today the American workman is employed, making big money, which automatically places him in a more conservative position than 4 years ago. He is now capitalistically inclined. He is a stockholder in the corporation known as America, through the purchase of War bonds. He is also a taxpayer for this corporation, through the payment of withholding tax. He realizes now more than ever before that the man who is President, governor, or mayor does have a lot to do with his well-being, and he is not going to place that responsibility into the hands of anyone but himself. Today he does have something to lose.

The present political campaign seems to be running true to form. Some of our labor leaders are again making deals with some of our politicians to deliver the vote of the rank and file of their unions. And true to form, some of our politicians are just fish enough to swallow this bait. But let me remind these politicians of a fact they may well remember. If these so-called labor leaders could deliver the vote of the rank and file, lock, stock, and barrel, as some of them claim they can do, a most dastardly condition would exist, as for instance: If the head of the C. I. O. could deliver the 6,000,000 votes of his organization to, we'll say, the Democratic Party, just because this party at the moment seems inclined to go along with the wishes of the leaders, then imagine what would happen at a future date if this mammoth vote could be delivered to a political party designed toward the overthrow of our Government.

Now let us look at it from another angle which also warrants consideration. The A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. are evenly matched numerically, each having around 6,000,000 members. If these two labor organizations take sides, one with the Republican Party and one with the Democratic Party, and we will say just for the sake of argument that each of them could deliver the vote of their rank and file to the party of their choice, they automatically become useless even to themselves politically. They are as useless politically as the man who is a Republican and his wife a Democrat. They both cast their votes for opposite candidates and place themselves in a position whereby they might just as well have stayed at home and not voted.

The average person when speaking of labor is inclined to think in terms of a few individual leaders. Labor is a great mass of working people in this country, organized and unorganized. These people are white and black. They are Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. They are Masons, Elks, and Knights of Columbus. They are fathers and mothers, bachelors and spinsters. They contribute to the Red Cross and community chest. They are of fifty-odd nationalities and have interests in the welfare of people in many parts of the world. They are nationalists and internationalists. In a word, they are American individuals with minds of their own. The fact that they or their forefathers migrated to this country to further their objective of individualism should be conclusive proof that there is enough intelligence in every workingman in this country to function individually without dictation by Sidney Hillman or any other labor leader.

It is an absolute insult to the intellect and independence of the American workman, whether unionized or not, to be treated as though he were a slave; something to be bought and sold at a price. The price that the labor leaders have for this "bill of goods" is patronage, not mainly for the rank and file, but patronage for these politically minded labor leaders. Proof of this statement is backed up by the fact that these labor leaders, who have been playing politics, especially for the past 12 years, have received some very fine political appointments. The reward to the rank and file for this political activity has been a complete split of organized labor, a condition of one union fighting another, not only politically but economically, which, to my mind, is a fine how-do-you-do.

When an economic group organizes politically, it forces those whom they oppose in a particular election to develop a policy in self-defense which may permanently be antagonistic to the best interest not only of the group, which in this case is labor, but of the country. Samuel Gompers understood this and pursued a policy which strengthened the labor movement, but at the same time preserved its American characteristics. He did not commit the A. F. of L. to any political party. Therefore, it is obvious that the vote of the worker, whether organized or not, carries more power when not committed to any political party but when exercised in accordance with the political desire of the individual worker.

American labor is not class conscious. It is country conscious. No American worker sacrifices his constitutional right to individual judgment just because he joins a labor union. The worker knows his interests and realizes that politicians are long on promises and short on performance. Rather than depend on an over-all selection of a political party by his union leader, he prefers to make his choice on a basis of known achievements. And he definitely resents any infringement on this American heritage—the right to vote in accordance with individual conscience and desire. Therefore, it should be quite obvious to all politicians that when any labor leader makes the assertion of being able to deliver the vote of his rank and file, just another "bill of goods" is being sold but can't be delivered.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor.

Hillman Takes Over New Deal—Farmers, Labor, and Business Must Meet This Issue

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, gradually the people of this country are becoming aware of the danger that exists in the pernicious activities of Hillman, Browder, and the Political Action Committee. The tie-up between them and the New Deal is obvious and the ultimate goal sought by Hillman and Browder is political power as a means to control our economic system.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include therein a timely editorial that appeared in the September issue of the Farm Journal and Farmers' Wife dealing with this subject:

ONLY ONE MORE STEP

For long years people have heard and talked about the Red menace of communism. Most of us have had a vague sort of an idea as to what it was all about. Soap-box speeches in Union Square, minor riots in some distant city, a "pink" now and then in the public eye, were hardly enough to worry about.

It was not easy for an American to be disturbed, even when he was told that there are more Communists in this country now than were in Russia when the Red revolution seized power over that nation's 180,000,000 people. One could not believe that such a little minority could take over the United States Government.

Then everybody hears that Russia lately has been veering away from the Communist doctrines. Forgotten have been the wholesale killing and uprooting of the thrifty "Kulak" families who wanted to stay on their farms. Forgotten have been the wholesale murders of those who disagreed with the Communist dictatorship. Our minds have been more occupied with admiration for the gallant fighting Russians who have beaten down the German might in the East.

Meanwhile Red radicals, far from the war fronts, have been steadily penetrating into places of power in the United States. They have pushed into controlling offices of many labor unions, notably in the C. I. O. From behind respectable fronts they have erected propaganda organizations to befuddle and confuse the natural loyalties of Americans to American principles of freedom. Their key men have pushed into the radio and movies. Their writers review our books and distort the meaning of our news. They have sought particularly to prevent the foreign-born in the city masses from acquiring the Americanism which most of us absorbed at home and at school.

Steadily the Red and radical push has advanced in America. Some time back the F. B. I. submitted to Federal department heads the names of 1,597 Government employees who had been identified with Communist-front organizations. A few were fired; most are still holding positions. They will be found classified as chief economists, senior editors, senior attorneys, and on down. Further up they have sympathizers and collaborators.

These supporters of alien ideas are no small power in national politics. In New York they organized the American Labor Party. In 1940 this radical party cast 417,000 votes for its nominee, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt's plurality in New York was 224,000; the radical front gave him the electoral vote of that often decisive State.

Now the United States discovers that a Russian-born radical, 20 years old before he came to this country, has become the outstanding political boss. Known as Sidney Hillman, this ruthless labor czar heads the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. At his command is a campaign fund of five or six million dollars, more than either national party organization will have.

Sitting in a rich suite atop a Chicago hotel during the Democratic convention, Sidney Hillman saw the Vice President of the Nation, Cabinet members, and Senators come to consult his wishes. Despite his outward support, he is generally credited with having helped the President to plow Mr. WALLACE under. Certain it is that Hillman vetoed the President himself on Mr. Roosevelt's second choice for a running mate, former Justice Byrnes, and compelled the convention to accept TRUMAN, the Pendergast protégé.

Will Sidney Hillman's Red minority become the dominant power in American affairs? They have but one more step to take—on November 7. Will farmers and business people, as well as labor, take their

orders the next 4 years from these alien-rooted groups?

The corrupt machine bosses of the big cities are joined with Hillman in his drive for supreme power. The honest, independent Democrats of America are left without a party.

The deepest issue of the campaign is clear. Will Americans run America?

A Study in Stature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me other Station WEVD, Wednesday, August 23, 1944:

The tides of history are rushing in upon us with bewildering urgency. Each hour, each moment is pregnant with the fate of nations, culminating either in a world sturdy in safety or consumed in chaos. At just such a time, the electorate of the United States is asked to choose its leader. Our country has grown in maturity, ready to take its share in world responsibility, deliberative and reflective. History is challenging and we will accept the challenge, in a manner worthy of the dead and the maimed who in fighting and dying have shown us the way. I repeat—and it is at just such a time—the electorate of the United States is asked to choose its leader.

It is significant to state that if our great allies, Russia, China, and England, were to hold elections now, the present leaders of those countries, Stalin, Chiang Kai-shek, and Churchill would be retained in office by overwhelming votes. As Quentin Reynolds puts it, they "may not know the game of base ball very well, but they know it well enough to follow the cardinal rules of the game which is—never remove a pitcher while he is pitching a winning game." Franklin D. Roosevelt is pitching a winning game.

We know the qualities we demand for the office of President—vision, imagination, courage, concern for humanity, humility. We want a man quick, and keen, and clean in thought and deed. We demand a man respected among his peers, a man at home in the White House and at home in the world.

We are asked to choose between President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey, to lead us from war to peace, from the manufacture of guns to the manufacture of consumers' goods, from induction into the armed services of our men and women to the orderly procession of civilian jobs for all who seek employment. We are asked to choose between President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey for the supreme posts of Chief of State, Chief of Foreign Relations, Chief Executive, and Commander in Chief. We are asked to choose between President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey to guide us in the intricacies of the international maze and to help us achieve our aspirations of a durable peace through world cooperation.

Let's measure the men, one of whom will occupy the highest elective office we the people offer. What sagacity, what breadth of knowledge, what leadership has Governor Dewey displayed? His most common comment has been "no comment." With Tom Dewey it is the case of "silence is the best resolve for him who distrusts himself."

We are asked to commit ourselves to the leadership of a man whose unhealthy fear of exposure restrains every public utterance. If he has a spontaneous thought or a devotion to a principle of government, he does not trust us to examine it. His form of wit descends to labelling the Commander in Chief's conference with General MacArthur "the President's holiday." His heavy-handedness in dealing with international affairs is painfully apparent when he lifted unsavory rumors about the Dumbarton Oaks Conferences and tried to give them the semblance of factual reporting, compelling Secretary of State Hull to make a categorical denial to clear the atmosphere of distrust Dewey created. He tried to inject a partisan note which was wholly uncalled for. He was cracked over the knuckles by Willkie who washes his hands of any obstructive Dewey tactics. Dewey masked his concern by speaking of "recent reports." A New York Times editorial said it was incumbent upon him to put his cards on the table and identify the recent reports. Of course, Dewey could not do so. His concern was a figment of his imagination.

I question also the clarity of his vision when I point to his previous noninterventionism. On the last occasion when he sought the Presidency, he said "nearly all of us are agreed that this country will not send men to fight in Europe"; "We must keep out of the war in Europe"; "The Republican Party is firmly opposed to our participation in this war." Apparently, Dewey's memory is very short-lived.

The job of President is too big for the man in the blue serge suit. He could have risen above politics in the soldier's vote issue. He could have helped 800,000 New York State service men and women—in addition to merchant marine men and Red Cross workers abroad—to cast their votes, but he feared a maximum vote and so preferred the obstructive soldiers' vote law to the simplicity of the Federal ballot.

What is the impress of his personality upon the people of the Nation? Have we felt that he seeks the Presidency because of any compulsion to serve? Has he made us feel that the needs of the man of the streets are his concern? Is he alive? Is he warm? Is he responsive? Does he inspire confidence? Does he compel attention? What forcefulness is his?

Do our times call for the dun-colored, burrowing, small-paced movement of a Dewey, intent upon his own protective coloring or for the stride, the tested vision, the resourceful leadership of President Roosevelt?

In word and execution, President Roosevelt stirred and challenged the people. He has vision. He has compassion. He could not operate in vacuum. He stated his theory of government so that each man, woman, and child could understand it. He said, when the whole country looked to him for salvation in the throes of its most desperate depression, "I see millions of families trying to live on incomes so meager that the pall of family disaster hangs over them day by day. I see millions whose daily lives in city and on farm continue under conditions labeled indecent by a so-called polite society half a century ago. I see millions denied education, recreation, and the opportunity to better their lot and the lot of their children. I see millions lacking the means to buy the products of farm and factory and by their poverty denying work and productiveness to many other millions. * * * It is not in despair that I paint you that picture. I paint it for you in hope because the Nation, seeing and understanding the injustice in it, proposes to paint it out. We are determined to make every American citizen the subject of his country's interest and concern, and we will never regard any faithful law-abiding group within our borders as superfluous. * * * If I know aught of the spirit and purpose of our Nation, we will not listen to comfort, opportunism, and timidity. We will carry on." The spirit and the purpose and the enthusiasm were there. They were translated into actualities by such measures as the bank holiday, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Frazier-Lemke law for debt-burdened farmers, the National Housing Authority, the social-security law, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which guarantees your savings and mine. The domestic crises that threatened to overwhelm a people is not easily forgotten nor is the man who dared to act.

Within the country Roosevelt worked to repair a shattered economy while from without reverberated the thunder of guns. With the Nation, divided and uncertain, half-aware of the danger yet clinging to the "splendid isolation," the President saw that danger clearly. In 1937, in Chicago, he said, "Let no one imagine that America will escape, that it may expect mercy, that this Western Hemisphere will not be attacked. * * * The peace, the freedom, and the security of 90 percent of the population of the world is being jeopardized by the remaining 10 percent."

It is well to remind my audience that Dewey was most vociferous in denouncing Roosevelt for his espousal of the cause of Russia. Dewey branded the recognition of Soviet Russia as "most unfortunate." He branded lend-lease to Russia as "fuzzy minded."

Reading all of Dewey's speeches now, and his speeches on the other occasion when he sought the Presidency, one gets the feeling of "confusion worse confounded." They abound in contradictions and reversals. His views are as brittle as glass.

He scoffed at Roosevelt's appeal for the production of 50,000 airplanes. He said the figure was fantastic and that we could not possibly produce that many airplanes. "It will take a plant about four and one-half times as large as our present plant. * * * It would take at least 4 years to accomplish this."

He had a rather Lilliputian idea of what American ingenuity and brains and brawn could accomplish. If he had such little faith in America, concomitantly we must have little faith in him.

Today Roosevelt leads a country to victory. A country was converted into an arsenal of democracy. The economy of the Nation that could so easily break in the emergency was preserved. Roosevelt has captured the imagination of all free-thinking peoples abroad. He is not overshadowed in the council of mighty men like Churchill, Stalin, Chiang Kai-shek.

These are the two men. History has already marked one for its pages. The other has chosen to be compared with him. It is not a happy comparison for Governor Dewey. The job of President demands the stature of a Roosevelt. A Dewey will not do.

Continuance of Lend-Lease Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following United Press release:

F. D. WANTS LEND-LEASE AID CONTINUED AFTER NAZIS' DEFEAT

President Roosevelt informed Congress today that lend-lease shipments to the Allies reached a total of $28,270,000,000 on July 1 and urged that the program be continued after the defeat of Germany to insure a speedier victory over Japan.

Mr. Roosevelt's report referred significantly to the "ultimate" accounting of lend-lease and—taking a slant absent from previous reports—stressed that the program's value never could be measured "in any dollar figures." It can be measured "only in terms of the battles won, the millions of enemy troops killed and captured, and the hundreds of thousands of lives saved," the report said.

SAYS SUCCESSES DUE TO AID

In apparent reference to recent discussions on whether lend-lease could not be halted after the war in Europe ends, Mr. Roosevelt warned in his sixteenth report to Congress:

"We should not permit any weakening of this system of combined war supply to delay final victory a single day or to cost unnecessarily the life of one American boy."

Lend-lease has helped raise the prospect of complete victory "sooner than we had hoped," the Chief Executive said, pointing out that the $28,270,000,000 cost of the program thus far represented but 15 percent of all United States war spending.

"Until the unconditional surrender of both Japan and Germany," he said, "we should continue the lend-lease program on whatever scale is necessary to make the combined striking power of all the United Nations against our enemies as overwhelming and as effective as we can make it."

The present lend-lease law expires June 30, 1945, unless terminated sooner by Congress.

AMOUNTS LISTED

Mr. Roosevelt's report listed these principal recipients of lend-lease aid: Great Britain, $9,321,549,000; Russia, $5,931,944,000; Mediterranean theater (Italy and southern France), $3,070,829,000; India and China, $1,402,426,000; Australia and New Zealand, $1,011,885,000, and Latin-American countries, $171,970,000.

Actual lend-lease shipments, including some others to other countries, totaled $21,534,870,000 on July 1, the President reported, but this did not include other goods or services in transit or awaiting shipment under lend-lease.

Mr. Roosevelt again stressed that lend-lease is not a one-way proposition. Not only have the Allies supplied about $3,000,000,000 in reverse aid, he said, but they "have been called upon to give more in lives, in destruction to their homelands, and in the suffering of their people."

His report showed that United States lend-lease aid through the 3 months ending June 30 totaled $4,045,000,000, thus falling slightly below the record of $4,239,000,000 in the first 3 months of this year.

Shipments to the principal war theaters have included:

United Kingdom: Over 6,000 planes and over 9,900 tanks.

Mediterranean: 4,800 planes, 5,100 tanks and 73,000 trucks and other motor vehicles.

The eastern front: More than 11,000 planes, 300,000 trucks and other military motor vehicles, 339 locomotives, 1,640 flatcars, 934,000 miles of field telephone wire, and 325,000 field telephones.

Southwest Pacific: Almost 5,000 planes and almost 3,000 tanks.

Statement by Under Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Under Secretary of State and chairman of the United States representatives, at the informal conversations at Dumbarton Oaks on the general nature of an international organization for the maintenance of peace and security:

There has been some misunderstanding about the reasons for reticence in regard to our joint discussions at Dumbarton Oaks concerning an international organization to prevent war and secure peace.

The preliminary discussions which are now taking place there are exploratory and designed to reach a common understanding. Embarrassment would ensue to the conferring governments if piecemeal reports of expressions of views advanced from day to day were construed as representing unalterable positions or as having a binding effect. I am sure that anyone who gives the subject careful consideration will understand this.

It has always been recognized, throughout the whole history of the United States, that an expression of opinions in confidence is an indispensable prerequisite to successful procedure in the preliminary work involved in reaching agreements.

From the time of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 right down to the present, private discussions have always preceded public announcements.

In our national political conventions the committees hold public hearings but they go into executive sessions to draft the platforms of the parties.

In the halls of the Congress matters are referred to committees which hold public hearings and obtain the views of various elements, but the committees then go into executive session and draft documents which are submitted to the appropriate house of Congress. Such is the practice of the Foreign Relations Committee, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, of the Appropriations Committee, of the Ways and Means Committee, and of all the committees of each house of Congress.

The object of this procedure is to obtain a calm exchange of views as a contributing factor to eventual agreement expressive of the ideas upon which those responsible have been able to formulate a concurrence.

The conversations at Dumbarton Oaks are no different in this respect from any other conference except that in this instance it is a matter of international as well as of domestic concern.

The representatives of the other agencies of our government invested by this Constitution with authority over these matters have been and are being consulted and kept thoroughly informed of developments.

It has been agreed that the heads of the three delegations will join in issuing statements which will carry information about the progress of the discussions. These statements will necessarily be general in form. To go beyond this and describe the discussions in detail would be not only discourteous but improper in view of the fact that the representatives of other governments represented at the Conference must enjoy the opportunity to consult their own governments before "meetings of minds" can be arrived at.

It needs to be kept in mind that there remain to be held the impending conversations with the Chinese. It should be obvious that toward giving full consideration to all suggestions which may be advanced by the several governments engaged at this stage in the formulating of common proposals the participants in the present conversations should continue to maintain open minds as regards a common progress until opportunity has developed to discuss with the Chinese delegation the approach of their Government to the subject and to bring the views of all the delegations into a common alinement.

Before any binding commitments are made there will be full opportunity for public discussion. As Secretary of State Cordell Hull said so well at the opening of the conversations:

"It is the intention of the Government of the United States that after similar consultations with the Government of China the conclusions reached will be communicated to the Governments of all the United Nations and of other peace-loving nations.

"It is our further thought that as soon as practicable these conclusions will be made available to the peoples of our countries and of all countries for public study and debate."

Show-Down on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by myself which appeared in the Progressive of Madison, Wis., on Monday, August 7, 1944:

SHOW-DOWN ON THE HOME FRONT

(By JERRY VOORHIS)

We know now that when the Armistice was signed at the conclusion of World War No. 1 Germany did not recognize that she had been defeated. There were good reasons for this. Whatever the military situation may have been, the Germans knew that their great monopoly industries were in as strong a position as ever. They knew the methods that they proposed to use to form cartels with French, British, and American firms would be successful in throttling production in the other nations and could be employed by these powerful German corporations in preparation for the next war.

We also know, or ought to know by this time, that during the present war these same German forces have not been idle. We know that there are those people in America who will say—off the record at least—that "after all, Hjalmar Schacht is not such a bad fellow." We know Schacht has been spending a great deal of time in Switzerland and is very close to the so-called Bank of International Settlements. We know that the report of that Bank of International Settlements on post-war arrangements in Europe was hailed with joy all through Germany, but was very coldly received in the democratic countries.

To a great extent, then, the question as to whether America and her allies will really win the war or not depends upon what their policy is with regard to the great economic problems, especially in regard to monopolies and cartels. We are now fashioning the molds into which the world of the days after this war will be poured. The policies we allow to come into being now while the war is still in progress will inevitably have far-reaching influence in shaping the kind of world in which our children will live. There are many things which in the nature of the present circumstances we cannot do.

A MAJOR CAUSE OF WAR

For one thing, we cannot interfere with maximum production for the war. On the contrary, whatever is necessary to be sacrificed for that purpose must be done. But the time is already long overdue when we should most seriously consider the increasing power of domestic monopoly and even of international cartels in the economic structure.

There are two reasons for this. The first is that monopoly has proven a far more serious obstacle to all-out war production than any, except those in the very inner circle of the war program, realize. True, progress has been made and bottlenecks have been broken—in some instances, be it said to their credit, by men who have come into Government service straight out of some of the biggest monopoly corporations in the country. On the other hand, the power of monopoly not only remains, but has unquestionably been greatly strengthened as a result of war conditions and the necessities of war production.

Therefore it is imperative that we chart our present and post-war course with a view to avoiding that greatest of all dangers to free democratic institutions, namely, closely held, private monopoly power. Throughout the years America has prided herself on being a land of opportunity, a land of enterprise, a land where men with ideas could put those ideas into effect, build prosperous businesses, both large and small, increase the supply of available goods and benefit their country thereby.

The growth of monopoly power, particularly if it has international connections, spells the doom of such an America. I say these things because the whole purpose of monopoly is to gain a sufficiently great degree of control over production to control the output and the supply of a product. The purpose of such control in turn is to maintain artificial price levels.

The philosophy of scarcity which is inherent in monopoly can have only one result in the long run—impoverishment of the Nation. For full and unlimited production is the only means of increasing real wealth. Indeed international monopoly power was directly responsible for the scarcities which have caused us so much difficulty with regard to rubber, tin, steel, copper, and aluminum.

I could go further and show how it was that this philosophy of scarcity, restricting production in nation after nation, insisting upon the levying of higher and higher tariff barriers, parceling out world trade and carving up world markets into preserves which were closed to competitors—how these developments in the period after World War No. 1 laid the groundwork for the present war and were, along with the aggression of the Fascist countries, the cause of this conflict.

The effects of monopoly fall with especial force upon the farm population of our country. For years Americans have wondered why it was that agriculture received such an unjustly small proportion of the national income. But the reason has never been far to seek. Through the years agriculture has remained predominantly a competitive industry. By and large, only through the formation of cooperatives have farmers been able to protect themselves against serious declines in prices for their crops at every period of harvest.

SQUEEZING THE FARMERS

This has been true because thousands, sometimes millions, of farmers have been marketing the same crop at the same time, and because purchasers were therefore in a position to compel farmers to compete with one another in the sale of those crops for lower and lower prices.

Meanwhile, item after item which the farmers had to buy—tractors, farm machinery, fertilizer, feed, seed, even processed food products themselves—have had to be paid for at prices fixed by monopolistic control of the market. But for governmental regulation, the same thing would have been true of charges for railroad transportation. But for governmental yardsticks, the price of electricity to the farmer would have been an exorbitant cost exacted from him by the monopolistic power of private utilities.

Selling in a market, therefore, dominated by monopolistic buyers able to force the price of his crops far below even the farmer's cost of production, and buying in a market at prices controlled by the seller, again without regard to real values, it has been inevitable that the farmers of America have failed to obtain their fair share of national income throughout the years. This is the basic reason why farm tenancy has increased as much as it has in America, the basic reason why Congress attempts from time to time to wrestle with the agricultural problem without more definite long-run success.

It is perhaps significant that the very financial agencies—the huge banks and insurance companies—which are the centers of monopoly power in America, are most frequently the landlords of the farmers who have lost ownership of their land through the operation of monopoly in our American economy.

PUBLIC YARDSTICKS NEEDED

In his very able report to the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning of the Senate which is known as Senate Document 106, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, includes a table which compares the total assessed valuation of the 48 States of the Union with the total assets of 34 corporations in this country having assets of a billion dollars or more.

It is interesting to note that the total assessed property valuation of the various States amounts altogether to $143,000,000,000 and the total assets of these corporations to more than half that sum, namely, $73,000,000,000. There are only six States in the Union which have assessed valuation greater than the total assets of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., which amount to $6,000,000,000.

Only 10 States have assets greater than the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Chase National Bank, or the Prudential Life Insurance Co., all of which corporations have assets between $4,500,000,000 and $5,000,000,000.

The greatest nonfinancial corporation in the country, second only to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., is the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, controlling assets of almost every conceivable sort, amounting in all to $2,200,000,000. The United States Steel Corporation is close behind with $2,120,000,000. The total combined assessed valuation of the States of Arizona, Idaho, Vermont, Wyoming, Delaware, Montana, and New Mexico fails to equal the assets of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, or the United States Steel Corporation.

I know about those soothing sentences which tell us that after all bigness is no crime, that huge corporations have been responsible for much of the industrial advance which has been made in recent years, that the management of these corporations is becoming more enlightened as time goes on. These ideas have lulled America into inaction long enough We are right up against the decision which will determine the future course of our country for centuries to come.

Either we are going to hug monopoly to our bosom and run up the white flag and say that the public interest has to be protected in some other way than by the free activity of truly competitive business, or else we have to face this problem and do something about it.

There are fields of business where monopoly is inevitable, indeed where it is the only sensible form of organization. These are the fields of public utilities, communications, and to some extent transportation. There is only one answer here, only one way in which the public interest can ultimately be served. That answer is the publicly owned yardstick.

Regulation has been tried and found wanting. And while I do not advocate that public agencies, Federal, State, or local, immediately take over the entire business in these fields of natural monopoly, I certainly do advocate that enough of them be owned and operated by public bodies to inject into the business the elements of true competition and of abundant supply at the lowest economically sound cost.

There are other fields in which monopoly has already grown so great that one finds it hard to believe that any agency other than the Government of the United States can be powerful enough to cope with the situation. One of these industries is oil, about which I have on numerous occasions addressed the House of Representatives at great length, but I wish to reemphasize the absolute necessity of action which can be effective in either protecting the opportunity of truly independent corporations to exist in the oil industry, or else can protect the public interest through government itself—by means of public ownership of pipe lines, for example.

THE BASIC DECISION

The record of the Congress so far on this matter is not one from which we can take much encouragement. Indeed, one of the last acts of the House before it recessed June 23 was to pass a bill completely exempting the huge business of insurance from all the antitrust laws. This bill was excused on the ground that the Supreme Court decision declaring insurance to be interstate commerce created a serious problem in the industry. But there were many other ways that this problem could have been met and solved, several of which were offered in the nature of amendments to the bill when it went through the House. These methods would not have had the effect of exempting insurance from all the antitrust laws.

True, the Smaller War Plants Corporation has been created by Congress and is now under Maury Maverick doing excellent work. But on the whole Congress has shied away from any of its forthright action which is required to reduce the power of monopoly. It has not authorized a real investigation of monopoly in the petroleum industry. It has let governmental policy through the Petroleum Administration for War be dictated by the major oil companies. It has not passed a resolution introduced by myself to make a thorough inquiry into this entire problem of the power of the major oil companies.

Even the question of pipeline ownership, a key to major oil company control, has been pretty much left alone. We have witnessed the war program build up the power of monopoly more than ever and we are now witnessing a situation where unless present tendencies are sharply changed, there will be nothing in the congressional program for the reconversion period which will

be calculated to protect small enterprise and pull the teeth of monopoly and cartels.

PENDING LEGISLATION

Senator O'MAHONEY and myself have introduced legislation to require registration of all cartel agreements entered into by any American corporation. This has not been passed. Neither has my bill to make it illegal and an action in restraint of trade for the owner of a patent to refuse a reasonable offer for its use or to enter into a patent agreement which restricts production.

With regard to the disposal of surplus property, particularly property in Government-owned plants, the program so far has been to leave in the hands of Mr. William Clayton, a former Liberty Leaguer, almost complete discriminatory power to do as he sees fit. I have introduced two bills on this subject, portions of which I should like to quote to readers of the Progressive. One is H. R. 5082, which lays down a policy for disposal of surplus property in the following language:

"SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to dispose of all surplus governmental property in such manner as—

"(a) to secure for the Government and its taxpayers the maximum practical return from the sale of such property;

"(b) to cause such property to be of the greatest possible benefit to the greatest practicable number of citizens of the United States;

"(c) to prevent any such property being employed as an opportunity for profiteering by anyone;

"(d) to offer such property for sale, wherever practicable, in small enough quantities or lots to enable veterans, small business, farmers, and similar purchasers to have full opportunity to purchase portions of it.

"SEC. 3. All property having been declared to be in surplus shall at regular intervals be catalogued by the Director with the advice and assistance of the Board and suitable arrangements shall be made to disseminate such information in the widest possible manner throughout the country. Such catalogue shall contain as accurate information as possible concerning each item together with the price at which such item is to be sold to direct purchasers from the Government and the allowable mark-up for resale. It shall be unlawful to resell surplus property for any price in excess of the allowable mark-up."

I also have another bill, of which mention has briefly been made in the columns of the Progressive, which would require that before Government-owned plants could be sold, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice would have to make certain that its sale did not further a monopolistic situation and under which the Smaller War Plants Corporation would likewise have veto power over such sales if in its opinion they would contribute to increasing monopoly power.

This bill provides that where a Government-owned plant cannot be sold without increasing monopoly power, it is to be leased for private operation on condition that its capacity must be used at least up to 75 percent thereof. I mention this legislation only to show two things—first, that there is before Congress a considerable body of legislation that would effectively combat monopoly power and that, second, Congress so far has not taken action in such legislation.

VIGILANCE IS VITAL

In my judgment, if we are really to win this war for freedom, this battle against monopoly and cartels must be won at the same time. Otherwise the world will drift into the kind of artificial scarcity economy which, in the period between the First and Second World Wars, condemned it to another blood bath.

We must not deceive ourselves. Already literature is being sent to Members of Congress urging modification or even outright repeal of the antitrust laws of the United States. The very people who talk about the preservation of private enterprise and free economy are demonstrating at this very moment that what they really mean by these phrases is the further freedom of a few monopolists to exploit the people and deny them full production, and to block the chance of any small business men to enter certain fields of industry.

Every true American must be vigilant not only in supporting the war with every ounce of his energy, but also in fighting this all-important home-front battle against monopoly and cartels.

Strange Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of August 14, 1944:

STRANGE CHANGE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Most remarkable fact about the President's Saturday night speech from Seattle, insofar as Washington listeners were concerned, was not what he said, but how he said it.

The voice was still the voice of F. D. R.—but how changed. Gone was the old style silvery smoothness and easy flowing delivery. Instead, there was noted a slow, careful, and several times actually stumbling delivery that lacked punch and precision.

Sunday morning found this city a-buzz with curiosity as to what has happened to the gifted orator who once made his promises sound so good, so true, and so beautiful on the Nation-wide hook-up.

As to the content of the speech, the most significant passage seemed to be the revelation that insofar as F. D. R. is concerned, the American soldiers and sailors are fighting across the Pacific to restore intact to the other nations of the world the colonies they have lost to the Japanese piecemeal throughout this century.

There was also considerable curiosity as to what the President meant by his remark that "We were not allowed to fortify Guam" in the years preceding Pearl Harbor.

The official record as to Guam is set forth in full detail in Senate Document No. 202 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. This publication, entitled "The Decline and Renaissance of the Navy, 1942–44," was prepared by Senator DAVID I. WALSH, Democrat, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs.

In that, on pages 4 to 8, the whole story of Guam unfolds. It is:

1. On December 18, 1919, the Joint Army and Navy Board recommended that Guam be "fortified and garrisoned adequate to its defense against any force that could be brought against it," but the Washington Naval Treaty of 1922 put an end to that idea.

2. On December 27, 1938, a naval survey board headed by Rear Admiral Richard Hepburn submitted to the Speaker of the House a long list of recommendations for naval development from Alaska to Guam to Florida. The terms of the 1922 treaty were by then far out of date, and, in fact, Japan had denounced the 1930 London treaty that followed it.

We were free to do anything we wished insofar as treaties were concerned.

3. As to Guam, the Hepburn report recommended $5,000,000 be spent not for fortification, but simply for harbor dredging and erection of a breakwater. Admiral William Leahy, then chief of naval operations, said that actual fortification of Guam to repel a major attack would cost $200,000,000 and nothing like that was in anybody's mind.

4. The House Naval Affairs Committee recommended the $5,000,000 Guam Harbor development, but on February 23, 1939, it was stricken from the list by a vote of 205 to 168 of the whole House.

The House was then overwhelmingly Democratic, of course, and if the Roosevelt administration had wanted anything done about Guam, it could have held the line.

But, discloses the WALSH report:

"After consulting with the President on this item, the House action was not changed by the Senate."

In other words, if F. D. R. wanted anything done about Guam, he didn't ever say so, and in fact, gave the Senate the nod to leave things alone.

Heroic Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "Heroic Poland," which appeared in the Boston Daily Record, Boston, Mass., August 29, 1944:

HEROIC POLAND

September 1 will be the anniversary of one of the most momentous and tragic days in the thousand-year history of Poland.

For it was on that date in 1939 when Poland, as the first nation to defy the aggressions of Adolf Hitler, was attacked by the Nazi hordes.

The Polish Government had rejected Hitler's proposal for a joint attack on Soviet Russia, and so World War No. 2 began.

Now, at the beginning of the sixth year of the war, Poland still fights on and the brave hearts of her patriots are cheered by the approaching victory of the Allies.

Much of Poland's war has not been fought in Poland.

Polish soldiers—refugees from Poland and others—have been trained in Russia, in the Middle East, and in Britain.

Germans, as the Polish Telegraph Agency notes, "are surrendering to Poles on every front."

There were Poles in Africa with General Montgomery.

Monte Cassino was taken by Poles, who are helping to drive the enemy up the Italian coasts.

Poles form a part of the Allied armies that are fighting the great battle of France.

The Polish Air Force, composed of 14,000 men in 14 squadrons, is fourth in size among the United Nations, and Polish fliers have shot down 1,500 German planes during the war.

Likewise, the Polish Navy has kept the seas and is larger than ever, with a cruiser, six

destroyers, three submarines, coastal vessels, and a merchant marine.

And in Poland itself, where the struggle has never ceased, Polish guerrillas have been fighting steadily with sabotage, bombings, and wreckings; a home army which has replaced the original forces, trained and bivouacked in forests, has met the invaders in pitched engagements, and lately Polish defenders have risen up again within the walls of Warsaw.

With more than 500,000 in the resistance forces in the homeland, the Nazis have been compelled to keep three-fourths of a million troops immobilized in Poland, while on the other hand much aid has been given to the advancing Russian armies.

Moreover, there is an underground government in Poland—a shadow state with courts of law, industrial and agricultural departments, a parliament, and 30,000 civil service workers.

But Poland has suffered terrible penalties, too.

Approximately 5,700,000 of her people have been exterminated—2,500,000 of them Jews, thousands of them Catholic priests.

Polish lads have been executed for the crime of belonging to the Polish Boy Scouts.

Farms have been looted and the buildings burned, and all cultural institutions have been closed by the Germans—all colleges, high schools, and professional schools.

And, of course, the Polish press was extinguished long ago.

The services and sacrifices of the Polish people should be gratefully remembered on September 1 in all of the United Nations.

Even more should they be remembered at Dumbarton Oaks, where the great powers are in conference, and at the tables of the peacemakers when the last shots of battle have been fired.

What Do They Seek?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dothan (Ala.) Eagle of August 25, 1944:

WHAT DO THEY SEEK

Somewhere in Washington there is an individual or group so ignorant or idealistic as to believe that the war emergency can be used to force the South to accept social equality and abandon its segregation laws and customs. This conclusion is justified by the recent War Department directive ordering abolishment of segregation rules and practices which heretofore have been observed in military camps of the South.

The new order already has gone into effect at Maxwell Field and, presumably, at Napier Field and Camp Rucker.

In simple language, enforcement of the edict means that white soldiers and Negro soldiers, white civilian employees and Negro civilian employees will be served from the same soda fountains, from the same restaurant tables, will share the same seats in motion-picture theaters, and will be forced whether they like it or not, to mix and mingle on a basis of social equality.

It is a dangerous order, enforcement of which is certain to lead to friction between the two races and destroy much of the progress the South has made in the promotion of racial harmony and understanding.

Even Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt concede that the war is in its last stages. Then why, at this late hour, should the War Department undertake to set aside social customs and traditions which the South has learned through experience are essential to racial harmony?

Does this order mean that the War Department has become a political tool of administration radicals who are concerned over reported Negro defections to the Republican Party?

Does it mean that agitators and meddlers are determined to stir up racial strife in the South at a time when this region is doing its patriotic best to fight this war to a victorious conclusion?

Or does it mean that this Nation's leaders are more concerned with bringing about a social revolution than with prosecuting the war?

We acknowledge that we do not know. But we do know that the South will not take this slap in the face without protest.

Benefits Available to Dependents of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, a generous Government has sought to lighten the burden of the dependents left at home by the millions of men now defending in all parts of the world the principles for which we stand, and it is my purpose here to brief for the information of those dependents the provisions of the statutes which have been enacted. I shall treat of other benefits available to those dependents for whom the future has been darkened by the black shadow of death in a subsequent analysis.

SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS' ALLOWANCE

This benefit is of especial interest to the wives, families, and other dependents of men and women serving in the armed forces and is available to a dependent of any enlisted man, for easy determination, any person serving in the armed forces receiving a base pay of $138 per month or less.

The law recognizes these three classes of dependents:

Class A. The wife, the child, or the former wife, divorced, of the enlisted man. Under this class, the monthly allowances are:

First. For a wife only, $50; for a wife and one child, $80; and an additional $20 for each additional child.

Second. For one child and no wife, $42; and an additional $20 for each additional child.

Third. For a divorced former wife, or wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or a written agreement, the allowance shall not exceed the amount fixed by the court order, decree, or written agreement.

Class B. A parent, a brother, or a sister found to be dependent upon the enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support—less than 50 percent of his support. The allowance under this class is $37 per month, whether for one or more dependents, and is payable only if there is no allowance to a class B–1 dependent.

Class B–1. A parent, a brother or a sister found to be dependent upon the enlisted man for the chief portion of his support—more than 50 percent of his support. The monthly allowances are:

First. For one parent, $50; for one parent and one brother or sister, $68; and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

Second. For two parents, $68; and an additional $11 for each brother or sister.

Third. For a brother or a sister and no parents, $42; and an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

The allowance for a parent is also available to the parent of the serviceman's wife, if such parent is actually dependent upon the serviceman.

The enlisted man's pay will be reduced by or charged with $22 per month if payments are made to but one class of dependents, and with $5 additional if payments are to be made to more than one class of dependents; but, if a written application for the family allowance is made by the enlisted man within 15 days after his entry into active duty in a pay status, the Government will pay an initial family allowance for the first month without a deduction from his pay.

Blanks on which to apply for family allowance may be obtained from the man's commanding officer. He should fill it out immediately upon induction, be especially careful to furnish all the information requested, and be particularly careful to see that all names and addresses are correct and legible (printed). Where the enlisted man fails to make an application the class A dependent may make the application instead, but he cannot be required to apply for allowances for class B or B–1 dependents unless it is his wish that the allowance be paid dependents in these classes.

CONTINUANCE OF BENEFITS WHEN SERVICEMEN ARE MISSING IN ACTION, INTERNED IN NEUTRAL COUNTRY, CAPTURED BY ENEMY

The pay of a member of the armed forces, officially reported absent for the reasons indicated above, will be credited to his account awaiting his return. Any allotments he may have made for dependents or for the payment of insurance premiums will be automatically continued for a period of 12 months, or until such person returns, or it is officially determined that such person is dead. If allotments had not been made, or if allotments made were inadequate for reasonable support of dependents and payment of insurance premiums, payments may be provided in sums not to exceed the amount the missing person would be entitled to allot to pay premiums or for the benefit of recognized dependents.

Dependents, upon receiving information from the War or the Navy Department that a person in the armed forces is missing, or has been captured, should

immediately write to the office listed below for the branch of the armed service in which the man was serving—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, as the case may be—giving name, rank, organization, and serial number; also setting forth the need for financial assistance, and whether or not the missing or captured person had previously made an allotment. If there is an allotment, give the number of the account:

For the Army: Office of Dependency Benefits, War Department, Newark, N. J.

For the Navy: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Dependents Benefit Unit, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

For the Marine Corps: Commandant, United States Marine Corps, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

For the Coast Guard: Military Morale Section, United States Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

The allowances stop when it has been determined that the missing or captured serviceman has died, or it is declared by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, that the serviceman is considered officially dead. Any benefits after that would be in the form of pensions, for which application would be made to the Veterans' Administration.

Assistance in claiming these benefits may be obtained from veterans' service organizations, the American Red Cross, or by writing to Congressman ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, 316 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Outstanding Record in War Bond Sales Made by Junior Chamber of Commerce of San Dimas, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pride that I ask consent to include with my remarks in the RECORD a brief account of the work of the San Dimas Junior Chamber of Commerce in its sponsorship of the Third and Fourth War bond drives in San Dimas, Calif.

It will be noted that this little city was the first city in Los Angeles County to exceed its quota in the Third War Loan drive and the third community in the State of California to accomplish this purpose, whereas in the Fourth War Loan drive it was once again the first community in Los Angeles County to exceed its quota and was this time the second one in the State to do so.

The account which I am asking to include does not cover the Fifth War Loan drive, but in that case San Dimas had a quota of $100,000, but actually purchased $185,367 of bonds. This, too, was under the sponsorship of the junior chamber of commerce. Therefore I wish to include the following brief account of the work done by the junior chamber and to express my personal deep appreciation of this splendid service:

SAN DIMAS JUNIOR CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE,
San Dimas, Calif.

The San Dimas Junior Chamber of Commerce has just concluded an extremely successful year in sponsoring bond drives in that community. The junior chamber was the role sponsorer of the Third War Loan Bond drive, the Fourth War Loan drive, and are now formulating plans for the Fifth War Loan drive. The junior chamber was requested by the local War Finance Committee to sponsor these drives in San Dimas and by unanimous vote of the entire organization it was agreed not only to sponsor these particular drives, but all bond drives for the duration of the war. We feel that the least we can do to assist our fellow Jaycee members, friends, and relatives, who are sacrificing their lives for their country, is to assist in the war effort in every possible way. By our participation in bond drives, we feel that the organization is assisting in getting the much-needed materials to the fighting forces, and we are going to continue to assist in this worth-while effort in every way possible.

The committee to handle this work was set up early in the year and consisted of one general chairman, vice chairman, and subchairmen in charge of publicity, special events, and house-to-house canvass. Each subchairman had several members working under him and the committee structure proved to be highly successful.

Third War Loan drive: The Third War Loan drive in San Dimas was sponsored in its entirety by the junior chamber of commerce. The quota set for this community was $100,000. Breaking this figure down according to population, we find that this amounts to $37 per every man, woman, and child in the area. When we analyze the town of San Dimas we find that there are no industries in this area except the orange and lemon packing houses. This situation threw the bulk of the purchasing on individuals. San Dimas, under the sponsorship of the junior chamber of commerce, went over the top on their quota on September 22, or just 13½ days from the opening of the drive. Our efforts did not cease there, however, and we continued to actively campaign for the sale of bonds until the end of the drive. At that time, we found that we had sold a total of $137,828.50 or 37.8 percent over our quota. According to the records of the Los Angeles County War Finance Committee, San Dimas was the first city in the county to exceed their quota and the third community in the State of California to accomplish this achievement.

The following are the methods used in the Third War Loan bond drive:

1. Letters were sent to all orange and lemon growers in the area, urging them to buy War bonds. These letters were sent out to the growers accompanying their checks from the fruit exchange for their crops.

2. Letters were sent to all utility companies servicing this area, as well as chain stores, mortuaries, Los Angeles County, and individuals, urging the purchase of War bonds and a portion of their purchases being credited to San Dimas.

3. Personal contact was made with individuals listed by the United States Treasury Department as possible large purchasers.

4. The chairman of publicity kept in constant contact with the local newspaper and saw to it that suitable articles and advertising was placed in each issue of the paper.

5. Arrangements were made with the local Boy Scout troop to distribute Third War Loan pamphlets to every house in the area.

6. The distribution of this material was followed up by a complete house-to-house canvass of each home in the town by the local air-raid wardens, aided by Jaycee members who solicited orders for War bonds.

7. A talk was given at the San Dimas Service Club on the opening day of the drive by the general chairman of the Jaycee committee, who urged the whole-hearted cooperation of all San Dimas citizens.

8. A circular was prepared, with the names of all San Dimas men serving in the armed forces listed and with a message from the junior chamber urging the cooperation of everyone in the Third War Loan drive. This was mailed to all box holders in the area and was the subject of much favorable comment.

9. Personal contact of all business houses in town urging their participation in the drive.

10. Notices were printed in church bulletins urging cooperation in the bond drive.

11. Conducted a contest in the San Dimas Grammar School and awarded prizes of War stamps to the room selling the largest amount of War stamps and bonds.

12. Built a bondometer and placed it in a prominent place in town and kept it up to date, showing the amounts purchased.

13. Arranged for parade of Army motorized equipment, accompanied by Army band, from Pomona ordnance base. This equipment was on display in town for 1 hour and gave the citizens a chance to see what was being bought with their bond money. Much favorable comment was received from this parade and display.

14. Window displays were arranged in store windows and War bond posters were plastered all over the town.

Fourth War Loan Drive: The Fourth War Loan Drive was also under the sponsorship of the San Dimas Junior Chamber of Commerce. In this drive the quota was set at $75,000 by the State War Finance Committee. San Dimas went over the top on this quota on February 1, just 15 days after the opening of the drive. Once again San Dimas was the first community in Los Angeles County to exceed their quota, and this time was second in the State. We continued to campaign for bond sales and at the conclusion of the drive we had sold a total of $125,848.50. This total figure was 67.7 percent over the quota allotted us. This made the second time in succession that the little town of San Dimas had been the first community in Los Angeles County to exceed their quota. When we realize that Los Angeles County has a larger population than 36 States, then we begin to realize the tremendous importance of this record made by a town of some 2,700 population.

Methods used during this drive were the same as the preceeding one but with the following additions:

1. All local merchants were solicited by the Jaycee and an advertising fund was set up for suitable bond-drive advertising.

2. This time the house-to-house canvass of all homes in the area was conducted entirely by the junior chamber members.

3. Arrangements were made to have a Treasury Department official speak at the annual meetings of the Orange and Lemon Growers Associations.

4. A War bond show was sponsored by the junior chamber and proved to be highly successful. At this meeting we had the first Coast Guard man to return to the United States from the Battle of Tarawa, as guest speaker.

5. At our distinguished service award banquet, we sold War bonds totaling $7,000.

6. Placed War bond posters on all lamposts in business area.

7. Articles were placed in the Pomona Progress Bulletin and the Los Angeles Times, telling of the bond drive in San Dimas.

In addition to these activities, the San Dimas Jaycee urgently requested the purchase of bonds on December 7 Avenge Pearl Harbor Day and a sizable amount was sold.

We feel that through our efforts in these bond drives, we have aided the citizens of our community in realizing the importance of purchasing bonds and have also done our part to assist in the war effort. The community has gained Nation-wide publicity because of the records established during the Third and Fourth War Loan drives.

When we stop to analyze the importance of this project, to the San Dimas Junior Chamber of Commerce and its members, we can definitely see where it has molded us together into a bigger and better organization. New members served as many of the committeemen and as a result are now firmly established in the organization. A total of 42 members assisted in these activities and aside from the valuable experience gained, much personal satisfaction was derived in helping our county to sell War bonds. We have been asked to sponsor the Fifth War Loan drive and are now working out plans for that event. We intend to continue our efforts in stimulating the sale of War bonds just as long as our Government needs to sell them.

Respectfully submitted.

D. F. HOOPER,
General Chairman, War Bond Drive Committee.

Editorials From the Daily Oklahoman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two very timely editorials appearing in a recent edition of the Daily Oklahoman:

THEIR LEADER'S WARNING

These loyal supporters of Mr. Roosevelt who disparaged the St. Louis conference of Governors and denied that there was any necessity for such a conference and chided Governor Dewey for calling such a conference, are the very ones who ought to be approving the conference, if they sincerely believe what their own leader has told them. For it was Mr. Roosevelt and not Governor Dewey who voiced these grave words:

"To bring about government by oligarchy, masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. We are safe from the dangers of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever they are in danger."

Those grave words of warning are the words of Mr. Roosevelt. To establish government by oligarchy it is necessary to centralize all authority in Washington. We are safe from oligarchy so long as government is not centralized. And government never can be centralized so long as the individual home rule of the States is preserved. Those are not the primary teachings of Governor Dewey and the St. Louis conference. They are the teachings of Mr. Roosevelt himself.

And since speaking those grave words Mr. Roosevelt has seen the Federal Government become more centralized than ever before in its history. He has seen Washington seize power after power that formerly reposed in the States. He has seen the States deprived of many of their most cherished rights. If centralization was a dangerous threat when he voiced that warning, it is an infinitely more dangerous threat today.

It is not necessary to mention the rights of States that have been taken away in the name of war emergencies. Even before a shot was fired the process of centralization was far advanced and sweeping onward. Long before Pearl Harbor and even before the sack of Poland Washington was telling the people of the different States whom they should elect to Congress and who should become their Governors. The war had nothing in the world to do with the action of servile Oklahomans in practically crawling to Washington to beg humbly for permission to run for Governor of their State.

If the supporters of the President really believe that he spoke the truth when he warned his countrymen of the threat to their liberties that derive from centralized Federal authority, they will refrain from disparaging Governor Dewey's effort to preserve the sovereignty of the States. Instead of criticizing him they will join in the effort to preserve this indestructible union of indestructible States.

TAKING OVER ALL PARTIES

While partisan Democrats deny vociferously that their party has been taken over by Sidney Hillman and his well-financed C. I. O.-P. A. C. evidence is multiplying every day that the Hannegan wing of the New Deal army is being completely submerged and supplanted in its campaign activities by the Hillman contingent.

Nor is that the whole of the picture. While the C. I. O. P. A. C. is issuing its orders to the Democratic organizations everywhere and leading the fight for the Roosevelt-Truman ticket, it is practically conducting the campaign for the election of the Republican senatorial nominee in Oregon and moving the seven heavens to bring about the reelection of Representative MARCANTONIO in New York. While MARCANTONIO may not be a Communist, he is universally admitted to be the nearest thing to a blood-red Communist that ever sat in Congress.

Certainly the C. I. O. P. A. C. is not a Republican organization, and possibly it is not as communistic as it has been charged with being. But who will say that it is Democratic? Nevertheless, it is making desperate efforts to select Democratic nominees all over the country, and it is issuing its orders to old-line Democrats by the hundreds of thousands. It has converted the Democratic National Committee into a political side show. It is making Chairman Hannegan an outcast in the very thick of a national campaign. And it is frightening scores of Democratic Congressmen out of their wits.

While belonging completely to no party, the C. I. O. P. A. C. is trying determinedly to control all parties, and insofar as the Democratic Party is concerned its control is hard to deny. Its real objective, of course, is control of the United States Government.

A Soldier's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much talk regarding our 19-year-old fighting men and what they are thinking. I desire to quote from a letter from a private in the Infantry who has just returned from the battlefront to a rest camp and who had been previously reported missing in action. This message should spur each and every one of us to renew our oath of allegiance and fidelity to both God and man:

AUGUST 10, 1944.

DEAR MOM AND DAD: I haven't been able to write for awhile because we were at the front all the time. We're getting a short rest at present and it certainly feels good to have the tension relieved.

I can't really say much about it; I've had some close calls and I'm very thankful to have come through without a scratch. I pray several times a day and have all my trust and faith in God. The Ninety-first Psalm is my creed and I know that I have all the faith to protect me. If anything should happen to me, it would be His will, and not because I have not trusted in Him.

I was able to attend church this morning and I shall take communion this evening.

I am thinking of you all the time and try to guess about what you are doing. I hope that we can all be together again very soon. Maybe Germany will collapse when the Russians hit the border; I don't believe the war can last much longer but I may be mistaken.

I talked to some prisoners we captured the other night and found three of them were from Wien. They seemed almost like pretty nice guys and we talked quite a bit about music. That is we mumbled back and forth with the little German and French I know.

* * * * *

I still haven't had any mail but I think I shall get some in a week or so, anyhow. I'll write all I can and keep you informed as much as possible.

Don't worry about me but just pray for me and maybe this whole foolish mess will end soon. Sherman's famous words were certainly an understatement in my opinion. When I get home I'll tell you about it once and then try to forget the whole thing.

* * * * *

Naturally, I'm hoping that everyone there is feeling well and that we'll all celebrate Christmas or even Thanksgiving together.

Lots and lots of love,

I. W. C.

Segregation of Races at Military Posts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. NEWSOME
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *August 28, 1944.*

Hon. JOHN P. NEWSOME,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am releasing to the press today the following statement:

"So far, I have had no answer from the President of the United States to my telegram of August 24, last, in which I protested an order of the War Department terminating segregation of races at a military post here. This I regret. The question raised is of such vital importance to the State of Alabama, it deserves immediate attention.

I made no reference in my telegram to any political implication, because I deemed such wholly unworthy of our Democratic Party. It is certainly to be hoped no political implications were intended by such an order. If there are such implications, then we of the South will find it difficult to hold the South within its traditional Democratic allegiance in the years to come."

CHAUNCEY SPARKS,
Governor of Alabama.

Truman Article Seen as Service to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

TRUMAN ARTICLE SEEN AS SERVICE TO NATION—PUBLIC SHOULD KNOW ALL FACTS ON PEARL HARBOR, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe Senator HARRY TRUMAN, Democratic Vice Presidential nominee, has unwittingly done the Nation a service by bringing on at this time a discussion of the true responsibility for the tragedy of Pearl Harbor—something that has been concealed from the public now for more than 2½ years.

When Senator TRUMAN wrote his article for an issue of Collier's Weekly magazine—published in the last few days—and made certain charges against Admiral Kimmel and General Short, he was obviously speaking with a background of confidential information obtained in his position as a member of the Senate committee investigating the war effort. Admiral Kimmel has indignantly denied the charges and innuendoes in a public letter, but the Missouri Senator insists that when the court-martial proceedings are held his charges in the article will be proved correct.

This raises at once the question of why the court martial has been delayed and what reason Senator TRUMAN had for taking the initiative in airing in a magazine article something that the Roosevelt administration has thus far so effectively kept from the public by postponing the court-martial proceedings again and again.

The official reason given for the delay is that it would be prejudicial to the war effort to try the case now. But the Republicans in the Senate also have been in possession of certain information about it and succeeded recently in forcing an Army-Navy board to begin an inquiry on what happened at Pearl Harbor. These proceedings, however, are secret and conclusions reached will not be available till after the Presidential campaign is over.

DEWEY HAS BEEN GIVEN CUE

Meanwhile, Governor Dewey, who has a bit of experience in prosecutions, might decide to try the Pearl Harbor case in public. Certainly Senator TRUMAN has given him the cue. For a long time Army and Navy officers, retired and otherwise, have been gossiping about the Pearl Harbor tragedy and have been asking many questions, as for instance:

1. Why were all our battleships in the harbor of Hawaii on December 7, 1941, instead of out at sea, and who in Washington gave the orders to keep them there, especially at a time of tension in the relations between Japan and the United States?

2. What admiral recommended that the ships be sent from Hawaii and what happened to the admiral who made such a recommendation, and was he relieved of his command at his own request or through the initiative of someone higher up?

3. Why, in view of the tense relations between Japan and the United States after the November 26 note was sent to Japan by the State Department and prior to December 7, were no mobilization orders sent to the fleet by Admiral Stark, then chief of naval operations, thus putting the fleet on a war basis?

4. Why was the report of Justice Roberts confined wholly and specifically to circumstances and events happening in Hawaii, and why were the official acts of commission or omission at Washington in the War and Navy Departments, respectively, excluded from the scope of the Roberts inquiry so that the public got only part of the story?

COLLATERAL QUESTIONS

There are many other collateral questions which a Congressional inquiry rather than a court martial could get at.

Inasmuch as President Roosevelt is running for re-election on the argument that he has been Commander in Chief of the armed services "for more than 11 years," as he expressed it in his letter to chairman Hannegan of the Democratic National Committee, the Republicans feel that they have a right to pin the responsibility for Pearl Harbor on the Commander in Chief who knew all the facts about our relations with Japan and was in a position to order the mobilization of the fleet or else to send it away from Pearl Harbor.

The American people, including the mothers and fathers of the more than 3,000 boys who were killed at Pearl Harbor, are entitled now to all the facts that Senator Truman had when he wrote his magazine article and to all other facts that bear on the tragedy.

Wings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in inserting a poem which was recently published in the New York Times by J. Mitchell Pilcher, field clerk at Maxwell Field, Ala., who served with the A. E. F. in France, 1918, and the First Army Corps, attached to the Seventeenth French Army Corps, and who was awarded the Medaille de Verdun by the French Government:

WINGS

(By Mitchell Pilcher)

As fliers conquer space—the prophet's dream
Of travel through the air, living in time
Beyond world fringe—man courses "on the beam"
And climbs the clouds in cold and sultry clime.
Though sky be dark and earth deep drenched with rain,
He seeks the heights and races with the gale,
And rides the storm (fearless of death or pain),
While dark shores roll below sun-vapored vale.
The peaks attained by man's immortal soul,
Are reached by thoughts that mount with eagle wings,
Born of high dreams and living that is whole.
Girded with truth, freed from all sordid things,
On wings of Spirit man achieves the goal:
Forgetting self with Faith at the control.

Political Action Committee Versus Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, it is our duty to protect that precious American heritage of liberty and opportunity created by the fathers of those men who now so valiantly fight for its preservation. In the coming election the American voters will have to make their choice between a New Deal party dominated by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee or a true American party. This C. I. O. Political Action Committee is dominated by Sidney Hillman, Harry Bridges and Earl Browder. I am sure the American people will not follow such leadership.

Because of the public resentment aroused by the partisan activities of this committee, I believe President Roosevelt will repudiate the action of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee before the election, but with the understanding that they will receive his blessings after the election. Others believe that in order to fool the voters the President and the "palace guard" of the White House will inform the public that they will repudiate Sidney Hillman and the P. A. C. after the election. This outfit has been repudiated within the ranks of labor—an article written by Philip Pearl in the American Federation of Labor News labels the C. I. O. as the strongest antilabor force in America today.

The P. A. C. is not going to convert politically the members of the American Federation of Labor, Railroad Brotherhoods, United Mine Workers, and other labor unions of America. The C. I. O. Political Action Committee cannot even keep the members of the C. I. O. in line to support such an un-American program. It is reported that Gary, Ind., C. I. O. steel workers local tabled a slush fund resolution because they decided to keep politics out of their local. Two C. I. O. locals in Utah quit the P. A. C. when they discovered that they were supposed to back New Deal candidates without listening to the pleas for support by Republican candidates. They did not believe in being told how to vote by anyone.

I was surprised to know that 28 union officials affiliated with the C. I. O. publicly supported Israel Amter who ran for Governor of New York on the Communist Party ticket in the 1942 elections. According to the report of the investigation of un-American activities, Israel

Amter is one of the original American Communists. His brand of Americanism is reflected in the following excerpt from a transcript of his testimony before a congressional committee:

Mr. BACHMANN. Briefly, tell the committee what you are going to do with the real estate and property, banks and churches, in this country when you take over?

Mr. AMTER. I think that should be clear from Mr. Foster's answer, that it is necessary to wreck them.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you owe any allegiance to the American flag?

Mr. AMTER. We regard the American flag as the British worker must regard the British flag—as a flag of the capitalist class of oppression.

Can you imagine these P. A. C. radicals getting control of our Government and wrecking the churches, banks, and property in America? One fact is certain, as long as I am a Member of Congress I shall continue to battle these forces which are trying to bore from within and from without in an effort to destroy the Constitution of the United States. No real American could do more; no real American should do less.

According to the latest report from investigation of un-American activities, Walter Frisbie, secretary-treasurer, Indiana State Industrial Union Council, has been affiliated with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, a front organization for the Communist Party.

Powers Hapgood, another Indiana labor leader and a Democratic State committee labor adviser who is taking an active part in the Political Action Committee, was a member of the Communist Party, according to testimony given before the investigating committee of un-American activities, Friday, October 13, 1939, volume 9.

No; I do not believe the rank and file of labor in Indiana will follow the leadership of Hapgood and Frisbie at the polls in November. I do not believe the rank and file of labor wants to see Sidney Hillman an acting assistant President of the United States or Secretary of Labor.

This C. I. O. Political Action Committee will not only prove a boomerang for the C. I. O. but it will do harm to the entire labor movement in America. It is up to the rank and file of labor to repudiate this committee at the polls in November to protect and preserve the American way of life and posterity of our fighting forces when they return.

The Bridge of Hands to Victory—Pay-off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an advertisement appearing in the Washington Post of August 28, 1944. The article was inserted as a paid ad as a public service by the International Latex Corporation, operating at Dover, Del., where material in aid of our war effort has been produced, and where the company has the reputation of providing good working conditions for its employees. The advertisement is as follows:

THE BRIDGE OF HANDS TO VICTORY—PAY-OFF

(By A. N. Spanel, president of International Latex Corporation)

The war of blood and roaring guns will soon be over and 9,000,000 fighting men will return to the ways of civilian life. They are the ones who sacrificed so much to preserve for us our freedom and our dignity as human beings.

Many of them will be as unprepared for peace as they were for war when war called them to the colors, but not for long.

Some of them are coming back with an unhappy estimate of the real contribution made by industry's labor in this global war and victory; but not for long. Every strike, every work stoppage had been vividly played up to them as planned sabotage, by the printed word, by official public utterance, and by the enemy.

It is the way of half-truths and propaganda that men's minds often hold false pictures while their very hands and bodies touch the demonstrable evidence of real accomplishment * * * the guns, the planes, the tanks, the ships * * * the very tools that help spell victory.

And what is the whole truth? There never was produced such a rushing, surging stream of weapons of war * * * never in the history of man. Every known science and every technology was harnessed by American industry to produce enough and on time.

Yes, American industry at war whose fabric is management and labor * * * with 25,000,000 laboring men and women * * * organized and unorganized * * * drawn like our fighting men, from every walk of life, gave of themselves in work, in sweat and in blood to make enough and on time a reality, and not an empty promise.

There have been deplorable stoppages and strikes, far too many of them with America at war. It has even been necessary, at times, for our Government to take over some war factories because their owners forgot our great and dire needs. At other times, workers, blind to our necessity, had to be pressed back to work. Inexperience, ignorance, illiteracy, greed. Neither industry nor labor were ever free from these. Nor mankind. Yet the American arsenal of democracy, with its 25,000,000 free men and women produced by day and by night so that our heroic fighters might have enough and on time.

Significantly, there have been fewer man-hours lost by war workers than by equal numbers of workers previously engaged in civilian production.

Enough and on time took on new meaning for industry and its labor in the global war. * * * for now the task meant supplying the weapons not only to our fighting men, but to our allies as well. England, Russia, China, France.

The guns, the planes, the tanks, the ships and the food * * * all these were made by industry and with free American labor that produced on rationed time * * * and in astronomical quantities. In freedom's cause, this was the great pay-off.

The price was not in profits earned or in wages paid. Nor in sweat or blood alone. Since Pearl Harbor nearly 50,000 workers died through accidents in the rush of speeding war work; the unsung, of the battle for production * * * 50,000 laboring men and women whose labors ended in eternity. They sacrified no less than their sons, brothers, and husbands, who fought and died on the battlefields of a tortured world.

As if this were not enough, and it wasn't enough, American labor was called upon to man a merchant marine * * * the ships that made a bridge of ships for us and for the whole free world. They were asked to deliver and they delivered, the guns, tanks, planes, and food * * * through oceans keyed with sudden death * * * through raging seas alive with the waiting enemy below and their death-pouring planes above. Clay pigeons were never more assailable than these human beings.

Little do we realize when we read it in our papers that when 4,000 ships roar out to invade our enemies, 3,500 of them are merchant ships manned by merchant seamen.

Since Pearl Harbor 6,000 of these brave men, they who manned our bridge of ships, these deliverers in more ways than one, are known to have died * * * 6,000 free, American workers, who, too, loved life. Compared to their numbers, more merchant seamen have given their lives in this struggle than any of our armed services have been called upon to sacrifice.

They also, are among the unsung. No color ads, to blaze their glory; only their deeds.

History will record that enough and on time became for American war industry and its 25,000,000 laboring men and women, a direction and a goal, world freedom through world victory * * * victory quickened by the stupendous production they were called upon to give. And they gave.

Every tool, every weapon of war supplied to our brave fighters is the concrete evidence and the steel-clad proof of the full contribution made by free American labor and industry in helping to destroy the Nazi-Fascist enemies of the free people of this earth.

In our great sacrifice for victory, let us never forget.

As a public service we give this answer to the disgruntled who would detract from the unprecedented performance of free American industry and labor in this war for human freedom.

INTERNATIONAL LATEX CORPORATION,
Playtex Park, Dover, Del.

Hopkins Again in the Saddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Harry Hopkins is again Roosevelt's right hand man; is again at the White House; and is today more influential with the President than Jimmy Byrnes. It is common talk on the Hill that Hopkins is the man that manipulated Donald Nelson's mission to China, and was also behind Wilson's resignation from the War Production Board. It is also freely predicted that he will soon force Will Clayton to leave his post of administrator of the War Surplus Property Act. Hopkins is opposed to the program for reconversion as outlined in the Baruch-Hancock report and adopted by Donald Nelson. Hopkins wants both reconversion and the disposal of surplus war property to be administered in line with New Deal principles; namely, "planning human

rights above property rights." In plain English this means that Hopkins wants his own social theories to govern the post-war program, and to be the controlling factor in all plans for reconversion and the disposal of surplus property. Hopkins is again in the saddle.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of August 28, 1944:

THE NEW DEAL CLIMBS BACK IN THE SADDLE

Mr. Roosevelt has turned the war production board over to his New Deal schemers. J. A. Krug, age 36, who has had a Government job from the day he got out of college, except for the year and a half in a telephone office, has been given the world's biggest business job, the management of American war supply.

To give this job to one of his radicals, the President has ordered Donald Nelson, Chairman of War Production, to go to the farthest corner of the earth—China—and has announced that Nelson might be kept there 2 or 3 months. The No. 2 man in W. P. B., C. E. Wilson, who it was thought for a time would succeed Nelson, has made way for the New Dealers by resigning. Mr. Wilson took the occasion to make it known that all had not been peaceful between him and Mr. Nelson. That is typical in Washington under Mr. Roosevelt. The President has repeatedly dealt secretly behind the backs of his principal executives. The row between Nelson and Wilson is just another in a series which F. D. R. created by his poor administrative tactics. The conflict between Nelson and Wilson will not obscure the fact that while they have been in control, munitions have become adequate for carrying on the war successfully.

That Roosevelt should seize the first opportunity to put the New Dealers in is no surprise. From the very beginning he wanted his starry-eyed young men to run the war production. William S. Knudson left the presidency of General Motors to take over this job, he thought. But he found that he was just a member of a board, in which he was outvoted and outshouted by New Dealers. Knudsen told the President that a debating society, composed of five members, several of whom were seeking social changes, couldn't provide for the national defense. The President then cut the number of war production managers from five to two. Knudson, under the new set-up, shares the direction of munitions procurement, not with another manufacturer, but with Sidney Hillman, the labor organizer, who now has created P. A. C. to bring about the election of Roosevelt for a fourth term.

The country stood for all this monkey business until Pearl Harbor. The shock of the greatest disaster the country ever experienced, and the prospect of defeat in the war, forced the President to kick out the New Dealers and turn war production over to businessmen. The new set-up was proclaimed on January 16, 1942. Donald Nelson became the Chairman of the War Production Board, and he has continued in office ever since, despite efforts of New Dealers with high support from the Army and the Navy to dislodge him.

Now that the Army thinks that the war in Europe will be over in October, Mr. Roosevelt thinks that it is time to hand the biggest of the war agencies over to his New Dealers. Nelson wanted to demobilize the organization promptly and start up peacetime production as fast as facilities became available. A man with ideas like that in an important position imperils the program of the radicals to perpetuate as much as possible of the wartime set-up. Krug, whose principal job under the New Deal has been helping David Lilienthal run the Communist experiment in the T. V. A., is an ideal man for the new job, especially since Hillman, who was Roosevelt's choice earlier, is busy with the P. A. C.

Members of Congress who have said that the war emergency must not be seized as an opportunity to further the social revolution, which was well started when the war broke out, must not allow the seizure of authority in W. P. B. to go unnoticed. They won't if they read statements by Representative THOMAS R. WINTER, of Kansas, who questioned Krug in connection with the investigation of the Rural Electrification Authority. Of Krug and his associates, Representative WINTER said:

"If I were to sum up in a few words the revealed attitude of this gang of fellow travelers who are bent upon prostituting to their own ends America's idealism and patriotism, to make America over during her hour of travail, I would say this is their arrogant attitude: 'To hell with the taxpayers, and the public be damned. To hell with the farmers, and let the Army and Navy play second fiddle; we come first. Up with communism and down with democracy, and let the war go hang. We'll win the peace, if we lose the war.'"

Libertys Played Big Invasion Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an article which appeared recently in the New York Journal of Commerce on the part the Liberty ship played in the big invasion role. The article is as follows:

LIBERTYS PLAYED BIG INVASION ROLE—THEY COMPRISED 95 PERCENT OF UNITED STATES FREIGHTERS IN SOUTHERN BEACH ACTION

An armada of 641 American-flag vessels took part in the invasion of the French Mediterranean coast, it was announced yesterday by the Navy through the War Shipping Administration. Hundreds of American freighters, of which 95 percent were Liberty ships, were included in the fleet which did a combined job of delivering not only the invasion forces but supplies of every description to the beachheads.

It was also revealed by the W. S. A. that during the early days of the Normandy invasion more than 150 American merchant ships, averaging about 10,000 deadweight tons each and largely made up of Libertys, carried men and matériel to the beachhead. With them were nearly 120 British merchant ships of similar capacity and a large number of smaller British craft. American and British sea-going tugs played an important part in the invasion effort.

Despite heavy enemy fire, the volunteer civilian crews of the American merchant marine took their ships in, it was revealed. They worked long hours operating deck machinery to unload cargo and delivered the goods and troops to hold the established beachheads. The difficulty and dangers of their task were reflected in letters to the crews by Admiral Sir Bertram H. Ramsay, Allied Naval Commander in Chief, Invasion Forces, and Vice Admiral E. S. Land, United States Navy (retired), War Shipping Administrator, commenting on a job well done and successfully completed in support of our armed services.

Many of the ships have continued to operate shuttle service across the channel, and the supplies and men they carry have been largely responsible for the sustained speed toward the liberation of Paris. Large numbers of ships have left Atlantic coast ports to unload their cargoes on the shores of France. Three-fourths of a recent large convoy was flying the American flag, in contrast to the last war when the greater part of American men and supplies was carried on foreign-flag ships.

G. I. Joe's Future Depends on a Dewey-Bricker Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, this Congress appropriately has passed many measures designed to provide for the post-war welfare of the veterans of World War No. 2.

This fall the people should elect officials whose performance will make good on these promises. Will these promises be forgotten like the 1932 New Deal platform? Will these pledges be evaded like the 1936 New Deal covenants? Or will these obligations go unfulfilled like the promise in 1940 not to send our boys abroad? Let us soberly review the prospects.

For almost 12 years the New Deal has been recklessly borrowing and spending the frugal savings of the American people.

As long as the victims of this inflationary and wasteful extravagance were just American citizens at home, no one could complain too much. The people could stop this riotous throwing away of their savings any time they woke up to its dangers.

Today the situation is different. Today the most unfortunate victims of New Deal spending-to-bankruptcy are the far-scattered veterans of World War No. 2. They must rely on us at home to be faithful trustees of their heritage. All will agree that the disabled veteran and the widow and orphan of the fallen hero have a first and prior claim against the Treasury of the United States. That claim comes ahead of all the U. N. R. R. A., world banks, and vote-buying handouts of the fourth-term machine.

Yet when the broken soldier or his fatherless family come up to the Treasury a few years hence, they will find it empty—unless the American people call a halt by a change in leadership on November 7.

Otherwise, the old rhyme of "Old Mother Hubbard who went to the cupboard and when she got there the cupboard was bare" will come to pass. The G. I. Joe for whom the politicians are piously beating their breasts today will be the victim. His heritage at home

will have been dissipated while he was abroad supposedly defending it.

Is this to be the pay-off for boys who have been sent further to fight to protect their homeland than any army in history?

The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the War Dads, and all the great organizations whose aim and purpose is to protect the veterans should carefully study the nonpolitical arithmetic of this situation.

The promises of the G. I. bill and other veterans' benefit measures can be made good only if the post-war budget is balanced. That fact is of supreme importance to those who make the sacrifices of this war. Of equal significance is that the New Deal has failed its every pledge to balance our budget.

Moreover, the New Deal could not balance the budget during years when both our debt and annual expenses were only a fraction of what they are today. Here is the practical yardstick by which you can measure the New Deal's ability to provide for the veteran.

A check against a busted bank is of little or no value; a pension claim against a bankrupt concern is of little or no value; and a claim against a government that has exhausted the resources of its people is of little or no value. The wasteful spending of the New Deal, now extending all over the world, must be stopped—now.

Otherwise you can expect here the tragedy that happened in Europe after the last war—when veterans sold their medals and the gold braid off their uniforms to get something to eat. Their pensions and government veterans' payments were paid in paper money which was almost worthless.

Those "liberal governments were wrecked," said Candidate Roosevelt in 1932, "on the shoals of loose fiscal policy." Our 1944 deficit is about a billion dollars a week.

Is the foregoing appraisal too pessimistic? Not if the studies of the president of that great nonpartisan scientific organization, the Brookings Institution, are correct. Harold G. Moulton concludes a recent study of the public debt and inflation with this warning:

> It will be necessary to make a choice. With unlimited debt expansion we cannot prevent inflation without the use of totalitarian methods of control. No compromise or halfway measures can adjust the difficulties. The choice is between regimentation and inflation.
>
> The foregoing analysis serves to disclose the gravest danger with which the United States is now confronted. Unable or unwilling to perceive basic inconsistencies, or to choose between clear-cut alternatives, we drift toward the deep financial waters from which there is no return other than through repudiation in one form or another.

The American people must face this "gravest danger" honestly and realistically. As they do, they will realize that the future of G. I. Joe depends on the election of Dewey and Bricker.

Dewey and Bricker have performed what they have promised; they have balanced their State budgets, they have kept the faith. To keep faith with G. I. Joe, his friends at home must elect Dewey and Bricker.

C. I. O. Political Activities in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Glenn E. Bunnell, the editor of the Stuart Advocate, of Stuart, Nebr.

Mr. Bunnell has been writing some excellent editorials. He is far enough away from Washington to do some clear, straight, honest writing. His editorials represent the thinking of the people in Nebraska.

It is quite evident that the C. I. O. is determined, if possible, to defeat the four Congressmen in Nebraska. The Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. will spend huge sums of money in various ways. They are very adroit in circumventing the law. They propose to collect money from every member of their union. The fund will be six million or more dollars. The union member must contribute or he may lose his job. The union member may believe in the election of Dewey and Republican members to Congress but nevertheless must contribute to the racketeer who holds the laboring man in the hollow of his hand and is pledged to work for Roosevelt's election.

Mr. Bunnell recognizes that the National Citizens Political Action Committee will do everything possible to defeat Mr. Dewey and the Republican candidate to Congress.

Mr. Bunnell's reference to Senator Truman trying to build himself up by stepping on Admiral Kimmel and General Short is worth careful consideration by thoughtful individuals.

The editorial follows:

THE EDITOR'S COLUMN

(By Glenn E. Bunnell)

The National Citizens Political Action Committee charges in its latest bulletin that Thomas E. Dewey lacks the necessary experience in foreign affairs to make a good President in these times. This bulletin says, "Since Dewey has had no experience in foreign affairs, what he would have done and what he may be expected to do, if elected, have to be figured out entirely from his public utterances."

It is evident from this statement that they do not know what Dewey's foreign policy will be, but because he is the Republican candidate, they do not approve of his foreign policy, whatever it is. Their's is a willfully blind support of Roosevelt for reasons best known to the C. I. O., brains of the C. N. P. A. C.

No one man can be an authority on foreign affairs, domestic economy, military affairs and all of the other phases of Government. He must select men who are specialists in the various fields of Government to be his advisors. President Roosevelt has done this to a greater extent than any other President. The wisdom with which these advisors are selected, is what makes or breaks a President.

Mr. Dewey's selection of John Foster Dulles as his advisor on foreign affairs should set at rest the minds of all fair-thinking citizens, as regards Dewey's wisdom in selecting his advisors. Mr. Dulles is a recognized authority on international law, and the author of several books on the subject. He has been a student of foreign affairs for more than 40 years, and has been secretary to a number of international peace conferences. Mr. Dulles is more able in his field than any man on President Roosevelt's "brain" staff. Such is the caliber of the men Thomas E. Dewey has picked to advise him.

Don't be misled by the C. I. O. or its campaign organization, the National Citizens Political Action Committee.

Senator TRUMAN is trying to build himself up by stepping on Admiral Kimmel and General Short, who were, and are, blamed for the disaster at Pearl Harbor. He has made charges against these men in a magazine article, before these men have been given the benefit of a hearing and an opportunity to clear themselves. Even if the charges are true, it is mighty small of Senator TRUMAN to publish his charges until the men have been given a hearing.

These two men have asked for a trial or hearing, but so far, they have been unable to get it. They are in disgrace, and if all the charges are true, they should be, but why not hold a court martial and get at the real truth of the charges, which for the most part, have never been made public. It may well be that the skirts of the administration are not too clean. Since, by official action a public hearing has not been held, it could be that the statesmen and diplomats of the present administration are as much or more to blame than are the two men now charged.

TRUMAN'S use of these unproven charges for a political toehold does not put him in the class from which I would care to see our Vice President elected.

Now that TRUMAN has aired these charges in a national magazine, during a campaign, I will raise my small voice to demand a hearing for Admiral Kimmel and General Short before election. The powers that be should no longer be permitted to hide behind the national security gag.

If We Had Fortified Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1944

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star of August 22, 1944:

IF WE HAD FORTIFIED GUAM

The recapture of Guam throws a rather ludicrous light on the excitement of some American politicians who tried to picture the failure of Congress to provide fortifications for that island as an outrageous and unpatriotic performance.

As a matter of fact, nobody proposed that we fortify Guam. The only point at issue was whether we should dredge the harbor. Neither the Army nor the Navy asked for more than that.

The recent history of the southwest Pacific has shown clearly enough that it would have made no difference in the long run whether we had fortified Guam or not. Tarawa, Saipan, and finally Guam itself demonstrated that air bases are of little value so long as they occupy only a small territory and are not backed up by control of the sea and the

air. When the Japs had control of the sea and the air, their successes in the Philippines, in Malaya, and in hundreds of smaller islands in the southwest Pacific were in the long range view of history little more than mopping-up operations. While the Japs had control of the sea and the air, they built up a great island empire. When the balance of sea and air power swung over to our side, Japanese schemes of further conquest came to a sudden, jolting halt.

Probably it will be more difficult to put the Japanese out of larger land masses like the Philippines and Java. However, the general rule will probably hold for the large island as it does for the small one.

We lost several hundred Americans when the Japs took over Guam after Pearl Harbor. If we had had a garrison of 10,000 men there, and elaborate fortifications, we would have lost them just the same.

Naval and air bases are very important when they support dominant sea and air power. Their use is slight and usually temporary when control of the sea and the air has passed for some considerable time into the hands of a hostile power.

The Truth About Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Newsweek for August 28, 1944:

THE TRUTH ABOUT GUAM—A SEARCH OF THE RECORDS

The question of whether the administration sought fortification of Guam in 1939 and was voted down by Congress is being injected into the 1944 political campaign. Several organizations are distributing pamphlets and other campaign literature blacklisting Members of Congress involved. Two weeks ago President Roosevelt, at Bremerton, Wash., said: "We were not allowed to fortify Guam * * *." Last April 23 Admiral Ernest J. King, in an official report on the war, wrote: "Proposal was made to proceed with the fortification of Guam, but after considerable debate in Congress it was rejected." Other high officials have joined in the controversy.

To ascertain the facts, the editors of Newsweek last week went back to the official records of 1939. Because they discovered much data that has not hitherto been published, a chronology and excerpts from the records, together with citations, follow:

On March 15, 1937, Rear Admiral Arthur B. Cook, chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, in a letter to Admiral William D. Leahy, chief of naval operations (now President Roosevelt's chief of staff), recommended that Guam harbor be deepened for better seaplane facilities. (Letter printed p. 220, official hearings on H. R. 2880, House Naval Affairs Committee, January 25 to February 17, 1939.)

In the Naval Expansion Act of May 17, 1938, the House Naval Affairs Committee, "of its own volition and without any request from the Navy," inserted a provision directing the Navy to set up a board to determine the need for additional bases. The board, headed by Rear Admiral A. J. Hepburn, on December 27, 1938, recommended a $326,216,000 program for new bases, including an $80,000,000 aviation and submarine base at Guam. (Pp. 4, 6, S. Doc. No. 202, 78th Cong., 2d sess., titled "The Decline and Renaissance of the Navy.")

In its budget requests for 1939 to the President and the Bureau of the Budget, the Navy asked for an appropriation of $94,000,000 to commence the Hepburn Board program which it had approved. (Admiral Cook, p. 134, House Naval Affairs Committee hearings.)

Although the Hepburn Board program called for development of 25 air bases, they were reduced to 12 "because of budgetary limitations," and the bill, as finally approved by the President and the Budget Bureau and sent to Congress, limited the program to $65,000,000. (Admiral Leahy, p. 7, S. Doc. 202.)

A proposal for $5,000,000 in harbor improvements, embodied in the 1937 recommendation of Admiral Cook, was substituted for the Hepburn Board proposal for fortification of Guam at a cost of $80,000,000. (Admiral Cook, p. 223, Assistant Secretary of Navy Charles Edison, pp. 189, 214–215, 220–221, House Naval Affairs Committee hearings.)

"The President," testified Rear Admiral Ben Moreell later, "stated that we could not have the $94,000,000. We could only have $65,000,000, so we reduced the facilities at each of these 12 stations so as to come within the $65,000,000." (P. 8, S. Doc. 202.)

FORTIFICATION?

The first witness before the House committee was Admiral Leahy. He was asked if the Navy was recommending the fortification of Guam. "We are not asking for authority to fortify the island," he replied. "There is no proposal in the bill before the committee to fortify the island. The proposal is that we improve the existing airplane facilities in the harbor of Guam. They are now unsatisfactory. Some dredging, seawall building, and fuel storage facilities are necessary in order that Guam can be used for handling both commercial and naval planes." (P. 60, House Naval Affairs Committee hearings.)

At twelve other stages in his testimony, Admiral Leahy repeated his assertion that the Navy was not asking to fortify Guam. (Pp. 61, 70, 72, 74, 76, 79, committee hearings.)

Discussing the Hepburn Board recommendation for fortification, Admiral Leahy was emphatic that it "would add greatly to the defensive power of the fleet in the Pacific," but he twice refused to recommend it, saying: "I did not say that I think it ought to be fortified" (p. 75, 76, committee hearings).

Admiral Cook, in his testimony, said the $5,000,000 project would enable Navy patrol planes to use the harbor more safely. Asked by Committee Chairman CARL VINSON if the Navy contemplated "maintaining any air unit there," Admiral Cook replied: "No, sir, you couldn't. I cannot see how anyone can connect it with fortification. It is just landing and take-off facilities for patrol planes and anchorage area for seaplane tenders." (P. 163, committee hearings.)

ONE DAY

At another point, Admiral Cook noted estimates it would take the enemy 30 days to reduce the aviation-submarine base proposed by the Hepburn Board. Under the proposal in the bill, he estimated Guam could not hold out more than a day, asserting: "Guam as it stands now could not be held a day against any appreciable enemy force. These improvements will have no literal defensive value for Guam itself." (P. 499, committee hearings.)

To make certain it knew the Navy's official policy on fortifying Guam, the committee summoned Charles Edison, Assistant Secretary of the Navy. He, too, insisted that fortification was not being sought, describing the project in these words: "The development of the harbor of Guam is a matter of, more properly speaking, civil development, much as you develop highways, schools, and other harbor improvements elsewhere." (P. 193, committee hearings.)

On the House floor in February 1939, four veterans of the last war, Representatives Sutphin, of New Jersey, Richards, of South Carolina, Colmer, of Mississippi, and Nichols, of Oklahoma, all Democrats, led a successful fight against the Guam proposal, contending it would jeopardize Jap-American relations. Sixty-four Democrats joined 138 Republicans to eliminate it 205 to 168. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 21, 22, 23, 1939.)

When the bill reached the Senate, no effort was made to restore the eliminated provision.

In February 1941, 10 months before Pearl Harbor, Congress voted $4,700,000 for the harbor improvements originally requested. In contrast to 1939, the appropriation met next to no opposition. Work was just getting under way when Pearl Harbor came. As Admiral Cook predicted, Guam, attacked in force on December 11, had fallen the following day.

Information for Servicemen, Veterans, and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the World War Veterans' Legislative Committee, one of the most important committees in the House of Representatives. It is this committee that is charged with the responsibility of preparing legislation for the benefit of the veterans of the present war as well as those of World War No. 1. This Congress has adopted the policy of enacting veterans' legislation during the war instead of after, in order that the machinery for assisting in the readjustment of veterans to civilian life may be completed to adequately and promptly take care of the large demobilization of our armed forces which will commence as soon as the war is over.

People everywhere are vitally interested in this legislation because almost every family has someone in the services. I find, too, that there are a great many in the service, as well as their dependents, who frequently do not get all the benefits to which they are entitled simply because they do not know about them. This is perfectly understandable. There has been so much legislation on this general subject in the last few years that it is difficult for the average person busy with other matters to keep fully informed. I have had hundreds of inquiries from my district asking for an outline of the benefits which Congress has made available for servicemen, veterans, and their dependents. I have prepared, in cooperation with the Veterans' Administration, an outline of information concerning the kind and amount of benefits currently available under Federal law, the qualifications therefor, and

how to proceed to get them. In this outline monetary benefits based upon service-connected disability or death are referred to as compensation and pension. The reason for the use of both terms is that, under existing laws, the service-connected monetary benefits for World War No. 1 veterans and their dependents are termed "Compensation," while World War No. 2 service-connected benefits are termed "Pension."

Naturally, the summary given here is only an outline. Any citizen can get more detailed information from the Veterans' Administration or from his Congressman about these benefits. The citizens of the Twelfth Michigan Congressional District, which I represent, can continue to get help on their individual problems by addressing their inquiries to me as follows: Congressman JOHN B. BENNETT, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. Assistance can also be obtained in matters of this kind by contacting the local Red Cross, the American Legion or auxiliary, the V. F. W., or similar responsible organizations.

While Public Law 346, popularly referred to as the G. I. bill of rights, has gone a long way toward creating readjustment benefits for returning servicemen, there are still many things left to be done if we are to give the veteran the full and fair consideration he deserves. Some months ago I introduced a bill which is designed to give returning servicemen priority rights in securing surplus war property such as jeeps, trucks, tractors, bulldozers, and other similar equipment. It is provided that each serviceman be given a credit of $40 per month for each month of service in this country and $60 for each month of service outside the continental limits of the United States. The maximum credit in any case to be $1,500.

Heretofore, it has been the policy of our Government to dispose of such excess supplies in large blocks to commercial bidders and dealers who in turn would peddle it to the public at a tremendous profit. None of us want that situation to develop after this war. The boy who used the jeep in defense of his country should have the first right to acquire it when he returns. That is the basic philosophy of my bill. It is now before the veterans' committee, and I am confident that when it is favorably reported it will pass the House of Representatives without difficulty.

While it is of utmost importance that Congress provide for all these benefits to the servicemen to make readjustment to civilian life easier, it should not be forgotten that the greatest benefit which Congress can guarantee the serviceman is twofold. First, to render every assistance to bring about an early ending of the war and the establishment of a just and permanent peace. And, secondly, to guarantee the preservation of our constitutional form of government—so that the serviceman will return to civilian life under a Government of free enterprise and free opportunity—the same kind of a Government that he has so willingly offered his life to preserve and defend.

OUTLINE OF BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN, VETERANS, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS UNDER EXISTING LAW—COMPENSATION AND PENSION FOR DISABILITY OR DEATH

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

Under the veterans regulations promulgated under the act of March 20, 1933, as amended, honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 are entitled to compensation or pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by such service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10 percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month. While the World War No. 2 veterans were entitled to these rates following the act of December 19, 1941, they were placed on complete parity under the veterans regulations by the act of July 13, 1943, Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, with reference to the requirements governing proof of service connection of disability. The latter act also liberalized the regulation concerning the presumption of soundness upon entry into service. Under Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates based upon service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including special awards and allowances fixed by law, were increased by 15 percent.

In lieu of such pension or compensation, reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, meeting the requirements of the Army regulations pertaining to retirement of officers of the Regular Establishment, are retired by the War Department, certified to the Veterans' Administration, and their retired pay equal to 75 percent of their base pay is paid by the Veterans' Administration out of the pension appropriation.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

Under Public Law No. 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the rate of pension for permanent and total non-service-connected disability, applicable to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion, the Philippine Insurrection, and World War No. 1, was increased from $40 to $50 per month with an increase to $60 per month where such veterans have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or reach the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. This act also provides that the above pension for non-service-connected disability shall apply to veterans of both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH

The rates of compensation or pension for widows, children, and dependent parents of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans based upon death in service, or service-connected death, are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100)	38
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

The above rates are contained in Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943, and constitute a material liberalization of the prior rates.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH

The widow, child, or children of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 are entitled to the following rates of compensation if the veteran at the time of death from a non-service-connected cause had a disability incurred in or aggravated by such war service:

Widow but no child	$35
Widow and 1 child (with $5 for each additional child)	45
No widow but 1 child	18
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	27
No widow but 3 children (equally divided)	36

With $4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

Payments are limited to an aggregate of $64 in any one case.

Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, act of May 27, 1944, increased the rates to the above amounts and also included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans, the law previously having applied only to World War No. 1 veterans.

Claims and effective date of awards: Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred to a Veterans' Administration facility, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for adjudication, the applicant should file claim on proper form which will be supplied upon inquiry addressed to any Veterans' Administration facility or regional office, or to the local representative of the American Red Cross or of a veterans' service organization.

Upon death in service the service department notifies the Veterans' Administration, and claims forms are sent immediately to all known dependents.

GROUPS POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE FOR PENSIONS

All members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the Public Health Service, or of the Coast and Geodetic Survey when ordered to active service with the Army or Navy, or as to United States Public Health Service while serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, and as to Coast and Geodetic Survey when assigned during present war to duty on business of War or Navy Department in areas outside continental United States or in Alaska or coastal areas of the United States as determined by the War and Navy De-

partments to be of immediate military hazard, are potentially eligible for pensions.

AWARDS TO DATE

Pension payments to veterans of World War No. 2 and their dependents total $37,760,572.78 through March 1944. In addition, retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration to Reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, totaled $1,020,137.33 from July 1, 1942, through March 31, 1944.

Disbursements for the relief of World War No. 2 veterans and their dependents from 1918 through March 1944 for disability and death compensation or pension, service connected and nonservice connected, totaled $5,007,029,954.54. In addition, disbursements for World War No. 1 emergency officers' retirement pay through March 31, 1944, totaled $84,889,697.63. Our older veterans are not being forgotten just because there is a new and larger crop, as these figures prove.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE, PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES, AND DOMICILIARY CARE

Eligibility is extended to any veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2, honorably discharged, having a service-connected disability requiring such care, treatment, or appliance, or one who was discharged for disability and not dishonorably; also one not dishonorably discharged, who is unable to defray his expenses, has tuberculosis or a neuropsychiatric ailment or disability which requires hospital care.

Dependent upon availability of facilities, eligibility includes any veteran of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, and who is in need of such care and is unable to defray the expenses therefor—regardless of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service.

CLAIMS

Any person who is to be discharged from active service and who is in need of and entitled to hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration, is transferred directly to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. Claim for all benefits, and necessary clinical and service data accompany him, or are filed by the manager if the veteran is insane or incompetent.

All others should file claim for treatment or hospitalization directly with the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office—one, or more, in each State in the Union except Delaware.

Sixty-four thousand nine hundred and eighty-two veterans of World War No. 2 have been hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration through April 30, 1944. On April 30, 1944, there were 44,967 World War No. 1 veterans and 12,866 World War No. 2 veterans receiving hospitalization, and 8,477 World War No. 1 veterans and 196 World War No. 2 veterans receiving domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration.

While domiciliary care cannot be said to be a part of the rehabilitation process, it is a valuable benefit for those who have reached a permanent state of disability and have no other means of support.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved by the President March 24, 1943, provides—

First, that any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war;

Second, and who was honorably discharged;

Third, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay;

Fourth, who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement.

The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by virtue of a handicap due to service-incurred disability. In performing the functions imposed upon the Administrator by Public Law 16, it will be the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to utilize educational institutions and establishments of recognized standing in the training of these disabled veterans into employment and to train each person as near his home as may be possible. In securing employment, a problem which obviously will be very great after the end of the war and perhaps acute after demobilization has been accomplished, every available Federal and State facility will be utilized. Employment of veterans has been accomplished to a considerable extent through the United States Employment Service. It will be the purpose to correlate these activities to the end that those vocationally trained will be graduated into employment opportunities.

While the disabled veteran is in training his pension, unless it equals or exceeds such amounts, will be increased to $80 per month, if single; $90 per month, if married, with $5 additional for each child, and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required.

CLAIMS

Those persons discharged from the service directly to the Veterans' Administration facilities for hospitalization will have their claims filed and processed; and the question of need for and entitlement to vocational rehabilitation may be given consideration as soon as the individual's physical and mental condition make training feasible. Any other person honorably discharged from the service may make claims for vocational rehabilitation in the claim for pension which may be filed at the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office.

INSURANCE—NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

National service life insurance was provided under the act of October 8, 1940, Public Law No. 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, and liberalizing amendments thereto were enacted during the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses. A number of other liberalizing proposals are pending in the present Congress and the Veterans' Administration has submitted certain proposed changes found to be justified by studies conducted. Application may be made for not less than $1,000 nor more than $10,000 without physical examination prior to the expiration of 120 days from entrance into active service. Thereafter, any such person in the active military or naval service may apply if the application be accompanied by acceptable evidence of good health.

APPLICATIONS

Application forms are supplied the service departments, and may be obtained from the commanding officer or designated insurance officer. The applicant may elect to pay premiums in cash, or by allotment of pay. Policies are not issued during the war, but insurance certificate is mailed to the address designated by applicant.

The insurance is against death only, but includes waiver of premiums during total disability existing for more than 6 months, and commencing prior to insured's sixtieth birthday. The policy is a 5-year level premium term policy with rate based upon the American experience table of mortality and 3 percent interest—the Government assuming the extra hazard of the military and naval service and the administrative expense. The insurance is payable only to a widow (widower), child (including a stepchild or illegitimate child, if designated as beneficiary by the insured), parent (including person in loco parentis), brother and sister of the insured; and is payable only in monthly installments. The insured may change the beneficiary designation at any time.

After the policy has been in effect for at least 1 year, while in force it may be converted to an ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policy upon application to the Veterans' Administration without medical examination.

In cases where the person in service died or became totally disabled, or was captured or isolated by the enemy prior to April 20, 1942, and had less than $5,000 insurance in effect, the law provides that gratuitous insurance to an aggregate of $5,000 shall be deemed in effect. Claims for such gratuitous insurance should be filed as soon as possible, because of limitations. In most of these death cases only a widow, child, or dependent parent can claim such insurance.

As of March 30, 1944, over 14,303,291 applications had been received, representing a total amount of nearly $105,596,766,000 of insurance. The average policy was approximately $7,382.60; the average coverage per life approximately $8,926.74.

The insurance is payable in the event of the death of the insured while the policy is in force to a beneficiary or beneficiaries, which may be designated by the insured, only within the relationship of widow or widower, child, parent, brother, or sister. The proceeds of the policy are payable as an annuity in 240 equal monthly installments of $5.51

for each $1,000 of insurance to any beneficiary who is under 30 years of age at the time of the death of the insured; otherwise, in continuous monthly installments throughout the lifetime of the beneficiary, with a guaranty of the payment of 120 monthly installments to the surviving relatives of the insured who are within the permitted class of beneficiaries. The amount of the monthly installments under the latter mode of payment is dependent upon the age of the beneficiary at date of death of insured. For example, if the beneficiary is then 40 years old, monthly installment is $4.50 for each $1,000 of insurance; if 50, $5.39; if 60, $6.81; if 70, $8.51.

CLAIMS

All claims for insurance benefits should be addressed to the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., but necessary forms may be secured from the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

United States Government life (converted) insurance: This insurance can be applied for only by those who served in World War No. 1. No one may have more than $10,000 national service life insurance and Government (converted) insurance combined.

Insurance premiums are guaranteed by Government under Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended: Any person in the active service having a commercial life policy or policies meeting the requirements of said law, article IV, may, upon application to the Veterans' Administration on form supplied the Army and Navy, secure guaranty of premiums, on amount of insurance not in excess of $10,000, while he is in the service during the present war. The insurance premiums so guaranteed by the Government constitute a lien against the policy and must be paid by the company out of any settlement thereof. In the event of the insured's discharge from service, he has a period of 2 years within which to pay the premiums with interest so guaranteed; or otherwise such indebtedness constitutes a loan on the policy with interest and if the amount of such indebtedness exceeds the cash surrender value the policy is automatically canceled and the Government pays the insurer the difference between such cash surrender value and the indebtedness. Forms for making application for such insurance protection are supplied to the War and Navy Departments and may be secured in person or from his commanding officer or other designated official.

As of March 31, 1944, 72,204 applications with insurance totaling $178,189,853.21 have been approved and premiums guaranteed.

INSURANCE UNDER OTHER LAWS

Old-age and survivors insurance is administered by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; unemployment benefits by Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; retirement by Railroad Retirement Board and Civil Service Commission. Credit for active military or naval service is allowed for civil-service retirement and railroad retirement purposes.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mustering-out pay is provided by the act of February 3, 1944, Public Law 225, Seventy-eighth Congress, and is administered by the War and Navy Departments. The amounts are from $100 to $300.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES

Administered by the War and Navy Departments for dependents of those in the service. Your Congressman can supply many details about this subject and help get delayed allotments straightened out for dependents of servicemen.

DOMICILIARY CARE

United States Soldiers' Home, under jurisdiction of the War Department; Naval Home, under jurisdiction of the Navy Department. This is in addition to that provided by the Veterans' Administration.

GUARDIANSHIP

Supervision is maintained in cooperation with the State courts, over payments of any benefits made on account of insane or minor beneficiaries to insure proper application of such benefits.

RETIREMENT PAY

Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard: For officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Establishment, and reserve components of Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

TAXES

Bureau of Internal Revenue: All veteran benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration are exempt from all taxation. Special consideration is shown in the income-tax laws for those in the service.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE

Up to the amount of $100 may be paid for any war veteran, honorably discharged or in receipt of pension or compensation, as to any veteran discharged from the armed forces for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

A United States flag to drape the casket, subsequently to be turned over to the next of kin, may be furnished as to any veteran, discharged honorably after active service during any war or after serving at least one enlistment or by reason of disability incurred in line of duty. Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, as to his minor children or adult unmarried daughters. The expenses incident to transporting the body of one who has died while in active service, or of a veteran who has died in a Veterans' Administration facility, to the place of burial, are, within limitations, borne by the Government. Headstone or marker—stone or marble—will be furnished for the unmarked grave of any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who died while in the active service.

Various benefits, rights, and privileges are also provided as to certain veterans, their dependents, and their organizations under State laws, as per the resumé thereof, as published by the House Committee on Pensions, entitled "State Veterans' Laws."

CIVIL, SPANISH, AND OTHER WARS

Pensions on the basis of age, degree of inability to earn a living, and/or length of service for, first, Civil War veterans in the amount of $75 per month, or $100, if in need of a regular attendant; second, Indian war veterans in amounts ranging from $20 to $60 per month, or $100 if in need of an attendant; and, third, veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion in amounts ranging from $12 to $75 per month, plus varying amounts if in need of a regular attendant, with total not to exceed $100, but only $20 while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by the United States or a political subdivision thereof if the veteran has no dependents, provided that as to those in a soldiers' home continually since on or before July 15, 1943, the pension not to exceed $50 shall be continued.

Pensions at lower rates than above are available to veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion based upon service of 70 days or more, but less than 90 days.

Pension under the Economy Act of March 20, 1933, and the veterans' regulations promulgated thereunder, as amended, of $50 per month for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, or World War No. 1, with 90 days or more of honorable service, or if less than 90 days, if discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, who suffer with permanent total disability, regardless of service connection, if not due to misconduct. Only $8 per month is paid to single men, without dependents, while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by a Government agency.

EDUCATION

Congress provided in 1944 that any veteran who served on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and whose education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service, or who desires a refresher or retraining course, and who served 90 days or more, is entitled to education at public expense. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition and books and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if single and $75 if married, not to exceed 4 years. Any person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service is assumed to have had his education interrupted. Veterans must meet the regular entrance and scholarship requirements.

FARM, HOME, AND SMALL BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

The Federal Government, through the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, will guarantee up to 50 percent and as high as $2,000 of any approved loan secured by a veteran from a private or Govern-

ment source for purchase or operation of a farm, home, or small business. Loans will be interest free the first year and interest will not exceed 4 percent per annum. Applications for this benefit must be made to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs within 2 years after discharge by those who served in the armed forces on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of this war.

JOBS

Congress provided, in 1944, in addition to the foregoing education, farm, home, and small business opportunities, that every veteran of World War No. 2 shall be helped to find a job. The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board cooperate to fill this responsibility. Veterans are to be registered and every effort made to assist them to find jobs. This provision includes veterans of all wars. Information on how to get the benefits of this provision can be obtained by the veteran from his own local United States Employment Office in his home town or county.

Return to the job after discharge is under jurisdiction of Selective Service; placing in other jobs is under War Manpower Commission; veterans' preference is administered by United States Civil Service Commission and various departments and agencies; job training, rehabilitation (nonservice disability) is administered by Federal Security Agency.

Certain preferences as to Federal civil service, as to physical and age prerequisites, examinations, ratings, appointments, retentions, and reinstatement of Federal employment, are extended to qualified service-connected disabled veterans, the wives of unemployable service-connected or 50-year-aged pensioned veterans, the widows of veterans, and other war veterans and regulars, supplemented by extensive United States Employment Service, and Veterans Employment Service, in every State, for war veterans. Any World War No. 2 veteran who applies therefor, within 40 days after discharge, is entitled to reinstatement to the Federal position held at time of entering service, or to one of equal grade and pay, or to his previous private employment, where at all practicable for employer, enforceable by order of court, if necessary.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Congress provided in 1944 that for the first 2 years after a veteran's discharge he will be entitled to unemployment compensation for 52 weeks if he cannot find a job or the Employment Service cannot find one for him. This allowance is $20 per week, less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of $3. Provisions for unemployment compensation, farm, home, and business ownership and education, are part of the so-called "G. I. bill of rights," one of many veterans' bills prepared in 1943–44 by the World War Veterans' Committee, of which I am a member.

In passing the G. I. bill of rights Congress has taken the first important step toward providing for returning veterans. I repeat, it is only the first step. Congress has many things yet to do in order to completely round out this all-important program. I again invite the servicemen, veterans, and their dependents to continue to write me concerning their problems. Simply address such correspondence to Congressman JOHN B. BENNETT, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

VETERANS EXPRESS APPRECIATION

Mr. Speaker, the following letter is a letter of appreciation I have received from the national legislative committee of the American Legion, approving my work for the veterans, signed by Francis M. Sullivan, executive director of the committee, and by Hon. John Stelle, chairman, American Legion special committee on rehabilitation legislation for World War No. 2 veterans. Mr. Stelle is a former Governor of the great State of Illinois. Both men have many years of experience in veterans' problems and their advice and counsel was of great value to our committee in perfecting this constructive legislation which will be so important to the veterans of this war and to the future of our country:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 20, 1944.*

Hon. JOHN B. BENNETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The American Legion is most grateful to you for the earnest, intelligent consideration and effort you have given to S. 1767, which provides Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans.

It was gratifying to observe that the House of Representatives appreciated the work of your committee. This was reflected in the Members following the leadership of Chairman RANKIN and the committee members when the measure was up in the House for consideration.

Naturally, we of the American Legion are very proud of our part in this program. We feel when the measure becomes a law that the proper plans may be made for the day when the war will have been won and there will be mass demobilization of the present-day members of the armed forces.

We believe the privileges which will be afforded by the terms of S. 1767 to World War No. 2 veterans is a sound investment in the future of our Nation. The proposal represents an intelligent approach to the problem of readjustment in civilian life of the World War No. 2 veteran.

Again we express our appreciation for your splendid work in connection with S. 1767.

JOHN STELLE,
Chairman, Special Committee on Rehabilitation Legislation, World War No. 2 Veterans.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, National Legislative Committee, American Legion.

Fireworks in the W. P. B.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from the Washington Post of Monday, August 28, 1944:

FIREWORKS IN THE W. P. B.

(By Mark Sullivan)

NELSON AND WILSON

The explosion in the War Production Board last week was sensational, and more developments will follow. But to see it as merely a clash or series of clashes, or to think of it as something within one Government department, would be superficial. The condition is wider and deeper than that. Consider just what happened.

In one of the most important administration departments, W. P. B., the No. 2 man is out. This No. 2 man, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, was powerful in the administration, as Vice Chairman of W. P. B., and also powerful in his own right—in private life he is head of the General Electric Co.

This No. 2 man is out, not because the No. 1 man wanted him out. The No. 1 man, Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of W. P. B., did not fire Mr. Wilson; he assured Mr. Wilson that he was fully satisfactory.

Neither is Mr. Wilson out because the President wanted him out. The President received his resignation reluctantly, and on two previous occasions when Mr. Wilson wanted to resign Mr. Roosevelt persuaded him to remain.

Why, then, is Mr. Wilson out? It is a remarkable reason. He stated it in his letter of resignation, and amplified it in even stronger words at a press conference. Mr. Wilson is out because of "attacks" upon him "inspired by subordinate officials of the board." These attacks, inspired by subordinate officials, and circulated publicly, were without the "knowledge or approval of Mr. Nelson." Yet, though the head of the W. P. B. did not approve the attacks, he was apparently unable to stop them. Mr. Wilson apprehended that "instead of being discontinued, these attacks upon me * * * will be increased." So, Mr. Wilson got out.

Here is a remarkable condition—the subordinates more powerful than the head of their own department—and more powerful than even the President, for, in getting Mr. Wilson out, they achieved a result which the President did not want, which he acutely deplored.

The condition is at once so startling and so difficult to grasp that it cannot be too much emphasized. Here is a group of men, subordinates in a Government department. They are not responsible to the public, the public has never heard their names. They are not responsible to Congress. They are responsible only to the head of their department, and above him to the President. Yet, against the wish of the head of their department and of the President, they do something which profoundly affects public policy and the conduct of public business, including conduct of the war, because the Army and Navy are dependent on W. P. B. for supplies.

To a large extent the Government has come to be operated by anonymous officials of subordinate rank. One reason is mere size, sprawling unwieldiness. In departments, more things must be done than can be done by the head of the department. And in the administration as a whole, more things must be done than any President or any man can have adequate information or sufficient time for thought to do. Heads of departments, and even more the President, must take action on the basis of reports put up to them by subordinates, sometimes accompanied by judgments suggested by the subordinates.

Some remedies are in sight. End of the war, by reducing the number of controls exercised by the Federal Government, will reduce the burdens on department heads and on the President, and reduce the number of subordinate officials. Another remedy is decentralization, preventing the Federal Government from taking over functions now exercised by the States. That Congress has this

in mind is shown by its insistence that the administration of unemployment benefits for war workers shall be carried on by the States, not by the Federal Government.

Address of Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following able address of Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy, former United States Ambassador to Great Britain, at the annual dinner of the American Gastroenterological Association at the Drake Hotel, Chicago, Ill., Monday, June 12, 1944:

At this hour, when the country breathlessly awaits the fortunes of battle, anything we say here must, perforce, sound empty and dull. Heartened and strengthened as we are by the realization of what is transpiring, our personal views seem pitifully unimportant.

Yet, however inadequate our efforts, the one thing everyone must do for those actually engaged in the struggle, is to lend a hand when asked, to the job of getting some shape and form for the post-war world. That is the excuse I offer for presuming even at your invitation to discuss a public question at a time like this.

Our subject—post-war monetary policies—is timely and pertinent, if anything except the battle itself can be so regarded.

Concerning money matters, one of the outstanding editorial writers of our time, the late Arthur Brisbane, once wrote that not over 20 people know anything about money, and 15 of them didn't know very much.

If Mr. Brisbane's arithmetic is correct, then there are only five men alive who know much about money, and by the law of averages I am assuming that none of that five is in this audience. Thus reassured, I may safely proceed to interview myself on the subject of post-war money policies.

And I do so, speaking seriously, because I believe that the monetary policies adopted for the post-war world are a matter of very deep concern to you and to me and to every American citizen. Wars and the consequences of war are paid for by the Government bonds that you buy and the taxes that you pay. We are all very conscious of our participation in bond campaigns and I have but to remind you of that fact in urging wholehearted participation in the fifth war loan drive now starting. Regardless of what progress may be made in the solution of post-war difficulties we must all be prepared to buy more bonds and in making this investment I urge you to buy with the intention and plan of holding them to maturity and not listen to the fanciful suggestion that directly the fighting stops you cash them in and spend the money on things you have been doing without. These bonds are designed to be held to maturity and to the extent that they are not held they will constitute a continuing problem which must result in continued high taxes and perennial new issues of bonds.

We must be prepared also to continue paying taxes not only those we are directly conscious of, like taxes on our income, but the invisible taxes on every article we buy and every service we receive. This is our task.

Apart from bonds and taxes, I would like to discuss the other pertinent questions in the mind of our typical American citizen. Public opinion surveys show that after wondering when the war will end he is thinking principally about three things. First, am I going to have a job after the war? Second, will the money in which I am paid have as much purchasing power as today's dollar? And, finally, will my children have to go to war all over again?

Stated in one-word language, the average American fears unemployment, inflation, and another war.

It would be rash, under existing circumstances, for anyone to attempt a categorical answer to these questions. I have found it prudent in my own personal affairs never to attempt a forecast beyond the probabilities indicated by factors already definitely known, and I will say to you that, so far as I can see, and judging from anything anyone now knows, it can safely be said that even after several million women and children have been dropped from pay rolls, a great many of the 53,000,000 now employed must accept temporary idleness when 11,000,000 now in service are assimilated into industry.

Conferences of experts and officials will doubtless devise ways and means to find work for many, but much of the increased productive machinery created by the exigencies of war is likely to be idle.

In spite of pent-up demands to be satisfied normal business alone cannot give full employment to 65,000,000 people now in industry, on Government pay roll and in the services.

The output of our total plant capacity—which capacity enabled us to double the entire output of the Axis—is much more than the daily needs our population will require 3 to 4 years after the war. Even civilian output increased 15 percent during the war.

The volume of business we are doing today is creating a national income of $147,000,000,000.

The highest national income in peacetime history was approximately $82,000,000,000 in 1929, only to decline with unprecedented and disastrous speed to $46,000,000,000 in 1932–33—actually down to the level of 1916, the year before we entered the First World War.

In the 8 years immediately preceding 1940 it never exceeded $72,000,000,000 and not until stimulated by defense and war preparation was the 1929 peak exceeded, which occurred in 1941.

It is obvious that we must do a business in this country capable of producing an annual national income of far in excess of normal if the sixty-odd-million employees are to have jobs. No one can now assure you business will be good continuously. Indeed no one can be sure how much business will drop from today's $147,000,000,000 during the 5 or 6 years following the war's conclusion. We saw it drop 44 percent in 3 years following the 1929 splurge.

Incidentally, if business were to drop to what was boom proportions in 1929 ($82,000,000,000) it would mean depression today.

I see nothing to be gained by encouraging baseless hopes. I know that pledges are being given that employment shall be provided for everybody and maybe the yearners and planners who retail that kind of optimism know how it can be done. It clearly cannot be done by the Government at the expense of the people through unlimited expansion of public debt. Our debt is now $196,000,000,000 and on the completion of this drive just started it will be well in excess of $210,000,000,000. Conservatively it is being forecast to land somewhere between $250,000,000,000 and $300,000,000,000 before the war ends and, in fact, Congress on May 31 last expanded the legal debt limit to $260,000,000,000. Frankly, I cannot comprehend the implications of such staggering totals. I know what a million dollars is and what it means and even what it takes to get it, but frankly I am lost in awe when that yardstick is multiplied by thousands.

I know all the spurious generalities and the loose talk that is indulged in about debt. "The size of the national debt," one of these planners recently said, "is of no consequence. After all, we just owe it to ourselves." I gave up trying to understand that one, except that I know perfectly well that when Government bonds are outstanding in anyone's hands, American citizens or foreigners, a debt and an interest charge has been created which must be met. You, as a taxpayer, must furnish the means with which your Government meets its obligations. The transfer of funds creates less friction when distributed at home instead of abroad, but in no other way does the fact that the national debt is owned by American citizens reduce the burden.

Furthermore, no government can guarantee full employment if such must depend upon unlimited expansion of the public debt.

Experience everywhere has shown that even industrialized nations cannot long endure an annual fixed charge in excess of 25 percent of national income. The total budgetary expenditure of this country with $250,000,000,000 net debt, and exclusive of debt retirement but including care of veterans we are fortunate enough to welcome home, will exceed $23,000,000,000, a sum which is almost 30 percent of any national income enjoyed in any but war-stimulated years.

Sensibly we must conclude, therefore, that there is no promise under normal peacetime conditions of a balanced budget and a national income safely permitting the Government to find work for all the 30,000,000 people whom former President Hoover, for instance, predicts must be demobilized from the war effort.

This debt and service burden is a contributing factor to the answer to our second question, namely, for those of us who will have work in the post-war world, what will the money with which our wages are paid be worth? And here you will say I am raising up the ugly head of inflation. Unfortunately for those who would enjoy what is called "a free ride" and "a silk-shirt boom" such as followed 1918, I am frankly, with what knowledge I possess and with the facts and statistics that are available, unable to persuade myself that inflation is as real a danger as deflation. I appreciate that there is a tremendous purchasing power demand for goods that are now under Government quota control and that once those controls are lifted the would-be purchasers have at hand the effective means of paying for what they want in the shape of enormous savings.

I would remind you, however, first, we are officially told that Government controls are not going to be abandoned on most of the manufactured articles going into civilian consumption and, second, that no one knows what the frame of mind of the public will be, which during the progress of war with swollen war wages has seen fit to put so large a percentage of their earnings into savings and into Government bonds. I am familiar with the spending spree that followed the First World War, but the attitude of mind which caused the individual civilian to spend his money recklessly then was generated by factors not in the present situation. For one thing, bank deposits doubled in 2 years. Of the $100,000,000,000 estimated liquid assets in the hands of the public today, bank deposits are only 25 percent larger than a few years ago. European currency fluctuations scared our people into spending 25 years ago, whereas today steps are being taken as indicated by the forthcoming Bretton Woods Monetary Conference to forestall such possibilities.

Finally, we must recognize the fact that after 5 years of defense and war production, supplies of many raw materials actually exist in surplus creating a problem of distribution, and some agricultural items now seem to be unnecessarily rationed.

In answer to the question of what kind of commodity dollar are we going to have after the war, I say with some confidence that it will buy for you just as many of the necessities of life as it does today, because I fully expect that Governmenta controls and priorities are not going to be abandoned for some time.

I take it for granted also that our currency dollar is going to be good, that the gold content of the dollar and its value in foreign exchange is not going to be changed. The traditional American policy is for stabilized currency. That was true, for instance, in 1862 when Abraham Lincoln in his second message to Congress said, "Fluctuations in value of currency are always injurious and to reduce these fluctuations to the lowest possible point will always be a leading purpose in wise legislation."

It was true on July 1, 1933, when President Franklin Roosevelt said that he planned to establish a dollar that would have the same purchasing power from generation to generation.

I take it that inflation is no part of anybody's agenda.

If it is, then there is no way of answering the third question, namely, what really are the prospects for a holiday from war.

What part are we to play in stabilizing international conditions? Our stake therein is great and it will undoubtedly be very much to our own interests that much of the aid we give Europe after the war shall be without any idea of repayment. It will be what President Roosevelt called, last week, an investment in peace. Such contribution, however, cannot be unlimited; because, strange as it may seem to say it, our resources are not unlimited. The contribution must remain within our means. And above all, the people, on whom the cost will fall, must be convinced that gifts made possible by their sacrifice are being used wisely. Otherwise there will be disillusionment, repulsion of sentiment and withdrawal of future cooperation.

People will watch for each sign in Europe and in Asia, of vigorous and courageous grappling with reconstruction; they will watch jealously the efforts made on currency stabilization, and if their funds are to be used, as the New York Times stated, "to support the currencies of China, Ethiopia and Iraq," and thereby "to support the internal economic policies of those countries," they are going to ask how long these burdens can be afforded by this country and why the same results cannot be attained by sound currency policies within each nation.

If we remember that no peace is durable which cannot be endured, if we remember Prime Minister Churchill's obligation on the part of the leading allies "to keep within certain minimum standards of armaments for the purpose of maintaining peace" we will get some idea of why sound economic conditions are essential prerequisites of any formula for preventing war; for we cannot do even the minimum that Mr. Churchill suggests if we are not economically sound.

No one can present a pattern for peaceful living, but it is absolutely essential that the principal Allied Nations must first settle their domestic problems, balance their budgets, and strengthen their economic positions at home so that they may be free to assume a full share in the responsibility of establishing and maintaining peace for the world. I have no completed program to suggest, for it is much too early to be rigid about such things.

I recently said in a public address that "Blueprints, but not contracts, should be in the brief cases of those who will meet in the conferences of peace. The contracts can be let after the designs have been carefully inspected for fundamental errors that can be corrected on the blueprint but not in a finished structure."

I think we on our part can do that best by restoring as fully as possible the American way of living and, as I also said in Boston a few weeks ago, leaving to the other fellow the talk about expansion of foreign trade. Not of course "discontinuing the traditional American system of trading with the rest of the world subject to some tariff limitations."

And American labor must also be protected by the maintenance of immigration quotas.

It is essential to European countries that they live by foreign trade and we may as well recognize the fact that the bottleneck in foreign trade is our unwillingness to buy—not our ability to sell. Unless we give other nations an opportunity to acquire dollars, unless we are willing to take goods and services of others to the extent that we want them to take our goods and services, we are going to deprive them of an opportunity to make the living which we have sacrificed countless lives and spent billions to obtain for them.

Frankly, I can see vast business abroad during the period of necessary reconstruction and rehabilitation, until those immediate needs are satisfied. India and China, for instance, because of their teeming millions, are heralded as a source of foreign trade for us. Briefly, the prospect of huge exports to these countries during our lifetime seems remote. Irrigation, housing, road construction, of course—but it will be many years before the standard of living in those countries will improve enough to create a demand for our essential products. Let me remind you that the total of our exports for the last seven years before this war averaged $3,000,000,000 annually. We send twice as much as that out of our ports in war materials now every month. We cannot possibly expect under normal conditions demand sufficient to guarantee substantial foreign trade. We know perfectly well that if lend-lease isn't to continue indefinitely, foreign countries cannot afford to pay us for exports.

So that in answering the query, "What are the prospects of an enduring peace?" I say to you that unless conditions after the war are such that the smaller nations of the world are not subject to the ruinous economic struggle for foreign trade, which could only be the prelude to chaos and political upheaval abroad fomenting the seeds of war, no peace prospect is durable because no such peace would be endurable.

At home we must move surely and swiftly to see to it that capital, labor, and Government, separately and collectively, assume their obvious responsibilities in the post-war world.

I am confident that under Government leadership a workable program can be developed.

I hold no brief for the view that private capital exclusively exhibits virtues of conduct. I am sure that Government control can become irritating interference and I can see no sense in he labor policy that leads workmen to go on strike when a factory is faced with the inevitable discontinuance of war contracts such as occurred at the Brewster plant 2 weeks ago. How that procedure could help either the workmen themselves, labor, or the owners of the business, capital, or the Government of the Nation is another one of those things I am too dull to comprehend.

I think it is absolutely necessary immediately that businessmen recognize that no useful purpose could be served if all controls were to be lifted; that the Government recognize immediately that complete control amounting to interference with American business enterprises is absolutely destructive of the initiative which is the hallmark of our economy and that labor recognize immediately that, in the enormous work of industrial demobilization that lies ahead, it must assume some share of responsibility and that dislocation and relocation of workers is inevitable.

There is nothing more certain, and in this I have no hesistancy to assume the role of prophet, than that if we wish to avoid unemployment and if we wish to make the dollar paid for labor's wage valuable, capital, labor, and Government must sit down together and do some pretty solid constructive thinking. And they had better begin thinking pretty soon because cut-backs and cancelations are inevitable—because the invasion which has started marks the beginning of the end of our wartime economy. Demobilization of industries, adjustment of productive capacities to normal conditions or to peacetime conditions is not going to be done easily at best—it is going to be stymied if capital, labor, and Government are at loggerheads.

In the adjustment from war to peace conditions our citizens too have an important role. They should develop the maximum of capacity for understanding and assuming their responsibilities. If they know enough about what is going on, and if they understand it, they have the power to exercise sufficient control over private initiative, Government and labor alike, to make certain that the problems facing us are not only solved in the common interest but are placed in the charge of the best people available, irrespective of social status or party affiliations.

Similarly, in the international field, cooperation is essential. We will have crisis after crisis leading up to a third world war, if we do not, in accord with the other great powers like Britain and Russia, try to understand the problems of the smaller states. There is in the world everywhere today a very strong consciousness among the people of their nationhood. Today, after the scourge of German or Japanese or even Italian fascism, the victims have one fundamental desire, merely that of being left alone. They do not wish to be bossed, even by their friends and liberators, and any attempt on our part to tell these nations what they are to do, or any scheme of making such economic help as we may be able to give them conditional on their obeying, would only antagonize them and promote further discontent in the world. If we wish to exchange not only goods and services but also ideas, inventions, and other matters of the spirit and the mind with these nations, most of which are old civilizations, we must not approach them in a spirit of aloofness, but rather as friends and partners in the most stupendous undertaking the world has ever seen.

To summarize: I do believe that in the post-war world most of our people who want to work will have a job. But common sense tells me that with the slow tempo of peace, following the fulfillment of temporary pent-up demands, it is not going to be possible to give continuous full-time employment to 65,000,000 people now on private or public pay rolls. I am not afraid that the laborer's wage dollar will be made valueless by ruinous inflation. I do believe that an enduring peace is possible if ruinous economic competition does not make small nations forget and larger nations ignore their international responsibilities—to live and let live.

I am confident a way will be found to maintain a decent post-war world; to make America strong and to keep it strong, thereby best serving the world. As Congresswoman Luce so aptly said, "There are no hopeless situations—only hopeless men." I am far from hopeless—I merely wish to be prepared.

Through the efforts of government, business, and labor we can avoid depression; but not if we allow things to take their course. The Government will have to encourage in every possible way an increase in the volume of national production, usually referred to as national income, and to the free marketing

of an expanded production and these matters should receive attention before some of the desirable, but not urgent, social objectives. Government, for instance, while tiding over those who cannot immediately find jobs must create some jobs itself in public works, housing operations, and particularly by liberal financing of home buying.

Business associations, in turn, can devise methods of employment and labor, by agreeing to remove building restrictions, can greatly accelerate expansion.

Self-reliant as the American people are, they will match with their savings any efforts made in their behalf; and as a consequence of these mutual efforts of government, business, labor, and the people themselves, we protect and maintain the American standard of living.

Five years ago I was opposed to having a nation that was then unprepared, rushed headlong into a war which it would be asked both to fight and finance. I now urge with all the strength I command that America keep strong industrially and financially, and that we be not compelled by those who have the power to bind us to bear an onerous share of the expenses of world-wide social service, foreign trade, and world currencies.

I have no objection to our share of the social bill necessary to promote tranquillity and world-wide decent existence for all who merit it by cooperation. I have no patience with the view that, because our cities have not been devastated and gutted as I saw London scourged that therefore we have not suffered from this war. You can't tell that to the family whose boy is not coming home at the end of the war.

I am happy that we have been allowed to enjoy intact so many of the things that we consider our heritage and our daily needs. I think it would be cowardly to shrink from participation in the problem of straightening out this world wreckage. But it would be stupid in our generosity to forget ourselves. Help the rest of the world by all means—but don't commit America to endless burdens. Preserve internationalism but serve America. Out of all of this terrible turmoil some one nation should emerge strong enough to stand as a beacon of hope to the world.

Let America be that shining beacon.

But let us now agree on the message its flashes will send forth. And let us be certain that no man chosen to serve our people shall alter one word or letter in that message, which I hope will be:

"No inflation, either direct or by repudiating our bond. No deflation achieved through ruthless unemployment. Stabilization at home and all help to those abroad who do the same—but to those only."

This is the economic path to peace. No peace ever reached its goal, with strength to hold it, over any other path.

The Patriotism of Italian Americans—Hundreds of Thousands Contribute Small Sums in Fifth War Loan Drive To Help Insure Victory

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the conclusion of the Fifth War Loan drive has shown some very interesting facts relating to the people of Italian origin in the United States.

This drive, which was a part of the general War Loan drive, was intended to reach every man, woman, and child of Italian origin residing in the State of New York. The State of New York is particularly mentioned since it contains within its borders a larger proportion of people of Italian origin than any State in the Union.

Many years ago it has been said facetiously that the city of New York contained more Italians than the city of Rome or Naples or any other fair-sized city of the Italian Peninsula. In fact, there was a current story that when Thomas Nelson Page, who was a native New Yorker, was appointed by President Wilson to represent the United States as our Ambassador to Italy, he said that he found the position very congenial, since in his own life he had met so many Italians in the city of New York that coming to Rome was like coming home.

This year, 1944, stands out also as the year in which fine progress was made by our armed forces in the Italian campaign and in which the American Army administration in occupied Italian territory is full of praise for the splendid cooperation it received from the people of Italy.

After the nightmare of fascism has been removed and the destruction of all that fascism stood for has been achieved by the people of Italy themselves, we found not only a defeated enemy, but what is more important, a loyal and cooperative friend.

For 22 years the people of that unhappy country suffered from the exaggerated pretensions of an upstart who tried to bully and dominate not only his own nation, but the world. Long before Hitler started on his career of conquest, Mussolini likewise tried to convert a law-abiding and sweet population into a nation of bullies and cutthroats.

It is to the eternal honor of the Italian people that after suffering from the tyrannical domination of this unhappy product of the last World War, they were finally able to rid themselves of the monster and resume their proper places in the family of nations.

The nation of Dante, of Petrarch, Tasso, and Verdi, came to know the measure of Mussolini and find him as utterly unfit to represent it as the many other tyrants who grew up in Europe in the era between the two World Wars.

Among the people of the United States, it was the people of Italian origin who forever were in the ranks of our honest and law-abiding citizens. They have reached distinction in many fields, particularly in the field of arts for which their natural genius so plentifully endows them. It would be unthinkable to find a more gifted race in the field of music, poetry, painting, sculpture, and many other products of human genius than you find among the people of Italian origin. In this country there is no greater symphony orchestra than that conducted by Arturo Toscanini, who is himself a refugee from the terror of fascism. The list of their great names could be multiplied indefinitely. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to the contribution made by such fine artists to the collective stream of American culture.

I do not wish, however, to expatiate on the artistic phase of Italy's contribution to American civilization. I wish to stress at this time the continued loyalty of its sons and daughters to the cause of democracy, a loyalty which was stilted and stifled during the years of Mussolini's ascendancy. Those years are a nightmare which we all wish to forget, and while it was 22 years of misery, nevertheless we hope there will be no recurrence of any such Caesarism in sunny Italy.

If I may digress for a moment, in the story of nations there comes a time when tyrants seize power and when the voice of the people is stilled. But, invariably a resurrection takes place and I know that, in God's scheme of things, it is not given that tyranny retain its control over the lives of the people.

The Fifth War Loan drive was another instance of a spontaneous response by the average man, woman, and child to the call of his country for loyal contributions to make victory secure. It was in this spirit that the Committee for Americans of Italian Origin of the State of New York set itself the goal of disposing of a large amount of bonds. We now have their report. It shows that $70,000,000 worth of bonds were sold during this drive to 836,715 individuals. This indicates again how many small contributions go to make up a large sum like $70,000,000.

At the present time when billions are the order of the day and when our national expenditures are measured by billions of dollars, $70,000,000 may not look like a very large sum, but if one considers that in order to arrive at this figure it was necessary to obtain contributions from 836,715 individuals, it is clear that this is no mean effort and no mean achievement.

I have before me the report divided into cities, counties, villages, and hamlets of the State of New York. There are in this list names of individuals who humbly purchased but $25 bonds, as well as others who have become purchasers of bonds of $500 or $1,000 or even more, but all these contributions of the people of Italian origin of the State of New York are in comparatively small amounts.

The intention of the committee was not to reach the wealthy who could purchase their own securities through their banks or their brokers. It was the humble purchaser of the $25 bond who was particularly dear to the committee, since such an individual would usually stint himself to buy a bond and would not buy a bond for investment. As in the former War Loan drives, many of these humble contributors did not wish to invest money in War bonds as a means of savings. They wish to give to the Government and while it is the intention of the Government to repay for such loan with interest, it is not the desire of these people to see their money returned to them, which animates these

humble purchasers, but on the contrary should they be permitted to make outright gifts to the Government, they would feel proud and happy to do so.

I have encountered many men in my own constituency who have urged me to accept small gifts for the Government to prosecute the war and who were rather disappointed that they were obliged to buy bonds which the Government would repay with interest rather than accept their contributions in cash. The prevailing spirit of these persons, however, is the spirit of sacrifice, the spirit of giving and not lending, the spirit of sharing and not demanding, the spirit of sacrifice and not selfishness, the spirit of devotion and not egoism.

In this list, which I consider an honor roll of the Italian people, we will find the names of men and women who make no claim to fame or importance, whose names will not be emblazoned on monuments and public buildings, but simple men, simple women, the sons and daughters of an honorable race and true and loyal citizens of the United States.

The Fifth War Loan drive of the Committee for Americans of Italian Origin in the State of New York, was conducted by Gene Pope, who was the chairmar of the drive and of whose patriotism there can be no question and whose success was only rivaled by previous successes which I had occasion to comment upon on the floor of the House. He has done a splendid job, in a self-sacrificing manner and deserves the thanks of all of our citizens.

Governor Dewey and the Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, informed citizens of New York State must be vastly puzzled with Governor Dewey's boastful embrace of his soldiers' vote law. His rejection of the Federal ballot can hardly call for the self-satisfaction he displays. When asserting that New York State leads others in percentages of war applications received, Governor Dewey omits the fact that in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Connecticut, which do not require application, almost 100 percent of the voters in service have already received their ballots. He makes no mention of the disenfranchised merchant marine New Yorkers or those serving abroad in the U. S. O. and Red Cross.

The following editorial, which appeared in today's New York Times, is an apt summary of the entangled New York State soldiers' vote law:

THE SOLDIER'S BALLOT

The State war ballot commission reports that applications for ballots have been received thus far from some 400,000 members of the armed forces who are residents of New York, and Governor Dewey hails this as proof that the State has taken adequate steps to "safeguard for its men and women in uniform their constitutional right to a full ballot." We hope that the Governor's confidence is justified. But it is certainly premature, and it certainly does not give the vote to members of the merchant marine or Red Cross workers.

It is premature because these are only applications and because, under the State law, a good many things must happen before an application becomes a ballot. The State's regulations set September 7 as the date when the first ballots will be mailed to those who have applied for them. All ballots must be returned by November 3 if they are to be counted. This leaves a period of just 57 days in which ballots mailed from Albany must catch up with soldiers and sailors who will in many thousands of cases have been moved to entirely new stations in the meantime, and for these soldiers and sailors to return their ballots to the State war ballot commission, the war ballot commission to send them to the counties, and the counties to send them to the assembly districts and the electoral districts.

It was the virtue of the Federal ballot, which Governor Dewey has held to be unconstitutional in New York, that it did at least provide a short ballot, distributed on the spot, to those whose full State ballots went astray. Obviously the chance of ballots going astray increases in direct proportion to the nearness of the soldier and sailor to the actual fighting fronts. Under the State law, those who are taking the greatest risks have the smallest chance of voting.

No critic of the State law ever contended that it did not make adequate provision for applying for ballots. The question has been whether it makes adequate provision for voting. And here the proof of the pudding must be in the eating. The only valid basis on which to pronounce the State law a success, if it is a success, is on the results achieved on November 7.

G. I. Bill of Rights—Questions and Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I, at the request of several of my colleagues, am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a discussion of the G. I. bill of rights:

The ANNOUNCER. Iowa Legionnaires are fortunate in having at the microphone this morning the Honorable PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Congressman from the Fifth District of Iowa, to give us some of the salient facts about the G. I. bill of rights. Certainly, no one is better equipped or more fully informed on this important legislation than Congressman CUNNINGHAM, who, as a member of the conferees of Congress, which prepared the bill, was very active in the drafting of the bill, and who, as a committee member of the Veterans' Committee of the House of Representatives, has the veterans' welfare at heart. It is a pleasure to present our own Iowa Legionnaire, a member of Baldwin-Patterson Post, of Des Moines, the Honorable PAUL CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Good morning, friends. Thousands of discharged service men and women of this war are writing the Veterans' Administration in Washington about opportunities offered them under the American Legion's G. I. bill of rights, which was signed as Public Law, 346, on June 22.

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, said that in the first month after the bill was signed his office had received more than 4,000 letters of general inquiry. In addition, there have been more than 1,000 applications for educational benefits provided under title II of the new law, to veterans who want to resume their schooling.

As a result of the widespread interest among veterans concerning educational and vocational training benefits granted under the new law, application forms for those who seek to take advantage of these benefits have been distributed to the Veterans' Administration's 51 field stations.

With such intensive, Nation-wide interest in this educational program for our veterans, both men and women, it is my thought that perhaps we can use this broadcast period so generously donated to the American Legion by radio station WHO, in a sort of question and answer session which may clarify many items or benefits in the program.

First, any veteran who served 90 days or more, and who had not passed his twenty-fifth birthday at the time of entry into service, is automatically eligible to educational or vocational training benefits, even though he was not in school when he enlisted or was inducted.

Veterans who had passed their twenty-fifth birthdays fall in two classes:

No. 1. In this first group are those who had finished their education or vocational training and who desire a refresher or retraining course in order to brush up on their work, but for a period of 1 year only.

No. 2. In this second group are those who can prove that their education or vocational training was interrupted by entry into service, and are, therefore, entitled to as much as 4 years of schooling.

In all cases, however, the veteran must show 90 days or more service, unless he was discharged for disability incurred in line of duty.

The veteran is free to attend any school or training institution he desires, provided that he can measure up to its general scholastic standards. For instance, if a college or university requires certain high school credits, the veteran must be able to show that he possesses them if he wishes to enter that school.

If a veteran should be rejected by a school because of scholastic credit requirements, there is nothing to prevent him from entering some other school to which his high school or college credits are acceptable.

The Government will then pay tuition and fees up to $500 a year, plus $50 a month subsistence for single men or $75 for those who have wives or other dependents.

I am glad to report that veterans eligible for educational benefits are automatically entitled to 1 year of schooling. How much additional schooling they get is determined by the length of their active service in the armed forces, but in no case may the total exceed 4 years.

Servicemen who participated in the Army Specialized Training Program or the Navy College Training Program are not entitled to educational benefits if either of these programs enabled them to complete a course of study which they had started before entering service.

However, if a man were studying architecture when he entered service, and he was then required to take an engineering course under either program, he would be eligible after discharge to complete his architectural

training under the educational benefits section of the G. I. bill.

But let's take a look at a set of very pertinent questions which were prepared by the American Legion. Perhaps we can answer most of these and thereby assist the veteran in a better understanding of the G. I. bill of rights while complete regulations are being drawn by the Veterans' Administration.

Here's what the Legion's G. I. bill of rights does for service men and women.

Question. Is any veteran eligible to the benefits provided by the G. I. bill?

Answer. No. Only those veterans who served 90 days or more after September 16, 1940, and who were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, are eligible.

Question. What if a man is wounded or disabled before he has served 90 days?

Answer. The 90-day restriction does not apply if he was discharged for disability incurred in line of duty.

Question. Does the time spent in school under the Army Specialized Training Program or the Navy College Training Program count as active service under the Legion's G. I. bill?

Answer. Not if the veteran completed a course of study which he had begun in civil life before entering service.

Question. If I was under 25 years old when I entered service, am I eligible to return to college and finish my course in medicine?

Answer. So long as you had not passed your twenty-fifth birthday when you entered service, you are automatically eligible to all of the educational benefits of the G. I. bill.

Question. I have a friend who was over 25 and was just starting to practice law when he entered service; now he feels that he has to brush up on his law because he was away from it so long. Is he eligible for aid?

Answer. If a man was over 25 when entering service, he has two opportunities: (1) He is automatically eligible for a 1-year refresher or retraining course; (2) he can get the same educational benefits as other men by proving that his education was interrupted by entry into service.

Question. Are nurses, WAVES, WAC's, SPARS, and Marine Women Reservists eligible for benefits under the G. I. bill?

Answer. They are, and on the same terms as men.

Question. Where can a veteran apply for aid under the G. I. bill?

Answer. He may consult the service officer of any American Legion post or ask the manager or contact representative of any of the branches of the Veterans' Administration.

Question. If I want to enter my State university, what can I do?

Answer. Go to the registrar with your honorable discharge and your high-school and other credits. He will tell you whether you are qualified to enter and will show you what forms to fill out for submission to the Veterans' Administration.

Question. Do I have to wait until the Veterans' Administration acts before I can enter school?

Answer. The rules and regulations are now being drawn, but the plan is to have the school certify you as a student eligible to veterans' benefits so that you can enroll at once.

Question. How much will the Government pay toward the cost of my schooling?

Answer. Up to $500 a year in tuition, fees, and similar costs.

Question. Will I receive anything to support myself?

Answer. Yes; $50 a month if you are single and $75 if you have a wife or other dependents.

Question. How long may I remain in school?

Answer. If you were under 25 when you entered service, you will receive 1 year of schooling for your first 90 days of qualifying service, plus a period equal to the time you spent in active service over 90 days.

Question. If I am out of a job, what do I do?

Answer. Go to your American Legion service officer and also register for work with the United States Employment Service, which will ask you to report regularly.

Question. Will I get any money while I am waiting for a job?

Answer. Yes. You will be paid $20 a week for unemployment which begins after the first Sunday in September 1944.

Question. How long will this last?

Answer. It can last as long as 52 weeks.

Question. Do all veterans get that much?

Answer. No. Less than 90 days, no entitlement, but a man who served 90 days receives 8 weeks of benefits for each month of active service, or 24 weeks.

Question. If a man served more than 90 days, how much would he be paid?

Answer. He would be eligible for 24 weeks of benefits for his first 90 days and 4 additional weeks for each month of active service above 90 days, but in no case may he draw benefits for more than 52 weeks.

Question. If a man finds work while he is drawing benefits, what happens?

Answer. The benefits stop.

Question. If he should lose his job after a short time, but has not used all of the benefits due him, what happens?

Answer. He may again draw benefits for the number of weeks remaining to his credit.

Question. How does the Employment Service help a man find a job?

Answer. It keeps a list of jobs and will refer veterans to employers for employment.

Question. Suppose I lose my job because of a strike?

Answer. If you have not participated in the strike, you may still draw benefits.

Question. Do I have to accept a job in a place where there is a strike?

Answer. You do not.

Question. Do I have to take any job that is offered in order to be eligible for help?

Answer. You do if the job is in line with your ability and talent.

Question. Some jobs do not pay what they ought to.

Answer. If the salary, hours, and working conditions of the job that is offered to you are not up to the standards of similar jobs in your home area, you do not have to accept it, and you may still draw the unemployment benefits.

Question. If I want to learn a trade instead of going to school, may I do that?

Answer. Yes. The Veterans' Administration is making up a list of private employers who will provide veterans with the opportunity to learn a trade which they are suited to teach.

Question. Could I learn to be a machinist?

Answer. Provision is made so that you can learn to be a machinist, foundryman, printer, engraver, barber, automobile mechanic, farmer, or any other occupation you choose.

Question. If I want to borrow money to buy or build a home, how do I go about it?

Answer. Go to your own bank or building and loan association.

Question. Won't the Government lend me anything directly?

Answer. No. The Government merely insures or endorses half of the amount of your loan.

Question. How much can I get this way?

Answer. That "half" may amount to as much as $2,000, so that most men with reasonable credit and earning power will be able to get $4,000.

Question. I have a friend who wants to buy a $10,000 house; what will he do?

Answer. If he has good credit and prospects of a good income, the Veterans' Administration will insure $2,000 of the amount and the Federal Housing Administration or other agency will insure the balance.

Question. Then some veterans can buy a $10,000 house without any cash outlay of their own?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. Why was this arrangement made?

Answer. Because many men with good earning power have been in service a long time, and their savings have been used during their absence in the armed forces.

Question. May I borrow money to buy a farm or set myself up in business?

Answer. Yes; you may borrow money under this plan for any business which you are qualified to operate. You also may borrow money to repair your house, pay taxes, and to buy farm machinery, equipment, and livestock.

Question. Then I could build or buy a filling station, garage, barber shop, drugstore, hardware store, meat market, or grocery?

Answer. You could.

Question. How long will I have to repay my loan?

Answer. As long as 20 years, depending on how much you borrow and for what purpose.

Question. If I should become sick or get hurt after I am out of service, will the Veterans' Administration help me?

Answer. As a veteran who fought for his country, you can get the best treatment that money will buy at the veterans' hospital closest to your home, or the one best suited to handle your case. Men and women with service-connected disabilities will be hospitalized. Non-service-connected cases will be hospitalized according to the availability of beds.

Question. Will I have to pay for this care?

Answer. Not if you sign a statement you are unable to pay the cost of hospitalization and treatment.

Question. If there is reason to believe that my trouble is the result of service, what do I do?

Answer. Call for a representative of the Veterans' Administration or an American Legion service officer, and he will help you prepare a claim.

Question. If I become totally and permanently disabled from a cause not due to service, am I eligible for a pension?

Answer. Yes; subject to certain service requirements and an income limitation.

Question. If I am not a Legion member, may I ask for help from a Legion service officer?

Answer. The American Legion helps all veterans.

Extract From Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extract from chapter III, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, by Edward Gibbon, 1737–94:

Before an assembly thus modeled and prepared, Augustus pronounced a studied oration, which displayed his patriotism, and disguised his ambition. "He lamented, yet excused, his past conduct. Filial piety had required at his hands the revenge of his father's murder; the humanity of his own nature had

sometimes given way to the stern laws of necessity, and to a forced connection with two unworthy colleagues: as long as Antony lived, the republic forbade him to abandon her to a degenerate Roman, and a barbarian queen. He was now at liberty to satisfy his duty and his inclination. He solemnly restored the senate and people to all their ancient rights; and wished only to mingle with the crowd of his fellow citizens, and to share the blessings which he had obtained for his country."

It would require the pen of Tacitus (if Tacitus had assisted at this assembly) to describe the various emotions of the senate; those that were suppressed, and those that were affected. It was dangerous to trust the sincerity of Augustus; to seem to distrust it was still more dangerous. The respective advantages of monarchy and a republic have often divided speculative inquirers; the present greatness of the Roman state, the corruption of manners, and the licence of the soldiers, supplied new arguments to the advocates of monarchy; and these general views of government were again warped by the hopes and fears of each individual. Amidst this confusion of sentiments, the answer of the senate was unanimous and decisive. They refused to accept the resignation of Augustus; they conjured him not to desert the republic, which he had saved. After a decent resistance, the crafty tyrant submitted to the orders of the senate; and consented to receive the government of the provinces, and the general command of the Roman armies, under the well-known names of Proconsul and Imperator. But he would receive them only for 10 years. Even before the expiration of that period, he hoped that the wounds of civil discord would be completely healed, and that the republic, restored to its pristine health and vigor, would no longer require the dangerous interposition of so extraordinary a magistrate. The memory of this comedy, repeated several times during the life of Augustus, was preserved to the last ages of the empire, by the peculiar pomp with which the perpetual monarchs of Rome always solemnized the tenth years of their reign.

Sidney Hillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the sound and the fury accompanying the activities of the Political Action Committee leaves one with the distinct impression of a conspiratorial clamoring. Charges range from racket to regimentation. Sidney Hillman has been called foreigner, the implication being that the place of his birth made him a suspicious character per se. Communist is hurled at him almost daily, though an examination of the record of his political behavior throughout the years, would definitely dispel any such notion. Why all the noise?

The objectives of the P. A. C. have been left out of the maligning campaign. Their very reasonableness does not make good copy for those who would exaggerate the P. A. C. into a crushing monster seeking to destroy the American way of life. P. A. C. proposes:

First. To place the election issues before the people.

Second. To urge people to register and vote.

Third. To supply voters with a list of the candidates and to solicit their support for those favorable to the organization's program.

There can be no quarrel with the desirability of educating the electorate to make use of the fundamental instrument of democracy, the ballot. To be vote conscious is a step forward in the working of our form of government. Nor can there be any question of the desirability for each voter to have a knowledge of and interest in the election issues. That the P. A. C. urges the election of Roosevelt and TRUMAN and such others as they name is no crime, any more than it is criminal for the National Association of Manufacturers to make known its preferences.

More hue and cry have been raised over the $1 contributions to the P. A. C. than the thousands contributed to the Republican campaign funds of 1940 by a single contributor. Is the $1 contribution of John Doe, welder, more inimicable to the interests of the country than the $10,000 contribution of a du Pont?

When Dewey received the $5,000 contribution in 1937 from the C. I. O., to be exact, from Hillman's union, I do not recall his rejecting it. In fact, his campaign manager asked for more.

Throughout the history of our Nation, organizations of all kinds have concerned themselves with political activity, endorsing, supporting with funds or work, some candidate or other. That is as it should be. The P. A. C. has shown no reluctance to reveal the intent, scope, and finance of the organization. Such openness is not the markings of a body sinister. Nor has the organization millions at its disposal, not even one million, contrary to those who are working so diligently to paint the P. A. C. as an overwhelming menace.

In his testimony before the House Committee on Campaign Expenditures, Mr. Hillman stated, "Our committee is a nonpartisan organization. Our purpose is to assist in welding the unity of workers, farmers, and all other progressives on the basis of a constructive and forward-looking program, and in support of candidates, irrespective of their party labels, who support that program."

The P. A. C.'s support of Roosevelt and Truman has no doubt been responsible for the fury of the attack upon it. That explains a great deal, does it not?

Increase in Number of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, according to an article, Taxation After the War, by Harley L. Lutz in the July 1944 issue of the Controller, giving a succinct presentation of the increase in the number of Federal employees, as of May 1943 the Federal employees outnumbered all State and local employees in the following States:

State	Number of employees	
	Federal	State and local
Alabama	64,500	45,700
Arizona	16,400	11,800
California	239,600	218,500
Florida	59,500	41,000
Georgia	73,100	55,300
Maine	29,200	26,600
Maryland	62,100	33,300
Massachusetts	129,700	127,800
Nevada	5,700	3,800
New Jersey	98,500	97,100
New Mexico	17,600	12,600
Pennsylvania	212,500	200,800
Rhode Island	22,100	19,500
South Carolina	53,000	35,200
Texas	149,400	124,300
Utah	38,400	17,000
Virginia	119,700	57,200
Washington	85,200	50,800
Total, above States	1,479,500	1,191,100
Total all States (exclusive of District of Columbia)	2,810,800	3,053,800

Special communications from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, dated Feb. 2, 1944.

Mr. Speaker, and thus it has come to pass, as it was written by Thomas Jefferson in his classic indictment of George III:

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

Amendment To Apply Proceeds From Surplus Property Sales To Reduce National Debt Will Work in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I am including in my remarks copy of an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post this morning concerning the Herter amendment to the surplus property bill, which would require all moneys derived from the sale of surplus property to be applied to the reduction of the national debt.

At the time this amendment was pending I stated that it was not workable. The Treasury must raise money to meet its expenditures, which requires the issuing of bonds and short-term loans. As everyone knows, the interest paid on Government bonds issued in recent years is extremely low. After the war it will be necessary, at least during the reconversion period, to borrow money. If bonds are issued, the Treasury will run into difficulties in trying to dispose of

them unless there is a higher rate of interest than has been paid in recent years. The editorial follows:

TREASURY PROTEST

The Senate hastily inserted an amendment into the surplus property bill prior to its passage providing that the proceeds of sales should be used exclusively for reduction of the public debt. In offering the amendment Senator WHERRY quoted approvingly the Baruch report to the effect that all the war surpluses have been paid for by the American public, either through taxes or by an increase in the national debt. Hence the proceeds of all sales of surpluses, it was concluded, should go to reduce the debt and lower post-war taxes. The Baruch report added that "no agency should be permitted to sell surpluses and use the proceeds for other purposes."

We venture to say that Mr. Baruch would be greatly surprised to learn of this use of his remarks. To have them cited as an argument in favor of putting all receipts from sales of surplus property into a special fund to be used exclusively to retire debt while deficit financing is continuing. The purport of the statement in the Baruch report, of course, is quite clear; it was intended to drive home the importance of utilizing the proceeds of sales to relieve the demands on the public, instead of regarding them as a windfall warranting new types of expenditure. With that thought in mind, the report warned against the danger that the receipts from sales might be dissipated by selling agencies.

The Senate bill originally provided that the proceeds of sales from surplus property should be turned into the general revenue fund of the Treasury. That was a sensible provision. It introduced safeguards against possible unauthorized use of funds by selling agencies. But it would be premature, to put it mildly, to require the Treasury to use the proceeds of sales to retire outstanding debt so long as the Government is running deficits of colossal size. No wonder the Treasury has registered a protest against this strange procedure. It has done so on the ground that it would be ineffective and would complicate its financial operations. It is interesting that the letter of protest stated that the Treasury "recognized the desirability of a debt-reduction policy after the termination of the war and would be prepared to submit recommendations at that time." However, the days of balanced budgets, to say nothing of budgetary surpluses, seem remote at present. Congress certainly cannot bring any nearer the day when the debt will begin to shrink by setting up special funds for debt retirement. There is just one way to reduce the Federal debt; that is for the Federal Government to spend currently less than it collects currently in the form of taxes and then use the surplus to pay its creditors.

Railroad Retirement Bill, H. R. 4805

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, was introduced in the House May 15, 1944, and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Up to the present time this bill has not been reported out of the committee.

I received a communication recently from the Federated Shop Crafts of the Norfolk & Western Railroad at Portsmouth, Ohio, in my congressional district, respectfully soliciting support of this railroad retirement bill, that is, House bill 4805. The membership of this organization, consisting of 2,000 men, deserves to have its wish for favorable action on this bill presented to the Congress, and that is what I am now doing.

It is my intention at the present time to support this bill whenever it comes before the House for action, unless amendments to it should be adopted that would nullify the main purposes of the bill. There are, however, a few constructive amendments, in my opinion, that could be made to this bill. For example, I should be perfectly willing to have the age limit for optional but not compulsory retirement lowered to the age of 55, and keep the upper higher age bracket as it now is. This, to some extent at least, would make for post-war employment.

In addition to that, there is a considerable number of railroad men who lose their jobs for some reason or other within a very few years short of retirement who do not get reinstated, and who do not receive retirement allowances. It seems to me that an amendment to remedy that situation might well be given some consideration.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be able to finish the hearings and report the bill to the House in the very near future.

The Hidden Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem received from one of my young constituents, who is now fighting somewhere in New Guinea:

THE HIDDEN FIGHT

(By Corp. Izaak Walton Bader, Somewhere in New Guinea)

Can you, back home, in easy chairs and living as you do
Have any sort of inkling what the boys out here go through,
The agony of waiting on a small spot on the map,
The mud, the heat, the jungle bugs and then, of course, the Jap.
It isn't that we're angry, across the ocean foam,
But just what will our land be like, whenever we do get home?
There are, they say, four freedoms which we are fighting for,
The right to sleep a peaceful sleep, without the thought of war,
The right to speak our inmost thoughts, and want to never know,
To worship God the way we please whenever to church we go.
But will we have these blessings when we get to Frisco's shore,
Or will the greed of those back home destroy its very core?
You men who made the guns for us (at eighty dollars per)
And you who reaped the profits on the lives of boys that were,
Will you, when peace has come again and when we all can plan,
Divorce yourself from selfish thoughts and help your fellow man?
Or will you stand with palm outstretched, and beg and plead for more
And prate about the sacrifice you made to win the war?
We've got to have your answer, for when the triumph's won
We won't have time for platitudes, we've had them by the ton.
By God, we'll give you victory, although the cost comes high,
We'll sweat and stint and fiercely fight and some of us will die.
Remember though the soldiers who struggle for the right
To come back to a better world, don't let them lose the fight.

Detroit News Poll—Michigan Goes for Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Detroit News, of August 28, 1944. The Detroit News is nonpartisan and has the largest circulation of any paper in the Detroit area. No one could accuse this poll of being false or politically inspired. The Detroit News has a reputation of years standing for honesty and clean journalism.

I might add that our Republican Governor Kelly and the Michigan State Republican machine dumped Dewey when they split our ballots in Michigan. They did not want to carry Dewey on their shoulders, so they split the ticket into two parts. The President and Vice President run on one ticket, the Governor, State officials, Congressmen, and county officials on another. Every voter will get two ballots instead of one. They tried to save their own skins, but this will not save them.

ROOSEVELT, 66 PERCENT, DEWEY, 34, IN POLL—SURVEY SHOWS PRESIDENT MORE POPULAR THAN AGAINST WILLKIE 4 YEARS AGO

The first sampling of opinion in the metropolitan area by Detroit Speaks—the Detroit News Poll of Public Opinion, discloses that President Roosevelt's popularity in the area is greater today than it was when Wendell Willkie ran against him in 1940.

Using the same scientific sampling technique which has been proved so effective by the America Speaks polls conducted by Dr. George Gallup, Detroit Speaks' first poll shows that if the election were held today, 66 percent of those Detroiters interviewed who had an opinion would vote for Mr. Roosevelt, and 34 percent for Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

The following table shows how voters in the metropolitan area answered this question:

"If the election were held today, for whom would you vote, Roosevelt or Dewey?"

(The percentages shown for Roosevelt and Dewey in the tables below concern only those persons who had an opinion; the "undecided" column shows the percentages of all the persons interviewed who had no opinion.

(In the metropolitan Detroit figure, for example, out of every 100 persons interviewed who had an opinion, 64 were for Roosevelt and 36 for Dewey. Out of every 100 persons interviewed, 8 had no opinion on the subject.)

Vote by all groups

	Of those decided		Undecided
	Percent for Franklin Delano Roosevelt	Percent for Dewey	
Metropolitan Detroit	64	36	8
Detroit only	66	34	9
Dearborn	62	38	7
Hamtramck	83	17	15
Highland Park	67	33	8
Suburban districts	53	47	3

(The disproportionate number of "undecided" percentage points in the Hamtramck poll is attributed to the fact that voters in districts heavily populated by foreign-born are frequently reluctant to express their preferences, even when they have made up their minds.)

The heavy Roosevelt vote indicated in this first poll, especially when compared with the President's Detroit vote in 1936 and 1940 elections, raises a question as to the accuracy of Dr. Gallup's prediction that Dewey will carry Michigan. The America Speaks poll of Michigan voters, taken some weeks ago, gave Dewey 57 percent of the State vote, compared to 43 percent for Roosevelt.

1936 MARGIN RECALLED

In 1940 Willkie had to poll 40.2 percent of the Detroit vote to carry the entire State by a bare 9,000 votes. On that basis it appears unlikely that Dewey can carry the State with only 34 percent of the Detroit vote.

It would be possible only if Dewey's strength out-State proves to be so much greater than was Willkie's that his popularity there would overcome his weakness in Detroit.

As a matter of fact, the President's popularity in the Detroit area almost approaches the landslide proportions of the vote he received against Alfred Landon in the 1936 election. In that year the President received 68.9 percent of the Detroit vote to 31.1 for Landon.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND TO TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND

One of the imponderable factors in this year's Presidential election is the soldier vote, which cannot be polled because of Army and Navy restrictions. In Michigan, according to estimates by the secretary of state's office, the soldier vote will run between 150,000 and 200,000.

If this soldier vote is gaged purely on the basis of age groupings, then it will go overwhelmingly for President Roosevelt in the Detroit area. The following table shows how the persons interviewed in the first Detroit Speaks poll broke into age groups.

Vote by all groups

	Percent for Franklin D. Roosevelt	Percent for Dewey	Undecided
21–30 years	71	29	7
31–40 years	70	30	6
41–50 years	61	39	7
51–60 years	57	43	8
Over 60	44	56	8

The following tables show how the sample vote taken by Detroit Speaks divided according to sex, income, and occupation:

VOTE BY SEXES

	Percent for F. D. R.	Percent for Dewey	Undecided
Male	65	35	4
Female	64	36	12

VOTE BY INCOME GROUP

Very wealthy	21	79	0
Substantial	37	63	5
Comfortable	64	36	6
Just getting by	71	29	10
Poor	80	20	15

VOTE BY OCCUPATIONS

Labor	73	27	9
White collar	54	46	9
Executive	46	54	7
Self-employed	50	50	4
Widows and retired people	40	60	15

Launching of the U. S. S. "Little Rock"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1944

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the launching of the U. S. S. *Little Rock* at Philadelphia, August 27, 1944:

When the French explorer, Bernard de La Harpe, first discovered the point of rocks which became the site of our State capital on the Arkansas River in 1722, colonial Pennsylvania had little contact with the South and West. It was inconceivable at that time that some day citizens of Little Rock would stand here to christen and launch a magnificent vessel to bear the name of that remote place.

But history decreed that our political destinies should be united. Pennsylvanians moved to Arkansas and Arkansans moved to Pennsylvania, some to help in the construction of this ship. The movements of people across the continent established ties that are reflected in the names of our cities and towns. I have been in Chester, S. C., named not for old Chester in England, but for your adjoining city. I know that Scranton, Ark., is named for Pennsylvania's Scranton, and that Philadelphia, Miss., is named for this great metropolis. Names of places, therefore, often have a historic meaning and we who live in Little Rock are glad that the explorer gave it that name to distinguish it from the big rock up the river, and that this name—rather than Arkapolis, as the residents once chose to call it—was retained, for Little Rock is the tie to our brief but interesting past.

For more than a hundred years fewer people lived in Little Rock than will live upon this vessel, but as the State's population grew the city grew, and today 150,000 people live in Greater Little Rock. The little rock has become the great rock commercially and is now an object of pride and affection for the 2,000,000 people who live in Arkansas.

As it acquired power and greatness the city also acquired charm and beauty, and its own individuality. Likewise those who man this ship will make it more than a pile of steel and timbers, they will give it individuality and I should hope something of the charm and beauty of the city whose name it bears. Men will learn to love it as they loved the other ship honoring our State, the Arkansas, which they called the Arky, the old but still serviceable vessel which provided the first cruises for thousands of high-ranking officers during their plebe days at Annapolis and when the *Arkansas* moved into the invasion on D-day they were thrilled by her performance.

The people of Little Rock are proud to have such a ship as this bear their city's name. Even those of us who know little about the classification of naval vessels know that the cruisers have distinguished themselves in the Pacific war and that this is the outstanding type of combat vessel for that area. The Navy men tell us that the cruiser is the "work horse of the Navy," big enough to go into any battle, fast enough to lead any task force.

Carrying, as they have, the heaviest load in the Pacific where the fiercest battles have taken place, the cruisers have added new luster to naval history. We hope that in the time remaining before our enemies are put down the *Little Rock* will take her place alongside the *Boise*, the *San Francisco*, the *Helena*, and the *Chicago*, in preserving the prestige of the cruisers.

And finally a word of appreciateion for the workmen who brought the dream to fulfillment, who breathed life into the blue prints and specifications. We cannot comprehend the vast engineering problems involved in the launching alone that tons of lubricants must be laid upon the launching ways, the exact amount to be determined with mathematical precision and the meticulous calculations of the effect of a ship's weight upon its plunge into the sea. These are fascinating details which defy our understanding but the ship's dimensions, its carrying capacity, and its gun power give us a feeling of admiration as we consider the magnitude of your completed task.

Perhaps you feel that an old friend is leaving you today, that as it glides into the water the doors of the past will close, but there is a lift in the thought that it becomes a mighty force in our defense, a symbol of power and adventure.

We are glad to honor the workmen and the splendid company for which they work. I am sure we are all impressed with the spirit of teamwork which produced these magnificent results. One day, perhaps in 1942, the *Little Rock*, a cruiser, showed up in a list of projects, was scanned by a committee of naval experts. A congressional committee scrutinized those plans, and my colleagues in the Congress authorized the expenditures involved in its construction. In March 1943 the keel was laid and for 18 months materials for the ship have come from everywhere. The taxes to pay for it will be assessed against men and women of large and small resources. Team work from beginning to end did the job.

So with the war. A glorious victory lies ahead, but there is much remaining to be done. Only team work can supply the dynamic power yet needed to complete that victory. It seems to me that every ship

launching is a reminder of the power to be acquired by people who work together for a purpose. On behalf of the people of Little Rock, I thank you all for your presence today and for the honor you have accorded my city.

The American Merchant Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, yes; let us call it "the American merchant navy." The Log, published in San Francisco and devoted to American maritime activities, has an excellent suggestion.

Instead of American merchant marine, we should in future say American merchant navy. D-day would have been impossible without the efficient work by those men who man our ships. As a matter of fact, every day the Nation's war effort all over the world would be hopeless without the loyal and devoted service of our gallant seamen. Yes, let us take up the idea of our American merchant navy as set forth in the August issue of the Log.

LET'S CALL IT "THE AMERICAN MERCHANT NAVY"

From now on the Log suggests we call it the American merchant navy instead of the American merchant marine.

American cargo carriers are as much a part of our fighting fleet as the sister ships they serve. Without the delivery of supplies in a never-ending stream, the men o' war of our Navy could not carry on.

Nor can the fighting Navy carry on in peacetime without the merchant navy. They are inseparable.

How large an American merchant navy will be needed to back up the world's greatest fighting Navy is the first point to decide in determining the size of our permanent postwar cargo and passenger fleet.

The Log believes the term "American merchant navy" will be of great psychological value in winning the support of millions of Americans by acquainting them with these basic facts. No phrase more accurately describes the functions of American ships as military auxiliaries.

Internationalization of the Ruhr Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Washington Star of August 23, 1944:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The suggestion of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Republican Presidential candidate, that the internationalization of the Ruhr Valley's armament production is an essential objective toward lasting peace has been received with skepticism in those quarters which have made it their business to watch the German war industry closely.

It is possible that Governor Dewey has not been kept fully informed about the German war industry. But, according to available figures the Ruhr's ammunition factories represent only a relatively small percentage of the total output of German war material.

Since the outbreak of the war a powerful war industry has been established between the Oder and Vistula Rivers where large quantities of raw materials are available. This area was chosen at a time when it appeared obvious to the German high command that the western portions of the Reich would be submitted to a continuous bombardment from the Allied air forces. But in addition to this eastern industrial area the Germans some time before the outbreak of the war established assembly plants and factories throughout the entire country and increased their facilities in Austria and Czechoslovakia.

In short, the area extending from the Vistula to the Rhine and from the Baltic to the Balkans has now become an important hub producing arms and ammunition in enormous quantities for the millions of men Germany has thrown into battle.

Had the Ruhr Valley been under international control soon after the World War Hitler probably would have had some difficulty preparing the Reich for another war. The Germans started planning their modern equipment soon after 1926, although prototypes of tanks and planes were built earlier in the U. S. S. R. One of the leading German officers in this war, Field Marshal Jodel, spent several years in Russia supervising their production and experimenting with them. The Russians learned tank technique from German officers and later improved it far beyond the skill of their original teachers.

But after Hitler rose to power and particularly after Czechoslovakia and Austria were incorporated in the Reich, the German war industry was spread throughout that entire vast region.

Moreover, it is pointed out, the internationalization of the war industry of the Reich alone will not necessarily end the threat of wars. According to political and technical observers, it might be necessary to bring about an internationalization and a strict control of all war plants in all the industrial countries of the world which consider force an important instrument of their national policies.

Unlike 1918, when the Allied political men refused to heed the urgent suggestions of their military advisers to enter Germany, the Reich this time will be occupied by the Allied forces for an indefinite period.

Moreover, if the pattern which has been discussed before is fully adopted the Reich will be dismembered. We had a revealing glimpse at the future of Germany by way of a recent dispatch from London that Premier Stalin had decided that Konigsberg would become a Russian naval base while important German cities such as Breslau and Stettin would be given to Poland.

The French, of course, will recover Alsace and Lorraine and may add for good measure the Rhineland, which they had attempted to incorporate under the guise of an autonomous Rhinish republic after World War No. 1. A large section of British political men desire to break up the Reich into its component parts and establish a number of independent republics as existed before Bismarck created the German Empire in 1871. There is nothing now to prevent the Allies from chopping up Germany and making it a powerless, divided country which will have lost all taste and ability to wage war for many generations.

Under these circumstances, the internationalization of the Ruhr Valley, as suggested by Governor Dewey as a "must" for lasting peace, will not fully answer the burning problem of how to prevent a third world war.

An agreement among all industrial countries to place their industries under an effective international control which would allow the manufacture only of weapons necessary for a police force may be the answer to the desire of those who wish to see power politics and aggressions removed from the scene of international relations. This, however, would involve the control of all industrial establishments in countries such as Russia, Great Britain and the United States as well as minor industrial states or potential industrial states.

Congress Needs Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House to an editorial published in Tuesday's edition of the Washington Daily News advocating the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 54.

CONGRESS NEEDS HELP

The Senate some days ago passed the Maloney resolution providing for a joint Senate-House survey of the legislative machinery of Congress, with a view to modernizing some of the creaking procedures of both bodies, and now efforts are being made to get action in the House on the corresponding resolution sponsored by Representative MONRONEY of Oklahoma.

This is a more important matter than a first glance might indicate.

Of recent years the growing complexity of the Federal Government has outstripped the ability of the national legislature to keep track of what goes on in the departments and agencies. Many of the laws that are ostensibly the product of Congress actually originate in the bureaus, and are sometimes so formidably intricate that very few of the lawmakers who pass upon them have a real knowledge of their contents. Congressional committees in need of lawyers and economists to help in the preparation of bills tend increasingly to borrow such experts from the bureaus—and you may be sure that these gentlemen, knowing which side their bread is buttered on, will impart no advice that might damage the power or the budgets of the bureaus which lend them to Congress.

A principal objective of the sponsors of the proposed survey is to show the need of expert staffs, not on loan but on a permanent basis, to do the leg work and the research that Senators and Congressmen are not able to do personally.

The advisability of such an arrangement seems indisputable.

Congress today is too often at the mercy of ambitious bureaucrats who have at their command vast staffs of technicians, willing and able to back up their bosses' legislative requests with bales of graphs and statistics and analyses—which Congressmen have neither the time nor the facilities for examining or weighing. And when said Con-

gressmen borrow these same experts as advisers—well, the dice are all too obviously loaded in favor of the executive branch as against the legislative.

The matter of expert staffing of congressional committees is only one facet of the Maloney-Monroney proposal, but it is a vital one. We should like to see the inquiry launched at this session, in time to have a good beginning made before the next Congress assembles.

Our State Department and the Jap's Incarnation of God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a splendid article by Capt. Miller Freeman, United States Naval Reserve, retired, in which I fully concur:

OUR STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE JAP'S INCARNATION OF GOD

(By Capt. Miller Freeman, U. S. N. R., retired)

"The Emperor is the incarnation of God, who rules the universe. * * * If the whole world cannot understand this, our way of life, it does not matter. We can have only one purpose in our existence. We must bring happiness, contentment, and prosperity to the world in accordance with the commands and wishes of the Emperor." (Lt. Col. Sabura Aizawa, 1935.)

"May we meet again in the ashes of Tokyo," said a great United States naval leader to his men in the earlier, and more grim, days of the Pacific war.

It is a hope cherished by every United States military leader and, even more important, by every boy and man who has followed them through the bitter jungle, the bleak tundras of the Aleutians, or the sharp blue dangerous waters of the Pacific.

It will come as a surprise to the majority of citizens that there are other United States leaders who want to meet again in another kind of Tokyo—a Tokyo intact not only as to its cherry trees and beautifully fragile dwellings, but also as to individual Japanese citizens, old and trusted pre-war "contacts." To meet again in Tokyo, believe it or not, wherein the almost unbelievable tragi-comedy of the divinity of the Emperor is still preserved.

This is of tremendous importance to the people of the United States and yet the movement—and it is a very definite movement—stems almost entirely from the east coast, and in large measure from Washington, D. C., itself. But the fact that there has been almost no publicity about it west of the Rocky Mountains does not by any means indicate that the divinity-of-the-Emperor theory will not have its strong advocates in the Pacific area.

What is meant by "divinity of the Emperor"? The connotation of the "divine Emperor" is simple enough. But rather let us hear from a properly prejudiced man. He is J. B. Powell, formerly editor of the China Weekly in Shanghai, who was beaten daily in a Japanese prison camp, who lost both feet due to his treatment in a 28-foot square cell with 40 others, and who was a personal witness to the torture of 6 American flyers shot down in the Doolittle raid. It was a torture preceding their mass murders.

"The institution of Emperor worship," says Mr. Powell, "is a comparatively new creation in Japan. It was developed since the restoration, and for the purpose of fostering political unity on the ruins of feudalism."

To Mr. Powell, who has observed it at close range, there is nothing sacred about the institution. To him it is simply a cleverly devised scheme for compelling all Japanese to show submission to the Son of Heaven. It is of vital importance to the Japanese military in bringing people to accept the militant stand which resulted in the attack on Pearl Harbor.

IN WHAT DO WE BELIEVE?

As in any time of war, there has occurred in this country a great rebirth of religious feeling. There are few families not deeply and humanly touched by the war. As for the actual battlefield, it has best been said like this: "There are no atheists in fox holes," and the testimony of Army and Navy chaplains bears ample witness to the fact that insofar as our fighting young men are concerned this is a war for the preservation of Christian principles as well as a war against aggression and a war for economic security in a world of peace.

The very great majority of mothers and fathers of these boys are unaware of the appeasement movement which has already gained such considerable ground. If the fighters themselves were aware of it, there would be a cry go up that could be heard above the roar of guns from Saipan to the Kuriles. To these boys and men this most certainly is not a fight to preserve the Japanese way of life instead of the American way of life.

What is this line of thinking of Americans in high places who want the religious myth preserved? It is a line that has recurred again and again in recent years. The idea is that after the war a ruler may be "of use" in handling a defeated nation.

Was this particular ruler "of use" in handling Japan before December 7, 1941; and if so, how of use?

What kind of a government does the United States have in mind for Japan after the war? When our State Department is not merely vague, it does give a disturbing hint. This hint indicates definite support of the Emperor, and it finely differentiates him from the Japanese military clique.

Edward Hunter, on the war deck of the New York Post, has carefully analyzed a speech delivered by Joseph C. Grew, special assistant to the Secretary of State and former Ambassador to Japan. This speech was delivered before the ninetieth anniversary celebration of the Illinois Education Association in December of last year. The following excerpts are among those which interested Mr. Hunter, a foreign correspondent in the Orient for many years and long an opponent of appeasement. I take Mr. Hunter's pertinent excerpts and add my own queries for Mr. Grew:

"There is much obscure thinking in our country arising from an inadequate grasp of facts, which has brought about a deep-rooted prejudice against the Japanese people as a whole."

(Query to Mr. Grew: Does not the Japanese Army, with its widespread conscription, represent, just as does our Army, a fair cross section of the country? And are not the atrocities general?)

"Even in our own country we have our Dillingers and our reputable citizens residing in the same street."

(Query to Mr. Grew: But do we allow the Dillingers, because we believe in a blinding and false concept of our highest leader, to so influence that street that all the residents of it become fanatical plunderers?)

"The Emperor, after the military fait accompli at Pearl Harbor, was obliged, willy-nilly, to sign an imperial rescript declaring war."

(Query: Come, now, Mr. Grew, do you really believe that the Emperor was not cognizant of the plans to attack Pearl Harbor; didn't even know the attack was coming off? His envoys did, you remember, at the very moment they were talking with Mr. Hull in Washington.)

"After describing how Japanese people would stop Americans on the streets of Tokyo after the sinking of the *Panay* (1933) to apologize, Mr. Grew says:

" 'Those (word italicized by the State Department) people did not want war with the United States.' "

(Query: Have you ever suggested this to Admiral Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, under whose ticklish command the Pacific Fleet was at the time?)

When some of the eastern press took note of the Illinois speech they drew some inferences therefrom; and, I think, very understandably. But Mr. Grew has indicated to me in a personal letter that at no time has he supported the theory of the Divinity of the Emperor. For proof he submits a story from the New York Times which, he states, contains his true belief. In fairness to Mr. Grew, I quote the paragraphs he himself encircled with a blue pencil:

"Since returning from Japan a year and a half ago I have expressed in print and in public addresses a good many views about Japan and our war with Japan which I have felt might be helpful to our national effort. I need hardly say that those views have in no respect changed. Rather have some of those views become intensified, especially as a result of the atrocities committed in Japan by the Japanese military."

Note that he is still very finely differentiating between the Emperor and the Japanese people on the one hand, and the military on the other. The interview goes on:

"Recently, however, editorial comment in various newspapers throughout our country, clearly based on distorted versions of one or more of my public speeches, indicates that much of what I have said and written has been forgotten or overlooked."

The speech before the education association in Illinois was neither forgotten nor overlooked, as we shall show. And if it was distorted, then the distortion was that of the release by the State Department, and it was upon the release that most of the comment was based. But let us go on with the Times interview which Mr. Grew approves. After saying that the record stands and need not be rehearsed, he is quoted as saying:

"Nevertheless for the purpose of clarification I wish to state categorically that never, either publicly or privately, have I expressed the opinion that Emperor Hirohito should be or should not be retained on the throne of Japan after the war. Frankly, I do not think that any of us are yet in a position to determine what shall be or may be the precise political structure in Japan after our certain, ultimate victory in the war. I fear that only harm and no good can come from reading into my public utterances views which I have never held, and, therefore, never expressed."

Since reading that clipping I have rather often speculated what harm would come from suggesting that Japan should be beaten as completely as Germany, and that nothing but the few decencies left to modern warfare should be heeded in the beating. In a letter dated May 2, 1944, Mr. Grew stated to me: "I do not believe and never have believed in such a doctrine * * * have

never enunciated that this Nation should uphold and exert its official influence to support and maintain the principles of the Emperor of Japan."

Perhaps Mr. Grew believes that the Nation should not so exert its influence. Yet it was so doing when the O. W. I. ordered that there be no derogatory references to the Emperor in broadcasts and other propaganda for overseas consumption. I hardly think that O. W. I., blown by many winds, was veered in this direction by any but the State Department. It would be ridiculous to think otherwise unless the idea was a notion of some "foreign expert" in O. W. I., and in that realm we are beyond all thinking.

The reader has noted that in the Times interview, which Mr. Grew likes, he says that he has never said that Hirohito should be or should not be retained after the war. We submit that either Mr. Grew has not made up his mind (a condition reprehensible at this point to the great majority of Americans) or that he has made up his mind, and dare not say in what direction for fear of offending either the American people or the Japanese friends he may meet again one day.

Mr. Grew's book, Ten Years in Japan, is revealing enough, but we leave it to Edmund Wilson, the astute reviewer for the New Yorker, to lift the curtain at its widest: "When you have finished it you come to reflect how little of the life of a country may be visible to a professional diplomat who has gone straight into the service from college and never known any other profession. Mr. Grew seems to observe nothing except those elements of the Japanese governing class with which his duties brought him inevitably in contact."

This is no attempt to discredit Mr. Grew personally, or to cast doubt upon his sincerity of purpose. But because his attitude—whether it be uncertain or secretive, and obviously it is one or the other—is the attitude of the State Department, it is of concern to you and me.

Certainly Russia, at peace now though she is with Japan, does not want too strong a Japanese Nation after the war. And Chiang Kai-shek has made clear his belief that "as to what form of government Japan should adopt, that can better be left to the awakened and repentant Japanese to decide for themselves." Perhaps he recalls that an awakened China, within the memory of hundreds of living Chinese, repudiated the idea of a "Son of Heaven."

Most disturbing is the quick fashion in which these ideas grow within our own country. Mr. Grew may insist all he please that he has been misunderstood. Then let it be noted that he has been misunderstood by experts. Such a reputable publication as the Atlantic Monthly believes it understands him clearly. In its February issue it lifts aloft the theory of the divinity of the emperor, ascribing it to Mr. Grew, and indicates its blessing. Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, no less than chairman of the Senate military affairs subcommittee on war prisoners, urged respect for the Jap love of emperor in the American Magazine. Countless newspaper editorials have cottoned to the idea. The fortnightly Amerasia, a recognized authority on events in the Pacific, believes it understands him clearly indeed. In its issue of June 9, 1944, it says: " * * * it is clear that the attitude of the State Department will in large measure determine the policies adopted by the United Nations toward China and toward Japan in the immediate postwar period * * * For this reason the position of the Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs in the State Department has become one of the most important foreign relations posts in the world. It is therefore not surprising that the appointment of Joseph Clark Grew, former ambassador to Tokyo, to succeed Dr. Stanley K. Hornback has aroused great interest both in this country and abroad."

Despite modifications, Amerasia says, "The Chicago speech clearly reveals what Mr. Grew meant by 'the healthy trunk and roots' of Japanese society." This forthright magazine further points out, that Mr. Grew's viewpoint is ably represented at all times by his special assistant, Eugene H. Dooman, a man who himself has admitted is an opponent of "a tough peace" for Japan.

Thus do we feed the Japanese propaganda machine.

So accustomed have we become to the Japanese propaganda line over a period of 50 years that even when we are at war with them, even when we isolate the Nisei and export the aliens, our high fever runs on without personal attention from the blandishments of the Japs themselves. Unquestionably many a disloyal Japanese now isolated would have liked to have remained at large. Unquestionably his work was planned for furthering sabotage and doctrine. There need have been no worry on the part of the enemy. Their actual presence in the United States is not necessary to their cause, and it may be, even, that we will do it better than could they. As in the past, for more than 50 years there will always be Americans in high places who will do such work, wittingly or not.

Unless—unless the great majority of the American public, the men and women who are furnishing the sons and the labor and the money for this war, insist that they have no interest in maintaining the religious myth of a foreign country. More, that they believe in their minds and hearts that the maintenance of such a myth means a short-of-victory war with Japan—and that, in turn, means another war with Japan. Another war with Japan will be fought under conditions we cannot now imagine, against Japanese allies no human can foresee.

We need not fight that war if we follow God and our conscience as to what is right—instead of seeking to uphold a lone human being who is the Japs' incarnation of God.

Germans to Murder 150,000 Warsaw Poles—Polish Warsaw Home Army Appeals for Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is rejoicing in Paris today, but in Warsaw the most bitter struggle that the world has ever seen is raging now.

When the Russian armies approached the gates of Warsaw on August 1, the Polish underground forces, the Polish Home Army, led by General Bor, started the Battle of Warsaw. With very little war equipment and ammunition they have put up a valiant fight. They desired to join in the fight to free Warsaw, just the same as the French desired to join in the fight to free Paris. The French had more arms and the fight was not as tough. For one whole month the Poles of Warsaw have been putting up a terrific and bitter fight, bloody and costly, but have not surrendered and still hold one-half of the city.

This is no time to argue that the uprising was premature. What if they did not receive instructions from Russia, England, or the United States to commence the battle against the Nazis? Is this the only excuse that one can find to deny aid and assistance to a valiant and heroic people? Were not the Russian armies at the gates of Warsaw when the Poles started their fight for the liberation of their capital city? Did they not suffer for 5 long years under the brutal and savage Hun?

What city and what people suffered more than the Polish people in Warsaw? Most people would cringe like whipped dogs after the brutal punishment that these people had received. There would be no fight left in them. Yet, these people sensed liberation and freedom. The urge was too strong and the fight was on. Mr. Speaker, the battle of Warsaw is on. There is no retreat. There can be no truce. They must either win the battle or die.

What shall we do? Turn a deaf ear to their pleas, and say we are sorry, you started too soon, you were premature? We must not and cannot let down a heroic and courageous people that have suffered for 5 long years the brutality and tyranny of the Huns. Help must be forthcoming immediately.

To take revenge upon the Polish home army of Warsaw and to bring about their surrender and capitulation, the German authorities aim within the next few days to exterminate more than 150,000 Polish civilians concentrated in a wholesale-slaughter camp near Warsaw. The Polish Government is urgently calling upon the entire civilized world to do everything possible to prevent such a monstrous crime.

I am including a statement to the press, issued on Monday, August 28, 1944, by Jan Ciechanowski, Polish Ambassador to the United States.

The Germans are guilty of another atrocity, exceeding by far anything they have hitherto done, including the treatment of civilians in concentration camps.

When the Polish home army started the Battle of Warsaw on August 1, the Germans realized that they were faced with a well-organized armed uprising by regulars and trained guerilla fighters. The Germans decided to stop this uprising of the Polish home army by retaliating against the civilian population and by taking their revenge on innocent civilians.

The German authorities aim at the extermination of the entire civilian population of Warsaw. All parts of the city captured and held by the Germans were surrounded by strong military forces and the population of all these districts was deported to Pruszkow, a small industrial town 15 miles southwest of Warsaw, where a wholesale slaughter camp was installed. The deportees were prohibited from taking any of their belongings with

them. They were forcibly driven to Pruszkow as they stood, without any food, extra clothing, or medical supplies.

According to authenticated information in the hands of the Polish Government in London from the Polish underground civil administration, more than 150,000 persons, mostly women, children, and older men—as able-bodied men are in the ranks of the home army and are still fighting inside Warsaw—are concentrated in the Pruszkow camp. They are being starved, tortured, entirely deprived of food or water and facing inevitable death. Untold scenes of horror in the Pruszkow camp are beyond description.

It is obviously the aim of the Germans to bring about the extermination of this population within the next few days, and this appears to be the reason why they were not deported farther west.

The Polish Government urgently appeals to the Governments of the Allied Nations and to the entire civilized world to do all that is possible to prevent the perpetration of this final act of German barbarity, unprecedented in history. Only the immediate intervention of the Vatican, of the Allied and neutral powers, of the International Red Cross, supported by the weight of the indignation of all free democratic public opinion may still stop the Germans from carrying out their heinous design of mass slaughter of defenseless and innocent civilians.

Suggestions to Servicemen and Servicewomen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in a series of extensions I have outlined for the veterans of this war, the benefits available to them, both in their readjustment to civilian activities after their return from service, through the provisions of the G. I. bill and the program for the vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped, and by way of compensation for the treatment of disabilities. The benefits available to the dependents of the servicemen have been summarized also, including benefits while the men are in service and benefits for the continued support of dependents in those cases where the serviceman has made the supreme sacrifice.

Now, drawing upon my own experiences in World War No. 1, and upon observations during the past quarter of a century in assisting veterans of World War No. 1, and more recently of World War No. 2, I wish to offer some suggestions to the members of our armed forces which may prove helpful and of value at some future time.

First. Remember the folks at home. Write every week. You know you are O. K., but the folks do not.

Second. Time has a way of making you forget little details you might want to remember in years to come—places you have been, actions in which you participated, people you have met, dates of happenings in which you were interested, and so forth. So put as much of these matters in your letters as censorship will permit. Tell the folks to save them for you.

Third. Keep your own service record. Start two, keep one up yourself and carry it in your billfold. Send the other to the folks at home and send them copies of entries you make so they can keep the duplicate complete. In this record might be entered:

(a) Your name, serial number, and original organization and station.

(b) Dates to remember: Date of induction or enlistment and place of admission; of transfers to other units, stations, or ships; of promotions; of departure from and return to the States; and finally of discharge.

(c) Draft information: Number and address of your draft board. Your draft number and induction order number.

(d) Insurance: Number, date, and amount of each insurance policy taken out. Names and addresses of designated beneficiaries, and if more than one, amounts allocated to each.

(e) Name, and when possible permanent address in the United States, of your commanding officer, your lieutenant or immediate superior officer, the noncommissioned officers of your company or unit, your squad members and barracks or shipmates, and of other servicemen with whom you have been closely associated.

(f) When you make application for disability compensation or pension after discharge make your "C" number a part of this record.

Fourth. Other suggestions:

(a) In case of injury or illness, get the names and addresses of persons who know the facts. If treatment or hospitalization is required, write home giving all possible details and facts—and have the folks preserve such letters. Get the name of the medical officer who attended you, of the nurses who cared for you, and of some of your ward mates in the hospital, with their home addresses. You never can tell when some small detail of which you wrote or made a record, or which some of those persons could furnish if you could find them, will be the fact on which your right to future benefits might depend.

(b) Preserve your discharge. Only one original will be issued. No duplicate is obtainable. Immediately upon your return home have a small photostat made to carry. Register the original with the register of deeds—there is no charge. Then place the original discharge in a place of safekeeping. If it is lost only a certificate in lieu of discharge can be obtained.

(c) Register with an employment-service office for a job. If you want the old job back, make a claim for it within 40 days after discharge.

(d) If you do not already have one, get a social-security number.

(e) Be proud of your service. Wear your discharge lapel button, which you should get on discharge. If you did not, apply for it at the nearest Army or Navy station, or office.

(f) Join a veterans' organization—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Purple Heart, if you are eligible, or some organization of World War No. 2 veterans. Take part in its activities. It will provide you association with men with a common interest for the rest of your life. And, incidentally, it will be an ever ready source of help in any problems involving veterans.

(g) If you need hospital care or medical treatment after discharge, get it when you need it. Do not put it off. That is the reason for maintaining Veterans' Administration facilities—hospitals. You have earned it; you deserve it. Take advantage of it.

Fifth. Final benefits. After all other benefits are given, there remain three final benefits when you have answered the last roll call:

(1) Uncle Sam makes an allowance of $100 to whomever pays the funeral bill. Application must be made within 2 years.

(2) A large American flag is available at the nearest post office for your funeral service.

(3) A uniform grave marker, upright or flat, of marble or granite, will be furnished, freight prepaid. In cemeteries where stone markers are not acceptable a bronze marker may be obtained after the war.

In every post of every veterans' organization and in the offices of the Red Cross you will find friends anxious to serve you when help is needed. Feel free to call upon them. Your Congressman, ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, 316 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., is always ready and willing to be of assistance.

Toward an International Economic Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an interesting article appearing in the August 1944 issue of Dun's Review entitled "Toward an International Economic Program" and written by Willard L. Thorp, trustee, Associated Gas & Electric Corporation.

This is a well-considered and prepared article, excellently presented by Mr. Thorp, and worthy of deep consideration:

TOWARD AN INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC PROGRAM

(By Willard L. Thorp, trustee, Associated Gas and Electric Corporation; editor, Dun's Review; director of Economic Research, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.)

One of the great failures of our country after the last war, was in the field of international economic relations. The learned statesmen who sat at the peace table focussed their attention on political problems—boundaries, minorities, plebiscites, mandates, and the like. They reserved the basic economic problems for the League of Nations, but the proposed machinery never shifted into high gear. Not only did we as a Nation fail to join in the consolidated effort to meet these problems, but in our own national policies we proceeded to disregard completely the new facts in the international economic picture.

The war and post-war period established us firmly as a creditor Nation by the normal course of trade. On top of that, we endeavored to increase the obligations of others to us, by insisting on the validity of various public international debts which had arisen in the providing of the sinews of war. We added billions of dollars of new private loans made to private and public borrowers in foreign countries. We set up a special Government agency to work with businessmen to increase our export trade.

And then, at the same time, as though it were a factor in a different world, we built higher and higher tariff barriers around our boundaries to keep out goods from foreign countries. The consequences were inevitable. Those programs could not balance. Foreign borrowers defaulted one after another on their loans. Foreign countries endeavored to keep their international trade in balance by erecting higher and higher barriers against our goods. Monetary standards were destroyed. Bitterness and ill will crept into international relations.

It is true that we then were relatively unsophisticated in the area of international economic policy. It is also true that the basic facts had changed substantially since the nineteenth century. To the extent that public policy usually takes the form of a recognition of facts and conditions some time after their appearance, we were following the age-old pattern. But the lag has now been so long that we can no longer offer it as an excuse. Now the facts are clear.

We shall again want to send our goods abroad. We shall again be a lender in the capital markets of the world. Our position will be even more strongly that of a creditor nation. We should know by this time that such a position is untenable unless we open our ports to the importation of goods and services. The payments for the use of our capital and for our exported commodities must be made in American dollars. The foreign purchaser can lay his hands on American cash only if Americans have paid cash abroad for goods, services, or securities which they have purchased.

There, of course, is one definite indication of some recognition of the facts of international life, in the reciprocal trade-agreements program. Its gradual application, built upon careful study by experts and detailed international negotiation, has operated to lower barriers to trade. It is important as an evidence of a new direction in foreign policy, but the limitations which surround its application make it small arms rather than heavy artillery.

The problem is not solely one of permitting the purchase of foreign goods by American consumers. International economic relations is a large-sounding phrase covering a number of complicated and often technical areas. Problems arise from such economic matters as shipping, aviation, access to raw materials, patent rights, allocation of markets, cartels, sanitary regulations, and a host of others.

Furthermore, a nation's international policies are not separable from its domestic policies. For example, there must be an effective international medium of exchange. This in turn involves the domestic monetary and banking system of each nation. Again, the problem of international credit, both as to controls and machinery, is tied up to each domestic economy.

It is essential that the peoples of the world move ahead on the post-war international problems now. Sometimes putting things off serves a useful purpose, as when the letter eventually does not need to be written, or the problem disappears or is solved by someone else. In this case, the outlines of the problem are clear today and will not change. There is absolutely no possibility that it will disappear. Today, we have the maximum opportunity to find the right answers. As time goes on, little decisions here and little decisions there will steadily narrow our freedom to find solutions. And today, we are not in that difficult position where the pressure of the necessity of the short-run interferes with long-run wisdom.

There are those who argue that we should put these problems aside until after the national election. But the problems are clear. The facts are clear. The votes cannot change them. It is much more important to move ahead while we are in close and continual contact with the other nations. The coalition for war is a marvelous atmosphere in which to strive for a peace coalition.

What can we do? First, I think that there is a basic job of education to be done. We still are doing a lot of our thinking in nineteenth century terms, when we were building our industries and borrowing abroad. Today, the facts lead clearly to the broad outlines of a program for the future, a program looking toward the lowering of trade barriers, and the stabilization of monetary and credit conditions. In such a program, both the hard-headed and the big-hearted can join.

The hard-headed can support it because, instead of providing protection for a few favored industries it will protect our investors, our consumers, and our credit and monetary systems. The big-hearted can support it because it is a program not limited to our own national advantage, but aimed at international economic health and well-being. These things must be said over and over so that they become an accepted part of our national thinking.

In addition to education, however, we also must have action, and have it soon. It is easy, and sometimes necessary, to generalize. But actual programs must be in very specific terms. Of course, the experts have been busy in this area, as evidenced by the several proposals for dealing with the problems of credit and currency. But, we as citizens can well be impatient. We do not know what our national policy is in this whole area. It is not enough for the experts to labor. We must have frank, thorough, and public discussion of the issues involved.

The peace will bring many problems to trouble and confuse us. Now is the time to determine our basic attitudes. Even then, there is much work to do, for there is no one quick gesture which will solve our many international problems. They require long and skilled labor plus time and patience.

There is a well-established technique, the international conference, which is being used most effectively in connection with problems of food and of relief and rehabilitation. The same technique should be extended to the problems of international currency and credit arrangements, and of international trade. These are world problems, and should be attacked by the nations together.

It should be sufficient punishment to have to fight a Second World War, without adding a second post-war failure. The time has come to shift into high gear, driving hard toward a clear-cut national policy and a series of international conferences to implement it.

Address by Hon. Chapman Revercomb, of West Virginia, Before Convention of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Chicago on August 23, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The year 1944 may well prove to be the most fateful in the history of the American Republic. We are in the midst of a great war, a war in which our forces are advancing victoriously on the far-flung battle fronts of the world. For us, the threat of invasion has vanished. Each day we know that complete victory in the clash of arms is nearer; and that perhaps soon we shall turn from the suffering and destruction of war to resume again lives of peace and peaceful progress.

The year 1944 is also, under the law of our country, the year set aside for a general election of some of those who will represent the people in their National Government. It is the time when our citizens traditionally inventory their public affairs and select those whom they will place in office for the next several years.

In discussing the subject of the welfare of our country, there is no body of our citizens with whom I would rather meet than with you and the other veterans of this country who have followed the flag to all parts of the world. I know that you place your country above all else. I know that your patriotism is strong and genuine.

Let me say at the outset that I plead no partisan cause. There never was a time in the history of the United States when our people were more earnest in their political thinking and less attached to party labels than they are today. The conflict is not one of platforms and personalities; it is a clash of philosophies of Government.

On one hand we have those who believe that the best Government for America is the one that leaves the Government in the hands of the people themselves, under laws that forbid wrongdoing and that protect each individual in his right to live his own life and make his own way. I subscribe to that view.

On the other hand are those who urge a centralization of power in the National Government, and, in particular, in a Chief Executive; who believe in a strict regulation and ordering of the lives of the people.

Between these extremes some compromise is possible, but it is not easily achieved. It can never be achieved except in the light of keeping the individual citizen free.

It can never be obtained so long as Government is dominated by any group within our citizenship who would subvert the Government to their own selfish benefits, de-

stroying the basic rights of each individual American.

When I speak of groups, I mean any group, whether it comes from Wall Street, from business, from labor, or from the farms, or elsewhere.

The claims of each must be heard and considered, but a government which has its policies dominated and directed and controlled by any group does not serve the best interests of our country. In the younger years of the life of each of us we were told and believed that America is the land of personal opportunity; the one country in the world where an individual could rise by his own efforts from any level to places of culture and comfort and influence and power.

That made America and it must be restored to America. I know that as veterans you have fought under the flag of your country, that your deep thought is with those boys who today fight under that same flag. That there is in your hearts the hope that they shall return to an America where they may live in comfort, with an opportunity to work, to make a living, to rear their families, to maintain their homes. That they shall have the freedom of an open road; that no bars shall be placed across their path by any theory of government that would strictly regulate their lives.

Your Congress has passed the G. I. bill, and it has become the law of the land. It gives certain temporary help to the discharged serviceman. It provides certain benefits for him if he should be up against hard going in the future, but I want to say that it will be a tawdry gift unless he has the opportunity and the right to return here to a country of freedom such as you and I and our fathers had.

Now, I realize that in time of war certain of the individual liberties of the people must be surrendered, in order that concerted action may be taken against a foreign enemy. But no greater duty is upon the Government than that it should restore to the citizens the freedom of action and personal liberties taken from them to meet the emergency of war.

Those controls that come out of wartime centralized Government must be ended. No form of dictatorship or plan of dictation should be set up over our people or any segment of them.

The laws we make must encourage and invite the people to return to peacetime employment. The needy, wherever they may be in our land, must be cared for. Those who, in fact and in reality, cannot sustain themselves, because of lack of places to work, must be helped through the Government, because there must not be and shall not be want or bread lines in America. However, we should not establish here the idea that those who can sustain themselves and have the opportunity to do so may lean upon their Government for support. The right of every American citizen to seek his own proper way in life must be sustained and safeguarded unto him.

The maintenance of such an order in this country will be a far greater gift to the heroic men to whom we owe so much than the justified provision that has already made for them by their Government.

The workers of this country have in result done a magnificent job in creating the needed materials of a consuming war. Industry in most part has met its obligation unselfishly. The wheels of industry must be kept turning to the greatest possible extent that men and women may find places of work and that there may be as little need as possible for a dole.

Most men and women here want to support themselves. They have that self-respect and independence. These high traits must be recognized and places of work protected for the American people.

There are some who have adopted the philosophy of a government by taxing and spending and regulating. That existed prior to the war. During the war it has had justification to some extent. But now we are preparing for a post-war period; for an America at peace; for an industrious, progressive America.

It appears that there are some who would continue the theory of taxing and spending and regulating, even for the days to come. That is a dangerous course. With some justification, caution was thrown away in spending for war. But that can find no sound basis when war has ended.

Today there is upon the backs of the American people a national debt that threatens to reach the gigantic sum of $267,000,000,000—a debt that is increasing at the rate of $228,000,000 each day.

Some people have the impression that if they have no property they have nothing to lose, no matter how high the national debt goes. Nothing could be further from the truth. If this Government should ever be forced to default on its obligations, it goes without saying that there will be no checks for veterans' assistance, no payments for assistance to the aged, the blind, and the handicapped; no unemployment compensation for unemployed workers, and, further still, no jobs out of which our people may earn their livelihood.

We have been told repeatedly, and the information is correct, that America is one of the richest countries of the world. Through the industry and freedom of our citizens we have built the finest cities. Providence has given to us broad, fertile acres. Our people enjoy the best comforts and conveniences of life invented to this time. But the total wealth of the United States can be measured in dollars and cents and our resources, already partly depleted by this costly war, while remaining comparatively great, are not inexhaustible.

The total value of all property in the United States in 1938 was $390,430,000,000, according to information provided by the Library of Congress. That figure represents the value of the business known as the United States of America. If our debt should substantially exceed that figure chaos will come. Such chaos breeds fratricidal strife and civil war. The ties with the people are severed; the old leaders are reviled and new ones are blindly followed. We have seen this happen in Germany and in Italy. I warn today, without excitement, but with fairness, that there are signposts in our country that point toward national socialism. That generally finds its growth out of a broken economic structure and a desire by a group to rule over and dictate to the people.

National socialism is built upon these elements in government: (1) Reckless spending; (2) creation of class hatreds as a matter of policy; (3) domination by a group; (4) division of the people and appeasement of minorities; (5) government operation of private business; (6) strict control over the private lives and actions of the people; (7) perpetuation of itself in office; and (8) the sacrifice of principle to unjustified expediency.

Consider these elements in choosing the course that our Government is to take.

In a world aflame; when we have sent from the hearthsides of this country our children to battle upon foreign shores and in the air above them, and upon the oceans, it is natural that our people should think in terms of world relations. We think in such terms with the hope that we may not be involved in another war—that some plan may be made among the nations that would prevent war. That is a justified and a laudable purpose.

This Nation will enter into any plan with the other nations of the world that would prevent the possibility of war or even delay the coming of it. But this Nation should not enter into any plan that will destroy the sovereignty of our people over their own dominions. Our people shall govern themselves. We shall be helpful and cooperative, yes, even benevolent toward those other nations that seek peace with us; but that benevolence shall come as a gift of this Nation and shall not be delivered at the command of others. It shall be based upon fairness and cooperation, but not through domination. America will continue to stand for her own independence and the protection of her own people. Other nations and their leaders will do this and we admire them for it.

We shall seek peace with all the world, but henceforth let us keep at hand a strong armament. Never again must we be so impractical as to be unprepared for the eventuality of force and attack that may come. In the words of a great American, "henceforth, we shall speak softly but carry a big stick."

We subscribe to peace. We will help lay and sustain plans for the keeping of peace, but we will do so in a practical way, knowing the frailties of man that have been so often exhibited since the rise of the curtain of history on his life, from the beginning until now.

With justice and consideration for our people, we should ask in fairness that those airports built throughout the world with the money of the American people shall be kept open for American commerce. Modern invention has drawn us so closely together that we know and we recognize that we are dealing more frequently and more closely with the people of other lands from day to day.

The freedom of the air over the oceans will be recognized, but the freedom of the air over America shall be under the control of the American people; just as the freedom of the air over the lands of other nations shall be properly controlled by them. And the use of the air over the land should be subject to grants of rights-of-way and lanes through it.

Whatever we do under the great policies of government will be decided by the American people. Whatever the decision may be, let us face it squarely and openly with the basic thought of what kind of life we are preparing for our own returned sons and daughters—our children and their children.

We are winning the war. I pay great tribute to the military and naval leaders who, with the American soldier and sailor and marine, have so gallantly upheld the honor and the glory of their beloved land. It is up to you and to me, who through circumstances have been left here, to see to it that they return to a strong America where freedom shall be the precious heritage of her people.

Latin-American Unrest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very enlightening article

on a subject in which all of us are vitally interested, particularly at this time. The article, which is entitled "Latin-American Unrest," was written by Mr. William Philip Simms, who writes for the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN-AMERICAN UNREST

(By William Philip Simms)

While the United States is fighting fascism in Europe reports from Latin America indicate growing unrest on our own side of the Atlantic due, in part at least, to Fascist-minded elements.

The root of the trouble seems to be in Argentina, centering around the pro-Nazi regime in Buenos Aires. But it has spread to Bolivia, Paraguay, Brazil and elsewhere. Unless checked it will almost certainly increase after the war.

The reasons for this are obvious. First, the richest German and Italian colonies in the world are in Latin America, notably in Argentina and Brazil. Many prominent Nazis have transferred large slices of their fortunes to those countries and are expected to follow in person as soon as they can leave Europe. There they will set up in business and begin to branch out.

Second, Argentina is traditionally against whatever the United States is for. She regards herself as a sort of rival and bitterly resents Yankee leadership in Latin America. She aspires to primacy herself and the first step toward securing it is to organize an anti-Yankee bloc among her neighbors, then push northward at least as far as the Panama Canal. The expected influx of Nazi refugees and German capital would fit in with these ambitions.

Third, our own relations with Latin America may well cool off somewhat after the war when lend-lease dwindles to a dribble and foreign rivalry for American business down there becomes acute.

Trustworthy sources in Bolivia report that the new regime of President Villaroel is playing ball with Buenos Aires as closely as ever. Its principal backers are said to be a clique of 47 young army officers, blood brothers to a similar clique behind Argentina's General Farrell. American recognition of Villaroel, it was urged, would insure the election of a democratic regime at La Paz, and recognition was accorded on June 23. But 10 days later the same old reactionaries piled up a landslide, winning 83 out of a possible 136 seats in Congress as against 21 for the combined parties of the Democratic Union plus a few scattering independents.

Events of this kind complicate Washington's efforts to achieve and maintain hemispheric solidarity. The State Department is being urged to apply economic sanctions to Bolivia. Others advise the contrary course. Both are repulsive to American ideals. One amounts to a big stick policy, the other to a form of bribery. But to do nothing in the face of Fascist maneuvers which may lead to bloodshed in our part of the world would be judged as national weakness.

Brazil has long been our biggest and warmest friend south of the Rio Grande. Yet Foreign Minister Aranha, well known as a pro-American, only recently was forced to resign by what resembled a humiliating Fascist trick. The national police closed a Friends of America meeting just as he was about to address it.

The Germans are extremely rich and powerful in southern Brazil. From there they maintain close liaison with their German and other friends across the border in Argentina.

Information for Servicemen, Veterans, and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. MILLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the many duties which are ours as Members of Congress, one of the first in my judgment is to keep the people at home informed of legislation of particular interest to them. I refer in this case to the benefits which we in Congress have provided for the service men and women, veterans and their dependents.

The many requests for information regarding these benefits indicates the need for a digest of the law on the subject that may be used as a ready reference and sent by the families, if they so desire, to their relatives in service, thereby keeping service men and women fully informed of the protection provided under our laws, and the necessity for compliance with the details in connection with making application for benefits thereunder.

Our Government should be liberal with those who wear its uniform in time of war. Our servicemen are the best paid, best trained, and best equipped in the world. The fact that our veterans and their dependents are better provided for than those in any other country is further proof that America cannot and must not forget those who fight and die to sustain the kind of life we cherish in America. Whether our forces serve at home or upon foreign fields, we must at all costs maintain that form of government which they have loved so deeply and have fought so nobly to sustain. Our matchless men and women in uniform will win this war, but we in Congress must provide the basis for a permanent peace and a lasting prosperity at home.

I am happy to have had a small part in the enactment of this legislation and I shall bend every effort to make sure that while these boys and girls are away the pure fountains of our form of government shall not be polluted with the poison of some foreign isms or tainted with the dangerous doctrines of political plotters at home.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

Dependents of all grades of enlisted men and aviation cadets of the Army and Navy are eligible to receive a dependent's allowance from the Government in addition to the serviceman's allotment. Those men and women serving as officers come under another system. The allotments and allowances provided by the Government are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife and one child, $72, and $20 for each additional child. (NOTE.—If the divorce or separation order of the court does not call for alimony or separate maintenance, the wife will not receive any allotment, and in case of a court order providing alimony or separate maintenance, she will get no more than the amount fixed by the court.)

Class B dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is substantially, but not completely, dependent upon the serviceman for support. A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37.

Class B–1 dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $50 plus $11 for each brother or sister; two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $68 plus $11 for each brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

It is important that men and women with dependents make application through their commanding officers for allotment and allowance, as these benefits will begin the date application is filed. Allotments are compulsory only for class A dependents. If the service man or woman for some reason or other fails to make application or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out; the Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children and dates of birth. In case a man is reported missing in action, the allotment and allowance continue to be paid for a period of a year, unless, in the meantime, his status is definitely determined.

Parents and brothers and sisters who can prove dependency can receive an allowance at the same time as wife and children. Parents can get an allowance from more than one son or daughter in the service. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son or daughter in the service, they get $68 per month. Now, if another son or daughter in the service helped support these same parents, they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

The agency for the Navy having jurisdiction over allotments and allowances is Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C. The agency for the Army is Office of Dependency Benefits, War Department, 213 Washington Street, Newark, N. J. If you experience any difficulty, contact your Congressman.

TEMPORARY AID FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Sometimes cases of extreme hardship arise involving dependents of servicemen. Many dependents, and even members of the armed forces themselves, are not fully acquainted with the two emergency agencies set up for the express purpose of helping such persons in need. These two agencies have branches all over the country. They are the Army Emergency Relief Fund, whose functions have recently been assigned to the Red Cross,

and the Navy Relief Society, which also can be reached through the Red Cross.

ARMY RELIEF FUND

Any member of the armed forces in the Army can appeal to the Army Relief Fund, represented in all camps, or through the Red Cross if the soldier is not at camp, for needed immediate financial assistance. He will receive courteous and willing assistance at all times. The fund is also open to all dependents of men and women in the Army and anyone needing relief should get in touch at once with this fund through the local Red Cross.

NAVY RELIEF SOCIETY

Any serviceman or servicewoman in our naval forces or his dependents can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. To get immediate action, it is advisable to take the case up through the Red Cross.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

This benefit is payable to all honorably discharged personnel of our services whose rank is below captain in the Army and lieutenant senior grade in the Navy. Payments are made in the following sums: Personnel with less than 60 days' active service, $100; personnel with 60 days or more active service none of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $200; personnel with 60 days or more active service, any part of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $300. Whenever mustering-out payments amounts to more than $100, payments are made in monthly intervals of $100 each. Servicemen who are discharged at their own request are not entitled to muster-out pay.

FREE MEDICAL AND NURSING CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF MEN IN OUR ARMED FORCES

Under this plan a wife of any man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service. If the doctor does not have these blanks, write to the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Missouri State Board of Health, Jefferson City, Mo., and ask them to send a blank to you. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2 at once and send it immediately to Jefferson City for approval. It is important that wives apply for this in early pregnancy; the State board of health will not approve payments of the doctor, hospital, or any service, before the application is made out. In the case of emergency, be sure that the doctor makes application for you within 48 hours after service is rendered. If the application is not made within 48 hours, no bills for medical or hospital service will be paid. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse; no money is given to the wife. This service is extended to wives and infants of servicemen in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, but not to any other foreign country.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY PENSIONS

Our honorably discharged veterans of all wars are entitled to a pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by their service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10-percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as a hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month.

The disability claim is filed by the veteran for benefits payable to him as the result of injury or disease resulting from military service. The award of compensation is based on the degree of disability which is determined according to the Veterans' Administration schedule provisions. Any disability, except misconduct, is compensable if it is as much as 10-percent disabling. This application is known as form 526. It is simple to execute and seldom does one have any trouble answering the questions. Additional evidence is seldom required. This is particularly true on the adjudication of the initial claim. No subsequent formal claim need be filed. If the veteran is dissatisfied with his present rating he can submit medical evidence to this effect.

However, it should be borne in mind that the doctor's statement must state not only his diagnosis but sufficient findings to warrant it. It is essential that this evidence show, or at least indicate, a higher degree of disability than the present evaluation. Upon receipt of competent medical evidence the Veterans' Claim Service will authorize an official physical examination for rating purposes, thereby reopening the case for further consideration.

Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred from one Veterans' Administration facility to another, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for settlement, veterans should file claim on proper form which will be supplied them by any Veterans' Administration facility, or the local representative of the American Red Cross. If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

READJUSTMENT TO CIVIL LIFE—EDUCATION

One of the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights offers an education to any man who served for a period of 90 days, on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition and books and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if without dependents, and $75 if he has dependents. Any man who served 90 days on or after September 16, 1940, may receive 1 year's schooling and 1 month additional education for each month in active service, but in no event shall the total period of education exceed 4 years. There is also a provision for part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

A veteran also has the right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities, extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Application for education and training should be made to the Director, Servicemen's Education and Training, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

HOSPITALIZATION AND PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

Adequate hospital facilities are provided for the care and treatment of veterans for nonservice disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

The veteran has the right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

RIGHT OF MEDICAL REVIEW OF IRREGULAR DISCHARGE OR RELEASE FROM ACTIVE SERVICE

A veteran has the right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service, (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination, benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (b) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (c) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

Loans provided for the above-mentioned purposes or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000. Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions. The interest rate must not exceed 4 percent. The loan must be practicable and suitable to veterans' circumstances. The loan must be repaid in 20 years. Application must

be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

A veteran of any war, honorably discharged from any one of the services, has the right to register for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service. He should contact his local United States Employment Office in his home town or county.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

There is also a provision for unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed. To be eligible, the person must reside in the United States; be completely unemployed, or if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week; be registered with and report to a public employment office; be able to work and available for suitable work.

Any person will be disqualified if he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; if he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work offered; if he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; if he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS AS A RESULT OF LOSS OF SON, DAUGHTER, HUSBAND, OR FATHER

There are four money benefits provided for the dependents of a deceased veteran: 6 months' gratuity payment, monthly insurance payments (if the serviceman applied for insurance), monthly pension, and back pay.

GRATUITY

The gratuity is a lump-sum payment equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received at the date of death. In addition, the dependents of any private or seaman who dies in foreign service receive 20 percent of his base pay, and the dependents of any officer who dies in foreign service receive 10 percent of his base pay. If the serviceman was in either the flying service or submarine service, his dependents receive, in addition, 50 percent of his base pay. There is also a longevity provision in addition to the above amounts.

The gratuity is automatically paid to a wife of a deceased veteran, or if there is no wife, it is automatically paid to the surviving child or children. It is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters of an unmarried serviceman. The serviceman should designate some one of this latter class to receive it; however, if he does not, they may apply for it. If two parents survive, the amount is divided between them. A grandparent must show an insurable interest in order to receive it.

Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to: Gratuity Pay Branch, Finance Office, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington 25, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

MONTHLY INSURANCE PAYMENTS

This insurance is not paid in a lump sum; it is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary—the older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy, if the beneficiary for whom payment is first made is under 30 years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in 240 equal monthly installments, at the rate of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance. If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is 30 or more years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in equal monthly installments for 120 months certain, with such payment in installments continuing during the remaining lifetime of such beneficiary. For instance, under a $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

It would be well to have parents and next of kin check with the men and women in service to see that all insurance certificates are in order and in the hands of the persons designated by the service men or women to receive them. An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of half blood. There is nothing to prevent a parent or brother or sister from being the beneficiary of more than one serviceman.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check their insurance policy now. See that everything is in order now. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A little care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen. I would suggest that you send your serviceman this pamphlet so that he may check all matters pertaining to his beneficiaries.

MONTHLY PENSIONS

This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, they are not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased serviceman can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month. Two parents, $25 each. Widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child. No widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38 equally divided, with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100.

The fact that a widow, a child, or parent gets the insurance, does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect both insurance and a pension.

BACK PAY DUE THE SERVICEMAN

When a casualty occurs, that service man or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. All this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to: Finance Officer, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington 25, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

HEADSTONE FOR GRAVE

Any person may make application for a headstone for the grave of any veteran of any one of the Army or Navy services whose service was honorable, to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE FOR ANY WAR VETERAN

After honorable service, reimbursement for burial may be allowed, not exceeding $100, on burial, funeral, and transportation expenses. Application should be made to Director, Dependent Claims Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, his minor children or adult unmarried daughters.

WRITE FOR OTHER INFORMATION

It is exceedingly difficult to cover all the details of benefits available to veterans of this and previous wars. I have tried to sketch briefly the benefits particularly relating to World War No. 2, as many pamphlets have been printed covering the provisions for veterans of other wars. I merely offer this digest as a guide to servicemen, veterans, and their dependents. If anyone has special questions or individual problems not covered in this summary, I suggest you write to me personally, to the following address: LOUIS E. MILLER, Room 343, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Excerpts From Speeches by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, on Foreign Policy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from speeches delivered by me from 1939 to 1944, inclusive, on the subject of foreign policy.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1, 1939, volume 84, part 2, page 2078:

"I do not believe in turning the hands of the clock back and sacrificing the international law the centuries have builded. I do not believe in resurrecting the buccaneers

and pirates, national or individual, of yesterday.

"International law and order and good will and common sense are part of the world's heritage of which we are custodians. Let us not, as did Essau of old, sell our heritage for a mess of pottage. There is no need for us to play the traitor to the future."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1939, volume 84, part 5, page 4679:

"This country demands and has a right to have 100 percent political allegiance from all of us; and the way to keep our allegiance unsullied and keep America alone in our thoughts is to think American. At this time of crisis each individual in this Nation has the responsibility of building national unity, and that is not built by meddling in foreign affairs."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 16, 1939, volume 85, part 2, page A308 (remarks before the Interparliamentary Union in Oslo, Norway, August 1939):

"From every land in Europe America has drawn her bloodstream. Your culture has enriched our lives. Your music, your literature, your drama, your great ideas in economics, philosophy, religion, we have made our own. But, Mr. President, you have something we do not want. I refer to those large barriers of fear, hatred, and distrust erected between your nations by centuries of fear, hatred, and distrust. Yes; we owe you much. We know the world is small. We are neighbors. We want to help you, but your problems are so intricate. There are so many equations that we do not understand. I say we want to help, but we want to help you to help yourselves to the end that your problems may find solution through you. We want to be helpful, but America does not want to meddle in Europe. The role of a meddler I do not crave for my country."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 16, 1939, volume 85, part 2, page A309:

"Our job is to see that a foreign policy is created which will protect and defend America."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1941, volume 87, part 2, page 1714:

"This bill, H. R. 1776 (lend-lease) * * * confers on the President the discretionary power to do the following: To open the arsenals, factories, and shipyards of America to any combatant nation; to transmit or dispose of to any combatant nation on such terms as the President may deem satisfactory any or all weapons, aircraft, ships, machinery; to repair, outfit, or recondition any ship, airplane, etc., of any other combatant nation; to give any combatant nation any defense information relating to any defense article furnished by this Government * * * This is intervention—yes, close to involvement. Under ordinary circumstances it would mean war."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1941, volume 87, part 2, page 1718:

"We are again—if this bill becomes law—passing a domestic law which runs directly contra to international law."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1941, volume 87, part 3, page 2505:

"I am voting against the pending $7,000,000,000 (lend-lease) appropriation for the following reasons:

"'1. As a protest against the President's failure to inform Congress what collateral he will secure.

"'2. It gives the President a blank-check power.

"'3. The appropriation is not backed up by a realistic tax program.

"'4. Because there is no disposition on the part of the administration to cut down on nondefense items.

"'5. Because the power of the Congress with reference to appropriations has become synonymous with the "must" request or dictates of the Chief Executive—with no explanation as to how it is to be secured, how it is to be spent.'"

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 8, 1941, volume 87, part 9, page 9509:

"America has been attacked in a dastardly manner and war declared on her by Japan. This is undoubtedly pursuant to the tripartite agreement between the Axis Powers, Germany, Japan, and Italy.

"We as a people did not want war; it has been brought to us. Now we will take care of the job. There is no division in our ranks now. The criminal attack on Hawaii and Guam and elsewhere has made America one. We have but one purpose, and that is to win the war and preserve our American way of life.

"Let us now have:

"(a) Less loose talk and more action but no underestimation of Japan's strength.

"(b) More defense production and more for our money.

"(c) Extension of the workday for everyone. This is no time for hysteria or complacency; no time for life as usual.

"(d) No grafters or racketeers should be permitted now in Government or in industry.

"Japan asked for it. We will, with God's help, carry through to victory."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 1943, volume 89, part 10, page A1674:

"The world has been contracted through science and discovery, and this makes it vital that we have cooperation and collaboration. * * * We can set up machinery to control nations in an effort to prevent war. We can establish treaties, we can write peace pacts, we can make agreements; we can do all these things in an effort to achieve a lasting peace. But none of these things will have eliminated the causes of war. If we are to build for lasting peace, we must first restore order and recovery to the world by (1) dealing justly with the problems which involve the political, economic, territorial, and ideological phases; (2) we must create some sort of instrumentality with power to preserve the peace."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30, 1943, volume 89, part 11, page A3322 (speech at Republican convention at Appleton, Wis., June 27, 1943):

"The Republican Party recognizes that as one of the major nations of the earth, the United States must accept a major share in helping to restore and preserve international law and order in the post-war period. The Republican Party proposes that a strong America shall be a strong champion of international justice; that a purposeful America shall help weave the pattern of durable international peace and order; that an America, aware and confident of her own great state, shall help relight the lamps of freedom for the groping nations of men."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1943, volume 89, part 6, page 7535 (telegram sent to Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG at Mackinac Island Conference, September 6, 1943):

"United States must cooperate actively with all other like-minded nations in an effort to preserve world peace. World peace can be best assured only when sovereign states, while preserving their own full sovereignty and their own essential interests, find common ground on which to work together. This common ground can be found only by clearing away existing differences, particularly among the major allied nations, and building on the basis of definite common purposes a new international order. Until such time as international relationships become beyond all question orderly and secure" (the people of this country want us to keep our eyes open. They know that in this matter we are dealing with international poker players who have been playing the game for 1,000 years and they believe that) "the United States should maintain such armaments as will not only enable us to discharge our international obligations but will assure our national security." (The people believe that the United States should secure adequate air and naval bases to assure our national security.)

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1943, volume 89, part 11, page A3774 (speech before Kiwanis State convention, Milwaukee, Wis., August 2, 1943):

"Our real problem in international affairs is the same as on the domestic front—how to attain the unity that alone makes peace possible * * * unity between States and nations is not a matter of legislation only. It is a matter of learning how to live and work together. * * * There is much talk about a new world order. We know until the spirit of cooperation dwells among men, until that time arises, mere government forums will not do the job."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 28, 1943, volume 89, part 11, page A4041 (speech before the Catholic Knights of Wisconsin, September 9, 1943):

"Theirs—the major powers—is the major task of post-war reconstruction. Theirs is the major obligation, building up a new international order of law and justice and fraternal freedom. They should invite the cooperation not only of all their associates; they should invite the cooperation of all the peoples and states which pledged to work for peace and law. It is not necessary to build some superstate to accomplish a new reign of world law. Talk of such only creates confusion and distrust. We have learned to our bitter cost that mere constitutions, that mere treaties and covenants, are meaningless unless the will and purpose which give them sanction, are present."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 4, 1943, volume 89, part 7, page 9082 (voted for Senate Resolution 192):

"We have demonstrated by the passing of this resolution that we are willing to cooperate by all honorable means to achieve peace. Resolutions do not contain magic power. No resolution we adopt will have magic power over our allies or over our enemies. * * * We have been burned in two world wars. * * * We know that making another Locarno Pact, or another Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war, does not do the job unless there is the will of the contracting parties to enforce and keep the peace."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1944, volume 90, page A129:

"As a matter of fact and as a matter of common sense, there is nothing at all contradictory in free and equal and sovereign States organizing to promote world peace and world justice. * * * It should be obvious beyond all question that only Americans who believe in our own system without reservations, hidden or open, should be entrusted with the important task of protecting and promoting legitimate American interests in the four corners of the earth."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1944, volume 90, page A195:

"The United States not only has an historic interest in these islands—the Carolines, the Marianas, and the Marshalls—we have a much more direct and immediate interest as a matter of national security. * * * As outer defenses of our west coast, as stepping stones and lines of communication with the densely populated lands of southwestern Asia and its islands, the three-ocean groups are of major importance to this country. * * * They should be incorporated definitely in the American system."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1944, volume 90, page A330:

"Just as no single state is powerful enough to achieve its own total security, so no single state or group of states can undertake to set up a system of world security without recognizing the reasonable security of the small as well as the great, the weak as well as the strong."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1944, volume 90, page 2206:

"There must be back of all pacts or treaties or organizations not only the desire to carry on, not only the desire of like-minded people and like-minded public officials to cooperate, but there must be the will to carry through the mandate, the pact, the treaty. * * * But if the nations begin double dealing, if they begin playing international politics, if they begin to sell each other out and fail to keep faith with each other, then all the ten commandments in international law will not result in the peace being kept."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1, 1944, volume 90, page 3388:

"Let there be no mistake about it. We must have international world planning. We live in a contracted world. We cannot escape our obligations. We will be false in our trust if we did not endeavor to participate in some kind of thinking which would insure that our children and our children's children shall not again travel along dreary roads to armed international conflict."

Management of Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Management of Money," by L. L. Coryell, Sr.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANAGEMENT OF MONEY

(By L. L. Coryell, Sr.)

"When Edgar Allan Poe wrote his famous poem The Raven, he said he was writing a poem the world would call great and no one would know what it meant. I sometimes think the articles written on money fall in that category," says Mr. Coryell. But we're sure you will find his article very interesting reading.

From the dawn of time it has been necessary to have a medium of exchange so men could trade commodities. In Homer's time a good woman was worth four head of cattle. The young swain, going a-courting, paid his prospective father-in-law four cows for the buxom daughter, maiden of his choice. Since the young fellow couldn't carry cattle around with him in his search for a wife, he gave the old man four pieces of wood, stone, or bone in exchange, each marked with the head of a heifer. The receiver exchanged these orders at the farm of the owner for the cattle. In other words, they were like our bank checks.

The end sought in establishing any system of money is to have it definite and sure, not contracting and expanding like the girdle in the fairy tale. The value of the dollar should be just as stable as the length of the yardstick, the capacity of the bushel, peck, or quart measure.

Money, like all other commodities, is governed by supply and demand. If we have a surplus or a shortage of wheat, the price will go up or down accordingly and few people will be materially affected but the quantity of money governs all else because all values are stated in terms of money. Contraction of the currency invariably causes a panic and an expansion of money destroys values, causes confusion, business uncertainty, and worst of all, it impairs life's savings, life insurance, pensions, endowments, etc.

The expansion or contraction of currency is a fight between debtor and creditor. If money is knee deep in the street, a man could take a bushel basket and gather up enough of it to pay off his mortgage. France printed money enough in 1925 and 1926 to pay off her World War debt, but where is France today? Contraction of the currency brings mortgage foreclosures.

To show the disaster of decreasing and increasing our circulation I quote the Republican platform of 1920: "We pledge ourselves to earnest, consistent attack upon the high cost of living by courageous and intelligent deflation of overexpended credit and currency." I also quote the Democratic platform of 1924: "We denounce the recent cruel and unjust contraction of legitimate and necessary credit and currency." Both statements were correct. The Republican policy withdrew over $5,000,000,000 in bank loans and discounts and brought disaster as mentioned by the Democrats. The Democrats have taken the other side and have increased our circulation from $35 to $161 per capita (nothing like it in American history) and the results verify the statements of the Republicans in 1920—confusion everywhere, at home and abroad. Mr. Bowles and Mr. Jones are "scratching like cats on a tin roof" and accomplishing about as much in trying to correct the evil. With a changing quantity of money, no grocer dare invest, no man dare buy a home, no man dare go into big or little business.

I think money, at all times, should be a creation of law. I would have a financial board of experienced men who would serve life terms, that board to be constantly in session, watching financial conditions. That board could expand or contract the quantity of money to a certain degree, according to the conditions at hand, thus the value of every commodity would yield to that of money. I would have sufficient money with which to do business. I would never create enough money to cause inflation. So sacred do I hold the quantity of money in circulation that I would not use metal of any kind.

Some of our best economists claim that the period of a thousand years, known as the Dark Ages, was brought about because the only money at that time was intrinsic gold and silver. The mines failed, hence there was no medium of exchange; no way to improve the country culturally or financially. We should not have our money volume affected by the quantity of metal mined or used in the arts and sciences. For example, in 1849, when gold was found in large quantities in California, we came near inflation because there was so much gold in circulation, and again, when the old lady washed the overalls of a miner in Cripple Creek and found that, with soap suds, she could extract gold from the dirt carried in the miner's clothes.

A further objection to metal money is its cost, its so-called semi-intrinsic value. Within the past few years we have found that the value of gold is a creature of law. If it is our law that makes the value of money just as good on paper as it is in gold, what is the use to work millions of men in the hazardous, arduous business of mining gold?

A few years ago, with a single stroke of the pen, we almost doubled the price of gold, thereby proving that it is American law that makes the value of gold and not gold that makes the value of American money. This gold which we now have in our vaults has been shipped back and forth, stolen, plundered, and traded for centuries. I imagine some of this Kentucky gold came from the mines of Ophir. I imagine the Queen of Sheba carried some of this gold on her camels. No one has ever eaten it or used it for material good—science and mechanics excepted. I, with a true American boast, while talking to a German in Berlin, said: "You fellows have no gold," to which he replied: "No; we don't want anything that does not work." I call that smart.

I consider the issuance of money purely domestic to our own Government, just as much as I consider the legislative, executive, and judicial departments absolutely our own affair. We cannot delegate or extend, to foreign nations, our legislative, our executive, our judicial, or our issuance of money. They are fundamental principles. If we want to extend charity to foreign nations, good and well; give until we starve to death if we want to, but there is no justifiable reason to upset our internal affairs.

This might bring the barter system until foreign nations could establish their own money like they establish their own government. The establishment of any government and the establishment of its monetary system should go together without any of our interference. Nothing would stabilize world money more quickly than to have our own money stable and nothing will demoralize our money more quickly than to mix it with the money of a lot of heathenish, "busted," warring nations. I have traveled in 73 nations and have never had any trouble cashing American money.

To guard well the quantity of our money in circulation I would date all of it, having it good for 10 years, at which time it would, upon presentation, be subject to exchange for other bills of the same denomination but dated ahead another 10 years. Money not presented for renewal would be considered lost and other money would be issued to take its place which would be clear profit in the Government and would keep our circulation normal.

When I was in Russia an iron box was uncovered in the Moscow Tunnel. This box was full of American paper money, none of it dated later than 1890. While this money had been buried for approximately 50 years, it was considered in our circulating volume. We do not know how much is buried, how much has gone down in the ocean, how much has been burned or lost. The dating system would correct this every 10 years. It would also stop the hoarding of actual cash. Mayor "Big Bill" Thompson (Chicago) would not have put a fortune in safety deposit boxes, thereby taking it out of circulation.

I will admit there is much that affects the flow of money, such as bank deposits, the velocity of money, big commercial contracts, money abroad, etc. That is true with wheat; there is the bread, the baker, the trucker, etc., but we should change the amount of money in circulation with great caution, keeping about the same amount of money per capita in circulation at all times with the safeguard of a skilled board which could make limited alterations. Such a system would throttle any scheme of controlling the lifeblood of our business. Inflation, deflation, panics, and uncertainly would be things of the past.

Coming Down My Creek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following poem published in the Atlanta Journal by Harry Stillwell Edwards:

COMING DOWN MY CREEK

(By Harry Stillwell Edwards)

THE CORNER STONE

Freed of the nurse and the doctor's hands,
Crippled and weak, and swathed in bands,
Wreck of a man, in the prime of life—
Out of its dreams, out of its strife—
Helpless and useless evermore,
A bit of wreck on a storm swept shore,
Jest of the waves, plaything of Fate—
Roosevelt of the Empire State!

"Take him away," the surgeon said;
"Life calls to us, not the lips of the dead."
They wiped their knives, they called it a day,
They donned their coats, and they went away,
From blue-gray eyes, and heart of a child,
The crippled outcast looked and smiled.
They left him there on a crutch alone—
Him, the builder's rejected stone.

The fight began; a man against death,
Pain submerged in each drawn breath—
Immortal light in the blue-gray eye—
Who dared to live, who refused to die.
Gethsemane; the dungeon's rack;
The tortured nerve ere the sun came back;
But ever the brave heart without guile,
And ever the dauntless Roosevelt smile!
Aye, the fight went on, one man against death.

And throbbing pain in every breath;
Trailing his way with a shriveled limb.
The eyes of the people turned on him.
They swung their hats, and cheered him on.
The cities' key. Then he was gone;
Lifted high in strong men's hands
Answering a call and a state's commands.
Then darkness fell on a frightened land,
Starvation wandering up and down,
Nowhere the touch of a helping hand,
God in heaven look down! look down!
Where art thou, Jesus, our brother, found?
Wealth had fled from the merchants' till;
Silent the loom, and idle the mill!
And millions of idle men, grief-crushed;
And the moans of their little ones ever unhushed!
God in heaven, to Thee, we cry!
Help, oh God, we die! we die!
We had forgotten Thee, Jehovah;
Our trust was in riches, and our pride
In the victory of bloody hands,
We counted our bonds, and we hugged our gold.
And we taught our little ones over and over
Our bloody deeds in the foreign lands!

We lived in luxury, day and night;
We sang of arms and the glory of fight,
Forgetting our sons that the war gas slew;
Planning, still planning, for horrors anew,
That we the weapons of death might sell—
Forgetting Thee, and forgetting hell.
Now the ashes are upon our head,
Now we cry to Thee for bread, for bread!

Upon the heights there came a man,
Immortal lights to his blue-gray eye,
Who had dared to live, who refused to die!
And over the land a murmur ran!
Around him the radiance of a new day shone;
Undaunted, still and still alone!
And his voice rang out, "If you would be free,
Lift up your hearts and follow me;
Cast off your fears, and break the rod!
Have faith in yourselves and faith in God!"
And the cheering people looked up to him;
"Here is Valley Forge," they said,
"Here is Trenton, and Lexington
And Bunker Hill come back in one!
Here is a man who was not afraid
To brave King's Mountain's embattled crest,
And slay the vulture in his nest!
Here is Manassas and red Shiloh,
And Gettysburg where to and fro
The blue and the gray in valor mix—
Here is the Spirit of Seventy-six.
Aye, here are Lincoln and Davis, too;
The cheer of Forrest sounding through;
And here is Jackson, the man of doom,
And Grant and Lee and the Stuart plume;
And Moffett and Semmes of the boundless sea;
Here is the land of the brave and free
And here is the manhood of '63."

God in Heaven, before Thy throne
We bend the knee, in shame, atone—
We did not see Thy outstretched hand,
Thy temple is built, "peace blesses the land!"
We cursed Thy name; in our grief we said,
We asked of Thee bread, and Thou gavest a stone—
We did not know 'twas the Corner Stone!

American Prisoners of the Japanese Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people, and especially the relatives of our nationals who are held in custody by the Japanese Government, are deeply interested in ascertaining all facts with reference to the treatment accorded those persons, and Chairman BLOOM of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House appointed a subcommittee composed of myself, Mr. RICHARDS, of South Carolina; Mr. BURGIN, of North Carolina; Mr. VORYS, of Ohio; and Mr. SCHIFFLER, of West Virginia; to look into this matter and to cooperate with the executive departments of the Government in doing everything possible toward facilitating the exchange of these prisoners.

On May 26, 1944, as chairman of the subcommittee appointed by Chairman BLOOM of the Foreign Affairs Committee to investigate the facts relating to American nationals interned or held as prisoners of war by the Japanese Government, I made a brief speech, giving the result of the investigation made by that committee. And we decided, in view of the interest of the American people in this subject, and especially the relatives of our nationals so interned, that we would continue to try to secure all information and do everything possible to cooperate with the executive departments of the Government relative thereto.

I am in receipt of a letter from the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, dated August 29, 1944, giving further information as to developments since June last upon this subject, and under leave granted I submit same herewith:

AUGUST 29, 1944.

The Honorable LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I refer to Mr. Berle's letter of June 21, 1944 which transmitted to you copies of a chronological record of the efforts which had been made as of June 6, 1944, to arrange for the shipment of relief supplies to American nationals in the Far East. In view of the intense personal interest shown by you with regard to the plight of Americans in Japanese custody and because of your official position as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs, I take this opportunity to inform you of subsequent developments in the negotiations being conducted with the Japanese Government in behalf of American nationals in Japanese custody. I am enclosing for your convenient reference a copy of the Department's information sheet of June 1, 1944, which summarizes the steps taken by the Department in behalf of American nationals in Japanese custody up to that time.

Since June 1, the Department has continued to give its close attention to all phases of this distressing problem with a view to bringing further relief to American nationals in Japanese custody in any manner possible and by any means that might be utilized. These efforts have resulted in a recent agreement by the Japanese authorities to permit American prisoners of war in the Philippines to receive financial relief. The Swiss Government has been requested to make the necessary remittances from United States Government funds on deposit with the Swiss Government to the maximum amount which the Japanese authorities will allow individual prisoners to receive. That amount is approximately $10 a month per individual. As you will recall, civilian internees in the Philippines have for some time been receiving financial assistance provided by the United States Government. The Swiss Minister at Tokyo has standing instructions, upon which he has acted from time to time as the need arose, to increase this financial assistance whenever necessary to maintain an adequate subsistence level for these people. Our continuous endeavors to secure Japanese permission for the extension of similar financial assistance to prisoners of war in the Philippines has, as I said above, finally succeeded.

The Japanese authorities also agreed recently to permit the extension of financial assistance to American prisoners of war and civilian internees held in the Netherlands Indies, and the Swiss Government has been requested to make the necessary remittances.

Elsewhere in the Far East, in territory under Japanese control, financial relief is being extended to all American prisoners of war and civilian internees who can be reached either by Swiss Government representatives or by delegates of the International Red Cross Committee. Both the Swiss Government and the International Red Cross Committee have been given broad discretion as to the disbursement of funds in order to ameliorate to the greatest extent possible the conditions of detention of American nationals.

While, owing to the continued refusal of the Japanese Government to allow neutral observers to visit camps in the Philippines, our information on conditions in prisoner-of-war camps there is deficient, reports received concerning camps elsewhere in Japanese-controlled territory indicate that conditions are not as bad as we had feared they might be. Of interest in this connection is a statement attributed to General Wainwright which was incorporated in a recent International Red Cross report that conditions in his camp in Formosa are "as good as can be reasonably expected." Encouraging as is General Wainwright's statement, you may be sure that we will not relax our efforts on behalf of our national in the Far East.

It is fully recognized that by means of financial assistance alone the required amount of relief cannot be furnished our nationals in the Far East. As stated in the Department's summary of June 1, efforts have been made continuously since the spring

of 1942 to arrange for the regular and continuous shipment from this country of food, clothing, and medical supplies for distribution to these American nationals. The situation with which we have been confronted in this regard is outlined in section 6 of that summary. As stated in the Department's press release No. 214, dated June 6, a copy of which is enclosed, there is reason to hope that in the near future it may be possible to open a supply route to the Far East by which shipments may be made on a continuing basis. A further communication from the Japanese Government indicated the general approval of that Government to the use of the port proposed by the Soviet Government, but imposed certain additional conditions which must be met before these shipments can begin. Those conditions, which require the agreement of the Soviet Govment, are now under consideration by that Government, and a public statement in regard to this matter will be made as soon as a reply from the Soviet Government shall have been received.

After long and painstaking negotiations with all the governments concerned, we were recently able to get their agreement to carry mail via the trans-Siberian railway to Teheran, whence our Army planes carry it to the United States. Mail to Japan now goes by the same route. As a result of these arrangements our people in Japanese custody should be able increasingly to exchange mail with their loved ones. The American Red Cross is attempting to forward by this route small packets containing concentrated vitamins and medicines of a sort which are thought to be scarce in the Far East. We have as yet no assurance that supplies so sent will reach those for whom intended. However, the fact that this method of shipment is being attempted will, I think, demonstrate that every possible means is being explored by which assistance, great or small, can be brought to our nationals in Japanese custody.

Certain other proposals for the relief of our people in Japanese custody, both prisoners of war and civilians, are receiving the active attention of responsible officials of the Government. As some of these involve the security of our military forces in the Far East, they cannot yet be made public; others, which are awaiting the Japanese Government's reply, could be jeopardized by premature publicity.

I assure you that the welfare of American nationals in Japanese hands is given and will continue to receive personal attention by the highest ranking officers of the Department of State and other interested departments of this Government. I have followed closely all developments in this situation and have particularly charged one of the Assistant Secretaries of State with the responsibility for taking all possible steps to do whatever can be done to ameliorate the conditions under which American nationals are detained in the Far East and to arrange for the repatriation of those whose release can be effected. He works in close collaboration with the Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs and the chiefs of the Division of Japanese Affairs, the Division of Philippine Affairs, and the Special War Problems Division, as well as with the chiefs of other interested divisions of the Department and other agencies of the Government and the American Red Cross. This whole problem is one of the chief preoccupations of the Inter-Departmental Boards on Prisoners of War and Civilian Internees, on which the War and Navy Departments and the Departments of State and Justice are represented by high-ranking officers. Moreover, the President has taken a deep personal interest in this matter and has directed that all possible assistance be provided for Americans in Japanese custody.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

C. I. O. Unions and Communist Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Westbrook Pegler in regard to C. I. O. unions and Communist fronts.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, August 29.—Reporters in France tell of the execution of French women and men who were deemed to have collaborated with the Nazis and of women shorn as a mark of disgrace. The trials must have been informal and emotional, and there runs through the dispatches a strong suggestion that the Communists of France now are sitting as judges of patriotism to a country which they themselves betrayed in the days of the phony war and on down to the fall.

In the Herald Tribune, John Chabot Smith, writing from Marseille, says the French Forces of the Interior, after seizing a town, install a local government consisting of representatives from each of the six principal political groups, including the Communists.

The Communists in France, like the Nazis, are political fanatics. They have so much in common that before the war some American writers were calling the Nazis brown Bolsheviks. It is a fact that they were traitors to France and would have opened the gates from the inside to let the Nazis in without a fight, just as the Communists in the United States did all they could to keep this country unarmed and helpless until June 1941. President Roosevelt, himself, flatly accused the American Communists of this when he sent the Regular Army to Inglewood, Calif., to drive their terrorists from the gates of one of our most important airplane factories so that Americans could get to their jobs.

To refresh our memory of the conduct of the American Communists during that time we may refer to the files of some of the house organs of the C. I. O. unions which were then, and remain today, Communist fronts, controlled by clever and indefatigable Communist minorities. The Daily Worker is another reliable reference.

The Communists in France were worse than useless in the French Army facing the Germans. They not only wouldn't fight the Nazis, but they made more ghastly the desperate position of those Frenchmen who did fight and many of whom died. They were saboteurs in the factories and ports and collaborationists in far more deadly and tragic ways while there was still a chance of survival than those who, during the long dark night since the fall, lost hope of rescue and simply submitted.

The Communists were active, aggressive traitors who stabbed their own country in the back just as surely as Mussolini did, and only after the foul deed was done and the Nazis were in, suddenly turned patriots because Russia, their spiritual homeland, was in danger. Their purpose was not to rescue France but to help Russia by harassing the Nazis in France.

That such people should now be able to hound and condemn and execute others, even though some of the accused actually were traitors, is a hideous irony and an injustice to the American and British fighters who drove the Germans out. For these American and British soldiers, too, were betrayed by the Communists and now find French Communists exploiting their victory.

It will not be so, apparently, but surely these traitors, too, should be called to trial. Instead we find them participating in the control of the nation they helped the Nazis to humiliate and torture.

Excerpts From Speeches Delivered by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, on the Subject of Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from speeches delivered by me from 1939 to 1944, inclusive, on the subject of preparedness, together with editorial comment thereon.

There being no objection, the excerpts and editorial comment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1, 1939, volume 84, part 2, page 2078:

"I shall vote for adequate defense. Are we in voting this money making provision so that every dollar of it will go into preparedness? There are so many places where money is needed to help and encourage and influence constructively the life of our people that we cannot afford to waste the money which is to be appropriated. We must see that no exorbitant profits or graft are permitted."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 1939, volume 84, part 4, page 3946:

"Today I am presenting a measure to restore the cut in prevailing tariff rates on zinc ores and slab zinc. * * * It is desirable that attention be directed to the prevailing zinc tariff rates because it is more than possible that they constitute a genuine menace to the American zinc industry and its employees; also this menace, with its resultant shut-downs, will seriously curtail production of a product vital to national defense."

On October 7, 1939, I discussed with Senator Schwellenbach the exportation of scrap iron and steel from this country. Opposed the exportation on the following grounds: (1) because it had an inflationary effect on our domestic prices; (2) because it made it possible for Japan to procure her armament requirements from American scrap.

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 9, 1940, volume 86, part 6, page 5821:

"There are rumors in and out of the Capitol relating to the sufficiency and adequacy of America's equipment for self-defense in this great hour. What have we in the way of raw materials? Are we spending our resources? Certainly if we need our raw materials adequately to prepare ourselves, none of them should be shipped to any other nation."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1940, volume 86, part 6, page 6226:

"I do object to diverting America's attention from the challenge of the hour—I mean the need for immediate preparedness, preparedness to protect our own, but not to spend our resources in brawls on other con-

tinents. * * * What are we preparing against? The answer must be that we are preparing against war within and war without, so that war will not reach our shores. * * * That brings up the matter of mental defense, something for which we cannot legislate, but something for which each citizen must prepare himself. He must not let hysteria or loose and irrational thinking determine his course, or the course of the Nation."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 11, 1940, volume 86, part 7, page 7919:

"I believe everyone agrees that today we must direct our attention to this phase of our preparedness program—accumulating so-called strategic and critical materials."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 23, 1940, volume 86, part 10, page 10798:

"It is conceded that it is imperative to get our national forces built up. That does not mean simply more ships of the same kind. No; it means, if we are to have a preparedness program, that America must use its head. We do not want more ships of the old type. We want our present ships made more immune to attack from torpedoes, submarines, and airplane bombs. It may mean the creating of a new type of ship.

"Recently I took the matter up with the Secretary of the Navy, Colonel Knox, of building on the Great Lakes a great program of shipbuilding, whereby America would create an independent arm of the Navy—a mosquito fleet—if you please. We could build these small torpedo boats—they are only 70 to 100 feet long—we could build a hundred or more of them for the cost of a battleship. In the Battle of Britain, which is to come, we may find new lessons. But when we speak about a two-ocean Navy, we talk of prospects 5 and 6 years from now. We could build in 6 months to a year 5,000 of these small torpedo boats by taking over the shipyards on the Great Lakes, and those boats could protect every harbor on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. Why? Because they are speedy. We could improve the present design. They carry torpedoes. Some of them go at the rate of 70 to 90 miles an hour. They have antiaircraft protection. The sinking of one of these small boats would mean the loss simply of a complement of a few men. These boats are built for attack. They could proceed 500 miles out to sea. They could tear out from behind warships. They could supplement our submarines, they could supplement the air force, and they would give us the protection which America wants now.

"For a year and a half now I have pressed this matter upon the Navy Department. I took it up about a year and a half ago with Admiral Land, as I recall, and I persisted in it. I hope to have talks with Mr. Knudsen and others in relation to that subject. We do not always have to look to Germany to have the most advanced step. Germany has the blitzkrieg. We have intuition here. We have invention here. We have brains here. Let America use these qualities. Let America awake and lead the world—not simply be a follower.

"In this challenging period let us arouse all America to contribute to the preparedness program."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1941, volume 87, part 2, page 1714:

"On the 14th of February 1941 I introduced a resolution that 'the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business with closed doors, and that the Secretary of State and his Under Secretaries be requested to attend to discuss the eastern situation and other related matters with the Senate.'

"I wanted to find out something about our situation in the world. What did I want to find out?

"(a) What are our commitments in the Far East? Putting it bluntly, are we going to step in if Japan continues to rape the East as Adolf Hitler has raped Europe? She has let it be known now that she wants all of Oceania.

"(b) What is the condition of our fleet, especially its coordinating air arm? Is it like the Russian Fleet was in the Japanese war? I wanted to know whether or not our fleet had a coordinating air arm, such as the world has recently demonstrated every fleet must have.

"(c) What is our military position and our condition in the Philippines? Have we sufficient airplanes there? Are we ready for any eventuality?

"(d) If a commitment exists, what about the Dutch ability, the ability of Britain to cooperate, and what about the French in the Far East?

"(e) Where do we stand in relation to Europe? How much are we expected to contribute in ships, planes, and material when Hitler shoots his major effort?"

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 3, 1941, volume 87, part 3, page 2962:

"I am hoping and praying that we will not get into this world war but I cannot close my eyes to the fact that we are at the present time considerably in it. We are a partner with Britain in many ways. America has changed her course from isolation to intervention and is not simply meddling but has become an active participant in European affairs, diplomatically and economically, and has taken sides in this conflict by opening up her shipyards for Britain, furnishing Britain equipment, airplanes, and ships, and now the Government will seize the ships of the Axis Powers in our ports; it has thrown neutrality out of the window and is now contemplating convoying British ships.

"I am speaking for the pilots of America who will be fighting your battle and mine if we become involved in war. Are we building inferior fighting planes? If our men are to do any fighting, they are entitled to the best ships America can produce."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1941, volume 87, part 12, page A2947:

"The Nation's job is essentially preparedness to meet any military threat, any economic war, or any ideological battle."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 10, 1941, volume 87, part 12, page A3347:

"I cannot favor any acts by the United States Government which are an immediate invitation to involvement. * * * I think that one of the best guarantees that America can have for peace is an efficient, highly mobile army with a coordinating air arm and an unparalleled navy with a coordinating air arm."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 7, 1941, volume 87, part 6, page 6850:

"All America agrees that there is a great need for a reasonable, sensible defense program. All America is ready to dig down and pay its share of the defense program * * * between 80 and 85 percent of our people have indicated clearly that they don't want the managers of Government to commit any overt act which would precipitate this country into war. In my opinion, the interventionists do not rate over 1 percent in this country in number. The strict isolationists probably do not rate over 5 percent in number in this country. In between these two classes is the great Nation of American people who are thinking things through * * * all of them are in favor of adequate defense * * * they want this country to remain safe and free and at peace. This group is also conscious of the fact that other nations that wanted to remain safe and at peace and free have been overrun and conquered. They know that if any other nation commits an overt act of war against this land, we shall have unity. We shall have 131,000,000 people rising up en masse to defend this land."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 30, 1941, volume 87, part 8, pages 8341–8342 (speaking on the resolution to arm American merchant vessels):

"We are unprepared for war. We must do everything we can to postpone any military conflict until we are prepared. * * * We have no choice. Unless war is thrust upon us by force of circumstance, we cannot court an unprepared involvement which would send our inadequately trained boys to a slaughter of the innocents. Because I believe we are unprepared I have opposed each and every measure which appeared to be directed toward an unwarranted involvement, and I shall continue to oppose measures looking toward an unwarranted involvement."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 30, 1941, volume 87, part 8, page 8346:

"Armed merchantmen have been conclusively shown to be ineffective by our experience in the last World War * * * under international law an armed merchantman has the status of a warship and is subject to attack without warning."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 30, 1941, volume 87, part 8, page 8348:

"I have a feeling that if the pending joint resolution (repealing the Neutrality Act of 1935) is passed, it means war. In my opposition to the other steps taken by the administration, I have never made that statement. I have a feeling nearing conviction that if this joint resolution becomes the law of the land and the President puts it into execution, your country and mine will be engaged in war."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1942, volume 88, part 8, page A319:

"I supported appropriations for more than $800,000,000 in 1939; more than eight billion in 1940. (That includes every military and naval appropriation presented to the Senate.) And in 1941 I supported defense appropriations of more than thirty-two billion."

EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Excerpt from editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, September 24, 1942, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 6, 1942, vol. 88, pt. 10, pp. A3585–A3586]

The short speech which Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, delivered on the floor of the Senate a few days ago is certain to grow in significance.

In it Senator WILEY advanced the most important, constructive, and forward-looking suggestion in behalf of the future peace which has come from Congress since the United States formally entered the war. He proposed that President Roosevelt be invited to join with the Senate in forming a foreign relations advisory committee. * * * If this be isolationism, then the internationalists could well embrace it. But this is not isolationism; it is the voice of constructive, midwestern leadership which is awake, alert, and concerned that the United States shall neglect no step which will produce a peace-secured world as the only guaranty of a peace-secured America.

[From the Washington Post of July 1943]

Ten months before Pearl Harbor Senator WILEY introduced another resolution asking the Secretary of State to report in executive session to the Senate on the threat of war in the Far East and our preparations to meet it. At that time the State Department knew that war in the Pacific was rapidly approaching. But the resolution was pigeonholed. The Senate did not get the information sought. No adequate preparations to meet an attack were made. The United States was humiliated at Pearl Harbor, and a great sacrifice of human life will be necessary to regain what we have lost in the Far East. No one can say with assurance how the situation would have been changed if the information in the hands of the State Department had been conveyed to key Members of Congress. This much, however, is certain: The withholding of such

information makes it impossible for the representatives of the people to act intelligently in the face of a global crisis.

[From the Kenosha (Wis.) Evening News of February 29, 1944]

Long before the Federal Government opened up low-grade zinc mines by paying a differential Senator WILEY made the suggestion to do so. Over 2 years before the Government began to utilize shipyards on the Lakes he asked the Navy and the Maritime Commission to do this very thing, suggesting the need for the building of corvette-type boats. If his suggestion had been followed earlier it would have saved 700 oil tankers, eased the oil rationing, and put the solution of that problem months ahead.

[From the Tribune and Legal News, Saginaw, Mich., of August 11, 1944]

SENATOR WILEY'S FORESIGHT

People in Washington can't get over the fact that American Ambassador Grew reported on the dangers of an attack from Japan to the Department of State long before Pearl Harbor.

And Washington remembers that Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, had an inkling that things were in a bad way in the Pacific, and that he introduced a resolution nearly a year before Pearl Harbor asking the Secretary of State to appear before the Senate in executive session and make a report on the situation in the Pacific. It has been suggested that had this WILEY "first" resolution been adopted that the Japs might not have been able to get away with the attack on Pearl Harbor.

It also appears that Senator WILEY has been "first" in looking ahead most of the time during the 6 years in which he has been in the Senate. At least he was the first person to recommend to the Secretary of the Navy and the Maritime Commission that shipyards be constructed in the Great Lakes area and utilized to help produce American ships. Today our Great Lakes areas stand out at the "peak" among the regions where big things are done to win the war.

War Refugees as Immigrants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, August 15), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "War Refugees as Immigrants," published in the Colorado Springs Gazette of August 19, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR REFUGEES AS IMMIGRANTS

Through the action of the President, a thousand war refugees have been brought from Europe and established in a camp in New York where they will be maintained for the duration. Normally, it would seem, marked victims of Nazi oppression, escaping, would be cared for in Italy or north Africa. Mr. Roosevelt has explained that he ordered them brought here as a symbol of America's willingness to assume a fair share of responsibility for such people. If, after all this country has done in the last 5 years, and continues to do, anybody needs such evidence, it is indeed, a strange world.

What is of particular moment is the problem presented by the presence of these WAR refugees and the means by which they were brought into the country. For the President, in directing their admittance, acted in violation of the immigration laws, and it seems inevitable that sooner or later most, if not all, of those brought here will seek immigrant status.

The problem is one of immigration policy and whether that which we have followed since the last war is to be torn down by war emotionalism and sentimentalism. Certainly when war ends there will be a rush of Europeans seeking admittance to this country. That WAS the experience last time and, coupled with the earlier experience with hyphenates, it prompted the first steps toward rigidly controlled immigration.

America had theretofore been a haven of refuge and a land of opportunity. Matured, it can no longer be so pictured with justice to those who have built it. The immigrant now seeks equal standing in a going concern. That is why the undeveloped lands of the world, even when rich in natural resource, offer no attraction. There the effort would have to start with spade work. Here a prosperous society is already in being.

If that society is to be maintained, free and independent and economically sound, it must be by a reasonably homogenous people; at least, a people sharing common ideals. The American ideal is held nowhere else in the world, nor much understood, however, what it has produced may be envied, and if it is to be maintained here the addition to population through immigration must be regulated both by selection and by the time factor involved in assimilation.

The country, in short, can take in no more than it can digest.

There is unbounded sympathy for Europeans who are suffering and will continue to suffer for years in consequence of war. The American people will do all they can to help alleviate that suffering. The most they can do will fall short of what is desired. Sympathy will demand the opening of immigration gates to accommodate as many as possible here. Cold reason says we shall thereby weaken ourselves without offering any solution of the broad problem. Reason should prevail.

Slaughter by Nazis of Polish People

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspapers contain the story of the slaughter by the Nazis of 6,000,000 Polish people since the German Army first invaded Poland, and yesterday's papers contained the story of the removal of 150,000 Poles from the city of Warsaw to the neighboring suburban area of Pruszkow, and also at Majdanek, near Lublin, where the Nazis have established "wholesale slaughter camps." The newspaper accounts are as follows:

[From the Washington Star of August 30, 1944]

GERMANS ON TRIAL CONFESS SEEING WHOLESALE SLAUGHTER

(By Daniel De Luce)

LUBLIN, POLAND, August 17 (delayed).—Four German prisoners of war stood with a bored air in front of a Russian-Polish atrocities commission here tonight and told their stories of Majdanek, perhaps the greatest horror in Nazi Europe.

In curt phrases, they asserted that men, women, and children of 22 nationalities had been gassed, hanged, shot, burned, drugged, or starved to death in the 3 years of the operation of the Majdanek barbed-wire-enclosed encampment in a rolling meadowland at the edge of Lublin. Russians and Poles have estimated that it received more than half a million persons doomed to extermination.

Majdanek is a ghastly fantasy. It was established for murder on a vast but methodical scale. Until a group of American and British correspondents visited it today—with its six concrete vaults for execution by cyanide or carbon monoxide gas, its open-air crematorium surrounded with skeletons, its mounds of human ashes mixed with manure for fertilizing cabbage patches, and its overflow burial ground in a pine woods carpeted with decaying bodies—most of these newspapermen could not even begin to imagine the proportions of its frightfulness.

CITE ORDERS FROM ABOVE

Tonight, with our clothes still reeking of the dead, we sat in a stuffy Lublin courtroom while three German SS (Elite Guard) officers and one German civilian renegade spoke indifferently of Majdanek's scenes of slaughter and blamed all on "orders from above."

N. A. Stalb, a blond, 6-foot German butcher, arrested in 1939 for selling meat in the black market, told in a clear, strong voice of his incarceration in Majdanek during which he once became a member of the barracks police detail.

"I have seen a tractor haul as many as 400 corpses at one time from the bath and disinfection house to the ovens on the hill," he said. "One day I saw the bodies of 157 Polish children who had been gassed. Another time I saw a group of Polish women marched up a hill to be shot to save the trouble of gassing them. They were ordered to disrobe. One refused—a girl about 28 to 29. Two men tied her hands and legs, put her on a steel stretcher, and thrust her alive into the white-hot oven."

"WE COULDN'T PROTEST"

Hermann Vogel, 42, an SS group leader from Mühlheim, stared ahead with a set face as he told of shipping 18 carloads of clothing to Germany from the Majdanek warehouse he supervised.

"Yes; all this clothing, even babies' garments, belonged to those executed," he said. "I have seen groups of 120 to 150 persons taken to the gashouse in the evening and their bodies stacked outside the next morning. Yes; I knew children were murdered, but what could we small people in the SS do? We couldn't protest."

SS Komandofuehrer Theodore Schoelen, 40, in charge of clothing collection at the shower room adjoining the gas chambers, claimed he never saw an execution—only corpses afterward. He admitted remembering November 3, 1943, when, according to the camp records, 18,400 prisoners received "special treatment" which reduced the number of camp inmates by that number.

"It was an order from above, perhaps direct from Berlin," he said. "The wireless played Strauss waltzes through the camp loudspeakers all that day and most of us were told to stay in barracks. I know nothing more

about it. I always gave bread and cigarettes to the prisoners."

SS Obersturmfuehrer Anton Ternes, a frog-faced man who handled Majdanek's finances, proudly referred to his age, 50, and his lieutenancy in the last war and then declared that the mass slaughter of November 3 netted little jewelry or other valuables.

"The camp physicians told me as many as 300 children were killed in a single day," he said. "I couldn't understand the systematic killing. I told my wife when I went home on furlough about it and she said: 'God will punish the German people for the crimes they do.' "

The Russian-Polish commission said the following facts had been adduced from seized documents, from testimony of the German personnel, and of surviving inmates, such as the French Communist, Fisherman Corenten Ledu, of Brittany:

Majdanek housed from 30,000 to 40,000 prisoners, but the turn-over in 3 years probably exceeded 600,000.

The gas chambers were sufficient to kill 2,000 in less than 7 minutes. The crematory ovens handled 1,900 corpses in a 24-hour period.

The majority of the dead were Soviet war prisoners, Poles, and Jews, but every country in Europe was represented, also China.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 29, 1944]

NAZIS TO SLAY 150,000 POLES, OFFICIAL SAYS IN PLEA FOR HELP

Poland's exile government appealed to the United States yesterday in an attempt to prevent the Germans from slaughtering 150,000 Polish men, women, and children who have been concentrated in a small town 15 miles southwest of Warsaw.

Polish Ambassador Jan Ciechanowski presented a formal note to the State Department, declaring that the 150,000 civilians were recently moved out of Warsaw and deported to a wholesale slaughter camp in the suburbs of Pruszkow.

"They are being starved, tortured, entirely deprived of food and water, and are facing inevitable death," the envoy's note said.

"Untold scenes of horror in the Pruszkow camp are beyond description. It is obviously the aim of the Germans to bring about the extermination of this population within the next few days.

"The Polish Government urgently appeals to the government of the Allied Nations and to the entire civilized world to do all that is possible to prevent the perpetration of this final act of German barbarity, unprecedented in history.

"Only the immediate intervention of the Vatican, of the Allied and neutral powers, of the International Red Cross supported by the weight of the indignation of all free democratic public opinion may still stop the Germans from carrying out their heinous design of mass slaughter of defenseless and innocent civilians."

The Polish note said the extermination of these citizens of Warsaw appears to be a German attempt at retaliation for the fact the Polish home army started an uprising in the capital on August 1.

If something is not done immediately these heroic people will be completely wiped out before it is possible for the Russian Armies to get through the Nazi lines defending Warsaw.

From time to time we have heard that American lend-lease weapons and other materials of war are not being furnished to General Bor, commander of the Polish underground armies in Warsaw. It has been stated in the public press that it is entirely possible to fly arms into Warsaw by American and British Army planes and supply the Polish citizenry of that city with the means to defend themselves but that for some reason that has not been done. Mr. Speaker, I can conceive of no reason why we should not supply lend-lease weapons to the Polish people as we supply them to any of the others of our allies. Polish soldiers are fighting on all the battle fronts of the world in the Allied cause and are fighting heroically. At Cassino, in Italy, we are told that three out of every four Polish soldiers who made the attack on that heavily defended fighting front were killed. When the British took Tobruk and held it, it was Polish soldiers in the service of the British who were largely responsible for that feat. Poland, Mr. Speaker, has suffered as no other Allied nation has suffered in this war and I believe it is the duty of this Congress to demand that our responsible officials who have the authority to designate where the lend-lease weapons shall go shall send them immediately to the underground army of Poland and I am sure if that is done the lives of many Allied soldiers now fighting in that country will be spared because the Polish underground army, properly armed, will became a tremendous power for the destruction of our common enemy.

In the name of humanity and everything that Christian people hold dear, let us spare no means to go to the rescue of the heroic Polish people.

Appropriations for W. P. A., C. C. C., and N. Y. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include some figures furnished by the Appropriations Committee with reference to the total appropriations or allocations for W. P. A., C. C. C., and N. Y. A.:

Appropriations or allocations for W. P. A.

Fiscal year	Allocation or appropriation	Emergency Relief Appropriation Act
1935-36	[1] $1,356,755,069	1935
1937	[1] 1,815,419,001	1936
1938	[1] 1,670,625,822	1937
1939	[2] 2,250,000,000	1938
1940	1,477,000,000	1939
1941	[3] 1,350,650,000	1941
1942	875,000,000	1942
1943	280,000,000	1943
Total	11,075,449,892	

[1] Net amount allocated by the President out of funds appropriated to him by the cited emergency relief appropriation acts. Excludes amounts transferred to subsequent acts or to the surplus fund.
[2] Includes $725,000,000 provided under Public Res. 1, 76th Cong., and $100,000,000 by Public Res. 10, 76th Cong.
[3] Includes $375,000,000 provided under deficiency appropriation.

Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration appropriations

Fiscal years	Civilian Conservation Corps	National Youth Administration
1936	$600,000,000	
1937	308,000,000	[4] $71,250,000
	95,000,000	
1938	[5] 350,000,000	75,000,000
1939: All expenses	226,331,000	75,000,000
	22,000,000	
1940: All expenses	296,000,000	100,000,000
1941:		
All expenses	280,000,000	
Youth work		21,980,000
Salaries and administration		500,000
Printing and binding		20,000
Total		22,500,000
Youth work		95,984,000
Salaries and administration		6,100,000
Printing and binding		75,000
Total		102,159,000
Youth work		30,535,375
Salaries and administration		1,941,063
Printing and binding		23,562
Total		32,500,000
1942	[6] 246,960,000	
Youth work		85,984,000
Salaries and administration		5,700,000
Printing and binding		83,000
Total		91,767,000
Project expenses		56,972,000
Administrative		3,028,000
Total		60,000,000
1943	[7]	
Youth work		49,729,000
Part-time		8,000,000
Salaries and administration		3,500,000
Printing and binding		45,000
Total		61,274,000
1944	[8]	[8]
1945	[9]	[9]
Grand totals	2,423,291,000	691,450,000

[1] In Works Progress Administration.
[2] Emergency Conservation work.
[3] $8,000,000 reappropriated.
[4] $20,000 reappropriated.
[5] $3,000,000 reappropriated, $1,500,000 reappropriated—$300,000, of the $4,500,000 available to Jan. 1, 1944, reappropriated.
[6] $9,300 included in "Salaries, Office of Administrator, Federal Security Administration."
[7] $78,000 reappropriated.

It will be noted that the grand total of the totals for each of these three agencies is as follows:

W. P. A.	$11,075,449,892
C. C. C.	2,423,291,000
N. Y. A.	691,450,000
Grand total	14,190,190,892

United States Writer Sees Horror of Nazi Death Camp—Most Terrible Place on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following news

article which appeared in the Detroit Free Press of August 30, 1944, written by W. H. Lawrence, of the New York Times foreign service:

UNITED STATES WRITER SEES HORROR OF NAZI DEATH CAMP—MOST TERRIBLE PLACE ON EARTH—1,500,000 KILLED IN LAST 3 YEARS AT GERMANS' LUBLIN FURNACES

(By W. H. Lawrence)

LUBLIN, POLAND.—I have just seen the most terrible place on the face of the earth—the German concentration camp at Majdanek, which was a veritable river of blood.

It is estimated by Soviet and Polish authorities that 1,500,000 persons from nearly every country in Europe have died there in the last 3 years.

I have been all through the camp inspecting its hermetically sealed gas chambers in which persons were asphyxiated and its battered fire furnaces in which persons were cremated.

I have talked with German officers attached to the camp who admitted quite frankly that it was a highly systemized place for annihilation.

I have seen skeletons of bodies the Germans did not have time to burn before the Red Army swept into Lublin on July 23.

And I have seen much evidence of bone ash still in the furnaces and piled up beside them ready to be taken to a nearby field as fertilizer for cabbages.

I have been at Krempitski, 10 miles east, where I saw three of the 10 opened mass graves and looked upon 368 partially decomposed bodies of men, women, and children who had been executed individually in a variety of cruel, horrible means. In this forest alone, the authorities estimate there are more than 300,000 bodies.

It is impossible for this correspondent to state with certainty how many persons the Germans killed here. Many bodies unquestionably were burned and not nearly all of the graves in this vicinity had been opened by the time I visited the scene.

But I have been in a wooden warehouse at the camp approximately 150 feet long in which I walked across literally tens of thousands of shoes spread across the floor like grain in a half-filled elevator.

Here I saw shoes of children as young as 1 year old. There were shoes of young and old men or women. Those I saw were all in bad shape—since the Germans not only used the camp to exterminate people but also as a means of obtaining clothing for the German people.

I have questioned a German officer, Herman Vogel, 42, of Milheim, who admitted that as head of the clothing barracks he had supervised the shipment of 18 freight car loads of clothing to Germany during a 2-month period.

He knew, he said, that it came from the bodies of persons who had been killed at Majdanek.

This is a place which must be seen to be believed.

But I have looked inside furnaces and have handled the huge steel stretcher on which bodies were loaded into a stove, five in each furnace—not unlike the huge instrument by which bakers remove bread pans from an oven after baking.

After inspection of Majdanek I am now prepared to believe any story of German atrocities no matter how savage, cruel, and depraved.

I was given an opportunity to sit with the special mixed Soviet-Polish Atrocities Investigation Commission, headed by Vice President Witos, of Poland, and to question six witnesses.

For the correspondents the commission's prosecutor, Christians, a Pole, summed up the evidence taken by the commission. He said it had decided that these Germans bore the main responsibility for the crimes committed at Majdanek and in Krempeitski Forest:

General Globcnik, Gestapo and SS chief of the Lublin district.

Governor Wendler, of the Lublin district, described as a distant relative of Heinrich Himmler.

Former Governor Zoerner, of the Lublin district.

Lisske, who had charge of all concentration camps in the Lublin district.

General Weiss, who was in charge of the Majdanek camp.

Company Commander Anton Tumann, who at one time had charge of Majdanek.

Mussfeld, who was in charge of the crematorium.

Klopmann, who was chief of the German political department of the Lublin district.

It is impossible in the space here availbale to relate the details, but here is the story as it came from the lips of a German. He had been a prisoner in Majdenek and was left by the retreating Germans. He was Hans Staub, 31, who had been imprisoned for engaging in black-market meat operations in Germany.

Despite German orders that prisoners were to keep away from the crematorium area, he managed to slip inside the brick fence one day. He secreted himself at about the time a truck loaded with approximately a dozen people drove up.

Among them was a Polish woman he estimated to be 28 or 29 years old. The prisoners were ordered to alight from the truck and undress. One woman refused, and this enraged Mussfeld, who beat her. She screamed, and Mussfeld lost his temper, shouting, "I will burn you alive."

According to Staub, Mussfeld then directed attendants to grab the woman and bind her arms and legs.

They then threw her on the iron stretcher still clothed and shoved her body into the oven.

"I heard one loud scream, saw her hair flame and then she disappeared into the furnace," Staub said.

According to several witnesses the peak death production day for Majdanek was November 3, 1943, when the Germans executed a total of 18,000 to 20,000 prisoners.

Majdanek is located about two kilometers from the middle of Lublin on the high road from Chelm to Crakow. As one approaches one gets a view of the concentration camp almost identical with those depicted by American motion pictures.

The whole camp covered an area of 670 acres.

As we entered the camp the first place at which we stopped was the reception center. Here Jews, Poles, Russians and in fact, representatives of a total of 22 nationalities entered.

Sometimes they went directly into the next room which was hermetically sealed with apertures in its roof. Down the way the Germans threw in opened cans of "zyklon B" poison gas consisting of prussic acid crystals which were a light-blue chalky substance. This produced death quickly.

Other prisoners were kept for long periods of time. The average, we were told, was about 6 weeks.

About 1 mile from the gas chambers was a huge crematorium built of brick.

We were told it took 15 minutes to fill each furnace and about 10 to 12 minutes for the bodies to burn. It was estimated that this battery of furnaces had a capacity of 1,900 bodies per day.

This is Majdanek as I saw it.

The Passing of a Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the Daily Times published at Mamaroneck, N. Y., Monday, August 28, 1944, titled "The Passing of a Party":

THE PASSING OF A PARTY

Should Franklin D. Roosevelt be reelected to a fourth term it is fair to predict that his very success on the ticket technically labeled Democratic will mean the passing of that party as it has been known for generations to American voters. For the forces which are most active in his behalf and to whom he will owe the greatest gratitude in event of victory at the November polls are not those which have made the Democratic Party as it has been known in the past, but others with widely different ideologies.

There have been Presidential campaigns before in American history wherein all the radical and subversive elements of the Nation were lined up behind one candidate. But never before have we witnessed not only the united support of one candidate by such elements, but an open, vigorous effort by these same elements to capture that party.

It is no secret that the C. I. O. and the Communist-minded leaders of some organized unions were the first to start the ball rolling for a fourth term for Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was equally apparent at the recent Democratic National Convention, in the backstairs manipulation of the Vice Presidential nomination, including the blackballing of James F. Byrnes, that these elements held the balance of power in that convention. And it should be just as clear that in the event of success of the Roosevelt-Truman ticket on November 7, it will be these same elements which will assume open control of what has now for 152 years been the Democratic Party, the oldest continuously existing political instrumentality in the United States.

Those elements may best be visualized as the Russian-born Sidney Hillman, his C. I. O. Political Action Committee, the affiliated Communist-controlled American Labor Party, variegated and assorted radical groups friendly to the principles enunciated by such leaders and contributors to their vast campaign funds, linked with some three and one-half million self-perpetuating pay-roll patriots of the Federal bureaus. Where in that group can be found Democrats as they were known under Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, or Alfred E. Smith?

These would-be captors of the Democratic Party are smart, they are vigorous, they are ambitious. Even here in the rock-ribbed Republicanism of Westchester they are steadily making their strength felt, as revealed recently in their successful union-led demands for higher war bonuses and pay for county employees and in grass-roots registration campaigns for their potential voters. Make no mistake about it, just so surely as to the victors belong the spoils in any election, so in this campaign a victory for the Roosevelt-Truman ticket in November will spell the conquest of the Democratic Party by the elements most active in the campaign.

Those true Democrats who oppose this seizure from within of a party whose cherished principles have long been far different from policies now enunciated by the C. I. O. Political Action Committee are naturally timid and hesitant in such opposition. They resent justifiably the appellation thrown at them of "Roosevelt haters" and reactionaries; properly they shy from charges of having selfish, sinister motives and of seeing nightmares in the daytime. But unless they make such opposition effective they will, as surely as election brings a Roosevelt-Truman victory, find their party has been taken from them and themselves bodily evacuated much in the fashion of Sewell Avery of Montgomery Ward.

That is the issue which will come before honest-to-goodness Democrats in this campaign. Here in Westchester we ask that such Democrats consider carefully and most seriously the impact upon their own party of success of this ticket they are asked to support. Is their duty that of loyalty to Roosevelt and Truman or to the party which has served the Nation so long and up to now so honorably, a party which through malignant masquerade and Machiavellian manipulation is now summoned to suicide?

The Late Second Lt. William J. Bucklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter that was written by Second Lt. William J. Bucklin and was mailed from Camp Benning, Ga., on November 24, 1943. Susan, not quite 4 years of age, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Francis G. Martineau, of 105 High Service Avenue, North Providence, R. I.

Lieutenant Bucklin was the son of Col. and Mrs. John G. Bucklin, of 11 Leah Street, North Providence, R. I. He attended Henry Barnard School and graduated from Classical High School, Providence. He was a member of North Providence Troop of Boy Scouts prior to entering college.

He received the degree of bachelor of science in mechanical engineering from Rhode Island State College in September 1943. At college he was a captain in the R. O. T. C., a member of the Honor Society, of Scabbard and Blade, and of the Newman Club. He contributed articles to the Beacon and the Rhode Island Review, and was editor of the latter publication in 1943 and wrote the leading editorial entitled "On a Darkling Plain"—which was a plea for preparation for the peace following an Allied victory. He also wrote an essay entitled "Let us see the Stars."

Upon receiving his commission at Camp Benning he was sent to Camp McCoy, Wis. He died on August 11, 1944, from an accidental gunshot wound received in line of duty, at Camp McCoy. At the time of his death he was assigned as cannon battalion leader to Company C, Four Hundred and Seventeenth Infantry Regiment, Seventy-sixth Infantry.

It was my privilege to appoint this young man, after examination, as first alternate to the Naval Academy at Annapolis in 1942. He was certified by the academy, but was subsequently selected for officers' training, and upon receiving his degree from Rhode Island State College went to Camp Benning.

Here is a boy who has given the last full measure of devotion to his country's cause. Here is a young man, on the threshold of a brilliant career, who has left us to go on to the Valhalla where all great warriors must meet. This letter has come out of the depths of his soul. It is a pledge that the Nation need have no concern for its destiny when this next generation shall have taken over. It is a promise of America's future greatness.

The letter referred to follows:

DEAR SUSAN: Although you're not quite old enough to read these lines all by yourself, much less understand them, I am writing you a love letter. It is undoubtedly your first one, and for that I'm glad.

There will be many more from other boys as you grow older, for you have learned from wise parents to hold beauty in your heart. When beauty is in the heart, it smiles in those smiling eyes of yours and in your dimpled chin, and you spread cheer and happiness to others.

Happiness is the only thing worth striving for in this crazy life, Susan, and that's why I'm writing this letter. You still live in a world which exists largely in your own mind, and you don't realize completely what has happened to this world about you. I'm just that much older than you that I have been forced to think about this funny ball of earth which is running wild.

Everyone, as he grows up, must find ideals to live for. In the ultimate analysis, this life is but a preparation for a better life, but while on earth, we must organize our mortal lives along a more prosaic pattern of ideals. I tell you this because you have given me a great part of my ideals, or at least you have crystallized them.

Perhaps this is a war of four freedoms for all mankind, but knowing a little of the way men are intrinsically selfish and apt to forget the further goal once an immediate victory is won, I sadly dismiss such world-wide ideals as futile. And so, while debating why I am about to risk a thing which most men seem to value above all else, I pictured you.

You, a little girl with a twinkling eye that sees nothing but good on earth, with a capacity for unselfish affection that would make a prince of the meanest pauper. Yes, Susan dear, I think of those fragile yet firm little hands that held mine in a grasp of openhearted friendship—I think of a heart that offers for every joy taken, the present of a thousand in return. And so Susan, when I have to decide if I am going to fight for something worth fighting for, I think of you.

Then my heart feels good, and clean inside, for I am exalted in believing that I fight for the right of you and other children like you to grow up the way you are now—unworried, happy and without a care. If I can help keep you as you are, it is worth the price.

How or why this mess started is of no concern to me now. My ambition is to help clean it up as quickly as possible. The more distant future may be a dark cloud, not yet a part of your life, but the little people about us can insure that rainbows are always in the skies, if they but learn to live as you live.

So Susan darling, stay in your happy ignorance as long as you can. The dreams you dream are the realest things in life. It is never too late nor inopportune to have them, but to keep mine real and vital, I give them to you to hold 'till happier days.

Take care of them 'till I come home. With love,

BILL.

Representative Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech made by Mr. John B. Napolitano, on August 9, 1944, in which he seconded the nomination of my colleague and friend, Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, for reelection in the Fourth Congressional District of Connecticut. It follows:

I am a labor man. I am a shop steward of Bridgeport General Electric Local 203, United Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O. My future is the future of organized labor, and I want organized labor to have a real chance in this country—a chance to hold on to its past gains and to continue to progress.

Naturally, I believe organized labor has a great deal at stake in the next election, but I do not think for 1 minute that labor's whole future is tied up in the present administration or in the New Deal.

I believe that labor's best chances now and always lies in the election or reelection of its tested and proven friends.

Nearly 2 years ago, when CLARE BOOTHE LUCE ran for Congress from the fourth district, many honest and sincere labor men were frankly skeptical. True, she had said repeatedly in campaign speeches that she was a friend of labor, that she was in favor of all the social gains labor had made and that she hoped some of these gains, such as the Wagner Act, would be extended by becoming part of the law of our own State.

But what I wanted to know and what other labor men asked was: "Is Mrs. LUCE sincere or is this just campaign oratory? Does she mean this or is she just kidding us along to pick up a few votes? What will she do when some anti-labor legislation comes up in Congress? Will she keep her word to us then?"

Well, as you all know, Mrs. LUCE was elected, and just 5 months, almost to the day, after she went to Congress a piece of prime grade anti-labor legislation came up on the floor of the House. I refer, of course, to the famous Smith-Connally Anti-Strike bill. It was a time when the whole country seemed down on organized labor because of the coal strikes. It was a time when many of labor's long-time friends were deserting our cause.

Plenty of pressure was being put on Congress to pass this bill, and plenty of Congressmen and Senators were yielding to that pressure. But our Representative, Mrs. LUCE, stuck by her word, resisted the pressure, and voted against the Smith-Connally bill. The bill passed, as you know, and was vetoed by the President. When it came back to the House Mrs. LUCE was paired to sustain the President's veto.

A great deal of other legislation of importance to labor has come before the Seventy-eighth Congress. For instance, there was the Carlson bill for current payment of income tax, which embodied the principles of the Ruml plan. Labor was opposed to the Carlson bill because it conferred a windfall on the rich and no comparative benefit on the ordinary workingman. Again the pressure for passage of this bill was enormous, perhaps chiefly because the plan was not clearly understood by the general public. Again Mrs. LUCE voted according to her conscience and her campaign pledges by consistently opposing the Carlson bill with its windfalls.

She paired against the Hobbs bill, which put organized labor in the same category as organized crime. She voted against appropriating money for another Dies committee witch hunt. She supported the Monroney amendment to the antisubsidy bill, which would have linked subsidies to wage increases and made it necessary for subsidies to achieve their purpose—to hold down the cost of living.

In her first term in Congress Mrs. LUCE introduced two bills related to labor and manpower. They have been falsely described as labor-draft bills, but they did not call for the mass conscription of labor. They were drawn up and introduced primarily to avert such a wholesale draft of labor as was contemplated in the Austin-Wadsworth bill.

The bills introduced by Mrs. LUCE called for utilization in the war effort of men who have not been drafted for military service because of mental or physical disabilities and who continue to work in a nonessential activity.

Men in war-essential activities, which includes the vast majority of union men, would not have been affected in any way by either of these bills.

At the time when it seemed that a draft of labor was inevitable, when even the President called for one, I am sure any labor man, even a Hillman Labor Democrat, would have much preferred either of Mrs. LUCE's measures to the Austin-Wadsworth bill for the indiscriminate conscription of men and women without proper safeguards for unions or individuals.

Yes, as far as labor is concerned, Mrs. LUCE is a thoroughly tested and consistently loyal friend. She is a much better friend than, say, the Democratic candidate for the Vice Presidency who voted for the Smith-Connally bill when it first came up in the Senate. She is a much better friend than Connecticut's New Deal Senator MALONEY who voted for this bill when it was first introduced and then helped to override the President's veto.

Many Republican candidates for Congress have as good a labor record as Mrs. LUCE. Many Democratic candidates have a record of continued sniping at labor. Remember, if the majority party, the party in power, which sponsors and controls most of the legislation to come up in the Seventy-eighth Congress, did not have more than its share of labor haters, so much discriminatory legislation could not possibly have been reported out of committees in either House. And if the administration is returned to power, these same men will still control the Congress as committee chairmen and majority members and we will certainly have more legislation designed to hamstring or crush organized labor.

Now the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is pouring money into congressional districts to defeat Republican candidates.

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee does not care about a candidate's past record in support of or opposition to labor. The C. I. O. Political Action Committee is trying to play politics—power politics—by putting all of labor's eggs in one basket—the very fragile and battered basket of the Roosevelt administration.

Suppose our aging President should be reelected and should die in office? Sidney Hillman and the Political Action Committee would die with him, and then where would labor turn? To Vice President TRUMAN, supporter of the Smith-Connally Anti-Strike bill? To the party which drafted and introduced this and other anti-labor legislation? To the poll-tax boys of the solid South?

I say that the Political Action Committee does not speak for organized labor. I say that it does not speak even for the rank and file of the C. I. O. I say that the workingmen in this country will not consent to being used as poker chips in a political gamble for power.

This committee is trying to give the impression that labor is lost if Roosevelt loses the election. When you look at the voting record of Republican legislators from all parts of the country you know that this is not true.

Labor in this country is wise enough and informed enough not to be stampeded down any one-way street. It fought far too long and far too hard for its gains to risk them all on the election of one candidate or one party. Its future is much too big to be risked and possibly lost with the fortunes of one candidate or to gratify the ambitions of one man. It has far too much at stake in the free American form of government to permit itself to be used as a catspaw by Communists or pinks or others who would like to make some drastic changes in that form of government.

Honest and sincere labor men and labor leaders don't have to be told how to vote this year. They know who their friends are and they know how to distinguish between friend and foe without getting a password from any committee. A true friend of labor, a candidate labor should and must support, is the legislator or official who stuck by us when the going was toughest, when the pressure was heaviest, when all the pull was coming from the other direction, and when the false friends were deserting to the other side.

That is why I, as a labor man and a member of the C. I. O., am glad and proud to second the nomination of labor's proven friend, CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, to represent us again in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Resignation of Hon. James A. Farley as Chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-Journal of June 10, 1944]

WHY MR. FARLEY RESIGNED

Although he personally offers no explanation save pressure of other business, the reasons for former Postmaster General James A. Farley's resignation as chairman of the Democratic State committee do not seem very obscure.

Mr. Farley has always stood flatly for recognition of the two-term precedent for presidents. He has never believed that President Roosevelt or any other single individual was indispensable. He has felt, and evidently feels today, that more harm might come to the country as a result of the establishment of a precedent that Presidents might serve indefinitely, than from the loss of the services of any particular individual of either party.

Four years ago, when he was sure that President Roosevelt intended to run for a third term, he resigned as Postmaster General and left Washington.

This year, when he was sure that the President was going to run for a fourth term, he resigned as State chairman, evidently burning all of his bridges.

Whether Mr. Farley's move was wise from a straight political standpoint is not clear at this moment. But feeling as he does, it was the morally honest thing to do, anyway. You have to give him credit for having the courage of his convictions.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of June 10, 1944]

FARLEY'S RESIGNATION

The resignation of Jim Farley as chairman of the New York Democratic State committee may signify that he is "resigned" to the prospect of a fourth-term nomination and does not wish to serve in a key position in the Democratic campaign to carry New York State.

The most obvious inference from all this is that Mr. Farley, who strongly opposed a third term and apparently is even less enthusiastic about a fourth term does not care to engage in the leadership of the campaign for Roosevelt in New York as would be the logical obligation of the State chairman.

New York is going to be one of the most important battlegrounds in this campaign and it goes without saying that the Democrats will miss the skilled and capable hand of Jim Farley. Presumably he will retire to the side lines for this campaign.

[From the Muncie (Ind.) Star of June 14, 1944]

JIM FARLEY STEPS FROM POLITICS

Big, kindly, canny James A. Farley, of New York, the man who won the 1932 Democratic Presidential nomination for Franklin Roosevelt by his practical and astute spadework with party leaders from precinct committeemen to State chairmen throughout the land, has bowed out of the political scene. He has resigned as New York State Democratic chairman, the last of his prominent party affiliations.

Now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Sales Co., seeing to it that "cokes" get to our fighting men in all theaters of operations, he said business took all his time and, therefore, he was retiring from the political post. But the observers declared there was more to it than that and "Big Jim" was getting out because he foresaw a fourth-term bid by the man he, more than any other person, placed in the White House. His views are well established.

"Big Jim" Farley, with the welfare of the country always first in his thoughts, was opposed emphatically to a third term and he is even more emphatically opposed to a fourth. He just doesn't think that's the best expression of American self-government and he doesn't want to be connected with an effort to keep one man at the helm in Washington such a long time, so the commentators say.

Whatever the basic reasoning in his resignation, the country lost one of its most loved, one of its fairest and one of its most able politicians—not only of this period, but of all its history—when Jim Farley gave up the New York State chairmanship. And that's using the word "politician" in its very best sense—a real servant to the cause of honorable self-government by a vast people. As national party chairman and as Postmaster

General, Mr. Farley had the highest esteem from the Nation. His has been a true personal contribution to the American scene—an example of what a politician should be. All Indiana offers him a handshake of good will for the future.

Ballot Is Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

BALLOT IS POWER

Some thinkers have said that Americans are yet only half prepared to be responsible voters. In other words, on the average, we do not yet realize the full meaning of our duty as a citizen of a democracy. Too many of us think of our vote as a whip. We surmise that should an officeholder not conform to our wishes, the vote will be used as a whiplash. The vote is that powerful, but with all power goes responsibility. When a man has power, if he uses it for the advantage of his fellow man, he does not regard it as a whip but as a means for improvement and help for all men at one time. Too many regard power as a means only to exert for personal and selected group pressure and let the rest of the Nation take care of itself.

Freedom of the press does not give the right to a man to be a continual disturbing element. In fact, our Constitution made a restriction with extension of freedom of speech and the press. Those who have its power cannot slander nor lie nor use malicious intent. Freedom of speech and press must have responsibility or even that may be vicious and degrading.

So it goes with the power to vote. A person should in all fairness to himself, his community, and Nation, vote for the good of all the people and not for personal prejudice or promotion. He should vote honestly as he sees the issues at hand and the personalities that are in line to handle them.

The ballot is a club that should be handled with great sportsmanship and regard. Some persons may easily become chronic "agginers" so deeply obsessed with prejudice they are removed from straight thinking. It is therefore proper that all of us check and double-check ourselves before we use this power delegated to each American citizen.

The privilege to vote is indeed a power issued to the individual. Privilege carries responsibility. We must get out of our minds the idea to vote for punishment, instead we must seek to vote helpfulness and justice for all.—Anadarko Daily News.

The Proof of the Pudding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the Daily Times of Mamaroneck, N. Y., published in the issue of Monday, August 28, 1944, titled "The Proof of the Pudding":

PROOF OF THE PUDDING

New dealers, frustrated in their attempt to foist upon the States a "soldier ballot" carrying only Federal candidates, and endeavoring frenziedly to make it appear that the Republican candidates seek to disfranchise those in uniform, have sought to leave the impression that it is extremely difficult for a citizen-soldier to get a 1944 ballot. Particularly, they stress, will it be practically impossible for a soldier serving abroad to get his ballot for this year's election.

To bring those vague, nonsensical partisan allegations up against the cold, realistic background of actual fact, we are quoting herewith from a letter written on August 3 of this year by a White Plains soldier "somewhere in Italy" to his father:

"The clippings are interesting, and informative of the political thought back in the States. The Army is making every effort to get the boys registered, through the war ballot officer in each squadron or company. We had to sign a form stating that we received the registration blank; whether we want to use it or not is up to us. No party will be able to say the Army bungled the vote. * * *

"I just received acknowledgment from the Board of Elections, White Plains, that they had received my application. It will be mailed 'on or about September 7.' So, all is ready."

There is not a soldier eligible to vote in New York State, we are convinced, who cannot receive a ballot in plenty of time for voting and returning, provided he wants to vote. The attempt to create a contrary impression is a plain effort to confuse and to antagonize by the C. I. O. branch of the New Deal.

Training of Disabled War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply impressed by the following official circular sent out by the International Association of Machinists of the American Federation of Labor on the matter of the training of disabled war veterans. Particularly do I want to draw attention to the resolution passed by this union stating that no veteran of this war will be asked to pay any initiation fee or admission fee if he applies for membership in this union.

The official circular of the International Association of Machinists follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
Washington, D. C., August 11, 1944.
Official Circular No. 417.
Subject: Training Disabled War Veterans.

To the Order Everywhere, Greetings:

Each week finds an increasing number of disabled war veterans returning from the battle front who are desirous of resuming employment in industry. These disabled veterans who witnessed some of their buddies blown to bits by shell shot and themselves under fire suffered injury must be afforded every opportunity to get the finest type of training to make an adequate living for themselves and families. To take any other position would be unsportsmanlike and un-American. Relegating disabled veterans to unimportant, poor-paying jobs will break their spirit. A man with a broken spirit is the most unfortunate being on earth.

Since most industrial insurance rates increase in proportion to the number of disabled persons employed by a given concern we must insist that industrial insurance laws be drastically overhauled so that the employer engaging these disabled veterans will not be penalized because of employing their share of disabled war veterans for training.

This war has shown that industry can use handicapped workers. Disabled veterans must not be relegated to the scrap heap. As an evidence of our deep concern for these disabled veterans the executive council of the International Association of Machinists is directing all subordinate local and district lodges and the membership everywhere to cooperate in every manner possible with Federal, State, Dominion, provincial, and municipal agencies to train disabled war veterans so these men, to whom we civilians owe so much, are fitted to again take a deserving place in American industries and be self-supporting.

Each local and district lodge is requested to create a veterans' rehabilitation committee, such committee to be required to familiarize itself with the provisions of all laws and resolutions relating to disabled veterans, that have been adopted by the Federal, State, Dominion, provincial, or municipal governments. Each local or district lodge is requested to acquaint local draft boards and bona fide veterans' organizations of the policy of the International Association of Machinists and our desire to assist in the work for rehabilitating disabled veterans. By thus extending our cooperation we demonstrate our consciousness of civilian responsibility and in a small way pay our indebtedness to the returning disabled veterans.

Before closing we believe it timely and opportune to embody a resolution adopted by the executive council of the International Association of Machinists during December of 1943 and submitted to the general membership on January 17, 1944, same reading as follows:

"*Resolved*, Veterans of the present war, not members of the International Association of Machinists, on reentering industry, to perform work coming under the jurisdiction of the International Association of Machinists, when applying for membership in our association, will be exempt from paying an admission fee, providing they can show evidence of honorable discharge from any military branch of the United States, Dominion of Canada, or Newfoundland."

Your cooperation will be appreciated.

With best wishes, we remain,

Fraternally yours,

H. W. BROWN,
International President.
E. C. DAVISON,
General Secretary-Treasurer.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herewith a revised and up-to-date

analysis of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress. It is based on a radio talk made by me over Station WHP, Harrisburg, Pa., on June 18. It describes the important basic legislation passed by the Congress and known as the G. I. bill of rights. I feel confident that it will be most valuable to keep for reference. The bill had my strong support at all times and my vote upon final passage. I am going to give you a short summary of just what the bill does. Obviously, time does not permit me to go into too great detail; also, rules and regulations to be set forth in the future by the Veterans' Administration as authorized by the act will develop more accurately and more specifically these rights and also the procedure which the veteran must follow. However, I do believe that anyone who reads this closely will know, in general, what benefits accrue to him or her under this bill. The summary follows:

ELIGIBILITY

In order to be eligible the general rule is that a man or woman must have served in the active forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or any of their component parts, during the period beginning September 16, 1940, and lasting up to the end of the present war. Such person must have served for a period of at least 90 days, or have been sooner discharged for disability incurred in line of duty. In addition, he or she must have been released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable. No distinction is made between enlistment and induction.

HOSPITALIZATION AND CLAIMS

First. The Veterans' Administration is declared an essential war agency, and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities on personnel, equipment, supplies, and materials. Priorities for materials are also given to any State institution built or to be built for the care or hospitalization of veterans. These provisions are extremely important. In practical effect they mean that the minute the war ends, at which time the Army and Navy will have no further pressing need for supplies, then the veterans' hospitals will have first call on the goods on hand. Until that time they will have second call.

Second. The bill orders the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization to provide additional necessary hospital facilities and authorizes arrangements for the mutual use of hospitals, and so forth, with the Army and the Navy. For this purpose it authorizes the appropriation of $500,000,000. These hospitals will care for diseases and disabilities nonservice connected as well as those incurred in service.

Third. Personnel of the Veterans' Administration may be placed in Army and Navy discharge centers, and so forth, to adjudicate disability claims and to give advice as to their rights and benefits to all servicemen about to be discharged. It forbids the discharge of servicemen and servicewomen until a substantial part of their pay is ready or, if disabled, until adequate arrangements have been made for filing claims for benefits provided.

These two requirements are extremely helpful. At one time a great deal of needless trouble and grief was caused by hasty releases, leaving the veteran more or less stranded. To some degree this has all been remedied by the cumulative efforts of individual Congressmen, including myself, through the exertion of pressure on the War and Navy Departments, thereby securing this action from those departments of their own accord.

Fourth. A further clause states that recognized veterans' associations shall place representatives at the various discharge centers to aid servicemen about to be released. The American Legion, the V. F. W., the D. A. V., and other similar patriotic organizations are admirably equipped to do this. They are eager and anxious so to do. They have been doing this job. They can now be of even greater help in the future than in the past to the veterans about to leave the service and reenter civilian life.

Fifth. It gives the veteran safeguards in respect to various statements against his own interest, and with respect to review of irregular discharges.

EDUCATION

First. It extends the right of vocational education for service-incurred disabilities to those who served during the period of September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Second. All veterans whose education was interrupted or interfered with by reason of their entrance into the service will be eligible for 1 year's education at any school or institution of his own choice and in any subject or subjects desired for which he or she is fitted. He must start the course not later than 2 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is later.

In order to make these opportunities widely available, it is stipulated that anyone who is under 25 years of age at the time he or she entered the service "shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded or delayed." This means that if the veteran was under 25 when inducted, then the solid presumption will be that this did cut into his education, whether or not he was in fact going to school or to college at the time. If he is over 25, then he or she must show that his education actually was interrupted.

Third. Every veteran can have a year refresher course. Every person who has served 90 days is entitled to a refresher or retraining course not in excess of 1 year. This is entirely irrespective of age and all veterans have to do is to prove that they had been in the armed services for the required time.

Fourth. The veteran may select any approved educational institution in any State in the Union whether he resides there or not. An educational or training institution is defined to include all public or private, elementary or secondary schools, business schools and colleges, scientific and technical institutions, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers' colleges, and so forth, and also technical training-on-the-job schools. It amounts to complete freedom of choice.

Also, an employed veteran may take part-time study under certain rules.

Fifth. The training shall be for a period of not to exceed 1 year, but it may be extended for another 3 years, except in respect to refresher or retraining courses. In brief, the requirement for getting the additional years is that the student fulfill satisfactorily the educational standards of the college or school at which he is studying. However, the greatest length of time which anyone can spend in college will be the length of his or her service after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, excluding the time spent in completed courses in the Army and Navy college and school training programs, as modified by the following paragraph:

Anyone who has spent 90 days in the armed services (excluding time spent in completed Army and Navy college-training programs) is entitled to 1 year's education. If the veteran has been in the services for 90 days or more, then he is also entitled to Government-provided education equivalent to the full amount of time he has spent in the Army. This is in addition to the 1 year. For example, Private John Doe has spent 1 year in the Army. He is entitled to 1 year's education in return for his first 3 months' service. Assuming he has satisfactorily passed his course, then he is entitled to 12 months additional over and above the year awarded to him by virtue of the first 90 days' service. This 12 months is to compensate him for his entire period of service and the first 3 months counts as part of this time of service. Note that the original 3 months counts as part of this time of service. Note that the original 3 months' period counts double:

(a) It entitles him to 1 year's education.

(b) It counts as part of his full time spent in the service in computing the amount of Government education which will be given to him.

Thus Private John Doe may receive 2 full years' education in return for 1 year's service. If John Doe has spent 3 years in the service, then he can get the maximum amount, i. e., 4 years' education. If he has spent 6 years in the service, he still can only secure 4 years' education because that is the top limit.

Sixth. The Administrator pays the institution the tuition and also the laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and similar fees. The Administrator may pay for books, supplies, and equipment. However the total of such payments shall not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

While pursuing a course of education or training the veteran will also be paid a subsistence allowance of $50 per month if without a dependent, or $75 per month if he has a dependent. Any sums paid to the veteran in apprentice schools, and so forth, for work done will be proportionately deducted.

Seventh. It takes time to get this program into full operation. However, to enable the educational features to get under way at once as much as possible, the Veterans' Administration has prepared a form called Veterans' Administration Rehabilitation Form 1950. This can be obtained from the Veterans' Administration in Washington, or any of its regional offices, from veterans' organizations, or you can get one through my

office. When filled out this form may be filed with the Veterans' Administration or with the school or college which the veteran wishes to attend.

Many boys and girls already discharged want to enter school this fall. They can do so if they fill out and file Form 1950 now. The Veterans' Administration will later notify you when it approves your application. You can matriculate without awaiting this notification, but the Government will not pay your expenses or allowance until it has passed on your eligibility. But if you and the school or college are satisfied that you are eligible, you can go ahead now and be reasonably certain that your application will be approved in due course.

LOANS

Any eligible veteran within 2 years after separation from the service or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is later, may apply for a guarantee by the Administrator of not to exceed 50 percent of the loan or loans for specified purposes, provided that the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed $2,000. For example, if the veteran borrows $5,000 or $10,000 he will get only $2,000 guaranteed. If he borrows $3,000, then he will have only $1,500 guaranteed—50 percent of $3,000.

Interest on the guaranteed part of the loan for the first year shall be paid by the Veterans' Administration. This gives the veteran more chance to get started. The loans shall run for not more than 20 years at not to exceed 4-percent interest. The loans to be guaranteed may be made by private persons, firms, or corporations, or by governmental agencies and governmental corporations. In connection with governmental loans, there are certain other liberalizing features.

Second. The specified purposes for which loans can be made are: (a) The purchase or construction of homes, or repairs to them or to pay delinquent taxes on a home; (b) The purchase of a farm, farm equipment, livestock, and for repairs on farms; (c) the purchase of a business, business property, business equipment, to be used in a gainful occupation. I hope that this will start many veterans on the road to becoming successful small-business men and to a revival of small business in this country.

The loans must be approved and the act sets out the broad standards to govern the Veterans' Administrator in his decisions as to whether or not to approve. In general, they are the same that any lending institution would apply: (a) That the proceeds be used for the purpose requested; (b) that the property will be useful and necessary; (c) that the ability and experience of the veteran and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such occupation are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will succeed; and (d) that the price paid does not exceed a reasonable normal value as determined by proper appraisal.

In the case of homes, the amount and terms of the payments must bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses.

EMPLOYMENT

The reemployment provisions are substantially the same as those now in effect. A veterans' employment representative, who shall be a veteran, is attached to the United States Employment Service in each State. He will help to get jobs, give information, and so forth. This is substantially what Bill Ilgenfritz is now doing so well in Pennsylvania at present. It should be noted that the veteran has other employment rights under the Selective Service Act and other laws passed by the Congress.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

First. Eligible veterans who are unemployed are entitled to receive under certain conditions unemployment compensation at the rate of $20 per week for a maximum of 52 weeks within a 5-year period immediately following the termination of hostilities. The unemployment must begin within 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later. A proportionate amount may be paid to the partially employed who receive less than the $20 allowance per week given by the act plus $3, that is, $23.

The allowance for a week will be $20 less that part of the wages payable to the partially unemployed for such week which is in excess of $3—figured to the nearest highest multiple of $1 where it does not come out even. Thus, if the veteran is earning $10, you subtract $3 from the $10, leaving $7. You then subtract the $7 from the $20, and his weekly payment for readjustment would be $13. Stated conversely, it is $23 per week less the amount earned in partial employment during the week.

Second. A claimant will be disqualified if he or she leaves suitable work voluntarily or is discharged for misconduct; if he or she fails to accept suitable work when offered to him or her or refuses to attend an available free training course; and also in certain cases where work stoppages are caused by labor disputes, but only if he or she is participating therein.

Third. Provision is made for self-employed veterans engaged in a trade, business, profession, and so forth. If his net earnings have been less than $100 in the previous calendar month, he can receive the difference between $100 and his net earnings for such month. This provision is not in our social security law and, so far as I know, is an innovation in our law. It should enable enterprising veterans to become self-employed.

Fourth. Those unemployed prior to September 4, 1944, are not eligible for any payments. On and after September 4 those who are either unemployed or partially unemployed can make application and their payments should start shortly. Any unemployed or partially unemployed veteran can file at the State Employment Office, or, if he is a railroad man, at the Railroad Employment Office.

Fifth. Where a claimant receives other Federal or State benefit, a proportionate adjustment is made in his allowance. Also, veterans who have rights under two or more different sections of this act can only receive the fair and proportionate amount.

PENALTIES

Anyone receiving any money under this title with intent to defraud shall be punished by a fine of $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year or both. The same penalty applies to anyone making a false statement or misrepresentation. Anyone knowingly accepting an allowance to which he is not entitled shall be ineligible to receive any further allowance of any kind under this title. As to other fraudulent claims under this act the general penal statutes will be applicable.

MISCELLANEOUS

This summary includes only the G. I. bill of rights. The Congress has passed other laws of benefit to veterans. These include muster-out payments, national life insurance, dependency benefits, maternity care, death gratuity, and others. Anyone in Cumberland, Dauphin, and Lebanon Counties can get information on where and how to apply for these benefits by getting in touch with my office.

Important: The Selective Service Act gives the veteran certain rights to his old job under certain rules and regulations. In this connection be sure to remember that the act requires the veteran to make application for reemployment within 40 days after he is relieved from training and service. Complying with this is essential if the veteran is to retain his reemployment rights with his employer. Keep this in mind and do not permit this valuable right to lapse.

Many veterans, or their families, will want additional information on various parts of this program. The Veterans' Administration is the source of all authoritative rulings on this and similar veterans' laws. If anyone feels that it would be helpful to have me get in touch with the Veterans' Administration in behalf of himself or others, just write your Congressman, JOHN C. KUNKEL, at either 459 Old House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C., or to 20 South River Street, Harrisburg, Pa. If you prefer, telephone me at 4–3356 on the Harrisburg exchange. If I am not there, my secretary, Mrs. Richings, will take your message and forward it on to me or arrange an appointment. She may very probably be able to help you, herself. Both Mrs. Richings in Harrisburg and Miss Garney in Washington have had much experience in this work. All three of us find it a real and great pleasure to do anything possible for the boys and girls in the services and for their loved ones back home.

Farley Steps Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Auburn (N. Y.) Citizens-Advertiser of June 10, 1944, titled "Farley Steps Down."

FARLEY STEPS DOWN

The resignation of James A. Farley as chairman of the Democratic State Committee brings to a close a 14-year term which included conspicuous political success for the Democrats not only in the State but also in the Nation.

As campaign manager for Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936, Mr. Farley saw his candidate elected by huge electoral majorities, the adverse vote in 1936 being confined, as he predicted, to only two States, Maine and Vermont. Opposed to a third term, and, for the same reasons, to a fourth, Mr. Farley in 1940 handed over the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee to Edward J. Flynn, confining himself to State activities.

Until Thomas E. Dewey upset the applecart in 1942, the Democrats had been consistently victorious in New York State since the mid-twenties. For nearly two decades Al Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Herbert Lehman monopolized the governorship; but when Mr. Farley chose to back John J. Bennett, a candidate unacceptable to the American Labor Party, the solid front was cracked.

Press and radio commentators are trying to read motives into Mr. Farley's resignation. They are not satisfied with the statement that he can no longer devote the time required for proper conduct of the State office during an important Presidential year. Knowing that Mr. Farley did not favor breaking the two-term tradition, they jump to the conclusion that he will oppose President Roosevelt's renomination in the convention. That is a risky guess.

Mr. Farley is fundamentally a party man. He is also a realist. In 1940, after registering objections to a third term, he turned to support Roosevelt following the nomination. This year it is practically a certainty that Roosevelt will be nominated on the first ballot. If Farley decides to make a futile gesture and enter into an open fight against President Roosevelt's renomination for a fourth term, it will be a departure from his usual procedure. He is not in the habit of disturbing party unity when nothing is to be gained from it.

Both friends and adversaries will grant that James A. Farley has been the ablest strategist which either party has produced in the last quarter of a century. But there was more in his success than strategy. There was affability amounting to genius. He made every new acquaintance feel that he was an intimate friend. He signed more personal letters and autographed more pictures than a dozen men in his position usually do. And it wasn't just the big shots on whom his genial smile was turned. The humblest party worker basked in the rays of his warm personality; and when Farley started in calling each by his first name, it was only natural to answer with "Jim."

The secret of Farley's success was this combination of the old-time politician who knew everybody with the technique of modern organizational methods. Jim was about the best fence-builder any party ever had. The trouble with Farley is that in the Democratic Party today fences are superfluous.

Let Us Develop Our Inland Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address delivered by me before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at New Orleans, La., on July 27, 1944.

It reads as follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, I believe it was Confucius, the great Chinese philosopher, who once said to make your speeches short if you want them to be long remembered. I shall try to follow that sage advice today.

You may be, by my remarks, like the fellow was by a proposed bill to tax bachelors. Some fellow said that if they put a heavy tax on bachelors that would make them marry, and then he said they would live longer. Up piped an old bachelor from the Middle West and said, "Well, they wouldn't live any longer; it would just seem longer." [Laughter.]

I hope my remarks today won't seem any longer than they really are.

I have no speech cut and dried for this occasion. However, I am satisfied that by the time I am through you will all say that it was dry enough.

I am for the development of our inland waterways—our entire waterway systems, from the source down—as well as the harbors into which they flow. The greatest natural wealth in America, outside of the soil from which we live, are these golden streams that drain our soil, provide hydroelectric power, and furnish us highways of navigation. I believe in using the water to water the people first, the stock second, and the land next, to generate hydroelectric power next, and then for navigation purposes.

I have consistently advocated that policy ever since I have been in Congress.

As co-author of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, I held out for that policy more than 10 years ago, just as I have on the Columbia River, and every other stream. The results have more than justified my contentions.

The T. V. A. has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times. I repeat that. The T. V. A. has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times. We have not only provided a new water transportation highway of more than 650 miles on the Tennessee, and connected it up with the great Mississippi Valley system, but we have controlled the floods on that stream, we have conserved the soil, and are today generating 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year on the Tennessee and its tributaries.

To let you know what that means, the power generated at Muscle Shoals alone exceeds the combined physical strength of all of the slaves freed by the Civil War; while the 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours generated by the T. V. A. every year equals the strength of 40,000,000 men working 8 hours a day 300 days a year. Electricity is the greatest servant mankind has ever known, and the only one the man or woman of ordinary means can afford.

I have been referred to as the father of rural electrification. I do not deny the soft impeachment. I began this struggle for rural electrification more than 10 years ago, and today, as a result of those efforts, joined in by some of my colleagues who are here today and by some who have already passed to the Great Beyond, there are more than 1,000,000 farm homes tonight enjoying the benefits of electricity, taking to them everything we have in the city except the noise and the city taxes. More than a million homes are enjoying those blessings now, and believe me, when this war is over and materials are again made available, we are going to continue the drive until we reach them all.

There is another thing that these streams should be used for, and that is national defense. I have always been disappointed that the Gulf coast was not better defended; for that reason, I am supporting this deep-water route into New Orleans, and also to Gulfport and Mobile and other points along the Gulf coast. I am not willing to depend on the goodwill of foreign politicians for our protection after this war. I am not looking for the millennium. But when the war is over, we want an Air Force and a Navy second to none, to protect our country and to help maintain the peace of the civilized world.

We have one great bottleneck in our inland waterway system that is costing us untold millions, if not billions, of dollars, that I want to talk to you about today, and that is the swift current on the Mississippi River. The other day we were discussing this slack water route up the Tombigbee and into the Tennessee River, when General Robbins, one of the ablest men who has ever been on the Board of Army Engineers, and now Assistant Chief, appeared before the Senate committee.

Now let me give you a brief outline of the situation. From Cairo to New Orleans and across to Mobile, and up the Tombigbee to the Tennessee, thence downstream to Cairo is a distance of 1,768 miles. Of that 1,768 miles, 1,121 miles of it is downstream. Practically two-thirds of the distance is downstream and the rest is in slack water. General Robbins said before the Senate committee:

"If we came up here and submitted a report recommending a project for slack water on the Mississippi between Cairo and New Orleans, by building locks and dams on the Mississippi River itself, at an estimated cost of $66,000,000, I think you would all take off your hats and cheer.

"This alternate route on the Tombigbee we are recommending amounts to the same thing, only the locks and dams are to be built on the Tombigbee instead of the Mississippi. There is no greater tangible saving than that which will accrue from use of the Tennessee-Tombigbee route instead of the Mississippi for the upstream traffic."

This would provide a slack-water route up to the Tennessee and a downstream route from there to Cairo, and at the same time retain the downstream route on the swift Mississippi from Cairo to New Orleans for the downstream traffic. It can be best described as a counterclockwise route using the Mississippi route downstream, then along the Intracoastal Waterway to Mobile, thence by way of the Tombigbee up this slack-water route to the Tennessee River, and thence down the Tennessee and the Ohio to Cairo.

I want everyone here to take note of this, because it involves everybody in what we call the Mississippi Valley area, from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Sioux City, Iowa, from the Alleghenies to the Rockies. When I say that I want you to know that I am not slighting rivers elsewhere, because I have borne the brunt of the battle in the Congress of the United States for the improvement of the Columbia River system, and every other river, when it came to developing hydroelectric power and all of the other facilities those streams afford.

Now, let's see what this means to you. One of the Army engineers prepared these figures for me, and I want you to hear them. An 8-barge load—that is, a tow and 8 barges—with an average of 3,500-ton load, going from New Orleans to Cairo, fighting the swift current on the Mississippi River, would spend for fuel alone $6,273. Going the other way or through the Tombigbee-Tennessee counter-clockwise route, the same tow, with the same load, would spend for fuel and lockage $3,868, or a saving of $2,405. If it were going to Paducah or to any point on the upper Ohio, the saving would be $2,803. Every barge load that comes down has to go back. Such a barge load from Pittsburgh, Pa., or Louisville, Ky., Cincinnati, Ohio, or Wheeling, W. Va., Chicago, St. Louis, or Cairo, St. Paul or Minneapolis, or from Kansas City, Omaha, or Sioux City, bringing us everything from machinery

product at Pittsburgh to wheat and corn and beef products from Iowa or Nebraska—every single one of them on the return trip would save an average of $2,500.

That would mean that traffic on the Mississippi would double and treble and quintuple in a few years. It would not take any traffic away from New Orleans, but it would far more than double the traffic on the Mississippi, and at the same time it would save untold millions of dollars to the shippers up and down these streams.

In my opinion, such a project would pay for itself in less than 2 years.

If such a barge load were going up into the Tennessee River, where we have that great wealth of raw materials, and where you are going to get your finished aluminum for probably a century to come, going from New Orleans to any point on the upper Tennessee, it would save $4,507. Going from Mobile to Cairo, the saving would be $3,270 a trip. But if it were going from Mobile into the Tennessee River, it would save $5,392 on every such load. Going from the mouth of the Warrior River—and that includes Birmingham—to Cairo, the saving would be $5,448. If it were going to Paducah—and that means to Pittsburgh, Louisville, Cincinnati, or Wheeling, the saving would be $5,847. But if it were going from Mobile into the Tennessee Valley, that great area now being so rapidly developed and in which we are producing so much of war materials, the saving would amount to $7,551 a trip.

What does that mean? It means it would bring the cost of such transportation down tremendously. It is the greatest project of its kind on earth, and the only one left where you can transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another with so much ease, at so little expense, and with such tremendous savings in transportation cost and distances. The only parallel is the connection between the Don and Volga Rivers, that has saved the Russians in this war.

So far as we are concerned, this is the greatest project of its kind ever proposed.

I know there are some people who will say that the Army engineers investigated this project and turned it down a number of years ago. Of course they did; for until we built the dams on the Tennessee River, there was no outlet. We had no 9-foot channel to the Tennessee River. We would have been going into a dead end. Besides, at that time we would have had to have lifts going up from the Tennessee, as well as up from the Tombigbee, without any water supply at the summit with which to operate the locks.

But when we built the Pickwick Dam on the Tennessee River, just below where this project joins the Tennessee, we raised the water level 55 feet at the mouth of Yellow Creek, and that enabled the Army Engineers to cut through the sand ridge separating the 2 watersheds and placed the summit of the project in the Tennessee River—in Pickwick Lake.

It makes a perfect set-up. Oh, but they went down the Tombigbee and said, "John Rankin is going to flood you to death!" Which, of course, was pure nonsense! The only water turned from the Tennessee will be just enough to run the first lock. Any of you who have been through the Panama Canal will recall that it is 85 feet above sea level. We couldn't operate those locks with sea level water. We had to dam the Chagres River and turn it into Gatun Lake. The only water turned into the canal is just enough to run the locks. That is what we did there, and that is what we propose to do here.

They continue to try to alarm the people of Tennessee by telling them that it would produce a water scarcity on that stream. The truth is that it wouldn't let enough water out of the Tennessee for you to discover it. It probably wouldn't lower the water level on Pickwick Lake one-half of an inch if you ran a barge through there every hour.

We are not building just for today! We are not preparing just for tomorrow! But this is a project that will last for a thousand years. That is what we are building for.

When our boys come home from this war, it will furnish employment for five or six thousand of them for about six or seven years. We want something for these young men to do. They want useful work. They don't want to rake leaves and chase mosquitoes, but they want employment that will help in building up the country, for themselves and their children and their children's children.

Again let me say to you that one of the paramount issues is national defense, and it always will be. Don't forget, as I said, that we are not going to be protected by somebody way off yonder. We are going to have to keep our own powder dry. I said the other day, and I say again, that one of our danger points is New Orleans and the Gulf Coast. Why? Because this Gulf Coast is what might be called the underbelly of the United States. The Gulf of Mexico is our Caribbean. The last time we were invaded, was right here. It is the most vulnerable portion of the United States. It must not be neglected any longer.

When Frank Reid, who sits by me here, was in Congress, he and I were fighting to defend General Billy Mitchell, who was showing us then what an air force could do, and pointing out the way to modern aerial warfare. If they had followed Billy Mitchell's advice, the Pearl Harbor disaster never would have happened. God bless his sacred memory. [Applause.]

I hope to see a monument erected to him as one of the greatest and most far-seeing military men America has ever produced.

In the years to come, we want to cooperate with the civilized nations of the earth, not only to maintain, but to enforce peace. But we want to be very sure that our own country is properly defended; and nothing would contribute more to that end than the development of our inland waterways—including this deep waterway along the Gulf Coast. If then, in the years to come, the Mississippi should be closed, as it once was at Vicksburg, then with this Tennessee-Tombigbee project, which would be protected from attack from the sea, we would still have an outlet.

Let's build America. Let us develop our own natural resources, beginning, as I said, where the water trickles down the hillside, and prevent the pouring of our alluvial soil into the Gulf of Mexico. Let us develop the water power we have today, improve the navigation of every stream, and provide a deep channel for the protection of the Gulf coast.

Last year there was produced and sold 184,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity in the United States. There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of undeveloped hydroelectric power going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year—enough to light and heat every home, to pump the water, milk the cows, and freeze the ice—enough to make America the richest and most powerful and most desirable country on the face of the earth.

I am for the development of all of it—but at the same time I want to provide for navigation on these streams so that we can take from the backs of our people the onerous burden of discriminatory freight rates. I say that not only for us here in the South, but for our fellow sufferers from Nebraska, South Dakota, Iowa, and every other section of the country. We want to see that everybody in America receives justice in transportation rates.

These are the things I am driving at. I am not willing to generate this power at public expense and then permit the plundering of the people through exorbitant light and power rates. It must be provided at rates the people can afford to pay, and it must be extended to every farm home in America.

In conclusion, let me give you an idea of what that means to some of the States. In Pennsylvania, for instance, with the proper rates last year, you would have saved $99,000,000 on your light and power bills. In New York you would have saved $195,000,000. The people of Georgia would have saved $18,000,000; Florida, $24,000,000; Ohio, $76,000,000; Texas, $45,000,000; Missouri, $29,000,000; and other States in proportion. This is a great natural resource—the greatest in all the world outside of the soil. Electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. The cheaper the rates, the more freely it flows; and the more freely it flows, the greater are its benefits to mankind.

It is our duty to see that the waterpower of this Nation is developed and provided to the American people at rates they can afford to pay, beginning with the T. V. A. rates as a yardstick basis, and reducing them as the economic situation justifies.

When our boys come home, let them not only find the American flag flying above American institutions, the same institutions their forefathers established, but let them not find a Fascist, a Communist, or a Socialist state of which they would be ashamed. Let them find the American way of life that you and I have lived. Let them find the real America for which they are now fighting. Let them not find our great resources neglected, but let them find an America where their representatives here and in Congress have taken every precaution to develop those resources and to provide them at the cheapest possible rates to make America for them and their children and their children's children, a richer and better and brighter place in which to live, and one they can always defend, and of which they can always be proud. [Applause.]

Congress Deserves Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today a column written by a good newspaperman and a good friend of mine, Mr. Chapin Collins, in his weekly paper, the Montesano (Wash.) Vidette.

Mr. Collins, a veteran of this war, is presently connected with the American Forest Products Industries, Inc., in the association's Washington, D. C., office, and writes a weekly column for the Vidette, which he owns.

One of his recent writings covered the subject of the public and press attitude towards Congress. Mr. Collins very lucidly takes the position that, by and large, Congress is composed of able, hard-working, intelligent men doing a hard and harassing job. He scores those portions of the press and public which habitually sneer at Congress and jibe unmercifully, and often unthinkingly, at the little foibles which any large group

of human beings will inevitably display, forgetting for the most part the exceedingly difficult and complex tasks which every one of us accomplish every day for the benefit of our districts, States, and the Nation.

I want by this means to extend to Mr. Collins my personal gratitude for his kind and encouraging remarks about Congressmen. I believe all of you who read his column I here insert will agree that he has assayed our worth in clear, impartial fashion—in short, that Mr. Collins has said a few kind words on a subject that is too often a target only for the clever, barbed, and erroneous writings and words of people who lack Mr. Collins' knowledge of it.

The column includes a tribute to Senator HOMER T. BONE, who is retiring as a representative of my State in the Upper Chamber to become a Federal circuit judge. While Senator BONE and I have differed politically, and belong to different parties, we have been warm personal friends for more than a quarter century, and I am glad that Mr. Collins took the Senator as his example of a good legislator.

The Collins column follows:

CHAPIN'S COLUMN

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Newspapers of Washington are seldom guilty of a phobia that seems to afflict a large segment of the American press, which is a constant badgering and belittling of Congress.

A large part of our free press, which after all is dependent upon continuance of free government, takes advantage of every possible opportunity (and creates others) to convince their readers that Congressmen as a whole are a moronic, greedy, often corrupt, and foolish lot of people who seem bent on misrepresenting their constituents.

You find almost none of this attitude in the newspapers of the Capital which, after all, have the best opportunity of observing foibles of the legislative branch. Certainly, of all newspapers, they have an objective and disinterested point of view, because no resident of the District of Columbia has a voice in electing Congressmen. In fact—which the rest of the country often forgets—residents of the District of Columbia have no vote on anything, not even their own local affairs. A soldier from here, for example, cannot vote.

The newspapers here evaluate Representatives and Senators on their own individual merits. Some they like and some they don't, and they don't hesitate to say so. But the institution of Congress commands their respect as, indeed, it should of the country as a whole.

There is no excuse for this barrage of jibes, and more than that, there is positive danger in it. The fact that we are fighting for democracy doesn't guarantee the democratic form of government, or to be more accurate, the representative republican form of government. If we are cynically agreed that the very men we elect can't be trusted, or are below normal, then the stage is set, indeed, for some form of fascism, without the help of Hitler.

There is no excuse for these jibes because there is no truth in them. Most Congressmen not only serve to the best of their ability, but they have ability, too. They are a hard-working group, probably more hard working than the average of business and professional men from whom they are largely recruited. Congressional casualties have been high, a reflection of the fact that they are hard pressed, harassed, and often confused by the complexities with which they constantly deal.

If you complain that we seem to have fewer statesmen in Congress than we used to, I'll reply that the people themselves are largely to blame. You have no idea of the multiplicity of requests and demands made of congressmen. Some receive hundreds of letters a day, asking for this and that. Each requires some attention. Some require a great deal of attention, calls on various bureaus, digging out facts, attendance at conferences. A Representative usually has a secretary and a stenographer. A Senator may have a larger staff.

It is nothing short of amazing the volume of material through which they plow every day. A large proportion of this work has nothing whatever to do with problems of legislation. A Congressman could keep busy even if he eliminated all legislative considerations.

But, you say, he shouldn't permit himself to be deflected by all these minor matters. Maybe so, but he wouldn't be a Congressman long. A Representative's employers are a hard lot. They threaten to fire him every 2 years. They are more likely to judge him by the way he responds to personal requests than by the way he acts in congressional committees or in the performance of other duties required of him by the Constitution. A new post-office building looms larger than intelligence in dealing with subjects of broad national scope.

Newspapers in Washington have little opportunity to observe how a Congressman jumps about on demand of local chambers of commerce, labor unions, farm organizations, and other groups. They see more of him in his role of legislator. They know little of all the local influences bearing on him and therefore take him pretty much as he is.

I think Senator HOMER T. BONE of our State is a good example of this. In the State of Washington he was for years a leading advocate of public ownership of electric utilities. Those who opposed him on this issue can see little good in him on any issue. They can't divorce him from his history in the homeland.

But Senator BONE has enjoyed in the Capital a higher prestige, I think, than he has enjoyed at home, even though he has been rather uniformly successful at getting elected. He is recognized here as a man of broad intellect, of wide interests, and of a fighting and fearless disposition. He is respected by foe as well as friend. I believe he has tried, during his terms of office, to act the statesman, and, to a very considerable degree, he has succeeded. This is true, whatever you may think of his ideas on public ownership. He has reflected credit on the State of Washington. His retirement to the Federal bench is regarded here as a loss to the Senate.

It is all a matter of balance. A Member of Congress ought not to ignore the needs of the communities he represents. It is incumbent upon him to serve those who elected him. At the same time, he is also a servant of all the Nation. It would help if the people at home would remember this and refrain, as much as possible, from complicating an already complicated situation.

Congress is blamed for abdicating its powers, for giving in to bureaus which also legislate by regulation. The usual attack on this condition—which undeniably exists—is to roar "Bureaucrat" at the top of one's lungs. That, of course, gets nowhere. To ask that Congressmen perform functions expected of the bureaus is to ask the impossible. A Senator or a Representative is still only one man, and there still are only 24 hours in a day.

I think myself that the flooding tendency toward centralization in this country is unfortunate. It entails deterioration of the free and daring American spirit. I believe that local government is the best government. Its hand should be strengthened. But to recognize these things or to hold these beliefs is not a cure. The cure for bureaucracy does not lie in calling someone a bureaucrat. You must go to the causes.

But—to tie this package with the string I started with—you contribute less than nothing to the preservation of our liberties by weakening Congress. If we persist in such a course long enough, Congress will become a vestigial organ, like the electoral college in politics, and like the appendix in physiology.

War Mobilization and Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement in connection with S. 2051, the war mobilization and reconversion bill:

WHAT WILL BE THE REACTION OF VOTERS TO LAVISHLY GIVING BILLIONS FOR FREEDOM FROM WANT ALL OVER THE WORLD BUT REFUSING TO KEEP HUNGER FROM POSSIBLY MILLIONS OF CHILDREN OF UNEMPLOYED AMERICANS?

Statement of John H. Pierson, Chief of the Post-War Division of the Bureau of Labor Economics, United States Department of Labor, in article in the American Federationist, official organ of the American Federation of Labor:

"Whether or not the return of peace is going to usher in a period of discrimination and bitter group feelings and antagonisms and contentions that draw the lines between men and women, Negroes and whites, ex-servicemen and civilians, native-born and foreign-born, old and young, depends almost entirely on whether or not we allow the unemployment situation to get out of hand."

Pertinent excerpts from address of Chairman ROBERT R. REYNOLDS of the Senate Military Affairs Committee in support of the Kilgore-Murray-Truman bill:

"There are two main objectives that we should keep in mind: First, to establish an indiscriminatory scale of unemployment compensation as between classes and groups, and as between workers in and from different States; and, second, to minimize unemployment itself by maintaining a fair purchasing power amongst the unemployed amounting to a bare subsistence level.

"I submit that it is essential that we use great foresight in considering the problems before us, for our action will affect millions of our people, and will have far-reaching influence upon the future welfare and tranquillity of our Nation.

"Ultimately it will be far less costly to be generous in providing for our unemployed and their families, than to pursue a short-sighted and niggardly course which may engender the very bitter group feelings and antagonisms about which Mr. Pierson so wisely has warned us.

"The civilian unemployed are the fathers, brothers, sisters, wives, and other relatives of those in our armed forces.

"It is well and good, Mr. President, to give medals and erect monuments to our war heroes, but it has well been said that veterans cannot eat medals. Neither can their little children. Erecting stone or bronze monuments is not going to put more food into the mouths of the children of our vet-

erans or more clothing on their little bodies, to protect them from the blasts of winter.

"Who can claim that, with three or four children to support, an unemployed veteran or civilian can keep his children from suffering the pangs of hunger when the family income is only $12 or $18 a week? If we could see hungry children of the unemployed on our doorsteps we would really do something to make proper provision for them.

"We do not seem to bat an eye when it comes to appropriating billions upon billions for the relief of people in all parts of the world, but when we consider the basic needs of possibly millions of children of the unemployed here in America, there appears to be a tendency to adopt a niggardly policy.

"We have been and are planning on being quite generous toward property in reconversion. Should we not be as generous and considerate of humanity as we are of property?

"After all, the whole problem boils down to the humanitarian issue of whether we are or are not going to provide adequately for the children of future unemployed Americans.

"Let us not be in the position of keeping bread from the mouths of hungry little children in this land which has sacrificed its all to aid in bringing freedom from want to the rest of the world."

Demand for Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of August 21, 1944:

RUBBER DEMAND SEEN EXCEEDING SUPPLY FOR 2 YEARS AFTER WAR

NEW YORK, August 21.—The world will need both synthetic rubber and the natural product for at least 2 years after the war, preliminary estimates for prospective supply and demand show.

That forecast is based on a belief among rubbermen that it will take at least 2 years to restore the war-ravaged Far Eastern rubber plantations to full-scale production.

It indicated this country can postpone for some time any decision as to disposal or retention of this Nation's $750,000,000-plus synthetic rubber facilities.

An official United States-British-Dutch study of post-war rubber supply and demand, aimed apparently toward an agreement similar to that recently reached on petroleum, has been started.

POINT TO CONCLUSIONS

Industry estimates point to the conclusions the international group may reach, John Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Co., believes world demand will probably run around 1,600,000 tons a year, compared with the pre-war record of 1,300,000 tons used in 1941. He figures this country's annual requirements will average 850,000 tons a year.

A major oil company foresees an American demand for possibly 1,070,000 tons annually for the first 5 years after the war, to which would be added needs of other nations.

Neither synthetic plants nor plantations could meet either of those totals.

Government-owned synthetic plants, rated at around 820,000 tons a year, may develop a potential of 1,000,000 with privately owned facilities good for another 200,000 tons, Mr. Collyer figures.

MAKESHIFTS MAY AID

Plantations and such wartime makeshifts as guayule, a desert shrub, cryptostegia, a wild vine, and the high-cost South American wild-rubber areas might eventually boost natural rubber output to 1,600,000 tons a year if pushed, Collyer adds.

While the maximum potential thus points to an eventual oversupply, Mr. Collyer believes it will take at least 2 years to get plantations back into operation.

The actual condition of the plantations is unknown. Mr. Collyer assumes the Japanese have not ruined the trees.

Automobile industry men talk of 6,000,000 cars a year, that's 30,000,000 tires. Replacements for automobiles still operating might run that total above 150,000,000. On top of that, hundreds of trucks and busses have been forced off the roads for lack of tires.

Incidental uses include vast quantities for industry, and such smaller needs as 2,100 tons a year for rubber bands, 1,200 tons for garden hose, and even 675 tons for baby pants.

What a Sailor Has To Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago there appeared in the March of Progress, a weekly newspaper printed and published at McLeansboro, Hamilton County, Ill., a letter from Carl H. Jordan, a resident of my district, who is now serving in the United States Navy. His home is at McLeansboro, Ill. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMP BRADFORD,
Norfolk, Va., June 18, 1944.

DEAR WARNER: I am in old Virginia, the stamping grounds of the Father of my Country, George Washington.

It was here that the great men of our Nation became inspired with the zeal of justice. It was here that great men showed their love for freedom. It was here that the great Civil War ended. It is consecrated ground for the living and the dead.

Today men are congregated here in arms, training to maintain the principles of Washington and of our great Emancipator, our fellow Illinoisian, Abraham Lincoln.

Men of all nationality and color march arm in arm here to win a just peace. We hope of security, honest political freedom.

The southern boy and the northern boys are in one accord.

They love their families, they want to rear a family in their own way, they love freedom more than they love any material thing or any promises of any group.

There is very little politics spoken here. I know for sure what the Navy men want more than anything. They want any man of any party who will prosecute this war to the fullest extent, with the most effective method. They want justice to be supreme. They want to go home to local government that is clean from corruption and graft. They want clean, honest, American jobs where they can earn an honest living, without strings attached.

Otherwise they want peace on the home front where they can enjoy life as was prepared and prescribed by the Constitution and Bill of Rights. They want the American way of life where competition is progress and where men may enjoy progress and where men may enjoy the fruits of their labor and enjoy the solace of quiet meditation in their beliefs. We Americans of all parties must and will cleanse it from the decay that has set in the two different major parties.

It is up to you and all other Americans to help prepare a cleaner and a better America for the men and women of the armed forces when they come marching back to a peaceful world after victory has come.

The aftermath of this war is what the people must prepare to meet, the farmer, the laborer, the manufacturer and business, clerks, etc. They will swim together or sink together. We will all go down in the valley of death together, roughly speaking, in my way, if we don't get together and express a little more charity and understanding than we have in the past.

One group must not take advantage of another group, but should work in good will and understand in the object of our Nation, in the hope it will strengthen all classes and groups.

All of the wealth of America will not create prosperity after this war. It is how industry and labor function. It means they must work in one accord, to promote the general welfare of our Nation through honest and justifiable reasoning with problems that confront them. Business must have profits that are feasible.

The consuming power should be great among the people.

Farmers must have an honest chance to use their talent for the benefit of the farming communities. They must use their own judgment in building their blueprint for their crops. All Americans must work in one accord to prepare it for the aftermath that will come.

Warner, I can't write you and explain all these things on paper. It would take a hundred sheets to do so. The peace to come must and should be drawn up not by politicians but by men who can use good judgment in working out a peace that will stand for years to come. We must not and will not give up any sovereignty to any country. Our strength is our honor, our family is its strength, our resources, our wealth, our Constitution is our guide, Christ is our master, our hope and guide for all justice through Christ, and Christianity is the only hope of the world. We men of the world are only the captains of our own souls.

Your friend,

CARL H. JORDAN,
Seaman Second Class,
Training Program, ATB.

Death Benefits Available for Widows, Orphans, and Dependents of Deceased Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, besides the men who are returned to civil life with broken bodies and shattered nerves, those who find the results of war with them long after the peace are the widows,

orphans, and dependents whose loved ones have made the supreme sacrifice.

In recognition of its obligation to those dependents, a just and sympathetic Government has made provision to contribute by way of pension to help them carry on. These benefits are the same for the widows, orphans, and dependents of this war as they are for the dependents surviving our veterans of World War No. 1, so the information given here will apply to both groups.

Pensions or death benefits for widows, orphans, and dependents are paid according to two schedules:

First. Where the death of the veteran has occurred in service, or has resulted from a service-connected disease or injury, the following monthly rates are payable:

(a) For a widow but no child	$50
(b) For a widow and one child (with $13 additional for each additional child—total not to exceed $100)	65
(c) For no widow but one child	25
(d) For no widow but two children (with $10 additional for each additional child—total not to exceed $100)	88
(e) For dependent father and mother:	
Both parents, for each	25
One parent only	45

(NOTE.—Pension benefits are allowable to dependent parents only in those cases where the veteran's death is due to service in the armed forces.)

Second. Where the veteran's death was not the result of a service-connected disease or injury, but provided he had at the time of his death a disability incurred in or aggravated in his war service, these monthly rates are payable, subject to income restrictions:

(a) For a widow but no child	$35
(b) For a widow and one child (with $5 additional for each additional child)	45
(c) No widow but one child	18
(d) No widow but two children (equally divided)	27
(e) No widow but three children (equally divided) (With $4 additional for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided.)	36

(NOTE.—Payments are limited to an aggregate of $64 in any one case.)

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

All persons in the active service of our armed forces may carry Government National Service Life Insurance in any sum, in multiples of $500, up to $10,000, and may designate as beneficiary anyone in the following permitted classes: Wife, (husband); child (including an adopted child, stepchild, or illegitimate child); parent (including person in loco parentis—foster parent); brother or sister (including those of the half blood) of the insured.

If deductions from service pay to meet premiums have been authorized, this insurance cannot lapse during active service, including the time carried in a missing status or as a prisoner of war.

Applicable, especially to men captured by the Japanese in the Philippines and on the Pacific islands, is a provision that men captured between December 7, 1941, and April 20, 1942, and held for a period of at least 30 days extending beyond April 19, 1942, who had less than $5,000 of Government insurance will be granted, as of the date of capture, a sum of insurance sufficient to make an aggregate of $5,000, on which payment of premiums is waived during the period of imprisonment or isolation and 6 months thereafter.

National Service Life Insurance, issued during World War No. 2, pays benefits on a somewhat different basis from the methods of payment under the previous Government insurance issued to men in service during World War No. 1 and during the period of peace that followed, and which these men have continued in force.

Under National Service Life Insurance benefits are paid in monthly installments, and the amounts are governed by the age of the beneficiary:

(a) Where the beneficiary is less than 30 years of age at the time of the death of the insured serviceman, the payments would be $5.51 per month for 240 months for each $1,000 of insurance—$55.10 on a $10,000 policy.

(b) Where the beneficiary is over 30 years of age installments will vary with the age of the beneficiary and will be payable for the life of the beneficiary, but with a guaranty that 120 monthly installments will be paid should the beneficiary die before the end of 10 years after payments were started. On a $10,000 policy the payments would be $39.70 at age 30; $45 at age 40; $53.90 at age 50; $68.10 at age 60; and $91.80 at age 75.

If no beneficiary has been designated, or the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries predecease the insured, payments are authorized by law to survivors, in the following order:

First. Widow or widower;

Second. Child (not including stepchild or illegitimate child);

Third. Parent, or parents in equal shares;

Fourth. Brothers and sisters in equal shares.

If none of these are living to receive payments, no installments are payable to heirs, creditors or legal representatives of the insured or of the first beneficiary.

Suggestion: Since it is necessary for a beneficiary to establish both age and relationship, it is important that beneficiaries or prospective beneficiaries obtain immediately, and keep in a secure place, the necessary evidence—marriage record, birth certificate, and so forth.

APPLICATIONS

Applications for the benefits here mentioned, both pensions and insurance, should be made to the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

SIX MONTHS' GRATUITY PAY

Immediately upon notification of the death of a person in service from wounds or disease, not the result of his or her misconduct, there is payable to his widow, child, or dependent relative, a sum equivalent to 6 months' pay at the rate being received on the date of death. This benefit is available first to the widow, if no widow to a child or children, and if neither widow nor child, to any other dependent relative of the person in service previously designated by him or her to receive this pay.

Proper forms on which to make application will be sent to the person entitled from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, as the case may be, when the death of the person in service is officially recorded. Applications should be returned, with any evidence called for, to the office from which blanks were furnished.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS

Any amount found in the final settlement of his accounts to be due a person who has died in service, where the amount is less than $500 and no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, is payable, through the General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C., first to the widow; if no widow to the child or children; if no widow or children to the parents, or if parents are separated to the mother; if one parent deceased, to the survivor; if no widow, child, father, or mother, then to brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters. Blanks will be sent from the respective services.

Persons claiming these benefits may call on veterans' service organizations or the Red Cross for assistance in the preparation of applications and assembling needed evidence. If there are any further questions, write to your Congressman, ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, 316 House Office Building, Washington, D. C. He will also be glad to help in presenting claims to the proper agency of the Government.

Information for Servicemen, Veterans, and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, in which I am intensely interested, it has been my privilege to watch the development of the Navy until it has reached its present proportion; namely, the largest and most effective and most potent Navy in the world today. Our Naval Affairs Committee is, naturally, interested in every phase of the war effort and, therefore, has followed the actions of the Committee on Military Affairs with considerable interest. Both of these committees have had major problems of stupendous proportion come before them. Other committees, such as the World War Veterans' Legislative Committee, have studied the problem of enacting veterans' legislation that should be effective and wise.

People everywhere are vitally interested in this legislation because almost every family has someone in the services. I find, upon investigation, that there are a great many in the service, as well as their dependents, who frequently do not get all the benefits to which they are entitled simply because they do not know

about them. This is perfectly understandable. There has been so much legislation on this general subject in the last few years that it is difficult for the average person, busy with other matters, to keep fully informed. I have had hundreds of inquiries from my district asking for an outline of the benefits which Congress has made available for servicemen, veterans, and their dependents. I have prepared, in cooperation with the Veterans' Administration, an outline of information concerning the kind and amount of benefits currently available under Federal law, the qualifications therefor, and how to proceed to get them. In this outline, monetary benefits based upon service-connected disability or death are referred to as compensation and pension. The reason for the use of both terms is that under existing laws the service-connected monetary benefits for World War No. 1 veterans and their dependents are termed "compensation," while World War No. 2 service-connected benefits are termed "pension."

Naturally, the summary given here is only an outline. Any citizen in my district can get more detailed information from the Veterans' Administration or from his Congressman about these benefits. The citizens of the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, can continue to get help on their individual problems by addressing their inquiries to me as follows: Congressman WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. Assistance can also be obtained in matters of this kind by contacting the local Red Cross, the American Legion or Auxiliary, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, or similar responsible organizations.

Legislation for veterans of World War No. 1 was very slow in developing, and, therefore, many inequities and injustices resulted. It has been the purpose of the Congress in World War No. 2 to formulate in advance, so far as possible, constructive legislation for our men in service so that on their return to civilian life they will have the benefit of existing laws.

With 11,000,000 men in the military service of our country, scattered in hundreds of bases throughout the world, and with a constantly returning force of honorably discharged soldiers, it behooves this Congress to assist these veterans in every way in order to make the transition period from military to civilian life as easy as possible and to give to these veterans such constructive legislation as will result to their benefit and to the benefit of the Nation itself.

OUTLINE OF BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN, VETERANS, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS UNDER EXISTING LAW—COMPENSATION AND PENSION FOR DISABILITY OR DEATH

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

Under the veterans' regulations promulgated under the act of March 20, 1933, as amended, honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 are entitled to compensation or pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by such service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10 percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month. While the World War No. 2 veterans were entitled to these rates following the act of December 19, 1941, they were placed on complete parity under the veterans' regulations by the act of July 13, 1943, Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, with reference to the requirements governing proof of service connection of disability. The latter act also liberalized the regulation concerning the presumption of soundness upon entry into service. Under Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates based upon service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including special awards and allowances fixed by law, were increased by 15 percent.

In lieu of such pension or compensation, reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, meeting the requirements of the Army regulations pertaining to retirement of officers of the Regular Establishment, are retired by the War Department, certified to the Veterans' Administration, and their retired pay equal to 75 percent of their base pay is paid by the Veterans' Administration out of the pension appropriation.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

Under Public Law No. 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the rate of pension for permanent and total non-service-connected disability, applicable to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion, the Philippine Insurrection, and World War No. 1, was increased from $40 to $50 per month with an increase to $60 per month where such veterans have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or reach the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. This act also provides that the above pension for non-service-connected disability shall apply to veterans of both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH

The rates of compensation or pension for widows, children, and dependent parents of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans based upon death in service, or service-connected death, are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100)	38
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

The above rates are contained in Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943, and constitute a material liberalization of the prior rates.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH

The widow, child, or children of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 are entitled to the following rates of compensation if the veteran at the time of death from a non-service-connected cause had a disability incurred in or aggravated by such war service:

Widow but no child	$35
Widow and 1 child (with $5 for each additional child)	45
No widow but 1 child	18
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	27
No widow but 3 children (equally divided)	36
With $4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).	

Payments are limited to an aggregate of $64 in any one case.

Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, act of May 27, 1944, increased the rates to the above amounts and also included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans, the law previously having applied only to World War No. 1 veterans.

Claims and effective date of awards: Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred to a Veterans' Administration facility, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area officers for adjudication, the applicant should file claim on proper form which will be supplied upon inquiry addressed to any Veterans' Administration facility or regional office, or to the local representative of the American Red Cross or of a veterans' service organization.

Upon death in service the service department notifies the Veterans' Administration, and claims forms are sent immediately to all known dependents.

GROUPS POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE FOR PENSIONS

All members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the Public Health Service, or of the Coast and Geodetic Survey when ordered to active service with the Army or Navy, or as to United States Public Health Service while serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, and as to Coast and Geodetic Survey when assigned during present war to duty on business of War or Navy Department in areas outside continental United States or in Alaska or coastal areas of the United States as determined by the War and Navy Departments to be of immediate military hazards, are potentially eligible for pensions.

AWARDS TO DATE

Pension payments to veterans of World War No. 2 and their dependents total $37,760,572.78 through March 1944. In addition, retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administrative to Reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States totaled $1,020,137.33 from July 1, 1942, through March 31 1944.

Disbursements for the relief of World War No. 1 veterans and their dependents

from 1918 through March 1944 for disability and death compensation or pension, service connected and nonservice connected, total $5,007,029,954.54. In addition, disbursements for World War No. 1 emergency officers' retirement pay through March 31, 1944, totaled $84,889,697.63. Our older veterans are not being forgotten just because there is a new and larger group, as these figures prove.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE, PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES, AND DOMICILIARY CARE

Eligibility is extended to any veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 honorably discharged having a service-connected disability requiring such care, treatment, or appliance, or one who was discharged for disability and not dishonorably; also one not dishonorably discharged who is unable to defray his expenses, has tuberculosis or a neuropsychiatric ailment, or disability which requires hospital care.

Dependent upon availability of facilities, eligibility includes any veteran of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 not dishonorably discharged suffering from disability, disease, or defect, and who is in need of such care and is unable to defray the expenses therefor, regardless of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service.

CLAIMS

Any person who is to be discharged from active service and who is in need of and entitled to hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration is transferred directly to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. Claim for all benefits and necessary clinical and service data accompany him, or are filed by the manager if the veteran is insane or incompetent.

All others should file claim for treatment or hospitalization directly with the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office—one or more in each State in the Union except Delaware.

Sixty-four thousand nine hundred and eighty-two veterans of World War No. 2 have been hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration through April 30, 1944. On April 30, 1944, there were 44,967 World War No. 1 veterans and 12,866 World War No. 2 veterans receiving hospitalization and 8,477 World War No. 1 veterans and 196 World War No. 2 veterans receiving domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration.

While domiciliary care cannot be said to be a part of the rehabilitation process, it is a valuable benefit for those who have reached a permanent state of disability and have no other means of support.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved by the President March 24, 1943, provides—

First, that any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war;

Second, and who was honorably discharged;

Third, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay;

Fourth, who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement.

The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by virtue of a handicap due to service-incurred disability. In performing the functions imposed upon the Administration by Public Law No. 16, it will be the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to utilize educational institutions and establishments of recognized standing in the training of these disabled veterans into employment and to train each person as near his home as may be possible. In securing employment, a problem which obviously will be very great after the end of the war and perhaps acute after demobilization has been accomplished, every available Federal and State facility will be utilized. Employment of veterans has been accomplished to a considerable extent through the United States Employment Service. It will be the purpose to correlate these activities to the end that those vocationally trained will be graduated into employment opportunities.

While the disabled veteran is in training, his pension, unless it equals or exceeds such amounts, will be increased to $80 per month, if single; $90 per month, if married, with $5 additional for each child, and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required.

CLAIMS

Those persons discharged from the service directly to the Veterans' Administration facilities for hospitalization will have their claims filed and processed, and the question of need for and entitlement to vocational rehabilitation may be given consideration as soon as the individual's physical and mental condition make training feasible. Any other person honorably discharged from the service may make claims for vocational rehabilitation in the claim for pension which may be filed at the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office.

INSURANCE—NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

National service life insurance was provided under the act of October 8, 1940, Public Law No. 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, and liberalizing amendments thereto were enacted during the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses. A number of other liberalizing proposals are pending in the present Congress and the Veterans' Administration has submitted certain proposed changes found to be justified by studies conducted. Application may be made for not less than $1,000 nor more than $10,000 without physical examination prior to the expiration of 120 days from entrance into active service. Thereafter any such person in the active military or naval service may apply if the application be accompanied by acceptable evidence of good health.

APPLICATIONS

Application forms are supplied the service departments, and may be obtained from the commanding officer or designated insurance officer. The applicant may elect to pay premiums in cash, or by allotment of pay. Policies are not issued during the war, but insurance certificate is mailed to the address designated by applicant.

The insurance is against death only, but includes waiver of premiums during total disability existing for more than 6 months, and commencing prior to insured's sixtieth birthday. The policy is a 5-year level premium term policy with rate based upon the American experience table of mortality and 3-percent interest—the Government assuming the extra hazard of the military and naval service and the administrative expense. The insurance is payable only to a widow (widower), child (including a stepchild or illegitimate child, if designated as beneficiary by the insured, parent (including person in loco parentis), brother and sister of the insured; and is payable only in monthly installments. The insured may change the beneficiary designation at any time.

After the policy has been in effect for at least 1 year, while in force it may be converted to an ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policy upon application to the Veterans' Administration without medical examination.

In cases where the person in service died or became totally disabled, or was captured or isolated by the enemy prior to April 20, 1942, and had less than $5,000 insurance in effect, the law provides that gratuitous insurance to an aggregate of $5,000 shall be deemed in effect. Claims for such gratuitous insurance should be filed as soon as possible, because of limitations. In most of these death cases only a widow, child, or dependent parent can claim such insurance.

As of March 30, 1944, over 14,303,291 applications had been received, representing a total amount of nearly $105,596,766,000 of insurance. The average policy was approximately $7,382.60; the average coverage per life, approximately $8,926.74.

The insurance is payable in the event of the death of the insured while the policy is in force to a beneficiary or beneficiaries, which may be designated by the insured, only within the relationship of widow or widower, child, parent, brother, or sister. The proceeds of the policy are payable as an annuity in 240 equal monthly installments of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance to any beneficiary who is under 30 years of age at the time of the death of the insured; otherwise, in continuous monthly installments throughout the lifetime of the beneficiary, with a guaranty of the payment of 120 monthly installments to the surviving relatives of the insured who are within the permitted class of beneficiaries. The amount of the monthly installments under the latter mode of payment is dependent upon the age of

the beneficiary at date of death of insured. For example, if the beneficiary is then 40 years old, monthly installment is $4.50 for each $1,000 of insurance; if 50, $5.39; if 60, $6.81; if 70, $8.51.

CLAIMS

All claims for insurance benefits should be addressed to the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., but necessary forms may be secured from the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

United States Government life (converted) insurance: This insurance can be applied for only by those who served in World War No. 1. No one may have more than $10,000 national service life insurance and Government (converted) insurance combined.

Insurance premiums are guaranteed by Government under Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended: Any person in the active service having a commercial life policy or policies meeting the requirements of said law, article IV, may, upon application to the Veterans' Administration on form supplied the Army and Navy, secure guaranty of premiums, on amount of insurance not in excess of $10,000, while he is in the service during the present war. The insurance premiums so guaranteed by the Government constitute a lien against the policy and must be paid by the company out of any settlement thereof. In the event of the insured's discharge from service, he has a period of 2 years within which to pay the premiums with interest so guaranteed; or otherwise such indebtedness constitutes a loan on the policy with interest and if the amount of such indebtedness exceeds the cash surrender value the policy is automatically canceled and the Government pays the insurer the difference between such cash surrender value and the indebtedness. Forms for making application for such insurance protection are supplied to the War and Navy Departments and may be secured in person or from his commanding officer or other designated official.

As of March 31, 1944, 72,204 applications with insurance totaling $178,189,853.21 have been approved and premiums guaranteed.

INSURANCE UNDER OTHER LAWS

Old-age and survivors insurance is administered by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; unemployment benefits by Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; retirement by Railroad Retirement Board and Civil Service Commission. Credit for active military or naval service is allowed for civil-service retirement and railroad retirement purposes.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mustering-out pay is provided by the act of February 3, 1944, Public Law 225, Seventy-eighth Congress, and is administered by the War and Navy Departments. The amounts are from $100 to $300.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES

Administered by the War and Navy Departments for dependents of those in the service. Your Congressman can supply many details about this subject and help get delayed allotments straightened out for dependents of servicemen.

DOMICILIARY CARE

United States Soldiers' Home, under jurisdiction of the War Department; Naval Home, under jurisdiction of the Navy Department. This is in addition to that provided by the Veterans' Administration.

GUARDIANSHIP

Supervision is maintained in cooperation with the State courts, over payments of any benefits made on account of insane or minor beneficiaries to insure proper application of such benefits.

RETIREMENT PAY

Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard: For officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Establishment, and reserve components of Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

TAXES

Bureau of Internal Revenue: All veterans benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration are exempt from all taxation. Special consideration is shown in the income-tax laws for those in the service.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE

Up to the amount of $100 may be paid for any war veteran, honorably discharged or in receipt of pension or compensation, as to any veteran discharged from the armed forces for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

A United States flag to drape the casket, subsequently to be turned over to the next of kin, may be furnished as to any veteran, discharged honorably after active service during any war or after serving at least one enlistment or by reason of disability incurred in line of duty. Burial in a national cemtery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, as to his minor children or adult unmarried daughters. The expenses incident to transporting the body of one who has died while in active service, or of a veteran who has died in a Veterans' Administration facility, to the place of burial, are, within limitations, borne by the Government. Headstone or marker—stone or marble—will be furnished for the unmarked grave of any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who died while in the active service.

Various benefits, rights, and privileges are also provided as to certain veterans, their dependents, and their organizations under State laws, as per the résumé thereof, as published by the House Committee on Pensions, entitled "State Veterans' Laws."

CIVIL, SPANISH, AND OTHER WARS

Pensions on the basis of age, degree of inability to earn a living, and/or length of service for, first, Civil War veterans in the amount of $75 per month, or $100 if in need of a regular attendant; second, Indian war veterans in amounts ranging from $20 to $60 per month, or $100 if in need of an attendant; and, third, veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion in amounts ranging from $12 to $75 per month, plus varying amounts if in need of a regular attendant, with total not to exceed $100, but only $20 while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care of the United States or a political subdivision thereof if the veteran has no dependents, provided that as to those in a soldiers' home continually since on or before July 15, 1943, the pension not to exceed $50 shall be continued.

Pensions at lower rates than above are available to veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion based upon service of 70 days or more, but less than 90 days.

Pension under the Economy Act of March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations promulgated thereunder, as amended, of $50 per month for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, or World War No. 1, with 90 days or more of honorable service, or if less than 90 days, if discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, who suffer with permanent total disability, regardless of service connection, if not due to misconduct. Only $8 per month is paid to single men without dependents while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by a Government agency.

EDUCATION

Congress provided in 1944 that any veteran who served on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and whose education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service, or who desires a refresher or retraining course, and who served 90 days or more, is entitled to education at public expense. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition and books and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if single and $75 if married, not to exceed 4 years. Any person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service is assumed to have had his education interrupted. Veterans must meet the regular entrance and scholarship requirements.

FARM, HOME, AND SMALL BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

The Federal Government, through the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, will guarantee up to 50 percent and as high as $2,000 of any approved loan secured by a veteran from a private or Government source for purchase or operation of a farm, home, or small business. Loans will be interest free the first year and interest will not exceed 4 percent per annum. Applications for this benefit must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs within 2 years after discharge by those who served in the

armed forces on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of this war.

JOBS

Congress provided, in 1944, in addition to the foregoing education, farm, home, and small business opportunities, that every veteran of World War No. 2 shall be helped to find a job. The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board cooperate to fill this responsibility. Veterans are to be registered and every effort made to assist them to find jobs. This provision includes veterans of all wars. Information on how to get the benefits of this provision can be obtained by the veteran from his own local United States Employment Office in his home town or county.

Return to the job after discharge is under jurisdiction of Selective Service; placing in other jobs is under War Manpower Commission; veterans' preference is administered by United States Civil Service Commission and various departments and agencies; job training, rehabilitation (nonservice disability) is administered by Federal Security Agency.

Certain preferences as to Federal civil service, as to physical and age prerequisites, examinations, ratings, appointments, retentions, and reinstatement of Federal employment, are extended to qualified service-connected disabled veterans, the wives of unemployable service-connected or 50-year-aged pensioned veterans, the widows of veterans, and other war veterans and regulars, supplemented by extensive United States Employment Service, and Veterans Employment Service, in every State, for war veterans. Any World War No. 2 veteran who applies therefor within 40 days after discharge is entitled to reinstatement to the Federal position held at time of entering service, or to one of equal grade and pay, or to his previous private employment, where at all practicable for employer, enforceable by order of court, if necessary.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Congress provided in 1944 that for the first 2 years after a veteran's discharge he will be entitled to unemployment compensation for 52 weeks if he cannot find a job or the Employment Service cannot find one for him. This allowance is $20 per week less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of $3. Provisions for unemployment compensation, farm, home, and business ownership and education, are part of the so-called G. I. bill of rights, one of many veterans' bills prepared in 1943–44 by the World War Veterans' Committee.

In passing the G. I. bill of rights Congress has taken the first important step toward providing for returning veterans. I repeat, it is only the first step. Congress has many things yet to do in order to completely round out this all-important program. I again invite the servicemen, veterans, and their dependents to continue to write me concerning their problems. Simply address such correspondence to Congressman WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., because my election to Congress has greatly increased my interest in legislation pertaining to our servicemen, and to our veterans, who, by their splendid ability, loyalty, and patriotism, not only are preserving our own Constitution, and our flag, and our constitutional form of government, but who are bringing to the liberty-loving people of the world their hope for the future.

Uniform Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made yesterday evening before the Town Meeting of the Air on the subject, Should the Federal Government provide uniform unemployment compensation above State standards during the reconversion period?—the statement being for the negative.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If the question were, "Do you favor doing all we can to secure full post-war employment?" I would answer, "Yes."

If the question were, "Do you favor unemployment insurance?" I would answer, "Yes."

If the question were, "Do you favor strengthening unemployment insurance now?" I would answer, "Yes; first, by the States increasing their benefits to keep up with wages and living costs in their respective areas; second, by expanding the Federal tax to include pay rolls of one or more employees; third, by including maritime workers and Federal employees; and fourth, by Federal guaranty of the adequacy of State funds to meet their loads."

However, tonight the question is, "Do you favor the Federal Government providing uniform unemployment compensation above State standards during the reconversion period?" To be concrete, this asks, "Do you favor the Kilgore plan that the Senate defeated 49 to 25?" To this I answer, "No."

I voted against the Kilgore plan because, regardless of its purpose, I believe it actually is against the best interests of the worker, the employer, and the public for five good reasons:

1. It tends to federalize the system. By requiring a uniform Nation-wide increase in benefits, it violates the principle of fitting the plan to local wages and living costs. That principle was established by Congress itself in 1935. Forty-eight States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii, have adopted that principle. The officials of these systems are loyal friends of unemployment insurance, and yet they have joined in united opposition to the Kilgore plan.

2. It is not even a good Federal plan. What can be said for the permanent federalization of unemployment insurance does not justify this hybrid plan, which consists of a permanent basis of State insurance plus a temporary addition of Federal benefits. This produces neither a good State plan nor a good Federal plan. It produces duplication of effort, handicaps administration, and adds unnecessarily to the public expense.

3. It introduces relief rather than wage standards. It does this by introducing the number of a worker's dependents as a new measure of the maximum benefits his employers should pay him when unemployed, although not when employed. It also extends benefit payments beyond a reasonable period of unemployment to 2 years after the end of the war. It thus produces something of a pension, payable by employers instead of by the public as a whole. It thus discriminates against industrial production.

4. It relies on the argument that it increases purchasing power. If such a basis for increases beyond reasonable insurance benefits is sound, then the benefits might better be doubled and so double the synthetic prosperity. The fallacy is that when payments are justified merely as providing purchasing power they are purely inflationary. They are paid for nothing. Whatever value they have comes from value arbitrarily taken away from someone else by taxation or by borrowing. Any resulting activity is false prosperity. It leads directly to deficits and depression rather than to solvency and prosperity.

5. Finally, the Kilgore plan defeats its own purpose by overreaching itself. It raises the benefits out of the field of reasonable insurance into that of subsidized idleness. By offering more for not working than for working, it substitutes the dole for wages. It blocks the roads to reemployment, recovery, and higher standards of living. It makes a reasonable rate unreasonable.

To make this clear, I recite the terms of the Kilgore plan. Within its maximum rates, which exceed those of every State, it offers to a worker, completely unemployed at suitable work and wages, until 2 years after the end of the war, 75 percent of his peak wartime weekly pay. This peak wartime weekly pay generally includes at least 48 hours of pay. Eight of these are at overtime rates of time-and-a-half, making an extra 4 hours of pay, or an actual peak pay of 52 hours a week. Seventy-five percent of 52 hours is 39. The worker will compare this with the 40 hours of pay he would receive for a full week of post-war work. He would thus receive only 1 hour more of pay a week by working 40 hours than by working none. Even this 1 hour margin of pay would disappear in his additional expense for transportation, food, work clothes and taxes because wages are taxable and unemployment benefits are tax free.

In other words, the Kilgore plan, at the employers' and public's expense, puts a cash premium on unemployment at the moment when the best interests of the worker, employer and the public call for every possible encouragement of employment and production.

For these reasons, the right answer to the Kilgore plan and to the question tonight is "No."

Dewey as a Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting editorial entitled "Dewey as a Farmer" published in the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, which is edited by Victor Murdock.

Mr. Dewey has never claimed to be a farmer but nevertheless has made a suc-

cess of farming in New York State. His farm has shown a profit every year, even though it has been largely a side line.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEWEY AS A FARMER

With President Roosevelt nominated by the Democrats the Presidential campaign becomes a race between neighbors. Candidate Dewey's farm home is a scant 30 miles from the Roosevelt estate at Hyde Park. The Dewey place consists of 300 acres. An additional 120 acres is rented. The home tract had been rented at first for a period of 2 years. Five years ago it was purchased for $30,000.

The Deweys like to call their place a going concern. By every standard of agricultural measurements it is just that. It produces a ton of milk a day, sold to the local creamery. Its grain crops are diversified. There are ample tracts of woodland and pasture. The place is highly improved, with modern buildings for all requirements. A substantial profit is shown each year.

Dewey insists he is not a working farmer. He refuses to capitalize politically by being pictured pitching hay or wearing funny garb. He is too busy with his duties as Governor of New York to spend much time on his land, but goes there at every opportunity. He has a love for the land, typical of the normal American. That he has made a success of farming, even though it has been largely a side line, is quite evident.

The Atlantic Charter—Three Years Old and Already in the Discard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Hastings (Nebr.) Daily Tribune, of August 16, 1944, which is one of the leading papers of the Middle West. The editorial is as follows:

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER—3 YEARS OLD AND ALREADY IN THE DISCARD

President Roosevelt's impetuous approach to international problems and the disappointing results that frequently ensue probably are no more pointedly illustrated than by the state of disrepair into which the Atlantic Charter has now fallen. The charter was 3 years old this week. Instead of being a lusty and arm-swinging youngster it already has faded into a decrepit document of mobile doggerel, lofty in theme perhaps but abased because of its impracticability. If the charter is a sample of what is going to happen after Mr. Roosevelt gets up from having been at the table with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin we have grave fears for whatever world formula is yet to be evolved.

For without much doubt the Atlantic Charter, signed with such a flourish of trumpeting, has become simply an incidental note in history. The two men responsible for it, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, have differed over what the eight points in it mean and how they should be applied. There has been a great feeling in the minds of people that Mr. Roosevelt and only Mr. Roosevelt is competent to sit about the same board with Stalin and Churchill. Actually it would appear that whatever else Mr. Roosevelt may do he often accomplishes little at the meetings of the titans other than to give sanction to plans the other two already have in mind. It was so at the charter meeting in the Atlantic, at Cairo, at Quebec, emphatically so at Teheran.

But to return to the charter itself. It pledges no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise, and no territorial changes except as the people affected wish. It guarantees all peoples the right to choose their own governments. It gives access to all states to the trade and raw materials of the world. It sets up international collaboration in the international economic field. It seeks to establish peace in which men may live in freedom from fear and want. It guarantees freedom of the seas. It calls for disarmament of aggressor nations, encouragement of world disarmament, and eventual abandonment of the use of force in world affairs.

But since 1941 this agenda of noble aims has been shot full of holes by act of its signatories. In Poland and in Yugoslavia the people have not been allowed to choose their own government, and will not after the war, because Russia already has set up regimes favorable to it—the Partisans. Mr. Roosevelt has acceded. The charter speaks out against aggrandizement, yet Mr. Stalin has made it clear by word and deed that eastern Europe is his; the only difference is that his is a political aggrandizement and not an actual military one. Our collaboration in the economic field has been to open the doors of the United States Treasury and to assume burdens that will add to the financial obligations of the American people. In trade and raw materials, Mr. Churchill personally inserted in the charter, and has called attention to it since, a provision that Britain would preserve its empire system. He obtained from Mr. Roosevelt, he told Commons, assurance that "Britain was no more committed to abolition of imperial trade preference than the United States Government was committed to abolition of its protective tariffs." In other words British business as usual.

As to the eventual abandonment of the use of force in international affairs, this country and every one of its allies is already anticipating the maintenance of powerful land armies, fleets, and air arms. For what purpose? For use in international affairs, of course. What else? We are not quarreling with that; we simply point out that it isn't consistent with the rosy glow which surrounded the creation of the charter back in August of 1941.

The charter was conceived and executed in one of those bursts of enthusiasm which offer wonderful spectacles of hope but which go to pieces in actual performance. It is unfortunate, for the charter for a time held out a robust rainbow to mankind. What will be the fate of other glorious documents to come out of the international playing about with the destinies of nations? Will they, too, be tossed off with airy naivete and then quietly allowed to perish? Is the celebrated peace table, for which Mr. Roosevelt is now running so hard, going to produce another charter? There is plenty of room for wonderment.

Production and the Accomplishments of American Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, as Monday will be Labor Day and the Senate will not then be in session, I think it appropriate that I should offer for the RECORD today a few figures showing the magnificent contribution of American labor during the war in bringing about the marvelous production which has astonished the world and made possible the victorious efforts of our armed forces on every battle front. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statistics on labor in the war effort

PRODUCTION

(a) Production per man-hour taking 1940 as 100 percent, in manufacturing industries:

	Percent
1940	100
To June 1944	110

(b) Agricultural production taking the period 1935–39 as a base of 100 percent:

1940	110
To June 1944	132

(c) Production by commodities for month and years indicated:

	June 1940	June 1944
Aircraft	$60,000,000	$1,650,000,000
Munitions	$150,000,000	$5,400,000,000
Shipbuilding	$20,000,000	$1,000,000,000
Steel, short tons	5,700,000	7,200,000
Aluminum, pounds	24,000,000	133,000,000

Surplus War Equipment for Farm Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to a very timely editorial from the fluent pen of my old-time friend Hon. J. C. Nance, an able legislator and one of the leading newspapermen of Oklahoma. In this editorial he calls attention to the importance of soil conservation and flood control. I hope that before the legislation providing for disposal of surplus property is finally agreed upon by both Houses of Congress and enacted into law, that a definite provision will be made to make surplus war machinery available to the Nation's farmers, and especially to organized soil-conservation districts, where there is much demand and real need for such machinery now.

The editorial mentioned is as follows:

WAR TOOLS FOR PEACETIME PROJECTS

How shall the Government dispose of surplus war equipment? What methods shall be provided for a distribution of this highly important equipment to the places in the Nation where it will serve the most useful purpose in post-war projects? Will the State of Oklahoma be able to obtain a proportionate allotment of such equipment for post-war projects? These are questions that should engage the thought and attention of the average citizen of Oklahoma interested in a great program of development in this State following the day of victory on the battle fronts.

Many war machines can be converted to peacetime purposes. The Army and Navy are now manufacturing many modern machines which will be just as useful in peacetime as they are in wartime. These machines will not all be consumed in battle. Many machines will never reach the battle front. If provision is made to divert these machines to every place and for every useful purpose after the war the Government will be able to recapture the investment made in such machines. These machines will be needed in many worth-while projects. The question is How shall these machines be obtained for such projects?

This Nation, and particularly Oklahoma, is engaged in a great soil-saving and soil-building program. The Federal planning and resources board is engaged right now in mapping plans for post-war flood control. No other projects are more important or more valuable to the general welfare of the Nation. The greatest dividends to posterity will come from such projects. And the program will furnish unlimited employment to returning veterans. Unemployment can be solved with that program. It is vital to the stability and progress of the Nation.

One of the smartest suggestions in connection with the utilization of war equipment in post-war work comes from J. E. Palmertree, a tenant farmer residing on the Hine farm west of Purcell. It was Palmertree who proposed that the legislature make provisions for the State to acquire surplus Army and Navy equipment for use in all types of projects in this State. Remembering the policy of the Government in disposing of war equipment following the last war, Palmertree expresses the fear that unless the legislature made provisions for the State to proceed to obtain that equipment it would be sold to speculators and wrecking corporations just as it was sold following the last war. The average individual or group of individuals are not financially able to bid in the equipment. It invariably goes to the big corporations with unlimited finance. The same policy may be followed this year unless sentiment is created to influence the National Congress in revising such policy.

Among the projects mentioned by Palmertree were soil conservation, flood control, lakes, ponds, low-water dams, terracing, etc. He pointed out that the Army soon will be disposing of tractors, bulldozers, trucks, power shovels, cranes, and hundreds of other machine and hand tools. All these tools and machines can be used in the respective counties of the State for the above-mentioned projects together with road and bridge building, the construction of public buildings, etc. If the State and all its subdivisions step into the picture and make request for these surplus items, they can all be used to great advantage and the Nation will be able to save every dollar invested in such equipment.

Palmertree has made a suggestion that is sure to receive the most earnest consideration of the legislature. It is a movement that should eventually reach the National Congress.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Peace Job No. 1," published in the Chicago Daily News of August 25, 1944, favoring the prompt completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE JOB NO. 1

The daily parade of warcraft of many classes down the Chicago River has become so commonplace that it takes a very unusual type to bring office workers to the windows of the buildings lining the river. Hardly anyone seems to have remarked the recent passage of seven oil tankers bound for the Gulf to enter the oil-carrying trade between Venezuela and this country.

These oceangoing ships, each 350 feet long, were too big for the locks in the St. Lawrence canals, and therefore went by the Lakes to the Gulf route, although it is not as deep as the existing 14-foot draft of the bottleneck canals around the rapids of the St. Lawrence.

Despite all the obstructions that have been thrown in its way, Chicago continues to reach out for blue water like a heliotrope seeking the sun. Speed the day of peace when work can begin in earnest on the St. Lawrence seaway.

The job is ready to go, when materials and manpower are available. Both Presidential candidates as Governors of New York worked for the seaway, so the days of political sabotage are over.

Freedom of Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Bergen Evening Record, published at Hackensack, N. J., on August 23, 1944. The editorial is as follows:

Richard F. Frankensteen, one of the Nation's best known spokesmen for that far-to-the-left labor organization known as the C. I. O., has appeared before the Federal Communications Commission to demand that radio station WHKC of Columbus, Ohio, be barred from the air because it allegedly permitted programs on its station opposed to organized labor and the New Deal. The station denies the allegation, but why it bothers to do so is beyond this writer's comprehension.

It seems to him—and it should seem to every citizen of this self-governing democracy, in which the people are the masters and their elected officials are the servants—that it is high time for the Congress of all the people to notify the Federal Communications Commission that the United States Constitution, that sacred covenant among the people and between them and their transiently elected governments, still lives, especially the first amendment thereof. And it might also be timely for the Congress to ask itself and to answer the question: What is the C. I. O., what is the New Deal, and what have they done or tried to do to the most progressive and the most productive nation in the world?

Perhaps it has forgotten that the C. I. O. followed the party line by sabotaging America's rearmament program when Communist-beloved Russia was a partner of Hitler's Nazis prior to his historic double-cross, a device to which the C. I. O. is not an entire stranger. It struck; it sat down; it seized munition plants, and stopped production; and it imported to the United States of America the Communist technique by superimposing mob rule on United States Government by law.

Here in Bergen County it had the effrontery to take over main State highways to the exclusion of the motoring public who paid for them; it would not permit local residents access to side streets on which their homes were located, and it called this writer a nervy ——————— because he quietly but insistently asserted his rights as a taxpayer. Yes, according to real American standards and precedents the C. I. O. stunk then, and when it attempts, through its Frankensteen, to bar criticism of itself or its patron, the New Deal, over the air waves, in violation of our Constitution's first amendment, it still stinks.

And what of the New Deal? Admittedly it has distributed lavishly the accumulated savings of the people for the benefit of that euphemistic individual called the forgotten man. But whoever he is, it has done so not with the personal funds (largely inherited but not earned) of its founder or of his political satellites or of his collegiate textbook theorists who have made a good living at the public trough during the past 12 years. All of them have moved in their mysterious way their wonders to perform with the accumulated savings of generations of American men and women who were taught at their mothers' knee that thrift and frugality are virtues instead of the vices which the New Deal and its C. I. O. affiliate have for years tried to make them appear. Yes, the C. I. O. has blackjacked increased wages from employers for its members and increased the cost of living for all the other partners in our joint civic enterprise called the United States of America; and the New Deal has squandered and lavished the accumulated capital (hard-earned savings) of a people in quadrennial campaigns for Presidential ballots in a self-delusive and evanescent dream of transient political power which, after our foreign enemies are beaten into complete submission is going to be our nightmare.

After that pitiful aftermath of political spending and electing, of higher wages and higher costs of living, there will remain the wreckage for a chastened people and a sober Congress to contemplate and to resurrect from the ashes of their political folly. But whatever their fiscal and economic vicissitudes, whatever the future purchasing value of their Government bonds bought under neighborhood solicitation and national high pressure, the sacred and revered Constitution of the United States must always be a living covenant among our people. Neither a discredited New Deal nor an ideologically foreign C. I. O. must be permitted in any circumstances to scrap that.

And the Congress should start now its preservation for posterity by informing the Federal Communications Commission in forceful statutory language that freedom of speech on the platform, in the press, and on the air still lives, and must always continue to live in the land for which past generations of American freemen laid their lives on the altar of constitutional principles, just as the present generation of our valorous sons is doing now on foreign battlefields.

America will doubtless win this war, both in Europe and in Asia, but it will have lost the peace if it permits the C. I. O. or anything else to scrap any part of its constitutional birthright. Congressional statemanship can preserve it, but selfish partisanship can destroy it and convert a free people into a nation of slaves to the state.

JOHN BOGE, *Publisher.*

Need for Mechanical Corn Pickers in Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter I wrote Mr. G. F. Geisler, director of the western division of the A. A. A. regarding the need for an increased number of mechanical corn pickers in Kansas. I am also including a letter received from Mr. Geisler this morning, which gives a full report on the corn-picker situation. This year Kansas has prospects of producing one of the largest corn crops in history. Corn picking requires much hand labor unless we can get corn-picking machines. The manpower of our State is so reduced because of military induction and workers in defense plants that I do not see how we can harvest this large crop without the assistance of these machines. I have discussed this matter with officials in the Department of Agriculture, the War Production Board, and War Food Administration, urging them to give every consideration possible to increasing our allocation.

The letters follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1944.

Mr. G. F. GEISSLER,
Director, Western Division,
South Agriculture Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEISSLER: Present indications are that Kansas will produce one of the largest corn crops in history this year. There are two reasons largely responsible for this. First, the State has had an abundant supply of rainfall, and second, an increased acreage was planted to corn in the northern part of the State because of weather and soil conditions last fall at wheat-planting time.

While at home this summer I visited with a large number of farmers and corn growers who advised me it looked as though it would be impossible to get this corn harvested unless our section was able to secure a large number of mechanical corn pickers. Since returning to Washington I have received a number of letters regarding the situation and am convinced something must be done to relieve the critical labor shortage. As I advised you yesterday, I feel certain this matter must have the full consideration of the Department of Agriculture, the War Production Board, and any other agency which is in a position to give assistance.

I would appreciate very much any suggestions you might have and will be most pleased to cooperate with you in any way I can.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK CARLSON.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., August 31, 1944.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CARLSON: This is in reply to your letter of August 23, in which you report of the urgent need for mechanical corn pickers in Kansas.

All machinery companies manufacturing corn pickers have been informed of the large corn acreage and the prospects for heavy yields in Kansas and other Great Plains States. Manufacturers are requested to fill the total corn-picker allocations in Kansas and other Great Plains States from their earliest production.

States in addition to Kansas for which this preferential delivery has been requested are: North Dakota, Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Missouri. Increased corn acreages and prospective bumper yields in these States are similar to the conditions existing in Kansas. Because of the spotty drought conditions and a more favorable relative inventory of corn pickers on farms in the major corn-producing States, the request for early delivery to the States mentioned appears justified.

The request to the manufacturers emphasized the importance of filling the quotas for the above States before the season begins so that the pickers could be utilized to the maximum.

We have made repeated attempts to secure an additional allocation of corn pickers for Kansas, but this is not possible as the entire scheduled production has been allocated. It is believed, however, that material relief will result by the State receiving its entire allocation of corn pickers at the start of the season. It also means that any reduction in the production of corn pickers through failure on the part of manufacturers to meet their production schedules will have to be absorbed by States receiving later delivery. We believe that such States are in a better position to stand any reduction that might occur.

For your information, Kansas was allocated 485 corn pickers by manufacturers from the 80 percent of their 1944 scheduled production which they distribute without direction of the War Food Administration. Kansas was allocated 308 corn pickers from the 20-percent National Reserve by the direction of the W. F. A., making a total allocation of 793 corn pickers for the year compared with a total allocation of 375 for 1943.

Your concern in this matter is appreciated and we assure you that we will keep in close touch with the situation and will render every possible assistance.

G. F. GEISSLER,
Director, Western Division.

Sidney Hillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago the new dealers in the Democratic Party had their own hatchet men going about the country purging men in public office who would not bow to their dictates. In this campaign Earl Browder and the Communists, along with Sidney Hillman and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, have joined forces to relieve the administration of this dirty, filthy job.

The following biography is taken from Who's Who in America, volume 23, 1944–45, Two Years, and in accordance with the custom of the compilation of Who's Who in America, Sidney Hillman has this to say about himself:

Hillman, Sidney, labor leader; born Zagare, Lithuania, March 23, 1887; son Schmuel and Judith (Faikin) Gilman; came to United States at age of 20; received rabbinical education; married Bessie Abramowitz, 1916; children—Philoine (Mrs. Milton Fried), Selma (Mrs. Irving Lerner); department under United Garment Workers, at Hart Schaffner & Marx, Chicago, 1911–14; chief clerk under Brandeis' protocol in Cloakmakers' Union, New York, February–October, 1914; president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America since 1915; chairman of board, Amalgamated Bank of New York; director, Amalgamated Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago; led strike, Hart Schaffner & Marx, which resulted in collective agreement with that firm, 1910; strike in New York which achieved 48-hour week, 1916, the 44-hour week, 1919; organized Rochester market, 1918; organized Chicago market, 1919; visited Russia, 1921, and made agreement for transmission of American dollars; made agreement with Arthur Nash Co., Cincinnati, 1925; organized Philadelphia market, 1929; built cooperative houses in New York; established unemployment insurance fund, Rochester, Chicago, and New York; member of Labor Advisory Board, N. R. A., 1933, National Industrial Recovery Board, 1935; member, Advisory Board, National Youth Administration, 1935; reached first national collective bargaining agreement in men's clothing industry in 1937; member textile and apparel industry committees, Fair Labor Standards Board, 1938; vice president, Congress of Industrial Organizations; chairman, Textile Workers' Organization Committee, 1937–39; chairman, executive council, Textile Workers' Union of America, since May 1939; appointed labor member, National Defense Advisory Commission, 1940; became associate director-general, O. P. M. and director, Labor Division of same, 1941; appointed to Supply Priorities and Allocation Board, September 1941, director, Labor Division, W. P. B. 1942; member, Academy Political and Social Science, home, 237 East Twentieth Street, New York, N. Y.; office, Social Security Building, Washington, D. C., also 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y.

Mr. Speaker, because Sidney Hillman is the spearhead in this purge and smear campaign, the following facts concerning him, which he did not include in his biography in Who's Who in America should be of interest to the voters.

Sidney Hillman was born in Zagare, Lithuania—then a part of Russia; was a leader of the Russian Revolution of 1905 in Zagare, according to the Communist press; was president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, but never a worker at his trade; a writer of a book on the Russian Revolution, entitled "Reconstruction of Russia and the Task of Labor;" conferred with Lenin in 1922 regarding the establishment of the Russian-American Industrial Corporation, of which Hillman was president; donated $3,000 to the Jewish Communist paper, Freiheit, in 1921; head of the Hillman-Communist coalition, together with VITO MARCANTONIO in the American Labor Party in New York.

It is very encouraging to read in the press every day that officers and members of the C. I. O. are beginning to realize Sidney Hillman's real objective is not in the cause of labor, but a determined effort to take over this Government of ours, to perpetuate Mr. Roosevelt and all his satellites in power until such time as

they can completely take over and abolish our representative form of Government.

The question before the American people today is a very simple one. It resolves itself into the following proposition. This is your America. Do you want to turn it over to Sidney Hillman? Or, in other words, do you want Sidney Hillman to rule this country?

Labor Day, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in all the criticism to which American labor has been exposed by reason of wildcat strikes and the active intervention of new factors into the national political scene, many Americans may have overlooked the substantial contribution which labor has made to the war effort. The high wages paid, the tremendous publicity given to unauthorized work stoppages and the frequently unfavorable reaction which such a combination inevitably produces obscure the record but they do not change it.

American labor on Labor Day 1944 can look back upon a year of work well done, of an achievement in production which has never before been conceived, much less performed. Many of the criticisms which have been leveled at our working organizations will prove in years to come to be merely the same symptoms of "growing pains" which have taken place in the evolution of other great developments in the social structure of the world.

It is easy to be critical. It is difficult to maintain an objective attitude towards those who occasionally exploit their position in labor organizations for personal reasons. Our working people themselves resent such activities. They will correct these abuses themselves in the not too distant future.

Fifth Anniversary of the Invasion of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN GORSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the fifth anniversary of the invasion of Poland and the beginning of the sixth year of the Second World War. During these 5 years there were dark periods for the Allied Nations and the fate of democracy hung in the balance. In the early days of this war Hitler roared his threats at all freedom-loving people, and the European nations trembled at his threats. He made promises to all of them that he did not want or desire their lands, but invaded one by one or forced them into what he called the new order—his order. There were times in the past 5 years when the nations fighting the Nazis were fighting with their backs to the wall, and the outlook for freedom and democracy was very dark and gloomy.

When the Nazis were winning battles Hitler and his murderous hordes were perpetrating every imaginable crime on their helpless victims, they tried to overcome the spirit of freedom and loyalty of the conquered people by brutality and terror so despicable as to shock the decency of the civilized world. No nation conquered or none of the people were spared, and no mercy was shown to women or children, among those who suffered most were the people of Poland, the nation first to defy his might, and the first to suffer the tortures and brutalities of the barbarous and inhuman Nazis. They forced them out of their homes, took away their food, imprisoned them on the slightest pretext, shot and murdered them by the thousands in the presence of their loved ones, starved the women and innocent children, but with all of these tortures they did not in all of these 5 years of war, produce one Pole who would collaborate with them, and today the people of Poland still defy them, and the love of freedom and democracy is stronger than ever, their soldiers are fighting gloriously side by side with the soldiers of the United Nations.

Today the beginning of the sixth year of this global war, the situation is different, the United Nations are winning on every battle front, and the Nazis see defeat staring them in the face, their leaders know what their fate is, and are beginning to spread propaganda with the idea and hope of staving off total defeat and unconditional surrender.

As this war draws to a close and the Nazis see that they cannot win, and they will resort to one of their favorite tricks by spreading propaganda to soften public opinion and thereby arouse a sentiment in their behalf so that they may not be dealt with too harshly, and in this endeavor they will again call upon their sympathizers to help spread their propaganda among the people of the United Nations. I am sure we will not be misled. We will never forget the innocent hostages whom they murdered and the crimes they committed. I hope that peace will come soon, but we do not want a peace that will give the Nazis a chance to rearm in a short time and again plunge the world in another war. We want a just peace, but with that just peace those who were responsible for the atrocities committed on the people of the conquered countries are brought to justice and punished according to the crimes which they were responsible for, and they should be tried in the countries where the crimes were committed. This would be a deterrent on war criminals. Now that victory is within our grasp, let us bring about such a peace that this country will never again be forced to marshall all its manpower and its resources to maintain our democracy. Let us seal the fate of tyrants for all time.

Poland Pleads for Help—Cordell Hull Warns German Barbarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 1st of September 1944 is the fifth anniversary of the brutal Nazi attack on Poland and the beginning of the sixth year for the Polish people of the most terrible horrors and suffering that the world has ever witnessed. For the first time since Hitler had come to power in Germany, German aggression met armed resistance from the Poles, exactly 5 years ago today. Five years ago the German military colossus pounced upon Poland with all of its military power and might. Poland was a young nation, struggling through its reconstruction after World War No. 1, after having 150 years of Russo-German-Austrian occupation.

For 35 days the whole world followed the events of the unequal struggle. The sacrifice of Poland in September 1939 was to save democracy. President Roosevelt called Poland the inspiration of the holy Allied cause.

The Polish campaign of 1939 was one long succession of heroism and sacrifice. The Polish soldier and the civilian population without regard to race, creed, or origin fulfilled their obligations to their motherland.

In the Polish campaign, which German military publications termed the most difficult of all campaigns to date, the Battles of Kutno, Lwow, and Kock—where the Polish Army was forced to surrender for lack of ammunition on October 5—stand out. All remember likewise the heroic defense of Hel and Westerplatte, Modlin, and Warsaw.

After 5 years Warsaw is again fighting. After 5 years Warsaw has again accepted the challenge to uneven battle with the German might. As 5 years ago the Warsaw Poles heeded the call of their mayor and defender of the city, Stefan Starzynski, likewise now at the command of General Bor they have taken up arms in open uprising to break the chains of their German bondage. Now as then they fight without outside assistance; now as then the Polish underground and the civilian population are fighting tanks with guns and bottles of gasoline.

The defense of Warsaw 5 years ago and the struggle for Warsaw's liberation today are not two isolated facts of Polish participation in this war. They are but two symbolic facts of an unending succession of sacrifice and struggle.

Polish resistance has persisted from the very first day of the war. It has persisted inside Poland and beyond her borders. Ever since the moment when the Germans treacherously crossed the Polish frontiers on September 1 the Poles have been fighting.

As soon as the war was officially ended in Poland guerrilla units which were to become the nucleus of a great under-

ground army were made up of Polish soldiers and civilians. At the same time, General Sikorski, 2 days after the fall of Warsaw, formed a Polish Army in France. This army numbered some 80,000 men and consisted of four and a half infantry divisions, an armored brigade, and the now-famous Carpathian Brigade. The first and second divisions of General Sikorski's army participated in the Battle of France; the Carpathian Brigade fought in Norway and was victorious in the battle for Narvik.

A large part of the Polish Army in France was successfully evacuated to England after the former collapsed. Poland's Army in Britain now numbers 30,000 men and boasts an armored division, a parachute brigade, and other units. A Polish women's unit, counterpart of the American WAC, has also been organized and numbers 5,000 women. The armored division is now fighting in France, together with the American, British, and Canadian Armies.

Another Polish Army was organized on Russian soil under General Anders following the signing of the Polish-Russian treaty in July 1941, and the release of a large number of Polish prisoners of war in that country. At the request of the Soviet Government, it was transferred to the Middle East, where it was equipped and grew to form a separate army corps with the Carpathian Brigade, which had been expanded to a division. This corps now numbers 75,000 well-trained and superbly armed men. They have fought in the Libyan campaign—Tobruk, El Gazala—and are now fighting in Italy, where they have already become famous for their victories at Monte Cassino and Ancona. A second Polish army has recently been organized in Russia, composed of the remainder of the Polish prisoners of war in that country, and this army is now fighting alongside their Russian ally.

Poland's air force, which grew out of squadrons set up in France in 1940 and evacuated to England in June of that year, played a glorious role in the Battle of Britain. Her crews destroyed 219 German planes at that time, in addition to 39 probably destroyed.

Up to May 1, 1944, the official record of the Polish Air Force operating from bases in the British Isles contains the following entries: 620 enemy aircraft known to be destroyed; 167 probably destroyed; 214 badly damaged.

Polish bomber squadrons have taken part in 893 operations of a varied character in which a total of 7,056 sorties were made. They dropped 15,547,771 pounds of bombs and mines.

At present the Polish Air Force numbers 12,000 men and ranks fourth in size among others of the United Nations—after the United States, Great Britain, and Russia. It consists of 14 squadrons and is larger than the air forces of France, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Belgium combined.

The Polish Navy has been fighting since the beginning of the war by the side of the British Royal Navy. It took part in the evacuation of Dunkerque, in the attack on the *Bismarck*, the landing at Dieppe, in the Battle of the Atlantic, and operations off the north African coast, Sicily, and Italy. It now consists of one cruiser, six destroyers, three submarines, and three coastal craft. Poland's merchant fleet is likewise in constant service on all seas and has carried much land material in convoys to Russia and to various other battlefields.

The largest Polish military command, however, is to be found in occupied Poland. This is the underground or home army. It is divided into two groups: (a) Operational units, in which soldiers are used in actual skirmishes with the invader; and (b) the regular army, whose men undergo constant training and are strictly subject to the military discipline of the organization.

The operational group consists of 250,000 men, while the number of men in the Regular Army is much higher.

In spite of handicaps as an army whose operational theater is occupied territory, the home army has been able, through its activities, to immobolize in Poland the following German forces:

First. Five full divisions; that is, over 60,000 men for special assignment, stationed at several points throughout the country.

Second. Fourteen divisions; that is, about 160,000 men on garrison duty.

Third. Military Nazi Party formations; in this, 57,250 S. S. men, 95,000 party policemen, and so forth.

Fourth. Formations of railroad, road, and frontier guards; over 200,000 men.

Fifth. About 180,000 civilians of military age doing military service in armed organizations, such as the German Self-Defense and the German Security—Sonderdienst—for defense against the Polish underground movement.

The home army is for this reason of tremendous significance in the total Allied war effort.

In conclusion, two figures should be borne in mind:

Poland's losses in the war:	
Losses on the battlefield	900,000
Losses in occupied Poland	5,700,000
Total	6,600,000

SECOND BATTLE OF WARSAW

When the Russian Armies approached the gates of Warsaw, the Poles sensed freedom and liberation. They desired to join in the fight to free Warsaw, just as the French people of Paris desired to join in the fight to free Paris.

This is no time to argue that the uprising was premature. Only such people as had suffered for 5 long years under the brutal and savage Huns have the right to discuss the question of prematureness. Since the end of July, the Germans had been using Warsaw as a key supply base and communication center for their eastern front. At the same time, they began a new reign of terror in the Polish capital by ordering civilians to evacuate the city, and by intensifying the number of mass executions and arrests. On top of that four German armored divisions were scheduled to pass through Warsaw on their way to reinforce the collapsing eastern front.

General Bor and the Polish Home Army rose to stop these German divisions, as well as to put an end to the persecution of Warsaw civilians.

At 5 p. m. on August 1 the Polish forces struck in an effort to occupy the vital central part of the city along with the main streets that lead to the three bridges across the Vistula to Praga, the eastern suburb. General Bor reported to London that this uprising of the Polish Home Army saved 1,000 internees and prisoners of war from deportation set for July 31. Many of these prisoners, his report continued, were officers and men of the Royal Air Force, shot down on missions over Germany. Saved from the Gestapo, they now fight side by side with their Polish allies.

Despite their desperate shortage of weapons and ammunition, the inability of the Allies to supply them and the stalemate on the eastern front, General Bor and his patriot army have miraculously held out for 4 weeks solely through their unparalleled heroism and wise strategy. Thus, a band of 20,000 emaciated, ill-armed and poorly equipped Poles held at bay the "superman" Wehrmacht that had so boastfully conquered all Poland 5 years previously. This unexpected insurrection greatly aided the Red Army.

During the first days, General Bor took the offensive, but as German resistance on the eastern front stiffened and Allied aid was necessarily limited, the Poles were forced to assume defensive positions in various parts of the city. Appeals were sent to both London and Moscow for military aid and supplies.

Both Britain and Russia were given full details of the plans and operations of the Polish Home Army.

Traffic on all three bridges across the Vistula was at first blocked, but during the first week the Germans succeeded in taking first the Poniatowski bridge, most southern of the three. Not until August 6 were they able to take the middle one, the Kierbedz bridge. In order to do so the Germans had to burn every building along the approaches to the vital bridge.

Desperate by the 9th of August, the Germans pressed two armored trains into service on the track that connects all the railway stations in Warsaw. These finally cleared a way to the third most northern bridge that carries both motor and rail traffic. One of these trains shelled Polish positions in a barrage that lasted 11 hours on the night from August 10 to 11, but in the end the home army rallied to retake the Stawki district. The Germans resorted to the most brutal methods of warfare. Sections of the city held by the patriots were fired by incendiary bombs, while all the fire-fighting equipment as well as most of the first-aid supplies in the city were confiscated. Polish prisoners were not treated according to international law. Nevertheless, the Poles held, and valuable time as well as armed forces and equipment sorely needed by the enemy on the eastern front were used up in this latest Battle of Warsaw.

General Bor still held large and important parts of the city that lead to these bridges as well as several vital suburbs. The Old City quarter of Warsaw, that section lying along the central river front, was held despite fierce German counterattacks. The northern suburb of Zoliborz, one of the most

fiercely contested areas, the Stawki sector with its vital freight assembly yards for the Danzig railway station still held by the Germans were all totally or in part controlled by General Bor.

So desperate did the German positions become in the Polish capital that the Wehrmacht had to rush six- and eight-barrelled mortars, tanks, and heavy artillery into the fray. German gunboats on the Vistula sent a searing cross-fire into the Polish sectors. General Bor ordered the underground outside of Warsaw to strike at general reinforcements flowing into the city, as well as to enter the city to strengthen Polish garrisons there.

At the end of the second week of hostilities, General Bor reported to London that if 400 Allied aircraft, 200 combat planes, and 200 transports with supplies were to come over Warsaw, the Polish home army would win the desperate battle within 24 hours.

On the 11th of August, following unsuccessful artillery barrages, the Germans hopefully sent an ultimatum to General Bor. Apparently unable to defeat the Poles on the field of battle, the Germans tried to do so by intimidation and "surrender or die" threats.

Saturday the 12th was marked by extremely heavy action in the Old City section which the Germans were furiously trying to retake. By Sunday, Polish garrisons in the western part of Warsaw again took the offensive and routed the Germans from several streets, but the German attack on the Old City, farther to the east, continued unabated. The Old City, Zoliborz, the northern suburb, and Stawki, with the Danzig railway station, changed hands incessantly throughout the second week of the struggle. Flames and smoke, some from artillery barrages, some from houses deliberately fired by the Germans, engulfed every part of Warsaw, creating additional obstacles to General Bor's forces.

Apparently forgotten by the rest of the world, General Bor's home army was, however, fully supported by the citizens of the capital who offered supplies, homes, labor and even their lives in the unequal struggle.

CORDELL HULL WARNS GERMAN BARBARIANS

On August 28 the Polish Ambassador, Jan Ciechanowski, issued a statement revealing that in order to take revenge upon the Polish Home Army of Warsaw, and to bring about their surrender and capitulation, the German authorities aim within the next few days to exterminate 150,000 Polish civilians concentrated in a wholesale slaughter camp at Pruszkow, 15 miles southwest of Warsaw; that the Polish Home Army at Warsaw was appealing to the civilized world to do everything possible to prevent the perpetration of this final act of German barbarity, unprecedented in history. Our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, immediately notified the German Government that those responsible for this atrocity will be fully and completely punished and that the German government will be held responsible for this depraved act of revenge against old men, women, and children.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let down this heroic and courageous people. We cannot turn a deaf ear to their pleas. The first battle of Warsaw was tragic. The pleas for help from the valiant defenders could not be met by the Allies at that time. The second battle of Warsaw must not be lost. This time the pleas for help must be heard and must be answered. History must not record a second denial.

Farmers and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, from the September 1943 issue of Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife:

Farmers, because they plan their lives as well as their days, will readily grasp the basic truth about a nation's foreign policy.

This truth is that foreign policy is shaped out of the centuries and designed to last for centuries. It is made by events and facts, not by temporary men; it is enforced by events and, when necessary, by armed might.

For the foreign policy of our great Nation to be made the subject of charge and countercharge in every fourth year's political campaign would be disastrous misfortune.

As Virginia's venerable patriot, Senator CARTER GLASS, said the other day, politics should stop at the water's edge.

To wrangle over foreign policy in the 1944 campaign, as is currently threatened, would be inexcusable in the midst of a critical war. Mud-throwing on the foreign front could only result in breeding hatred for our allies as well as for our enemies. Such a campaign would necessarily be conducted in ignorance of those essential facts which only the executive inner councils and the State Department possess. It would critically hamper the State Department in dealing with the very great responsibilities now in its care.

The small groups of noisy extremists on either side must not be permitted to turn foreign policy into political capital. This is no time for either the extreme internationalist or the extreme isolationist.

One war abroad is enough, without having the Nation split into rival camps contending over future foreign policy which neither can make, which neither can understand, and for which the time has not yet matured.

The hearts of the American people have, during their history, been devoted to three basic principles of foreign policy. Fundamental has been an attitude of Christian decency, with friendly cooperation toward all nations willing to meet us part way.

For a century and a quarter we have supported the Monroe Doctrine. That was our declaration to Europe that it must keep out of the New World and we would respect the Old. The support of the Monroe Doctrine was equipped with our own power and that of Britain and the British Fleet. Our interests and British interests were of mutual self-advantage in supporting the Monroe Doctrine. We have twice chosen to resort to war to save the British Nation, among other things, in order to safeguard this doctrine. And we have clung to the simple policy of no entangling alliances which George Washington set down for an infant nation to follow.

In time of war, foreign relations must be dictated lagrely by the armed forces in the interest of advancing the victory. In peacetime, we return to long-range policies. Then, our policy will be that determined by the American people, through a two-thirds vote in the Senate for approval of ideas submitted by the then Chief Executive and State Department. It will recognize that we are but 7 percent of the world's people. Foreign policy always recognizes this minority position.

There is much war ahead of us. More than one administration may come and go before our adjustments for a long-range modern peacetime policy can be fully developed.

We shall be wiser and stronger to stand united on the broad basis of extending the hand of Christian fellowship wherever it will be received, always keeping the mailed fist as a protection aaginst the threats of would-be aggressors. And let's beware of the kind of man who is "a steady patriot of the world alone, the friend of every country but his own."

As Abraham Lincoln said, "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all notions."

A Challenge to the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most timely and excellent article entitled "A Challenge to the American People," written by Mr. Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, and published in the New York Times of August 13, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHALLENGE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(By Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress)

THE TIMES DEMAND GREATNESS, SAYS MR. MACLEISH; IT IS NOT WEALTH BUT WHAT WE ARE THAT COUNTS

There are times in the history of any people when greatness is demanded of them; when they will either achieve greatness or lose themselves. This is such a time in the history of the American people. There are decisions of great danger and difficulty to be made. We have a part to play in making them. They will require of us whatever resources of greatness we possess.

Some of our public advisers seem to be telling us that the resources on which we must rely are our resources of power and size and wealth and strength; that in the "real world," as they call it, a great nation is simply a great power; that what is required of us now is to conduct ourselves like a great power in concert with other great powers; that if we do, the new world we want, the new

world we must create or perish, will be created of itself.

It is attractive doctrine. It fits in with everything we have been telling ourselves over the last 25 years about our size and our wealth and our productive capacity. If all we need to do to achieve the greatness demanded of us is to be big and powerful and rich and to make reasonable arrangements with other states which are also big and powerful and rich, we have nothing to worry about.

But there is something in our past, something in our tradition, which makes it difficult for us to believe that the quality of greatness in a people is the same as the quality of bigness. We are not at all sure, most of us, that we were a greater nation under McKinley than we were under Jefferson. And we suspect that the same thing may be true of other peoples—of the English, for example. England—and it is no disparagement of a Queen to say so—England was greater in the reign of Elizabeth when she was half an island than in the reign of Victoria when she was half an earth. Between Greece which was small and Persia which was large there was never any question which was the greater.

It is the same of a people's wealth. Most of us have a streak of New England in us somewhere, and New England remembers men and women who achieved their Nation's greatness on a thin, poor soil, in a country of rocks and sand and hemlocks and long winters. They say of a man in Massachusetts, "It isn't what he has to do with it; it's what he is." They would say the same of a nation.

It is not size or power or wealth we think of when we reach back in our minds for the strength we know we need in this moment of decision. Curious as it may seem to the rest of the world—curious as it seems apparently to some of our own compatriots—the American mind and the American tradition mistrust mere size and wealth and power. The qualities we have in mind when we ask ourselves wherein our greatness has consisted in the past, and in what it now consists, are qualities, as New England knows and as the country knows, which lie within a people, not around them. It is not our wealth or power. It is what we are.

We are not the first to ask what the quality of greatness in a nation is. A statesman of Athens once discussed that question in a famous speech. Pericles was a man who had some claim to knowledge of these things, for his name, then as later, was associated with the epoch of the greatest fame of a people whose fame has never been surpassed. He spoke, moreover, in the time of a great war of his people and over the bodies of the first dead in that war.

The reasons given by Pericles in his funeral oration for the greatness of the Athenians are reasons which have a peculiar appropriateness to the questions which now haunt our minds, for not once in the whole of his oration—and it is remarkable that this should be so—not once did Pericles list or describe the possessions of the Athenians, though they had many of great richness and repute, and only once, and as a kind of afterthought, did he speak of the skill of the Athenians in one thing or another, though they were a skillful people. All the rest was an account of the things in which the Athenians believed—the ideas they believed in; the principles they loved and admired—as though he assumed, and as though all his hearers assumed with him, that what makes a nation great is not what it owns, or even what it can do, but what it loves.

"We live under a form of government," said Pericles, "which does not emulate the institutions of our neighbors. On the contrary, we are ourselves a model which some follow rather than imitators of other peoples. * * * Our Government is called a democracy because its administration is in the hands, not of the few but of the many. * * *"

"We are restrained from lawlessness," he said, "chiefly through reverent fear, for we render obedience to those in authority and to the laws and especially to those laws which are ordained for the succor of the oppressed, and those which, though unwritten, bring upon the transgressor a disgrace which all men recognize.

"In our system of training for warfare," he continued, "we place our dependence upon the courage which springs from our own souls when we are called to action * * * a courage which springs more from manner of life than compulsion of laws * * *.

"We are lovers of beauty, yet with no extravagance, and lovers of wisdom, yet without weakness * * *.

"Again in nobility of spirit we stand in sharp contrast to most men. For it is not by receiving kindness but by conferring it that we acquire our friends."

And it was in these words that Pericles concluded this part of his address: "Many are the proofs which we have given of our power, which we have acquired in consequence of these qualities * * *. And assuredly it does not lack witnesses and therefore we shall be the wonder, not only of the men of today, but of after times. We shall need no Homer to sing our praise, nor any other poet * * *."

To Pericles, who had more reason than most to understand the quality of greatness in a people, a great people was a people whose ideas had greatness and who practiced those ideas.

There are many Americans who believe, in the deep tradition of their Nation and their nurture, that what was true of the quality of greatness in Athens is true of the quality of greatness in ourselves; who believe, that is, that the greatness of the American people does not now and never did consist in the size of the United States, or in its wealth of material resources, or in its armed power, but in the people themselves—which is to say, in the attachment of the people to the idea which created them as a people.

In the beginning of the great generation, in the generation of first American greatness, it was the living attachment of the American people to the ideas which they set down by the hand of Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of their Independence, and the willingness of the American people to fight for those ideas, and their willingness to commit themselves to a government established upon those ideas as a foundation, which made them great.

America had greatness as a nation in those days, small as it was, and weak as it was, and poor as it was, because it was a symbol of human liberty—of the right of all men everywhere to live their lives in dignity and freedom and of the possibility that men could live so.

America had greatness as a Nation in those days because America had meaning as a Nation.

Whenever in its history America has been great, it has been great because it had this meaning and not otherwise.

Because it meant something.

Because it had the only greatness that has ever mattered in the history of nations:

The greatness of the devotion of a people to a great ideal.

The greatness of a great idea become a nation.

Whenever in its history America has been less than great, it has been less than great because it listened to those who said that size and power and wealth came first, and the beliefs came after; that reality came first and the ideas could wait; that wars came first and the purposes of the wars came later; that the making of peace came first and the principles on which the peace was made were for afterward.

We were a symbol in the beginning of our history of the eventual freedom of all mankind. When we cease to be that symbol we shall cease to be this Nation.

H-Hour of D-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the whole world searches for an ethic—some field of agreement in which a universal covenant can be drawn up sufficient to maintain the peace of the world. Meanwhile, the letters from the boys at the front indicate that they are growing very, very serious about this whole matter of war.

At this time it is my thought that perhaps some interest might attach to the material being sent to the boys at the front through the chaplaincy of the armed forces. Therefore, I am enclosing an article which is going in large quantities to the boys around the world. It was written by Rev. C. A. Cooper, president of the Pacific Northwest Evangelistic Association. Reverend Cooper is a constituent of mine.

Perhaps we may, after all, find the ethics for world peace in the very keystone of our American morality.

H-HOUR OF D-DAY

On H-hour of D-day, June 6, 1944, America's and the world's hour of destiny struck. Titantic struggles were in the offing. Momentous issues hung trembling in the balance. On that fateful day no better action could have been suited to the need than that of President Roosevelt and King George VI in calling upon their citizenry to seek the Lord's aid, the latter calling for the confession of our own shortcomings. This was timely, since to invoke God's blessing with high-sounding phrases without sincere confession and true abandonment of sins—personal and national—is pure, unadulterated folly.

The time has come for a spiritual offensive on the home front to complement the military offensive on the battle front. Peace cannot be purchased with rivers of blood. Guns alone do not win wars. Might does not make right even when that might is on our side. In the name of Him before whom all nations are as a drop in the bucket, when will we learn that the fortunes of war are in the hands of God and the smile of God is victory? Arguments could be multiplied, no end, to substantiate the fact that total victory in a total war cannot possibly come without total mobilization of such spiritual resources as national repentance, prayer, and righteousness.

In further support of our contention that victory for the United Nations can come only from the Lord who "maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth" (Psalms xlix:9), we have but to cite a few military victories granted at the Lord's discretion in answer to prayer.

"Prayer was the strongest weapon of the marines on Guadalcanal," said Maj. Donald

O'Neil. "Do marines pray? They pray unashamedly and often aloud."

Gen. Sir Bernard L. Montgomery in a special message to his valiant Eighth Army before the Battle of Egypt, said, "Let us pray the Lord God Almighty to give us the victory." Later he called upon them to give thanks in these words, "He has done so and I know you will agree with me when I say we must not forget to thank Him for His success."

The prayers of General Gort, dubbed "Britain's praying General," and General Dobbie, a Christian gentleman of long standing, "I have known Christ for 47 years," were the main factors in the heroic defense of Malta. Consequently the most-bombed spot on earth stands today as a witness to God's preservation, in answer to the daily prayer meetings General Dobbie held with his troops.

"IN GOD WE TRUST"

These words first appeared on United States of America coins in 1864, when America was in the throes of the Civil War. People everywhere wondered what the outcome of the terrible struggle would be. The Nation faced disaster. Foes were without and within. The motto was chosen by the Government, at the request of Salmon P. Chase, then Secretary of the Treasury, to fittingly express the ideal that "no nation can be strong except in the strength of the Lord." America and all the United Nations need that vanguard today.

In these days of war we must not abandon our trust in God for utter reliance upon exclusive military might. We can, we must, as Oliver Cromwell once advised his troops, "Put our trust in God," as well as keep our powder dry. I was delighted with a statement by a United States Army chaplain in a recent letter. He wrote, "Who knows if we all praise the Lord we might save a lot of that ammunition." God bless America and save her and her allies from degenerating into a materialism which cries "In guns we trust," and help us to see "To whom God will, there will be the victory." Man proposes, but God disposes.

Unless God shall keep our city
All its watchmen wake in vain;
For in God and in Him only,
Peace and safety may we gain.
Unless God shall guard our country
Ne'er securely can it stand;
He alone holds all the nations
In the hollow of His hand.

Restoration of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago today Hitler invaded Poland. The inexcusable and brutal attack was made with full knowledge that Great Britain was committed to come to the defense of Poland. What Hitler did not seem to realize was the fact that he was starting down a road that could only lead to suffering and disaster for millions of people.

Today, 5 years later, Hitler must realize that unconditional surrender is his only remaining move. When victory is finally achieved, we will remember Poland's heroic defense. The brave people of Poland held back the Nazi hordes while the United Nations mustered their forces.

In the near future representatives of the nations of the world will sit around the council table to work out a plan to prevent future wars. It is my sincere hope that whoever represents the United States will insist upon the restoration of every foot of Polish territory. As long as I have a voice in the affairs of our Government, that voice will be raised whenever necessary to insure the restoration of a free Poland with her boundaries respected by all.

French Reds Assume Role of Liberators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Westbrook Pegler as his column in the papers of August 30, 1944:

FRENCH REDS ASSUME ROLE OF LIBERATORS

(By Westbrook Pegler)

Reporters in France tell of the execution of French women and men who were deemed to have collaborated with the Nazis and of women shorn as a mark of disgrace. The trials must have been informal and emotional, and there runs through the dispatches a strong suggestion that the Communists of France now are sitting as judges of patriotism to a country which they themselves betrayed in the days of the phony war and on down to the fall.

In the New York Herald Tribune, John Chabot Smith, writing from Marseille, says the French Forces of the Interior, after seizing a town, install a local government consisting of the council of liberation, or men named by the council. The council, he says, includes a representative from each of the six principal political groups, including the Communist.

That the Communists in France, as here, fight desperately for communism no man will deny. Like the Nazis, they are political fanatics and as cruel, wanton, devious, and treacherous. They have so much in common that not long ago before the war some American writers who had studied history in process in Germany were calling the Nazis brown Bolsheviks.

But it is a fact, nevertheless, that they were traitors to France and would have opened the gates from the inside to let the Nazis in without a fight, just as the Communists in the United States did all they could to keep this country unarmed and helpless until June 1941.

President Roosevelt, himself, flatly accused the American Communists of this when he sent a regiment of the Regular Army to Inglewood, Calif., to drive their terrorists from the gates of one of our most important airplane factories so that the Americans could get to their jobs. Elmer Davis, of the O. W. I., said that in the absence of more exact information he would regard as a Communist anyone who opposed our rearming program prior to Hitler's attack on Russia but changed overnight when the Berlin-Moscow alliance broke.

To refresh our memory of the conduct of the American Communists during that time we may refer to the files of some of the house organs of the C. I. O. unions which were then and remain today Communist fronts, controlled by clever and indefatigable Communist minorities. The Daily Worker is another reliable reference.

The Communists in France were worse than useless in the French Army facing the Germans. They not only wouldn't fight the Nazis, but they made more ghastly the desperate position of those Frenchmen who did fight and many of whom died. They were saboteurs in the factories and ports and collaborationists in far more deadly and tragic ways while there was still a chance of survival than those who, during the long dark night since the fall, lost hope of rescue and simply submitted.

French politics has been so horribly corrupt and confused that even before the war few Americans had the confidence in their judgment to boast that they understood. But undoubtedly there were Royalists and Fascists of varying degrees who saw the situation as a choice between fascism and communism and, after the collapse, went Fascist or collaborationist.

But there was one certainty during all that time down to the collapse: The French Communists were active, aggressive traitors who stabbed their own country in the back just as surely as Mussolini did, and only after the foul deed was done and the Nazis were in suddenly turned patriots because Russia, their spiritual homeland, was in danger. Their purpose was not to rescue France but to help Russia by harassing the Nazis in France.

That such people should now be able to hound and condemn and execute others, even though some of the accused actually were traitors, is a hideous irony and an injustice to the American and British fighters who drove the Germans out, for these American and British soldiers, too, were betrayed by the Communists and now find French Communists exploiting their victory.

It will not be so apparently, but surely these traitors, too, should be called to trial. Instead we find them participating in the control of the nation they helped the Nazis to humiliate and torture beyond respect of recovery within that term which President Roosevelt calls the foreseeable future.

Asks Pearl Harbor Probe Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

ASKS PEARL HARBOR PROBE NOW

Senator FERGUSON (Republican), of Michigan, disclosed today he will seek an immediate senatorial investigation of the Pearl Harbor tragedy.

FERGUSON'S decision to urge an inquiry, despite the fact that Congress enacted a law postponing court-martial proceedings of Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and Lt. Gen. Walter C. Short, the two former Pearl Harbor commanders, grows out of Kimmel's declaration that the Nation would be amazed by the true story.

WANTS PUBLIC TO JUDGE

"Since they bring out the information that he (Kimmel) is to blame, I think the matter should have the fullest investigation so that the public will have all the facts and judge who is to blame," said FERGUSON.

In refuting statements made by Senator TRUMAN (Democrat), of Missouri, former chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee and now the Democratic Vice Presidential candidate, Admiral Kimmel contended he has been denied an opportunity to tell his story. Thus, it is assumed he would testify before a congressional body.

Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat), of Wyoming, member of both the Judiciary and Military Affairs Committees, branded as politics the repeated demands for a court-martial of Kimmel and Short, while Senator BREWSTER (Republican), of Maine, backed the demand for full information on the Pearl Harbor incident without delay.

BREWSTER'S CONTENTION

BREWSTER said the whole treatment of the situation has been such as to make Kimmel and Short "the goats" without their ever having an opportunity to defend themselves, which is most un-American.

"I have never been satisfied with the argument that it would hinder the war if we have all the facts known," BREWSTER added. "I think Congress has leaned over backward in not going into the matter."

BREWSTER added tartly that one could hardly expect a commission created by the Executive—the Roberts commission—to convict the Executive who created it.

Synagogue of Rome Broadcast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, in the extension of my remarks I am pleased to include the first Jewish broadcast from Nazi liberated territory. The broadcast was under the auspices of the American-Jewish committee and was heard over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. on Sunday, July 23, 1944. It follows:

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. in cooperation with the American Jewish Committee brings you now a special broadcast of historic significance, with the first Jewish broadcast from Nazi-occupied territory liberated by the Allies. The program will originate in this Synagogue of Rome, which was reopened only last month.

The reopening of the Synagogue of Rome symbolizes the triumph of all religion over nazi-ism, the liberation of peoples of all religions and creeds. The synagogue service will be under the direction of the chief rabbi of Italy, Rabbi Israel Zolli.

CANTOR AND CHOIR. Selection: Yo-Fu-Tzu O-Y'Vecho—Thine Enemy Be Dispersed.

RABBI ISRAEL ZOLLI. From the moral and religious point of view the life of a man or of a nation has only the value of the ideals that have inspired their life and their deeds. The brave American soldiers, like the armies of the Allied Nations, are the expression, I daresay the incarnation in our minds of the ideal of liberty and justice, for us who are a part of the European Jews who have suffered and who, in those countries that have not yet been freed, still suffer unutterably for the same ideal. You fight heroically and victoriously for the ideal of which we are the martyrs. It is for the sake of this ideal that joins us together that I bless you and all the Allied armies, the generous United Nations and their leaders and their governments, from the bottom of my heart. I bless the noble Italian people and its Government, the Jews that are fighting in the Allied ranks, his ancient community, the Jews of Italy and of the whole world. Amen.

I now have the honor and the privilege to introduce Chaplain Aaaron Paperman, Jewish chaplain of the Fifth Army.

Chaplain AARON PAPERMAN. It is indeed symbolic for the Jewish people that this traditional period of 9 days of mourning over the ancient destruction of the temple in Jerusalem by the Roman legions of Titus, should be transformed almost 1,900 years later into a period of joy, celebration, and thanksgiving for the Jews of Rome at their deliverance from their Nazi and Fascist tyrants and oppressors. Yes, centuries ago pagan Rome tolled the apparent death knell of the Jewish people. Today its children in the first capital of Europe to be liberated, found the time and the hope and the courage for the survival of the Jewish people.

It is most fitting that the happy celebration of the liberation of the Jews of Rome should be manifested in these religious services of thanksgiving to God. For the godliness in man played as decisive a role in the preservation of their lives as the armed might of the Fifth Army played in their liberation. If it had not been for the very large and substantial succor and aid extended to them by the Vatican and church authorities in Rome, these hundreds of refugees and these thousands of Jewish inhabitants would undoubtedly have perished long before Rome was liberated. May God grant the preservation of our remaining brethren in the still enslaved countries of Europe, that they, too, may rejoice with their compatriots of all faiths at their liberation from Nazi oppression by the United Nations. Amen!

I now bring you a message from Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark, commanding general of the Fifth Army. These are General Clark's words. I quote:

"This is a proud day for the Fifth Army, for the Jewish people and for the free world. For us who are fighting this bitter struggle, today's services represent the fruit of what we are fighting for, the promise of what the United Nations will bring to a liberated world."

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard a special broadcast presented by the National Broadcasting Co. in cooperation with the American Jewish Committee marking the first Jewish broadcast from Nazi liberated territory. The program originated in the Synagogue of Rome and celebrated the triumph of all religious forces over nazi-ism. Participants in the program were Rabbi Israel Zolli, chief rabbi of Italy, and Chaplain Aaron Paperman, of the United States Army.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, which appeared in the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald recently, titled "'Big Jim' Farley Out as State Chairman":

"BIG JIM" FARLEY OUT AS STATE CHAIRMAN

The testimonial dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York, attended by 1,500 people, marks the passing of James A. "Big Jim" Farley as chairman of the Democratic State committee.

Of Mr. Farley it can be said that he is a straight shooter who doesn't play a double game in politics, business, or personal relationships. When he reached a point where he could not go along with his party, except by adopting a hypocritical and insincere attitude of agreement with principles which in his heart he repudiated, he resigned, though anyone who knows his love of the political game must realize that this decision was not reached without regret. But that's the way "Big Jim" plays ball. Whatever the immediate prospects may be, one doubts that he is out of the political picture permanently.

Senator George A. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, knowing that Senator Norris' friends in the Nation's Capital are concerned over his present illness, I am passing on for information of the House a telegram received this afternoon from the Senator's home town. I hope that he will soon be on the road to recovery. The telegram is as follows:

McCOOK, NEBR., *September 1, 1944.*

Congressman CARL T. CURTIS,

Washington, D. C.:

Not much change in Senator Norris' condition this morning. Still in semiconscious state.

CARL F. MARSH.

Truman Versus Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald:

TRUMAN VERSUS TRUMAN

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The debate between HARRY S. TRUMAN, chairman of the Senate committee investigating the war production program, and HARRY S. TRUMAN, second half of the term IV midstream horse, if any, is now beginning to get under way. It will get hotter.

For it so happens that back in the days when he never dreamed Vice Presidential

lightning would strike him, HARRY S. TRUMAN, the senatorial investigator, was a considerable personal critic of F. D. R.'s ability as a war maker on the industrial front.

Latest disclosure along this line came yesterday in the matter of the article Senator TRUMAN, with the aid of a ghost, did for American Magazine in November 1942. The key line of that piece, which TRUMAN signed and then tried to keep out of circulation was:

"We owe it to ourselves to insist that the President act promptly to halt the selfish fights for power, the endless bickerings, and dissension which have so far blocked the complete utilization of our productive energies."

Just why the Senator tried to strangle that after he had approved it for publication is unclear, for he had said as much before and has said as much since.

For example, on August 14, 1941, TRUMAN, the senatorial investigator, was ripping up the administration's handling of war production when Senator VANDENBERG of Michigan (see pages 7117-18 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 7), asked:

"Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, the Senator is now saying that the chief bottleneck which the defense program confronts is the lack of adequate organization and coordination in the administration of defense?

"Mr. TRUMAN. That is exactly what the hearings before our committee will prove.

"Mr. VANDENBERG. Who is responsible for that situation?

"Mr. TRUMAN. There is only one place where the responsibility can be put.

"Mr. VANDENBERG. Where is that—the White House?

"Mr. TRUMAN. Yes, sir.

"Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. [Laughter.]

"Mr. TRUMAN. I have been very happy to note that a number of the Members of Congress have recently seen the seriousness of this matter, which I have been pointing out for many months."

"I noticed the other day a quotation from the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to the effect that the priorities situation is going to be worse than anything Mr. Hitler could do to us.

"Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, my observation at this moment in my own section of the country—if the Senator will permit me to say it—is that the summary and precipitate and arbitrary fashion in which priorities and curtailments are being administered is calculated to do infinitely more damage to the United States in the next 6 months than any external enemy possibly could do.

"Mr. TRUMAN. That is the present view of the committee."

Again, early this year, the Truman committee took another rap at Roosevelt in its annual report to the whole Senate on war production for 1943:

"From its inception, this committee has insisted repeatedly on the need for clear-cut authority centered in a single executive, rather than multiheaded agencies, to administer the war program.

"The delay of 18 months in establishing such an administrative set-up was responsible for many weaknesses and failures criticized by the committee in the early months of the war effort."

Incidentally, the $750 he got for the article in American Magazine is not the only sum Senator TRUMAN has received for his comments on the war production program.

He has been paid, he said yesterday, a total of $1,200 for three speeches that parallel, on the whole, his usual line that the war could be run better. The money for these, he said, he has deposited to his own personal credit. The $750 he handled in another way.

It seems the committee has been operating two bank accounts at the Hamilton National Bank, here, "HARRY S. TRUMAN Account No. 1" and "HARRY S. TRUMAN Account No. 2."

Account No. 1 is for official funds granted out of the United States Government's tax revenues by Congress and spent only on objects authorized in the resolution establishing the investigating committee. These would include such items as clerk and counsel hire, travel expenses for members, stationery, and recording expenses.

Account No. 2 is something novel in the congressional line. Into that, according to Mrs. Peggy Buchholtz, clerk of the committee, the $750 went to pay for "committee expenses not on the official list," as for instance, extra copies of reports over and above the number officially published by the Government Printing Office for the committee's use.

Senator TRUMAN, who said he didn't really know much about it all, disclosed that his committee has received several gifts of money, all of which have been deposited in Account No. 2. Just who gave these, he couldn't recall yesterday nor did he remember the total deposits and expenditures through this account, but promised he would look them up and report in a few days.

When he does, details will be reported herein.

Federal Aid to Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution passed by the chamber of commerce of my home city of Greenville, S. C., pointing out the great need for immediate action on the part of the Congress on the Federal aid to public-highway legislation.

Needless to say, I fully concur in the views expressed in the resolution and again call upon the Committee on Roads to press for final action on this important legislation before any other recesses are taken.

Whereas the highways of our Nation, and the passenger cars, trucks and busses that use them are necessary to the economic and sound development of our rural and urban life; and

Whereas our rural highways have never been developed to such a point that the maximum safety and lowest cost of operation are afforded highway transportation users; and

Whereas the development of our highways by the States in conjunction with the Federal Government was stopped after our entry into this war, with the exception of those projects necessary to the war effort, thereby placing on highway wartime loads under conditions that were such that proper maintenance has been impossible; and

Whereas such wartime conditions have caused a rapid deterioration of our highways, many of which require replacement or reconstruction; and

Whereas highway construction and increased highway transportation resulting therefrom create a maximum of high level employment so necessary in the post-war period of adjustment for men returning from our armed forces, as well as civilians now engaged in war work, thereby eliminating the need for setting up public works projects of an artificial nature; and

Whereas public works Federal-aid highway legislation has been introduced in both branches of Congress (bills S. 205 in the Senate and H. R. 4915 in the House of Representatives), indicating that the Congress recognizes the need for a highway program, and that such a program will create useful jobs for returning servicemen; and

Whereas the highway departments of the several States cannot properly proceed with our post-war highway plans until such a time that post-war Federal-aid highway legislation has been enacted by the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved by the highway committee of the Greenville Chamber of Commerce on August 28, 1944, That this organization recognizes the need for immediate action on the part of the Congress and urges immediate consideration of pending post-war Federal highway legislation by both branches to the end that this legislation will be voted upon favorably before the next recess of the Congress.

Resolved, Copies of this resolution be furnished the Senators and Congressmen of South Carolina urging their influence in having this legislation voted upon favorably during this session of Congress.

K. B. MILES,
Executive Vice President.
A. C. MANN,
Chairman, Highway Committee.

Make Way for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, we are giving much thought these days to the physically handicapped citizens of the United States. There is a Labor Committee subcommittee, headed by Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, now conducting hearings on this subject. I am pleased to serve on this group, which to use Mr. Kelley's words—

must first determine how many physically handicapped persons there are in the United States, and where they are located. We must determine the best way to group and classify the types of physical handicaps. We must find out what facilities are available to aid all groups of physically handicapped. We must learn the causes of the handicaps and the means to cure or alleviate them. We must know what is the best way to train and educate each type of physically handicapped person. And, if possible, we must determine on an over-all program for assistance to this enormous segment of our population.

A radio talk by Fraser S. Gardner, national employment officer of Disabled American Veterans, has recently been called to my attention. I believe its contents form a contribution to the subject of what we can and should do to assist physically handicapped. The address follows:

There isn't a better recruit to be found right now to man the machines of the Na-

tion's war plants than the man who has been wounded in battle and been discharged as unfit for further duty.

Right up there with these veterans, as topnotch production workers, are many men who have been discharged from service for disabilities incurred in some other fashion than at the fighting front.

There are many jobs in which these physically handicapped persons are doing especially good work—and some in which they even excel the able-bodied. Recent studies of the utilization of handicapped workers show that placements of such workers in 1943 were approximately seven times the number placed in 1940. During 1940, a period when production was stepped up to meet the needs of the Allied Nations for war materials, only 27,703 placements of handicapped persons were made. In 1941, the number placed rose to 53,224. During 1942, following Pearl Harbor, the total went up to 91,410, and at the end of 1943, records showed 194,239 handicapped persons had been placed last year, many of whom were disabled veterans.

The fact that thousands of servicemen will come back from this war placed in the category of "disabled" cannot be ignored, and the foregoing figures give us reason to believe that industries' current attitude toward handicapped workers will continue in the post-war period. Blind workers with proper training are satisfactorily employed in a wide variety of positions. They are especially proficient in manual occupations requiring a delicate sense of touch. They are well suited to jobs which are repetitious in nature, such as packing cartridges, inserting kapok into life-belt pads, and various types of sorting. They perform these jobs faster and more accurately than those who rely on sight.

Workers with limited or no hearing are preferred by many employers for noisy jobs. Examples: Boilermaker, welder, riveter, chipper, press operator, and office-machine operator. Many are good at clerical duties. Others have corrected their loss of hearing with modern hearing aids and are no more conscious of the fact that they are using an aid than they would be if they were wearing glasses.

Persons with disabilities of one or both upper extremities, especially when wearing modern artificial appliances, work efficiently as welders, as spray painters, and in many other jobs in production departments. Others are profitably used as inspectors, storekeepers, clerical workers, etc.

Workers with deformities of the spine are successfully employed in a wide variety of work in which no heavy lifting is required.

Persons with arrested tuberculosis are suitably employed in any number of positions calling for light, moderate, and semiarduous duties, provided the environment is favorable (absence of fumes, dusts, extreme temperature changes).

Organic heart cases, fully compensated, frequently excel in positions involving desk or bench duty, in machine-shop positions, and in drafting positions.

Many persons with handicaps are doing outstanding work in technical, scientific, and professional positions. At all occupational levels, handicapped workers are engaged in jobs vital to the war program.

All of these men are putting a real effort into production in any war plant that hires them. They have a desire for work that is catching. They know what war is; they know how badly production is needed. They pass their enthusiasm on to other workers. They give a lift to the morale of all workers.

It is interesting to learn that the Army and Navy E production award has been awarded to the employees of G. Barr & Co., of Chicago, Ill. Ninety-five percent of all the employees of this company are people with severe physical disabilities, all of whom have thoroughly demonstrated, as the presentation of this award indicates, that, when disabled veterans and other handicapped people are selectively placed in jobs they can handle, they can do as much work and as good work, or better, than people who have no disabilities. Disabled veterans have participated in Army and Navy E production awards as working men in other plants, but this is the first time an E award has been granted to a firm whose whole office and factory personnel, with very few exceptions, are handicapped people.

The procedure in placing these men in jobs best suited to their skills and abilities is not much different than that which is generally followed in present-day employment. Of course it can be done more expertly if completely and adequately staffed employment and medical departments are available. (Some additional special training may be wise for those individuals handling such cases.)

A complete physical examination will augment and assist the employment experts in selecting the best type of work. It may be necessary to transfer these men several times before the right niche is found. Following the examination and placement of the disability cases, recommendation can be made by the examining physician for certain continuing medical treatments as in cases of nutritional deficiencies and tropical disease infections.

All efforts should be directed to reestablishing these men in a gainful occupation so that they may "carry their own weight." In some instances they will not be able to earn a full wage. Disabled veterans sometimes find job placement difficult because of insurance risks and accident compensation costs.

Not all employers carry Workmen's Compensation Insurance. These employers should consult their insurance companies as to workman's compensation insurance or insurance employment policies. It is highly important that all employers, insured, self-insured, or noninsured, be informed of the facts and figures pertaining to employment of the physically handicapped. Such considerable uncollated information as is available, points to the physically handicapped as a source of untapped manpower, revealing that under suitable conditions such persons can serve effectively without becoming hazards to themselves or others, they expect no favors and produce as well or better than the average of normal people—having suffered once, they are exerting every effort and precaution, not to suffer again.

It is interesting to note, K. Vernon Banta, Specialist in Services to Physically Handicapped, United States Employment Service, has said: "That a survey was recently made in a large manufacturing plant, in which some 685 handicapped employees were compared with the same number of able-bodied workers, and 5.6 percent fewer accidents were found to occur among the handicapped workers."

It is obvious that to obtain full utilization of an employees' capacity, disabled or not disabled, he must be placed in a position for which his capabilities fit him and that in justice to employer and employee alike, special thought should be given to his placement. The very great majority of people who may be termed "disabled" are disabled only to the extent of being incapable of performing some functions, while remaining or capable of becoming skilled in many kinds of employment. Thus, the disabled veteran worker will find his employers emphasizing his capabilities rather than his disabilities.

The problem boils right down to finding the kind of work these handicapped people can do—training them to do it. The variety of jobs for which they are suited—and which they are already handling with unusual capacity—is truly amazing.

The Pearl Harbor Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News:

A CHALLENGE

The story of the Pearl Harbor disaster which plunged the United States into the war has never been told in full.

But it should be—and before the Presidential election.

The American people are being asked to elect President Roosevelt to a fourth term on the theory that it would be a mistake to change the Commander in Chief while the war is in progress.

At the same time the American people are not being given an opportunity to judge the capabilities of the Commander in Chief because of the suppression of facts on one of the most disastrous defeats in the Nation's history.

The excuse was made, during the early days of the war, that national security made it inadvisable to tell the full story of the Pearl Harbor tragedy. That was true at the time but it is no longer true.

The damage wrought by Jap bombs at Pearl Harbor was repaired—long ago. Germany is on the verge of defeat. There is no longer question about the outcome of the war in the Pacific.

Revelation of the last detail of the Pearl Harbor matter, including the fixing of the responsibility for the failure of American defenses to properly function, could no longer be of military value to the enemy.

There is no longer reason to hold anything back, unless the reasons are political.

And the suspicions that political pressure has entered strongly into the secrecy that has surrounded our first battle of World War No. 2 grows stronger every day.

Court-martial trials of Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, military commander, and Lt. Gen. Walter C. Short, Army commander in Hawaii at the time the Japs struck, have been delayed with the generally understood intention of not holding them until after the war is over.

The delay is in spite of the fact the two men, held responsible in the report on the Roberts investigation, have repeatedly said they are ready to answer the charges.

Admiral Kimmel only recently branded as false statements regarding lack of Army-Navy cooperation at Pearl Harbor, made in a magazine article by Senator TRUMAN, Democratic nominee for Vice President.

And Representative WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Washington Democrat, recently called public attention to stories that are going the rounds, to the effect that the Japanese envoy tricked American officials into bottling up the United States Fleet in Pearl Harbor and withdrawing air patrols in that area, thus setting up a situation which made possible the Japanese surprise attack.

Representative MAGNUSON declared that these rumors say that Admiral Kimmel had received orders from Washington to draw in the Fleet, curtail air activities, and do everything possible to dispel the notion that America was about to attack Japan, in answer to the envoy's complaint that United States military maneuvers were blocking his peace efforts.

"I do not know whether this story is true or false, and I don't venture to speak for or

against it," Representative MAGNUSON said, "but I do think the charge should be answered promptly in Washington."

And it should. Reports such as these reflect on the Commander in Chief, particularly as in recent months he has based his plea for reelection on the fact that he holds that office.

As matters now stand, only one side of the case has been told.

Admiral Kimmel and General Short were held responsible for the disaster, and were relieved of their commands.

But they have never been brought to trial, and won't under present arrangements until after the war.

They have been given no opportunity to defend themselves. They cannot, as Army officers, speak out until called before a court martial.

Thus the people of the country have not the facts upon which to pass judgment as to whether these two men are guilty or whether the fault lies higher up, as has been charged in some sources and as the stories being circulated would indicate.

The public is not being given an opportunity to pass judgment on the capabilities of the Commander in Chief who is asking retention in office for a fourth 4-year term.

The requests of the accused Army and Navy commanders for immediate court martial, with the expressed confidence in their ability to vindicate themselves, and the rumors which place responsibility for Pearl Harbor in Washington, constitute a challenge which the administration cannot very well ignore.

Only the administration can clear up the Pearl Harbor mess by ordering immediate court martial for Kimmel and Short.

Only the administration can release the facts which will enable the public to determine whether the Commander in Chief is worthy of retention in office.

Fifth Anniversary of the German Invasion of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement released by the Polish-American Congress relative to the fifth anniversary of the German invasion of Poland, and also a letter addressed to the editor of the New York Times.

STATEMENT OF POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

Five years ago, on September 1, cloudless skies rained steel, devastation, and death upon Poland when the Nazis unleashed their hordes for conquest. Though unprepared for the attack, Poland resisted valiantly, with only 31 divisions against 70, 1 armored division against 15, and 443 planes against 4,320. That was all that Poland had mustered because she, on the advice of Great Britain and France, had delayed her mobilization, so as not to give Germany any possible excuse for the attack which came regardless.

Though disarmed within a month, terrorized and subjected to unbelievable and fiendish tortures, Poland fought on, the only occupied country without a Quisling. For 5 long years, within the borders of their motherland, the Poles have been waging a desperate and relentless struggle, engaging in pitched battles, sabotage and destruction of enemy war material, railroads, and military concentrations. Their secret courts have passed sentence and the underground fighters have sent hundreds of Nazi leaders to death. They have paid a terrible price for this activity during the 5 years of bondage. Hundreds of thousands of hostages were hung or shot and hundreds of villages and hamlets have met the fate of Lidice by being burned and plowed under in reprisal. The Polish underground army of 200,000 fully organized and disciplined fighters, has kept over 500,000 Nazi soldiers immobilized and about 60,000 Gestapo agents busy.

Outside Poland, in France and Italy, the Poles fight on as an organized and potential military force. In the invasion to liberate France, 2 armored divisions are now fighting alongside the Canadians and the British. In the campaign in Italy 70,000 Poles, attached to the British Eighth Army, under the command of their own General Anders, are making great progress along the Adriatic shore, after covering themselves with glory at Cassino. The Polish Navy is also making history, in taking part in invasions and sea patrolling and in effective work against submarines and even battleships of the enemy. More than 12,000 fliers make up the heroic Polish Air Force, which so ably proved itself in the Battle of Britain and is continuing its great exploits over Germany and in the sky lanes over the battle fronts in France and Italy.

The fifth anniversary of the German unprovoked attack on Poland, will be marked by Poles everywhere, starting on September 1, at mass meetings and in church services. Here in the United States, in every city and town where Americans of Polish ancestry are grouped, this sad anniversary will also be commemorated in like manner with appropriate programs sponsored by civic leaders, the Polish clergy, and Polish organizations.

[From the New York Times]

POLAND'S POSITION ANALYZED—SETTLEMENT, IT IS CONTENDED, SHOULD BE AFFAIR OF UNITED NATIONS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is paradoxical that Rumania is now in a better international position than Poland, even though Poland has, from the very beginning, been the most faithful ally and Rumania the most loyal to Adolph Hitler. King Michael, who collaborated with the Nazis and the Iron Guards, is better off than the democratic Prime Minister Mikolajczyk of Poland.

It is not commonly known that bitterness and anxiety are spreading among the Poles. I have just received a letter from one of my Polish-American friends in Italy about the Polish Army. He writes: "The Polish soldiers' newspapers are full of bitterness and anxiety. I agree that our situation is difficult, but there are situations where reason should overcome emotion, and common sense should be obviously necessary for justice." But the Poles recognize that they are losing the independence for which they have been fighting, and therefore emotions, understandably, run high.

There are many false rumors about the anti-Russian Poles. Most of the Poles recognize the necessity for close cooperation and friendship with the Soviet Union, because they know that they cannot alter natural geography, and that the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia are their natural friends.

In order to bring about this friendship it is essential that the United Nations do not consider the Polish-Soviet settlement as a Polish-Soviet affair only; but, for reasons of collective security, regard it as an international one. However, the United Nations are washing their hands of the matter, and it remains a unilateral—at best a bilateral—instead of a United Nations settlement. The apathy of the United Nations in Polish-Soviet affairs again shows their weakness in dealing with serious international problems. The ideal of the United Nations is losing its prestige, as the ideal of the League did, because they have not been able to solve these problems.

A settlement established by the United Nations will be accepted and respected as a just one, but a settlement reached on a bilateral basis can easily be regarded by the losing side as an imposed decision. For the sake of future peace in central and eastern Europe, therefore, it is most urgent that a special United Nations commission be created to solve the dispute.

FELIKS GROSS,
Editor, New Europe.

NEW YORK, *August 25, 1944.*

Beneath the British Chestnut Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel of August 30, 1944:

BENEATH THE BRITISH CHESTNUT TREE

Speaking of the Guam issue—Maj. George Fielding Eliot, internationalist and pro-New Deal "military expert," writing in the New Republic for February 1, 1939, had this to say:

"The position of Guam itself, so far west of our main base at Hawaii, is seriously exposed."

He pointed out that "the islands of the Japanese 'mandated area' surround Guam, and aircraft and submarines operating from them would hamper our approach from the east."

In that same article Eliot warned that the time necessary to put Guam in a state of defense would be "a period of danger," declaring that "mere commencement of fortifications might precipitate war."

The decision as to whether or not to take that risk, he insisted, was "bound up with the broader question of what our policy in the Far East is going to be." In which, of course, Eliot was saying exactly what the Hepburn board had said in its report to Congress a few weeks before.

It should be borne in mind that the United States had given the Philippines their independence, to be effective in 1946, and it was to be taken for granted after that time there would be a cessation of American responsibility for their defense.

The report of a policy committee, adopted February 9, 1939, by the Republican conference of the House of Representatives, made that assumption in stating that "we are withdrawing from the Philippines and shall not be expected to defend them."

And newspaper dispatches from Washington in that same month reported that "while naval officials say that strengthening of Guam would simplify defense of Hawaii, they concede that it is not essential for that purpose."

In a paper prepared for Editorial Research Reports on February 16, 1939, Buel W. Patch, one of the most competent of the veteran Washington observers, declared:

"Apart from simplifying defense of Hawaii, the only other reasons mentioned for maintaining a strong position at Guam, in the event of our complete withdrawal from the

Philippines, have been defense of the 'Open Door' in China and defense of the trade routes to sources of rubber in the East Indies."

There you have it! Minority commercial interests in China and alien proprietorship over a rubber monopoly on which we were to be kept dependent as long as possible, and by whatever means might prove necessary or feasible?

The British and Dutch controlled the natural-rubber racket, which took its richest prizes from American motorists. And they quite naturally wanted to hang on to that racket and discourage Americans from producing their own rubber from their own alcohol distilled from their own grain.

Moreover, the British, with many, many times as large an investment in China as Americans had, were playing for American aid in protecting their Chinese holdings; although they knew that American investments in Japan were enormously larger than American investments in China, and much larger, also, than British investments in Japan.

So, of course, they wanted us to extend our stakes in the Western Pacific—in Guam or anywhere else in that neck of the woods.

Pin Point of Battle and Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be no question aside from the war itself that creates as much discussion and about which there has been so much misinformation handed out by those high in authority, as the vote on the supposed bill to fortify Guam. Of course, every Member of the House, including the Speaker himself, knows no such proposal has been before either the House or the Senate.

Newspapers throughout the country have dealt with this question editorially, and it is amazing how many of the editorial writers have assumed to be true this propaganda based upon nothing other than utter falsehoods.

Among the newspapers which have discussed this question with clarity and veracity is the editor of the Shreveport Times, of Shreveport, La. In his fine editorial he has clearly set forth the facts as they are and not as they are supposed to be by many misinformed people. This paper is published in the deep South and the editor is to be commended for his contribution to a better understanding of this important question.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the editorial with my remarks:

PIN POINT OF BATTLE AND DEBATE

The island of Guam, pin point in the Pacific, is the scene of raging battle in the Pacific war and bids fair to become the subject of considerable debate in the coming political campaigns. It is to be hoped that reports of American successes on Guam are more founded on fact (and of course they are) than is most of the Guam debate which has been going on at home for many years.

The favorite charge of factional political pulpiteers since the start of the war is that so and so or such and such a group blocked the plans to fortify Guam, or voted against fortification of Guam, or kept the President from fortifying Guam, or what not.

Exactly 100 percent of all such talk is plain unadulterated bunk.

No one ever voted against fortification of Guam or for fortification of Guam because no bill in Congress ever has come up calling for fortification of Guam.

No one ever "kept the President" from fortifying Guam because President Roosevelt never in his life has proposed fortifying Guam. On the contrary, 6 years ago he pigeon-holed the report of his own Navy board which urged fortification of Guam.

And, beyond all of this, all Navy and military men agree that no matter how strongly Guam had been at the start of this war it would have been helpless before the Japs without the full support of Hawaii, Wake, and the Philippines, and Hawaii and the Philippines were immobilized in the first blows of the Jap attack, while Wake was unfortified to any extent and fell quickly.

For the sake of our Nation and its posterity, it would be well if political office seekers would quit playing political pushball with American history in the matter of Guam. What happened about Guam is this:

Guam was acquired by the United States in 1898, under the treaty with Spain. Following World War No. 1, when all civilized nations of the world joined in disarmament, the United States agreed not to fortify Guam, in return for Japan's agreement not to fortify the Marianas, including Saipan, of course.

In the early 1930's the administrations and ruling influences, which were to be effective when World War No. 2 came, went into power in Japan, in the United States, and in Germany. Hitler immediately began building his war machine; shortly afterward the Japanese military clique began its preparations for war against the United States. This Nation let even its defenses disintegrate. Just when Japan began fortifying the Marianas and other Pacific islands in violation of her treaties is not known specifically, but records indicate it was fully known to the United States Government by the time the Roosevelt administration began its second term, for President Roosevelt himself showed some slight interest in the matter then. It was then also that Japan canceled various treaties with this Nation, including the Disarmament Treaty.

In the middle of his second term—the late 1930's—President Roosevelt, acting on the insistence of various Navy admirals and officials and on previous recommendations of General MacArthur when he was Chief of Staff, appointed a naval board headed by Admiral Hepburn to look into Guam. The Hepburn Board made its report in 1938. It recommended full fortification of Guam at a cost of $155,000,000, the island thus to be made into a major air and submarine outpost. The fortification of Guam was to fit in with MacArthur's recommendations for a 6-year program of fortifying the Philippines. Later, almost as war actually descended MacArthur was given some dribbles of support for his fortification plans, but when war came, his official reports show, there was "no more than one or two of any modern weapon" in the Philippines. Guam was unfortified, defenseless.

The Hepburn board report of 1938 apparently made no impression on anyone—from the White House to the Capitol. The President made no recommendation to Congress on it, did not send it to Congress, made no public comment of any kind. Figuratively he put it in a pigeonhole and presumably it still is there, gathering dust.

In 1939 the Navy appropriation bill included a modest item of $5,000,000 for harbor improvements at Guam. Many of those favoring full fortification of Guam voted against this ridiculously tiny item on the ground that a mere $5,000,000 worth of straightening around of some docks, some dredging, et cetera, had nothing to do with defense and would only provoke Japan. In 1940, a similar item, but only $1,000,000 this time, was in the original Navy bill and was stricken by the House. No one in his right mind would contend that either or both of these items would have enabled Guam to hold out so much as one extra minute when war came. The House membership which removed the items was two-thirds Democratic. In 1941, the first appropriation steps toward fortification of Guam were taken—but it was too late.

The story of Guam, so far as fortifying is concerned, is simply a paragraph in the general story of little or no effort to built real defense for this Nation throughout the decade when both Hitler and Japan obviously were building war machines for aggression, especially in the final years when war for the United States itself became little less than an absolute certainty.

The People Want the Truth About Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today a resolution adopted by the Young Men's Republican Club, of King County, Wash., with reference to the attack on Pearl Harbor which started our war with Japan.

I call particular attention to the final paragraph of this resolution, in which this alert organization declares "that the public should be given the facts immediately regarding the Pearl Harbor tragedy, either through an unhampered and full congressional inquiry or through the official court martial proceedings itself."

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, also calls attention to Senator TRUMAN'S assertion that confidential records substantiate his recent charges in a magazine article against Admiral Kimmel and General Short. It also points out that Senator CHANDLER "says he has also seen the complete confidential file in the case and that there is absolutely nothing to justify court-martial proceedings."

The resolution declares that Admiral Kimmel and General Short are "being made the scapegoats for the Pearl Harbor tragedy to protect the New Deal administration."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution embraces some very serious charges; it very clearly points up a national question upon which the merciless light of complete and public investigation should be thrown without further stalling or delay. I am heartily in support of the objectives of this resolution, and I sincerely hope that the people of America are given the true and entire story of Pearl Harbor before it is lost entirely in the smoke screens which have been thrown up around it ever since the first bomb fell

on Hawaii. The people want the truth about Pearl Harbor, and it is high time they had it.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the proposed court-martial trial of Admiral Kimmel and General Short for neglect of duty at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, has been inexcusably delayed for over 2½ years; and

Whereas the Democratic candidate for Vice President has seen fit to make charges against Admiral Kimmel and General Short in a recent magazine article, which charges he claims are substantiated by the confidential Government record; and

Whereas Senator CHANDLER says he has also seen the complete confidential file in the case and that there is absolutely nothing to justify court-martial proceedings; and

Whereas it seems that Admiral Kimmel and General Short are being made the scapegoats for the Pearl Harbor tragedy to protect the New Deal administration; and

Whereas there appears to be no valid reason why the whole truth should not now be told since military secrecy no longer appears involved and since said officers in common decency should be given an immediate hearing and opportunity to defend themselves: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Young Men's Republican Club of King County, That the public should be given the facts immediately regarding the Pearl Harbor tragedy, either through an unhampered and full congressional inquiry or through the official court-martial proceedings itself; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Congressmen from this State.

Signed at Seattle, Wash., this 28th day of August 1944.

YOUNG MEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB
OF KING COUNTY,
FRED C. BECKER, *President*,
CHARLES R. POLLOCK, *Secretary*.

A Letter to Rural Editor Stating My Views on International Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which expresses my views and sentiments on the vital issue of maintaining and preserving world peace through international cooperation.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 30, 1944.

To the Editors of the Walton Reporter,
Walton, N. Y.

DEAR SIRS: It is very seldom that I answer editorials in the papers of my congressional district, or anywhere else, but I feel, out of fairness to myself and my friends and supporters, that I should answer your editorial in a recent issue, entitled "Shall It Happen Again?" You were kind, in this editorial, in referring to my visit to the fair and the favorable impressions that I made in meeting with the people there. I am quite sure that you did not deliberately intend to do me an injustice or to misrepresent my views on international cooperation to preserve a just and lasting peace.

It is quite true that I was opposed, together with more than 80 percent of the American people, to having America become involved in foreign wars until we were attacked in such a dastardly way at Pearl Harbor. I voted for all appropriations to maintain and build up the Army and the Navy, as well as the Air Force, but opposed measures, along with 90 percent of the members of my party in the Congress, that would tend to involve the United States in war.

It might interest your readers to know that as far back as January 30, 1939, I introduced a bill in Congress which would prohibit the sale and shipment of scrap iron to Japan, which measure was opposed by the administration. Since that date, and up to the time of Pearl Harbor, over 8,000,000 tons of American scrap iron was shipped to Japan, and it was this scrap iron, turned into Japanese bombs, which poured out of the skies on December 7, 1941, that destroyed our warships and killed 3,000 American soldiers and sailors. I certainly did everything in my power to keep this country out of war; there is no blood upon my hands or upon my conscience for the life of a single American. I refuse to remain silent when you state in your paper: "In times like this a firm handshake and a pleasing smile mean little when compared with the lives of our children and grandchildren." I do not know how many children you have in the war or how many wars you served in, but I served in one war; was decorated for gallantry on the field of battle by both the French and American Governments, and have a son, a stepson, and a son-in-law in this war.

I am as anxious, certainly, as you are or anyone else to keep this country out of future wars, as I believe that modern wars are the greatest curse, not only to civilization, but to religion and to the happiness and welfare of the people. I therefore think, in all fairness, that your readers should know that I voted for the Fulbright resolution in favor of international cooperation to maintain world peace; that I voted for the U. N. R. R. A. to feed and rehabilitate the peoples of Europe; that I introduced in my own name and had passed in Congress by a unanimous vote (which is a very unusual honor to be given to a minority Member), a bill urging that the women and children in the occupied nations of Europe should be furnished with food, milk, and the essentials of life to prevent millions of women and innocent children from dying from rickets, tuberculosis, and mass starvation. I know of nothing that I would not do to bring about a just and lasting peace by way of international cooperation. I am not, however, in favor after this war has been won of using our armed forces to make Europe safe for Communism, when the war was fought to preserve small nations against oppression from large and ruthless neighbors.

I pray that a just peace may be realized and that the territorial integrity and independence of the smaller nations may be preserved and, if so, no one will go further in international cooperation to maintain a lasting peace than myself. I am not, however, in favor of setting up a superstate and sacrificing our independence, or setting up a world-wide glorified W. P. A. with our own money. Although I did seek in every way to keep this country out of war before Pearl Harbor, I shall do everything within my power and influence to promote a just and enduring peace—not one that will continue for 20 or 25 years—but one, I hope, that will prevail for 100 years, to safeguard the lives of not only our sons and grandsons, but other generations as well.

You can assure your readers that regardless of politics or partisanship, so far as I am concerned, world wars shall not happen again, but to bring this about there must be a just peace in order to be a lasting peace; that is close to my heart, and there is no sacrifice I will not make to attain a lasting and enduring peace.

Trusting that you will do me the courtesy of publishing this letter which contains my views on international cooperation, and with kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

Hon. Joaquin Miguel Elizalde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET O'NEAL
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, for several years Joaquin Miguel Elizalde was the Resident Commissioner in the Congress of the United States representing the Commonwealth of the Philippines. His host of friends in Congress regret deeply that he will no longer be one of us, and I have heard expressions from many, many Members of Congress that his friendship, ability, and splendid personality will be greatly missed. Mike Elizalde's record as a businessman, a patriot and a statesman is most outstanding. A short biography of his life fully justifies that statement.

Joaquin Miguel Elizalde finished his education in England and Switzerland; was chairman of the board of directors, Elizalde & Co., Inc., industrialists and financiers, Manila, P. I.; he was president of the National Development Co., Manila, and Cebu Portland Cement Co. in 1934; was economic adviser to President Manuel L. Quezon in 1937; a member of National Economic Council in 1937; chairman of subcommittee on finance, Joint Preparatory Committee on Philippine Affairs in 1937; was Philippine envoy to the International Sugar Conference, London, 1936–37; a member of Council of State in 1938; at present a major, cavalry reserve, Philippine Army; he was appointed Resident Commissioner to the United States on September 29, 1938; was appointed by President Manuel Quezon as member of Philippine Cabinet, without portfolio, and member of the Council of State on September 29, 1941; was appointed member of President's War Cabinet in 1942; chairman of the Philippine delegation of the Conference Institute of Pacific Relations held at Mont Tremblant in December 1942; was chairman of the Philippine delegation to the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture held at Hot Springs, Va., in May 1943; appointed as Philippine representative to the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, July 1943; Philippine representative to the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Atlantic City, N. J., November 1943.

He represented the Commonwealth of the Philippines gloriously during the war period. His abilities are widely recognized in this country and abroad. As great as they are, he will be missed chiefly because of his rare and charming

personality, and his great capacity for making friends. Throughout the membership of the House, he had an entree which assured the cooperation of his colleagues in any problem in which he was interested. Many of us have envied him as to his ability to accomplish that which he undertook to do. His fine intelligence, persistence, and sound sense are great assets, but his personality and his understanding of human nature are even rarer. The friendship and best wishes of hundreds of his colleagues go with him wherever his future journey may lead.

Address of Hon. Josephus Daniels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Josephus Daniels to the graduating class of the University of North Carolina, August 30, 1944:

When I confided to an old friend that the members of your class had done me the honor of asking me to deliver the commencement address, he advised: "Decline it with thanks." He proceeded to say that this class is graduating in a day when every door of opportunity will be blocked, and every avenue of achievement closed by the war. He added that the fighting would be followed by a night of chaos and gloom. He urged if I essayed to speak at all, I commiserate with you in that your unlucky star has brought you to graduation when, through no fault of your own, the dreams of usefulness and success cannot be realized.

As I reflected upon the advice of this pessimistic Gloomy Gus, I recalled a story told in normal days which ran something like this: An ambitious youth went to a college presided over by a visionless dean whose demeanor almost caused an inscription to be written over the entrance—"Let him who enters here leave hope behind." The young man said: "I wish to enter college." A voice as cheerless as from the sepulchre asked: "And then?" The would-be matriculate replied: "I hope by applying myself diligently to complete the course and graduate with honor." Mercilessly the dean inquired: "And then?" The applicant replied: "I will study law, seek a degree, and hope to become an honor to the profession." From out of what seemed a cavern proceeded: "And then?" The answer: "I hope to win the confidence of my countrymen and be elevated to the bench." Again came: "And then?", as from an avenger. The answer: "I hope to win the love of a beautiful girl and establish a happy home." Once more demanded the voice, "And then?" Being thus called upon to live his whole life before he had really passed the threshold, the disillusioned youth grabbed his hat and ran from the college campus leaving hope behind. That was in normal times.

What if that application had been made to such a dean in the day of war tragedy in which we live? He doubtless would have convinced some youths they had failed before they started life.

Instead of commiserating with you, I bring congratulations that you are privileged to come on the stage at a time that will challenge every faculty and aspiration and in which the highest rewards will come to those who overcome and take the heights. Truly I can say to you and all youths anxious about what lies ahead:

> "We are living, we are dwelling
> In a grand and awful time,
> In an age on ages telling,
> To be living is sublime."

You do not need to be told that this era is truly described as "a grand and awful time." Mourning flowers on the doors of thousands of homes, and dislocation in many lives speaks the sorrow and distress. These, and doubts about what the future holds in store, make this truly in many ways an "awful time." But does it not hold the promise of a "grand time" of reconstruction and achievement in which to be living is "sublime"? I counsel you to look beyond the clouds into the morrow of victory. Let us in the darkness remember that, though war is ugly and venomous, it wears yet a precious jewel in its head. The knightly deeds of our chivalric men in the armed service glorify our humanity and illumine our sky. They forecast the better world that is to be in which the "four freedoms" will cast out the devils responsible for this holocaust. The counsel of the sage of Craigenputtach is as applicable to you as to the generation for whose guidance it was written. Let us take it as a light to our pathway as we go out from this campus. "On the whole," said Carlyle, "a man must not complain of his 'element,' of his 'time,' or the like. It is thriftless work to do so. His time is bad. Well then he is there to make it better."

How will you make your world better? Certainly not by grousing or taking the advice of the flabby materialist commencement speaker a score of years ago who gave as the certain road to success: "Marry your boss's daughter." Rather, though not inveighing against unasked advice where love leads, I counsel you to marry yourselves to a righteous, unpopular cause, and lose yourself in complete consecration to it. You may ask how to determine whether an unpopular cause is righteous, seeing that unrighteous causes are camouflaged as pure and demagogs masquerade as patriots. If your education has not given you the acumen to differentiate between the true and the false, I give you this perfect rule: Watch where those who have opinions for sale and those who put their convictions on the auction block. Then go and enlist in the opposing army. You will be sure to find yourself in a temporary minority which is destined to win if it is truly righteous, and if valiant men enroll under its banner.

There are righteous causes calling for crusaders. I beg you to begin at Jerusalem—in your home town—and not imitate Mrs. Jellyby, complaisant in every crisis, who left the children of her dirty and disorderly home to their own devices while she gave a sweet smile and a far-away look turned upon distant Africa, busy knitting sweaters for the inhabitants of Borrioboola-Gha. The country is full of self-appointed world fixers who are drawing blueprints of the post-war world by men—men who do not know in which ward they vote or the name of their congressman and who have never turned a hand to end the slums or stenches in their own backyards—without training or experience they think themselves peculiarly competent to mark off the metes and bounds and subdivide Europe and Asia. Let me impress upon you, first of all, that near your doorstep you will find wrongs that need redressing and righteous causes waiting for champions.

"Brighten the corner right where you are" is more than a revival hymn. It is a command to drive out the crooks, the sharks, and other evil doers infesting every town and city. Only by fighting for a clean community fireside will your muscles be toughened and your capacity be enlarged to effect reforms in larger terrains. No man can draw a blueprint for the world—it is just now the absorbing indoor occupation—unless he has used his prentice hand to build more stately and sanitary edifices in the community in which he lives. To justify your right of citizenship and leadership, you must incarnate the virtues you expound. One ounce of example is worth a ton of precept.

There never was a time when there was such need for strong men of vision to translate into civic life the same new character of invention and instruments which have revolutionized warfare. A way must be found by which radar, robots, tanks, and other devices can be applied to the location and destruction of the diseases, the poisonous bugs, the malarialism, the ignorances, and the prejudices which prey upon mankind. We need in the days ahead creative Edisons, Wrights, Pasteurs, to name only three pioneers of progress. Will not some member of this class guide robots to the destruction of the pestilences that lay in wait for their fellowmen?

Just now, coming out of the atmosphere of a world in arms, you will be confronted with a challenge to enroll in a real battle for a righteous cause that will call for opposition of powerful influences. Gold braid and brass hats and decorations, associated with valor and victory, will make a strong appeal to carry over into peacetimes the trappings of war.

Already, while fighting is in progress, there is propaganda to put all the youth in uniform. There are not wanting those who approve the Mussolini and Hitler plan of introducing military training in the elementary schools. Others would confine it to the high schools. The argument is that it makes for physical strength and disciplines youth. True, but it was on the athletic fields of Rugby—not compulsory drilling that won the Battle of Waterloo. When all youths in our schools receive athletic training, as they should, they will be fit and ready for the duties of peace and war.

Advocates of compulsory military training are in four classes: 1. Those who think the schools cannot insure physical fitness; 2. Those who lack faith that post-war wisdom can organize and undergird lasting peace; 3. Those who are congenital militarists; 4. Those who wish standing armies ready for colonial exploitation or imperialism.

It will be unpopular for awhile to combat this un-American doctrine. All the more reason for enlisting and battling against permitting the evil of militarism to get its feet under the tent in a democracy which it would endanger. This country was born in hostility to colonialism. The introduction of compulsory military training would turn back the clock of self-government and democracy. Fight against it and all other encroachments upon individual liberty.

As you enroll in the army for democracy and for personal liberty, threatened tomorrow by the glamour of the goose step, you will be upheld by this summon in the immortal words of Matthew Arnold:

> "Charge once more, then and be dumb!
> Let the victors when they come,
> When the forts of folly fall,
> Find thy body by the wall."

Black-Pencil Ballots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRANT FURLONG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of August 31, 1944:

BLACK-PENCIL BALLOTS

Just why the Ohio election laws should require that absentee ballots be marked with black lead pencils is one of those legislative mysteries that has to be filed away among the unsolved crimes against common sense. On the face of it there would seem to be no reason under the sun why a ballot marked with a red pencil, a blue pencil, or even with pen and ink, is not just as valid and just as deserving of being counted as one that is marked with a black pencil. But a different view seems to prevail in the Buckeye State, and a controversy of no small proportions is well under way.

The State auditor, a Democrat, is threatening to file suit to compel the election authorities to send a pencil, presumably one with black lead, to every soldier requesting an absentee ballot. But that is a poor solution. Some soldiers, like some civilians, probably have a way of mislaying their pencils and, in the heat of battle, a mislaid pencil can be a very difficult thing to find.

A simpler remedy, it would seem, would be to change the law. But Ohio's Governor Bricker, who is also the Republican Vice Presidential candidate, is opposed to this. He says that it is a "clean politics" law, designed to protect the "secrecy of the ballot," and that the State election boards were being instructed to count only those ballots that are marked with black pencils.

All of this is confusing, to say the least. But there is one day of hope. The governor, after thinking the matter over, said he had not closed the door on the issue and that he would study it further. Perhaps this will lead to the conclusion that the law is a silly one and that it ought to be changed. After all, the inability to find the right pencil at the right time is as apt to be a Republican failing, and it may be that quite a few of Ohio's soldiers will want to vote the Republican ticket.

Vermont Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am including as an extension of remarks the address which I delivered at the Republican State convention at Montpelier, Vt., on the forenoon of August 30:

Mr. Chairman, a man who heard Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President, deliver the immortal address at Gettysburg, says we are all mistaken when we emphasize "'of' the people, 'by' the people, and 'for' the people." Lincoln said, "of the 'people,' by the 'people,' and for the 'people.'" There is a big difference. It is the responsibility of the Republican Party to see that the people realize that difference, and the desperateness of their situation, to take advantage of their possibly last opportunity to save themselves.

It is conceded that Nation-wide there will be cast the smallest vote next November ever cast in a Presidential election. The absence of so many citizens overseas and in employment away from home are two reasons.

It follows there is and there will be no great enthusiasm for candidates as such. It cannot be manufactured nor be relied upon to get out the vote, because the real enthusiasm of the people stems from their faith in themselves, their demonstrated ability to win the war, and intention to do so, and that right early. So they are not particularly interested in politics, post-war planning, or the election. They want the boys back home, victorious, and soon. However, we must make them understand and appreciate the fact that though they may win the war they may lose all for which they have fought, if the New Deal makes the peace. They can win the war and lose the peace.

We have met here today to dedicate ourselves to make the road on which America can march toward victory, toward opportunity, toward peace. We Vermont Republicans are determined to restore Republican leadership from the grass roots to the Presidency. And now.

It is easy to say, but difficult of accomplishment. As Governor Earl Warren, of California, said the other day, "Whether we win as a party is of less importance to us than whether we win as a people."

The C. I. O. Political Action Committee recognizes the situation completely. It has been preparing for it for 2 years—or since it determined to back Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term. Such a possibility, even, is a menace to democratic republican form of government any time, any place, or anywhere.

However, you just cannot laugh off the millions of political primers and pamphlets which have been and are being distributed Nation-wide and are still in preparation by this organization to do that very thing.

The years immediately ahead are the most critical we have ever faced—the years of decision when new patterns will be formed. The people, fed up with years of New Deal fallacies, tired and confused by war and post-war problems, need as never before to be kept alert and informed as to their political interests.

The 1944 elections will decide many things. How the war will end. How secure our peace will be. And whether we shall have full employment and win our fight over a government by a man, poverty, illness, and ignorance, for one of law. Never before has it been so important to vote.

A crystal ball can't reveal your future—nor a pattern of tea leaves in the bottom of a cup. But the coming election will. Your dreams for a world of peace and freedom and security, and the preservation of free enterprise at home will depend on the kind of President and Congress that you help elect. You want men who will truly represent the interests of the people. To get them you must understand the issues of this election.

Philip Murray tells the C. I. O. plenty as he hands his primer to them with instructions as to how to get the vote. "You must vote," he says, and makes available the necessary funds to serve the best interest of the people. His ideas are neither new, novel, nor patented. Though his advice to his partisans is not intended to be instructions for the Republicans it may very well be read by and taken to heart by us as such. Victory in a political campaign is spelled by votes, and to get the votes out this year is the elemental effort that will mean victory or defeat. Organization is the slogan.

The fact is that as Republicans the last few years we have depended too much on speeches and big talk. We've drawn big crowds at our rallies and got a lot of applause, but when the votes were counted the other fellows' candidate had them and was elected.

It must not happen again. We must organize from the bottom to the top. And that means that everybody must work as never before. We should put up or shut up now, or forever after hold our peace.

All the Republican governors and each and every Republican Member of Congress may talk night and day till election day without avail, and we may lose the election for—

"It ain't the guns nor the armament
Nor the Army as a whole,
But the close cooperation
Of every bloomin' soul."

It's organization which counts.

The issues are simple: Whether we are going to elect a government which will take our country along with the rest of the world into a peaceful and prosperous future, or whether we shall lie down and let the totalitarians run over us forever, as they smash democracy at home and start sowing the seed of World War No. 3. The answer is to be found in the vote of the people on November 7. It is your responsibility, my responsibility, and particularly the responsibility of the Republican Party.

The duty of the Republican Party is found in the situation which confronts us; its obligation to correct that state of affairs has been assumed and defined; its responsibility to do its duty, to discharge its obligation was never heavier nor greater since the day it became a power in politics.

What the people must be made to realize is that unless they save themselves this time, the government of, for, and by the people will have ceased to exist.

What the voters must understand and be made to appreciate is that these are not just words, but facts.

Crises are nothing new to the Republican Party. It has been well said that, "The Republican Party was born in a great crisis." The American people turned to it because they wanted to get safely, speedily through that crisis and get on their way again. Then as now, the Republican Party was called by the people to displace a regime of men who had grown tired, complacent and cynical in the business of government. Then as now, the Republican Party was called upon to replace a party that was torn with dissension and in revolt against itself. Then as now, the Republican Party was called by the people to furnish youth and vigor and vision.

Now, as then, the Republican Party will respond to that call. It will represent the Nation, the whole Nation and nothing but the Nation. It will devote itself fervently to the problems of the people and in everything it does the Constitution of the United States of America will be its guiding star. It will function through established law and not through the caprice of bureaucratic regulation. Its greatest concern will always be for those who have the greatest need. It will conduct Government openly where the people can see, discuss, and decide. It will operate less from the Government down and more from the people up. It will make wise and careful use of the people's money. It will keep the public's books in such a way as to allow the people to see how their money is used. It will see that taxes are just, visible, and designed to stimulate rather than punish. It will strengthen our great public school system, keep it under the control of State and local government, where it is responsive to the people, and prepare it to play a stronger part in the life of the

Republic. It will promote peace in industry by stimulating good will between labor and management. It will free the agencies of public information from the domination of Government. It will make fully effective the immeasurable strength of the Nation by promoting good will and unit at home. It will not be cocksure in good times or depressed and cynical in bad times. It will direct our combined material and spiritual resources against the enemies of our country. It will make any sacrifice to achieve victory even one day sooner so our boys can come home. It will see to it that they are cared for when they do come home. It and we will honor them the rest of our lives.

The question is, Will the Republican Party rise to the occasion and be equal to its destiny? To ask that question is to ask whether Americans have the will to live.

It has been well said that our natural tendency to drift, our individual indifference to public duty, our lack of any positive policy at home or abroad are the results not of the attempt to do great things, and of failing, but of a long habit of not having to do great things. We are to blame for having done too little too late.

The Republican Party is challenged today as it never has been before. It must exert itself fully, and believe in and work out its destiny as the saviour of a Republican-Democratic form of government and a civilization which it comprehends.

If we comprehend our destiny we shall become equal to it. As Walter Lippmann said of America, I say in closing, "The vision is there, and our people do not need to perish."

The Republican Party, to paraphrase him, is now called to do what its founders and the pioneers always believed was the American task—to make the New World a place where the ancient faith can flourish anew, and its eternal promise at last be redeemed.

That is the challenge of this day.

Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress and millions of civilian war workers have looked forward to the passage of legislation that will better prepare us for the transition from a war economy to a normal peacetime economy.

For the past several months committees of both the House and Senate have been studying post-war plans. All recognize the fact that waging war is the responsibility of the Federal Government. Our soldiers and sailors do not fight as New Yorkers, as Ohioans, or in the name of any other State. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government, not only to actually fight the war, but to accept the task of changing over our industries to meet the war needs. It is just as much our task to make certain that our industries, which include buildings, equipment, and labor, are properly set going on peacetime pursuits.

Frankly, the bill now before us is disappointing. Its passage will not do any harm but neither will it be much help to anyone. Its passage could be harmful if we took the position that we have done all we can do toward preparing for reconversion. As I see it, all this bill does is to approve the provisions of the President's executive order creating the office now filled by the Honorable James F. Byrnes and, second, it does provide that if any State's unemployment funds are exhausted, the Federal Government will loan that State the money needed to keep the fund solvent.

I feel certain that if extended open hearings had been held on this legislation some plan could have been devised that would provide adequate unemployment compensation without wrecking the State's control of this activity. Without too much trouble we could have found out how many men and women have moved into Connecticut, using Connecticut for example, to work in our war industries. Providing for them is the responsibility of the Federal Government. If any, or all, of the people who move into a given State to do war work become unemployed, it is the Federal Government that should see that they can get back home and that they receive unemployment compensation until they can find another job. The money needed to do this should be paid into the Connecticut Unemployment Insurance Fund by the Federal Government without waiting for that fund to become depleted. Every other State should be treated the same way.

How can we justify paying unemployment compensation to men who have earned large wages in private industry and then refuse the same benefits to the girls who have been working down here in the War and Navy Departments for $1,440 or $1,680 a year and paying the high cost of living here in Washington? Employees of many war factories can look forward to work on peacetime products as soon as the tooling up has been completed, but thousands of the employees of the Federal Government, whether employed in offices or in shipyards and arsenals, know that when they are laid off their services will never again be needed by this Government. As I see it, we have a greater responsibility to provide for the employees of the Federal Government than any other group mentioned during this debate. Included as Government employees, in fact at the head of the list, should come those who have manned and are manning our merchant marine.

The preparation of legislation to meet the needs of reconversion is the responsibility of the party in power. Leadership has been sadly lacking during the preparation of this legislation. Is the President opposed to unemployment compensation for Government employees? Is this committee bill an administration bill? We must assume that it is, even though his party leaders have been strangely silent during this debate.

The ruling of the Chairman, sustaining points of order raised against several amendments, make it absolutely necessary that we give immediate thought to the problems not adequately dealt with in the present legislation. I am not criticizing the ruling of the Chair, as I realize that no other rulings were possible.

If there is a record vote on this measure I shall vote "no," not because I am opposed to its provisions, but rather because it fails to meet our needs.

Poland After 5 Years of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago today the war engulfed the world. On September 1, 1939, the Nazi Germans invaded Poland, without declaring war, and Hitler started on the Vistula plains his modern blitzkrieg experiment. The Poles, outnumbered unproportionately, as they were not given a chance to mobilize, their armies tremendously overpowered in mechanized war equipment, especially in tanks, heavy artillery, and airplanes, nevertheless fought gloriously, paying a huge toll to the unchained demons of war, and at the same time to the gods of democracy and freedom. Poland's cities and villages were burned and destroyed, her innocent people robbed, ravaged, and murdered. Millions of them were expropriated and forcibly transferred to distant, foreign lands; her valiant defenders decimated and driven off from their own country by sheer violence and barbarous methods of German warfare. It really was not war, it was terror and extermination. Yet the Poles never gave up nor surrendered; in fact, they never, not for one single day, ceased to fight, struggling against all enemies, all chances, all odds.

The Government of Poland had to leave the unfortunate country, moved to France, and later to England, relinquishing the land and the people to underground authorities, to conduct affairs as well as possible, and to continue the strife unrelentingly. Since then, during this long 5 years of privation, moral and physical torture, infinite and unreserved sacrifices of this whole crucified nation, the Poles have never swerved from the righteous path of honor and fidelity to the ideals of democracy, liberty, and to the sublime goals of our allied nations. There never was a collaborant, as Laval, among the Poles, nor was there a Quisling-Judas in Poland. Semper fidelis she is justly called in history, which means—forever true and faithful.

During all these unbearably long years of Poland's via dolorosa, the way of martyrdom, the entire nation labored perseveringly and fought undauntedly. Today the Poles are entering with us into the sixth year of this atrocious war, and disregarding all miseries, sufferings and, I am sorry to say, disappointments and disillusions coming even from their allies, they still struggle heroically, hoping for justice and believing in the good judgment of our fighting democracies.

They hope, as we all do, that this will be the last year of this misery of war, and that the near future will bring to Poland, and to all democratic nations, a triumphant victory, lasting peace, and absolute freedom in self-determination of political existence.

On the day of this grave anniversary Poland looks up to the United States and to our allies, with expectation and confidence, still unshaken, with spirit still unconquered, proceeding in her work, in her strife, in her faithfulness for this common cause, which one of our greatest Presidents, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, defined in so simple yet so powerful words, that "this war must make the world a better place to live in." The Poles hope, in this better future, for a whole, free, and independent Poland. It is the only worthy goal of this great nation, which has behind her over 1,000 years of old culture, so valuable to mankind. For an upright, patriotic Pole there cannot be any other orientation than the desire of a free and independent Poland, and of her undivided territory, for after all the Poles had to go through in history there should be no more partitions for Poland. In Europe and in the cultural world, there must be room for the Polish cause and for a free, independent Poland.

Europe and the whole world will never experience permanent peace as long as the Polish question shall remain in neglect and oblivion or as long as the only just solution shall be put off with half measures.

The Poles are a peace-loving people; they desire peace just as they need breath for their lungs, but it cannot be peace at any price, not peace at the price of a compromise with conscience, with their national honor, peace of another patchwork. If there be peace, it must be based on justice; it must right the wrongs perpetrated, and restore what was stolen and seized by a stronger power. Human society has long ago reached this stage of understanding, that one individual cannot seize the property of his neighbor with impunity; the nations, however, collectively continue to maintain in power the criminal maxim "might before right." It certainly is high time to change this injurious attitude.

Unsatisfactory solution after this war of the question of nations, hitherto oppressed by stronger political systems, will be only a new deceit, a new beguiling of the peoples, a phantom of peace. As long as violence continues to exist among nations, as long as a nation numerically smaller and weaker must fear the more powerful who fatten at the expense of the neighbors as it is in the case of Poland, just so long there cannot be any sense in talking of a brotherhood of nations and of peace among them.

A free Poland will constitute a guarantee of peace, and will help to maintain the European equilibrium. A free and independent Polish Nation will render the world services still more valuable than those given in previous years and centuries. Willingly the Poles offer their lives for their freedom, and for liberty of other peoples. They always were and still are undauntedly faithful knights of great ideals, which uplift humanity to God.

One of the greatest Polish masters of literature, one of the most famous of all times, and of all men, Henryk Sienkiewicz, during the First World War, wrote about his country, then as now, unhappy victim of striving powers. His inspiring words are today as actual as they were a quarter of a century ago. I quote them:

In the midst of a terrible war that caused unimaginable misery, the demons of death and destruction now dispute the empires of the world. Thousands upon thousands of soldiers are dying on the fields of battle, and millions of peaceful human beings are perishing of hunger and of all possible atrocities. One country has been more specially a victim of this conflict and suffering—it is Poland. Poland has been crushed and devastated by the iron heel of war. The blood of my unhappy country cries out for Divine justice. From the banks of the Nieman to the summits of the Carpathians fire has destroyed the towns and villages, and over the whole of this huge, desolated country—the specter of famine has spread out its black wings. All labor and industry have been swept away. The plough is rusted, the peasants have neither grain nor cattle. The artisan is idle, all factories have been confiscated or destroyed. The hearths are extinguished, and disease and misery prevail. The aged and infirm have no shelter, little children, stretching out arms to their mothers for bread, receive in answer—but tears. Of such starving people, crying out for aid, listen, Christian nations; there are millions of them. Has Poland no right to assistance? To protection? To justice? Each unfortunate nation has such right in the name of humanity, but the Polish Nation has also other claims to plead her cause before the world. For centuries she was the rampart of civilization, the defense of Christian culture in struggle with the barbarians. She ever fought side by side with all defenders of freedom. Where was there any noble cause in which Poland did not shed her blood? Where was human suffering, which she did not attempt to alleviate? Her genius, her labors, her creative powers, have written Poland's name upon many pages of the world's history. Therefore in the name of universal fraternity of democratic nations, in the name of the teachings of Christ, I appeal to the civilized world—protect Poland and help her. May the Polish Nation survive this period of trial, strengthened in her justified hope for a glorious dawn of her resurrection.

Political Action Committee of the C. I. O.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hollywood Citizen-News of July 21, 1944:

This year's national primaries mark the first entry into local politics of Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. They also mark the first time that any pressure group, nationally organized, has undertaken to dictate who shall, and who shall not be, elected to public office even in local contests. It's the first time any cunning conniver ever had the monumental insolence to tell the American people who shall and who shall not represent them under the American way of doing business, even down to such local matters as the governors of their States.

Hillman, the new self-activated one-man United States Government, has been an agitator and an organizer for most of his 57 years, but aspiring to the unofficial ownership of the United States is his magnus opus to date. He is a native of Zagare, Lithuania, when it was an official part of Russia, and although he is a very polished gentleman, famed for his beautifully tailored clothing, he still speaks with the accent of his homeland.

The grandson of a rabbi and the son of a well-to-do tradesman, he began an education for the rabbinate at the age of 13 at Yeshivah, the Jewish seminary in Kaunas, also called Kovno, but instead he spent 8 months in Czarist jails for trying to change the government. He started early.

At 20, he headed for the United States via England, where he stopped in Manchester long enough to clerk in the shop of a wealthy uncle. August of the same year, however, saw him an immigrant at Ellis Island, whence he proceeded onward to Chicago.

There, 5 girls, 1 of whom is the present Mrs. Hillman, started a strike. It spread to 40,000 garment workers and became a cause celebre. All the legitimate social reformers and the self-starting do-gooders of the time eventually mixed into it. Included were Jane Addams, Clarence Darrow, Mrs. Raymond Robbins, and some more. Hillman, already a whizz at impressing big shots and worming in where the real business was, had performed so nobly in the role of errand runner and liaison agent that the local people passed him on to New York where he became identified with the crowd around Lillian Wald's Henry Street settlement.

Here he met sundry liberals and idealists, including the Honorable Frances Perkins, who became his close friend and sponsor, and a long list of others both inside and outside of labor. These powerful friends got him a job as conciliator with the Cloakmakers' Union, and with characteristic ability to bore inward, he was on his way. He really didn't have the stuff to hold the conciliator's job and was about to lose it when a battle broke out in the ranks of the long-established Union Garment Workers.

Hillman moved in with the dissidents and his revolutionary training paid off. They split off into the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America with Hillman as president. This job he held for 26 years, and through a period of labor terrorism in New York into which gangsters mixed and during which men were killed.

Through continuing friendship with Madam Perkins and other liberals high in the New Deal, Hillman finally moved into national prominence as a member of the advisory board of the N. R. A. He retired from this in 1942. The reason officially given was bad health. The Washington rumor was that Madam Perkins soured on him. Importance had gone to his head. Maybe he was already dreaming of ruling America through dictating to its voters.

Hillman came back as the head of something brand new in this land, a Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. It looked illegal, and it probably is. For 20 years in this land there's been an act of Congress prohibiting any corporation to contribute to a political campaign fund. The law was fully respected. There's never been even one test case. Unions, by another act, were spe-

cifically named corporations within the meaning of this prohibition.

Hillman claimed he was outside the law because the P. A. C. was educational in character, designed merely to educate the people in the business of voting, and to urge them to vote. Still it endorsed candidates as in the present election, marking this one for the purge, that one for election, crossing party lines and thus building a P. A. C. national governmental pattern beholden to Hillman and evidently to be dictated to by him.

The House, the Senate, various individuals such as the G. O. P.'s Harrison Spangler, appealed to Attorney General Biddle. Nothing happened, the unofficial opinion being given that P. A. C. intrusion was all right in primaries but might be questionable in finals. Hillman promptly moved to get around that. This about ends the primaries. Taking over now will be another Hillman purge project with a slightly different name, and a slightly different procedure. Contributions to it will be "voluntary," but envelopes for the "voluntary contributions" have been dutifully handed to C. I. O. members.

Ostensibly Hillman is working for the fourth term, but Hitler ostensibly was working for Germany. Freedom means the right to vote in freedom and to run the same way. If Americans accept this dictation, or even, the blessings of this sort of dictation, they're no longer Americans. Heil Hillman or some other master mind isn't too far away.

Progress—And a Suggestion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of August 30, 1944:

PROGRESS—AND A SUGGESTION

When the Big Four—the United States, Great Britain, France, and Italy on that occasion—were deep in discussion at Paris during the winter of 1918–19, a hullabaloo arose because the press was not admitted to meetings at which peace treaties were being formulated.

After this uproar had proceeded for some weeks, testy Premier Georges Clemenceau snapped, "You cannot negotiate agreements among states on the public street corner." And that was that.

Undersecretary of State Stettinius, answering the critics of secrecy at Dumbarton Oaks Conference, is more diplomatic. But he is nonetheless effective. His explanation of the procedure being followed in this semifinal effort of the Big Four to shape agreements on a new peace system is so reasonable that it will be extremely difficult to challenge his premises, or the precedents he adduces to support the present course of the conference.

For the benefit of the Congress—though he tactfully fails to press the object lesson too sharply home—he reviews the procedure of the Constitutional Convention, which met in secrecy and then piles in illustration after illustration taken from Senate and House procedure, as well as from the realm of business and international affairs. His argument is simple enough: The task of committees, of which the Dumbarton conferees comprise one, is to exchange views and formulate agreements. That task performed, the results can be offered for public study, debate, and decision.

Accompanying Mr. Stettinius' statement is a very important announcement that agreements have been reached on three major issues with respect to the proposed peace structure. There is to be an assembly, in which all peace-loving nations shall participate on the basis of sovereign equality; there is to be a council, composed of a smaller number of members in which the principal states will be joined by a number of other states to be elected periodically, and there is agreement that effective means must be instituted for peaceful settlement of disputes, including an international court of justice to handle justiciable questions, and other agencies for the maintenance of peace and security.

This means that the program outlined by President Roosevelt several weeks ago, presenting this country's idea of the peace structure, has won approval from Britain and Russia. That it does not mean agreements have been reached as yet on problems of function and power, is obvious. Nor has the difficult issue of the coordinated use of force to thwart aggression been worked through to agreement.

Progress is, nevertheless, excellent. The attitudes of the participating governments afford promise that the thornier problems are manageable. Apart from the nature and use of peace enforcement machinery, the greatest problem before the delegates has to do with the role, the rights, and the freedoms of smaller nations.

In this matter it is worthy of notice that neither the present war nor the First World War was inaugurated by a small nation. Both were engineered through the machinations of great powers—usually working on small nations as pawns. The proposed anxiety of the great states about the future peaceful intentions of their smaller neighbors is, therefore, curious—to put the matter mildly. Would it not be sensible to be done with such pretenses and, in framing the peace structure, to require clear official pledges by all members—including the most powerful—that none will undertake to intervene, directly or indirectly, in the domestic politics or policy of any other, regardless of its size? Or attempt to exert pressure from without, affecting the make-up of governments? Or the freedom of the peoples to decide these matters themselves?

Such a pledge would hobble imperialism. It would also guarantee the smaller states genuine sovereignty.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Regulate Production and Distribution of Margarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John D. Jones, Jr., of Racine, Wis., has for over 20 years been recognized by the people of Wisconsin as one of the outstanding farm leaders of our State. He is a man of the soil. His practical background and his keen interest and understanding have found him all these years closely associated with what was best for the agricultural welfare of our Nation. This devotion to the soil and all that is associated with the soil has made him turn a deaf ear, time after time, to the pleadings of his friends to accept political office. His statement which follows is a practical presentation of the farmers' attitude toward oleo and the coconut cow:

STATEMENT OF JOHN D. JONES, JR., REPRESENTING HOARD'S DAIRYMAN, FORT ATKINSON, WIS.

Mr. JONES. My name is John D. Jones, Jr. I am associated with Hoard's Dairyman, a dairy publication published at Fort Atkinson, Wis.

Senator AIKEN. Are you the Mr. Jones who used to be Commissioner of Agriculture for the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. JONES. I was Commissioner of Agriculture for that State from 1923 to 1927, Senator AIKEN.

Senator AIKEN. All right. You may proceed with your statement.

Mr. JONES. I will speak briefly from an outline. And by way of introduction, would state that the position of Hoard's Dairyman with respect to the production and sale of oleomargarine was first established and enunciated by the founder of the publication, the late W. D. Hoard, one-time Governor of the State, who, the records will show, appeared in these Halls on many an occasion 40 years ago in the same type of undertaking in which we are engaged today. Following him, A. J. Glover, now the senior editor of Hoard's Dairyman, took up the cudgels on behalf of the dairy industry in controversial matters involving the industry and the producers of oleomargarine. And it is from an editorial prepared by Mr. Glover, which appeared in the January 25, 1936, issue of Hoard's Dairyman that I will take my text.

This editorial was preceded by many other editorials, and followed, all of which adhered to the position stated therein. [Reading:]

"For nearly 50 years the dairy industry has been committed to the policy that oleomargarine should sell on its own merits, and in its own clothes. Legislation has been enacted to accomplish this end.

"One of the great principles of pure-food legislation is that the consumer is entitled to know what he is purchasing, and that commodities should be sold on their own merits, and the manufacture and sale of food products which are unwholesome and deleterious to health should be prohibited. We believe all fair-minded people subscribe to this great principle in pure-food legislation.

"While oleomargarine is taxed ¼ cent a pound, and that colored in semblance of yellow butter is taxed 10 cents a pound. The purpose of this legislation is to force oleomargarine to sell on its own merits, and to stop the sale of oleomargarine when colored in semblance of yellow butter.

"Yellow is the trade-mark of butter. It is not possible to make white butter. By requiring this demarcation in yellow between butter and its so-called substitutes, the consumer has been given greater protection, for in the early days, and to some extent now, oleomargarine was and is sold as butter. Selling oleomargarine as butter is a fraud upon the consumer, and injurious to the dairy farmer."

And then Mr. Glover went on:

"We have a law similar to that governing the sale of oleomargarine applied to grades of butter. Renovated butter is taxed ¼ cent a pound and adulterated butter, 10 cents a pound, the purpose being to stop the fraud committed when renovated butter is sold as creamery butter and to stop the manufacture and sale of adulterated butter. There are those who have not always agreed with

this legislation, but no one will deny that the purpose back of the legislation to make oleomargarine and adulterated butter sell on their own merits is sound."

That expresses the position taken by Hoard's Dairyman. I wish to say that from my own observation, from my association with the dairy industry—and I was born on a dairy farm, which I now own and operate—I am forced to the conclusion that the history of the production and sale of oleomargarine in the United States up to and including the present time, reveals a purpose on the part of some manufacturers and some distributors to resort to misrepresentation and deception to effect the sale of an inferior imitation of genuine butter.

That is my personal observation and conclusion, and that assertion is based on one of my earliest recollections as a boy in the nineties, back on the farm, where father kept cows and mother made dairy butter. We received one paper a week. It was a weekly paper. We did not have many publications in those days. And one of my earliest recollections is listening to father read from the paper an account of how a local grocer in Racine, Wis., had been haled into court for selling what was then called butterine, as butter. That was back in the nineties.

I then come on to 1911, and in order that there may be no question about the fact, I turn to Funk & Wagnalls' New Standard Dictionary, edition of 1932, page 1719, in which the authors of the dictionary define oleomargarine. They call it artificial butter, and then to present something informative with respect to the product and some of the views concerning it to the readers and the users of the dictionary, the authors of the dictionary first print a letter from one of the large manufacturers of oleomargarine, which is as follows:

"Oleomargarine is made from oleo oil, neutral lard, vegetable oils, milk and cream, and pure butter, although butter is not used in all grades. In order to obtain the desired flavor, all the fats used are of necessity the very finest obtainable. Oleo oil is made from the selected fat of the steer, and neutral lard is made from the leaf fat of the hog. After removing the animal heat, these are chilled in cold water, washed, melted at a low temperature and in the case of the oleo oil the hard portion, known as oleostearin, is removed by pressing. The mixed fats are churned with milk and cream and a considerable percentage of the very finest pure butter is also added in most cases, the quantity of butter depending upon the grade of butterine and flavor desired. In some cases coloring matter is added, such as is used in pure butter. After churning, the oleomargarine is worked, salted, and packed just as in the production of pure butter"—with the signature of a large producer of oleomargarine appearing in the dictionary's account. There is a formal admission on the part of a producer that it was his purpose to lean on the dairy industry, to use dairy products, to create the impression that the imitation product was something closely akin to genuine yellow butter, which has been known and regarded as the gold standard in food qualities for many, many centuries.

In conjunction with this letter, the authors of the dictionary publish, on the same page, the same edition, an excerpt from the book of Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, Foods and Their Adulteration, pages 189-190. Dr. Wiley, as most people in this room know, was one of the foremost advocates of pure foods, adequate pure-food legislation and its enforcement. The excerpt reads as follows:

"The manufacture of oleomargarine can take place in the United States only under the supervision of officials of the Internal Revenue. All oleomargarine which is artificially colored a yellow or yellowish tint in semblance of natural butter pays an internal revenue tax of 10 cents per pound. Oleomargarine uncolored pays a revenue of one-fourth cent per pound. There has been a constant disposition on the part of dishonest manufacturers and dealers, since the time when oleomargarine became a commercial commodity, to sell it as butter. With a more rigid National and State inspection, it is reasonable to hope that this fraudulent use of oleomargarine can be avoided, and the pure, unadulterated article under its own name be supplied to those who prefer it either on account of its properties or its price. The components used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, when properly made, are all wholesome and digestible materials such as are consumed in eating various food products. It does not appear, therefore, that any valid objection can be made against the use of oleomargarine from a physiological or hygienic standpoint."

And then I come on a little further, to December 1943, and on December 10 of that year, 1943, I found this advertisement in a leading Chicago daily paper, an advertisement of a popular brand of margarine. It is about a little less than a quarter of a page ad, and after giving some attention to what the club women of the community think about this particular brand of oleomargarine, the manufacturer goes on to state, in bold type, that this product is "Made from pasteurized fat-free milk and vegetable oils." That passage is featured. That is followed by the statement that this margarine "is a scientific blend of two of America's basic foods," meaning pasteurized fat-free milk and vegetable oils.

Now, inasmuch as it is required that oleomargarine contain not less than 80 percent of fat, and in this case it is vegetable fat, and inasmuch as there is probably 12 or 14 percent of moisture in addition to the fat, and 1 or 2 percent of solids, obviously there could not be much more than a trace of milk solids, not fat, in this preparation. And yet, according to the representations of the manufacturer, the fat-free milk is featured. The uninformed consumer might easily be led to believe that milk solids formed the major portion, or at least a very substantial portion of the ultimate product. And I submit that that is misrepresentation and constitutes deception. That occurred in December 1943.

And on May 18, 1944, in the Cincinnati Times-Star, appeared another advertisement of a prominent manufacturer of oleomargarine, announcing the "Whole milk margarine, better than any other. 1. Whole milk with all the cream left in. * * * the pure, nourishing, edible oils are mixed with whole milk, an ingredient which adds even greater quality" to the product, naming it.

"Enjoy the delicious flavor of—" naming the product—"the whole milk margarine."

Again, even assuming that whole milk is used—and the principal reason why milk was used in the first instance by the manufacturers was that they might by that use impart the flavor of butter to the imitation product—even assuming the use of whole milk, there can be only a small quantity of whole milk solids and whole milk fat.

We take the position that those who contend that the lower-income consumer groups should have made available to them a lower-cost spread for bread, and that this is impossible if reliance must be placed on butter, particularly at this time when butter is rationed, we take the position that if those who make that contention are sincere, they would be the first to favor the retention of existing legislation, because oleomargarine is available now to the consumers of this country, so far as Federal taxation goes, after the imposition of only a quarter of a cent tax. That means, however, that it must be sold with its natural color, which is white.

And in that connection, I wish to point out that white is not a reprehensible color. One of the finest dairy products I know of is cream cheese, which, I believe, was originated up here in Philadelphia, sold under a trade name, manufactured by a number of firms in America now, and in rather large volume normally, although I believe the production has been reduced somewhat during the war period. The color of that product is white, and always has been white. It is used as a spread, used in sandwiches, used in the preparation of salads. No objection has ever been raised to the color of cream cheese because it is white.

And then again there is another very fine, nutritious product that results from the processing of the lowly peanut—peanut butter—containing not only a high percentage of fat but very valuable protein; a product that has been on the market for years; that is relished by youngsters and adults as well; highly nutritious; sold in its natural color, which is brown; sold under its name, "peanut butter," without misrepresentation, without deception; and the dairy industry has never offered any objection whatsoever to the sale of peanut butter.

And we submit that there is no reason whatsoever why the needs of the low-income groups for something to supplement the limited amount of butter that is not available cannot be met, if the supply of oils is sufficient, under existing tax laws of the United States which permit uncolored margarine to move freely in interstate commerce with a tax of only a quarter of a cent a pound.

There is another point that I wish to make in connection with this controversy between the dairy industry and oleomargarine which, in my opinion, perhaps is more fundamental. It has within it the long-range view of public welfare. It has been well stated that American civilization rests on the 9 inches of top soil of American farms.

Recently I picked up a report of the United States Department of Agriculture, and there it was stated that in that area east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio River several millions of acres of one-time fertile land had been ruined for the production of tillage crops by erosion.

In New England, along the east Atlantic coast, throughout the North Atlantic States group, in my own group of States in the Middle West, the North Central area, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, even that greatest agricultural State of them all—Iowa—there are millions of acres of land—good land—that due to the topography, the lay of the land, the slopes, the roughness in some cases, that land should be kept, so far as may be possible, permanently under grass or legumes, in order to hold that soil—to prevent it from blowing and washing away.

As a matter of fact, out of that territory that I have mentioned—the North Central area—millions of tons of that fine topsoil have already gone down the Mississippi River and are now part of the delta.

The dairy cows, the beef animals, and sheep are practically the only animals that can utilize grass and the coarse forages to advantage, and of the three the dairy cow is the most efficient converter of grass and forage into edible foods that we know of.

I imagine that in the South the dairy business is on the increase. Within a week I have been told by one cattleman in Wisconsin of the selling of 200 dairy cows in Georgia. I note that dairy leaders in the South, in the colleges and in the farm organizations, are urging that their eroded acres be placed under grass, so far as possible, and that dairy cows be used in that area. I sincerely hope that that may be done because, with our knowledge of dairy cattle, I am sure that dairy products can be produced economically down there, and thereby the incomes of the farm people will be raised, and the nutritional standards of the farm

people, as well as those in the urban centers, will be raised as the result of the production of dairy products.

We are opposed, on the basis of the facts presented, to the passage of this bill.

Reconversion—Government Owned Land—Pearl Harbor Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee between the House and Senate are now attempting to iron out differences on two bills dealing with reconversion and demobilization.

The first bill sets up machinery for the greatest remainder sale in all history—the disposition of surplus property which Uncle Sam will have on his hands at the close of hostilities. The House and Senate bills disagreed on the make-up of the agency's top-side management. The House version would grant full authority to a single administrator. The Senate plans would vest authority in an eight-man board.

A reasonable compromise seems possible, a board to lay down policy and a single head to carry it out.

The problem of the disposal of our huge war surplus might easily become Uncle Sam's biggest home-front headache. It could make or break all our post-war plans looking toward production and more production—and with it jobs and more jobs.

Surplus-property disposal was a headache following World War No. 1. The total involved was $6,000,000,000. The Senate Small Business Committee recently estimated that the end of the war in Europe will find Uncle Sam with $103,000,000,000 worth of surplus property—everything from defense plants to jeeps. It is made up as follows:

Land and housing	$23,784,000,000
Industrial plants	16,554,000,000
Aircraft and parts	26,000,000,000
Ships and tankers	10,000,000,000
Army vehicles and parts	9,500,000,000
Civilian goods	7,450,000,000
Raw materials	4,588,000,000
Materials in process	3,700,000,000
Miscellaneous supplies	2,252,000,000
Total	103,828,000,000

Seventeen times greater than the problem following World War No. 1, and potentially 17 times the headache.

Major General Clay of the War Department recently testified that already $255,000,000 worth of Army matériel has been declared surplus. Our investment in the total estimated surplus-to-be is fully a third of our national debt.

The other bill would set up an Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion to be headed by a Director appointed by the President with Senate advice and consent. The Director would have jurisdiction over the Surplus Property Office and also the Office of Contract Settlement.

The principal controversy during debate on this bill centered around efforts to federalize the unemployment compensation system by the use of Federal funds, rather than existing State reserves, to make payments to jobless workers. This proposal was defeated in both the House and Senate.

Several features of the Senate bill were ruled out of order in the House and so never came to a vote there.

Uncle Sam has acquired, during the war, more than 34,000,000 acres of land. This makes the Federal Government the owner of some 383,000,000 acres of land, an area equal to 21 of the 26 States east of the Mississippi River.

The Byrd report lists Secretary of Interior Ickes as the land czar of the Government. More than 205,000,000 acres are under his control. The Department of Agriculture is next with 162,000,000 acres. Together these two departments control over 95 percent of all land owned by the Government.

Senator TRUMAN'S article in Collier's only served to accentuate the demand for action on the Pearl Harbor trials. But the administration still refuses to let the American people know the story. Those in the know insist that that story when told will rock the country.

Last December Congress extended the statute of limitations to June 7, 1944. Shortly before that time expired the House passed a resolution making it mandatory that courts martial be held within the next 3 months, or by September 7. But the administration, not wanting to let the American people have the story before the November elections, succeeded in getting the resolution changed, and extending the time to December 7, a month after election.

If Admiral Kimmel and General Short are guilty, they should be punished and relieved of the $6,000 a year that each draws as retired pay. If they are innocent, they should be exonerated, and the blame placed where it belongs.

Fifth Anniversary of War and Dastardly Attack on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the fifth anniversary of the dastardly attack of the Germans upon peace-loving Poland and the beginning of the barbaric conflagration and slaughter that ultimately compelled us to get into the debacle in an effort to not only preserve ourselves but also the civilized world.

Though, according to the press reports, Poland was conquered after 3 or 4 weeks of heroic and stubborn fighting against overwhelming odds, her people, her soldiers still fight on in the various war theaters. Why only in this morning's papers we read that the Poles fighting in Italy have captured Pesaro. In the meantime, Hitler continues his butchery of women, children, and aged men. He has more than 150,000 of them in a concentration camp only a few miles outside of Warsaw and is subjecting them to the most fiendish and imaginable cruelties before merciful death meets them.

Not far to the east of Warsaw stands the mighty Russian Army, but for some unknown reason it has remained frozen in its tracks and has not made any advance in more than 3 weeks. Within the city of Warsaw and throughout Poland the Polish underground at insistence of Moscow and upon orders from the Polish Government in exile began its activity some 4 weeks ago. They have fought valiantly but their supplies are meager. They have made repeated pleas for aid but except for token supplies flown over from Italy by the English and Polish fliers, no substantial assistance has been delivered. Let us pray that the Russian Army will not remain inactive and passive until the remaining Poles in occupied Poland are annihilated before continuing their march on Berlin. A brave, courageous, and liberty-loving people who throughout their suffering have carried on should not be sacrificed upon the altar of politics.

In all decency, morality, and justice, Poland and the Polish people deserve a better fate.

Army-Navy Game

REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the edict issued by the Honorable James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, banning the Army-Navy football game from public scrutiny amazes me. To me, and I know that I speak for millions of American sports-loving fans, the edict—as Whitney Martin, well-known sports columnist said—is "incongruous." It verges on the so-called hysteria that enveloped this Nation after Pearl Harbor. Then it might have been fully justified, or even in 1943, but certainly not now.

I have been 100 percent behind the war program, and we all recognize that although the road ahead is rough, victory will soon be with us. During the past two crucial years, the American sports public graciously accepted the order of the Army and Navy with respect to this great classic. Nevertheless it was perplexing for the public to understand why such a policy was required here in the United States when England, only a few miles from hostile air fields and hostile guns, has continued her

sports schedule for the benefit of public crowds of 125,000 at single events. It seems a trifle on the "silly" side for the United States, practically out of the danger zone, to be so cautious in our sports program.

During the past three years, we know that the American people have performed a miraculous job of production. We have out-produced the world in planes, tanks, guns, shells, and in all implements of war. Morale has definitely been a great factor in attaining these production records. And in the interest of morale we need a good sports schedule. The British have set a good example. After five years of war, the British firmly believe that the morale value of sports in war time fully justifies their continuance and for the 1944–45 season the British Sports Coordinator has scheduled 65 athletic events that will attract approximately 3,000,000 people. A Gallup poll taken showed that the American people favor war-time sports; and that they favored the Army-Navy game to be played in a metropolitan city. Ninety-two percent of our boys in the armed forces favor war-time sports; they favor the Army-Navy game being played for the benefit of the general public.

However, after 3 years of effort, I am practically convinced that trying to change the edict of an "arm chair" strategist in Washington is more futile than batting one's head against a brick wall. The answers I get are "military expediency prohibits," "would impede the war effort," or "these limitations are imposed in accordance with wartime necessity for economy," or that "our principal desire is to avoid any unnecessary burden upon transportation facilities and to discourage nonessential use of gasoline and tires." These answers are plain hokum. The American people have accepted rationing and other restrictions willingly as a part of the war burden. But no American individual will be able to interpret Secretary Forrestal's reasons for again submerging the Army-Navy game. His reasons are more confusing than any of the multitude of O. P. A. or W. P. B. regulations. The Navy cannot go to Philadelphia or New York to play the Army, but the Navy can go to Cleveland to play Notre Dame before an expected 80,000. The Army cannot go to Philadelphia or New York to play the Navy, but it can go to New York to play Notre Dame before an anticipated 78,000. The drain on transportation facilities is listed as a drawback yet the Navy is scheduled to play as far south as Atlanta, Ga. This just does not make sense. The service teams are not permitted to play before crowds when they play each other but they are permitted to travel thousands of miles to play outside opposition in heavily populated centers.

Further, various rallies and drives are set up at considerable expense to the Treasury Department to sell more War bonds, and to help prevent inflation. Then when we have a natural, like the Army-Navy football game, which would account for the sale of a billion dollars' worth of bonds—and it could be sponsored by the United States Treasury Department—the military authorities put a damper on it. In addition, the failure to play this game before the general public will cost the taxpayers millions of dollars as the academies will be compelled to come to Congress to obtain appropriations to replenish their depleted funds.

Just as the fall of Paris was a vital morale builder to our men on the battle lines, the Army-Navy game would prove a great morale builder to the thousands of men on the production lines. We need the cooperation of both to win and to win quickly.

If the strategists at home or the powers that be insist on making a dud out of the Army-Navy game, why do they not call it off entirely? Either give the game back to the American people where it belongs, or quit giving phony excuses. Our sports-loving public catches on easily enough.

Millionaire Radicals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered why a few of our wealthy people in the United States who have inherited large fortunes have turned radical and joined forces with the Communists and other un-American groups, and I believe I have found one of the answers in an article written by Dr. Dan W. Gilbert under the title of Millionaire Radicals, which I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of these remarks:

MILLIONAIRE RADICALS

(By Dr. Dan W. Gilbert)

It is a strange and interesting fact that the radical movement, aiming at the overthrow of our "capitalistic" system, has always attracted the support of certain men and women of wealth.

The most influential radical magazines and newspapers in America are largely subsidized by individuals who belong to the social class of the "idle rich." While it is paradoxical on the surface, the phenomenon of "capitalists" financing the anticapitalist agitators is, to a large degree, explained by the fact that nearly all of the "millionaire radicals" inherited their wealth.

Born to riches, unfamiliar with the work and sweat expended by their fathers or grandfathers to acquire their estate, ignorant of the means by which wealth is produced, unacquainted with the value of a dollar, it is perhaps only natural that some rich men's sons and daughters should ignorantly revolt against the capitalistic system.

Most young men inheriting wealth seek to use it for the benefit of mankind. They seek to carry on the businesses which their fathers created; they seek to manufacture improved goods for the consuming public, while maintaining good jobs for thousands of workers. They usually divert a large share of their excess wealth to the supporting of churches, schools, colleges, libraries, hospitals, research laboratories, and other agencies for the help of humanity.

But among the inheritors of great wealth there is always a minority of wastrels who delight in squandering money as a means of exhibitionism—of attracting attention to themselves, of making a show. Some of them squander their money on yachts, chorus girls, diamonds, race horses, etc. Others seek personal notoriety and ego-gratification by financing radical movements and radical propaganda, of which they are the heroes, under the guise of the uplift of the underprivileged. In either case, snobbery and self-glorification are the main motivation.

Behind almost every ambitious agitator who promises to turn the world upside down, there is a financial angel—a spoiled son or daughter of wealth, who, having tired of painting the town red, derives great emotional exhilaration from the prospect of painting the world red.

One son of wealth spends part of his inherited fortune financing "red" fronts and "red" propaganda organs; another has given over a million and a half dollars to the same purpose. A daughter of a wealthy Californian has for years been the angel of the Communist efforts toward revolution in the United States and is high in the leadership of the movement on the west coast; another has given nearly two millions of her accumulated fortune toward keeping a leftist weekly magazine afloat in the United States, although she has for some years resided in England. Still another daughter of wealth spends generously of her fortune in defense of troubled comrades and for bails and bonds when they get too red hot and become involved with the law. A former New Dealer bequeathed a fortune to build a foundation to perpetuate Marxism by propaganda and other means; a wealthy minister gave to the Communist Party a check for $350,000. A get-rich-quick Russian, made rich by sales of war chemicals in the First World War, has donated hundreds of thousands of dollars of his accumulated fortunes to the Communist revolution in the United States. A son of a Wall Street banker has devoted years of his life and much of his fortune to the "red" cause in the United States and to the interest of Russia; a hoodwinked Jewish individual in New York has been taken over for plenty by left-wingers who have led him actually to believe that Hitler's anti-Semitism is just around the corner in the United States. This money is, in turn, used to defeat conservatives in Congress and not for the intended purpose. These are but a few examples; many are available.

Karl Marx, the founder of modern communism, was subsidized in his literary and revolutionary activities by his ardent admirer, Frederick Engels also of Germany. Engels, and Marx, lived luxuriously off of Engels' inherited income from his father's investments in textile mills in England.

Marx called all workingmen "wage slaves." He contended that profits represent the robbery of the workers. Yet, all his life, he lived off the profits which Engels received from his father's estate.

Marx made a special issue of the condition of the textile workers of England. In fact, he wrote many articles on the subject of their so-called enslavement and exploitation. The same insincerity and hypocrisy are evident in the attitude and deeds of the modern well-to-do radicals.

Money comes and goes, easily and readily, in Hollywood. The millionaire movie stars do not always by earnest effort earn the fabulous salaries which they receive. A star may receive half a million dollars a year, not because of any special effort or excellence on her part (though many are real artists), but merely because nature gave her a beautiful face, a dimple, long eyelashes, platinum blonde hair, an attractive figure, or some other physical attribute.

As among the indolent sons and daughters of inherited wealth, squadermania is a raging plague among some of the millionaires of the movie colony. Some spendthrift stars invest heavily in yachts, mansions, jewelry, furs, and—as might be expected—the cause of radicalism, which offers a further unique outlet for their mania for notoriety and egogratification. Not all of the stars, by any means, have invested in radicalism; but a number of them have made an ostentatious pretense of devotion to the so-called "cause of the underprivileged."

Frequently, it is a rather transparent pretense. A well-known Hollywood commentator once told of attending a "benefit" staged by some of the radical stars during the course of the Spanish Civil War. The purpose was to raise funds for the so-called "oppressed Communists of Spain." In reality, it was a combination cocktail party and "radical benefit." After the consumption of what he estimated to be $600 worth of cocktails, a collection was taken—and a grand total of $32 was "raised" for the "oppressed Communists of Spain."

Hollywood's most notorious "millionaire radical"—who has remained in this country for a generation, but still refuses to become an American citizen—posed during the early phases of the war as a "champion" of a second front. In 1942 and 1943, when the Communists were demanding a second front, prematurely, against the advice of American and British military experts, he made a number of speeches demanding a second front in the "name of humanity." But, in Hollywood, this man is looked down upon because he has consistently refused to participate in entertainment programs for the boys in our army camps.

In obedience to the propaganda line of the Moscow leaders, he raised his voice on behalf of a premature second front, which probably would have cost needless casualties; but, he would not give of himself, of his own talents, to bring joy and entertainment to our soldiers in army camps.

Many of the political champions of the so-called underprivileged display the same strain of hypocrisy. One of the largest inheritors of wealth in American history has founded newspapers in two of our leading cities, which publicize him as a "great champion of the colored people." These papers, operated at considerable financial loss, are everlastingly whooping it up for greater opportunities for Negroes, and they are against almost everything that is, just to be different.

Other men of wealth, who never propagandized and publicized themselves as "champions of the Negro," have founded great schools and colleges in the South which have functioned in a practical way to give "greater opportunities for Negroes." A campaign of race hatred, which pretends to be waged in the interests of the colored people, can lead only to bloodshed and disaster for blacks and whites alike. The men who have extended real economic and educational opportunities to the colored people are not the ones who noisily and vaingloriously parade as "uplifters" and "champions" of the Negro race.

Many of the leaders of the most radical element of the New Deal are men of inherited wealth. Before the war the propagandist of class hatred loudly contended that one-third of our people are "ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed." The strange thing was that the scene of their "championing of the cause of the underprivileged" was, more than once, a $100-a-plate banquet in the Nation's most expensive hotel.

After stuffing themselves with a multicourse meal, consisting of fine and rare foods prepared into expensive dishes with unpronounceable foreign names, washed down with champagne or other expensive drinks, the "champions of the underprivileged" would rise and "view with alarm" the condition of their "millions of ill-fed countrymen." It seemed not to occur to them that, instead of proposing radical legislation, they might better and more sincerely help the poor and underfed by sharing with them some of their own inherited abundance including the food.

Certain churches have simple and sincere methods of helping the poor. Once a week all members of the church who habitually enjoy three square meals a day will deny themselves their main meal of the day. Then they will take the amount that the meal would ordinarily cost them and put it in a fund to buy food for the poor. If a man is used to paying $1 for this meal, he will miss the meal and put the $1 in the offering for the needy. Some politicians who are used to partaking of a $100-a-plate banquet might show greater sincerity and sympathy for the underprivileged by missing such a meal and putting the $100 in the offering plate of the Salvation Army or some other responsible agency for the relief of the real distressed.

While the millionaire radicals make a great display of self-righteously proclaiming their sympathy and solidarity with the underprivileged, the claim is usually hypocritical.

Nevertheless, many ordinary observers still find themselves puzzled to understand this form of behavior. They ask, "Why will a man of wealth finance a movement which would destroy all men of wealth, including himself, and at the same time the men of no wealth?"

There is a simple answer to this question. To find it, we need only survey the literature of the radical movement. The central point, emphasized by all Marxists, in the radical philosophy is that the revolution is inevitable. The future belongs to communism. The world of tomorrow will be controlled by the radicals.

Once a rich man becomes convinced that this is true, he becomes frightened. The revolution is coming, surely and inevitably; that means the liquidation of all capitalists. Anxious to save himself, he joins the radical movement; he pours his money into it, in return for the assurance, expressed or implied, that by becoming a fellow-traveler of the radicals he will save himself from the condemnation and liquidation which will be visited upon the enemy capitalist class when the revolution comes.

It was by playing upon the fears of the wealthy that the radical National Socialist Party of Germany, led by Adolph Hitler, was able to secure the support of certain wealthy industrialists. The Nazi propagandists sold these gullible businessmen on the idea that nothing could stop the Hitler drive for power. Get on the bandwagon and you will not be ground to death beneath its wheels was the come-on invitation which they made to men of financial power and influence.

Of course, after he got power, Hitler turned upon the men who financed his movement, imprisoning or exiling them and confiscating their properties. Vainly they had sought to purchase personal safety and immunity from the radical terror.

More often than not, when rich men finance the radical cause, it is because of cowardice and desire to save themselves, rather than any love of country or for the downtrodden whom the radicals pretend to champion.

The American constitutional (capitalistic) system provides for liberty and justice for all. True patriots, rich and poor, will be devoted to upholding and protecting that system.

There should be no double standard. When a poor man enlists in the radical cause, people will sometimes say, "He is just greedy and envious of those who have more than he has." But when a rich man enlists in the radical cause, there are some who are deceived by the pretension that he is guided by pure and humanitarian motives of concern for the underprivileged.

The fact is that any person, rich or poor, who seeks to tear down the temple of American liberty and equality is actuated either by ignorance, cowardice, or unworthy selfish motives.

Radicalism is a disease of the mind or heart, or both. Men and women of wealth, whose minds are clear, consciences are clean, and hearts are pure, find other means of helping the underprivileged than by aspiring to be "big shots" and synthetic heroes of a movement which would reduce all their fellow citizens, rich and poor alike, to the level of sovietized or nazified slaves of a radical regime founded on terror and dictatorship.

Butter Is Still Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the Grange has been the outstanding national farm organization in the legislative protection of the farmers of America. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the National Grange is the only national farm organization that has appeared before the House and the Senate Agriculture Committees in support of the dairymen of our Nation this session. Here is a farm organization that works quietly along for the interest of the farm people of the Nation. It does not get off the reservation and become a tail end of any political party. It is an organization that is for the farmers first, last, and always.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF FRED BRENCKMAN, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. BRENCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, my name is Fred Brenckman. I am the Washington representative of the National Grange and our offices are located at 1344 F Street NW.

This bill proposes the repeal of the Federal tax of 10 cents a pound on yellow oleomargarine, together with certain other taxes that are levied under existing law against wholesalers and retailers of oleomargarine.

The National Grange is opposed to any legislation of this character. Just because we are at war, and because there is a temporary shortage of butter, is not any reason why we should repeal much of the legislation in this connection that has been enacted during more than half a century.

Early in its career, the Grange directed its energies and efforts toward securing the enactment of legislation in State and Nation to suppress fraud and deception in the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine made in semblance of butter. The first Federal regulatory measure regarding this matter was passed in 1886, followed by the Grout Act of 1902.

This legislation worked satisfactorily for many years with the Federal Government collecting a tax of one-fourth cent per pound on the sale of oleomargarine in its natural color, which is white. A tax of 10 cents per pound has been levied on the product when colored in imitation of butter. This is intended to protect the dairy industry against dishonest competition and the consumer against fraud.

In November 1936 the then Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued a ruling under

which oleomargarine colored in imitation of butter by the use of palm oil, chemically treated to make it yellow, was permitted to escape with a tax of one-fourth cent per pound, instead of 10 cents. The ruling rested on the technicality that palm oil was a natural product and that its use was permissible without the payment of the additional tax. This ruling caused the price of butter in the New York market to drop from 45 to 25 cents per pound. Prices of other dairy products registered a correspondingly sharp decline.

As soon as this ruling was made, there was a perfect rash of oleomargarine advertising in streetcars, newspapers, and magazines all over the country, because the oleomargarine interests naturally reasoned that if they could sell yellow oleomargarine with a tax of only one-fourth cent per pound, they could do a very profitable business. As an example of the money that was spent in this advertising campaign, on January 10, 1931, the Saturday Evening Post carried a double-page advertisement in colors, inserted by one of the leading oleo manufacturers of Chicago, which made it appear that oleo was just as good as butter, and which was well calculated to make a strong appeal to the thrifty housewife.

The advertisement pictured many tempting dishes, all of which depended on the generous use of oleomargarine. We were reliably informed that this advertisement cost more than $23,000. No one ever heard of butter being advertised at such a lavish outlay. The reason for this is simple. There is not enough profit in making butter to warrant such an expenditure for advertising. In normal times it costs about 10 cents to make a pound of oleomargarine. There never was a time from the days of flintlock rifles and wooden moldboards down to the present when it was possible to make a pound of genuine butter for 10 cents and live.

After a fruitless attempt to induce the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to rescind this ruling, the Grange joined with other farm groups in demanding corrective legislation. After a memorable battle extending over the whole of the short session of Congress ending on March 4, 1931, the Brigham-Townsend Oleomargarine Act was passed. This calls for the use of the Lovibond tintometer test in differentiating between white and yellow oleomargarine, entirely eliminating all grounds for argument regarding the coloring matter used in yellow oleomargarine. The passage of this legislation corrected a situation which was costing the dairy farmers of the country approximately $1,000,000 a day in the form of lower prices.

My home State of Pennsylvania uses the tintometer test and yellow oleomargarine cannot be sold in Pennsylvania.

Some producers of cottonseed oil have long entertained the idea that our oleomargarine laws have worked to their disadvantage, the theory being that without any regulation of the manufacture of oleomargarine, or any taxation, a larger market would be afforded for cottonseed oil. This, of course, overlooks the fact that the dairy industry is one of the best customers of the producers of cottonseed products. Whatever injures the dairy industry also injures the cottonseed-oil industry. Moreover, there can be no permanent agriculture without animal husbandry. The destruction of our dairy industry would break the immemorial rhythm of nature: Up from the soil, and back to the soil.

Notwithstanding all the talk about the improved nutritive value of oleomargarine, Canada prohibits the manufacture, importation, or sale of oleomargarine, butterine, or other substitutes for butter. The Dominion Department of Agriculture declares that there is little likelihood of any change in this legislation, notwithstanding the war emergency. With imports of foreign oils and fats practically shut off by the war, domestic producers are finding a ready market for their products at ceiling prices. Under the circumstances, there appears to be no justification whatever for such legislation as is proposed in S. 1744.

After the war, we will be flooded by imports of cheap foreign oils. It is conceivable that Congress, animated by a generous desire to rehabilitate the Philippines, will admit coconut oil free of duty. The manufacturers of oleomargarine may be depended upon to use the cheapest oil they can get. That will be coconut oil and not cottonseed oil.

In view of these considerations, we think the producers of cottonseed oil and soybean oil would be working against their own best interest in trying to pass such legislation as is embodied in S. 1744.

In saying that, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it entirely clear that I personally have the highest regard for Senator SMITH, the author of this bill. And that goes for the National Grange as well.

Senator ELLENDER. Are there any questions by the committee?

Thank you very much, Mr. Brenckman.

Statement on Oleo Made by Mrs. Sam A. Rask, of Minnesota, State Agricultural Chairman, Federation of Women's Clubs

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the following testimony of Mrs. Rask in opposition to oleo should be of particular interest to every housewife in America:

STATEMENT OF MRS. SAM A. RASK, STEELE COUNTY, MINN., STATE AGRICULTURAL CHAIRMAN, MINNESOTA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mrs. RASK. My name is Mrs. Sam A. Rask, and I live in Steele County, Minn. I am State agricultural chairman of the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs.

Senator ELLENDER. Will you describe that, tell us what it is, its membership and so forth.

Mrs. RASK. Yes, sir. I live in Steele County, Minn. This small county, comprising only 12 congressional townships, has 22 large farmers' cooperative creameries producing annually more than 6,000,000 pounds of butter. We call it the butter capital of the world. The State of Minnesota produces annually over 300,000,000 pounds of butter.

I am the State agricultural chairman of the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs, and I have been State president of that organization and a director of the General Federation of Women's Clubs with headquarters in Washington, D. C.

Senator ELLENDER. What is the membership of that agricultural committee of the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs? What is the membership and how do you maintain yourselves?

Mrs. RASK. We are a committee appointed by the State president of the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs. The Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs has over 40,000 members. The president appoints the chairman and we work very frequently under direction from the national chairman. We also use our own individual ideas.

Senator ELLENDER. You maintain yourself from funds that you collect from your own memberships, I presume?

Mrs. RASK. Yes; from the dues. Whatever expenses are incurred are paid by our dues.

In appearing here today to oppose the passage of this bill, S. 1744, may I say at the outset that my statements are based on no little familiarity with the dairy business. I was born and grew to girlhood on a dairy farm in Wisconsin. My father sold milk to families living in a city of considerable size, and usually delivered that milk himself to his customers. Many times, when help was not so plentiful, I drove the milk cart to town myself, or accompanied the hired man, if we had one—to make deliveries and collect accounts. I know from experience what it means to the dairy farmers in long hours and endless days, 7 days in the week and 52 weeks in the year. There is not a 40-hour week for them, with time and a half for overtime. I know from experience the meager returns received for their effort in the days before the dairy business began to come into its own. In fact, it was not until some time after the first national legislation was enacted to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine that the dairy farmer began to receive a fair return for his labor. And now, Mr. Chairman, it is proposed to repeal legislation which has been on our national statute books for 57 years, and put our dairy farmer back to where he was in the early days of this century.

In all my years of married life I have lived in a typical American village in a dairy community. My husband has owned and operated dairy farms, and has dealt with dairy farmers all his life, except for the time he served our country during the Spanish-American War. In fact, our living and our very existence and prosperity has always been dependent upon, and has been coexistent with that type of farming. The success and prosperity of these farmers meant our success and prosperity, and only to the same extent as that enjoyed by these farmers.

Agriculture is the most basic of all occupations. We depend upon it for most of our food, our clothing, and a large part of our industrial raw materials. Two-thirds of the wealth added each year to our national resources spring from agricultural production. And one-sixth of the entire agricultural income of the farmers of these United States comes from dairy products.

In 1940 the purchasing power of American agriculture was only $161 per capita, as compared with $700 per person for those not living on farms. Anything which adversely affects the income of the farmer is reflected at once in a lessened income for us all. History shows that the national income increases in the ratio of approximately 8 to 1 with the total income from agriculture.

There are in this country approximately 35,000,000 people living on the land—on farms; and 25,000,000 people living in the villages and rural cities of our country. All of these people, approximately 60,000,000 people, are entirely dependent upon the income from the farms in their respective communities for their living, and a little to be saved for old age and a rainy day. When the farmers prosper, the people in these villages and rural cities prosper; and when the farmer's returns for his labor are only sufficient to pay for operation costs and living expenses there is not much left for the people in these villages and rural cities.

The entire purchasing power of the 60,000,000 people who are dependent upon the prosperity of farming is the outstanding factor in our so-called business life. The farmer

draws from the soil and creates new wealth every year, which eventually finds it way into channels of trade and commerce.

At this point it might well be asked: "Why are the members of the women's clubs in the cities and villages so interested in this legislation? They are consumers; are they not? If all restrictive legislation were removed from the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine would not that tend to lower the price of butter which we women buy?"

That probably is just about what would happen, Mr. Chairman, and is one of the main reasons why we oppose this bill. Outside of the ore taken from our iron mines, and the returns from which support only a very small portion of our population, farming produces the great bulk of new wealth in our State. Most of the 40,000 members of our Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs live in the villages and rural cities. They are a part of those farming communities. Whatsoever affects our farmers also affects us.

I would like to say right there that, just like cotton used to be the chief topic of conversation in the South, dairying today is a chief topic of conversation in Minnesota. That's true in the cities and towns as well as on the farms. That's because dairying is so important to all people, even in the large cities of our State. We have large cities, and the economic welfare of these, too, are dependent largely on the economic welfare of our Minnesota and Northwest dairy farmers.

Manufacturers of oleomargarine — and there are only a handful of them—seem to be set on using the wartime emergency as a means of repealing regulatory legislation with respect to oleomargarine that is not prohibitive of its use, but is an insurance against fraud and substitution and a protection to the consumer. From the standpoint of dairymen, there is no desire to prohibit the sale of oleomargarine, but they demand that it shall be sold for what it is. And we are definitely opposed to its sale, merchandising, and advertising it as an imitation of butter.

If, as it has been contended, it is a food for the low-income groups, then certainly these groups should by all means be protected against any possible substitution of oleomargarine for butter. Most of these supposed low-income groups are today in the high-wage-earning class and certainly are privileged to buy food of their own selection and, regardless of their income, be afforded protection that is given them through the very limited tax and license regulations that are now in effect.

An attempt has been made in the past to claim that this is a question of the southern cotton farmer versus the American dairy farmer and purely on a basis of their economic welfare.

From this standpoint, it should be recognized that if the dairy farmer were not in a position to purchase for his dairy cattle the cottonseed meal produced by the cotton farmer, the cottonseed producer would be the loser, for at no time would he receive sufficient additional income from the sale of the oil to compensate him for the loss in price on the sale of his cottonseed meal. This is not a question of the cotton farmer against the dairy farmer. It is wholly and simply a question of the large oleomargarine manufacturers trying to gain a favored position that would be of special benefit to them at the expense of both the producer and the consumer.

Now, why are these manufacturers of oleomargarine so determined to do everything in their power to repeal the present Federal law? Why are they striving so desperately hard to so disguise their product that no difference between it and butter can be detected by the consumer? What other possible reason than a wish for more profits by misleading the public through this continual insistence that their product be permitted to be sold looking like, tasting like, and smelling like butter?

If we are not right in our assumption, then why is it so imperative that oleomargarine be permitted to be colored yellow—the traditional color of butter? Since this legislation has been urged as a war measure, why not color oleomargarine red, white, and blue? The addition of coloring matter does not in the slightest degree increase its nutritive value. It is beyond the question of a doubt that should this bill be enacted into law we would find oleomargarine produced and sold in butter cartons within 60 days after its passage.

If oleomargarine is allowed to be sold in imitation of butter it will result in widespread distress to our farmers. Let olemargarine be sold for just what it is, without masquerading as a dairy product. The addition of artifical color to olemargarine causes the product to resemble butter. Colored oleomargarine could, therefore, be easily substituted for butter by the retailer and by the restaurants and other eating places. Should we now remove the present restrictions on the sale of colored margarine, we are opening wide the gates of deceptive and fraudulent practices. The fact that the manufacturers of oleomargarine wish to copy coloring, flavor, texture, and chemical properties of butter makes it evident that it is their purpose to attempt to market their product as a substitute for butter and, ultimately, to supplant butter with oleomargarine.

Summing it all up, all that we ask is that oleomargarine be sold for exactly what it is; that it be prohibited from using the color associated with butter since the beginning of time; the oleomargarine contains no dairy products; and that no material be added that will make it smell, taste, or look like butter.

Beyond that, the manufacturers may go the limit.

I have here a reprint from an article—found in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, and I would like to read a part of it. This was published last November.

"At the Fort Worth convention of the General Federation of Womens Clubs in 1942 a resolution endorsing oleomargarine was defeated. The proponents of this resolution claimed that competent authorities had gone on record for oleomargarine, as set out in the following article by Dick Wilcox, which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press recently."

That was last October.

"There have been an avalanche of propaganda recently favoring oleomargarine over butter. Dairymen claim that there has been a concerted effort to expand and circulate this propaganda at the expense of the dairy industry.

"Doubtful experiments at the Minnesota College, showing that there was no substitute for butter as a good-health producer were published and widely circulated. Similar results were obtained in experiments at Wisconsin and other universities.

"Before Russia asked for food from the United States under lend-lease, it experimented with different steps as soldier diet, using butter, oleomargarine, and fortified with vitamins, and oleomargarine fortified. It was found that when the soldiers fed on butter were wounded, they recovered much more quickly than those fed with substitutes."

I thank you, gentlemen.

Senator ELLENDER. Thank you very much, Mrs. Rask.

Dr. Harrison A. Ruehe, Executive Secretary of the American Butter Institute, Makes a Statement on Oleo Before the Senate Agricultural Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have known Dr. H. A. Ruehe 20 years. He knows whereof he speaks. I recommend that all who wish a keener insight into the problems that are confronting the dairy industry read the following testimony given before a committee of the Senate:

STATEMENT OF DR. HARRISON A. RUEHE, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, AMERICAN BUTTER INSTITUTE, CHICAGO, ILL.

Dr. RUEHE. My name is Harrison A. Ruehe. At the present time I am executive secretary of the American Butter Institute. Qualifying myself, may I report that I was graduated from the College of Agriculture, University of Illinois, in 1911; received the master degree from the University of Illinois in dairy husbandry in 1916, and the degree of doctor of philosophy from Cornell University in 1921. I joined the staff of the University of Illinois in 1912 as an instructor, and at the present time am on leave of absence from the University of Illinois and acting as secretary of the American Butter Institute.

Senator ELLENDER. What is the American Butter Institute?

Dr. RUEHE. American Butter Institute is a trade association of some 500 members scattered throughout the United States.

Senator ELLENDER. How is it maintained?

Dr. RUEHE. It is maintained by dues from the various members.

Senator ELLENDER. Do you obtain any dues other than those collected from your membership?

Dr. RUEHE. That is all. It is based on their production.

Senator ELLENDER. You say you have a membership of 500?

Dr. RUEHE. Approximately 500 plants.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, what percentage is that of the entire number of plants in the country, do you know?

Dr. RUEHE. Well, there are some 3,000 creameries in the United States, but our membership manufacture about one-third of the butter produced, and they merchandise some butter in addition to that, so I would assume that they merchandise approximately a little over one-half of the butter manufactured in the United States; that is, creamery butter.

Senator ELLENDER. You may proceed with your statement.

Dr. RUEHE. The American Butter Institute, a trade association representing more than 500 commercial creameries scattered throughout the United States, opposes the passage of the Smith bill, S. 1744. It is the opinion of the American Butter Institute that the passage of this bill will eliminate the present 10 cents per pound tax on colored oleomargarine and permit wholesale and retail dealers to color oleomargarine yellow without paying a license fee. The removal of this 10-cent tax is retrogression in legislation in the production and control of a food product which is manufactured as a substitute for butter. Removing this tax

will open the door to the fraudulent practices of selling an imitation product to the unsuspecting public as the wholesome dairy product, butter.

It should be pointed out clearly that the reputable oleomargarine manufacturers are honest and their integrity is not questioned. Even though the product were not taxed, the reputable manufacturers would not stoop to fraudulent practices, but fraud will develop in the distribution of this product.

It is only necessary to go back to the era when oleomargarine was not taxed to discern the malpractices which would develop. Previous to 1886, when oleomargarine was not taxed, the practice of selling oleomargarine colored to imitate butter ran rampant in many areas where food-control measures were lax, and in most instances consumers in lower-income brackets were most greatly imposed upon.

In 1886 a 2-cent tax was placed upon colored oleomargarine, but experience shows clearly that the 2-cent tax on colored oleomargarine was not sufficient to discourage fraud and the malpractice of selling oleomargarine colored as butter continued. The Federal authorities found it necessary to increase this tax on colored oleomargarine to 10 cents per pound in order to properly control the merchandising of this product and to discourage fraudulent practices. Even with the 10-cent tax, considerable time was required to thoroughly enforce its provisions. I remember as a small boy I visited the neighborhood grocer—King Kelly—and caught him coloring oleomargarine which he sold to his trade as butter, and this neighborhood was in the lower income bracket class.

Should the acts of Congress which created these protective measures be eliminated or modified so as to eliminate the 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine, there is no question but that those who have a thorough disregard for law and the rights of other people would turn to the fraudulent practice of merchandising colored oleomargarine as butter. It is possible that this activity might destroy both the reputable butter and oleomargarine industries.

Provisions are now made for the licensing of the manufacture of oleomargarine and for the taxing of uncolored oleomargarine to the extent of one-quarter of a cent per pound and colored oleomargarine at 10 cents a pound. The one-quarter cent tax is not a prohibitive one; it merely provides a method by which the production and sale of this commodity can be checked from its source of production to the purchase by the ultimate consumer, thus safeguarding the public. The addition of coloring matter to oleomargarine does not increase nor improve its food value. It merely makes it possible for the product to appear as something which it is not—butter.

The natural color of butter is golden yellow. The degree of intensity of this color varies somewhat with the breed of cattle which produces the butterfat and the feeds which the cattle consume, but yellow is nature's color of this product. There is a correlation between the intensity of the yellow color of butter and the carotin content, and carotin is the precursor of vitamin A. It is one of nature's sources of this essential vitamin.

The chief sources of the raw materials for oleomargarine are various vegetable oils. These products are liquid fats at normal room temperatures, and consequently it is necessary for them to be subjected to hydrogenation in order to change their chemical composition so that they will have a melting point simulating that of normal butterfat. It must be pointed out, however, that these hydrogenated vegetable oils are not and cannot be made chemically identical to the natural fats existing in butterfat. They consist primarily of what the chemist terms "long chain fatty acids" and hydrogenating does not in any way shorten the chains of their molecular structure. The natural color of these hydrogenated oils is white or an off-white color. Butterfat is composed of glycerides of a number of fatty acids, an appreciable amount of which are short chain fatty acids. Milk fat is the only natural fat which contains these short chain fatty acids, but they do appear in the milk fat of milk of various animal species including the human. This is singular. Undoubtedly the great Creator, in His wisdom, had a justifiable reason for having such short chain fatty acids present in the fat which He created for the nourishment of the young of the species, which the chemist has failed to determine with his present knowledge and ability. The great Creator has performed many miracles which chemists and other scientists have spent lifetimes of service trying to understand. Undoubtedly the necessity of short chain fatty acids in the diet of the infant is one of these which, up to the present time, remains unsolved by the scientist.

During recent years oleomargarine manufacturers have been fortifying oleomargarine with synthetic vitamin A, and it is claimed by some that 9,000 units of synthetic vitamin A per pound of oleomargarine are equal nutritionally to the vitamin A content of a pound of butter produced during winter months.

It is true that the vitamin A content of butter produced in winter is lower than that of summer-produced butter, but much of it contains more than 9,000 units of vitamin A per pound even in the winter, and at least twice that amount during other parts of the year.

It must be realized that up to the present time no scientist has proved that 9,000 units of synthetic vitamin A in a pound of oleomargarine are nutritionally equivalent to 9,000 or more units of natural vitamin A in winter-produced butter when these products are included in the diet of human beings.

Such claims are based primarily upon experimental work carried on with experimental animals. Everyone realizes that 6 months or a year in the life of a laboratory animal—the white rat, for instance—is vastly different from the span of life of a human being, and there is no evidence that oleomargarine fortified with synthetic vitamin A, fed to a human being from infancy to senility will be equivalent to the feeding of equivalent amounts of natural butter through the same span of life.

There is no evidence to prove that the potency of synthetic vitamin A in oleomargarine is retained in that product from the time of its manufacture to the ultimate consumption to the same degree that the potency of natural vitamin A is retained in natural butter Consequently, there is a question as to the validity of the claims of many, including some scientists. The veracity of their statements that synthetically fortified oleomargarine is nutritionally equivalent to butter has not been proved in human diets.

During the last two or more decades, from 35 to 40 percent of the milk produced in these United States has been marketed in the form of butter. Butter is the balance wheel for the dairy industry. In fact, it is the balance wheel for a large portion of the agriculture of this country. It has been a factor in improving the productivity of the soils of this and other countries. It is now serving in this capacity throughout many States, including Southern States.

The removal of the controlling tax on colored oleomargarine opens the doorway for fraud. It goes further—it opens the doorway for the destruction of the market for from 35 to 40 percent of the milk produced in this country. If this tremendous market is destroyed, it means a vast curtailment in the dairy-cattle population of this country.

This would be serious if considered only from the standpoint of dairy products, but the seriousness becomes multiplied when we realize that dairy cattle furnish a large portion of the supply of veal and beef in this country, as well as hides for leather and hair for various commercial uses. Such an elimination of essentials would be catastrophic, but this is even more far reaching. Dairy cattle supply an extremely important market for the byproducts—soybean, linseed, and cottonseed meals, as well as other crops which are important items in the agricultural production program of this country.

It is realized that at certain times cottonseed oil is used as the basis for oleomargarine, and other times soybean oil or linseed oil or a mixture of these are the products used in the manufacture of the hydrogenated fats for oleomargarine. However, these are not the only sources for the raw oils, as history points out that copra fat and the oils from various nuts may serve as the basic ingredients for vegetable oleomargarine. It should be pointed out that the sources of materials for the manufacture of oleomargarine are selected on the basis of their cost and availability—that is, economic rather than nutritional factors are considered.

From newspaper comments, it is evident that certain phases of agriculture having been misled into thinking that the elimination of the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine would greatly improve the market for the oils from the seeds of certain crops. This has been especially true in the case of soybeans. It should be pointed out clearly that if a large portion of the market for the means of these seeds was destroyed by the elimination of 25 or 30 percent of our dairy cattle, the growers of these crops would be in a dilemma. On might go further and state that soybeans and other fat-producing seed crops are soil-depleting crops, and consequently, to maintain fertility and productivity of our soils, certain chemical elements—especially nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium—must be returned to the soil. Experience has proved that feeding these seed meals to dairy cattle and returning the manure to the land is not only one of the most economical methods for maintaining soil fertility but it is also one of the most satisfactory. Consequently, the elimination of 25 or 30 percent of the dairy-cattle population of this country because of the destruction of the market for butter would undoubtedly raise a grave question concerning the maintenance of the fertility of the land, which is basic to the supply of human food for the population of this country and our lend-lease neighbors.

It might be well to interject here the thought that there may be a change in our scheme of tariffs in order to carry out a good-neighbor policy, and whereas we may now think that the source of materials for oleomargarine will always come from crops grown within the United States, we must not lose sight of the fact that a few changes in tariffs may eliminate a large part of the market for cottonseed oil, linseed oil, and soybean oil produced in this country, and open the door for vegetable and nut oils produced by our neighbor countries, especially tropical and semitropical areas.

On October 13, 1943, in speaking before the Minnesota Creamery Operators and Managers Association in St. Paul, Dr. T. G. Stitts, Chief of the Dairy and Poultry Branch of the Food Distribution Administration, made the following statement:

"Butter is one of the most talked-of things in the country today. It affects more people more intimately than almost any other war or civilian commodity. That's why butter production in Minnesota makes not only the St. Paul and New York papers, but the Moscow papers as well."

From this statement, it seems clear that the Food Distribution Administration realizes the importance of butter, not only from the standpoint of its nutritional value, but also because of its morale-building importance. The results of a W. P. B. consumer study showed butter as the article most sorely missed by consumers among the rationed commodities.

Any legislation which would let down the bars for the destruction of the market for this important commodity and thus discourage its production, would be sabotage to the war effort and to the agricultural industry of this country. It is only necessary to look back to a few months ago when some camps were unable to supply the soldiers stationed there with an adequate supply of butter, in order to get a slight appreciation of dejected morale caused by a lack of butter.

Great demands are being placed on the dairy industry for dairy products to meet the requirements of our armed forces, allies, and civilian consumers. It is only necessary to compare butter production for 1943 with butter production for 1942 and the production so far in 1944 to that of 1943 to realize that there is a gradual decrease in the supply of this commodity. Any legislation which would in the slightest degree give butterfat producers the thought that butter was to be faced with the unfair competition of a substitute product, would undoubtedly have a demoralizing effect which would result in an immediate decrease in the production of milk and butterfat.

The American Butter Institute protests legislation which would remove the 10-cent tax on yellow-colored oleomargarine and thus open the gateway for the fraudulent marketing of a substitute product as butter, and protests the consideration of legislation which would have a discouraging and demoralizing effect upon the dairy farmers of these United States, the result of which could be a reduction in the basic food commodities which are greatly needed, and especially during the war emergency.

The effort of the American Butter Institute is not directed toward eliminating or hindering the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, but rather we are in agreement with the opinion of some of the officials of some of the oleomargarine manufacturers that the product—oleomargarine—should be sold for what it is and on its own merits, and not in semblance of butter.

Senator ELLENDER. Dr. Ruehe, will you tell the committee how you come to the conclusion that the removal of the tax will tend to promote fraud?

Dr. RUEHE. For the simple reason that at the present time you have this 10-cent tax control, which makes it hurt when they disobey, and there is less tendency for it.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, could you not make it more effective by penalizing a manufacturer or a wholesaler or a retailer for selling a product that is not what it is represented to be?

Dr. RUEHE. Well, it is a little harder, unless you have a definite tax, to follow through all the channels of trade, I think.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, I was in hopes that some way could be worked out whereby the element of fraud could be eliminated, because that seems to be the only contention, or one of the main contentions.

Dr. RUEHE. Well, history shows that they were not able to do it with the 2-cent tax, were not able to control it, and, as a matter of fact, I think at the present time they are having difficulty in controlling it, even with the 10-cent tax.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, you suggested that a retailer could easily substitute in a carton margarine for butter. In that case, do you not think that might be eliminated by forcing the margarine manufacturers to pack their product in a certain shaped container?

Dr. RUEHE. No; because, take the kitchen of a restaurant, the consumer never sees the container.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, could we not force the restaurant man to have a sign in his restaurant saying that the product served here is margarine, if he does serve that?

Dr. RUEHE. Yes; they have that now.

Senator ELLENDER. I see. In other words, what I was trying to get from you, if you have any views on it, is as to whether or not we could write into the law such strong provisions that would eliminate the fraud element.

Dr. RUEHE. There is nothing that hurts worse than to pinch a person's pocketbook one way or another, and I personally have no suggestion as to a simpler manner than the tax.

Senator ELLENDER. You think it is justifiable to put a tax on a——

Dr. RUEHE. Because the coloring does nothing so far as improving the nutritional quality—it is purely a matter of disguise.

Senator ELLENDER. But there is evidence here to the effect that you color butter 9 months out of the year, and the material used to color butter is the same as that used to color margarine. What have you to say about that?

Dr. RUEHE. That varies a lot. I learned the butter-making trade. Really 4 months of the year we have to add some color.

Senator ELLENDER. There is evidence to that effect.

Dr. RUEHE. It depends entirely upon your cows, what the cows are getting. Sometimes the butter is too yellow, even with natural color.

Senator ELLENDER. What difference is there, then, in that process? In one instance you make it legal to color and the other you make it illegal.

Dr. RUEHE. But yellow is the natural color of butter.

Senator ELLENDER. Now, we also had some evidence here this morning that oleomargarine that is made entirely from soybean oil has a yellow color, and to look at it, it is about the same color, to me, as butter. Now, if the color can be obtained from a natural product, would the objection be as great, as far as you are concerned, as it is now to using this artificial color?

Dr. RUEHE. I question if they can always get the same intensity of color. There are a number of technical problems. I am not an authority on margarine, but I have worked with fats, and in the natural purification process of getting these oils so they are really, from the standpoint of flavor, acceptable to the public, in purifying these oils they do discolor them by certain filtration processes. I know a number of years ago our own experiment station was trying to develop some cooking oils with soybean oil. I was called in to pass on some of the products cooked, one of which was doughnuts, cooked in that soybean oil. The soybean oil was oxidized with trimethylene, and those doughnuts tasted like they had been fried in fish oil. So there are certain purifying processes these oils have to go through to make them suitable in flavor, and I imagine much of that color is taken out. In other words, you might have a soybean oil that looked yellow, but whether it would make satisfactory margarine is a question. I think the oleomargarine people make the statement that they have difficulty in maintaining the flavor of margarine if an appreciable amount of soybean oil is used.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, of course, there has been considerable progress made in the manufacture of margarine from the early eighties up to the present time.

Dr. RUEHE. Because they have hydrogenated it. That has been developed.

Senator ELLENDER. I notice in your statement that one of your many objections was that margarine was made from oils that came from off shore, or something to that effect.

Dr. RUEHE. It might open the door for those oils if our tariff system was changed.

Senator ELLENDER. Would you have a different attitude as to this bill if it was written therein that the tax now imposed shall be applied only as to those margarines that are made from oils that are imported to this country?

Dr. RUEHE. I would be opposed to it whether that was in it or not.

Senator ELLENDER. In other words, whether——

Dr. RUEHE. That would be purely a tariff proposition you are speaking of.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, what I had in mind was this: Here you have a product that is made from beans and nuts, and so forth that are produced in this country, and I am wondering if there would be any objection, providing, of course, that the elements of fraud would be thoroughly circumscribed so there would not be any chance, or little chance, of fraud, as to whether or not, if margarine is made entirely out of American products, grown in this country, you would object.

Dr. RUEHE. I would still object to having it in.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, your objection is based a good deal from a commercial standpoint; is it not?

Dr. RUEHE. Both——

Senator ELLENDER. I mean, your feeling is that if margarine is permitted to be produced in large quantities, that it might in some measure curtail the production of butter?

Dr. RUEHE. That is right. Then again, I do not know—no experiments have been carried over a long enough time. I mean, we do these things with rats, and a rat 3 or 4 years old is an old man.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, Dr. Ruehe, we have used rats to determine a lot of things that have been very helpful to the human race.

Dr. RUEHE. Yes, indeed, but sometimes it is difficult to make the proper transition from the life of the rat to the life of the human.

Senator ELLENDER. We had a very eminent authority, in fact, I consider him so—it took him about 15 minutes to tell us about all the degrees he has, and the work he has done for the past 40 or 50 years—and he stated, as I recall it, that since vitamin A was added to oleomargarine that nutritionally it was just as good as butter. Of course, you differ with that?

Dr. RUEHE. Well, I would question that statement, because I do not believe there is any evidence that has proved that feeding fortified oleomargarine through the life span of a human—not a rat, but a human—shows it is nutritionally equivalent.

Senator ELLENDER. Of course he countered that——

Dr. RUEHE. In other words, the rat may have lived, but a lot of these difficulties do not come up in 6 months or a year. We do not know. There is a possibility of getting too many vitamins. We do not know that.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, he countered that by saying that many human beings have lived to maturity in cases where very little milk or butter was available to them.

Dr. RUEHE. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. Thank you very much. Any questions?

Senator AIKEN. Yes. You represent the American Butter Institute, Dr. Ruehe?

Dr. RUEHE. Yes.

Senator AIKEN. What is the American Butter Institute?

Dr. RUEHE. It is a trade association of about 500 members.

Senator AIKEN. Butter manufacturers?

Dr. RUEHE. Butter manufacturers. And we manufacture about a third—the membership manufacture about a third of the creamery

butter in the United States, and merchandise about a half—a little over a half.

Senator AIKEN. Swift & Co. are a member?

Dr. RUEHE. Yes.

Senator AIKEN. Armour?

Dr. RUEHE. Armour.

Senator AIKEN. Wilson Packing Co.?

Dr. RUEHE. Yes.

Senator AIKEN. Does it strike you as being peculiar, Mr. Chairman, that Swift, Armour, and Wilson are 3 of the 18 members of the Oleomargarine Association, and Mr. Hopkins appears here in support of this bill on behalf of Swift, Armour, and Wilson, and Dr. Ruehe comes here opposing it on behalf of the same people, and I wonder from that which side Swift, Armour, and Wilson are on.

Senator ELLENDER. No; I would not say that. I imagine that a lot of the members of this association distribute oleomargarine.

Dr. RUEHE. That is right.

Senator ELLENDER. Of course, they do, and that does not make them for or against it. The mere fact that Swift, Armour, and Wilson handle butter and oleomargarine, I do not believe necessarily indicates that they are for or against it. And I would venture to say that probably 90 percent of the membership of your association handle both butter and margarine.

Dr. RUEHE. No.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, what is the percentage?

Dr. RUEHE. I do not suppose over 10 percent.

Senator AIKEN. Well, with two or three exceptions, are not Swift and Armour the largest manufacturers of butter in this country?

Dr. RUEHE. Yes; with two or three exceptions.

Senator AIKEN. Are they not also the largest manufacturers of oleomargarine?

Dr. RUEHE. I cannot speak for them, Senator Aiken, but I think you would find that their policy would be that they want to sell oleomargarine on its own merits.

Senator AIKEN. In this particular case, their policy is hands off. It strikes me as being peculiar that Dr. Ruehe is here testifying on behalf of the same people who were against it yesterday.

Senator ELLENDER. Some corporations find it very convenient to be on both sides of a question, many times. Thank you very much, Dr. Ruehe.

Oleo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Mr. F. M. Skiver, representing Michigan State department of agriculture, appeared against oleo and other butter substitutes before the Senate Agriculture Committee recently, and he submitted the following testimony, which should convince every dairyman in America that his industry is being threatened by the invasion of the domestic market by inferior so-called substitutes. The success of the oleo industry has been made possible by misrepresentation of the comparative food value of butter and its substitutes. I suggest that every Member of this House read Mr. Skiver's testimony carefully. Mr. Skiver's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF F. M. SKIVER, REPRESENTING MICHIGAN STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. SKIVER. Senator, my name is F. M. Skiver. I represent the Michigan State Department of Agriculture, which department is charged with enforcement of all Michigan laws pertaining to dairy products and other foods. I am at present director of the bureau of dairying, and have for the past 15 years been engaged in enforcement of Federal and State laws and regulations governing the production, handling, and sale of dairy products.

The Michigan Department of Agriculture is definitely opposed to lowering the present Federal tax on oleomargarine as proposed by bill S. 1744. We believe this bill, if enacted into law, would permit almost unhampered manufacture and sale of oleomargarine made and colored in imitation and semblance of yellow butter.

The present Federal tax of 10 cents a pound on oleomargarine, colored yellow in imitation of butter, serves the very definite purpose of preventing fraud through representation and sale of such a product as butter.

Recently, oleomargarine, colored in imitation of yellow butter, has been sold at retail stores, and served in dining rooms in Michigan. In several instances it has been sold and served as butter. This is a misrepresentation and is a fraud upon the consumer. This yellow oleomargarine is a mixture of from 77 to 79 percent vegetable oil, 16.76 to 19 percent water, and 2.85 to 3.03 percent salt. It contains in the fat 7.7 parts per million of carotene equivalent—4,000 units of vitamin A per pint.

In February 1944 the manufacturer of the above-mentioned product obtained a circuit court order restraining the Michigan Department of Agriculture from enforcing our statute pertaining to the sale of oleomargarine. In November 1943 complaint was filed by the same manufacturer in Federal district court in Detroit, Mich., against the collector of internal revenue to restrain him from collecting the 10-cent tax on yellow oleomargarine.

It will take many months to obtain final decisions in these cases and in the meantime this yellow oleomargarine is being advertised and offered for sale as soya butter.

Senator AIKEN. You say that is soya oil margarine, or oleomargarine?

Mr. SKIVER. Yes.

Senator AIKEN. I have been trying for 2 days to find out what soya butter is, and none of the previous witnesses seemed to know what soya butter might be.

Mr. SKIVER. I have heard of it.

Senator AIKEN. I have had several people mention it to me, and I understand that has upset the oleomargarine people somewhat in itself.

Mr. SKIVER. I would not know.

Senator AIKEN. I have been trying to find out more about it, and you are the first witness who has told us anything about it so far.

Mr. SKIVER. I do not know just how to answer your question. I have a copy of that label here.

Senator AIKEN. Do you think it is made wholly from soya oil?

Mr. SKIVER. That is their claim.

Senator AIKEN. The natural soya oil, without the color removed;

Mr. SKIVER. No; the color is added.

Senator AIKEN. The color is added?

Mr. SKIVER. Yes. They claim that it is not oleomargarine.

Senator AIKEN. Where it is made with pure soya oil, with color added?

Mr. SKIVER. They claim it does not come under the definition of oleomargarine.

Senator AIKEN. Well, is that because the soybean was not grown in this country to any extent when the last amendments were put on the definition of oleomargarine?

Mr. SKIVER. I do not know just what their claims as to exemption from the oleomargarine statutes are, Senator.

Senator AIKEN. But they have filed papers in court?

Mr. SKIVER. That is right.

Senator AIKEN. Claiming exemption from the tax?

Mr. SKIVER. Yes.

Senator AIKEN. Do you know who makes this soya butter, so called?

Mr. SKIVER. Yes, sir. It is made in Michigan.

Senator AIKEN. Have you the label?

Mr. SKIVER. I have one of the labels.

Senator AIKEN. I was wondering if it could be made easily anywhere. Could anyone make it at home?

Mr. SKIVER. I am not familiar with that. I understand it is made from refined soybean oil.

Senator AIKEN. Is it a small company that makes it?

Mr. SKIVER. I believe that it is rather a comparatively small company.

Senator AIKEN. Then if the court upholds their contention, we are going to have a new and rather radical situation injected into the field of the oleomargarine and butter controversy. I would think so, anyway.

Mr. SKIVER. If both the Federal and State courts uphold their contention.

Senator AIKEN. If they are upheld, what would hinder, instead of 18 manufacturers being in the market, 1,800, or 18,000 small manufacturers going into the business?

Mr. SKIVER. There is nothing to hinder them.

Senator AIKEN. You have the advertisement here?

Mr. SKIVER. Yes, I have it, to read into the record.

Senator AIKEN. I am interested, because I have been trying to find out for 2 days what this soya butter situation might be.

Mr. SKIVER. I prefer not to submit this for the record, as we have to have it for our case in the State court.

Senator AIKEN. Then we will not take it.

Mr. SKIVER. However, I am glad to show you that, and here is the advertising.

Senator AIKEN. This label reads:

"Butler's soya butter. Patent pending. Butler Food Products, Cedar Lake, Mich. Contents: 1 pint. Contains hardened soya oil, vim-ilk, salt, carex, and flavoring, not less than 4,000 United States Pharmacopoeia units of vitamin A."

And then a description:

"Soya butter is a 100 percent vegetable product developed in our laboratory. It is made from soya oil and other parts of the soybean."

What other parts might that be, do you know?

Mr. SKIVER. No; I do not know, Senator. To my knowledge it would be very small.

Senator AIKEN. A small portion?

Mr. SKIVER. It would be a very small percentage, because it is 77 percent fat, and up to 19 percent moisture, and 3 percent salt. It would be a very small percentage of any other part of the soybean.

Senator AIKEN. And then the description on the label goes on to say:

"Blended into a palatable and tasty vegetable spread. May be used freely by those who wish to maintain normal weight. Try Butler's vegetable shortening made of whole soya and parts of meal. The dietary trend is toward soya, the wonder food. Enjoy these benefits by using Butler's foods regularly."

Is this product finding a ready sale? Do you know about that?

Mr. SKIVER. It is sold in many instances.

Senator AIKEN. How does the price compare with common oleomargarine?

Mr. SKIVER. In Michigan—I am reading from this ad, Senator, it is advertised at 36

cents retail. In Washington, D. C., 59 cents retail.

Senator AIKEN. No ceiling on it?

Mr. SKIVER. No ceiling. The Michigan ad reads "No pts." I do not know if there is an O. P. A. ceiling.

Senator ELLENDER. Is it not in violation of the law to label that "Butter"?

Mr. SKIVER. We feel it is. They have a restraining order against our State department of agriculture, and the department of internal revenue.

Senator ELLENDER. How long has that been processed?

Mr. SKIVER. To our knowledge since, oh, possibly early last winter. Now they obtained a restraining order against the department of internal revenue in November, and against our Michigan Department of Agriculture in February.

Senator ELLENDER. What is the color of that butter?

Mr. SKIVER. Yellow.

Senator ELLENDER. That must be made from the same product as the samples produced by Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. SKIVER. No; I do not think so; I doubt it very seriously.

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Hopkins testified, as I recall, that the margarine, as he called it, that was the product of pure soybean oil, was yellow.

Mr. SKIVER. The color is added to this in the form of carex. That is stated on the label here. Carex is the trade name for carotene, and our laboratory analysis shows carotene is in it, and vitamin A.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, was that placed in it to give it color, or add the vitamins, do you know?

Mr. SKIVER. For both, I imagine, because there are only 4,000 units of vitamins added.

Senator ELLENDER. I thought carotene was a substance to add vitamins, and not color.

Mr. SKIVER. I believe not. I am not an authority on that, but I have never seen carex that was not colored yellow.

I believe I was referring to the ad, and I was quoting this advertisement:

"Soya butter. No. pts. Pint carton 36 cents. Save on butter."

This is quoted from an advertisement in the Lansing State Journal on Thursday, May 18, 1944, and Thursday, May 25, 1944.

This yellow oleomargarine is one of the products manufactured and sold by a concern using several large 6 feet by 15 feet outdoor billboards, to advertise in the following words:

"Visitors welcome to plant. The magic food of perfect vitamins. Products of soybeans. Replaces: Meat, milk, cheese, butter, coffee. Home of Butler food prod. Cedar Lake."

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Skiver, do you know whether or not those people who manufacture this soya butter escape the tax?

Mr. SKIVER. They are not paying the tax now, due to the restraining order, Senator.

Senator ELLENDER. I see. Well, has any effort been made by the Internal Revenue Department to collect taxes prior to the issuance of the injunction order?

Mr. SKIVER. I would not know definitely as to that. I presume that it was, which was the reason for the restraining order.

Senator ELLENDER. Is this material soft, or must you heat it in order to be able to use it as a spread?

Mr. SKIVER. Oh, it spreads just like butter.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, has it the appearance of butter?

Mr. SKIVER. Yes, sir; the appearance, the flavor, the odor, and the color and the taste.

Senator ELLENDER. Do they use any milk fats in its manufacture?

Mr. SKIVER. They claim not. They claim that there is no animal ingredients in there. In fact, one of the complaints in their case against our Department, and against the Internal Revenue Department is that the manufacturer is a member of the Seventh-day Adventists, and that several of the people in that sect are vegetarians and do not want any animal products in their food. The complaint is that to prohibit the manufacture of this would be a violation of the Constitution permitting religious freedom.

Senator ELLENDER. Is this the only company that manufactures that product, to your knowledge?

Mr. SKIVER. To my knowledge it is, Senator.

Senator ELLENDER. What is the capacity, do you know?

Mr. SKIVER. No; I do not know what the capacity is. I would say it is rather large. Our inspectors went in there some time back and were refused samples of the ingredients going into the product.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, you could or could not detect them chemically by using the product itself?

Mr. SKIVER. We can, pretty well.

Senator ELLENDER. Have you made an analysis of it?

Mr. SKIVER. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. Proceed.

Mr. SKIVER. A second ad used on those billboards is:

"For goodness sake—Butler's products. Soybean foods. Replaces: Meat, milk, butter, cheese, coffee. Cedar Lake, Mich. On M46—18 m. west of Alma."

During the existence of these restraining orders against the internal-revenue collector and against the Michigan Department of Agriculture, this yellow oleomargarine is being manufactured, advertised, and sold, and the Federal Food and Drug Administration have taken no action to control the product.

On Tuesday, June 6, 1944, several representatives of the Federal Food and Drug Administration were in my office in Lansing and we discussed this problem. At that time they informed me that they had previously made an investigation of this product and could find no grounds which would permit them to prosecute. On what theory they assumed that they could do nothing to protect the public against this product, I do not know, although they indicated that they would be powerless unless there was interstate commerce involved. However, since coming to Washington, I have been convinced that the interstate commerce problem could not be the deterrent, because I found the product offered for sale at a store located at 1228 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Senator AIKEN. Well, evidently in petitioning the court for an injunction, the manufacturers stated that the product was sold just within the State. I am just assuming that.

Mr. SKIVER. I do not believe it would be necessary, Senator, to stipulate that, because in our case it would not matter; it was sold in the State, anyway. In the Internal Revenue case, as I understand, they must pay the tax, whether it is in interstate commerce or not; they must pay if it is manufactured. Now that is my understanding of it. I did not notice it in either one of the bills.

Senator ELLENDER. We will not go into that.

Mr. SKIVER. I was unable to purchase a sample myself because it was necessary to pay six points (though no points are charged in Michigan for it, and the ad, as I read you a while ago, says no points).

This leaves control entirely to State laws and the Federal internal-revenue tax, which control is now temporarily restrained by court order. Since the Federal Food and Drug Administration cannot control this yellow oleomargarine, repeal of the internal-revenue tax would leave entire control of the product to Michigan State laws.

In our enforcement of State food laws we have been asked to cooperate and work with Federal authorities for enforcement of Federal laws, orders, and regulations. We have worked with the Federal Food and Drug Administration, the War Food Administration, the Food Distribution Administration, the Internal Revenue Department, and other Federal agencies; in fact, my men are working with them at this time.

We believe it is necessary that Federal laws governing foods shall act as an aid to enforcement of State laws in the prevention of fraud and deception. In the absence of the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter, all oleomargarine would be colored yellow and the fraudulent practices cited as presently taking place in Michigan would immediately spread to all States and be multiplied thousands of times. The extent of this fraud will be readily recognized from the fact that this imitation product is offered for sale in pint cartons weighing only $13\frac{3}{16}$ ounces at the exorbitant price of 43 cents a pint in Michigan and 59 cents a pint in Washington, D. C., and the 10 cents Federal tax is not being paid.

Such frauds, if permitted in the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, would immediately be apparent in the sale of other dairy products. In Michigan, we have found filled milk being advertised as milk. A mixture of cream and vegetable oil is now being widely sold for use as whipping cream in Michigan and other States. We have recently found fraud in the manufacture and sale of ice cream containing a high percentage of vegetable oil. The manufacture and sale of this ice cream involved violations of O. P. A. and W. F. A. orders.

In conclusion I want to reiterate that from our experience and observations, we are sure that the most practical way of preventing wholesale fraud upon the consumer is through the use of the present tax on oleomargarine that is colored yellow in imitation of butter.

Senator AIKEN. Can you say why this soya butter should cost more than oleomargarine?

Mr. SKIVER. No; I do not know.

Senator AIKEN. Yet it is selling for almost three times the price of oleomargarine.

Mr. SKIVER. My only conclusion is there is an exorbitant profit in the manufacture and handling of it. I am not familiar with the prices, but from comparison of the prices of this product with the price of oleomargarine, it is a great deal higher than the retail price of oleomargarine.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, Mr. Skiver, do you think it is possible for Congress to enact suitable legislation so as to prevent the fraud that you have discussed during your presentation of this matter? In other words, what confuses me is that I cannot for the life of me see how, by the payment of a tax, you can prevent fraud. Certainly the manufacture of it is not stopped, and in order that the product may be sold as margarine, oleomargarine, or whatever other label you want to put on that, whether you have a 5-cent tax or a 10-cent tax, the same things relating to what may cause fraud, exist, and the mere imposition of a 10-cents-per-pound tax, to my way of thinking, does not act as a deterrent to the practices of fraud. Now, as I indicated this morning to Mr. Brigham, I think it was, who was a witness against the bill, he stated that in his State, as I recall it, oleomargarine sold for 25 cents per pound, or 26 cents, and butter for 51 cents, or a difference of 26 cents. Now, instead of making the difference 16 cents in place of 26 cents, I cannot quite get through my head how the payment of a tax will circumvent fraud. And if you have any views on that, I should like to have them in the record.

Mr. SKIVER. Well, I am sure that in the past it has limited the manufacture and sale of it.

Senator ELLENDER. I do not doubt that in the least.

Mr. SKIVER. To the extent where fraud did not occur, whereas these orders have been

placed against us and the Internal Revenue Department, it has occurred.

Senator ELLENDER. I do not doubt that in the least, and my contention is that the purpose of that tax is to prevent the manufacture of oleomargarine, so that it will not be so highly competitive to butter. Am I not stating it right?

Mr. SKIVER. Well, I do not know as to the purpose of it.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, you put it on a broad basis, and I cannot follow you. I do not mean to say that you are "trying to put anything over," or anything like that.

Mr. SKIVER. No.

Senator ELLENDER. What I should like for any witness who testifies hereafter to do, is to tell me how the imposition of a tax will act as a deterrent to fraud. My contention is that it is a deterrent to the manufacture of it in quantities that may compete head-on with butter.

Mr. SKIVER. I think that that may be so, and in reciting these experiences, it was my wish to show that fraud was not prevalent until this product was manufactured and colored in imitation of butter. It is sold as butter. It is served in hotel dining rooms as butter.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, now, would your attitude on this problem be in anywise changed if we could enact a law wherein no tax shall apply on margarine that is manufactured totally from products that are grown in this country; that is, totally from oils produced in this country, and should margarine be produced from foreign oils then the tax shall apply? And then I will state further, put almost any law within reason on the statute books so as to make it certain that when a person buys margarine he will know he is buying margarine, in other words, decrease the possibility of fraud, now what would be your slant if it were possible to do that?

Mr. SKIVER. I do not feel qualified, Senator, to answer all that. However, I will say that it was the feeling when the Pure Food and Drugs Act was passed and the present definition of oleomargarine was established, that that would serve to prevent fraud, which it evidently has not in this case.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, of course, I cannot do it at the moment, but I am sure I could cite you many, many acts that have been amended from year to year. For instance, in the sale of gasoline in my State. I was the speaker of the house there in 1932, and prior to that time I served as floor leader, and while I was floor leader I believe that we passed in my State one of the first laws providing for a tax on gasoline. You would be surprised to know the number of amendments that we had to make to that law from year to year in order to stop fraud, in order to prevent people from buying gas without paying the tax and to prevent other violations. I have been legislating for my own State and the country at large now for, oh, almost 20 years, and I believe sincerely that it would be possible to draft a law to prevent fraud and make the penalties so strict that they would act as a deterrent for one who would attempt to sell margarine and say it is butter. I understand, of course, that we might get some chiselers who would get by, just as you have in the liquor trade today. We have a lot of rules and regulations about that, but somehow some folks make pretty good corn whisky in Kentucky and Georgia, maybe in Louisiana, for all I know, and those lawbreakers simply get by the law. And I do not need to tell you also that we have a lot of criminal statutes on the books today that are flagrantly violated, and sometimes we cannot catch the culprits. And I do not pose as being able to draft a law that will catch all fraudulent violators, but I do believe that it is possible for us to draft an act that would substantially and materially prevent the fraudulent practices you and the other gentlemen have been talking about, and I believe the public can be better protected from fraud through the imposition of penalties than by the imposition of a tax. I am glad, however, that you were frank enough to state that the purpose of the tax was to curtail the production of margarine, and that is the way I feel about it.

Mr. SKIVER. Well, I do not know that that is the purpose of it, Senator. That is the way it has acted in our case, that at least it was not true until the order was issued.

Senator ELLENDER. Have you anything further you desire to state?

Mr. SKIVER. No; I do not believe I have, Senator.

Speech of Acceptance of Hon. Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, at Lamar, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last week it was my privilege to attend the notification ceremonies which were held at Lamar, Mo., at which our colleague the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] was notified of his nomination for the high office of Vice President of the United States.

Mr. President, the notification ceremonies were held in what to some might seem to be a small and insignificant country town in the great State of Missouri, but as I walked around the town square and mingled with the people from that section of Missouri and from Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, I was appreciative of what seemed to me to be a more or less significant fact. I may add that I enjoyed being in that community because it is the kind of a community I have known all my life. As I walked around there and watched the people I thought that men of lesser caliber might have chosen a larger place, where the fanfare would have been greater and the great white light of publicity might have shone stronger; and the thought also came to me that the greater the man the more does he appreciate the simpler and, to me, the finer things of life. I think it is a rare tribute to our colleague, the Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States that he chose to go to that humble city and there in the town of his birth be notified of the signal honor which has been conferred upon him by his party. I think, Mr. President, it is a mark of true greatness, and, in keeping with the surroundings and in keeping with the greatness of the occasion, the Senator delivered what to me was a great and significant speech. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the speech he delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the notification committee, and fellow citizens, I am deeply honored to have been named as the Democratic Party's candidate for the Vice Presidency and accept with humility and a prayer for guidance that I may perform honorably and well whatever tasks are laid before me.

Upon being nominated for the office of Vice President of the United States, my first wish was to express my appreciation to the members of the Democratic Party.

I have wanted since then to address my fellow-Americans everywhere, regardless of party, so that I might offer a statement concering the critical times that lie ahead.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt is my leader and Commander in Chief. In the past I have supported the policies formulated by him to protect and advance the welfare of our Nation. I will continue to do so and will continue my efforts to make certain that those policies are carried out promptly and efficiently by those entrusted with their administration.

We have long been engaged in a desperate struggle to preserve our liberties and to safeguard the American way of life. Many of our brave citizens have given their lives to win for us the certainty of victory, now assured. All of us now toil and sacrifice to win this most terrible of all wars. Victory is now in sight. Our courageous well trained and completely equipped soldiers and sailors are beating down the enemy wherever he can be found. Their unequalled valor under the greatest leadership ever given a fighting force guarantees the victory.

The task of the Government has been to provide that leadership, as well as the foresight which will enable victory to be won as soon as possible. When victory is won, Government must provide for our returning veterans and our war workers an assurance that their sacrifices were not in vain; that they will return to a country worth fighting for; that they will have an opportunity to earn a good living; and that the same humane principles and policies for the protection of the average man and woman carried out under Franklin D. Roosevelt for the past 12 years will be continued under his leadership.

Although victory may be close at hand, it must still be won. Our enemies are still numerous and well equipped. They have the advantage of fighting on the very threshold of their homes. We must fight in every climate and on every terrain. We must transport our armed forces and their equipment—and maintain them—thousands of miles from our shores. Our enemies are fanatical and desperate. They chant hymns of hate and utter threats that before they succumb they will destroy the foundations of our civilization, so painfully and slowly erected by the hard work of generations of mankind.

The carrying out of plans already made to overwhelm the enemy and the formulation of new policies as the occasion demands requires the coordination of all our resources and all of our people. The skill and ability of the military, of business, of labor, and of agriculture must all be directed with initiative, with courage, with foresight, and with experience, just as they have been since the emergency actually began. We know from the success of our efforts to date that under the continued leadership of President Roosevelt these objectives will be accomplished.

Under his leadership we have met one crisis after another, in peace and war. In each of these crises we have had anxious moments when we faced the fearful possibilities of national disaster. No one can ever forget the prayerful moments that preceded our successes in Africa, in Italy, in France, and in the Pacific. Those successes were possible because our fighting men had what they needed, where they needed it, and when they needed it. Much of the credit for this must be given to the wise decisions of the Presi-

dent. None but the most uninformed questions the fact that Franklin Roosevelt did make those vital decisions in collaboration with the great leaders of our war allies. Those decisions brought about the greatest succession of victories in the annals of warfare.

Tomorrow's challenge is today's problem. The proven leadership of our successes must continue. The fortunes of the future for which our boys have fought, bled, and died, must not be endangered by entrusting them to inexperienced hands. There is no substitute for experience, which can be gained only through years of application and service.

I am confident that the people of the United States, and I know that the people of my own home State of Missouri, may be trusted in this vital hour, to choose their President from a standpoint of proven experience and qualification. They will not choose for President, by political chance, a man who lacks experience.

In the struggle to rid the world of enemies of Democracy, the firing of the last shot on the battlefield marks but a beginning. Military victory over Germany is but a step. Military victory over Japan, though it may follow with all possible speed, will be but the completion of one turn in a long road.

War has taught us that, whether we like it or not, we cannot build a wall of isolation around the United States. Our very existence depends upon the establishment and maintenance of a sound and just peace throughout the world.

If you ask the historian why we failed to bring about a lasting peace after World War No. 1, he will answer, "A partisan struggle for political power." Let us remember the warning of Woodrow Wilson. He stressed that in an effort to make peace partisan politics should be adjourned.

"Partisan politics" he said, "has no place in the subject we are now obliged to discuss and decide." His wisdom has been proved by the test of time.

We have another historical parallel today. Make no mistake about the fact that once again we also have among us a group of isolationists as determined, as bitter, and as dangerous as the band who set themselves against the League of Nations and gave to Wilson's peace in 1920, a stab in the back.

Much work has been performed in the task of building for peace. The peace we seek is partly made. While the main task is yet ahead of us, world peace was actually in the process of making many months, even years ago.

The administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt was preparing the ground to support this peace structure when, against the bitter criticism and dire warnings of the isolationists and their press, Mr. Roosevelt first proposed lend-lease.

This peace was in process many months ago when two men met in mid-Atlantic and drew up a charter, a set of principles for peace that have been cited and used as guides by both Democrats and Republicans alike ever since they were first set forth.

This peace was being made at Casablanca, at Moscow, at Quebec, at Cairo, at Teheran. It was being made last week in our own Nation's Capital. It will be made in many other places, at many other times. It is a continuing process, already years under way, still years in prospect. We are, in our effort to make this peace, very definitely in midstream.

And this peace has been given life movement and certainty by the high resolve of the men who are making it. Neither time nor space nor the personal hazards of a world at war have been allowed to interrupt it.

The destruction that already has occurred and that which is reasonably certain to occur before the war finally is won will make this a most difficult task. The people of the earth will have to rebuild a new and greater prosperity from the ashes of the efforts of the many generations that preceded them. The nations, great and small, must adjust themselves to these new conditions, and must find a sane and sensible means of living together in friendship and with mutual advantage. We comprise but a small percentage of the people of the earth, and we shall have to guide the way with wise counsel and advice if we expect to play our full part in establishing a good and an enduring peace.

The end of hostilities may come suddenly. Decisions that will determine our future for years, and even generations to come, will have to be made quickly. If they are made quickly and wisely by those who have had years of experience and the fullest opportunities to become well informed with respect to our national and international problems, we can have confidence that the next generation will not have to spill its blood to rectify our mistakes and failures.

It takes time for anyone to familiarize himself with a new job. This is particularly true of the Presidency of the United States, the most difficult and complex job in the world. Even in peacetime it is well recognized that it takes a new President at least a year to learn the fundamentals of his job. We cannot expect any man wholly inexperienced in national and international affairs to readily learn the views, the objectives, and the inner thoughts of such divergent personalities as those dominant leaders who have guided the destinies of our courageous allies. There will be no time to learn, and mistakes once made cannot be unmade. Our President has worked with these men during these trying years. He talks their language—the language of nations. He knows the reasons which govern their decisions. Just as he respects them and their opinions, so do they respect him. At no time in our history has a President possessed such knowledge of foreign leaders and their problems. None has ever so completely won their confidence and admiration.

Winning the war and concluding the peace are only part of the task facing us during the next 4 years. We must also reestablish our own domestic economy.

To win the war we have shifted millions of workers hundreds and thousands of miles from their old homes; we have built thousands of fine new factories and equipped them with tens of thousands of the best machine tools; we have increased enormously our facilities for manufacturing basic commodities; we have evolved new processes for shaping materials and new uses for those materials.

We cannot go back to our pre-war status, for it is impossible to reshuffle our people into the old pattern. Nor can we throw into junk heaps $20,000,000,000 worth of new plants and equipment. Only by using them can we hope to provide good jobs for our brave fighting men when they return, and for our splendid war workers. With those plants we shall make more and better goods. We shall combine full employment with an even higher standard of living. By utilizing new methods and products discovered during the war, and by encouraging further research and invention, we shall insure the position of the United States as a leader of world progress.

The achievement of the goals the administration has set for the post-war Nation will not be easy. Already some selfish interests are complaining. If they can, they will prevent new independent enterprises from acquiring these plants—from hiring workmen and from putting into civilian production a flood of consumer goods at prices within the reach of all.

We must not accept the kind of thinking that during the 1920's kept Muscle Shoals and other World War No. 1 plants idle.

The administration proposes to see to it that these plants are sold or leased on fair terms to those who will use them to manufacture consumer goods, and to create employment for our fighting men and our men and women war workers.

If we devote the same ingenuity to production for peace in America that we have given to the making of engines of destruction in this war, our future will be secure. But to do this will require energy and courage. The forces of reaction, and the selfishness of those who always fear any kind of change, will have to be overcome. We cannot go back, as we tried to do in 1920. We cannot stand still. We must go forward.

On all of these great issues we know that President Roosevelt will take a progressive and courageous position, because his past record of able and forthright action speaks for itself.

As early as October 5, 1937, when few of us dreamed that war was approaching, Franklin Roosevelt in a speech at Chicago, warned that the peace and freedom of 90 percent of the world's people were being jeopardized by the remaining 10 percent, who were threatening a break down of all international law and order. You need not be reminded that he was then called an alarmist and a warmonger by the isolationists and their press—the same group that now seeks to block every advance he makes for the welfare of the country.

Despite strong opposition he pushed through the national defense program. He steered a course toward preparedness. Through his efforts we obtained Selective Service that enabled us to train a great army and to discover and supply its needs. Countless thousands of lives were saved by this one prophetic act. He advocated lend-lease which enabled the British and others to let contracts that gave us a full year's start on war production. He declared a national emergency that enabled our own defense program to make progress beyond anything ever before achieved in the history of the world. I need not recall to you the vitriolic violence of the opposition to these measures—nor the identity of those who opposed them.

Franklin Roosevelt set production goals that were ridiculed as fantastic and misleading. For example, his request in June 1940 for 50,000 planes. But under his leadership those goals were attained and even surpassed. Industry, labor and agriculture were coordinated and did cooperate to produce this inspired achievement.

Without this kind of leadership and preparation what would have been the fate of our Nation? Who can tell how many more years would have been required to win the war, and at what greater cost in lives?

On this greatest of all issues, the defense of the country, President Roosevelt was years ahead of his time, just as he was years ahead of his time when he fought for freedom from want and forced through protective legislation for labor, social security for the aged, work relief for the unemployed, and a farm program which saved the farmers. Just as he battled to protect the savings of small depositors, and for security regulations to prevent a repetition of the financial excesses of the twenties that brought on the depression.

You remember the battles he fought to accomplish all this, and you know the sources of his opposition. His opponents are still the same. But which of these great programs are they now willing to tell you they propose to destroy? Those programs have stood the acid test of the years, and the President's opponents dare not openly attack them.

Ask yourselves whether you dare to entrust the further development and growth of these great social reforms to those who not only were without the ability to develop these programs but who even lacked the foresight and courage to support them.

Ask yourselves whether you dare to entrust the negotiation of the peace of the

world to those who are not familiar with world affairs.

The welfare of this Nation and its future, as well as the peace of the whole world depends upon your decision on November 7.

You can't afford to take a chance. You should endorse tried and experienced leadership—you should reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt president of the United States.

Reclamation Looks to Arizona's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I will include a statement by Commissioner Harry M. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, before a Senate committee at Phoenix, Ariz., on July 31, 1944. Under the above caption Commissioner Bashore indicated the great work which had been done for Arizona through reclamation and pointed out some future prospects of still greater work which should logically follow the war. No portion of our country is more blessed by nature than is Arizona. No State presents a greater challenge to the hydraulic engineer and to the scientific man than does Arizona. Her rich river valley, under a subtropical sun and rich in soil, capable of producing abundantly throughout the entire year, offers the greatest return to reclamation. Her rivers, flowing through mile-deep canyons, offer great opportunity for power development, and all these being adjacent to proven mineral deposits lay the foundation for expanding industry. These facts are summarized in Commissioner Bashore's statement, which is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to appear before your committee. I shall first present a summary of what the Bureau of Reclamation has done in Arizona, what it is doing today, and what it is planning as a contribution to the permanent development of the State through the full use of the waters of the lower Colorado which may be allocated for irrigation and power production in Arizona. Members of my staff will give you detailed discussion on the several phases of our goals for your State.

There is more than an alphabetical reason for placing Arizona first in the roster of Reclamation-served States. Here are located two of the oldest and most successful projects under our jurisdiction. The first is the Salt River project near Phoenix, with 216,600 acres directly dependent on the system and 94,660 acres receiving supplemental service, and of equal significance is the Yuma project in southwestern Arizona, where 55,000 acres are under irrigation.

Arizona shares physically and financially in the operations of Boulder Dam, which has the largest power installation in the world. Parker Dam on the Colorado is an important source of power supply for Arizona. Imperial Dam of the All-American Canal system diverts water for irrigation in Arizona as well as California.

Imperial Dam is diverting water for one of the most constructive programs the Bureau of Reclamation has undertaken. On the Gila project, predevelopment of mesa desert land is being carried on to demonstrate the behavior of these sandy soils under irrigation and what crops they will produce with regulated application of water. The University of Arizona is cooperating in this endeavor, which will be of far-reaching importance in the settlement of the Gila project.

The war has retarded or halted many of our activities through the West, but the acceleration of construction on the Gila project to complete the irrigation system on the Yuma Mesa and extend service to the Wellton-Roll area are at the top of the Bureau's post-war list for Arizona. The resumption of construction on Davis Dam, for river regulation and power, can also be speeded up when hostilities cease. A second transmission line authorized for construction as a war measure from Parker Dam to Phoenix is a permanent feature of the Davis Dam project.

The Gila and Davis Dam projects and 14 others under study look to maximum use of Arizona waters for irrigation and power production in the post-war period. Our plans envisage irrigation of nearly half a million acres of new land with supplemental water for about 325,000 acres now irrigated. More than a million and a quarter of kilowatts of firm power from installations are possible in the potential projects. A total cost of $640,000,000—more than five times the outlay for Boulder Dam—is estimated.

Employment for returning servicemen and demobilized war industrial workers is the first goal. Permanent farm homes on irrigated land to balance the economy of your State is the long-time objective of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The construction of the projects that I will list for the record would provide employment in Arizona for an average of more than 20,000 over a period of 5 years. From 10,000 to 20,000 newly irrigated and permanent farm homes would be carved from the desert.

The permanent benefits in irrigated farms, stabilization of business, power for industries, and the expansion of the cities and towns will assure the prosperity not only of Arizona, but will make a substantial contribution to the development of the West and to a more secure future for the Nation.

The Salt River and Yuma projects, which serve about half of the total irrigated area in Arizona, are responsible in a major part for the present economic structure of the State. Before discussing the future development of the Colorado River Basin, let me take time to review the history of irrigation in Arizona which was climaxed by the passage of the Federal Reclamation Act by the Congress in 1902.

Irrigation on the American continent had its start in the Southwest. In the valleys of the Little Colorado, Salt, and Gila Rivers, and along the Verde River and smaller tributaries, we find remains of canals which indicate that, in an ancient civilization, Indians possessed skill in the science of irrigation.

Prehistoric canals in the Salt River Valley totaled in length at least 150 miles and were sufficient for the irrigation of 250,000 acres of land. Probably the whole area was never watered at any one time. Here primitive farmers, who lived a thousand years ago, raised cotton, corn, beans, squash, and tobacco.

The Jesuits—the first European irrigators in Arizona, followed by early Mexican colonists and Mormons—all of these people made desperate attempts to bring water to parched lands so that they could produce food.

After the War between the States canal construction was rapid, beginning with the old Swilling Ditch in 1867. Twenty years later about as much land had been reclaimed as could be irrigated from Salt River in seasons of meager flow. Additional acres, however, were put under cultivation until more land was reclaimed than could be irrigated by the meager water supplies available for direct diversion from streams. The storage of water during flood seasons for later use had not been developed.

You know the sequel. Drought came in 1898 and 1904, and with it anxious requests for some means of rescuing cultivated acres. The Reclamation Act of 1902 meant salvation for this land. Under this act the pioneers and their successors laid the foundation of a great State in the desert. The Salt River project was authorized for construction by the Secretary of the Interior on March 12, 1903. Not only was Salt River one of the first irrigation projects to be started under the Reclamation Act, but here the first power plant was constructed and operated in 1906 by the Bureau of Reclamation at Roosevelt Dam, which was completed in 1911.

The occasion for building this first power plant was to provide power needed in the construction of irrigation works. This plant demonstrated the economic double use of water stored for irrigation and power development and was the forerunner of the more than 30 plants which make the Bureau of Reclamation the largest single operator, public or private, of power plants in the country with an installed capacity of more than two and a quarter million kilowatts. Great hydroelectric plants help serve the multiple-purpose plans of Reclamation—bringing power for pumping irrigation water, power for farm homes, and large blocks of energy for industries vital to the prosecution of the war.

The Salt River project has proved its worth many times. Last year the crop value per acre was $157. Compare this with the crop report of 30 years ago when the average production per acre was $23.14. There are 12 towns within this project area. Phoenix, the largest, has a population now of over 120,000; the population in 1906—the year Roosevelt Dam was begun—was 9,000. The great growth of your capital city has been made possible in a large measure by the irrigation development on the Salt River project.

The Yuma project, located in the southwestern part of Yuma County, Ariz., and the southeastern part of Imperial County, Calif., on both sides of the Colorado River, had an average crop value last year of $172.

Water for irrigation in the Arizona section of the project is diverted from the Colorado River into the All-American Canal at Imperial Dam, and is delivered to the project at Siphon Drop, 15 miles south of Imperial Dam. The remainder of the irrigation water used on the California portion of the Yuma project is diverted from the Colorado River at Laguna Dam and delivered to the project through the California main canal.

Like the Salt River project, Yuma is famous for its high-quality vegetables, cantaloups, and grapefruit. The Yuma project also furnishes valuable forage and pasture for cattle and sheep which are brought to the project lands for feeding, particularly during the winter months when such feed is not available on the ranges.

Yuma is noted for its production of alfalfa seed, both because of the large per-acre yields and the viability of the seed produced.

Arizona shares with Nevada the honor of having the highest dam in the world and the largest power plant. By taming the Colorado River, Boulder Dam serves the multiple-purpose plan of the Bureau of Reclamation—a plan which includes flood control, power, navigation, irrigation, and municipal water supplies.

While the bulk of power from Boulder Dam goes to Los Angeles and nearby cities in southern California, Arizona is vitally interested in this gigantic structure. The potentialities of Boulder Dam in relation to irrigation have not been fully realized, but future generations in Arizona will be served by the giant which now rules the Colorado and forces it to do his bidding.

Not only will Arizona benefit from reclamation expansion through new homes, power for industries and agricultural increases, but she is making financial gains through the development of power. Under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940, Arizona receives annually $300,000 of Boulder Dam revenues and also shares in the Colorado River development fund, which is set up for irrigation and power investigations and construction.

From Parker Dam, downstream between Arizona and California, Colorado River water released from Boulder Dam is pumped into the aqueduct of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California to provide a supplemental supply of domestic and industrial water for Los Angeles and 12 nearby cities.

One of the several functions performed by Parker Dam is its assistance to irrigation by reregulating the river discharge from Boulder Dam, thereby assuring a reliable supply of water for diversion at Imperial Dam, 153 miles below, for the irrigation of lands in lower Arizona, as well as in California.

Parker Dam was constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation with funds advanced by the metropolitan water district of southern California, an incorporated union of 13 coastal cities around and including Los Angeles. The power plant at the dam is operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the electric output is distributed largely in Arizona for industrial operations.

It goes to Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma; the San Carlos and Colorado River Indian Reservations in Arizona; the Bagdad copper mine near Bagdad, Ariz.; the Gila reclamation project in southwestern Arizona; and the Imperial Valley in Imperial County, Calif.

The construction of Davis Dam at the Bullshead site also located on the Colorado River between Arizona and Nevada, was scheduled to begin in 1941 as another great defense project of the Bureau of Reclamation. Work, however, was stopped in December 1942 by the War Production Board, but will be resumed as soon as war conditions permit.

Davis Dam, when completed, will produce a billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually, will aid in the power operations of other projects on the river, and will help irrigation, through added regulation of the Colorado River. The new transmission line from Parker Dam to Phoenix that is being built as a war measure to meet urgent power needs in Arizona will serve Davis Dam when the latter is completed.

Newest of reclamation developments for Arizona is the Gila project, near Yuma, extending east from the Yuma Valley about 80 miles and south to the international boundary The immediate plans for the Gila project include the irrigation of nearly 150,000 acres on the Yuma-Mesa and in the Wellton-Roll area. When completed, the Gila project may serve a total of 585,000 acres.

Extension of irrigation beyond the Yuma-Mesa and the Wellton-Roll may depend upon further Bureau investigation, what the people of Arizona decide, and the Congress authorizes with respect to service to the interior of the State. Obviously, the controlling factor is not land but the amount of water that Arizona receives under the Colorado River compact.

The development of the Yuma-Mesa Gila lands poses many new and serious agricultural problems. For about 6 years the University of Arizona has been conducting exhaustive tests on alfalfa production at its Gila project farm, located on the mesa. This work has enabled the Bureau of Reclamation to demonstrate conclusively that under the practices developed by the university these mesa desert lands can be made highly productive under irrigation.

Between three and four hundred acres are now growing alfalfa, and seven or eight hundred additional acres are being cleared and leveled for planting to alfalfa this fall. The plans for predevelopment under authority granted by the War Production Board call for the predevelopment of 4,200 acres of public lands. Additional contracts will be let for clearing and leveling so that this work can proceed as rapidly as possible.

Alfalfa yields at a conservative estimate will average five tons to the acre annually, under ordinary management. When the many components which determine production are all handled efficiently, it has been demonstrated that production can range as high as ten to twelve tons to the acre. The initial cuttings on 115 acres planted to alfalfa in October 1943 have averaged over a ton each. At current prices for alfalfa hay in the Pacific Southwest, it will be possible to repay all costs of predevelopment with 1 or 2 years' production.

The Bureau of Reclamation is endeavoring to demonstrate what crops, in addition to alfalfa, the Gila Mesa lands can produce. We know that the Wellton-Mohawk lands, with a good irrigation supply, will produce cotton, winter vegetables, and the traditional cantaloupe-lettuce crops with excellent yields. Because the mesa lands are inherently low in organic matter, and because the water-holding capacity of the soil is relatively low, the commercial production of winter vegetables is not definitely established.

Although it has been amply demonstrated that citrus, particularly grapefruit, can be produced on the mesa lands, there is the added problem of marketing the fresh fruit. The Bureau of Reclamation is negotiating with the University of Arizona for a cooperative study looking into the potentialities of commercial vegetable production on mesa lands. Even if it should develop that only the valley lands are suitable for vegetable production, there is assurance that large acreages on the Yuma Mesa can be developed for growing alfalfa. I do not need to tell you how important the production of this feed crop will be to the livestock industry of Arizona.

All of the past and current work of the Bureau of Reclamation has been made possible by the hearty cooperation of the people of Arizona, your Senators and Representatives in Congress, your State officials, and your State legislature. We are not content to rest on these results but are looking to a future that will assure even greater achievements through a continuance of this cooperation. The recent action of the Arizona legislature in appropriating $250,000 for cooperative investigations with the Bureau of Reclamation to determine the best uses of the waters of the Colorado River was a heartening step. Your great university has worked with us on agricultural problems.

Last October, Senator CARL HAYDEN, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Post-war Economic Planning and Policy, called on the Bureau of Reclamation for an inventory of irrigation and multiple-purpose projects which could be made ready for construction in the post-war period to give employment for returning servicemen and demobilized civilian war workers. The foresight of Senator HAYDEN in this respect, as well as the forward-looking move of Senator MCFARLAND in setting up this study by Senate Resolutions Nos. 155 and 304, are evidences of the vision of the representatives of Arizona at Washington, where Representatives MURDOCK and HARLESS also have been of great assistance.

In pursuance of Senator HAYDEN's request, the Bureau of Reclamation set to work and on June 6 presented to the Senate committee an inventory in which Arizona projects hold a prominent part. I will quote briefly from a résumé of the possibilities for developments in your State and will leave further details to other members of my staff:

"Two major areas are eligible for the greater part of the Colorado River water which has been allocated to Arizona under the Colorado River compact—the Paradise Valley region north of Phoenix and the Gila project east of Yuma. The new lands in the vicinity of Phoenix would be reached by one on the several plans to divert water from the Colorado.

"There is a potential area of 300,000 acres of new lands; also a supplemental supply would be assured to an additional 300,000 acres now in production. This gross acreage would be subject to reappraisal following completion of land classification. In addition, there are a number of small scattered projects in the northern half of the State which offer an opportunity to supply both primary and supplemental water to relatively small acreages, which are, nevertheless, significant in their economic contribution to the State. These include the Chino Valley, Snowflake, Winslow, Holbrook, and Hassayampa.

"The Wellton-Mohawk unit of the Gila project, consisting of 81,000 acres of new land and 16,000 acres to be served with a supplemental supply, is high in priority for post-war consideration. Other developments under study include: Buttes, Coconino, Sentinel, and Bill Williams-Alamo Reservoir. These combine the functions of irrigation, river regulations, silt control, flood control, and power.

"Power installations at Boulder Dam and Parker Dam are now supplying the larger part of the power needs of southern California and Arizona in the expanded war program. Additional power will be developed at Davis Dam, now authorized for construction, but stopped by order of the War Production Board. Construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam above Boulder would make possible an additional power installation of 750,000 kilowatts and also provide for silt control."

Bridge Canyon is looked to as the key project for post-war expansion in Arizona. Bridge Canyon will lengthen the life of Lake Mead at Boulder Dam by controlling silt. It will produce power and store water for diversion at some point downstream through a proposed Phoenix diversion system which would serve a gross area of 300,000 acres of new land in central Arizona and supplement existing water supplies for 300,000 additional acres.

In his capacity as Regional Director of this area, Mr. E. A. Moritz, who has had wide experience, will have the responsibility of helping Arizona carry out the post-war plans which we have outlined. As you know under the decentralization plan of the Bureau of Reclamation, Arizona is in region 3, which also includes southwestern Nevada and southern California. This plan is designed to bring the activities of the Bureau closer to the people of the West whom it serves and seeks to serve in the post-war period.

If we are to judge by population trends of the past 4 years, Arizona will be a major State where public works and permanent settlement opportunities will be in demand. Arizona has had the greatest percentage increase in population since 1940 of any State in the Union. You may expect to hold the major part of the 40 percent gain you have made in the war years, and your problems will be intensified by returning servicemen and demobilized civilian war workers.

Many of your problems arising from the influx of population may be solved by the transiation of these proposed reclamation projects into reality. But even as we envision a stabilized agriculture founded on irrigation, we realize that the projects listed in the inventory are dependent, first, on the appropriations by the Congress for the completion of field investigations of water supplies, land classification, other factors, and preconstruction work, and, second, on the authorization and appropriations for actual construction, as well as assurances of adequate water supplies are essential.

The construction work on all of the Arizona projects listed in the inventory, which I submit for the RECORD, would give employment at the rate of an average of 12,000 men for 5 years. The related benefits to the State at large, the West, and the entire country would aid materially in the solution of the problems incident to the transition from war to a peacetime economy.

Let us visualize for a moment what the irrigation of nearly half a million acres of new land that I have mentioned would mean, using the common denominator of the word, home. With the new lands developed under irrigation and supplemental water brought to a large area now irrigated, the farm population of Arizona would be increased from 35,000 to 60,000 people.

Since the time of Alexander the Great men have complained that they could find no more lands to conquer. We of the Reclamation Service know that there are still lands in the great Southwest where our two weapons—water and power—can conquer drought and despair. And as these enemies of mankind are routed, we can build a greater Southwest with the help of those who will seek employment here in our permanent public works.

Hydroelectric power possible through multiple-purpose projects would stimulate the production of Arizona's vast mineral resources. Linked with irrigation, which is the predominant use for the waters in the West, these potential developments by the Bureau of Reclamation offer a golden opportunity for Arizona to share with other States the riches of the Colorado River basin, and to give renewed meaning to her motto Ditat Deus—God Enriches.

Accent on Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following letter of Mr. Henry W. Reger, of Indianapolis, Ind., is a complete answer to the New Deal position against the ability of youth:

ACCENT ON YOUTH

To the EDITOR of the INDIANAPOLIS STAR:

There are some who are using the argument of youth and inexperience against Tom Dewey, who is 42 years old and Governor of New York, with an unequaled record as a prosecutor and Governor.

In reviewing the lives of famous statesmen of yesteryear, you will find that Thomas Jefferson was a mere youngster of 33 when he penned our leading state document, the Declaration of Independence. The Federalist, a set of 85 articles explaining and advocating the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, was written by Alexander Hamilton, aged 30; James Madison, aged 36; and John Jay, aged 42.

Alexander Hamilton was only 32 when he placed our financial system on a sound basis. In the successful operation of the new government his work was masterful. John Jay, our first Chief Justice, was only 32 when he put on the robe of justice. George Washington was the age of Tom Dewey when he took command of the Continental Army.

The average age of the framers of our Constitution was less than 40. One framer and signer was only 26 years of age, 4 were under 30, and 21 were less than 40. Who would be stupid enough to say that they were too young to handle the task when they instituted democracy in its finest form.

Looking further into the lives of great men, we find Alexander the Great was a mere boy, in his early twenties, when he ruled the world of his time. Napoleon was only 35 when he became Emperor of France, was a mere youngster when he held all Europe in subjection.

Disraeli and Gladstone were younger than Dewey at the height of their careers. William Pitt, the greatest English statesman, had all the old heads of Europe seeking his advice when he was only 30.

Finally, the Master of Men, who formulated the perfect set of laws and rules for men to live by, completed his task at 33.

In the light of the foregoing, Dewey's youth speaks for him.

HENRY W. REGER.

INDIANAPOLIS.

Governor Dewey and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"OLD MAN" HULL IN SHIRT SLEEVES

In a military sense, this week end was the most cheering to the peoples of the Allied world since the beginning of the war. Hitler's armies were reeling. But there was one sour note. It best can be described in Washington dispatches.

AN ANGRY HULL

"Newsmen," Leon Pearson wrote, "who crowded Hull's office yesterday (Thursday), within a few hours after Governor Dewey had issued his attack on the Big Four world security plan, found the 'old man' in his shirt sleeves, nervously fingering his spectacles on a black silk ribbon, and eager to enter battle—not for politics but for peace. For an hour they listened to his high-pitched voice, rasping through the record of what he has done to prevent recurrence of the unspeakable experience of war. It was a 'background conference', which meant that Hull was not to be quoted directly. So he spoke with far more freedom than usual, and with the colorful language that only his intimates know. He denounced the Dewey charges of 'Big Four' domination of the world. Time after time, he repeated the words 'nonpartisan' and 'non-political,' as he has been doing for months past, in an effort to keep the new peace plans out of the campaign."

WORD TO DEWEY

Then Secretary Hull did a wholly unprecedented thing in American political history. Publicly, he anounced he would be glad to meet with Governor Dewey or with any man Dewey might designate to discuss international peace for the simple purpose of keeping that issue out of partisan politics. That action of Hull's has no precedent in American political history and is the measure of Mr. Roosevelt's and Mr. Hull's desire to keep world peace from becoming the football of party politics and a presidential candidacy, as in the instance of the Lodge conspiracy in the campaign of 1920.

FATHERLY ADVICE

It was, in effect, the action of a man who, in off political seasons, Republicans and Democrats alike have praised highly for his handling of foreign affairs, saying to a beginner: "Now, young man, you have said a nasty, ugly thing. You have voiced a sinister suspicion. It is time you should grow up and put away your rompers. So that you may know what it is all about, come over and see me sometime, or if you prefer, send whomever you may desire to confer with me."

ALWAYS A GENTLEMAN

Of course, Cordell Hull did not use that language, at least publicly. As a gentleman from Tennessee, he remained true to the traditions of the cult. His invitation to Governor Dewey was couched in the most courteous, patient language, and Mr. Dewey's quick acceptance was equally commendable. So, before long, it appears that Hull and Dulles, Dewey's confidential foreign adviser, will sit down in the shade of the tree and talk things over. It is well that this is the climax of a young man's impetuosity that had every earmark of much mischief. For Cordell Hull's latchstring has been out not only to Mr. Dewey, but to the Republican Members of the Senate, with whom he has conferred repeatedly, in the sole hope of averting a ghastly world tragedy at the close of the ghastly business of war.

THE GREAT BUILD-UP

There is more to it than this. Senator HAROLD BURTON, of Ohio, in a public statement, hailed Governor Dewey's acceptance of Mr. Hull's invitation on international affairs as "a constructive and important step that demonstrates Governor Dewey's clear understanding of the needs of the times." It was most commendable and nothing short of commendable. It would have been even more commendable if, instead of blowing his top with a blast against "cynical power politics" to set in circulation fears that had no actual existence in fact beyond Mr. Dewey's own head, publicly he had requested a conference on these matters "to keep the issue of peace out of party politics."

With full credit to Governor Dewey, Senator BURTON'S omission is most significant. What is there while lauding Dewey to prevent him from saying a kindly word about a man, maliciously and falsely accused of a heinous design for "power politics" in the world, big enough to extend an invitation to the man who makes the false charge? It would seem Senator BURTON was looking out of only one eye.

A COMMON AILMENT

It is an ailment not confined solely to Senator BURTON. The same cruel astigmatism affects about 90 percent of the men writing editorials for American newspapers. What a big, a generous, and a statesmanlike attitude Governor Dewey reveals, they cry in the blackest type. Well, what about this quarrelsome old man in shirt sleeves, temporarily cussing in the picturesque language of the mountain regions of Tennessee, and then turning around to invite Mr. Dewey to conference? What about him? Is he a statesman? Is he big? Did he initiate an attack on Dewey's foreign policy, or did he reply patiently and generously to a young man who said a really nasty thing relating to a conference in Moscow which Mr. Hull attended in person? If Mr. Dewey's action is commendable, and it is, what about Mr. Hull's action? What about the misplaced emphasis? What about the one-eyed journalists, who in this matter of peace, for which a world badly bruised hungers, can see in one direction, and one direction only?

PUBLIC APATHY

There is more than this, unfortunately. Cordell Hull, Pearson reported, saved his

strongest phrases for a denunciation of public apathy and an appeal for the spirit of '76. He recalled how Sam Adams literally worked his pants off appealing to the revolutionary patriots. He recalled the fight for Cuban independence. Some kind of stuff was developed in us that impelled us to go, he said, and if we hadn't public opinion would have given us a good, swift kick. Now people forget—they forget overnight. And then he expressed the wish that he could burn this into the public mind and memory for the next 50 years:

"That the human race this day, this hour, is confronted by the gravest crisis in all its history. You may sit down, or lie down, or go to sleep, or you may stand mute, but the responsibility for action will cling to you and you cannot escape it."

AS INEVITABLE AS DEATH

You cannot escape it. This decision and its effect upon the human race is as inevitable as death. What we do now in developing a durable peace will echo down through the centuries of this earth's existence. The mistakes we make, if we make mistakes, will bedevil our steps and blister our hides for the next hundred years. In all this nightmare of destruction and slaughter of the youth of the world, what we do now will give others to come a chance to breathe, to rebuild, and to live peaceful, normal lives, or will sentence them to endure the same agonies of folly.

TRANSCENDING EVENTS

On the battlefields, the thunder of guns, the roar of planes, and the rumble of thousands of tanks played a dirge for those wicked men and those cruel nations that set out to conquer the world. Germany's military might was dissolving in the fumes of battle in France. Incredibly, the German general staff and the soldiers under it were being cut to pieces. It may be a week, a month, or many months, but the Prussian militarist and the German people, who have initiated three bloody wars in Europe since 1870, were being brought to realization that defeat of any plan of world conquest, like death itself, is inevitable.

ON TO BERLIN

Back home President Roosevelt informed the American people that regardless of what happens to the German Army, the United Nations are going to march into Berlin and Tokyo. They are going to occupy Germany and Japan. That will be a finished job unlike the vain sacrifice of 1918. People may have doubts about going on to Berlin—the most honest and sincere people. They can have no doubt on the face of the grim, grisly evidence of recent years, that it was a mistake in 1918 not to go on to Berlin. That mistake will not be repeated. There is a place in this tired old world for experience in order that there shall be youth.

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S REVERBERATING "NO!"

There are times, it would appear, when a great newspaper like the Omaha World-Herald, long distinguished in Nebraska and far beyond the confines of this State for its editorial page, can make itself ridiculous.

Witness this:

"Governor Dewey enters a reverberating 'No!' and his 'No!' will serve to blast away the fog of uncertainty and secrecy and double-talk that rapidly has been enveloping the post-war issue. 'No!' says Dewey, to any proposal that the United States enter into a permanent military alliance of four big powers to rule the world. Together to utter defeat of the tyrants—yes. Together to disarm them—yes. Together to keep them permanently disarmed, to invoke force jointly against possible attempted future aggression—yes. But a world organization, and not a four-power military alliance. An organization in which all nations, great and small alike, 'shall be assured of their full right.' Any cynical agreement on the part of the Four Powers to dominate the world by force and in 'spheres of influence,' says Dewey, would be 'reactionary—the rankest form of imperialism—immoral.' Challenging words, these."

It has been quite apparent for years that it does not take much to challenge the World-Herald's thought, so long as any expression is in opposition and away from Mr. Roosevelt's foreign and domestic policies.

It is reasonable to anticipate that when this was written there was in the editorial rooms of the Omaha World-Herald the denial by Secretary of State Cordell Hull that no arrangement involving a 'military alliance of the four major nations permanently to coerce the world is contemplated or has ever been contemplated.' In a prepared statement honest, honorable and forthright, Cordell Hull said that any such fears on Mr. Dewey's part are 'utterly and completely unfounded.'"

Mr. Hull went further than that. The shaft Gov. Tom Dewey aimed was interpreted widely to refer to an unofficial Russian proposal. And since Russia was the target, Mr. Hull declared that the Moscow declaration, issuing from a Moscow Conference attended by Mr. Hull, resulted in the four nations—United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China—placing themselves on record as advocating a "general international organization * * * open to memberships of all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

Now, in the simplest language, is Cordell Hull lying about a matter as grave as this, or is Gov. Tom Dewey, the Republican candidate for the Presidency, campaigning to get a seat in the White House? Is old, rugged, blunt, and consistent Cordell Hull a cheap, sleezy liar, or is Tom Dewey shooting darts into the air to confuse and mislead the American people?

The American people have the plain, simple declaration of Secretary of State Cordell Hull that the resounding "No!" which Mr. Dewey uttered actually was a "No!" to a question that never existed and has never been considered. They have all this, and more, too. If they have the capacity to read, and the ability to remember, they will recall that the only authoritative, responsible suggestion made at any time during all these discussions of peace of military alliances between the United States and foreign powers was made by Gov. Tom Dewey himself in connection with Great Britain. And if they read and observed, they will recall Mr. Dewey dropped that one quicker than he would drop a steaming hot potato.

It may be an explanation why at this time he is so nervous about all talk of military alliances. It may shed light why the young man seems to be seeing ghosts that do not exist, and talking about specters that arise in his own mind.

All this is rather sad. All this borders on the fringes of a great national tragedy. All this revives the painful memory of American failure to discharge the responsibilities which the American people owed to their dead of World War No. 1 in the failure to mold from out of its sacrifices and its sorrows something of a durable peace.

In the early months of 1919, it was Henry Cabot Lodge. As a Member of the United States Senate, he called a Sunday morning breakfast weeks before the Versailles conference completed its labors, solidified Republican opposition, shaped the outlines for the Presidential campaign of 1920, and served notice, with the support of 36 colleagues, that in practical effect the Versailles conference should adjourn to the Senate Chamber for consultation with the late Senator Lodge and his Republican colleagues.

If Mr. Dewey insists upon talking, and he should talk as the nominee of his party, let him talk about things which are, instead of things which are not.

If Mr. Dewey insists upon talking, let him talk about things which are a logical and sensible basis for discussion, and not things which represent universal agreement among the American people.

Who is there in this country that objects to utter defeat of the tyrants? Who would dare to stick up his head or open his mouth in opposition to utter defeat of the tyrants? Who is there that is opposed to disarming Germany and Japan? Who is there at this time, when rich and decent American blood is being spilled on the earth's soil, that would object to disarming the military criminals that have sent thousands of American boys to their deaths? Who is there, beyond a small circle of irreconcilable isolationists, that objects to a permanent world organization? Who is there that suggests the smaller nations should not be represented in that organization—but who is there so silly—unless it is the Herald and Mr. Dewey—to believe that organization will have any vitality unless the larger, more powerful nations give it decent force?

Who is there of common intelligence that believes a world organization would mean anything without the inspired, unselfish, decent leadership of the great powers?

Once again, Mr. Dewey will do better when he gets down to facts.

Once again, Mr. Dewey will serve his party and the Nation to a far greater degree by telling what he does propose to do in acquiring the cooperation of Russia, Britain, and China, than by continuing to object.

Suppose these nations should not like every proposal Mr. Dewey has in mind.

Is that the end?

Resolution of the American Legion, Department of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House of Representatives tc the fact that no capital ship of the United States Navy bears the name "Michigan."

The Michigan Department of the American Legion has adopted a resolution petitioning the Secretary of the Navy to direct that the next constructed battleship shall be called U. S. S. "Michigan." I heartily concur in this action and have written to the Secretary asking his favorable consideration of this suggestion.

Michigan's contribution to the war effor both in war materials and personnel has been enormous and it is only proper that the State should be so honored.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the text of the American Legion resolution on this matter:

Whereas the State of Michigan has contributed major quantities of war materials and personnel to our naval forces and will continue to do so; and

Whereas no capital ship of the United States Navy bears the name Michigan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Michigan, petition the Secretary of the Navy to direct that the next constructed battleship shall be named U. S. S. *Michigan*, and it is further

Resolved, That a copy of this petition be forwarded to the Governor of the State of Michigan and to each Senator and Representative in the national Congress.

This resolution was duly adopted by the convention.

Turning Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Racine Journal-Times:

TURNING LEFT

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The definite impression is growing here that President Roosevelt, in the event of reelection, will turn more to the left than ever before and will give during his fourth term the most radical administration of his entire career.

Many new reforms, the attainment of which has been interrupted by the war, will be sought. This pattern is forecast by new dealers who feel that whatever concessions Mr. Roosevelt may have felt it desirable to make to the southern Democrats in the last 2 years will become unnecessary during the fourth term.

The defeat of several southern Democratic conservatives, the stronger and stronger position politically being assumed by the C. I. O.—the principal ally of the Roosevelt administration—and the need for the creation of jobs for returning servicemen are all factors that are expected to be influential in the establishment of a planned economy.

Price control, modified somewhat from wartime but nevertheless sufficiently powerful to exert a penetrating effect on the operations of business and industry, would be continued, and there would be an effort to keep wages and salaries stabilized on the theory that this is essential in order to prevent inflation.

ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY

The adminstration's policy of securing maintenance-of-membership clauses in contracts of labor unions will be continued and the prospect is that many of these contracts will be converted into closed-shop arrangements under the economic coercion of strikes or threatened strikes.

The biggest single item in the reform program has been slumbering for the last three years. It concerns the cartel system in foreign trade. The administration is opposed, of course, only to cartels in which private businesses of this country are engaged. The new cartels would be government-managed so far as the United States is concerned.

The second item concerns the break-up of large industrial units in America. Many companies which have had a large volume of business in this war would find themselves under scrutiny. The pressure of antitrust lawsuits would be used to force what is to be called "competition."

Actually, however, a form of subsidized competition may come into being if the Roosevelt administration is continued in office. This means the use of Government funds and Government favors to assist certain units to compete with others. This may happen especially in the field of surplus property and war plants. The new dealers think that the "production for use" doctrines of the Socialist Party have some merit in them and that a system of government utilization of war plants to give employment would meet with support in Congress because of the widespread unemployment that may follow the cancellation of war contracts at the end of the war.

Thus the pressure to prevent cancelation could find employer and employee at the mercy of the administration in Washington. The idea that certain commodities should continue to be produced and that the surpluses should be bought by the Government or made available at lower prices in competition with already existing plants is one that has been bandied about here in the National Capital ever since December 1941 when war broke out. It has always been apparent that when the war was ended, the new dealers would wish in some way to influence prices and competition by causing the Government to hold surplus plants as a club over private enterprise.

Legislation governing surplus property and reemployment plans has not yet been worked out. The Senate and House may reach compromises but it is reported that President Roosevelt may veto the measure when it comes to him and demand something much more akin to the Murray-Kilgore bill.

The new dealers are frankly hopeful that a fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt will not only mean a resumption of the reform program but they are confident that by such a course the New Deal may expect to retain indefinitely its labor-union support which, if Mr. Roosevelt is reelected, will be given the major share of the credit for the victory at the polls. It looks like a period of economic and political disturbance is coming inside the United States the moment hostilities cease in Europe.

Paying the Costs of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, too many of the people of this Nation are entirely unmindful of the critical financial situation our Nation is in, and in which it will find itself when this war is over. While we willingly give all that is necessary for the prosecution of this war to final and complete victory, and that will continue until victory is ours, there are so many things that our Government must forego because of the terrific drain upon the resources of our Nation, and economy must be put into effect if we are to survive as a nation.

We do not hear of Winston Churchill planning to finance the world, when this war ends—because he is thinking of England. Stalin has made no statements that his country will either police or finance the other Nations when this war ends—because he is thinking of Russia. But, here, the President wants to finance the other countries of the world—because he fails to realize the situation our own country will face when this tragic war is over.

A very enlightening article recently appeared in the United States News, in which a comparison was made of the probable indebtedness of the various countries after this war is over, which I desire to extend in and as a part of my own remarks on this subject, and which article I hope the membership will read and give careful study.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the article to which I have referred, appearing in the United States News, of recent date, which article is as follows:

PAYING THE COSTS OF WAR—FINANCIAL BURDEN THREE TIMES THAT OF BRITAIN FACING POST-WAR UNITED STATES—MANAGEMENT OF DEFICIT, WITH $5,000,000,000 IN INTEREST YEARLY, A TASK FOR PLANNERS

The British are thinking and talking now about the economic plight in which the war will leave them. British spokesmen openly use the word "broke" to describe their condition.

At the same time, the world still thinks of the United States as a rich uncle. This country is pictured as rolling in riches without the financial problems that beset so many of the other nations.

A glance at a few debt figures, however, is beginning to cause some questioning of the basis for the tendency to draw a sharp contrast between the situation of this country and some other countries. America is going to have its troubles, along with the rest of the world. To illustrate:

BRITAIN

The national debt of Great Britain has risen from $33,600,000,000 (at $4 to the pound) in 1939 to what will be an estimated $93,000,000,000 by mid-1945. That is an increase of somewhat less than three times.

UNITED STATES

The national debt of this country has risen from $45,900,000,000 in 1939 to an estimated minimum of $250,000,000,000 by mid-1945. That is an increase of 5.5 times. It means that this country's debt, which was $12,000,000,000 greater than the British debt in 1939, has grown almost twice as fast during the war, and will be $157,000,000,000 greater before the war ends. By the end of the war our debt will be nearly three times the British debt.

This situation already is causing concern to the Government's experts whose job it is to handle the debt. They are getting set for the explanations they think Congress will soon be asking for. The first faint questioning already is being heard. There is bound to be a growing volume of questions as the subject is studied.

THE CAUSE

Britain's debt increase has been less rapid than that of the United States because: (1) British industry's productive capacity is smaller and Britain cannot spend as much as fast as this country; (2) Britain has taxed very heavily from the beginning, so that she has covered a larger percentage of her war spending with revenue; (3) lend-lease will add at least $35,000,000,000 to United States debt by mid-1945, of which at least $12,000,000,000 will represent aid to Britain.

THE EFFECT

After this war the United States Government will have by far the greatest debt in the world. The United States will lead the big-debt league. For the first time in American history this debt will be so large that it probably cannot be retired in substantial part and will call for interest payments to bondholders that are so large as to be a defi-

nite Budget problem. This interest cost soon will reach $5,000,000,000 a year and it may go to $6,000,000,000.

Even the sponsors of Federal Government pump priming admit that the public debt now is to involve a real problem in fiscal management and to raise a question whether the Nation can afford to have its debt continue to rise in the post-war years. The debt has been rising steadily since 1930 and each year of the rise the Federal Government has operated at a deficit. That is, the Government has spent more money than it has taken in.

It is true, however, that the debt problem of this country is not as great as that of the British because of some other factors. To illustrate:

DEBT AND POPULATION

The United State debt per capita will be $1,923 by mid-1945. The British debt per capita will be $2,022.

DEBT AND NATIONAL INCOME

It is the national income of a country that determines its ability to carry or pay off a debt. While the United States will wind up the war with a debt something like three times that of the British, this country's national income is running about four and one-half times that of the British, so that American ability to pay is somewhat greater.

INTERNAL VERSUS EXTERNAL DEBT

A debt that a country owes to its citizens is much easier to manage than a debt that is owed abroad. All the United States debt is internally held. The British owe as much as $12,000,000,000 abroad and must face the problem of finding foreign exchange or credits to meet that part of the debt.

But still the United States debt is of serious proportions and this country, like Britain, must find some way to manage it. The difference between the two countries is that Britain is recognizing what the Government must do in order to carry her debt. She is frankly facing the fact that the Government must support a high national income, must dig deeply into the taxpayer's pocket, and must keep a stable price structure. The British Government also has laid squarely before the people what this will mean in incomes and jobs and the future of every individual. The United States seems not yet convinced that it must face these facts now that it is at the head of the big-debt league.

Army's School for Special and Morale Services, Lexington, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, all of us have a general knowledge of the composition and functions of this vast military machine which we as a Nation have built during the course of a few short years—the monumental achievements of which will embellish the pages of history as a miracle of the rapid and efficient organization of the combined resources of a stalwart and determined people accelerated into high-speed action in an almost unbelievably short time—but few, if any, of us have had opportunity to observe in detail the multitudinous activities of this enormous machine which combine to make it the most efficient, effective and formidable fighting force the world has ever seen.

We are familiar with the more spectacular operations of this great and powerful military machine whose throttles now are wide open, forging ahead to victory on the battle fronts of the world. Most of us have a working knowledge of air and submarine warfare, some comprehension of the globe-encircling transportation and supply lines we are maintaining, and, as our casualties tragically mount, we are watching with keener interest and becoming more acutely aware of the marvelous efficiency, speed, and effectiveness with which the Medical Corps of both Army and Navy operate.

Today, however, I want to speak of a less spectacular but very important Army activity which, in my opinion, is one of many evidences of the thoroughness with which every need—tangible and intangible—of the personnel of our armed forces has been anticipated, planned for, and provided for. Over a recent weekend it was my privilege to visit the Army's School for Special and Morale Services at Lexington, Va., where I was particularly impressed with the work of the music section of the athletic and recreation branch of this school. To the music section come specially qualified officers and enlisted men, carefully selected from Army installations everywhere, who are given highly specialized training for a period of 1 month in the organization of vocal groups of all sizes and types—from large choirs right down to barber-shop quartettes.

These students are also taught how to encourage men to organize instrumental groups, ranging from large military bands down to hillbilly bands. Here they are trained how to encourage men in hospitals and rest areas to learn an instrument or at least to develop an interest in listening to music, all of which serves not only purposes of diversion and relaxation but frequently is a means of dissipating gloom and anxiety as well as distracting and diverting attention from physical injuries and ailments.

At this school I heard a splendid glee club, made up of men from the 24th class; from any representative group of battalion size such a glee club can be organized under the trained leadership of a graduate of this school. I also heard different small instrumental groups—a jazz band, a hillbilly band, and a moderated swing band, all expertly trained and performing with the smoothness and ease of seasoned professional artists.

One could visualize the graduates of this music section going forth to spread the healthy cheer and interest of song and music among our armed forces, relieving the boredom that so frequently has overtaken our troops in far distant places, as well as now and after the close of hostilities aiding in the soothing and restoration of war-weary nerves, chasing the cobwebs of gloom from war depressed minds, and lifting the spirits of battle-scarred servicemen and women into whose young lives have entered the shattering experiences of war.

The music section of the Army's School for Special and Morale Services is under the able direction of Lt. Col. Howard C. Bronson. Captain Walter Schumann, well known in both radio and theatrical fields for his splendid accomplishments, is in charge of the vocal work of the school, and Capt. Forrest McAllister is the Chief of the Soldier Music Section. These men are doing a thoroughly constructive piece of work and I am happy to take this opportunity to pay tribute to their fine efforts.

The Lawyer, the Constitution, and the Modern World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege on the first of September to have the opportunity of speaking to the Indiana Bar Association at its forty-eighth annual meeting at Indianapolis, Ind. I ask that my remarks on that occasion may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My theme tonight is that industrial organization in the modern world has outrun the formulae by which, under law, the individual rights and opportunities of men are preserved, and that the lawyer of this age is presented with a task comparable to the one which confronted the framers of the Constitution. They knew how to preserve human rights and liberty while setting up a new and powerful National Government. They wrote the immutable principles of freedom into the Constitution at a time when the clashing interests of 13 discordant States threatened the orderly development of society.

There are clashing interests now, not among the States, but among economic classes. The relation of government to the organizations by which our economic life is dominated, the power of government over people, the authority of industrial management and of Government management, the relationship of labor, capital, and agriculture, all constitute an area in which legal concepts have not yet clearly crystalized. It is in this area that the lawyer must prove his capacity to understand and to preserve the public interest.

It has been said that this period in which we live, like the days in which the Constitution was drafted, is a time for greatness. Surely that is true for the members of this learned profession who know that the law is not only a rule by which commerce and industry may be carried on, but also a rule of democratic order under which people may live in security, and, in an atmosphere of freedom, make the most of the personal attributes of spirit, mind and body with which they have been endowed.

THE PEOPLE ARE THE SOURCE OF LAW

As lawyers we know that, according to our tradition and our most sacred beliefs, the law springs from the people themselves, and that there is no higher authority than

the people. They are the source of all political power, but in this age we have seen the people lose control over their own affairs. We have seen an age of chaos, a chaos that has produced the most terrible war of all time, and all, primarily because leadership in business, in industry, in politics, has not understood how to adjust individual, human rights to the complexities of the modern world. To make this adjustment is the opportunity, and indeed the duty, of those who are members of our profession.

Consider for a moment the times in which we live. We have established a marvelously efficient national industrial organization operating on a national scale.

We have, through the National Government, coordinated these industrial groups into the most superlative technical organization for the production, transportation, and delivery of military power that was ever imagined.

Even before the Government stepped in to achieve this national organization of industrial might, we saw national economic organizations make gigantic strides in wealth and power. The great units which were created to carry on commerce and industry throughout the country were accompanied by the appearance of other national organizations. A national chamber of commerce came into being, and a score of national trade associations; organized labor formed itself into national groups; agriculture, the only occupation in the modern world still carried on for the most part by individuals in their individual capacity, was also organized on a national basis. Then followed national consumer groups, and national educational groups, and national organizations of practically every calling to which men turn.

EMPHASIS OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATION

This emphasis of the national scope of our existence has turned our attention away from the needs of the purely individual and local side of our natures. This side of society has been, as it were, overwhelmed by national and international development. Yet, as lawyers, we know that the principles of human freedom which lie at the root of all our political and legal concepts must lie also at the root of our economic concepts. We cannot have political freedom unless we preserve economic freedom. The two concepts are, as it were, opposite sides of the same shield. Capitalism and democracy are identical. Capitalism, basically, is the right of private property and by "private" property we mean individually owned property. Democracy, basically, is the right of the individual to control and direct the means by which he makes his livelihood, as well as the means by which he preserves order in the village, the county, the State, the Nation, yes; the whole world.

This is indeed a time for greatness, because this is no ordinary time. It is the most extraordinary the human race has experienced in perhaps a thousand years. In such times as these it is the duty of the lawyer to devote all his energies, all his learning, all his spiritual understanding to the great task of adjusting the concepts of law to the needs of the people in the complexities of national and international economic organization by which we are surrounded.

He is shortsighted, indeed, who imagines that this world crisis is only a military interlude after which law and living will revert to what they were before Hitler moved into Poland. The past is dead. We race forward toward a new world in which there will have to be a new adjustment of the people and the law. All through the history of mankind the basic duty of the lawyer has been to understand the relationship between the individual and the authority which governs him. Having understood that relationship, it has always been the lawyer's duty in times of crisis like this to help frame the law so as to preserve for the individual the maximum freedom consistent with good order and public welfare.

It would not be too much to say that this war is being fought because the lawyers of the last 50 years have not understood that the times were out of joint, and have not undertaken the task of protecting local and individual rights from the new authorities that were being called into existence by the astounding advances of science, engineering, and industry.

What I am saying is that in the modern world the scientist, the engineer, and the industrialist have taken leadership, but the lawyer has lagged behind. In the world of physics and chemistry, of science and invention, there has been almost unimaginable progress. But the law has not coupled human freedom to that progress. The achievements of science have been used by ambitious, power-hungry, and emotionally unstable men to crush mankind, to deprive the individual of liberty, and to establish arbitrary control. The lawyers, who as a class have not carried out their task of preserving the balance between men and authority, cannot escape their share of responsibility for the conditions that exist.

Does that sound like an exaggerated statement? Tell me then how did it come to pass that an Austrian paperhanger whose writings and speeches marked him by every standard of intelligence and culture as a man of mean attributes and gross philosophy almost made himself the master of the world? How did this impossible thing happen? It happened because people all over this globe, in their local communities, in their States, their nations, their empires, were unable to solve the personal problems of daily livelihood in a world in which science and invention, while creating new luxuries, had brought about such concentration of economic authority and such a lack of local and individual power, as to open wide the door to the political demagogue. It was the failure of business and political leadership to preserve a stable opportunity for the masses to earn a living that brought the authoritarian state into existence. The authoritarian state brought the war.

It could not have been otherwise, for once the principles of popular government were overthrown, and arbitrary power was established in Italy and Germany, the war of world conquest was inevitable, because the authoritarian state could not be safe until the principle of democracy had been utterly uprooted everywhere else.

LEADERSHIP AND THE LAWYER

As a profession, we lawyers did not comprehend what was happening and we took no steps to preserve the principles upon which our Constitution was founded, though they were being undermined before our very eyes. Now that victory in the war is certain, we can no longer postpone consideration of the problem of authority and the individual in the modern world. It is the very basis of post-war reconstruction. While maintaining all the gains of industrial organization, we must develop the formula by which to preserve, in economic as well as political organization, the principle of popular sovereignty that is the heart of the Federal Constitution.

We have the example of the men who drafted that instrument. It was the lawyers in the Constitutional Convention who planned and wrote that charter of individual freedom. There were 34 of them among the 55 delegates who attended. Ten of them had been judges. They were chosen not as representatives of the commercial class, but as representatives of the public. They were selected in the States by farmers, landowners, and traders in the colonial legislatures, who believed them to be the men best qualified to represent all groups and all interests. They were known as men of public spirit, rather than as the spokesmen of class interest.

I emphasize this aspect of their service because so many lawyers in our time are regarded as the spokesmen of special groups, and because there is so great a tendency nowadays to classify men, not as citizens of the Republic, but according to their economic interest—business, agriculture, labor, and so on through all the pressure groups which on a national scale serve special interests instead of public interest. The men who drew the preamble of the Constitution were not thinking in terms of special classes or of class government. They were thinking of the people as a whole. They were thinking of justice, of domestic tranquillity, of the common defense and general welfare. They were trying to erect a government that would "secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity" that is to say for all the individuals who then constituted, and in the days to come, would constitute the people of this great Nation.

Then, when the First Congress assembled, this objective was made even more clear by the adoption of the Bill of Rights. This again was the work of lawyers who understood the deep public significance of the new government and how important it was for the preservation of freedom to leave no doubt that the people were the source of authority, that the new government was being created to serve but not to rule them.

LAWYERS AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

These men who gave us the Constitution knew from intimate experience precisely what they were trying to do. They had seen a king attempt to rule by the exercise of arbitrary central authority, authority they were expected to obey but which they were not permitted to direct. The lawyers of 1789, animated by a patriotic public spirit, labored to erect a government which derived its sanction from the will of all the people, not from any part of them. It is true, of course, that the business interests of the Colonies were enthusiastically active in the campaign for ratification, but that was not because they thought the new Constitution would set up a businessman's government. They knew better because they had joined in the promise that a bill of rights would be adopted. They worked for ratification because they knew it would be good for business and for all vocations to have a stable government designed to safeguard the public welfare by protecting fundamental human rights.

The Bill of Rights was an assertion of the sovereignty of the people as individuals over the organizations they create. It was an unmistakable declaration of their authority over government. It could not have been otherwise, therefore, than an assertion of their authority over every subordinate organization as well. But more of that later.

IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL AUTHORITY

Let me here invite attention to another lesson that may be drawn from the Constitution. One of its greatest virtues is to be found in the delicate balance it established between the local and the national powers of government. It is true, as Charles Warren, the distinguished modern authority on the Constitution points out in his book, The Making of the Constitution, that the members of the Convention were filled with the purpose of forming a strong central government. "One cannot fail to be impressed," he writes, "with the fact that the burning desire and insistent determination pervading them was that the union of the States must be preserved and that all legislative or

other conditions prevailing in the States which were impeding or undermining this possibility of union must be remedied in any new form of government that might be developed."

It was also true, however, that the advocates of a strong central government joined the opponents of that idea in defense of the rights of the individual as against the Government. "The desire to protect individual rights (whether of property or otherwise, whether of the rich or poor) against governmental injustice was shared by leaders of thought on both sides," Warren tells us.

The lawyers of the Constitutional Convention saw both sides. Knowing that they were building a national government for people who nevertheless lived and earned their livelihood in local communities, they drafted an instrument that was designed to preserve to the States and to the people full authority over local and State concerns, while vesting in the National Government full authority over those concerns which affect the Nation as a whole. This elementary distinction between State and Federal power is known, of course, to every lawyer, but it cannot be said that every lawyer nowadays applied the cold logic of that distinction to the economic questions of the hour as John Marshall did to the economic problems of his time. It was that great Chief Justice himself who defined the scope of the commerce clause as embracing even wholly intrastate business transactions when they "affected more States than one," a doctrine which many a briefholder for national business would like to toss aside if possible, in our time.

CAUSE OF FEDERAL EXPANSION

The expansion of the Federal power which we have witnessed during this century has not been the result primarily of the efforts of those who would create a stronger central government than that created by the framers of the Constitution and later perpetuated by judicial construction and by force of arms. The expansion of Federal power in our time has been due almost exclusively to the expansion of national commerce. That expansion, in turn, has been due to the fact that science and invention have utterly altered our world and have completely eradicated the geographical boundaries by which business was confined when the Constitution was written.

The devastating speed with which science has advanced is scarcely comprehended even by those of us who have witnessed its greatest strides. Certainly we have not clearly perceived the dislocations of local and individual economic authority it has caused. Thirty-five years ago, when I went West, the airplane was still in the experimental or demonstration stage. It was not an instrument of commerce. At the beginning of this century there was no such thing as an automobile highway. The traveler who would venture 100 miles from home in the motor car of that era was an intrepid adventurer. Radio was undreamed of and though the telephone was a thriving success and in constant use for local business, the coast-to-coast and international phone conversations of our time never entered even the dreams of the average person.

During the less than 3 years since we entered this war, science has leaped forward again. We made the landings in Normandy and we are sweeping the Germans back to their own frontiers, because our engineers have accomplished physical wonders beyond even the capacity of the scientific Teutons. Tojo, who in December 1941 felt certain that Tokyo was beyond all possibility of danger from the enemy he dared to challenge, has fallen from power because the American B–29 has almost abolished distance.

These are the things that have built up central power. Science has extended the radius through which men can exercise their influence. Measured in terms of transportation and communication, the globe today is, in size, only a fraction of the globe into which every man in this room was born.

INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION

More than that, the instruments that we use, the services we demand, even the entertainment upon which we insist can be produced and supplied only by huge organizations of men and capital.

Consider the invasion of Normandy. There were 13,000 seagoing craft in the English Channel that memorable 6th of June, and 17,000 aviators were overhead, in I know not how many aircraft, furnishing an air umbrella for the tens of thousands of boys who went ashore with other thousands of jeeps and tanks and even bulldozers. They tell me that the paper in which were drawn the countless maps that were needed for the operation weighed more than 100 tons.

All of this was the product of organization of which the eighteenth century had no conception. It tells the story of the coordinated activities of literally millions of men. It was possible only because before the war we had industrial and business organization that was completely beyond the scope and jurisdiction of merely local governing authority. To perform this miracle of science and industry by which we are overwhelming Hitler, we had to have the central coordinating power of government in a degree never before conceived, save by the totalitarians. It was possible here and in Britain only because a high degree of central power had already been developed in industry before central government itself had begun to grow.

This is the modern world of which I speak, the modern world of highly concentrated economic power in which it is the task of the lawyer to preserve the constitutional right of the individual to live freely and pursue his own happiness in his own way. This is the world in which is posed again the delicate problem of adjusting necessary government authority in such a manner as not to destroy or impair either the economic or the political freedom of the individual citizens.

INDIVIDUAL ECONOMY SUBMERGED

Members of the profession of law will miss the whole meaning of the modern crisis if they fail to realize that local business has been submerged by national business. It is this submergence of our purely local and individual economy in the organized national economy that is the most vital factor of the modern crisis.

The State of New York is the richest and most powerful State in the Union. It gross revenues in 1942 amounted to a little more than $720,000,000. Yet that same year the Pennsylvania Railroad took in more than $838,000,000, the General Electric Co. more than $913,000,000, the Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co. more than $1,378,000,000, the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. almost $1,500,000,000, United States Steel almost $1,900,000,000, and General Motors $2,250,548,859.

Each of the last three has in excess of 300,000 employees. If you were to count their stockholders also and take into consideration the families of the employees, you would realize that each of these giants is an economic state with a population of more than a million. Every one of a hundred national corporations is more wealthy and powerful than most States and practically all cities. Only the Federal Government can cope with them.

Yet when you read the law books, you will find the courts using the simple personal pronoun in referring to these gigantic economic entities as thought they were flesh and blood persons instead of collectivist organizations. Here, for example, is a sentence taken from an opinion of Justice Holmes in a case involving two wealthy corporations engaged in the manufacture of chewing gum. They were litigating an accounting arising from a patent infringement. "It would be unjust," writes the great justice of the corporate litigants, "to charge an infringer with the gross amount of his sales without allowing him for the materials and labor that were necessary * * * but it does not follow that he should be allowed what he paid for the chance to do what he knew that he had no right to do." The same habit of personalizing the huge corporate organizations of the day is followed in Congress. The debate on the surplus property bill now under consideration is full of "hes" and "hims" that refer not to persons, but to the huge corporate units which outfitted the Nation for this, the greatest war of all time.

CORPORATE PERSON VERSUS NATURAL PERSON

It is this fantastic confusion of the corporate person with the natural person which has made it so difficult for many a legal mind to comprehend what has been happening to our local and individual economy. If we insist upon thinking of an economic state as a natural person, it will be difficult if not impossible for us to preserve the balance which the constitutional fathers established. When they performed their monumental public service, most business and commerce was purely local and purely personal. The people who inhabited the original States supported themselves working with or from their neighbors, and communities were economically independent. This was the foundation of democracy. Economic authority and political authority were coextensive. But we have lived to see a great change. Economic authority has moved out of the local community to the financial centers of the Nation.

When the managers of a billion-dollar corporate giant alter a production policy, millions of people in thousands of communities all across the country are affected. Jobs are made and unmade not only for the thousands employed by the giants but by other thousands employed by other businesses in affected communities. Grocers and haberdashers, doctors, and even lawyers in every State experience a change of economic status when a board of directors sitting in New York decides, for example, to curb expenditures, for reasons that are good and sufficient for the corporation. Yet they can do nothing about it. If they try through the State legislature, or the city council, it is not unlikely that they will find that the best local lawyers have been retained by the foreign corporation and are appearing before the local lawmakers to protect the corporate rather than the community interest. It is not at all unusual to run across the lawyer who, in all sincerity, talks of personal rights and individualism while serving the modern collectivist economic state.

It is this disappearance of local economic independence that is destroying the foundations of democracy much more than the machinations of agitators or politicians. If there had been no economic instability in Germany, Hitler could not have overthrown the Weimar republic.

PEOPLE ARE SUPERIOR TO ORGANIZATIONS

This is not to say that the huge corporate organization is an evil, for it is not. It is absolutely essential in the modern world, but so also is the independent local community; so also, above all, is the economically independent individual citizen. It was he the authors of the Bill of Rights had in mind when they wrote the charter of personal liberty. When they made the people masters of the Government, surely they did not intend that the people should not also be masters of those national economic organizations, corporate and unincorporated, which,

after all, though they dominate the economic destinies of the people, are, nevertheless, mere creatures of man.

As we move now toward the complete collapse of our enemies in this war, we do so bearing a national debt that amounts at this moment to more than $208,000,000,000, or $1,540 for every man, woman, and child of our 135,000,000 people. The income of our people has, it is true, reached unprecedented heights—one hundred and fifty-eight billions—but it is based on Government expenditures. The Federal Government has been buying with deficit dollars 50 percent of all goods and services produced in the country. These purchases are for purposes of war. When peace comes and war purchases stop, production will cease, with consequent disaster to us all unless we find a new market for our tremendous productive capacity.

SOCIAL AND INDIVIDUAL ECONOMY ESSENTIAL

Where is this new market to be found? It will be found in the revitalization of our local communities, in the stimulation of renewed local and State pride, in the reestablishment of the local economy, and, above all, in the maintenance of a high standard of living for all. The expanded purchasing power of the masses alone can take the place of Government spending, if we want to maintain a democratic economy and the institution of private property.

We dare not rely on big national business alone. These organizations are not so constituted as to serve the general public interest except in the narrow field of their own operations. They are concerned with their own success in interstate commerce rather than with the success of all commerce or with the success of any purely local business.

We must develop the formula by which national commerce and local commerce may exist side by side, each performing its own function. The development of this formula is distinctly a task for the lawyer, for it will be a rule of law. It cannot be found in a test tube in the chemist's laboratory. The engineer cannot calculate it on a slide rule. The businessman cannot find it in his ledger. But the lawyer can find it if only he will cast aside his prejudices, and in his local community, emulating the example of his predecessors of the eighteenth century, seek again in his books those immutable principles of human justice which in every crisis of the past have helped mankind forward.

THE PEOPLE WILL PREVAIL

Make no mistake about it, the people will prevail. Nothing can stop their onward sweep.

Who did not feel a tightening of the throat when he read of the liberation of Paris? The jubilation on the streets, the wild joy with which our soldiers were greeted, the embraces and kisses that were showered upon them were all the manifestation of a people who knew that once more they were free, that once more they were at liberty to handle their affairs without constraint from any outside authority.

We set them free—we and our allies. Here, indeed, do we see again "a new birth of freedom," for all the peoples of the world. To make it live and thrive and spread—that is a problem of government and of law. Let the lawyer then take up his task. Let him go back to his own community and there among his neighbors in every walk of life, seek to build anew the foundations of democracy. Let him realize that the victory of organized might in this global war will not be complete until individual economic freedom has been established in every State, city, and county in which people live. Let him absorb anew that spirit of public service which filled the hearts of the lawyers who wrote the Constitution. Then will he open new horizons of freedom for all mankind.

Let the Facts Be Known

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district are asking why Admiral Kimmel and General Short have not been court-martialed. In my opinion, the answer is because the administration is afraid to let the facts be known. The people remember that immediately after the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor, they were told that charges had been filed against Kimmel and Short. Now it develops that court-martial proceedings have never been started against them. No charges against them have ever been filed. Efforts have been made by the Congress to have charges filed and to have these charges tried, but nothing has been done except the recent announcement that an investigation is being made to determine if charges should be filed. Why the investigation? The Commander in Chief was their superior officer. He surely knows whether they disobeyed his orders or not. Kimmel and Short have been trying to get something done in their case so the public could know the facts. They claim a court-martial trial will absolve them of all blame. Admiral Kimmel says that when the entire story is given to the American people they will be "amazed at the truth." I think this is correct and that the real reason no action has been taken is because the blame lies much higher than Admiral Kimmel and General Short, and that the administration does not dare let the truth be known before the election.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the people should continue to demand an immediate hearing so that the people can definitely know who was responsible for our disastrous defeat at Pearl Harbor, and for the loss of over 2,300 lives and practically all of our Pacific Fleet, which permitted the Japs to capture the Philippines and extend their conquest to Hong Kong, Singapore, and through the Pacific. If action is not had now, there is no reason to believe that the facts will ever become known as long as President Roosevelt remains Commander in Chief. There is no reason to believe that, if he is successful in his fourth term effort, he will not run for as many terms as his span of life will permit.

It is not just a coincidence that after the elapse of 3 years the President should suddenly decide to visit Hawaii. Many over there undoubtedly know the facts about Pearl Harbor and an election is soon to be had. Undoubtedly, there is much "fence building" to be done in that territory.

Many inquiries have come to my office asking how much the President's junket and fishing trip to Hawaii and the Aleutians cost; how many battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and carriers this trip took out of the fighting lines, and how long the immobilization of these naval forces would prolong the war. It is impossible to get information to answer these inquiries. It has been stated that the cost to the taxpayers was $20,000,000, but the number and kind of naval units taken out of action remains "a military secret," and there is no way to tell how long the war will be prolonged by reason of this trip.

Upon returning to Bremerton the President made a speech. The Socialist Party claimed it was political and demanded equal radio time. The Army ruled the speech was political and granted the Socialist Party the radio time requested. Then, mysterious things began to happen, and 6 hours later the Army reversed itself and held the speech was not political. I think everyone who heard the speech will have no hesitancy in saying that it was political. In fact, the trip was political. This calls to mind the trips the President made to war plants, and his speeches in the 1940 campaign. It is a peculiar coincidence that these trips and speeches came during a political campaign. Recently, I talked to the head of one of the great war material producing industries which was visited by the President on a so-called inspection trip of defense industries in October of 1940. He told me that this inspection trip knocked his plant out of about 1 week's production. This great steel mill was required to stop production, to turn the workshop into a show place, to move at least one of every article it produced, and place these articles along the route which the President would travel while riding through the plant. At the appointed time the President's automobile came through the plant, but the President did not look at any of the articles produced by the plant, he was busy waving and nodding his head at the workmen, who were required to keep at least 50 feet away from the Presidential party. When the Presidential party departed, the workmen were required to move the various articles back to the stockrooms and then put the plant into operation. This caused this great steel mill to lose about 1 week's total production. Everyone knows that this trip did not and could not help in the least in getting production, but was purely political.

A few nights ago I attended a moving-picture show where the current events showed General MacArthur explaining the Pacific strategy to the President. It was noticeable that Admiral King and General Marshall were not present. The war strategy is planned by the military and naval heads, although there have been attempts made to make the people believe this strategy is planned by the President. I think the President's political acumen slipped, when, in an unguarded moment, he permitted pictures to be taken, showing General MacArthur explaining the Pacific war strategy to him. No doubt there will be many more similar trips before the election, unless the President senses the unfavorable public reaction to such junkets.

Mr. Speaker, there should be a complete congressional investigation of the case of Tyler Kent, the State Department employee assigned to our Embassy in England, whose duty it was to encode and decode messages sent under our private code. He handled the messages between the President and Mr. Churchill, who for some reason which has never been explained, had been permitted to use our secret code. These messages were sent in 1939, before the war, and while Churchill was First Lord of the Admiralty, and while Chamberlain was Prime Minister.

The matter was first exposed in the House of Parliament, where it was charged that in these messages President Roosevelt assured Churchill that if England went to war, the United States would come to England's rescue; that a message from Churchill to Roosevelt states, "should I become Prime Minister we can control the world"; that the messages contained many uncomplimentary and disparaging remarks about Joe Stalin; that Mr. Kent took these messages to his room and made photostatic copies, which he showed to Captain Ramsay, a Member of Parliament, and also to a Russian woman who is presumed to have communicated them to Stalin, which probably accounts for Stalin's procedure at the start of the war.

Kent was arrested and charged with embezzling secret messages from the American Embassy—was tried in a secret British court and sentenced to 7 years in prison. Captain Ramsay has been detained in custody because he has knowledge of the matter.

The story of this matter was first published in the press on November 12, 1941. At that time the White House professed to have no knowledge upon the subject. Recently the matter was fully discussed in the British Parliament and the stories on this discussion were passed by the British censors and were published in the United States press. The matter was fully discussed in the Congress, and only when the public became interested and demand for an investigation made, did the State Department say anything about it. It is interesting to note that neither Mr. Churchill or any Member of the British Parliament, nor Mr. Roosevelt or any member of the State Department have ever denied that Mr. Churchill was given our secret code in order to communicate directly with the President before he became prime minister, nor that the messages as above mentioned were sent.

I am not in any way defending Kent's actions, but mention this matter for the sole purpose of comparing what had actually taken place and the commitments made by the President, with his statements on the eve of the 1940 election when he made his now famous "again and again and again" speech telling mothers and fathers that their sons would not be sent to fight on foreign soil. This matter should be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. Speaker, it now looks as if complete victory is about to be had, and we all hope and pray that this victory will come real soon, so that our boys and girls can return to their homes and loved ones.

We are winning the war because we have the best generals and admirals in the world, who have planned our strategy, provided for proper training of our forces, and secured the proper equipment and implements of war; because we have the best Army and Navy in the world; because of the productive capacity of American industry; because American labor has gone into the mills, factories, and mines and produced the war materials needed; because the American farmers, although unable to get farm machinery and equipment they need, while enormous quantities of this needed farm machinery have been sent all over the world to farmers of other countries, and with farm manpower greatly curtailed, have produced the necessary food; and, because the American taxpayers and bond buyers have produced the finances. All these elements have made a great team which is winning the war, and this team will bring the war to a victorious end regardless of who is elected President on November 7.

When the war is over, the boys and girls in service want to come back to a free United States and to a Government under the Constitution. They want to pick up life where they left off when they entered the service, and to have an opportunity for free private employment at good wages, and to enjoy the liberty and blessings of our system of Government, which they have so valiantly fought, and many died, to preserve.

They do not want their country to be run by Earl Browder, Harry Bridges, or Sidney Hillman, or by anyone else who is dominated by them. They know that the Communist National Convention, which was held long before the New Deal Convention, unanimously voted not to run a candidate for President on its ticket this year, but unanimously voted to support President Roosevelt for a fourth term, as the candidate meeting its approval. This shows conclusively that the Communists think pretty well of President Roosevelt and that he is satisfactory to them. No doubt they have an understanding. The New Deal Convention simply ratified what the Communist Party had done, although the New Deal's Convention action was not unanimous. The New Deal 4–H Club, Hillman, Hopkins, Hannegan, and Hague, together with other big city bosses such as Kelley and the Pendergast machine, have joined with the Communists, and they have all joined hands for a fourth term.

Harry Hopkins has been kept in the background for quite a while, but he still occupies the same positions of influence. Sidney Hillman must have quite an influence with the President as shown when the President required that the Vice Presidential candidate must be approved by Hillman. The President's statement to Hannegan to "clear it through Sidney" will be heard about many times. I wonder what else must be cleared through Sidney.

We all know we cannot continue under the New Deal and the philosophies of Earl Browder, Harry Bridges, and Sidney Hillman and remain a free, independent, and prosperous people. It is the intent of the new dealers to completely regiment the American people; they have no idea of relinquishing any controls now exercised after the war is over but, instead, they intend to make the controls more stringent. It is the opinion of those who are "in the know" that the President will turn decidedly to the "left" if he is reelected, and in that event his fourth term would be more radical; that he and his "planless planners" would provide a complete system of planned economy to govern us. The Congress is the only agency today not under the administration's control, and this probably accounts for the anti-Congress triades of the New Deal. If the New Deal again takes control of Congress, the United States as you and I have known it will no longer exist.

Our forefathers braved the perils of an uncharted course across the ocean to settle in this new land; they wanted economic and political freedom; they wrote the Declaration of Independence; they fought a long, hard war, and many of them died that their dream of liberty and freedom might be established in a government; they wrote the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights, and established the Government of the United States of America. From the time they landed upon our shores, up to the present hour, American manhood has been ready and willing to fight, and to die, to preserve this form of government and to protect the liberties and freedoms under our form of government.

It has been said that if Hitler should win the war, he would destroy our form of government, and in that event life would not be worth living. Actually, it would make little difference whether Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, or "Joe Blow" destroyed our form of government, the result would be the same.

We are engaged in a mighty war against foreign foes to preserve our form of government. We could lose our form of government from within, and we should be just as alert against those within our borders who would destroy it as against those without our borders. A form of government which is worth fighting against foreign foes to preserve, as many of the flower of American manhood are doing today, surely is worth voting for so as to make sure that it is not destroyed from within, and when we have done this I feel sure that when the boys come home after victory they will be happy that we have saved here that which they were fighting for over there. We will have protected and preserved against the enemies from within what they have protected and preserved against the enemies from without.

Every effort should be made to bring about an understanding and cooperation between the nations of the world which will insure a lasting peace. This enduring peace must be built upon a solid foundation of truth and fairness, and cannot be established by secret intrigue. Our Nation should do everything possible to bring about this understanding and cooperation among the nations of the world. We must make sure that no one can ever again get enough power that in his lust for world conquest he could array nations against nations in another world war.

An American Ideal in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article, I am anxious to call the attention of my colleagues to the national scope of the work that the better business bureaus are doing. Today there are about 80 better business bureaus in active operation throughout the country, located in practically every State. These organizations are supported by business for the benefit of business and the protection of the purchasing public. They are nonpolitical, but they work in active cooperation with the constituted authorities.

In the enclosed article, An American Ideal in Action, Miss Elizabeth Frazer has well explained the work of these organizations. Miss Frazer is an experienced writer, well known to the American reading public. In World War No. 1 she was a war correspondent in Europe for the Saturday Evening Post and has written many articles on business, finance, and economics, which have appeared in Good Housekeeping, the Saturday Evening Post, and other national magazines. She is an author of no mean reputation and perhaps the best known of her books is A Woman and Her Money.

I hope my colleagues in the House will read this article and will support the work of the better business bureau wherever possible. They are bound to play an important part in the reconversion period, particularly in the disposition of surplus Government goods.

AN AMERICAN IDEAL IN ACTION

(By Elizabeth Frazer)

They are not Government bureaus—although their main function is the protection of the public and their services are free. They are non-profit organizations. They neither buy nor sell. They have no legislative activities; no political ax to grind; no ideological propaganda to promulgate—unless a belief that honesty should prevail in business transactions can be called an ideological slant. In which case, the people have cast their ballots in its favor, for Mr. and Mrs. Average American, by hundreds of thousands each year, have beaten a broad path to their doors.

Located in the chief business centers of the country, the work of these 80 bureaus covers a vast field of everyday business transactions which touch every household—securities, real estate, services, and all kinds of merchandise. Most of their work is carried on without fanfare, and it is doubtful if even the people who use them know what they are all about. And yet these 80 bureaus house an American ideal in action which is one of the most constructive forces shaping the whole pattern of business conduct in this country today. Let us look at some of these activities and see what actually goes on.

Telephones were ringing in the offices of the better business bureau. A steady trickle of callers entered. Housewives, businessmen, law enforcement officials. At his desk, a man we will call Mr. Moore, head of his section, received callers and answered the phone. First of all, I talked with the manager of the bureau.

"In order to get a clear picture of the work of these bureaus," he said, "we'd better peg down a few fundamental facts. Our whole work is based on an ideal. It's a typically American ideal of self-government. Of regulations and restraints imposed, not from the outside, but voluntarily from the inside. These bureaus are an integral part of business itself, set up for the express purpose of promoting truth, accuracy, and fair play in everyday business transactions. Business itself supports us to investigate fraud, misrepresentations, or sharp selling practices, to establish the true facts, and then act without fear or favor in the public interest."

To sample some of these activities, I sat by Mr. Moore's desk. A sailor was ushered in. He had bought a silver bracelet which the salesman had told him was sterling, but an appraiser to whom he had taken it said he had been gypped. He wanted his money back. Mr. Moore examined the bracelet and the sales slip. "If we get a refund, where shall we send it?" he asked. The sailor gave his mother's address. Mr. Moore rang for an investigator. "Take this bracelet and sales slip to that jeweler. Get hold of the owner. Ask him to explain."

Later in the day the investigator returned with a duplicate copy of the jeweler's letter to the boy's mother, expressing regret for the error, due to an inexperienced clerk. A check for the full amount had been enclosed to her.

Again the telephone rang. The credit department of a bank wanted information on the business record of a man we will call Jones. "Hold the wire," said Mr. Moore. "I'll look at our files."

These files are unique. They contain factual information on the business practices of individuals and companies collected over the years and are further supplemented by data from other bureaus. The librarian produced a folder on Jones. Mr. Moore read aloud from its contents into the phone. No comment. No opinion. Just the bare factual record. But that record was conclusive. Hearing it, no bank would lend Jones a dime. The credit department of the bank hung up. Then Mr. Moore explained how the files are built up.

"This Mr. Jones, let us say, comes to town and starts a store. And now Jones begins to write his own history. Complaints about him begin to come in. We investigate these complaints. We get both sides of the story. For experience has shown us that the customer is not always right. So we carefully examine all the facts. If the complaint was not justified, our records show that fact. Or perhaps it was just some slight error which Jones corrects and the customer is satisfied. But suppose Jones refuses to make good on a bona fide grievance which our impartial investigation shows was justified. Complaints from the public continue. Again we investigate, and again we take the matter up with Jones, giving him ample opportunity to correct his bad practices voluntarily. If persuasion fails we take our findings to the law-enforcement authorities and our files contain the law's verdict. The complete factual record is there. Then one day Jones asks the bank for a loan and the bank phones us for information on his business record, for our reliability as an impartial, fact-finding agency is well known. And now Jones' history which he wrote himself has caught up with him."

The work of the better business bureaus has two aspects. On one hand they act as guardians of the public to protect citizens from fraud, misrepresentations, and sharp-selling practices. On the other hand, they collaborate with business itself to promote high standards of truth and accuracy and to evolve practical machinery so that these standards can be put into actual operation. The bureaus have fashioned many instruments to implement the principles of truth and accuracy in business transactions. One of the most important of these is the fair practice code called the guide for retail advertising and selling. This guide contains standards, rules, definitions, and recommendations on how to describe properly almost every article sold at retail. It is used by all leading stores, newspapers, radio stations, and advertising agencies in cities in which the bureaus operate. It has a Nation-wide scope.

"But that is not all," said the manager of one bureau. "Constant changes are going on and we keep retailers acquainted with these changes. We also maintain a copy consultant department so that any manufacturer, retailer, publisher, or radio station may call us up anytime. Every day retailers ring us up asking for accurate descriptions of the goods on their shelves. Often they themselves do not know what an article is actually composed of or how to describe it truthfully. So they apply to us. We may not always know. But when we don't, we find out. In addition, we scan carefully all store advertisements in the daily papers and when we find any that look suspicious, we check them for investigation. This work covers not only legitimate companies, but also the vicious outer fringe of unscrupulous concerns which exploit the public and destroy fair competition.

"The experience of all the bureaus shows that the vast majority of business firms are honest. They want to do what is right. That does not mean they don't make mistakes. It does mean they correct those mistakes. Voluntarily. Figures in our files show that out of the whole number of bona fide grievances received each year, the overwhelming majority are settled voluntarily to the satisfaction of both parties."

To obtain an objective point of view on the work of those bureaus I interviewed lawyers, bankers, Federal authorities and police officials. A high executive in a great department store said:

"I cannot conceive doing business in a large city without a better business bureau. Let us visualize such a picture. In the first place, that city would be the roosting-place of all manner of racketeers, and the unscrupulous outer fringe of business without ethical responsibility would increase to dangerous proportions. But that is not all. Legitimate business itself would suffer. Let us take, for example, the retail trade. This is a highly competitive field. One merchant, let us say, makes untrue or exaggerated claims. His competitors, naturally, want him to stop. If he can't be stopped, some competitors may try to go him one better, and thus an unhealthy condition arises. Public confidence is impaired. And public confidence is the very taproot of existence in business; it is the most precious asset in the world. So we must have some agency that is fair, impartial, and respected by all to point out the bad plays. The decisions of that agency must be based, not on mere opinion, but on solid facts. It must always act in the best interest of the public and treat everybody alike. These three things: curbing fraudulent business, checking in the public interest and checking impartially on everybody alike are what make these bureaus valuable instruments of voluntary regulation, highly necessary in modern business life."

In their constructive work with business and the settlement of complaints the Bureaus have a very flexible method of procedure. If investigation shows that the complaint is justified the bureau takes up the matter directly with the owner or the proper executives of the company.

"In this part of our work," the manager of one bureau explained, "we are very careful,

very patient. What we are trying to do is to develop a better spirit, a feeling of ethical responsibility. So our method is not a cracking-down from the outside but a building-up, brick by brick, from the inside. This first step in our procedure—taking up the matter directly with the owner or executive in charge—is successful in a great majority of cases. If, however, it fails, we may take the results of our investigation to the newspapers or radio stations which carry the company's advertising. They have their own high standards to maintain and are usually very cooperative in getting the bad advertising corrected or, in aggravated cases, in refusing to carry it. As a last resort, if other methods fail, we bring the results of our investigations to the law enforcement authorities. And here again we follow straight through, take the witness stand when necessary, and record the verdict in our files."

The war added many new duties to the normal activities of the bureaus. Acting as a liaison agent between Government and business and respected by both for their unswerving devotion to the public interest, they were able to achieve successful results on the basis of voluntary cooperation through the self-regulation of business itself.

Ever since their initiation the bureaus have waged a relentless warfare against swindlers, stock crooks, and promoters of devious schemes, cooperating heartily with the Securities and Exchange Commission and the postal authorities in their fraud-fighting activities. Frequently a bureau, with its broad experience, is able to detect a well-planned pattern of fraud operating through a wide territory, which to the untrained eye appears like an isolated case. This sixth sense in fraud detection has saved the public millions of dollars.

"Of course," said the manager of one bureau, "we don't catch everything. We're not supermen. But we've had a lot of experience. Our fraud-fighting program has two aspects. First, we work to prevent fraud. We try to stamp it out before it gets started. The bureaus join hands when a problem is regional, and we often know beforehand when some fraudulent scheme is headed our way and can take effective measures against it. The second aspect of this fraud-fighting work is our educational program. Through publicity, radio talks, articles, and leaflets we try to educate citizens to recognize the earmarks of rackets and, above all, before they invest their savings to investigate thoroughly."

Another important activity which the bureaus have carried on through the years is a broad program of education designed to aid citizens in the management of their everyday business affairs. Fact booklets give basic information on subjects of practical interest to the average household, such as borrowing, budgeting, buying, or building a home, life insurance, legal problems, and savings.

Eighty of these better business bureaus operate in the principal centers of the country, serving the needs of their own communities and cooperating with each other. Each bureau is supported by annual subscriptions from members who represent a cross section of the entire business community. The president and board of directors are representative businessmen, serving without compensation. The actual operation of each organization is in charge of a paid manager. The bureaus cannot recommend or sponsor any company or product, and membership in them cannot be used for commercial advantage or to gain consumer good will. The National Better Business Bureau is also a fact-finding, fraud-fighting organization to promote high standards in business on a national scale.

The work of these bureaus throughout the country goes on quietly, steadily. The detailed picture of their daily activities reveals a lot of little things. Little wrongs righted; little corrections made. More good feeling; more good faith; more confidence all around. And it all adds up to something rather splendid. It is the democratic process in action. Self-government in business. Self-imposed restraints.

"It is one thing," Woodrow Wilson said, "to entertain fine principles, and it is another thing to make them work."

The better business bureaus of this country are making fine principles work.

Senator George Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Senator Norris' death a few days ago removed one of the outstanding statesmen of this generation. Whether you agreed with him or not you could but admire his courage, and his far-seeing vision, and he accomplished much for the rights of the common man during his 40 years of service in the Congress of the United States.

An editorial in the New York Times yesterday pays tribute to him, and under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

SENATOR NORRIS

George Norris was one of the last of the elder statesmen. Probably no Senator in his time left a deeper impress on a changing America. He stood like a rock dividing the liberal and conservative streams of thought in this Nation, diverting much of it into the channels through which he wished it to flow. That was always to the left, always toward what he felt was the side of the common man and against what he felt was entrenched privilege. He was uncompromising and incorruptible. The possible dangers that lurked in a socialized society he ignored. In his last days, accepting the honorary chairmanship of Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee, he stood further to the left than he had ever before ventured.

The end of his life was saddened by his defeat for the Senate in 1942. He regarded it as a "repudiation of 40 years of service" by "the people I love." But most of the reforms for which he fought so stoutly were already incorporated in our political system, and his place in history as one of the great American progressive leaders was assured. It was 28 years ago that Senator Norris really stood in the shadow. Then he voted against the first war with Germany when this country had determined to defend its rights, and he was thrust by Woodrow Wilson into that "little group of willful men." But Hitler's rise to power brought Senator Norris to the most complete reversal of his career. This time, despite his hatred for war inspired by the misfortunes of his family in the struggle between the States, he urged war to the hilt against both Germany and Japan.

His career was colored by the bitter experiences of an impoverished youth. It was inevitable that he should fight for the poor and oppressed. Elected to Congress as a partisan Republican, he became by slow stages a party maverick, an insurgent, an independent, and finally an ardent supporter of President Roosevelt. It was he who led the revolt in the House against the iron rule of Speaker Cannon. The list of constructive legislation he fathered is extensive and impressive. He was the author of the twentieth amendment, which outlaws "lame duck" or hold-over sessions of Congress. He brought the single house legislature to Nebraska. He was responsible for the vast power enterprise of the T. V. A., and it was with infinite satisfaction that he saw similar authorities established in other sections of the country. No man could ask a more monolithic monument than Norris Dam.

But his character was his noblest monument. Grave and gentle in individual relations, he was hard as granite toward the things he hated. Above all, he hated corruption and sought to crush it. Wrong-headed he could be. Wrong-hearted he never was. His influence will remain as the shining exemplar of the utterly sincere and honest man in politics.

Civilian Public Service Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and illuminating letter addressed to me by the noted authoress, Miss Ruth Suckow.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CEDAR FALLS, IOWA, *August 31, 1944.*

Senator GUY GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: I am writing you about a matter which has greatly concerned me all during this war period, the position of our conscientious objectors. If there had been more time, last evening at Mr. Paul Diamond's, I should like to have told you and Mrs. Gillette something about the trip I made during the earlier part of the summer, visiting six Civilian Public Service camps and one mental hospital unit, in North Dakota and the three West Coast States. I went under the auspices of the American Friends and Brethren service committees, and the F. O. R. for their educational program, and talked on subjects related to writing and literature in general.

While there are all kinds in these groups, as in every sort of group, I would like to say that I found here some of the finest young men I've ever met, taking their responsibilities seriously, thoughtful, deeply devoted to the best service of their country and the world. They have taken a different way of moving toward world peace, the one that seems to them most hopeful, but their objective is the same as that which you expressed in your talk at Cedar Falls. They take their stand on that same pronouncement of 2,000 years ago.

I can testify that the majority of men in these camps are working hard in the long-time service of their country. The financial situation of many of them is getting serious. Some have been in C. P. S. since the beginning of the draft. Two dollars and fifty cents a month doesn't go far. The hand-me-down left-over C. C. C. coats and shoes don't always fit. At all the evening meetings

where I spoke, men sat patching up old clothes and even shoes while they listened. There is considerable soreness, too, in regard to the fact that in a democracy such as ours, a minority group is allowed to work for its own Government at less than subsistence wages. Many feel this makes a bad precedent. The question of dependents is very serious. Mrs. Roosevelt recently in some of her columns took a stand against an allowance for the dependents of conscientious objectors, describing them as men who in this crisis are doing what they like. They certainly are not. Most of them would like to give aid and relief immediately in war-torn areas everywhere. The work of the guinea pig units shows that they don't shun danger. They feel that their families are being penalized for their stand on the grounds of religious conscience—one of the things that has entered into the making of our country from the very start, from the landing of the Pilgrims. The men know that they are a minority, were prepared to sacrifice and have sacrificed many cherished things, present approval of communities and country, financial benefits of all kinds, jobs in many instances They know there won't be any priorities on jobs for them after the war.

I don't wish to present these men as martyrs—they aren't, and aren't willing to be considered so. But I do wish to express concern for their actual needs. The burden is too heavy on the small peace churches alone, although what these groups do accomplish seems close to miraculous often, considering their numbers. Help from other churches doesn't meet the situation. And I agree that a precedent of work without adequate pay may well be dangerous. As one individual, I want to urge that the Congress move in the matter of financial support for men in Civilian Public Service.

Knowing your sincere devotion to world peace, and your humane spirit, I hope you will take the case of these young men into your consideration. I realize that the Congress as a whole may not be willing now to take up this matter, and yet I believe it no more than right that it should be done. I am speaking from personal experience—I met several hundred conscientious objectors on my recent visits, had intimate and candid talks with individuals, and for some time have corresponded with boys in C. P. S. all over the country, have read a great many of the things they have written, in which they express their deepest convictions and experience. They have sent me these manuscripts for criticism on literary grounds.

I am very glad to have had the opportunity of meeting you and Mrs. Gillette. Please give Mrs. Gillette my best regards.

Sincerely,

RUTH SUCKOW,
(Mrs. FERNER NUHN.)

Commendable Candor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, reading the Palo Alto Times recently I was very much struck by a brief editorial which appeared therein. It commented upon the commendable candor with which Jim Farley frankly admitted he and former Vice President Garner had discussed politics when they met. At a time like this, in the heat of political campaigns throughout the Nation it is interesting to know that outstanding leaders of the country such as Mr. Farley are so very frank and forthright in their statements. It is unfortunate that the same frankness and honesty is not displayed by the various groups which are today active in the political campaigns. I am sure that the people as a whole would thoroughly appreciate such frankness and that it would materially benefit the Nation to have the present campaigns conducted openly, honestly, and fairly.

The editorial to which I refer reads as follows:

COMMENDABLE CANDOR

James A. Farley, after a visit recently with former Vice President John Nance Garner, said, "We discussed politics from every angle. Mr. Garner, like myself, is concerned with conditions in the Nation now."

Of course they talked politics. Who among us isn't talking politics in the thick of a Presidential election campaign? Most especially we would expect exactly that at a meeting of two such notable, top-notch politicians as Farley and Garner. What we like about the Farley statement is its characteristic honesty and candor. It is in such striking contrast to the hypocritical pose taken by some men who, although being politicians, currently engaged in discussing, directing, and manipulating politics in closed rooms, pretend publicly to have neither time nor thought for such things when there is a war to be won.

Pope Urges Enforced World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item from the Washington Post under date of September 2, 1944:

POPE URGES ENFORCED WORLD PEACE—APPROVES ROOSEVELT'S IDEAS TO MAINTAIN POST-WAR SECURITY BY POLICE FORCE

VATICAN CITY, September 1.—Pope Pius XII, addressing the world on the fifth anniversary of the war's outbreak, appealed tonight for the establishment of effective international machinery to render future conflicts impossible.

Voicing the hope that the present war might soon come to an end, His Holiness expressed approval of a post-war league to maintain security, corresponding to ideas set forth by President Roosevelt, and declared that such an institution must have teeth to enforce its decisions.

The Pontiff, in a broadcast over the Vatican radio, pointed out that an enduring peace could be built only on the foundations of moral justice and the well-being of the world's peoples.

END ARMED MIGHT

He called for an end to the rule of armed might in international affairs, declaring:

"Humanity is horrified in the face of the abysmal misery into which the spirit of violence, domination, and force has cast it."

A world battered and devastated by the ravages of history's greatest war, the Holy Father proclaimed, is determined to prevent the recurrence of such a catastrophe.

"We express our approval of the aspiration for a new universal peace institution," he said, "and put forward the wish that its creation truly metes its high aims, namely, the maintenance of tranquillity and world security."

FAVORS POLICING

The Pope further made it clear he favors international policing. He declared this was "inevitable within juridically and morally justifiable limits even after the conclusion of peace in order to safeguard the observance of treaties and prevent attempted new conflicts."

"An ancient world lies in wreckage," the Pontiff exclaimed. "The earliest possible rebirth of a new world, juridically healthier and more orderly—that is the yearning of martyred peoples."

His holiness stressed further that the well-being of nations and their people is one of the essential prerequisites of lasting peace, declaring:

"Mankind expects at the end of the war a definite improvement in its condition."

He said humanity in the last 5 years has traveled a trail of tears and blood.

He spoke of cooperative unions among nations which he said must pay their part in the post-war society.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, in the many duties which are ours as Members of Congress, one of the first in my judgment is to keep the people at home informed of legislation of particular interest to them. I particularly refer to the benefits which have been provided for the service men and women, veterans, and their dependents.

The many requests for information regarding these benefits indicates the need for a digest of the law on the subject that may be used as a ready reference and sent by the families, if they so desire, to their relatives in service, thereby keeping service men and women fully informed of the protection provided under our laws, and the necessity for compliance with the details in connection with making application for benefits thereunder.

Our Government should be liberal with those who wear its uniform in time of war. Our servicemen are the best paid, best trained, and best equipped in the world. The fact that our veterans and their dependents are better provided for than those in any other country is further proof that America cannot and must not forget those who fight and die to sustain the kind of life we cherish in America. Whether our forces serve at home or upon foreign fields, we must at all costs maintain that form of government which they have loved so deeply and have fought so nobly to sustain. Our matchless men and women in uniform will win this war, but we in Congress must pro-

vide the basis for a permanent peace and a lasting prosperity at home.

I am happy to have had a small part in the enactment of this legislation and I shall bend every effort to make sure that while these boys and girls are away the pure fountains of our form of government shall not be polluted with the poison of some foreign isms or tainted with the dangerous doctrines of political plotters at home.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

Dependents of all grades of enlisted men and aviation cadets of the Army and Navy are eligible to receive a dependent's allowance from the Government in addition to the servicemen's allotment. Those men and women serving as officers come under another system. The allotments and allowances provided by the Government are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife and one child, $72; and $20 for each additional child. Note: If the divorce or separation order of the court does not call for alimony or separate maintenance, the wife will not receive any allotment, and in case of a court order providing alimony or separate maintenance, she will get no more than the amount fixed by the court.

Class B dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is substantially, but not completely, dependent upon the serviceman for support. A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37.

Class B–1 dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $50 plus $11 for each brother or sister; two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $68 plus $11 for each brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

It is important that men and women with dependents make application through their commanding officers for allotment and allowance, as these benefits will begin the date application is filed. Allotments are compulsory only for class A dependents. If the service man or woman for some reason or other fails to make application or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out, the Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children and dates of birth. In case a man is reported missing in action, the allotment and allowance, continue to be paid for a period of a year, unless, in the meantime, his status is definitely determined.

Parents and brothers and sisters who can prove dependency can receive an allowance at the same time as wife and children. Parents can get an allowance from more than one son or daughter in the service. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son or daughter in the service, they get $68 per month. Now, if another son or daughter in the service helped support these same parents, they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

The agency for the Navy having jurisdiction over allotments and allowances is Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C. The agency for the Army is Office of Dependency Benefits, War Department, 213 Washington Street, Newark, N. J. If you experience any difficulty, contact your Congressman.

TEMPORARY AID FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Sometimes cases of extreme hardship arise involving dependents of servicemen. Many dependents, and even members of the armed forces themselves, are not fully acquainted with the two emergency agencies set up for the express purpose of helping such persons in need. These two agencies have branches all over the country. They are the Army Emergency Relief Fund, whose functions have recently been assigned to the Red Cross, and the Navy Relief Society, which also can be reached through the Red Cross.

ARMY RELIEF FUND

Any member of the armed forces in the Army can appeal to the Army Relief Fund, represented in all camps, or through the Red Cross if the soldier is not at camp, for needed immediate financial assistance. He will receive courteous and willing assistance at all times. The fund is also open to all dependents of men and women in the Army and anyone needing relief should get in touch at once with this fund through the local Red Cross.

NAVY RELIEF SOCIETY

Any serviceman or servicewoman in our naval forces or his dependents can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. To get immediate action, it is advisable to take the case up through the Red Cross.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

This benefit is payable to all honorably discharged personnel of our services whose rank is below captain in the Army and lieutenant senior grade in the Navy. Payments are made in the following sums: Personnel with less than 60 days' active service, $100; personnel with 60 days' or more active service, none of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $200; personnel with 60 days or more active service, any part of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $300. Whenever mustering-out payments amounts to more than $100, payments are made in monthly intervals of $100 each. Servicemen who are discharged at their own request are not entitled to muster-out pay.

FREE MEDICAL AND NURSING CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF MEN IN OUR ARMED FORCES

Under this plan a wife of any man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service. If the doctor does not have these blanks, write to the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, California State Board of Health, Sacramento, Calif., and ask them to send a blank to you. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2 at once and send it immediately to Sacramento for approval. It is important that wives apply for this in early pregnancy; the State board of health will not approve payments of the doctor, hospital, or any service before the application is made out. In the case of emergency be sure that the doctor makes application for you within 48 hours, or no bills for medical or hospital service will be paid. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse; no money is given to the wife. This service is extended to wives and infants of servicemen in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, but not to any other foreign country.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY PENSIONS

Our honorably discharged veterans of all wars are entitled to a pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by their service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10 percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as a hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month.

The disability claim is filed by the veteran for benefits payable to him as the result of injury or disease resulting from military service. The award of compensation is based on the degree of disability which is determined according to the Veterans' Administration schedule provisions. Any disability, except misconduct, is compensable if it is as much as 10 percent disabling. This application is known as Form 526. It is simple to execute and seldom does one have any trouble answering the questions. Additional evidence is seldom required. This is particularly true on the adjudication of the initial claim. No subsequent formal claim need be filed. If the veteran is dissatisfied with his present rating he can submit medical evidence to this effect.

However, it should be borne in mind that the doctor's statement must state not only his diagnosis but sufficient findings to warrant it. It is essential that this evidence show, or at least indicate, a higher degree of disability than the present evaluation. Upon receipt of competent medical evidence the Veterans' Claim Service will authorize an official physical examination for rating purposes, thereby reopening the case for further consideration.

Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred from one Veterans' Administration facility to another, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose

claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for settlement, veterans should file claim on proper form which will be supplied them by any Veterans' Administration facility, or the local representative of the American Red Cross. If the disabled person is insane or incompetent the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

READJUSTMENT TO CIVIL LIFE—EDUCATION

One of the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights offers an education to any man who served for a period of 90 days, on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition and books and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if without dependents, and $75 if he has dependents. Any man who served 90 days on or after September 16, 1940, may receive 1 year's schooling and 1 month additional education for each month in active service, but in no event shall the total period of education exceed 4 years. There is also a provision for part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

A veteran also has the right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities, extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Application for education and training should be made to the Director, Servicemen's Education and Training, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

HOSPITALIZATION AND PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

Adequate hospital facilities are provided for the care and treatment of veterans for nonservice disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

The veteran has the right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

RIGHT OF MEDICAL REVIEW OF IRREGULAR DISCHARGE OR RELEASE FROM ACTIVE SERVICE

A veteran has the right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service, (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination, benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (b) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (c) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

Loans provided for the above-mentioned purposes or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000. Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions. The interest rate must not exceed 4 percent. The loan must be practicable and suitable to veterans' circumstances. The loan must be repaid in 20 years. Application must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

A veteran of any war, honorably discharged from any one of the services, has the right to register for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service. He should contact his local United States Employment Office in his home town or county.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

There is also a provision for unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed. To be eligible the person must reside in the United States; be completely unemployed, or if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week; be registered with and report to a public employment office, be able to work and available for suitable work.

Any person will be disqualified if he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; if he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work offered; if he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; if he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS AS A RESULT OF LOSS OF SON, DAUGHTER, HUSBAND, OR FATHER

There are four money benefits provided for the dependents of a deceased veteran; 6 months gratuity payment, monthly insurance payments (if the serviceman applied for insurance), monthly pension, and back pay.

GRATUITY

The gratuity is a lump-sum payment equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received at the date of death. In addition, the dependents of any private or seaman who dies in foreign service receive 20 percent of his base pay, and the dependents of any officer who dies in foreign service receive 10 percent of his base pay. If the serviceman was in either the flying service or submarine service, his dependents receive, in addition, 50 percent of his base pay. There is also a longevity provision in addition to the above amounts.

The gratuity is automatically paid to a wife of a deceased veteran, or if there is no wife, it is automatically paid to the surviving child or children. It is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters of an unmarried serviceman. The serviceman should designate some one of this latter class to receive it; however, if he does not, they may apply for it. If two parents survive, the amount is divided between them. A grandparent must show an insurable interest in order to receive it.

Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to: Gratuity Pay Branch, Finance Office, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue, N. E., Washington 25, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

MONTHLY INSURANCE PAYMENTS

This insurance is not paid in a lump sum; it is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary—the older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy, if the beneficiary for whom payment is first made is under 30 years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in 240 equal monthly installments, at the rate of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance. If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is 30 or more years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in equal monthly installments for 120 months certain, with such payment in installments continuing during the remaining lifetime of such beneficiary. For instance, under a $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will be $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

It would be well to have parents and next of kin check with the men and women in service to see that all insurance certificates are in order and in the hands of the persons designated by the service men or women to receive them. An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of halfblood. There is nothing to prevent a parent or brother or sister from being the beneficiary of more than one serviceman.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check their insurance policy now. See that everything is in order now. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A little care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen. I would suggest that you send your serviceman this pamphlet so that he may check all matters pertaining to his beneficiaries.

MONTHLY PENSIONS

This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, they are not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased serviceman can get a pension at the some time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month. Two parents, $25 each. Widow, but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child. No widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38 equally divided, with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100.

The fact that a widow, a child, or parent gets the insurance, does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect both insurance and a pension.

BACK PAY DUE THE SERVICEMEN

When a casualty occurs, that service man or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. All this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to: Finance Officer, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington 25, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

HEADSTONE FOR GRAVE

Any person may make application for a headstone for the grave of any veteran of any one of the Army or Navy services whose service was honorable, to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE FOR ANY WAR VETERAN

After honorable service, reimbursement for burial may be allowed, not exceeding $100, on burial, funeral, and transportation expenses. Application should be made to Director, Dependent Claims Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances his minor children or adult unmarried daughters.

WRITE FOR OTHER INFORMATION

It is exceedingly difficult to cover all the details of benefits available to veterans of this and previous wars. I have tried to sketch briefly the benefits particularly relating to World War No. 2, as many pamphlets have been printed covering the provisions for veterans of other wars. I merely offer this digest as a guide to servicemen, veterans, and their dependents. If anyone has special questions or individual problems not covered in this summary, I suggest you write to me personally, to the following address: NORRIS POULSON, Room 236, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The Rotation Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday's mail brought me a poem written by a serviceman with more than 2½ years service in the Pacific area. This poem expresses my own thoughts on the so-called rotation plan better than I could hope to express them in my own words.

None of us have any desire to say or do anything that would retard the winning of the war in the Pacific at the earliest possible date, but I have been forced to the conclusion that to date the War Department has not done everything that could be done to speed up the rotation plan announced last April.

During the past 10 months I have corresponded with the War Department and with General MacArthur's headquarters, urging that whenever possible, men with more than 1½ years' service in the Southwest Pacific area be brought back to the United States, at least for an extended furlough. Some of the former Connecticut National Guard troops have now had more than 2½ years' jungle service. Among the Connecticut troops serving in the Pacific is an antiaircraft unit. I am at a loss to understand why some of the antiaircraft regiments who, until recently, were guarding industrial areas throughout the country, could not now be shipped to the Pacific, thus permitting troops with long service to return home. The longer these men are kept in the jungle without relief, the greater the expense we are piling up for the future, to say nothing of the loss of life and health.

The poem above referred to follows:

THE ROTATION PLAN

As days passed on and on, and months turned into years,
The soldier needed something to comfort his many fears.
His thoughts turned ever homeward, as only a soldier's can,
And from this urgent problem was born the rotation plan.

In words concise and pretty, it sounded fine and daper.
Indeed it was encouraging and looked so good on paper.
In flowery words and phrases, it built hopes in every man—
Surely it is wonderful—this new rotation plan.

Men who served the longest in places of desolation
Would be the first sent home when they started the rotation.
Eighteen months away from home made one ready to depart.
But holy smokes! We're away 2 years before the thing did start.

While waiting for the quotas, the time so swiftly flew,
Rumors came and went, as only Army rumors do.
Serving in the north so long, we were as happy as could be;
For according to this plan, we'd get priority.

Then one day arrived the news for which we had waited.
At last we'll hear the number of those to be rotated.
But wait, what's this—it can't be true!
Instead of ten or twelve, there are only one or two.

Such news as this is excellent, and so encouraging to be true;
For the boys who are lucky will be home by '52.
Then another thing we like so well is the adherence to this plan
For the time above a year and a half isn't really worth a damn.

One more thing that elevates our hearts in silent glee
Is the speedy way the boys are sent to their homes across the sea
After 3 months' operation, we are just 6 months behind,
And apparently the "powers that be" certainly do not mind.

Now what has happened to cause delay, questions every man,
What is wrong with this hope of ours—this great rotation plan?
Doesn't anyone consider the feelings of an old G. I.?
Isn't there anything left at all, upon which we can rely?

Oh my, yes, to be sure, excuses are handed all around,
Shipping space is scarce, and replacements can't be found,
Yet there are millions of men at home who have never been away,
And ships are leaving daily for the good old U. S. A.

With these facts in mind there are things we'd like to know,
For with each day that passes our doubts increase and grow.
Is this plan a child of the present political race?
A politician's dream with which he hopes to cinch his place?

Could it be just a trial to see what it would do
Toward giving us a lift and build up hopes anew?
Is it just a plan to give morale a raise?
Or perhaps a feeble try to bring forth home front praise?

One thing more we'd like to ask before we sadly close,
And we'd appreciate an answer from one who truly knows,
Just how long will we be stuck where going's tough and life is bare,
Three years away from all we love—really, don't you think we've done our share?

Why Give History Chance to Repeat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Hartford (Conn.) Daily Courant of August 24, 1944:

WHY GIVE HISTORY CHANCE TO REPEAT?—ROME AND FRANCE, RELUCTANT TO "CHANGE HORSES," SAW REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT DEGENERATE INTO DESPOTISM

To the EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

I have just been rereading Mr. Roosevelt's preconvention letter to Mr. Hannegan—the one in which he described his yearning to return to civil life. "All that is within me," he said, "cries out to go back home on the Hudson River." Yet with Spartan fortitude he said he was ready to answer his country's call to a fourth term, because he thought only of the good of the American people.

I have reread, also, Gov. Robert S. Kerr's keynote address at the Chicago convention and several other speeches delivered at that momentous gathering. All these stirring utterances left me with two disturbing

thoughts, namely, that the language of ambition and sycophancy has not changed throughout the ages; and that republics are singularly vulnerable to subversion by designing men who have discovered that the key to personal power is the credulity of the public.

The historian Tacitus' tale of the fall of the Roman Republic is a sorry one. He begins by pointing out that the partisans of Rome's "new deal" "had no leader but Octavius"—a shrewd and popular hero, who grasped at power "which he professed to assume for the protection of the people." These are the historian's words—not mine.

CAESAR AUGUSTUS, IMPERATOR

You may remember that young Octavius, on his entry into public life, promptly underwent a curious metamorphosis. He changed from being a defender of the republic into Caesar Augustus, the founder of Imperial Rome. Of course, this did not just happen of itself.

Tacitus says: "In a little time, when he had allured to his interest, the people by distribution of corn * * * his views grew more aspiring. By degrees, and almost imperceptibly, he drew into his own hands the authority of the Senate, the functions of the magistrates, and the administration of the laws."

No effective opposition seems to have been offered to these encroachments. Men's minds were blinded to future dangers by the sweets of the present which they owed to Octavius. To be sure, the forms of the Republic were still scrupulously respected. And as Tacitus says, "the magistrates retained their ancient names," but the republic was overthrown, nevertheless, and nothing remained of ancient manners or ancient spirit. Of independence, or the equal condition of Roman citizens, no trace was left. All ranks submitted to the will of the prince.

Do peoples profit by past experience? Unfortunately they do not. Look at what happened to another republic in later times. On the threshold of the nineteenth century the corrupt directorate of France was overthrown, and a new republican government was instituted under a written constitution, with Napoleon Bonaparte its chief executive.

The times were astonishingly like our own. The French Revolution, which began in 1789, unleashed forces that everywhere weakened or destroyed old loyalties. Indeed, none of its leaders limited the Revolution to the boundaries of France. "The globe was the country of its dogmata," said Lamartine, "France was only the workshop. It worked for all other peoples." Soon the continent of Europe trembled under the tread of marching feet. And even in the Middle East the sound of heavy guns echoed and reechoed among the Pyramids. A world war was in progress.

THE INDISPENSABLE NAPOLEON

The stream of events had become a raging torrent. Should a republic change horses in the midst of such a stream? The partisans of Bonaparte said emphatically—no. The state required stability and continuity of policy. So Napoleon's term of office was extended 10 years beyond its original limit. Do the grounds put forward to justify this change sound familiar? Listen. The senatus-consultum said:

"Considering that, in the existing circumstances of the republic, it is the first duty of the conservative senate to employ all the means in its power in order to give the government the stability which can alone augment the national resources, inspire confidence without, establish credit within, reassure our allies, discourage our secret enemies, remove the evils of war, bring to maturity the fruits of peace, and leave to the wisdom of administration the selection of the proper period for bringing forward all the designs which it may have in view for the happiness of a free people," etc., it was necessary to extend the executive's term of office.

How did the "Indispensable Man" take this proposal? "The interest of my glory and happiness," said Napoleon, "seem to have marked, as the termination of my public career, the moment when a general peace was signed. But you deem a new sacrifice necessary on my part. I will not scruple to undertake it, if the wishes of the people prescribe what your suffrages authorize."

This is not the end of the story. An inordinate political appetite seems to grow with what it feeds on. The torrential stream of events showed no sign of subsiding. So, still further precautions were taken against the possibility of changing horses. The term of office of the first consul was again extended, this time for life. Oh, yes; it was all very democratic. The question was put to popular vote. And out of 3,557,885 votes cast—3,368,259 were in the affirmative. But just the same the outlines of the Republic were becoming dim. Indeed, they were no longer visible.

Napoleon had begun like Octavius and followed in his footsteps. When the time was ripe to abandon all pretense and to bury the Republic under the trappings of empire, the sycophants who surrounded him exclaimed: "Greatest of men, complete your work; render it as immortal as your glory. You have extricated us from the chaos of the past; you have overwhelmed us with the blessings of the present; nothing remains but to guarantee for us the future."

With these words Bonaparte was implored to assume the imperial crown. In accepting this added burden, he said: "Fifteen years ago, by a spontaneous movement, we ran to arms, we gained liberty, equality and glory. Now these first of blessings, secured beyond the possibility of chance, are beyond the reach of danger; they are preserved for you and your children." There would be no more talk of changing horses in the midst of the stream. But a free republic had given place to an Asiatic despotism.

It may be true that history does not repeat itself, but sometimes it shows a frightening disposition to do so. Why give it a chance?

ARCHIBALD E. STEVENSON.

NEW CANAAN.

General Marshall and the German Rout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, not long ago certain interests in Washington sought to send Gen. George C. Marshall to London and replace him as Chief of Staff. Following disclosure the plan was abandoned. In view of what happened I believe the following editorial which appeared in the September 2 issue of the Washington News should be preserved:

MARSHALL AND THE GERMAN ROUT

In the midst of rejoicing over victories in France and the distribution of compliments to Allied commanders, one name should rank above all others. Because of his modesty the public knows little about him. But American officers will tell you that he deserves most of the credit, if any one is to be singled out. We mean General Marshall.

Our Chief of Staff is the top Allied strategist. While Roosevelt and Churchill take the spotlight, he does the actual planning. On the Anglo-American Combined Chiefs of Staff he is the most respected and influential member. Sometimes he is overruled by the politicos, but in the end they usually have to come back to his plan because events prove him right.

As a strategist Marshall is not original. His basic conception is the same as that of the great commanders of history—first cautiously amass overwhelming power, and then use it with lightning speed. His genius consists in a rare combination of patience and of daring—patience during the long period of preparation, and daring when the cards are running his way. The Germans did not invent the blitz. Marshall is a master of the war of movement. That is why his forces are now out-blitzing the Germans. He planned it that way.

Unlike some brilliant strategists, Marshall is also a great leader and organizer. He personally conceived the over-all plan for training, supplying, and transporting our mass Army to battlefields largely of his choosing at the early date when the wherewithal in men and materials was pitifully small.

He personally picked the commanders—in most cases jumping them over the heads of less able officers. Eisenhower, his chief choice, is his devoted junior. The two are so close it is impossible to separate the combat contributions of this perfect team. Bradley, Patton, Hodges, Patch all were picked and trained by him.

He gave the Army Air Forces its freedom and its growth and insisted that General Arnold be a member of the Chiefs of Staff.

In the Battle of Belgium and the Battle of Germany, into which the Battle of France is now so rapidly merging, we may rejoice that Marshall is the dominant military mind. If it is humanly possible to maintain the unprecedented speed by which the Allies have riddled the German Armies, he will do it. He, more than anyone, knows how much more expensive it will be in time and in Allied sacrifice if the enemy is given even a brief breather in which to re-form and stabilize a defense line.

For the first time the Germans are running. Keep them running!

Some Facts on the Table Mountain Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the flood-control bill, H. R. 4485, which some time ago passed this House, was recently voted upon favorably by the Senate Committee on Commerce and is now pending for consideration in the Senate. One of the controversial items in the bill is the Table Mountain Dam, which is located in my district in California. I wish to present some factual matters in regard to that project, discuss the objections to the dam, and the alternatives which have been proposed to it.

LOCATION, SIZE, AND LIMITATIONS ON DAM

The proposed Table Mountain Dam is on the Sacramento River approximately 5 miles south of the Tehama-Shasta County line. It is to be approximately 170 feet maximum height. The present bill specifically limits the dam to the low-level structure, not to be built above the 400-foot elevation above mean sea level and on a foundation sufficient for such dam and not on a foundation for future

construction of a higher dam. This language was put in the bill at my suggestion at the request of the Shasta County Table Mountain committee to foreclose the possibility of present or future building of a high dam which would flood much greater areas in Shasta County.

AREA FLOODED AND PROTECTED BY PROPOSED DAM

The low-level dam will flood 18,500 acres—10,900 acres of this is in Tehama County, which is not protesting the dam; 7,600 acres are in Shasta County, where there is vigorous opposition; 2,200 acres of the land in Shasta County is irrigated. The rest is dry farm or dry pasture. The total acreage below the dam to be protected by it is 150,000 acres. In addition, the dam is the key project of the Army engineers in the entire flood-control plan comprising a total of seven dams protecting one and one-half million acres of the most fertile land in the Sacramento Valley. There will be no towns or communities flooded, and the waters from the dam do not come within 7 miles of the city of Redding, the county seat of Shasta County.

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS TO THE DAM

The objections to the dam have centered around four primary points:

First. That the building of the dam will excessively damage Shasta County.

Second. That the building of the dam should be deferred until the feasibility of building tributary dams as an alternative is fully investigated.

Third. That the building of the low level dam will preempt the site for a future high level dam to be built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Fourth. That the building of the low-level dam will effectively eliminate the salmon industry.

I will discuss each one of these objections in order.

WILL THE DAM EXCESSIVELY DAMAGE SHASTA COUNTY

Less than 50 percent of the total flooding back of the dam is in Shasta County—7,600 acres—compared to 10,900 acres in Tehama County. Of this less than a third—2,200 acres is irrigated lands—the balance being dry farm, dry pasture, or river channels. Neither Cottonwood nor Anderson will be flooded, nor any other community, and the water will not back within 7 miles of the city of Redding. There has been much loose talk about the water backing into the city of Redding, and this proposed dam utterly ruining Shasta County.

The above figures give the facts. Tehama County is not even complaining about losing nearly 11,000 acres; why should the loss of 7,600 totally ruin Shasta County? It represents only a small part of the total area and the total wealth of the county. Admittedly, the dam will do some damage. But, it will protect 150,000 acres. If one group because it is to be damaged to some extent can stop a project which will be an overall benefit, then no flood-control project could proceed. The Shasta Dam would not have been built, nor any of the others which are giving vast benefits to the people in this country. The question as to whether or not damage is excessive depends upon the need and the benefit to accrue, and that question has to be answered in the national interest.

THE TRIBUTARY DAM PROPOSAL

It has been generally admitted that flood control on the Sacramento River is necessary. But it has been argued that flood control can be accomplished by a method less damaging to Shasta County by dams on the tributaries. If such is feasible it should be done. But the Army engineers investigated the proposed tributary dams, and state they are not feasible—that they would cost a minimum of $90,000,000. This is $64,000,000 more than the proposed Table Mountain Dam. The Shasta County engineer estimates that the tributary dams for flood control only can be built for $40,000,000. That is $14,000,000 more than the cost of the Table Mountain Dam. In other words, even on the lowest figure the taxpayers would be paying $14,000,000 to save the 2,200 acres of irrigated land in Shasta County. In addition the tributary reservoirs, built almost entirely in Shasta County, would flood more land in Shasta County than the Table Mountain Dam and some of it good land, even though in total it might not be as valuable.

The Bureau of Reclamation has made some investigation of the tributary proposal and has stated that it is physically feasible. It is physically feasible to build a dam across the Golden Gate. The question is whether or not the cost can be justified. And the Bureau, in all these months, has never come forward with a proposal to build the tributaries and has never made any statement of their cost or their economic feasibility. The Bureau has never mentioned the tributary-dam proposal in any of their studies filed on post-war planning, not even mentioned it as under study. The Bureau proposal to build a dam at Table Mountain has, however, been mentioned in such studies time and again. And one of the objections made by the Bureau to the dam proposed by the Army engineers is that it will take their site for a dam at Table Mountain.

In summary, the tributary proposal has been rejected by the Army engineers as too costly; the Bureau of Reclamation has taken no definite action on it; and it has no sponsors whatever, save those in Shasta County, opposing the Table Mountain dam.

WILL THE LOW DAM PREEMPT THE SITE FOR A HIGH DAM?

This brings me to the objection to the Table Mountain Dam, mentioned by Mr. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, in his testimony before the Senate committee hearing the flood-control bill, that the Army taking this site will preempt a site long in the plans of the Bureau for a high dam at Table Mountain. Surely those protesting the low-level dam can find little comfort in this argument, and I can agree with them because I have always opposed a high dam. However, the Army engineers have stated that they do not believe that the site at Table Mountain will sustain a high dam. Such being the case, the Bureau and those advocating a high-level dam for the generating of power are being deprived of nothing in the Army taking the site for a flood-control project.

WILL THE SALMON INDUSTRY BE ELIMINATED?

The fourth and last point raised against the dam is that it will destroy the salmon breeding grounds which are the basis of a million-dollar fish industry. No counties in my district are interested in this industry so far as I know, but the question raised does bear upon the overall merit of the project. Some sporting organizations, the California Fish and Game Commission and the Fish and Wildlife Service, have questioned the possibility of saving the salmon. They do not know that it cannot be done; they think it is in serious doubt. The Army engineers, in conjunction with the Fish and Wildlife Service, are now making studies to handle the problem. The Army engineers claim that it is being successfully handled at other larger dams where the same problem existed. The Director of Natural Resources of the State of California has said that the problem can and will be taken care of. The entire salmon industry does not depend upon the few spawning grounds above the proposed site of this dam and below the Shasta Dam. And the record is conspicuously lacking in any showing of great alarm on the part of the million-dollar industry which supposedly would be ruined.

THE IRON CANYON SITE AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE TABLE MOUNTAIN SITE

The Army engineers are currently studying the possibility of the substitution of a dam at the Iron Canyon site for the proposed Table Mountain site. The Iron Canyon site is several miles farther down the river. If the dam is built at Iron Canyon it will reduce the total acreage flooded in Shasta County from 7,600 acres to 3,650 acres—over 50 percent; it will reduce the irrigated acreage flooded in Shasta County from 2,220 acres to 830 acres—almost two-thirds; and it will reduce the dry farm land flooded in Shasta County from 1,280 to 300 acres—over 75 percent. In Tehama County the irrigated acreage flooded by the two dams would be the same—1,000 acres each; the dry farming land flooded would be reduced from 3,400 acres to 340 acres—a 90-percent reduction; the dry pasture and channels land flooded would be increased 6,500 to 11,010—almost 70 percent. However, the total values involved would probably be less. The total acreage flooded in Tehama County would be increased 10,900 to 12,350.

Whether or not the Iron Canyon site is finally selected will depend among other things upon the comparative merit of the foundation with that of Table Mountain, and the local sentiment as to which site would more nearly conform to local wishes. The report of the Army engineers on the Iron Canyon site was submitted to the Shasta County Table Mountain Committee for their consideration and comment but to date they have given no expression on it one way or the other. Objection has been received from some of the farmers in the Cottonwood-Anderson irrigation district, who

claim that the Iron Canyon project is not as desirable because it will not flood as much of the district as the Table Mountain project. They contend that the Table Mountain project is an answer to their water-shortage problem as it will eliminate excess lands, leaving those remaining with adequate water.

ALL CALIFORNIA FLOOD CONTROL GROUPS FAVOR TABLE MOUNTAIN DAM

The Table Mountain Dam was under consideration over 30 years ago. It was considered as a site for the present Shasta Dam. The merits and demerits of the project have been debated all those years. Since the Army announced their program for the Sacramento River the matter has been fully discussed before the California State Board of Reclamation, charged with the responsibility of flood control in California, the Committee on Water Problems of the California State Legislature, and the Flood Committee of the California State Chamber of Commerce and the Directors of the California State Chamber of Commerce. Each and all of these agencies after full hearing on the Table Mountain project have gone on record approving the program of the Army engineers. The Director of Natural Resources of the State has publicly supported the project. None has found in favor of the tributary proposal or even recommended that the authorization of the project be deferred for further investigation of that proposal. They have been equally unimpressed by the other arguments against the dam.

IN CONCLUSION

First. The dam would flood 7,600 acres of land in Shasta County of which 2,200 acres is irrigated land; the dam would protect 150,000 acres. Many of the landowners in the area to be flooded have expressed themselves as not opposed to the building of the dam.

Second. It is generally admitted that flood control is necessary and no better feasible method has been proposed. The tributary dam proposal is totally lacking in engineering support.

Third. In hearing after hearing before Federal and State agencies the arguments against the dam have been fully presented and the decisions have been unanimously for the project.

Fourth. The authorization of the project will permit it to be built at either the Table Mountain or Iron Cayon site; if both sites are feasible the dam should and will be built at the one most agreeable to the local people.

Tributes to Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials relating to the public services of the Honorable James A. Farley.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hawkeye-Gazette, Burlington, Iowa, of June 13, 1944]

STILL A STRONG MAN

Big, good-natured Jim Farley has resigned as chairman of New York's State Democratic committee, but don't get the idea for a minute that Jim Farley is out of politics or that his day of influence has come to the setting of its sun.

Farley is a realist. He is a rugged individualist. He has political character, plus a political sagacity that is almost supernatural. Through personal friendship, politics, business, and religion Farley has a tremendous following, and it will remain loyally admiring until his dying day.

He has an uncanny memory. Once when we ran into him in a hotel lobby in New York and when introduced as hailing from Burlington, he beamed, and boomed, "How's my friend, Ray Baxter?" It is said Farley knows more people intimately and can call more names than any other citizen.

Farley, more than any other man, is responsible for the political success of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He started F. D. R. on the road to the Presidency. He stuck with him through thick and thin, until his stomach rebelled against much of the New Deal trickery and sham.

When he stepped out of the President's Cabinet gracefully and without any publicly expressed hard feelings, he also retired as national Democratic chairman. Then enemies within the Roosevelt ranks attempted to purge him as chairman of the New York State committee. It was a tender spot—a blow below the belt. Farley wouldn't stand for it, and he triumphed in the show-down.

Farley was opposed to a third term for the President, but remained loyal to him. He still is loyal to Roosevelt through friendship's sake, but he cannot subscribe to a fourth term. Unquestionably he is getting out of the New York chairmanship now ahead of the national convention in order to make it easy for the Roosevelt crowd and to leave him a free agent.

We don't believe Farley will ever desert the Democratic Party as such. He loves it passionately * * * the old rugged Democratic Party before it began to turn pink. He owes it much, and it owes him more. But Jim Farley won't give Franklin D. Roosevelt more than lip service as a personal friend, in a fourth-term campaign, and it wouldn't surprise us if he becomes quite outspoken on the subject.

Farley is a man of convictions, and has the courage to express them and to stand by them * * * win, lose, or draw.

[From the Pawtucket (R. I.) Times of June 12, 1944]

MR. FARLEY STEPS DOWN

In appraising the work of James A. Farley, politician, it is not necessary that one should speak either as a critic or as an admirer. Rather, the correct approach would be, we think, that of the onlooker at life, the recorder of an event or a series of events. Great affairs have been brought forward in American political life in the past two decades, and James A. Farley has been a part of them. He is a man, then, not yet to be appraised but to be reported.

Yet, now that he has given up his office of chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, one finds it difficult to look at his work objectively. We have said here that it is not necessary to speak either as a critic or an admirer in discussing him. But actually it is hard to escape both attitudes. And when you come down to cases you must admit that, regarding Mr. Farley, you are more likely to admire than to criticize.

If you are a Democrat, you find more Republicans admiring him than any other Democrat; the same is true if you are a Republican. You can remember party associates saying frequently and fervently, "What we need is a Farley." Verily this man has built up a host of friends among those who do not believe in his political philosophy.

Whether he is retiring from politics we do not know. He is a man who speaks and writes freely, yet he knows how to keep his own counsel. But it must be difficult for him to keep out of politics. We think we can see lonesome days ahead for him. He has attached himself to a great private business, and perhaps it may be thought that anyone in business in these days has enough to do. We hope he finds it as stimulating, as much a part of himself, as the political life has been.

And we are informed by the New York Times that he has been a political chairman 26 years, a long time. He presided over the Democratic organization in his county of Rockland before he became a national leader as chairman of New York State committee and the national committee. And of him the Times also says:

"He has done an immense amount of drudgery. He has managed effectively a great Government department. Now, in a letter full of characteristic kindness for his fellow-workers, he becomes free at last to earn the competence which his great ability, exclusively exerted, would have won him long ago.

"A political chairman usually becomes something of a mythological figure. To his opponents his words and his works are evil. Mr. Farley did not entirely escape the demonologists, but the sinister myth could not stick long to a personage so incorrigibly honest, friendly, and straightforward. Even the straightest-laced objectors to his code of sticking to his party through thick and thin had to make him an exception. Both politicians and the public have been impressed by his character."

It is worth while to work hard, and to take the bumps that a man in politics gets, to win such tributes from a great newspaper. We expect, of course, to hear more from Mr. Farley whether he steps entirely out of political life or not. It has been a pleasure to record his comings and goings through the years.

Army Delivers C. I. O. Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am attaching part of a column written by Bill Cunningham and published in the Boston Herald recently. Mr. Cunningham is a responsible newspaperman. In the first paragraph of his column he states that he has the name of the officer who provided the information to which he refers and that he is at liberty to use the man's name if, by so doing, it would serve some useful purpose.

I call this incident to the attention of the House Military Affairs Committee and

urge that that committee investigate the facts disclosed. If the story is true, I agree with Bill Cunningham when he says that courts martial should be in order for all concerned. If the story is not true, that fact should be made available to the public, in all fairness to the C. I. O.

The article follows:

"But," then he writes, "here's one for Ripley. The other day a United States Army amphibious duck came alongside us and shoved aboard our ship a bundle of C. I. O. news publications called the Pilot. Laugh that one off. That's election year for you in the U. S. A. What's the idea? Is it 'Win the votes and to hell with the war?' Or has John L. Lewis et al. taken over entirely. We've had no mail for nearly 5 months over here. There's been but one mail delivery since we arrived, yet the C. I. O. seems to have no difficulty getting its literature over and in having it delivered to our boys and our ships, where men are not communistic, are not striking, are not indulging in slowing down the war effort, nor endorsing anybody for office, but are daily risking their necks and fighting like hell for all peoples, all parties, the U. S. A. and the world.

"This C. I. O. contribution is delivered by United States Army soldiers, in U. S. A. ducks, while ships lay out here actually waiting for ducks with which to get vitally needed supplies to the men fighting ashore. We need 'em to discharge the cargo so we can go back for more. But the United States Army can wait. Evidently the C. I. O. has a priority. It can get ducks to swing around distributing its house organ, when we can't get 'em to move food and munitions ashore.

"I could say plenty more, and will about that sort of thing when I get home, but I know it would be useless now because it would undoubtedly be censored to hell, but when I get home I intend to see whether free speech, like the ducks, is reserved for the C. I. O. and the politicians who know how to win votes regardless of how deceptive their words or their actions may be. I'm not alone in feeling as I do. There are plenty more of us over here who feel the same way and we intend to see that some of these affairs are brought out into the light for the American people to examine.

"We can't even get mail from home, yet time, money, and space is wasted by the delivery of C. I. O. literature to the invasion front in France by United States soldiers whose hours, energy, and equipment is supposed to be employed in winning the war. It simply doesn't add up and we're all plenty burned up about the situation."

There's more, but that's the report. As above, I haven't been honored with a perusal of The Pilot, and the gentleman offers no survey of its contents, although he refers to it in one place as "damned Communistic propaganda."

But the C. I. O. is definitely in the political business. It has called its shot in the open and it has publicly campaigned through the primaries. It publicly campaigned at Chicago. Its national action committee is endeavoring to lay a $1 levy upon every C. I. O. member for a fourth term campaign fund. It has publicly endorsed the fourth term and is universally considered a new holding company for the New Deal-leftist division.

Any C. I. O. publication is naturally suspect, but even if it were as sweet and free from guile as a Sunday school weekly, what the hell is it doing taking priority over invasion beach cargoes, and being distributed by United States Army soldiers? Congress should see if the charges in this letter are true, and if they are, courts martial should be in order for all concerned, including the C. I. O.

Post-War Highway Legislation Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there are two highway bills—S. 2105 and H. R. 4915—before the Congress for its consideration. These bills call for a post-war highway construction program which, in view of impending events, we should consider immediately.

The development of our roads by the States in conjunction with the Federal Government was stopped after our entry into the war except for those projects necessary to the war effort. This has meant that our highways have had to carry wartime loads under conditions that made proper maintenance impossible. Because of the rapid deterioration of our roads due to these conditions, there is a real need for replacements and reconstruction.

The furthering of this program will also create employment in the post-war period for men returning from the service as well as for civilians now engaged in war industry and will eliminate the need for setting up public works projects of an artificial nature. It is also necessary to consider now because the highway departments of the States cannot properly proceed with post-war highway plans until such time that post-war Federal-aid highway legislation has been enacted by the Congress.

Federal highway aid has in the past been allocated on the basis of one-third area, one-third population, and one-third post-road mileage. This policy should, I believe, be continued. States like Montana, with a large area and great mileages of road, have generally spent their automotive taxes so as to get the most roads from their limited tax revenues. In considering post-war highway construction and development we should keep in mind the fact that more than 30 percent of the people of the Nation live in rural communities of less than 2,500 population, and that there are 54,000 communities in the United States that are dependent solely upon automotive transportation for the movement of goods and persons.

The need for haste is emphasized by the fact that any program which may be passed by the Congress must be approved by the various State legislatures. Forty-five of these legislatures meet next January and many of them will not meet in regular session for another 2 years. Time, as can be seen, is running against the States because blueprinting of post-war road construction projects cannot go forward and improvement programs cannot be formulated until we determine what our Federal-aid policy shall be. It will also take about a year to perform the necessary engineering and legal work after Congress has acted.

Mr. Speaker, during the reconversion period that lies ahead, there will be millions of men who cannot be absorbed by private industry. Therefore, to fill a pressing need and to cushion the shock of transition from a war to a peacetime economy, it is imperative that this program be undertaken at once so that men can be put to work on sound projects thereby furnishing necessary employment and, at the same time, giving to our highway systems the necessary repairs, replacements, and new roads needed. We should consider this legislation and pass on it before we recess. We cannot afford delay.

Issues in the November Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio broadcast delivered by Gov. Andrew Schoeppel of Kansas on Friday night, September 1, over a coast-to-coast hook-up, sponsored by the Republican National Committee.

While I have the floor, I wish to call attention to one or two of the statements made by Governor Schoeppel, which I believe to be worthy of special consideration.

This political campaign, Governor Schoeppel predicted, will be a fighting campaign because the issues are fighting issues.

The thing that is at stake next November—

Said Governor Schoeppel—

is your freedom and my freedom; it is whether your children and mine will be their own masters in a Nation where heretofore the people have been the masters, or whether a vast all-powerful, super-government will order their lives, possess their minds, and dominate their spirits.

After referring to the rising power of pressure groups backing bureaucracy, Governor Schoeppel charged:

The New Deal administration has been attempting to curry favor with these groups. The most despicable, graft-ridden gang of political thugs is welcomed with wide-open arms if they can deliver a block of votes. We now have a national administration which has aligned itself with every corrupt political machine in the country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are beginning a national political campaign. In such a campaign we believe plain facts should be stated and understood. In my small part this evening, I want to talk just as frankly and just as plainly as I know how.

This campaign will be a fighting campaign because the issues are fighting issues. They are not partisan issues between Republicans and Democrats. They are deep-down American issues.

FREEDOM AT STAKE

The thing that is at stake next November is your freedom and my freedom; it is whether your children and mine will be their own masters in a Nation where heretofore the people have been the masters, or whether a vast all-powerful, supergovernment will order their lives, possess their minds and dominate their spirits. That is a stake well worth fighting for.

We who are interested in the Republican cause propose to fight for it and to fight as hard as we know how. The American people in order to intelligently decide issues in our democracy must have the facts. We want to give those facts, and give them straight from the shoulder.

For the past 12 years we have witnessed in this country the building up of a tremendous Federal bureaucracy. This has gone on to such an extent that we are now largely governed by boards and bureaus and directors and coordinators. To the extent that this is actually necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, we all gladly submit to it. But to the extent that it is unnecessary for that one great purpose, we object to it with all of the strength and vigor at our command.

NOT PARTISAN ISSUE

I said this wasn't a partisan issue. All true Democrats know what the stake in this election is. We are indebted to them for warning us long ago. Senator BYRD, of Virginia, warned us. So did Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, and Congressman HATTON SUMNERS, of Texas. They have made it clear that the issue in this year's campaign is the preservation of America's free institutions and the freedom of American men and women.

This issue arises because for the past 12 years there has been allowed to grow up in this country small groups of ambitious men who have organized themselves into pressure groups, as we have come to call them. The New Deal administration has been attempting to curry favor with these groups. The most despicable, graft-ridden gang of political thugs is welcomed with wide-open arms if they can deliver a block of votes. We now have a national administration which has aligned itself with every corrupt political machine in the country.

At this particular time we have a new pressure group which looms large on the New Deal political horizon and seems to be all-powerful in its councils. This group to which I now refer is called the Political Action Committee.

It has as its head Sidney Hillman. It takes its doctrines direct from Earl Browder. This Earl Browder-Sidney Hillman Political Action Committee is not democratic. It is made in the image of nothing that is American.

Why is this Browder-Hillman Political Action Committee promoting the fourth term? The answer is plain and obvious. They want a fourth-term administration because they want a government in Washington that they can use.

They want a government in Washington that is indebted to them up to the ears. And they expect to collect on that debt.

UNDER FALSE BANNER

To me the most alarming thing about all of this is the fact that this Browder-Hillman-Communist axis is attempting to parade under the banner of labor. It is not labor. Let me prove it to you.

Here is the voice of the 1,200,000 members of the railroad brotherhoods, which says in their own official newspaper, and I quote: "What concerns us is Mr. Hillman's proposal to raise slush funds to carry the coming election. Coupled with Mr. Hillman's own alliance with the Communists in New York State and elsewhere, we have a situation which is full of ominous possibilities for the entire labor movement."

Remember, this is not a Republican speaking; it is not a Democrat. That is the voice of labor.

Let me further quote from Philip Pearl in the Weekly News Service of the American Federation of Labor:

HARMFUL TO LABOR

"People have the right to know," he emphasizes, "people have the right to know the strongest antilabor movement in America today. It is the Political Action Committee. * * * We are convinced that Mr. Hillman's political gamble will not only prove a fearful boomerang for the C. I. O., but that it will do lasting harm to the cause of the entire labor movement in America."

Those interested in the Republican campaign propose to fight government by pressure groups. Government of the people must be by the people and their elected and duly authorized representatives. And most important of all, it must be a government for the people rather than a government for the benefit of any group or any class or any clique.

Sanctuary for Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Must Give Jews Sanctuary," written by Harry H. Schlacht and published in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of September 3, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST GIVE JEWS SANCTUARY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

America must act now.

The beasts of Nazi Germany are pledged to slaughter every remaining Jew in Hitler-held Europe.

Millions of Jews already have fallen, consumed by fire and sword.

They are dying daily of starvation and of barbarous executions.

Tens of thousands of innocent people—children, infants and sucklings, old men and women, cry out to America:

"Save us!"

The Hearst newspapers appeal to the conscience of the civilized nations to give the Jews of oppressed Europe sanctuary.

They seek to arouse a storm of public indignation against the horrors of this persecuted race.

They call upon the United Nations to rescue them from their torture.

Like the shot fired at Lexington, our militant appeal will re-echo 'round the world.

Our voice will be heard.

Our words will be forged into thunderbolts to be hurled into the teeth of tyrants.

Upon what this Nation does will determine the destiny of these long-suffering people.

The mighty power of America, which a beneficent God has given us, we hold in stewardship for all mankind.

She is the land of the crusader, who wills to do right because, before God, it is right.

Let us show the world that the heart of America is kindly and human as its sword is invincible and mighty.

There have been programs in history.

But never before has the cold, organized destruction of defenseless human beings been established as a fixed official policy to be carried out ruthlessly by agents under government orders.

It is the blackest crime in the annals of recorded time. Christendom has spoken in England.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has called upon civilized mankind to act at once.

Hear his stirring words:

"We urge the government of the United Kingdom to give a lead to the world by declaring its readiness, in consultation with the governments of united and neutral nations, in finding immediate refuge in territories within the British Empire and elsewhere for all persons threatened with massacre who can escape from Axis lands or for those who have already escaped to neighboring neutral countries."

The American tradition of justice and humanity dictates that every possible means be used to save the last remnants of the Jewish race.

Let us open the doors of Palestine to these refugees, a land given to them, under oath and covenant, by the Lord as an eternal heritage.

Let us persuade the neutral countries to permit them to seek temporary security within their borders.

They have stood as a symbol of right through the centuries.

It was born of sorrow.

It was kindled in the fires of inquisition.

It comes from the poetry of their prayer books.

If we allow these people of the Bible to perish, it will be an eternal blot of shame on the shield of mankind.

Theirs is a challenge to the moral sense of civilization.

Let us beseech almighty God for His helping hand,
To rescue those in ravaged lands.
Let us raise our anguished cry,
As tortured thousands daily die,
And the souls of helpless people suffocate
Within the walls of hate.

A Way To Solve Problems in the Missouri Valley—Valley Authority Can Do It, But Is Not Necessary—Suggestions on Protection of Western Water Rights, Coordination of Plans, and Joint Authorization of Both Army Engineers and Reclamation Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, in many quarters there is a growing tendency for people to throw up their hands when a problem confronts them and say, "Oh, let us have a committee investigate that,"

or "Oh, let us create a new commission to do that," or "Oh, let us have a study made." This tendency, Mr. Speaker, expresses itself now with regard to the flood and related water problems of the Missouri Valley by the proposal to create an authority into whose lap the entire matter can be tossed.

I do think that a Missouri Valley Authority, properly constituted, could set up and operate an interrelated program of flood control, irrigation, power development, navigation, soil conservation, wild-life control, and so forth. I do not, however, think that such an authority is necessary. I do not, in fact, think that additional studies, surveys, and bureaus or commissions are necessary.

TWO PLANS HELP EACH OTHER

The Army engineers, for their part, have proposed a logical and well-considered plan of flood control that embraces some multiple-purpose reservoirs that will serve all other interests. The Bureau of Reclamation, for their part, have proposed a well-considered plan of irrigation and power utilization that admirably complements and supplements the works proposed by the engineers.

The Soil Conservation Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the State services in the several States can continue to operate in the valley under their plans as they now do. There is no need for a valley authority to go into their fields.

There are pending in the United States Senate two bills, H. R. 3691, the rivers and harbors bill, and H. R. 4485, the flood-control bill, which offer a complete opportunity for integration of these plans and initiation of them as among the first of the post-war construction work programs.

These bills have already passed the House, and when action on them is completed, draftsmen can start immediately upon designs and specifications for the initial structures. Money available to the Army engineers for plans and designs, provided in the civil functions bill approved last June, was specifically made available for work on projects thereafter as well as previously authorized.

In other words, if action had been completed on these bills in July, engineers would be drawing the plans for the first works today.

On the other hand, the proposals for a valley authority suggest a 2-year period for additional surveys and studies and reports and coordination; two years. In the last 2 years, floods in the Missouri Valley have caused direct dollar damage in the amount of $114,000,000. Why take a chance on doing that again? Why not, instead, get started on the remedial measures and apply the cost of the damages to prevention? Why wait 2 years more to get under way?

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that delay plays into the hands of people who are opposed to doing anything. That is what I feared last winter and why I urged the Bureau of the Budget to recommend authorization for the features that the two plans, Army engineers and reclamation, had in common, leaving controversial features to be settled when we reached them.

AN INTERSTATE, A NATIONAL PROBLEM

People who are acquainted with the Missouri Valley flood problems, Mr. Speaker, cannot be content to do nothing. They know that the floods cost far more than it will to prevent them. They know, also, that control of the longest river system in the country is essentially an interstate, a national problem. The interstate character of the Missouri River floods was graphically portrayed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] on the floor of this House, last spring, when he said:

> The Missouri River is establishing a new channel at its mouth. The confluence of these two great rivers is being moved 26 miles upstream. A new river is being opened through what was a short time ago inland fields. Through this new avenue water is rushing at the rate of 17 miles per hour. It has engulfed whole sections of the M. K. & T. Railroad and the Burlington Railroad. It has obliterated interstate highways. It has broken the pipe line which runs from Texas to New York, which has been carrying the oil without which the New England States would have endured the greatest privation. It is sweeping away the cables carrying electric current from the Keokuk Dam to metropolitan St. Louis, and steel towers supporting the transmission lines are at the bottom of the river. It has resisted all efforts to curb the current and hold the levees and railroad embankments and railway cars loaded with rock for revetment have been undermined and rolled into the river. It has destroyed light, telephone communications, and sanitary systems. So rapid has been the rise of the waters that it has been necessary to organize relief to rescue marooned families from farm homes. The loss to agricultural production is incalculable. Growing fields, livestock, machinery, fences, houses, barns, and equipment have been swept away overnight and cannot be replaced in time to produce a crop without Federal assistance in the form of both loans, grants, and priorities.

DROUGHTS AS WELL AS FLOODS

The interstate character of the droughts that have afflicted upper portions of the Missouri Valley is well stated in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation, published as Senate Document 191 of this Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. On pages 98 and 99 the story of Ward County, N. Dak., is given. In the single year from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939, expenditures for relief and charity amounted to $154,715.43. That in a single county, Mr. Speaker, and 87.5 percent of the amount came from the State and Federal Governments.

In that crop year of 1938, Ward County wheat averaged 5.9 bushels per acre and potatoes 52 bushels. But in 1941, with abundant rain, Ward County lands averaged 20.7 bushels of wheat and 92 bushels of potatoes. If the flood waters on the Missouri that cause the havoc in the lower valley were held back and put on the lands of the upper valley in the dry years, the damage would be prevented downstream and the relief loads would not occur upstream.

So, this is an interstate problem; it is a Federal problem. And that is why a valley authority will be accepted by the people of the valley if there is no other way to get results—but why wait?

Why create another board or bureau or authority? Why commission some new agency to start all over with surveys and studies? Why give to some agency that is not responsible to the people, independent of Congress, the authority to take over and run affairs in the valley when a solution has already been presented by the two experienced agencies already in the field—the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers?

AGENCIES ARE TOGETHER

Presumably the answer is that these two agencies have not presented a joint report. Mr. Speaker, these two agencies or their representatives, in meeting after meeting, in hearing after hearing, have expressed their common points of view. All that is needed is to take their repeated statements and embody them in the legislation now pending.

Under the restrictions of existing statutes, the Army engineers may not make reviews of or supplements to reports that have been submitted to the Congress unless they are requested to make a review report or there is further legislation thereon. But the engineers, in response to questions at hearings and in response to letters by Members of Congress have clearly indicated the points of coordination.

And similarly, so have representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Recently the Missouri River States Committee, composed of the Governors and two representatives of the nine States in the Missouri Valley, met at Omaha and adopted resolutions asking the Congress and the President to call for a written coordination of the reports by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation and then to pass a joint authorization for the coordinated program.

As one who attended that meeting as one of the representatives of the State of South Dakota, I have endeavored, Mr. Speaker, to work out a way for those resolutions to be carried out. From my knowledge of the general subject and from what I have heard at various meetings and hearings and from participation in the debates of the House on this subject, it seems to me that this coordination and joint authorization calls for three things:

First. A satisfactory reservation or guarantee of water for irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses in the semiarid portions of the West.

Second. Technical coordination of the physical features of the two plans, Army engineers and reclamation.

Third. Amendment of the pending bills to authorize both programs as thus coordinated in order to produce the comprehensive plan for complete development.

Consequently, believing that these bills should be passed now in order to permit plans to be drawn so that this work in the Missouri Valley can be ready for the soldiers when they return from Europe and the benefits for flood control, irrigation, and other purposes be realized at the earliest date possible, I have ventured to prepare suggestions to carry

out the Omaha resolutions under these three heads.

AMENDMENTS NEEDED

I. PROTECTION TO IRRIGATION

The following language is suggested as embodying the full protection sought by paragraph (c) of the so-called O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, while at the same time avoiding the interpretive fears expressed by the Army engineers for controversies on consequential damages with injunction suits and other litigation.

The language gives an absolute, unqualified protection to irrigation, and yet is in line with the thought expressed by General Reber at the Omaha meeting. Here is the suggestion:

Projects herein or hereafter authorized with benefits to navigation shall not be construed as limiting or preventing the right of anyone to use waters west of the ninety-seventh meridian for beneficial consumptive purposes including irrigation and mining and the satisfying of domestic, municipal, and livestock needs.

The proper place for such a statement of policy, it seems to me, would be to incorporate it in the sections of both H. R. 3691—rivers and harbors—and H. R. 4485—flood control—that set forth the authorization for irrigation projects in connection with dams or reservoirs built by the Army engineers. Personally, I think it might be well to replace the last two sentences in those sections as reported to the Senate. To accomplish this in the flood-control bill, the amendment would be on page 6, line 21, to strike out the balance of the paragraph after the period, and insert the suggested language.

II. COORDINATION OF REPORTS

Study of the separate reports, Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers, and hearing of a great deal of testimony at committee meetings and other gatherings suggests that the actual coordination of the two reports needs only to cover five matters. The balance of the coordination is already done by the common recommendations of the two reports.

It is suggested, therefore, that the Senate Commerce or Irrigation Committees could call upon the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers for a joint statement upon these five points, same to be received by the Senate and printed as a Senate document for legislative reference and identification. In the absence of such an identification, the coordination can be placed in the bill by adding provisos to the authorization paragraph in the flood-control bill.

The coordination of the two programs, Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, will be accomplished by any such legislative device that incorporates in the authorization, an agreement that—

First. The Gavins Point and Randalls Island Reservoirs are to be constructed on the main stem of the Missouri River as proposed by the Chief of Engineers rather than the Randalls Island and Big Bend combination as proposed by the Commissioner of Reclamation.

Second. The Oahe Reservoir is to be built to a pool elevation of 1,620 feet as proposed by the Commissioner of Reclamation if the Chief of Engineers finds that to be structurally sound and feasible and is to be designed for multiple-purpose uses, including power and irrigation as well as flood control and navigation.

Third. The Garrison Dam and Reservoir shall be designed and built for the same multiple-purpose uses as Oahe, but shall not be designed or built to a height that will, in operation, back waters above the 1,837-foot elevation level, the purpose being to avoid injury to existing or potential irrigation projects above or in the vicinity of Williston, N. Dak.

Fourth. Upon completion of the first major reservoir between Fort Peck and Sioux City, the waters of Fort Peck Reservoir shall be made available for irrigation.

Fifth. The Bureau of Reclamation will select the sites, design, construct, and operate all dams built on tributaries of the Missouri River primarily for irrigation purposes, and will consult with the Chief of Engineers on flood-control features thereof; the Army engineers will design, construct, and operate any dams built primarily for flood-control but will consult with the Bureau of Reclamation for coordination of their location and design with existing or potential irrigation projects.

All other variations in the two programs are fully covered by the recommendations under which the two reports have been submitted to the Congress and would be law under the language of the authorization paragraphs.

III. ENACTMENT OF JOINT AUTHORIZATIONS

The following amendments if added to the bills pending in the Senate, will, it is believed, give effect to the coordination and accomplish the request of the Missouri River States Committee for an authorization of all three programs—flood control, irrigation, navigation:

FLOOD CONTROL AND IRRIGATION

Amend H. R. 4485, on page 20, line 12, by inserting after the words "substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session" the following:

And the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as coordinated by their joint statements in Senate Document No. ——, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session,

And in lieu of the words "and as thus expanded is approved" say "and as thus expanded and coordinated is approved."

And on the same page, in line 15, after "$200,000,000", insert "of which one-half is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of War and one-half is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior."

Which goes on to read "for the practical accomplishment", and so forth.

RIVERS AND HARBORS—NAVIGATION

Amend H. R. 3961 by substituting for the present paragraph on the Missouri River the following:

Missouri River: Waters in the existing Fort Peck reservoir heretofore constructed for navigation, power, and incidental purposes under the act of May 18, 1938, shall be available for the needs of irrigation upon the completion of a major reservoir between Fort Peck and Sioux City with storage equal to that of Fort Peck needed for irrigation. The Garrison reservoir, recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 475, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is hereby authorized to be constructed and the necessary appropriations are authorized to be made. The existing project between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth of the river is hereby modified to include such additional bank revetments, construction works, cut-offs, removal of snags, and dredging as the Chief of Engineers may deem necessary to provide such navigable depths in excess of 6 feet as may be practicable with the flows which may from time to time be available.

Placing of the authorization for the Garrison reservoir in the rivers and harbors bill, it may be noted, Mr. Speaker, is proper since it will serve as a replacement for Fort Peck which is being released from navigation to irrigation. This is the proper place since all items, release of Fort Peck, creation of substitution storage, and the authorization for clearing the channel below Sioux City are essentially navigation items. This transfer of the budgetary charge for the Garrison Dam from flood control to river-and-harbor funds is equitable for the reasons just stated, and avoids impairing the flood-control authorization provided by the House bill now to be shared with the Bureau of Reclamation under the amendments proposed.

These suggestions are offered, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that they may be helpful in working out what has been one of the major legislative burdens of this Congress. They are not proposed as the only way to accomplish the end desired; they are proposed to show that there is a way to accomplish it, now.

The Pope on Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the permission to extend my remarks, I include therein a splendid editorial, well considered and well written, entitled "The Pope on Peace," appearing in the Washington Star of September 3, 1944:

THE POPE ON PEACE

With more than a little solemn fervor, Pope Pius has now raised his voice in support of all those who are laboring today—at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and elsewhere—for a just and lasting peace. In an address marking the end of the fifth year of the war, he has spoken movingly of the "terrible disaster, both spiritual and material," which humanity has suffered and of the impelling need to guard against a repetition of it.

"An old world lies in ruins," says the Pope, a world "shattered in its foundations and torn apart," and if the craving of peoples everywhere is to be satisfied, a new world

must be built, "a healthier world, better directed, and legally more in harmony with the needs of human nature"—a world, above all, in which the nations will work well enough together to bind up the wounds of mankind "quickly and lastingly" and to prevent a recurrence of anything like the past 5 years.

To this end, Pope Pius unequivocally declares himself in favor of international organizations, "avoiding the omissions and deficiencies of the past," to preserve the peace "in accordance with the principles of justice and equity," not hesitating to use the sword—if necessary and if juridically and morally proper to do so—"to safeguard the observance of rightful obligations and prevent a temptation to conflict." In other words, the world needs a collective security system with teeth in it, one equipped to stop any future Hitler in the first act of aggression.

The Pope, however, considers such an organization as only part of what is required if our international society is to have health in the future. Long before the war began he repeatedly warned that the world was basically sick, primarily because it had begun to travel far from the religious or Christian spirit. This century has been an intensely pragmatic and ultramaterialistic one, with much of society inclined to scoff at the metaphysical and to measure life in terms of hard cash or what pleases senses of the flesh—as if human beings, like cattle, were totally earthbound; as if it were all a myth about man being made in the image and likeness of God, and as if the sole function of life were to gratify one's self as much as possible until the grave opened and everything then ended in eternal negation.

From such a materialistic attitude it is but a few steps, in strict logic, to the kind of world inherent in the philosophy of the Nazis. It is not for nothing, then, that the Pope pleads for the Christian spirit as something indispensable to the success of the next peace. This applies not merely to whatever international collective security organization is set up but also to the political, social, and economic order within individual countries. Our society must get back to recognizing more fully "the moral laws written by the Lord in the hearts of men, natural law deriving from God, the fundamental rights and inviolable dignity of the individual."

Such terms may sound abstract and metaphysical, but what kind of civilization can we have if we ignore them? The truth is that everything decent in man's history up to now has been actuated by them. Christian principles are not things to be confined to Sunday church going. They constitute a practical, working philosophy for our everyday life. Without them it will avail us little to make elaborate plans for a better world tomorrow.

Aid and Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a resolution adopted at a meeting sponsored by the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, and held September 3, 1944, in Wilmington, Del.:

We, Americans of Polish descent, assembled at the Modjeska Hall, at Wilmington, Del., on Sunday afternoon, September 3, 1944, to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the treacherous attack on the Polish Nation by Germany, which started the total war.

Further, we, as Americans of Polish descent, upholding the American principles which stand for freedom, liberty, and independence for all nations throughout the world, also firmly stand by the Atlantic Charter, the four freedoms, and by the declarations of our President made so many times to the world, that this war is being fought for one purpose—the establishment of freedom and independence in all parts of the world.

Whereas 5 years ago on September 1, cloudless skies rained steel, devastation, and death upon Poland, for the Nazis unleached their hordes for conquest. Though unprepared for the attack, Poland resisted valiantly. Though disarmed within a month, terrorized, and subjected to unbelievable and fiendish tortures, Poland fought on—the only occupied country without a Quisling. For 5 long years within the borders of their motherland the Poles have been waging a desperate and relentless struggle, engaging in pitched battles, sabotage, and destruction of enemy war material, railroads, and military concentrations. Their secret courts have passed sentence and the underground fighters have sent hundreds of Nazi leaders to death. They have paid a terrible price for this activity during the 5 years of bondage. Hundreds of thousands of hostages were hanged or shot, and hundreds of villages and hamlets have met the fate of Lidice by being burned and plowed under in reprisal. The Polish underground army of 200,000, fully organized and diciplined fighters, has kept over 500,000 Nazi soldiers immobilized and about 60,000 Gestapo agents busy.

Whereas outside of Poland, in France and Italy, the Poles fight on as an organized and potential military force. In the invasion to liberate France, two armored divisions are now fighting alongside the Canadians and the British. In the campaign in Italy, 70,000 Poles, attached to the British Eighth Army, under the command of their own General Anders, are making great progress along the Adriatic shore, after covering themselves with glory at Cassino. The Polish Navy is also making history by taking part in invasions and sea patrolling, and in effective work against submarines and even battleships of the enemy. The Polish air force, composed of 14,000 men in 14 squadrons, is fourth in size among the United Nations, and Polish fliers have shot down 1,500 German planes. It has proved itself most able in the "Battle of Britain" and is continuing its great exploits over Germany and in the sky lanes over the battle fronts in France and Italy.

Whereas during the month of July, Soviet Russia daily made radio broadcasts appealing to the Polish underground to rise against the Germans, and when, on August 1, the Russian guns started bombardment of Warsaw 6 miles away, the Polish underground taking that as a signal, under the leadership of their General Bor, started a revolt against the German forces in Warsaw. To this day there are furiously fighting, holding their positions, appealing to the world for aid, as Russia on August 3, has stopped the bombardment and has not even sent one bomber to bombard the German positions in Warsaw. Shall Warsaw be denied adequate aid, it is difficult to understand why. We, therefore, implore our Government to grant as much lend-lease aid to General Bor and his underground army as is deemed necessary to carry on as effectively as possible their full collaboration with the United Nations to the end in order that complete victory might not only be assured but measurably hastened since Poland more than any nation deserves aid, for she has and is sustaining the greatest sacrifices for the common victory of the United Nations.

Whereas we are greatly disturbed in seeing the progress of international affairs pointing strongly to the ruination of the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," and declarations made by the President to our Nation and to the world why this war is being waged. Having Soviet Russia openly disregarding by their action in annexing the Baltic states and nearly half of Poland into the Soviet Union, creating a committee to govern the remaining part of Poland, disregarding the only legal and rightful Government of Poland in London which is recognized by the United States and Great Britain, also creating their committee to rule over other nations in Europe.

We, patriotic Americans of Polish descent, believe that the time has come for the United States to act in order to prevent the death of Poland. If nothing is done, certainly the peoples of the world will have no confidence in our professions of freedom or our capacity for world leadership.

Furthermore we here assembled declare that further silence as to aggressive plans of Soviet Russia which are being already put into effect in Poland and in other nations in Europe will prove to the world that the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," lend-lease agreement signed by Soviet Russia on June 11, 1942, and all other declarations that were made time and again to the world were nothing more than hyprocrisy proving that this war is not being truly waged in the interest of freedom, democracy, and justice.

The Approach to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, approaching the close of this war, we of this Congress, Representatives of the people of this Nation, realize that one of the most compelling and important problems facing this Nation and the world is to try to work out some sort of a formula or plan that will bring about a just and enduring peace.

The Congress, some months ago, expressed its desire and, I believe, the hope of the American people when it passed the Fulbright resolution, expressing the purpose of the Nation in its willingness to cooperate with other nations in the hope of bringing about permanent and lasting world peace. The State Department, since that time, has met with other nations to study the vast problems for world cooperation in an effort to work out some just and equitable plans looking to that end.

In approaching this question it is my opinion that if we are to make the proper headway those representing our Nation must give first consideration to a realistic approach and, secondly, to the idealistic or spiritual side of the question. It has been my contention all the while that our influence at the peace table will be greater if our country could be kept in the strongest possible condition financially and if the other nations of the world realized that our spokesmen represented the unity and force of the American people when they speak at the peace table. Obviously, the greater our industrial and financial strength the greater

will be our influence. That is one of the many reasons why some of us have urged the absolute necessity of making certain that we shall be able to enter the conferences at the peace table as a solvent Nation rather than we may find ourselves in such a condition at the close of the war that our freedom and representative form of government may be threatened with financial difficulties here at home. In addition, we must make certain that sovereignty of this Nation remains unimpaired.

Further approaching the problem in a realistic way it must be this Nation's policy since we have builded up the greatest naval and air forces in the world not to scrap this military equipment as we did after World War No. 1 but to maintain our naval and air superiority. Other nations cannot object and will not object to this position because the past history of a century has proven to the leaders of the nations of the world that America has never been and never will be an aggressor Nation. This Nation has contributed more of its money and resources to the defeat of the Axis Powers, and in this world war, than all of the other nations of the world combined, including the war debt of the Axis Powers.

If any of the nations of the world, after they have bound themselves by solemn agreements, are tempted to break those engagements, the naval and air power might of the American Nation will cause them to hesitate and most likely will be of sufficient influence to prevent such action and contribute to continuing peace. If we had had a naval and air force, one-half as large as we have at the present time, doubtless Hitler would not have started this war by attacking Poland. England, France, and America had lapsed into a lethargy of a lack of military preparedness that gave Hitler a right to believe that he could conquer England and France and that America, so wholly unprepared, would not attempt to enter the conflict. Such a situation should never be allowed to occur again.

I point out what I believe to be these two cold realistic approaches because I think it is necessary to follow such a policy at least for a number of years after the war until the nations and the peoples represented by their leaders at the peace table have a chance to try to cooperate, work together, and settle their internal differences and become accustomed to living in peace together without resorting to war. It is quite possible that in a number of years when the ideas of peace are deeply rooted in the minds and hearts of the peoples of the world that then a gradual reduction of armaments, world-wide, could safely be embarked upon, but, in my judgment, not until then.

Mr. Speaker, now I should like to call your attention to what I referred to as an idealistic or spiritual approach. Most all of the people of the world would prefer peace to war and destruction. I think it is safe to assume that the rank and file of the peoples of the world who have furnished the manpower and been the victims of the slaughter of war have never before been so impressed with the necessity of keeping the peace. Those who favor wars probably do not equal 3 percent of the people. It seems a tragedy that so few can bring such suffering, death, poverty, and hardship to so many of the people of the world. It is my opinion and the opinion of many of the leaders of world thought that at the basis of wars lie to some extent the fact that the people in their race in life for the material things have lost sight of their responsibility to the cultivation of the spiritual necessities and richness of life. For instance, if the Golden Rule were applied there would never be wars between nations.

It is the opinion of many men advanced in world thought that permanent peace ultimately, unless we are able to keep it by the realistic approach of power, must come from a resurgence of the spiritual welfare of men coupled with a great diffusion of education among the nations of the world. With more millions of people praying for peace than ever before in their humble homes throughout America and the extension of such spiritual supplications in their own form and manner from the uneducated masses of the world, is it too much to hope that out of the tragic suffering of the people of the world that they will in some way succeed in building such a foundation of spiritual and educational values that it may permanently support in the hearts, minds, and actions of the people a temple of justice and permanent peace?

As an example, this terrible war which has almost laid waste the world was started by two godless men, Hitler and Mussolini. They attempted to dethrone the power and influence of the Divinity of the centuries, dash to earth traditions of morality and the actuality of spiritual achievements and build upon what they thought would be the ruins, a world of power, greed, and savagery.

They have failed as every nation has failed since the dawn of civilization that has lost sight of the spiritual values of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that the selfishness of the national leaders of other nations which wrecked the peace negotiations at the close of World War I will not be in evidence at the peace table at the close of this War. It is to be hoped that the philosophy of the Golden Rule among nations will weigh more heavily in their deliberations than at the last great peace conference. It is the hope of the people of America and of the world that the men and women upon whom this tremendous responsibility shall rest may be able to work out a fair and just plan for continued peace.

The Case Against Oleo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, many years of my life have been spent in the dairy-products business. This experience has been both in producing milk and as a dairy-products manufacturer. In fact, I was president of the Illinois Milk Dealers Association for 5 years.

During all these years I have tried to keep abreast of the new discoveries in dairying and also familiarize myself with the legislative attempts to allow interstate shipments of filled milk.

Filled milk is milk with butterfat removed and cottonseed oil added in its place. This then is sold to take the place of condensed or evaporated milk. The substitution of cottonseed oil for butterfat in cheese has not as yet been advertised. The butter people have had a constant fight to protect their product from the unfair, false, and misleading propaganda and advertisements of the Oleo Trust.

During these years I have read and kept many articles and editorials from the papers, and also the experiments on oleo by the agricultural colleges.

My greatest surprise was last spring when I found the following editorial in the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of March 7, 1944. It is as follows:

OLEOMARGARINE IS HERE TO STAY

Senator SMITH, of South Carolina, wants the special Federal tax on colored oleomargarine repealed. He considers it a "damnable protective tariff" in favor of butter—a tariff which is made worse by the fact that many States also tax oleo in an attempt to keep it off their markets.

Protagonists of butter, as the only really adequate "spread for bread," will see red at this. They have usually maintained that what they are fighting for is not the sale of the white and "unappetizing" oleo but the sale of a product which, through the use of the same dye as makes butter its uniform yellow, "masquerades" as butter. They adopted that position somewhat late in their fight and only after it was established scientifically that fortified oleo has approximately the same dietary value as prime creamery butter. Today, however, it is their stock argument. They are willing, they say, to reduce or perhaps even remove the tax on white oleo, provided it is sold on its own (to them questionable) merits.

The fact is that the battle against oleo, colored or white, is already lost, though dairymen will not yet admit it. The wise farmer will begin now to condition himself to oleo's inevitable rise. In the long run, we doubt that dairy interests will suffer, since the demand for fluid milk and natural cheese is rising. The reason for that is that it has slowly dawned on the consumer that the butterfat is not the only important part of milk. The consumer now realizes that, while there may be a substitute for butter, there is no equivalent for the other valuable elements in milk.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot figure this out. Here was a paper in the leading dairyland State with such a misleading editorial. In the first place all oleo is not fortified. When fortified it has 9,000 international units of vitamin A per pound, and winter butter averages over 11,000 I. U.'s per pound, and summer butter over 20,000 I. U.'s per pound. Much butter also has 27,000 I. U.'s of vitamin A, or three times as much as oleo. Butter also has from 50 to 500 I. U.'s of vitamin D and oleo has none.

I wonder if the writer of this editorial would concede that—

First. If cottonseed oil or other vegetable oil is as good as butterfat, insofar as butter is concerned, would he recommend filled milk?

Second. Would his paper recommend that the butterfat in cheese be replaced in full or in part by cottonseed oil or other vegetable oil, so that filled cheese would be offered in place of good full-cream Wisconsin or Illinois cheese?

Third. Would he favor legislation that would allow filled milk to be marketed in place of natural condensed or evaporated milk?

Fourth. What would the Milwaukee Journal do with the butterfat if they were to make use of the skim milk where they say that "it has slowly dawned on the consumer that the butterfat is not the only important part of milk"? Cottage cheese has been made for centuries; where does the "slowly dawned" come in?

It seems peculiar to see any agency such as a newspaper in Wisconsin take this position. If the dairy farmers knew the strength of the vegetable oil interest in Washington, they would know the danger the dairy industry of the country is in at the present moment. I hope the dairymen of our country will wake up before it is too late and combat this type of propaganda.

Economic Situation in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested this morning in reading an article from Rome which appeared in today's New York Times with regard to the deplorable food, public health, and mortality situation in Italy.

I noted with a great deal of personal pleasure the comment that my former chief, who appointed me assistant district attorney of Kings County, N. Y., Brig. Gen. William O'Dwyer, Chief of the Allied Control Commission's Economic Section, has in a short time become thoroughly familiar with the economic situation there and that Italian and some Allied officials agreed that of all the administrators sent to Italy during the occupation period none has worked so energetically and with such clear-cut vision as General O'Dwyer.

I am vitally interested in this very important matter not only because of my previous close personal association with General O'Dwyer but because of the many communications I have had from constituents of my district who have relatives living in Italy with regard to the unfortunate conditions in that country. I feel confident that this great nation of ours with its vast and rich economic resources will not permit the Italian people to perish for lack of food and proper public-health conditions but will promptly and adequately send relief to these stricken people.

The New York Times article follows:

ROME, September 4.—The situation in Italy with regard to food, public health, and mortality has become so alarming that Brig. Gen. William V. O'Dwyer, Chief of the Allied Control Commission's Economic Section, left Rome today on a dash back to Washington to place facts and figures before President Roosevelt.

Both he and other high officials here feel that not only humanitarian considerations of first rate importance are involved but that the whole test of whether we can give an example in Italy of the American way of life is in jeopardy.

The figures are so terrifying that they can be allowed to speak for themselves. It should be kept in mind that the Allied armies began the conquest of Italy on September 3, 1943, and entered Rome on June 4, 1944.

The infant mortality rate for Italy for children in their first year per 1,000 for live births in the years 1931 to 1935 averaged 104.7. From 1936 to 1940 it was 102.8. The figures for Rome alone (it is naturally impossible to get all-Italy figures now) for June 1943, was 287 per 1,000 and for June 1944, 393; for July 1943, 289, and for July 1944, 433.

In other words, during this July babies born alive in Rome since the preceding year were dying at the rate of nearly one out of every two.

POLETTI ALLOCATES MILK

So alarming was this situation that the office of Col. Charles Poletti, Allied Military Government Chief for the Rome area, has arranged to allocate milk destined for children between the ages 1 to 5 years to babies under 1 year, which has brought the latter's death rate down but obviously brings up the question of what is now going to happen to children between 1 and 5.

The general mortality trend is also upward, figuring from last year to this. For instance in June 1943, in Rome 1,373 persons died against 2,535 in June 1944. Similar figures for July are 2,032 and 2,321.

The tuberculosis death rate in Rome from January to July 1944, was 3,450 as compared with the prewar rate of 1,200. It is estimated that people are now dying of tuberculosis in Italy at the rate of 200,000 annually as compared with the prewar rate of 60,000.

An A. M. G. Rome health officer said about 2 months ago that the incidence of tuberculosis in Rome was about 200 per 1,000.

Here is the food situation. Before the war the average Italian individual consumed about 2,900 calories daily without alcohol and 3,100 with. During the first 18 months of war the Italian basic ration in Rome was 1,391 calories daily. During the next 12 months it was 1,129. For 9 months before the entry of Allied troops it reached an all-time low of 304.50.

VITAL NEEDS ESTIMATED

Since the Allied occupation a basic ration of 664.77 calories daily has been allowed.

It is estimated that the vital needs of the population are a basic ration of 1,400 calories with available ration foods to bring the daily total up to 2,700.

As things are now it is officially estimated that the average Italian has lost five to ten pounds in weight. In short, it is officially admitted that the Italian diet has caused a general loss of weight in population, an increase in general and infant mortality, an increase in the tubercular rate and a general increase in mortality to all diseases.

If the present basic ration is not increased there is no doubt in the minds of Allied medical and health authorities that existing mortality rates will show a continued increase.

These are some of the facts that General O'Dwyer is going to place before President Roosevelt. Prime Minister Churchill already knows what the situation is because he studied it on the spot while here and he is known to have been upset by what he found.

As Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt may meet soon it is hoped here that they will take what measures are necessary to save Italy from a situation of great gravity.

With harvests now coming in the country can get along until about the first of the year but between then and next July, as General O'Dwyer put it, it is a case of either helping them or letting them die.

Italians and some Allied officials agree that of all the Americans sent here during the occupation period none has worked so energetically and with such clear-cut vision as General O'Dwyer.

Excerpts From Inaugural Address of President William Henry Harrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include parts of the inaugural address of President William Henry Harrison, copied from volume IV, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, page 1860. This address was delivered March 4, 1841.

I wish every American might have the opportunity of reading this message. How applicable the words of President Harrison, stated over 100 years ago, are today. He emphasizes—

It is the part of wisdom for a republic to limit the service of that officer at least to whom she has entrusted the management of her foreign relations, the execution of her laws, and the command of her armies and navies to a period so short as to prevent his forgetting that he is the accountable agent, not the principal; the servant, not the master. Until an amendment of the Constitution can be effected, public opinion may secure the desired object. I give my aid to it by renewing the pledge heretofore given that under no circumstances will I consent to serve a second term.

And again let me quote:

Always the friend of my countrymen, never their flatterer, it becomes my duty to say to them that there exists in the land a spirit hostile to their best interests—hostile to liberty itself. It is a spirit contracted in its views, selfish in its object. It looks to the aggrandizement of a few, even to the destruction of the interests of the whole. The entire remedy is with the people.

Mr. Speaker, the Presidency of the United States is not a lifetime job for anyone. In the best interests of the country, two terms should be the limit. Let us not have a fourth-termer in the White House after January 1945.

The excerpts follow:

Called from a retirement which I had supposed was to continue for the residue of my life to fill the Chief Executive office of this great and free Nation, I appear before you, fellow citizens, to take the oaths which the Constitution prescribes.

It was the remark of a Roman consul in an early period of that celebrated republic that a most striking contrast was observable in

the conduct of candidates for offices of power and trust before and after obtaining them, they seldom carrying out in the latter case the pledges and promises made in the former. However much the world may have improved in many respects in the lapse of upward of 2,000 years since the remark was made by the virtuous and indignant Roman, I fear that a strict examination of the annals of some of the modern elective governments would develop similar instances of violated confidence.

The outline of principles to govern and measures to be adopted by an administration not yet begun will soon be exchanged for immutable history, and I shall stand either exonerated by my countrymen or classed with the mass of those who promised that they might deceive and flatter with the intention to betray.

If we would compare the sovereignty acknowledged to exist in the mass of our people with the power claimed by other sovereignties, even by those which have been considered most purely democratic, we shall find a most essential difference. All others lay claim to power limited only by their own will. We admit of no government by divine right.

The great danger to our institutions does not appear to me to be in a unsurpation by the Government of power not granted by the people, but by the accumulation in one of the departments of that which was assigned to others. Limited as are the powers which have been granted, still enough have been granted to constitute a despotism if concentrated in one of the departments. Knowing the tendency of power to increase itself, particularly when exercised by a single individual, predictions were made that at no very remote period the Government would terminate in virtual monarchy. I should take this occasion to repeat the assurances I have heretofore given of my determination to arrest the progress of that tendency.

I proceed to state in as summary a manner as I can my opinion of the sources of the evils which have been so extensively complained of and the corrective which may be applied. Some of the former are unquestionably to be found in the defects of the Constitution—of these former is the eligibility of the same individual to a second term of the Presidency. The sagacious mind of Mr. Jefferson early saw and lamented this error, and attempts have been made hitherto without success, to apply the amendatory power of the States to its correction. As, however, one mode of correction is in the power of every President and consequently in mine, it would be useless, and perhaps invidious, to enumerate the evils of which, in the opinion of many of our fellow citizens, this error of the sages who framed the Constitution may have been the source and the bitter fruits which we are still to gather from it if it continues to disfigure our system.

It may be observed, however, as a general remark, that republics can commit no greater error than to adopt or continue any feature in their systems of government which may be calculated to create or increase the love of power in the bosoms of those to whom necessity obliges them to commit the management of their affairs; and surely nothing is more likely to produce such a state of mind than the long continuance of an office of high trust. Nothing can be more corrupting; nothing more destructive to all those noble feelings which belong to the character of a devoted Republican patriot. When this corrupting passion once takes possession of the human mind, like the love of gold it becomes insatiable. It is the never-dying worm in his bosom; grows with his growth and strengthens with the declining years of its victim. If this is true, it is the part of wisdom for a republic to limit the service of that officer at least to whom she has entrusted the management of her foreign relations, the execution of her laws, and the command of her armies and navies to a period so short as to prevent his forgetting that he is the accountable agent, not the principal; the servant, not the master. Until an amendment of the Constitution can be effected, public opinion may secure the desired object. I give my aid to it by renewing the pledge heretofore given, that under no circumstances will I consent to serve a second term.

There is still an undercurrent at work by which, if not seasonably checked, the worst apprehensions of our anti-Federal patriots will be realized, and not only will the State authorities be overshadowed by the great increase of power in the executive department of the general Government but the character of that Government, if not its designation, be essentially and radically changed. This state of things has been in part effected by causes inherent in the Constitution and in part by the never-failing tendency of political power to increase itself. By making the President the sole distributor of all the patronage of the Government the framers of the Constitution do not appear to have anticipated at how short a period it would become a formidable instrument to control the free operations of the State governments. Early in Mr. Jefferson's administration it became so powerful as to create great alarm in the mind of that patriot from the potent influence it might exert in controlling the freedom of the elective franchise. * * *

It is not by the extent of its patronage alone that the executive department has become dangerous, but by the use which it appears may be made of the appointing power to bring under its control the whole revenues of the country. The Constitution has declared it to be the duty of the President to see that the laws are executed, and it makes him the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. If the opinion of the most approved writers upon that species of mixed government which in modern Europe is termed "monarchy" in contradistinction to "despotism" is correct, there was wanting no other addition to the powers of our Chief Magistrate to stamp a monarchical character on our Government but the control of the public finances; and to me it appears strange, indeed, that anyone should doubt that the entire control which the President possesses over the officers who have the custody of the public money, by the power of removal with or without cause, does, for all mischievous purposes, at least, virtually subject the treasure also to his disposal. The first Roman emperor, in his attempt to seize the sacred treasure, silenced the opposition of the officer to whose charge it had been committed by a significant allusion to his sword. By a selection of political instruments for the care of the public money a reference to their commissions by a President would be quite as effectual an argument as that of Caesar to the Roman knight.

The influence of the executive in controlling the freedom of the elective franchise through the medium of the public officers can be effectually checked by renewing the prohibition published by Mr. Jefferson forbidding their interference in elections further than giving their own votes, and their own independence secured by an assurance of perfect immunity in exercising this sacred privilege of freemen under the dictates of their own unbiased judgments. Never with my consent shall an officer of the people, compensated for his services out of their pockets, become the pliant instrument of Executive will.

There is no part of the means placed in the hands of the Executive which might be used with greater effect for unhallowed purposes than the control of the public press. The maxim which our ancestors derived from the mother country that "the freedom of the press is the great bulwark of civil and religious liberty" is one of the most precious legacies which they have left us. We have learned, too, from our own, as well as the experience of other countries, that golden shackles, by whomsoever or by whatever pretense imposed, are as fatal to it as the iron bonds of despotism. A decent and manly examination of the acts of the Government should not only be tolerated, but encouraged.

The reign of an intolerant spirit of party amongst a free people seldom fails to result in a dangerous accession to the executive power introduced and established amidst unusual professions of devotion to democracy.

Long the defender of my country's rights in the field, I trust that my fellow citizens will not see in my earnest desire to preserve peace with foreign powers any indication that their rights will ever be sacrificed or the honor of the Nation tarnished by any admission on the part of their chief magistrate unworthy of their former glory.

Always the friend of my countrymen, never their flatterer, it becomes my duty to say to them that there exists in the land a spirit hostile to their best interests—hostile to liberty itself. It is a spirit contracted in its views, selfish in its object. It looks to the aggrandizement of a few even to the destruction of the interests of the whole. The entire remedy is with the people.

Benefits Available to the Discharged Veteran of World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, although an appreciative government has endeavored to provide for the readjustment of returning veterans to civilian activities and for the rehabilitation of the men who have returned from war broken in body, and to care for those who have become disabled, it can never adequately pay these men for all they have gone through.

The benefits allowable to the veterans of World War No. 2 for disabilities are the same as for those of World War No. 1.

FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES—COMPENSATION

The basic rates of compensation allowable range from $10 monthly for a 10 percent disability to $100 for total disability, established as due to service, or 75 percent of this basic rate for disability presumed, but not proved, to be the result of service. The basic awards were increased by 15 percent, effective from June 1, 1944.

A veteran without dependents is limited to $20 per month, regardless of the degree of his disability, during the time he is undergoing treatment or receiving domiciliary care in a Federal Government or State institution.

There are also special statutory rates for stated disabilities, such as loss of hands, loss of feet, or blindness, in several combinations, providing benefits as

high as $300 per month. The 15 percent increase does not apply to these awards.

FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES—PENSION

A pension of $50 per month is allowed for a permanent and total disability not the result of nor connected with military service and not due to misconduct, increased to $60 if the veteran has been rated permanent and total and has received the pension continuously for 10 years, or when he reaches the age of 65 years.

To be eligible for this benefit, the veteran must have served 90 days during the period of the war, or have been discharged for a disability incurred in service. This pension is not payable if the veteran is unmarried and has an income in excess of $1,000 a year, or is married or has minor children and has an income in excess of $2,500.

BLIND

The Veterans' Administration is authorized to provide seeing-eye or guide dogs for the aid of blind veterans entitled to disability compensation, and to provide mechanical and electronic equipment to aid such veterans in overcoming the handicap of blindness.

RETIREMENT

The laws governing retirement in the Regular services—Army, Navy, and Marine Corps—are made to apply to officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel serving in World War No. 2. An officer who becomes unable to perform active service as a result of an incident of service may be retired at 75 percent of the pay of his rank at the time he became incapacitated.

A member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) or the Navy Nurse Corps (female) who became disabled in line of duty from performing the duties of a nurse may be retired at 75 percent of the pay of her rank at the time she became so disabled.

INSURANCE

National service life insurance issued to persons serving in World War No. 2 pays benefits only on the death of the insured. It does not, as did the War risk insurance of World War No. 1, provide that the veteran himself shall draw benefits when permanently and totally disabled. There is, however, a provision for a waiver of premiums, upon application by the insured, in case of total disability.

National service life insurance is initially issued on a 5-year level premium basis. It may be converted any time after it has been in force for 1 year, and within the 5-year term period, into an ordinary life, a 20-pay life or a 30-pay life policy, in any amount, in multiples of $500, but not less than $1,000 nor more than the face value of the original policy.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

A program has been set up for the purpose of preparing veterans handicapped by disability to reenter gainful employment. This is in no way related to the provisions under the G. I. bill. Eligibility requirements are—

(A) Active military or naval service at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of World War No. 2.

(B) Discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

(C) Service-connected compensable disability due to World War No. 2 service.

(D) Vocationally handicapped due to disability.

(E) Need for vocational rehabilitation to overcome such handicap.

No training course longer than 4 years will be approved, and no training will be available beyond 6 years after the termination of World War No. 2.

While in training, and for 2 months after it has been determined the veteran is ready to take employment, each veteran will receive allowances, including compensation, of not less than the following:

Disabled person with no dependents, per month	$80
Disabled person with wife but no child, per month	90
Disabled person with wife and 1 child, per month, with $5 more for each additional child	$95

If the disabled person has dependent parents, he will be allowed $10 per month additional for each parent during this training period.

If pension or retirement payments exceed these rates, the pension or retirement will be paid in lieu of training pay.

If the trainee receives wages while in training, payments from the Government may be reduced, but not below the pension or retirement pay to which he is entitled.

The Veterans' Administration is authorized to advance not more than $100 to persons commencing vocational rehabilitation courses, to be paid back without interest, by deductions from future payments of pension or retirement pay.

An injury or aggravation of an injury suffered as a result of training which results in additional disability or death will be compensated on the same basis as disability or death incurred in war service. Application for this benefit must be made within 2 years after the injury.

HOSPITALIZATION

The Veterans' Administration is authorized to furnish domiciliary and hospital care, including needed medical treatment, within the limit of its facilities, to persons discharged or released from service under conditions other than dishonorable who have served in our armed forces.

Priority of admission is afforded war veterans for the treatment of service-connected disabilities. War veterans suffering from ailments not due to service may be admitted for treatment, provided there are accommodations available and they are not able to meet the cost of treatment in private institutions.

Out-patient treatment, medical or dental, including necessary medicines, prosthetic appliances, and other supplies, may be authorized for a service-connected disability, if requested.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

The first benefit available to the veteran of World War No. 2 upon discharge is the mustering-out pay allowance, not available to officers above the rank of captain in the Army or lieutenant, senior grade, in the Navy, men who have had no service except special training or student college program service, and with some other limitations, in the following sums:

First, $300 for persons who, having performed active service for 60 days or more, have served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

Second, $200 for persons with 60 days or more of service who have not served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

Third, $100 for persons who have performed active service for less than 60 days.

To those entitled to $300, one third will be paid at time of discharge and the remainder in equal installments one and two months, respectively, thereafter. To those entitled to $200, one half will be paid at time of discharge and the other half one month later. If entitled to $100, full payment will be made at time of discharge.

This condensed summary of necessity leaves out many details regarding which there may be questions. Help in answering them may be had from the service officers of veterans' organizations, or the Red Cross. Or, inquiries may be addressed to Congressman ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, 316 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., who will be glad to be of assistance in presenting claims and in clarifying any questions which may arise.

Effect of Vegetable Oils on Minnesota Calves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, in reading the testimony of Dr. E. B. Hart, world noted scientist, before the Senate Agriculture Committee when the oleo hearings were held in June 1944, I noted the following statement:

In none of our experiments have we ever found butterfat inferior to any of the animal fats or vegetable oils experimented with. In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition.

I might add something which is not contained in this printed matter as to the experiments of Mr. Gullickson at the University of Minnesota with calves. He fed calves skim milk with butterfat in some cases, and with the vegetable oils in other cases, and he published the records in the Journal of Dairy Science in 1942, and the records show that those animals receiving the vegetable oils grew poorly; in fact, he snatched them from the grave by merely substituting, as they

got down, certain animal fats, butterfat, or even lard, and he even used tallow, and it successfully brought those calves away from death. He has not pursued the subject further, and you might ask me why, or how this works, and I would simply have to tell you that I do not know in the present state of our knowledge of nutrition.

Mr. Speaker, with all of the propaganda put out by the Oleo Institute, it would appear that the consumers of America should stop, look, and listen before they permit themselves to be misled by many of the statements of the oleo group.

Communists Plot Control of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the Labor Day issue of Labor Views, published in Milwaukee, Wis., by William A. E. Chappelle, Jr.:

COMMUNISTS PLOT CONTROL OF LABOR—C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE CALLED NEW BORING-FROM-WITHIN PLAN OF DISBANDED "REDS"

(By William A. E. Chappelle, Jr.)

Labor Day 1944 finds organized labor threatened with destruction by a Communist-inspired plot to gain control of our Government and all workers' organizations after supposedly having disbanded their party on orders from the Commintern.

This, in effect, is the purpose and plot behind the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. It is a new line of attack; a rejuvenated and more subtle "boring from within" tactic of the American Communists, and it is fooling a lot of union leaders and members who are allowing themselves to be duped into becoming a part of this un-American movement.

One need only look back to that period between 1939 when Hitler and Stalin signed a pact of nonaggression against each other and jointly sliced up Poland between them; and June 1941, when Hitler tore up the nonaggression pact and attacked Russia. During the life of the Hitler-Stalin pact the American Communists and their puppets in the C. I. O. fought against all attempts to prepare for the defense of our country.

CALLED ROOSEVELT "WARMONGER"

During that period these same leaders of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee who are now proclaiming President Roosevelt the "friend of the workingman" and declare a fourth term is imperative for the welfare of organized labor, were loud in their denunciation of Mr. Roosevelt whom they then called "warmonger" and the head of an imperialistic crowd who were out to destroy the rights of the worker.

These same plotters, during the term when Hitler and Stalin were palsey-walsies, were systematically campaigning against every effort of America to build an Army, Navy, and Air Force, and to produce the weapons with which our allies were holding off the enemy while we were developing our "Sunday punch." They addressed an avalanche of letters and telegrams to Members of Congress whenever any measure seeking to prepare America for defense and eventually victory or whenever we made any attempt to provide weapons for our allies.

It was these same C. I. O. Political Action Committee leaders who during the period between 1939 and June 1941 introduced the sit-down strike and the slow-down and other means of holding up production of war materials. The most vivid memory of Wisconsin is the fraudulent 72-day C. I. O. strike at the Allis-Chalmers plant under the leadership of Harold Christofel in which it was revealed that hundreds of fraudulent ballots in favor of a strike had been cast when the strike vote was taken. This strike held up vital equipment for the Navy and the delay has never been overcome.

NOW DEMAND FOURTH TERM

But when Hitler began his war against the Russians in June 1941 these same leaders became enthusiastic supporters of Mr. Roosevelt and his program for defense and war.

And now, Labor Day 1944, we find this new C. I. O. Political Action Committee organizing and spending funds taken from the pay envelopes of the same good Americans who were forced to impede war production in 1939, 1940, and part of 1941. The C. I. O. P. A. C. leaders now demand that their members get behind the campaign to elect Roosevelt to a fourth term.

It was under these same leaders that the split in America's labor organizations came about in the early thirties. Russian born Sidney Hillman, who now heads the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, was a leader in engineering this split.

During the intervening years the C. I. O. grew and became a powerful segment of American economic life. While it still ranks far behind the membership it has succeeded in gathering nearly all of the left-wing labor leaders into its fold, and on this Labor Day 1944, while it is not apparent to most A. F. of L. leaders, Sidney Hillman seems to be plotting to get into a position in the Government from which he can snipe at and eventually crush the A. F. of L. with the aid of his Communist allies.

An awakening of the sincere labor leaders of America is needed at once or Mr. Hillman and his comrades will have done irreparable damage to organized labor.

HURTING LABOR CAUSE

Whether Hillman and his Political Action Committee will be successful is questionable. In spite of their claims of victory in certain political campaigns there is little of fact to prove their claims. Thus far it would seem that the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is more of a political liability than an asset.

It appears that some New Deal politicians are using the P. A. C. for whatever votes they may put in the bag. It is just as apparent that the C. I. O. P. A. C. is using the New Deal as the best possible vehicle upon which to ride into power. The prime purpose of the C. I. O. P. A. C. is not the election of Mr. Roosevelt. It is an attempt to get into position to control organized labor.

Win or lose, the C. I. O. P. A. C. is placing American organized labor in a precarious position. It has already inspired much anti-labor legislation and during the next year or two this sort of un-American plotting is bound to bring repercussions that may well set organized labor back 50 years.

Organized labor should recognize the C. I. O. P. A. C. for what it is—a Communist-inspired plot to get control—and begin this Labor Day 1944 to block such intrigue in an effective, truly American manner—denounce it for what it is.

Address of Hon. Ed Rowe, of Ohio, to the Pan-Icarian Brotherhood, at Akron, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. ED ROWE, of Ohio, at the fortieth annual convention of the Pan-Icarian Brotherhood held at the Mayflower Hotel at Akron, Ohio, September 3, 1944:

When you invited me to come and enjoy this fellowship with you, and further invited me to speak to you, I confess my knowledge about your homeland was about nil.

I knew generally of its location and I sort of had the impression from the name Pan-Icarian, that it was a part of Greece.

My conclusion was probably facilitated by that legendary Arcadian Deity—Pan—part goat and part man—the giver of fertility. The mythological god of flock and pastures, the patron of shepherds, forest, and wildlife.

Icarian registers on my mind with like tendency toward a conclusion of something associated with Greece.

I have since learned about this island, the homeland of many of you and your forebears, studding the Aegean Sea, almost on the line which divides Europe and Asia Minor; located a short distance northwest of that small island upon which St. John the Divine interpreted the word of God in the Book of Revelations.

I learned it was by the sturdy and militant effort of the Samians and probably with the help of the Icarians that your deliverance was effected in 1912, and you once again became a part of the mother country Greece.

Those of you who have lived there can no doubt easily visualize in your moments of nostalgic retrospection—or when you're yearning for a sight of those steep mountainsides descending to meet the ocean or sea—yes; visualize, the spires of Phardys—Hypsiles—Atachides—and Melissa towering into the blue heavens from the mid-Aegean channel.

These, together with other mountains running the length of Icaria, whose quick descent continues after meeting the blue waters of the Aegean Sea, until a depth of a 100 fathoms is reached a very short distance from the shore line.

I'm sure it is a dream of pleasure when those among you who have lived and observed the simple sturdy life of these island people can reflect upon the traditions of your homeland.

That life was arduous enough for balanced exercise and good health. The excellent God-given climate upon this little island which lies in the shadows of the Holy Land is a contributing factor in the sturdiness of its people.

Simple diet of grilled fresh fish, the succulent tender meat of lamb and goat, olives, and fresh figs of your own planting, the citrus fruits and raisins ripened in the sun and warm Aegean breezes, the luscious wines diluted to the taste of the thirsty and hungry; all these memories tickle the appetites of the true Icarian.

The afternoon rest or siesta and the journey over winding road to Hagios Kerykos,

where sometimes you met the ships which anchored in its cove harbor, bringing news and curious visitors from the outside world.

Yes, my friends; I have learned something of your small island homeland. I know through the eyes of others something about the charcoal burners of past years, the maid servants, the beekeepers, the fruit growers, the wine makers, the very simple, meager, though fruitful life, of the Icarians.

You have migrated to this great country and your children will mingle with my children in its further building.

We are now all of a great national fraternity where the sovereignty is as rich and untrammeled in any one of us as it is in any other.

That really is the greatness of this Nation. It matters not from whence you came, it matters not your race or creed, our national background creates no difference, each of us can qualify by native birth or by living within the law of the land over a stipulated time as an equal sharer in the richest estate of citizenship upon the face of the earth or under God's sun.

I am removed but one generation, as are many of you here, from the Old World, yet there is no office, no place of prominence, no height in the rank of business, art, culture, or science, no place of leadership in the strong armed forces of our country, no public acclaim to which any of us may not aspire and reach if we have the fortitude, ability, perseverance, and the good faith of our fellow citizens.

It has been said that the United States is the great melting pot of all creeds, races, and nationalities. I find myself in disagreement with that conclusion.

I prefer regarding it as a great indistinguishable light of the world and humanity.

It has always been my conception of a melting pot as being a furnace or caldron into which one places various and sundry items and then applies extremely high temperature to melt down whatever you have placed therein. After the process and the cooling you remove from the furnace or caldron one homogeneous mass and sameness resulting from the high temperature of fire applied to the various elements you originally place therein.

That is certainly not the result, as the simile may apply to these great United States. This very meeting belies that conclusion. All over this Nation tonight there are thousands of meetings much like this one wherein the peoples who originated in some other nation with difference of race or creed are clinging to the rich traditions and lore of their native land, or their fathers' native land.

My own people, of Welsh ancestry, have their annual meeting in honor of our patron saint—St. David. There we hear some speaker, who revives the pride in our hearts about our rich traditions. We sing the songs and cite the history and proclaim our worth by telling what our contribution has been to this greatest of nations.

No; we do not come out of the melting pot with a sameness except as it may apply to freedom and liberty.

This great light, to which I referred and the way in which I prefer to regard this Nation of ours, is the incubator to nurture the soul of man. We all know it is the one place where patriotism stems from the firm foundation of liberty, freedom, and justice.

It is because of this liberty, freedom, and justice that we form the great confraternity made up of the component parts of our varied former national fraternities. To this Nation we make our several contributions. It is the place where our aspirations live in the privileged expression we enjoy under this great light of freedom.

The patriotism of a free people under a government which proceeds by the consent of the governed is best expressed in the words of a former President, long since deceased. He said—

"Patriotism should be an integral part of our every feeling at all times, for it is merely another name for those qualities of soul which make a man, in peace or in war, by day or by night, think of his duty to his fellow man and his duty to his nation, through which their and his loftiest aspirations must find their fitting expression."

Oh, yes; this great light, under which you and I bask, gives us the force and warmth of common purpose.

It illumines the dark paths of bigotry so that our footsteps may not wander and brings us to a place where we would design men's religion and foolishly attempt making of ourselves a god.

This great light shines upon and makes bright the broad road of tolerance so that when we travel thereon we may reach out our hand of fellowship to a brother even though he may not be of our exact kind, and help him live in the same way and with the same blessings as we may enjoy ourselves.

It lights the way back to the rich traditions and quickens one's concept of the worth of our forefathers in whose breasts there was a dream, a song, or a prophecy, which is your heritage to proudly lay in the lap of America. From this source has come the arts, the cultures, and the sciences with which we are going forward in our tremendous national effort in the misfortunes of this day.

It is our headlight for the highway of national purpose to which all of us are pledged to travel because the Nation is us and we are the Nation. We are the light and we are the road. We are the moving force, combined as we are of many natures of peoples. It is here that our liberties are equal.

Lincoln said, "True liberties are never intolerant or destructive of equal liberties in others. Men may receive liberties in proportion as their understanding enables them to use them with restraint."

This light gives our share of the liberties we can wisely use and it shows the way to enrich and enhance them.

We are each privileged to come to the place—

When the mind is held clear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world is not broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
Where the word comes out from the depths of truth;
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert of dead habits;
Where the mind is led forward by this great light into ever widening thought and action;
Where we can walk in the midst of tempests meeting the emergency without fear or mistrust in ourselves, guided by the star, the light of freedom.

My new friends, my fellow Americans of Icarinan origin, as your fathers came here to this land to produce riches, you too were born here to produce riches by the keenness of mind and strength of will.

I, like you, am a descendant of another people, and all of us who are here assembled, apart in kinship of national origin from you, are of sameness under this great light. We are proud to be Americans and we also have pride in the blood of our forefathers.

We are admonished of the dangers which ever seek to take away from these rich virtues that are ours. The forces are always at work to destroy our unity. The subtle voices are amongst us which would lead us into the darkness. It has been said that "Vigilance is the price of our freedom."

Beware of him who would rise among us to champion that which we already possess. The words of Plato are our warning—

"The people have always some champion whom they set up over them and nurse into greatness. This and no other is the root from which a tyrant springs. When he first springs above the ground he is a protector. In the early days of his power he is full of smiles and salutes everyone he meets. He liberates debtors and distributes land to the people and his followers, and wants to be so kind to everybody."

Beware that you do not trade your liberty for the temporary gift. Franklin said, "They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

Our challenge is to keep secure the real worth of our cardinal institutions of liberty. We of this great confraternity should always be reminded of the words of the Father of our Country—when he wrote—

"Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the oceans, another generation may renew it; if it exhausts our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolates and lays waste our fields, still under a new cultivation they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests. It would be but a trifle if the walls of our capital were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished governments?

"Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

"Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty and States' rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

"No; if these columns fall they will not be raised again. Like the Colosseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Rome or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of Constitutional American Liberty."

Icarians, American Icarians, my hand of fellowship in common purpose is extended to you. Thank you.

New W. P. B. Order Wrecking the Lumber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, recently the Lumber Division of the W. P. B. issued a new order entitled "L-335 Governing the Production and Distribution of Lumber." Under this order each producer is required to get a certificate before he can sell the product of his mill. The order is having the effect of damming up the production of the small mills throughout the country and unless they get some relief they are all going out of business. The certificates for sale of their production just are not coming through; their lumber is piling up; they can't pay their labor; they do not have room or facilities to

carry a heavy backlog of lumber. Lumber today is No. 1 essential and yet this order is blocking production. This is a matter which should have the attention of the committees of the Congress set up for the purpose of protecting the small business enterprises. I am filing a telegram which I today received from one of my lumbermen which gives a graphic picture of the situation:

AUBURN, CALIF., *September 5, 1944.*

Congressman CLAIR ENGLE,

House of Representatives:

Order L-335 is creating chaotic confusion in every field of western lumber industry. Manufacturers, planing mills, retailers, consumers, and labor are set back alike. It is proving complete failure here and doing opposite from benefit claimed for it. We should return to successful system in effect prior to August 1 when priority system and central procurement agency buying insured first call on all lumber for Government requirement. Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest, August 31, termed the order a complete flop. States unnecessary and not working to satisfaction of anyone. Benefits to war uses is nil because war demand has fallen off so rapidly only a fraction of the war footage remains as was bought under previous order, consequently not needed now. The Digest says it is very harmful.

Production of big mills is being dammed up and blocked with an accumulation of low-grade commons which the Government never did buy to any appreciable extent. Newest amendment exempting number four common helps but why not also exempt three and two commons as well since quantities of three are greater than four and two will soon be a problem.

Nowhere is the effect of the L-335 muddle worse than with the rough lumber producers in your district where many sawmills produce from ten to fifty thousand feet per day of rough lumber. This previously moved directly from the sawmills to be a distributing yard or a remanufacturing plant. These mills are mostly in the mountain with long hauls to railroad or market. The cost of this chain of production is higher than with the big mills but their total production count very large in the total for this State and has been of vital importance in the war effort.

There is not now enough war orders to go around to all the mills and these go to the big mills with full manufacturing facilities. With domestic demand choked by L-335 and no war orders there is little less of market for the rough lumber these many sawmills produce. They can't continue to pile up their lumber indefinitely without income and help is needed quickly from Washington to immediately restore production with the removal of the choke on their market instituted by regulations L-335.

I was in San Francisco Thursday and Friday on behalf of several of these producers as W. P. B. made statement that producers without market should see their regional office. They had no market—they had no orders. Every day Government orders are less. W. P. B. proposes to increase quota of box factories to take some of the slack. Those quotas were already based on regular requirements. Winter is coming on when important maintenance and repair work must be done in public interest everywhere. Why not have a simple, free from red tape, low priority clearance for this work that would not take any essential material from any higher rated war orders which may exist. If lumber is short production can only be kept up by maintenance of a market for it immediately. This would help and at the same time maintain some necessary employment for war industry. Also for manufacturers of auxiliary building materials everywhere whose markets are also suffering from effects from L-335.

Your interest will be thoroughly appreciated by all in the California lumber industry and is most helpful in a tough situation.

WENDELL ROBIE,
Auburn Lumber Co.

Causes of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Causes of War," delivered by me before the Kiwanis Club of Roanoke, Va., September 6, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs and guests, we are living in an hour of momentous happenings. The end of the war, which is rapidly approaching, will pose gigantic problems for the world, and our Nation in particular. How wisely we act in approaching these problems will determine the future peace and security of our country.

Looking to the end of hostilities, Congress has sought to provide in a measure for some of these problems. We have passed, and it has become law, an act for the generous care of the fighting men and women and their dependents. We are in the act of completing action on two other important problems.

Ways and means of disposing of the large surplus stores that will remain on hand, and provisions for reconversion. There are other pressing matters, that will be reached as the situation develops. Smooth and expeditious reconversion is most important. It holds the key to one of our most important domestic problems, that of providing jobs—jobs not only for those who are laid off from war production, but jobs for the returning soldier—jobs not on a gigantic federally operated W. P. A. but secure jobs—jobs in private industry.

Every incentive and assistance must be given private enterprise to get into operation. The Government must get out of business. Government controls must be abandoned or relaxed as rapidly as possible. War agencies must be liquidated, and in short, everything possible must be done to get us back to a normal way of life where the individual citizen will feel that he is once again his own master. So much for the domestic front.

WAR AND PEACE

I wish, however, to draw your attention for a little while to the thing that is uppermost in our minds at the moment, war and peace.

Thomas Paine once said, "This is the hour that tries men's souls." Undoubtedly, the particular hour in the history of the world to which Thomas Paine alluded was a critical hour, but from the viewpoint of this generation, the day in which you and I live is the day of great decisions, decisions that will more profoundly affect the future welfare and happiness of the human race than any that have ever before been made.

COURSE OF THE WAR

On the battle front, success attends our arms. We but wait the inevitable end which will bring complete victory to our cause. Myriads of hands are lifted heavenward and prayers ascend the mercy seat for the early dawning of that day. They are the hands of tiny infants, and of wrinkled age—the soft white hands of women; the caloused hands of those who work. All are stretched upward with strained eyes and a fervent prayer that this unspeakable horror may end. In the language of the patriarch of old, "How long, O Lord, how long?"

Every day that this struggle is extended, means the loss of more precious lives on the altar of war. It means more broken hearts, more vacant firesides, more blasted lives.

War is a horrible monster. Its blighting breath sears the human soul; dulls the human intellect, and spreads ruin and devastation wherever it strikes. It is the only game that men play where everyone loses. No one is the winner in the game of war. We must never permit this world to be plunged into another awful war.

EFFORTS FOR PEACE

One thousand nine hundred years ago the Prince of Peace preached "Peace on Earth." Although we Christians give lip service to that exalted ideal, yet candor compels us to admit that the Christian era is a record of one war after another. Our own "peace loving" country has had seven major wars in its brief existence. It makes us wonder if democracy is a cure for war. There is one thing which I think we can put down as a fairly established fact, and that is, that another war in another 25 years will practically destroy the human race.

Individually and collectively as a nation we abhor war. Some have tried and labored to prevent war and to establish peace. We sent our sons in the First World War to fight the "war that was to end wars." Our great World War President, Woodrow Wilson, living away ahead of his time, broke his great heart in an effort to convince his fellow Americans that there was only one way to end war, and to establish peace, and that was by concerted action among the powerful nations of the earth. I am thinking at the moment of another great American, Frank B. Kellogg, who was Secretary of State in the Collidge Cabinet. History will not record Kellogg as a very great Secretary of State, or a man of outstanding brilliance, but he had one great dream, and that was to outlaw war. In the face of many obstacles, much discouragement, and many handicaps, on an August afternoon in 1928, in Paris along with the diplomats of other nations, the Kellogg Peace Treaty was signed. Kellogg's dream, however, did not bear fruit, but it can be recorded that it did not fail until it had been tried by another American of his time, Henry L. Stimson, then Secretary of State under Hoover, who is now our great Secretary of War. Stimson saw clearly the signs of approaching wars, and he rightly believed that if the many minor wars which were then heading up could be averted, that it might be possible to prevent a world conflagration. Today the hearts and the hopes of the American people center in the efforts that are being made by representatives of the leading nations of the earth, now assembled at Dumbarton Oaks and who are laboring in the cause—laying the pattern for world collaboration which is the only effective way of securing world peace.

REMOVE CAUSES OF WAR

War will not be averted, however, nor peace established merely by the signing of imposing documents or making eloquent professions. We must remove, as far as we can, some of the causes of war. In 1922, it was the firm belief of many Americans that if we could stop the mad rush for armaments, that we would remove the most irritating cause of war. Hence, there gathered in the city of Washington, an imposing array of representatives. They were there from Ger-

many and Japan, Italy, France, Great Britain, and America. They signed a great treaty on limitation of naval armaments. Under that treaty, America scrapped her Navy and Germany tore up some blueprints. The representatives of Germany and Japan must have gotten a great laugh out of our pious action. It opened wide the door for them to begin the construction of a gigantic war machine, which, a few years later was to spread terror over the world.

One of the causes of war is racial and national prejudice. One cannot underestimate the great difficulties that will be had in overcoming this very human cause of distrust and suspicion.

TRADE WARS

Another cause of war, and one which I desire to comment upon is trade and commerce. The tension of the world can be released and good will be established among nations only by opening up the channels of trade. This has been demonstrated by the experiences of many centuries. The effect of the contraction of trade by exhorbitant tariffs, by monetary disorders, by embargoes, quotas, and bounties and what not, is to set the people fighting each other at home and abroad in a desperate struggle to keep their share of a diminishing national income. Such a situation is a fertile field of operation for Communists, Fascists, and extremists of all sorts. Men resort to violence when their standards of living are being destroyed. A liberal and generous democratic society is one in which men feel free, generous and have opportunity; it is dissension, depression, restriction of opportunity that arouses violence, intolerance and enmities. This simple fundamental is going to be particularly true in the era following the present war. Thoughtful citizens give much consideration to this subject.

On the statement of fundamentals, I would like to quote a distinguished American educator, Harry D. Gideons, president of Brooklyn College:

"After the war there will be a crying demand for America's mass-production goods and farm products from every country in the world. If we maintain a liberal policy regarding imports, this demand can create thousands of post-war jobs in this country, utilizing industrial and agricultural capacity which otherwise would be idle.

"But to export we must be willing to import. Hence, the renewal of the trade-agreements program is essential for maintenance of employment and business activity at a high level after the war. Moreover, in the Atlantic Charter the United States is pledged to the long-run principle that all nations, great and small, should have access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world.

"Every country, therefore, if it wishes to promote the expansion of world trade, which is a fundamental condition for the establishment of a durable peace, must show greater willingnes to accept the goods of other countries. In other words, the lowering of tariffs under the leadership of great trading nations is an essential means of realizing the program of economic and political cooperation endorsed by the United Nations."

The American policy, fortunately for us, has been firmly established. Under the leadership of Secretary Hull, we had, up to the present world conflict, since 1934, made notable progress in building the framework of trade treaties with the principal nations of the earth and more particularly our South American neighbors. In 9 years, during which the reciprocal trade-treaties program has been in operation, trade treaties have been concluded with 27 countries. Over 65 percent of the total foreign trade of the United States has been carried on with countries with which reciprocal trade agreements have been concluded. The United Kingdom and Canada, respectively, have been the largest and second largest customers for American exports.

THE SUCCESS OF THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

The trade-agreements program had to make its way against a general deterioration in international relations and the strong currents of barter trading and other nationalistic excesses which tended to paralyze foreign trade generally.

The United States was faced with a choice between the use of its economic power in an ultimately self-defeating effort to coerce other nations into maintaining trade with us or to offer them an example of leadership in reestablishing world trade on the basis of cooperative action. To the everlasting credit—and self-interest—of the United States, it chose the latter course.

The course chosen in 1934, and held to since then, has paid dividends of two kinds: Expanded trade, with all that it has meant in terms of income, pay rolls, and employment, and, at the same time, improved general relations with other countries, which have meant much to us in time of war and which will continue to mean much to us not only between now and complete victory of the United Nations over the Axis powers, but also in the years of peace.

Recently we had before the Congress the question of whether or not America would continue the trade treaty program. It was widely endorsed. The United States Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of commerce and industry—the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Workers on behalf of labor—the American Farm Bureau, and many other civic organizations on behalf of the public—all came with a most impressive testimony to this American policy of world collaboration in the field of trade.

The case was so clearly and convincingly stated by Secretary Hull, that I herewith quote a portion of his statement before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

"Important as was the trade-agreements program in the past, important as it has been and will be from a broader point of view, it will be more significant than ever, from the viewpoint of our own material interest, when the present fighting stops. * * * Foreign markets will be very important to us then and will continue to be essential as far as anyone can see ahead. It will be well to have in being and in working order a tested and tried instrument for obtaining the reduction of foreign-trade barriers and the elimination of discriminations against our products.

"As we look into the future, it is this theme of international cooperation that should be uppermost in our minds, if we really want to make sure that another world conflict is not to be ahead of us after we win this war.

"When the day of victory comes, we and other nations will have before us a choice of courses to follow. Basically, that choice will be, as it was in 1918, between, on the one hand, extreme nationalism, growing rivalries, jealousies, and hatreds, with the ultimate certainty of another and even more devastating war; and, on the other hand, increased international cooperation in a wide variety of fields, and at least the hope of secure peace for our children.

"No one can give a promise that secure peace will really prevail. It is much harder to make the peace secure than it is to wage successful war. Many wars have been fought and won, by many nations, but not yet has any nation made its peace secure and enduring. No one nation, no two nations can do this. For war is an international affair; in a world of many nations its prevention requires international collaboration. In the new world of the airplane all nations are the near neighbors of all others. In such a world any one strong industrial country has power to plunge the world into war with devastating suddenness and violence. To keep the peace secure will require the resolute and continuous collaboration of all law-abiding nations. It is a hard way and a long way, but it is the only hopeful way there is to prevent war.

"Of the various necessary fields of international collaboration one of the most essential is the field of economic life. The goods and services by means of which men live must be abundant, and they must be well distributed. If the material basis of civilization fails, we must not anticipate that human beings will be civilized or peaceful. Solid and lasting friendships between large groups of people require mutual willingness to cooperate in the fundamental business of earning a living. That is why it is so essential, in the words of the Atlantic Charter—to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

"This objective, and the balance of the charter, have now been endorsed by all of the United Nations. That action was taken by the hard-headed and realistic men who guide these governments, not by reason of humane sentiments alone, but because they recognize that the only way to attain these ends is through cooperative action.

"Stable peace and economic warfare will not mix. We know that, now, from bitter experience. Just as we must work together to set up and operate the necessary machinery to maintain peace, we must work together to make the years of peace fruitful for ourselves and for others."

More recently, in May to be exact, the Secretary of State summed up the situation in the following statement delivered on the occasion of the observance of National Foreign-Trade Week:

"Such an international system of trade and financial relations embodying sound economic standards and the principles of justice, must be created and made effective in order to support any international organization that may be set up to keep and enforce the peace. Otherwise, the structure of international security would be threatened with collapse as a result of economic disorder and conflict.

"Leadership toward a new system of international relationships in trade and other economic affairs will devolve very largely upon the United States because of our great economic strength. We should assume this leadership and the responsibility that goes with it, primarily for reasons of pure national self-interest. We ourselves cannot live in prosperity and security in our own country while people in other countries are suffering want and being driven to despair by economic hardship. If we are to have jobs for all our workers and markets for all our goods, people in other countries must likewise have opportunity to produce to their maximum capacity and to pay us, with the fruits of their efforts, for the things we want to sell them.

"The Government of the United States and other United Nations governments are endeavoring to make as rapid progress as possible toward the objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter, and the mutual-aid agreements, and the Moscow and Tehran Declarations. In carrying out this great task, they need and must have the support of the people whose interests they serve.

"In this matter foreign traders have a special responsibility extending far beyond the mere safeguarding and enhancement of their own business interests. They have a special knowledge of foreign trade and its place as a necessary support of international prosperity and world security. They can contribute much to the establishment of a sound system of trade relations among nations by

sharing their knowledge and understanding with other citizens and groups. Observance of National Foreign-Trade Week is one means of carrying out this responsibility."

So much for the necessity of removing competition for markets and foreign trade as an irritation that in the past has sown the seeds of war.

WAR INSURANCE

All signs point to a great determination on the part of the United Nations to take every precaution humanly possible to see to it that there is not another world war. I think I see a sincere effort on the part of the great nations to erect a world state in the hereafter wherein nations can dwell together in peace and tranquillity—and where every nation, no matter how small, will be respected and protected in its pursuit of happiness in its own way and according to its own concepts. Of course, we all do hope and pray that the race has learned its bitter lesson—the lesson of the tragedy and the futility of war, but what if, in spite of all of these precautions—what if notwithstanding all of the imposing commitments and inspiring professions and legalistic treaties—what if in spite of all of that, human nature asserts itself and some Hitler of the future appears upon the horizon with ideas about conquest and power? Will we be where we were when this scrap started? Will we again have to start from scratch to build for our defense? Will we again have to send the flower of our land into battle to fight for peace? I hope not. I pray not. If we do, then in my humble judgment we will have been faithless to those who are giving their lives in this conflict.

Patrick Henry once said, "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way judging the future but by the past." And so say I. I have seen this thing happen once, and, insofar as my humble efforts may have any influence, it shall not happen again.

Some of us through the years have pleaded for a strong military establishment as insurance against war. I can tell you, though, it was hard going, even right up to Pearl Harbor. We won't go into details at this time.

On February 5, 1927, 17 years ago, I addressed the House of Representatives on the subject. I termed the subject of the speech at the time, Peace by Preparedness. I take the liberty of quoting the concluding paragraphs of that address.

"Until such time as all nations of the earth can meet and agree upon some plan to reduce naval and military strength, I want to see America go forward with a steady, orderly, and progressive strengthening of her Military Establishment on the seas, on land, and in the air, so that at all times she may not only be willing but ready and able to defend her traditions and protect her citizens and their property."

"I have said that in the present state of world affairs there is little to lead us to expect anything approaching universal peace in the near future. Such a statement seems to be abundantly justified when we inventory the happenings of the day in Europe, shot through as it is by passions, misunderstandings, and ambitious rulers thirsting for power and domain.

"AMERICA'S MISSION

"America must ever be ready with her good offices, her economic strength, and her political prestige to counsel and advise upon an amicable settlement of these varied disputes; and while a realization of the dream for universal peace, certainly so far as it affects Europe, may lie for future generations to enjoy, yet we can have peace in America.

"PEACE BY PREPAREDNESS

"America can be spared the wasteful effects of another war. American boys can be spared the awful experience of the boys in the recent war. American homes can be spared the horror and the heartaches that ever follow in the wake of conflict. We can be spared all of this by putting ourselves in such a position with reference to our national defense that the nations of the earth may know that not only does America stand for peace among the nations of the earth but that she demands peace for her own territory; that America will protect her citizens and their property wherever they may rightfully be; that not only does America stand for freedom of the seas for all nations but that she will demand freedom of the seas for her own commerce; that not only will America refrain from involving herself in European entanglements but that she is in a position to successfully resist any effort to cause her to be so involved. It has many times happened in the history of the world that the only way to have peace was to fight for it, and the poet has said, 'He only deserves freedom and liberty who is prepared to win it for himself every day.' No, sirs; the time is not yet come when America can strip herself of her arms and stand naked and defenseless before the world, relying for protection only upon the beauty and glory of her innocence and the lofty ideals for which she stands."

Those were my sentiments 17 years ago. Time and experience has, I think, vindicated those remarks.

POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY

In providing for this post-war Military Establishment a number of things must be considered. For that purpose we have set up in Congress a Select Committee on Post-war Military Policy. I have the honor to be chairman of that committee. We are currently conducting interesting studies, and are having splendid support from the armed services.

One important consideration will be the expense of the Military Establishment. The Nation will be groaning under a terrific debt caused by war expenditures. Everything possible must be done, consistent with national security, to lighten that burden. In this connection we are giving thought to the following:

1. The size, and relative component parts of the post-war establishment. Obviously one cannot fix these elements with exactness until the future diplomatic developments show what our commitments are going to be in the new world order of collaboration and cooperation. We are, however, making notable progress in the study. For instance, we believe it is quite possible to materially, if not drastically, reduce our requirements for the Regular Establishment by use of highly trained reserve force, in all branches—that is, Army, Navy, and Air. Such a procedure would call for periodic refresher training of the present members of our armed forces, who are mustered out, in good physical condition—for a much more sympathetic and liberal treatment of our National Guard organizations, and perhaps for some logical and attractive form of universal military training for the youth of our land.

In addition to this we are convinced that we can profit much by the lesson of unified command, which we are learning from this war. We have had most interesting hearings on this subject. Within the services there is a wide difference of opinion as to what can or should be done. There is undoubtedly, however, an area of agreement in the situation whereby certain consolidations, coordinations, and avoidance of duplications, there can not only be great savings to the taxpayer but much greater efficiency in the services. We are pursuing those studies.

In conclusion, it all sums up to this: Americans do not wish again to be involved in war. We shall use every possible means to settle disputes by amicable means, but, failing in those efforts, we propose to be ready by the use of military force to prevent a recurrence of the horrible tragedy of war.

The Amazing Record of Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, an eloquent tribute to labor's amazing record of production from the pen of Toney E. Flack, published of the West Side Messenger, of Indianapolis, is a first column feature of the September 1 issue of that publication written in commemoration of Labor Day.

No one can read that article without a thrill of pride over the magnificent way labor has responded in the production of the implements of war which have kept the United Nations supplied without a break with the most modern equipment from the opening of the world conflict until the present hour when victory is almost in sight.

By unanimous consent of the House I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Flack's recital of the record of war production. It is as follows:

Little has been said in favor of the great mass of laboring people who have made up the vast industrial army on the home front that has made possible the achievements of our fighting men and women in the European and Pacific theaters of war, as well as the untold amount of supplies for our allies made possible by the labor and craftsmanship of millions of hard-working American men and women. These toilers make up the great industrial army of our country, and to them this Labor Day we pay tribute for their part in this great war that we are engaged in and which even now we seem to be victorious in.

Our great army of productioneers have won major victories against the enemy by breaking all past records for the output of guns, planes, tanks, ships, ammunition, and military supplies. Make no mistake about it—our successful invasion drives in Africa, Sicily, Italy, France, and the Pacific, as well as the powerful offensive of our allies, never could have gotten to first base without the vast supplies of war equipment produced by our American labor.

Just as surely as America's fighting forces are outfighting the enemy, the superiority of American armed equipment, both in quantity and quality, has swung the tide of victory to our side in this war and will keep it there.

The criticism of labor for strikes is not warranted to the extent that it has been in the past. In 1943 strikes in manufacturing and construction resulted in a loss of manpower of less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the manpower actually used, whereas manpower contributed by labor in that year exceeded that used in 1939 by 76 percent. These figures speak for themselves in defense of the vast army of labor on the home front.

If the figures were available for the number of servicemen absent without leave during the year of 1943, then I feel certain there would be less reason for criticism of labor and strikes.

Here are a few statistics obtained from official Government reports of the accomplishments of labor in the war effort:

Since July, 1940, American workmen have produced more than $130,000,000,000 worth of planes, tanks, guns, ships, and ammunition.

The average output per worker was 30 to 35 percent higher last April than in December 1942.

In west coast airplane plants taken as a whole, the average output per worker has increased 51.4 percent in the past 3 years.

Twelve merchant vessels were built in American shipyards during the entire month before Pearl Harbor. Now we are building them at the rate of 1 a day. Our merchant fleet now has more than 3,000 ships.

Our fighting fleet has been tripled in size since the beginning of the preparedness program. The United States Navy had 1,140 combatant ships as of last month, the greatest armada in world history.

Such statistics may sound dry and uninspiring. But they mean a great deal to the boys facing the enemy overseas. In many cases they mean the difference between life and death. The American doughboy, seeing the vast fleets of fighting planes and fighting ships which are protecting him and witnessing with his own eyes the superiority of his fighting equipment over anything the enemy can throw at him, must experience a deep sense of gratitude to his friends at home who are backing him up so effectively.

But the American worker seeks no special credit for his services in the war effort. This is his war, just as it is every other American's. He is doing his bit and he is going to keep on doing it, regardless of criticism or praise. He knows that victory is the only thing that counts.

Labor's support of the war effort is not limited to the production program. Laboring men and women are purchasing War bonds to the limit of their ability, they are contributing generously to all war relief activities, they are giving their blood to the Red Cross, and they are actively supporting every administrative and legislative policy which will help speed the day of victory.

Labor, too, has its casualties in this war. Labor casualties incurred since Pearl Harbor while serving on so-called safe jobs here at home on the production lines, now have reached the staggering total figure of 4,681,700, according to official figures supplied by the War Production Board. (We only have to recall the number of accidents right here in Indianapolis in our local plants to realize the truth of these figures.) Of the above number, 36,500 have lost their lives while 212,300 have become permanently disabled.

We take this opportunity to commend American laborers and labor leaders and organizations for the splendid part that they have taken in the war to make possible the victories our fighting men have experienced and enjoyed to date.

Oleo Trust Threatens Nebraska Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing a district in the State of Nebraska that is recognized as one of the leading livestock districts of our Nation; livestock and its products, including beef, milk, eggs, and poultry, representing a large percentage of the agricultural income of our State.

Today I wish to address myself to the importance of the dairy industry and the threat to this industry that is becoming more apparent each day here in Washington.

Nebraska last year produced over 3,000,000,000 pounds of milk, about 100,000,000 pounds of butter and about 2,500,000 pounds of cheese. For several years I have watched the propaganda and advertising carried on by the Oleo Trust whose headquarters are here in Washington. The South is in the saddle and the producers of cottonseed oil are becoming bolder and bolder each day in their attempt to promote oleo at the expense of butter. The Oleo Trust tried to put through a bill this present session of Congress under the guise of being a war measure. Cheap political supporters tried to promote the oleo legislation on the basis of being a war need. It was disclosed that all of the oleomargarine is being made and marketed that can be made with the oil which is allocated to the industry by the War Reclamation Board during this time. The Oleo Trust seems to have considerable support in the present administration.

On July 5, 1940, the United States Department of Agriculture put on a radio skit in which they extolled the value of oleo. This was done on your time and with your facilities and at your expense.

Oleo, my friends, is being served in the Agriculture Department cafeteria in Washington this very day. In one breath these new dealers say oleo is as good as butter and in the next breath put 2 points on oleo and 16 points on butter. The broad question involved in this problem is whether vegetable oils are going to supplant animal fats in the markets of this country or whether the dairy industry should be allowed to have their natural market to which they are entitled. Much misleading propaganda is being furnished.

The Oleo Trust not only maintains a headquarters and lobby here in Washington but there is also another organization that is representing the cottonseed oil interest with headquarters and lobby here as well. The whole oleo industry has been based on deceit and deception. They are trying to change the properties of the product somewhat and the Oleo Trust want it called margarine instead of oleo, at the present time. It appears they want to change the sex as they used to call it Ole and now they want to call it Margie.

Let us analyze a few of the facts in connection with this product. The oleo makers inject some vitamin A into oleo to make it have some of the properties of butter and then they put in some diacetyl acid to make it taste like butter and then give it a shower bath in skim milk to make it smell like butter and then try and make the public believe it tastes like butter. In fact the Oleo Trust in their report shows that they used 74,000,000 pounds of milk in the manufacture of oleo in 1942. Even publications of the present pro-oleo United States Department of Agriculture shows the same amount of 74,000,000 pounds of milk. This is skim milk and is so admitted by the Oleo Trust.

A Nebraska dairyman that would advertise skim milk as milk would soon be in the toils of the law.

Here is another fact. All oleo is not fortified. What is fortified has 9,000 international units of vitamin A injected into it. Many advertisements claim this is as much vitamin A as is contained in butter. Many loose speakers say it has more vitamin A than has butter. I received information from the Agricultural Research Administration, Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics and they say:

> Butter has been found quite variable in vitamin A content. An average value of summer butter is about 20,000 international units per pound and for winter butter 11,000 international units per pound.

This is conclusive proof that butter contains considerably more vitamin A than does oleo. The same Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics says:

> The Food and Drug Administration does not advocate the use of preservatives such as sodium benzoate and tried to discourage their use. According to law, small quantities may be used—one-tenth of 1 percent. However, this must be declared on the label. A report has been published covering investigations made in 1908 and 1909 which reaffirms the above statement. It is known as F. I. D. Report 104 in the Department of Agriculture. This report is now out of print, but Food and Drug Administration can have a photostatic copy made if you so desire.

There were 215,000 pounds of benzoate soda put in the oleo of America in 1942, according to the report of the Oleo Institute. A really good food should not need a preservative and most assuredly should not require as much embalming fluid as oleo evidently needs.

The council on foods and nutrition of the American Medical Association on August 22, 1942, says that "butter contains from 50 to 500 international units of vitamin D per pound." This article also says that "oleomargarine is practically devoid of vitamin D."

THE DAIRY SITUATION

The time has come for the dairymen of this country to realize that there is not more in 100 pounds of milk, so far as nutrition is concerned, than is found in 5 pounds of butter plus 8 pounds of skim milk, 13 pounds of powdered whole milk, 10 pounds of cheese, or in 50 cans or pounds of evaporated or condensed milk. The time has come when every milk producer, regardless of the outlet for his milk and regardless of whether he lives in Nebraska, California, Wisconsin, or New York, must realize the dependence of one on the other. While no bogey scientist will come out for filled milk as yet, you can expect this step if and when oleo is given the chance to replace butter. We have considerable Federal legislation against the manufacture of filled cheese. The dairy industry of America can be assured of one thing, and that is if the Oleo Trust is able to get through their legislation and ruin the butter industry, filled-milk interests and filled-cheese interests will not be far behind in their efforts to break down all protective legislation.

Many people that get off on a tangent in their thinking even now try to make one believe that skim milk is superior to whole milk. Surely skim milk is a good food as it as a powder contains 35 percent of a splendid animal protein. Cottage cheese contains most of the food

value to be found in skim milk. Experiments have long ago proved that growing children must have skim milk supplemented by butterfat for proper growth and as a protective food.

THE WASHINGTON LEGISLATIVE SITUATION

Every effort is being made to push through some type of oleo legislation this session of Congress. The heroic work of the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, as ranking Republican member on the Agriculture Committee, has been able to curb the program of the Oleo Trust. The oleo interests came within two votes on the Agriculture Committee of having success during this Congress.

The Oleo Trust appeared before the Agricultural Committee and tried to deceive its members and lead them to believe a lot of things that were not based on facts. They did not start to inject this vitamin A into oleo until 1938 and yet as you know long before this time the Oleo Trust was trying to deceive the people into believing that even then it was equal to butter.

THE C. I. O. AND C. I. O. OLEO APPROACH

The C. I. O. appears before all our committees of Congress in support of oleo. Here is what their representative Mr. H. S. Haddock testified before the Small Business Committee:

Oleomargarine has a greater food value than butter today.

Speaking of butter, he said:

It should be rolled back to 25¢ a pound.

In answer as to what a farmer would get for his milk, he said:

A farmer at 25 cents a pound for butter, if he utilized all of his milk products, should make 12 cents per pound.

He also said:

I think the facts are available to show that during this time the country would be much better off if they had stopped producing the butter altogether, and I will make that as a positive statement.

Here, then, we find the C. I. O. lined up with the Oleo Trust trying to undermine the dairy industry. The C. I. O. has found it cannot organize the farmers, but evidently think they could organize the oleo makers.

The dairy industry is one of our great industries, representing some $3,000,000,000 a year, and yet these C. I. O. self-styled experts testify that we ought not to make any butter at all. The United States Department of Agriculture must be cooperating with them because their rulings have surely reduced the production of butter in our country.

CONCLUSION

This vegetable oil versus animal fat controversy is causing a very serious situation. If the Oleo Trust, with the help of the C. I. O.'ers, can get oleo legislation passed, then the filled milk and the filled cheeses are sure to follow.

The oil in oleo is being subsidized by the present administration for an amount twice that obtained by the oleo tax. This tax is about $2,000,000 per year.

When science proves the claims of the oleo promoters, there will be ample time then for the consumers to buy their wares. The milk producers of the Nation can and should willingly yield to science. But the dairy industry should not yield one step to any group that has had the background of deceit and deception the oleo people have had and not until science proves the facts beyond doubt.

When powdered whole milk is offered to the public, it can be reconstituted and a saving to the law-income group will be effected that is three times more of a saving than could be made by buying oleo instead of butter.

Nebraska butter is recognized in the butter trade as without a superior in our country. It is hoped that the dairymen of Nebraska and our Nation become aware of the danger before it is too late.

The beef producer also has an interest in this situation. Formerly considerable beef products were used in the manufacture of oleo but now the cheaper vegetable oils are being used. The packers in the oleo business may not be so enthusiastic in supporting fortified protein as they are in fortified oleomargarine. The vegetable-protein people are trying even now to follow the lead of the Oleo Trust and inject vitamins into vegetable protein such as soybean meal and trying to prove that it is the equal to meat.

The injectors of vitamins into vegetable proteins may cause the meat industry the same troubles that the injectors of vitamins into oleo have caused the butter men of our country. Remember ladies and gentlemen there is only one substitute for good Nebraska butter and that is good Nebraska butter and there is only one substitute for good Nebraska beef, pork, and poultry and that is good Nebraska beef, pork, and poultry.

There is not much use of talking about a post-war agriculture until we know who is going to head the agricultural policy of our Nation. We want a market with the natural products of our State, and I or no one else wants to deprive anyone of the chance of eating oleo if he wants to eat it but I repeat that we cannot allow legislation to pass that will give the big Oleo Trust a chance to sell their synthetic product in unfair competition with the natural products of our land.

Just Another Squabble or Part of the Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently another one of those interdepartmental "rows" which have characterized President Roosevelt's New Deal agencies and which have so hindered the war effort came to public attention.

After a period of rumor of existing dissension between Donald Nelson, War Production Board Chairman, and his Executive Vice Chairman, Charles E. Wilson, on Friday Wilson resigned, accusing Nelson of having failed to keep his promises to vindicate Wilson of charges of opposing reconversion and stating that Nelson himself delayed reconversion through a policy of procrastination. Wilson said that, as long ago as 8 or 9 months, he had submitted the only reconversion plan which W. P. B. has and that some 20 weeks elapsed before he could get Nelson's O. K. on the plan.

The President had just this week announced that Nelson would be sent on an important, special mission to China. Nelson's friends, recalling WALLACE'S recent trip to China and his subsequent dumping overboard by the new dealers, immediately began speculating on the meaning of this trip and expressed the thought that Nelson was being kicked in the teeth; that he was being eased out of the chairmanship of W. P. B.

The President at first attempted to refute these rumors, but at his Friday press conference and as Nelson left the Capital on the first lap of his China trip, asked whether he expected Nelson to resume his duties as head of W. P. B. after his trip, the President replied that Nelson's mission was most important; that he regarded the question as an "iffy" question, did not know, and that it was sort of "iffy" to say what was going to happen in the future.

Thirty-six-year-old Julius A. Krug has been named by the President as acting W. P. B. chief. Before entering the Navy, Krug was W. P. B.'s program vice chairman and has served also as chief power engineer and manager of power for the Tennessee Valley Authority. The press states that he is "one of the most ardent new dealers," and further says:

President Roosevelt yesterday clearly indicated the War Production Board is being taken out of the hands of the businessmen who directed the most tremendous war materials program in history and is being turned over to New Deal bureaucrats to pilot the vital problems of post-war reconversion.

In this connection, the comment of David Lawrence, an eminent columnist and the editor of the United States News, is interesting. In his article on the W. P. B. intrigue, Mr. Lawrence writes:

President Roosevelt, floundering in a sea of rumors and political pressures, unable to make up his mind to clean house in the top floor of the War Production Board and put it on an efficient basis, accepted the resignation of Charles E. Wilson after the latter had pointedly referred to the dissension inside the Board.

Whether Mr. Roosevelt intends to do anything now about the intrigue is not known but certainly he appears to have sided with the intriguers. What it all boils down to is the fact that certain new dealers who have socialistic ideas about using the surplus property on a "production for use" basis in competition with industry, are finally in control of policy in the War Production Board. They have schemed for months to weaken Donald Nelson and to get rid of Charles E. Wilson. They have the ear of the White House or

somebody in the President's entourage who has in turn the ear of the President.

* * * * *

It turns out now that the plot to get Donald Nelson out of town was hatched by some of the ardent new dealers themselves and that their hope was to get rid of Charles E. Wilson by aggravating him into a resignation while Donald Nelson was away in China. This would mean the elevation of some new dealer whom the cabal wanted to put in power in the War Production Board.

* * * * *

This correspondent called attention to the same kind of intrigue when Ferdinand Eberstadt was summarily removed last year as vice chairman by Donald Nelson. The Government lost the services then of one of the ablest young men in the country. It was made to appear that the friction was between Mr. Wilson and Mr. Eberstadt, when, as a matter of fact, the effort was to get rid of one executive from the business world and then concentrate on the other.

Just what purpose is behind all the intrigue is not clear, except that various new dealers have not been content to stand idly by while such huge properties as have been established in the various war plants are available.

The new dealers, supporters of a fourth term, have had a great deal to say about the inadvisability of changing horses in the middle of the stream. Now, when the vital problems of reconversion are demanding solution, what justification will they offer for depriving W. P. B. and the Nation of the services of Nelson and Wilson?

Production Record in Jackson, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the Second Congressional District, which it is my privilege to represent in Congress, is one of the busiest national defense areas in the country. The mammoth Ford Willow Run and kindred war industries have created a general manpower shortage problem in this area. Jackson, the largest city in the district, has been exceptionally free from labor disputes and dissension, and all Michigan residents are proud of this record.

The Labor Day editorial of the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot is well worth reading, and I submit it to the House. It is as follows:

LABOR DAY

Contemplating another Labor Day, the automatic first thought is the continuing obligation of labor and management to the winning of the war.

Jackson has a proud record in this respect. The very fact that nearly all of our industries are closed today is evidence that schedules have been maintained or exceeded. Even the plants which find it necessary to forego the holiday have the satisfaction of knowing that the pressure for their output is national rather than local. Jackson workmen and management have not fallen down.

Our local record of industrial relations has been as good as—we suspect better than—any other city in the southern Michigan area. We have gone many months without industrial disturbance of any moment. This is a tribute to the leadership and the personnel of the C. I. O. and A. F. L. unions and as well to management which, it is fair to assume, has kept its agreements else trouble would have developed.

Recently we have had an outstanding example of cooperation between unions and employers in the local effort to obtain added manpower for critical industries. In the same splendid spirit labor has taken a major part in other community enterprises, notably in the financing and management of the war chest, which is as it should be.

But Labor Day, when looked at from the national standpoint, presents a challenging study.

Representatives of the C. I. O. and A. F. of L., after visiting the French war front, recently reported that soldiers are not antiunion. That is a defensive statement. It implies that the public had thought otherwise, and there is some justification for that feeling. In truth, it was R. J. Thomas, head of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. and one of the leaders who reported from France—it was Mr. Thomas who warned his union many months ago that there must be no more strikes because an embattled America was losing sympathy for unionism by reason of interruptions in production, although the vast majority of workmen stuck loyally to their jobs.

Regardless of the word from the labor leaders who have been abroad, organized labor definitely has a job to hold and justify public confidence.

It isn't only the fact of wartime strikes in munitions plants which have weakened public respect and faith in unions. It is the lack of integrity among certain unions.

Samuel Gompers, who did more than any man to establish union labor on a high plane and to win progress for the workingman, held to one basic theory in all relations between labor and management—the pledge of the union must be kept.

That was axiomatic among the stronger unions and was a basic reason for their strength. Once a contract was made, it was not to be violated.

But in recent years violation of contractural agreements has become so common as to be scarcely newsworthy. Most recent was the strike at the Highland Park Ford plant. The union had a contract with the company. That contract provided specifically for grievance machinery, including arbitration of difficulties which could not be otherwise settled. But the union ordered and carried out a strike without first using the grievance machinery or calling for arbitration of its disagreements, if any, with management. The same story could be written about 80 percent of wartime strikes; and in many cases the strikers have been A. F. of L. unions, despite the Gompers tradition.

Another problem which modern unionism must face is the left-wing campaign to use labor organizations as the front for class warfare. Such class warfare has in mind not the elevation of workers to a higher economic status but the destruction of the present social order. It is a revolutionary movement, yet union leaders, who do not themselves believe in the theories involved, lend themselves to class warfare, ranging worker against boss and callouses against white collars. The inevitable ultimate goal of such a program is destruction of unionism, because in the kind of social order which class war envisages there can be no labor organizations here any more than there are in Russia.

The present adventure of the C. I. O. in politics is another experiment of dubious wisdom which runs directly contradictory to the wisdom of Gompers. There is danger to America and to the unions as a group in this deviation from past policy. The C. I. O. P. A. C. program is a pressure group attempting to force its will upon the people of the Nation It is seeking special privilege just as surely as did the money interests of the nineties. When Sidney Hillman told a congressional committee that P. A. C. is nonpartisan, he knew that the statement was untrue, because he himself had caused the rejection of one candidate for the Vice Presidency in the Democratic Convention and had been an active behind-the-scenes wirepuller in that convention.

These are problems which labor will find itself facing in the years to come. There is a conflict within labor organizations more vigorous than any conflict between labor and management. Radical left-wingers want to get their foot into the door of management; they want to make unionism a political as well as an economic and social movement; they want to set up class barriers.

In the early stages of the development of any labor organization such as the C. I. O. it is the radicals who are most vociferous who frequently gain control. But real, lasting progress seldom comes from these front runners. Union labor is as American as the flag, and in the ultimate evolution its organizations will find firm footing on the solid foundations in which are deeply rooted the philosophies of our people.

Hon. Joaquin Miguel Elizalde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the many friends of Hon. JOAQUIN MIGUEL ELIZALDE, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines from September 29, 1938, until his recent resignation, will miss him greatly.

Commissioner ELIZALDE's service in the Congress has been outstanding and distinguished. The Philippines was indeed fortunate in having a man of his good common sense, sound judgment, and broad business experience to represent its 17,000,000 people during these past hectic, unhappy, and trying 4 years.

All during the time the Japanese have occupied the Philippines, Commissioner ELIZALDE has been the leading spirit in bracing up the morale of his conquered and ill-treated people. He has a wealth of knowledge of economic, military, and social conditions, not only of our friends and allies, the Philippines and China, but also of the Japanese enemy and the countries Japan has overrun. That knowledge places him high on the list of men valuable and useful to our country. He has willingly shared his knowledge with Members of Congress and the departments of Government, to the great benefit of the war effort.

I, like the other Members, have learned to admire and respect "Mike," as he is affectionately known to his colleagues, as a man and a friend. All of us wish him well in whatever he undertakes.

Protect the United States First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that I have been one of the Members of Congress who has consistently brought to the attention of the Congress the importance of giving some consideration to the protection and interests of the United States, and to the taxpayers who will have to pay the billions of dollars of our national debt in taxes.

Long before Senator BUTLER issued his statement about the vast amount of money that was being spent by the United States in other countries, I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of speeches entitled "Good Old Santa Claus," and today I read from yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a protest along the same lines by Senator BROOKS.

Mr. Speaker, self-preservation is the first law of nature, and it seems to me that we should give serious thought to the military safety of this country, for who can tell whether or not in 25 years we will not have to defend our own country again?

Instead of spending all of the money of the taxpayers of the United States to build airports, bases, and otherwise rehabilitate other countries of the world, it is high time that something be done in this respect for our own country.

I am in favor of securing all of the islands, all of the air bases, all of the naval bases, and any other installations which can and will protect us from aggression from any side, and I am again calling this matter to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, as it is my opinion that this is a responsibility which rests squarely upon our shoulders, as well as upon the shoulders of our Army, Navy, Air Force, and other officials of our Government.

I am of the further opinion that we should preserve all of our war plants, and not destroy them, and perhaps have to rebuild them in future years.

I am glad to read in this morning's press a statement issued by Hon. Bradley Dewey, Rubber Director, wherein he stresses the necessity of keeping the low-cost rubber plants in operation.

Since I have in my district a large synthetic-rubber plant, and plants manufacturing allied and byproducts essential to the manufacture of this important commodity, I am heartily in accord with the statements made by Mr. Dewey, and with your permission I would like to include in my remarks the published articles by Senator BROOKS and by Mr. Dewey, as follows:

BROOKS DEMANDS UNITED STATES RIGHTS IN AIR BASE SALES

Senator BROOKS (Republican, Illinois) protested in the Senate yesterday against the recent sale of air bases in Canada and called upon Congress to prohibit further sales of American-built aviation facilities in other lands until American rights to their use have been guaranteed by treaties.

Asserting it is doubtful whether there is a single area where future air rights will be as necessary as those in Canada to the defense of the United States, BROOKS declared:

"Yet the War Department has already disposed of them by sale without first having our country enter into a treaty which will establish our right to future use of these air bases. * * * Already, before the war has been won, our War Department has sold all of these bases and flight strips at a price of almost $14,000,000 less than the cost to us."

In other countries throughout the world where air bases have been built, no provision has been made for their use by the United States, BROOKS said, "for any purpose," beyond 6 months after the close of war.

He said there was eloquent proof that the British Empire is moving with greater speed than we are in this all-important question.

[From the Washington Post of September 6, 1944]

KEEP SYNTHETIC-RUBBER PLANTS, BRADLEY DEWEY URGES

(By Christine Sadler)

A strong plea for the post-war operation of synthetic-rubber plants in this country was made yesterday by Bradley Dewey in the "appendix" to his final report as the Nation's rubber director.

Three major reasons for keeping the low-cost plants in operation were stressed as follows:

1. The post-war demand for rubber will be so great that an annual production of between 400,000 and 600,000 tons of synthetic will be needed, in addition to what the country could expect when it has access again to crude-rubber plantations of the Far East.

2. Specialty synthetics will be in demand due to qualities superior to crude rubber.

3. Buna S—the main general purpose synthetic—"will be in large demand at prices which will act as a governor and will set a ceiling on the world price of crude rubber."

Documenting his contention that synthetics can be produced at competitive prices, Dewey presented figures compiled by the Rubber Reserve Company to show that purchasers of natural rubber from July 1940, through June of this year have been made at an average cost of 25.6 cents per pound. This included purchases from Central and South America. Exclusive of supplies bought in the "other Americas," the cost per pound has averaged 21.4 cents.

The Rubber Reserve Company in the same period paid the following for American synthetics: Buna S. 35.2 cents per pound; neoprene, 26.7 cents; butyl, 35.6 cents; thiokol, 42 cents.

In its sales, the figures showed, the Company has been able to break even only on neoprene, which was sold for an average of 39.9 cents per pound—exclusive of Government purchases for war, and on natural rubber, not including that from Central and South America. The price received for the latter product averaged 24.9 cents per pound.

Numerous factors other than straight production costs should be considered before any synthetic plant is scrapped, Dewey urged. Among these were listed:

1. The public's stake in the plants, more than 95 percent of which have been built with Government funds totaling above $1,500,000,000.

2. The rapid deterioriation of plants not kept in at least stand-by condition and the rapid retrogression in chemical knowledge which would result should experiments and pilot production not be continued.

A Poet Was a Prophet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission given by the House, I offer for the RECORD, the following item from last week's editorial columns of the Custer County (S. Dak.) Chronicle, embracing a poem by Badger Clark, poet laureate of South Dakota, written in 1940 and entitled "Acceptance":

[From the Custer County (S. Dak.) Chronicle of August 31, 1944]

OUR POET WAS A PROPHET

Four years ago the Chronicle published a poem by Badger Clark entitled "Acceptance." To refresh memories on the background of those times, we reprint certain remarks by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

March 4, 1937: "My great ambition on January 20, 1941, is to turn over this desk and chair in the White House to my successor, whoever he may be, with the assurance that I am at the same time turning over to him as President a nation intact, a nation at peace, a nation prosperous. * * * A nation which has thus proved that the democratic form and methods of national government can and will succeed." (Speech at Democratic victory dinner.)

July 10, 1940: "When, in 1936, I was chosen by the voters for a second time as President, it was my firm intention to turn over the responsibilities of government to other hands at the end of my term. * * * Like most men of my age, I had made plans for myself, plans for a private life of my own choice and for my own satisfaction, a life of that kind to begin in January 1941. * * * In the face of public danger, my conscience will not let me turn my back upon a call to service." (Radio acceptance speech from the White House.)

And now we reprint the poem:

[From the Custer County (S. Dak.) Chronicle of October 24, 1940]

ACCEPTANCE—1940

My friends, my fellow Democrats,
Job holders, bosses, bureaucrats,
I see your fealty has not changed,
And things have gone through as arranged;
So I return with some elation,
Thanks for my third-term nomination.

This triumph draws the happy tears,
Yet I don't want it.
I've schemed to land it for two years,
But I don't want it.
I've praised the poor and cussed the rich,
I've tossed my old friends in the ditch,
I've got the Presidential itch,
Yet I don't want it.

Likewise my wife, dear girl, in tears,
Shrinks from the spotlight four more years,
And trembles at your call;
She writes and writes and talks and talks,
She drives and dances, flies and walks,
But how she hates it all!

We long to live in humble peace,
To terminate our White House lease.
Sweet peace! Oh, how we crave it!
Yet this wild Willkie must be braved
And our dear country must be saved,
And who but I can do it?

No; duty holds me on the rack;
And though I never may go back
To my dear little Hyde Park shack,
I'll stick to duty's rugged track.

Washington turned a third term down,
But he was only Washington.
Jefferson ducked the third-term crown,
But he was only Jefferson.
But you see,
I am me
And this is an emergency.
Emergency! How oft with me
That cry rings from the rafter!
I always shout emergency
To get what I am after.

Emergency. With tongue and pen
I dare and do not flee it,
Though those bone-headed Congressmen
Quite often cannot see it.

Emergency! It always ends
With my foes trounced severely,
With Federal jobs for all my friends
And votes for yours sincerely.
So, my friends, I'll bear once more
The burden for my country's sake,
Open again the Treasury door,
Give the poor bread while we have cake.

Once more, my friends, we'll prime the pump,
Once more beat down all hostile clans—
Hitler, that Indiana chump,
The Japs and the Republicans.

And when our joyous spending spree
Has blessed this land for four years more,
I'll dig up some emergency
To use in nineteen hundred and forty-four.
—*Badger Clark.*

And to bring the story down to date, we reprint certain recent utterances by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

July 10, 1944: "For myself, I do not want to run. By next spring, I shall have been President and Commander in Chief of the armed forces for 12 years. * * * All that is within me cries out to go back to my home on the Hudson River, to avoid public responsibilities, and to avoid also the publicity which in our democracy follows every step of the Nation's Chief Executive." (Letter to Robert E. Hannegan, Democratic national chairman.)

July 20, 1944: "I accept the nomination. * * * It seems wholly likely that within the next 4 years our armed forces and those of our allies will have gained a complete victory over Germany and Japan sooner or later, and that the world once more will be at peace. * * * In any event, whenever that time comes, new hands will have full opportunity to realize the ideals which we seek." (Acceptance speech at west coast naval yard.)

Our poet was a prophet.

The Late Hon. George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to present for the wider perusal which will come through publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the September 5 issue of the Washington Post concerning the late Senator Norris and written by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger.

Senator Norris was loved and respected by the rank and file of Americans as few men have ever been. What is here written by able Captain Neuberger is a sensible and just appraisal of the character and the serene integrity of the late Senator from Nebraska. The article follows:

A COMMUNICATION

Throughout the Nation George W. Norris was a symbol of hope and progress to millions of men and women. In 1940 he spoke in my home State of Oregon and in the neighboring State of Washington. Farmers drove all night from hundreds of miles away to see and hear him. At Grand Coulee Dam they shook his hand with tears in their eyes. Some of them had been active in the progressive movement for five decades and shaking hands with Norris was the crowning event of their lives.

There were tears in the old Senator's eyes, too, as he looked down at the great dam, the largest power project on earth. "This is the fulfillment of my dream," he said, and I am sure he remembered those days when alone in Congress he fought for Government development of America's rivers.

Norris went back a long way, to the time of Bryan and T. R. and McKinley. I once heard Col. C. E. S. Wood, who fought in the Indian wars with Custer and Kit Carson, tell me that Norris had been "the standard bearer of liberalism's guidons for three generations of Americans."

Of all his deeds I think the old Senator was most proud of his vote in 1917 against American participation in the First World War. I remember sitting with him in the den of his little stucco house in McCook and hearing that tale—of how he had been sent German Iron Crosses in the mail and how he had gone back to Nebraska to report to his people.

He rented a hall at Lincoln and walked onto the platform all alone. No one would dare introduce him. He looked out over the silent throng, a white-haired old man in a neat black suit and shoestring tie. "I have come home to tell you the truth," he began. Somewhere near the back of the hall a man applauded. Another man took it up. The applause grew, then the crowd was on its feet. Cheering commenced. "In that moment," Norris told me, "I felt repaid for all the agony, for all the abuse, for all the vilification."

This event made a vivid impression on his mind. Yet that mind was never closed. He changed his mind about this war and was an early advocate of American intervention. He supported the President's foreign policy on through from the fall of France.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is Norris' monument. He began advocating the T. V. A. in 1923 when he opposed the sale of Muscle Shoals to Henry Ford. The elder La Follette stood at his side for a few years. When La Follette died Norris said of him, "He was the leader of the advancing column of hope and progress." La Follette never saw the T. V. A. built. Norris Dam on the Clinch River is now one of the T. V. A.'s key units, although the old man declined to attend the dedication of a bust of himself at the site of the project.

People in every State wrote to Norris about injustices and wrongs. They felt that in him they had a ready champion. Oregon, where I live, is 1,700 miles from Nebraska, yet men and women on Oregon's farms looked to Norris for help and assistance. To the end of his career he maintained an interest in the family of the late Senator Lane, of Oregon, who was one of the four in the Senate who stood with Norris and the elder La Follette against war in 1917.

Norris was no breast-beater making loud noises. Neither did he view the functioning of democracy from Olympian heights, as do some liberals. He believed that democracy was part of one's daily life. He was considerate to those who worked for him. He shunned display and protocol. He had no chauffeur. He and his wife often stopped at tourist homes and boarding houses on their way between Nebraska and Washington.

Norris disliked slickness. Innuendo and double meaning were not in his arsenal. He trusted people who were open-handed and outspoken. He asked simple, direct questions. A number of administration supporters did not want the late J. D. Ross to be the first Director of the Bonneville Power Authority. "J. D." wore high shoes, suspenders, and big hats. "'J. D.' is right down the line for public power, isn't he?" asked Norris. The President appointed "J. D."

The last time I saw Norris was in the summer of 1942, shortly before I went to Alaska with the United States Army Engineers. I spent the afternoon in his office with him and Irving Dilliard, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, who is now also in the Army.

The Senator talked of his past. He relived the days when he overthrew "Uncle Joe" Cannon. He spoke of T. V. A. and Bonneville and Coulee and what they could do for the Nation. He stood again with "the little group of willful men." He said this would have to be the last war or we all were finished. He tired as the shadows of late afternoon lined the park outside.

Dilliard and I got up to leave. "Good-bye, Irving," Norris said. "Good-bye, Dick. You boys and the rest all over the country will have to carry on. I am at the end of the trail. My part in the struggle is over."

R. L. NEUBERGER.

WASHINGTON, *September 3.*

Farley Steps Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Troy (N. Y.) Observer-Budget of June 11, 1944, titled "Farley Steps Down":

FARLEY STEPS DOWN

The news that Jim Farley no longer heads the Democratic State committee seems almost incredible. Since 1928, when he was elected secretary of that body, he has been the helmsman and never let go of the tiller at any time, even after he went on to the national chairmanship and the office of Postmaster General. Mr. Farley was the most dynamic and energetic individual to head the Democratic Party in this State and infused life into a political organization whose activities for many years had been merely perfunctory. The strategy of the Democratic command before Big Jim came into the picture had been to pile up a big vote in Greater New York through the popularity of Al Smith and then ride along on his coat tails. Upstate New York was a neglected country.

Not so with Farley. Under his leadership the chairman of every county committee began to feel that he and his organization really amounted to something and the personal letters signed in the famous green ink which were sent to him from the fourth floor of the

Biltmore Hotel inspired him to do his damnedest for Jim and the party candidate. The results were amazing for many years, until the party schism occurred in 1942 and the legendary Mr. Dewey entered the State political picture.

We do not profess to know what Mr. Farley's future political plans are. We assume that he intends to bring his ideas of democracy before the national convention in Chicago. If he does, we think that he will perform a valuable service to his party and to the Republic. It has been apparent for several years that there is more than one school of thought in the Democratic Party. An open discussion of these differences of opinion in the forum of the national convention could by no means be construed as disloyalty to the Commander in Chief in time of war.

It would, we think, be convincing evidence to the world that we practice at home what we preach to the world—democracy.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speeker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Post-war Problems," delivered by me before the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs, Richmond, Va., September 5, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs and guests, the war has brought many changes—changes in our industrial, social, and economic lives. We now face the problem of reappraising our way of life and readjusting our economy to meet these new conditions. America has new responsibilities to itself and to the world. Aside from the prime purpose of joining hands with the other peace-loving nations in an effort to build, by collaboration and cooperation, a world where there will be peace and tranquillity, we face a problem on the home front of equal proportions. Our war-inflated industrial capacity cannot be allowed to drop back to pre-war levels without causing a domestic crisis we dare not permit. This is our No. 1 domestic problem. According to whether or not we are able to solve this will depend, to a very large extent, our domestic happiness and peace. The rapidly approaching end of the European phase of this war poses a number of problems of great magnitude. Congress has scught to meet these problems, insofar as they can be met by legislative action at this stage of developments.

Keenly sensible of our duty to the fighting men and women and their dependents, we have passed legislation and set up the machinery which I think will generously care for them. This is what I am sure the majority of the American people wish to have done.

We have passed in the House of Representatives, legislation dealing with contract termination, surplus property disposal, and reconversion. These latter two important pieces of legislation are now being worked out by joint committees of the House of Representatives and United States Senate. It is reasonable to suppose that they will fairly well meet this problem until experience has shown us where, if at all, we should make changes.

I have mentioned our war-inflated industries. When some time before Pearl Harbor it became perfectly apparent that the war was world-wide in scope, and that it would in all probability spread all over Europe and Asia and even to the Western Hemisphere if not checked, the President of the United States set about to mobilize American thought and action in an effort to put into the hands of the powers who were resisting Axis aggression equipment of war and supplies necessary to enable them to carry on the fight. He appeared before a joint session of Congress and made his "Arsenal of Democracy" speech. The objectives which he set seemed at the time fantastic. About that time there was called up in Washington a conference which was attended by leading industrial analysts, statisticians, and production experts. This conference was attended by gentlemen of all types and philosophies. There were present the ultra-conservative, as well as the so-called starry-eyed boys. The question posed was what could American industry do in the way of supplying for our expanding forces and for the United Nations implements and supplies of war. The more conservative, and by far the greater percentage, estimated that by a great united effort we might produce in war material and supplies in the neighborhood of twenty or twenty-five billion dollars in the first year. The extremely optimistic put it as high as $40,000,000,000. Now let us see what America really did when we got together and decided on a course of action. We produced more than twice the amount estimated by the most optimistic experts—namely, more than $100,000,000,000 worth of war materials in the first year. The increased production of food was equally impressive. What has been accomplished by this united effort of the American people will, I am sure, go down as one of the industrial and agricultural miracles of the age. That is not an overstatement or an exaggeration, and this was accomplished in spite of handicaps and difficulties. We raised an Army, Navy, Air Forces, and Marine Corps.

We equipped them and transported many of them to foreign bases. We supplied and sent equipment to the United Nations. We built planes, tanks, ammunition, motor vehicles, all manner of supplies, clothing, medical supplies, and foods in ever increasing quantities. Since the beginning of the European war, we built 65,000 ships for the Navy and a vast merchant marine. Transportation systems within the United States went into high gear and the railroads have performed one of the most remarkable accomplishments in the history of rail transportation. All of this spells out the present high road to victory which we are traveling. It makes us realize the unlimited power of this Nation and her people when united they set out upon a course of action. These phenomenal results could only have come about in one way and that was by the united action of the American people. I do not overlook the fact that there have been rough spots in this picture—some very ugly spots. There have been instances where segments of labor have been under bad leadership. There have been instances where some categories of industry were very slow to get into step and were very loath to overlook the opportunity for war profits and advantages. There were some instances where the public generally were most impatient, apathetic, and noncooperative, in falling in line with a Nation geared up to total war—but in the sum total of things, these were isolated instances and, percentagewise, of little consequence. When one steps back from the whole picture and gets a sweeping panoramic view of America mobilizing for war, it is an inspiring picture. It is a tribute to industry, labor, and agriculture and to the American people. This war has been splendidly organized.

Yesterday was Labor Day. What is labor? It is the rank and file of the productive workers of the country—the men and women who make things, who keep the wheels of industry turning. They may work in office, shop, or factory, in the fields or on the sea. It does not matter where they work, whether it be in teeming city, or on a lonely hillside farm, whether the sound in their ears is that of whirring machinery or the slap of waves against a small fishing boat. So long as they produce or help in production proves that they are labor. There are literally millions of these laborers in America. It is appropriate and fitting, right at this point, that I make an observation or two on that subject.

The history of the labor movement in America is one of absorbing interest. Because of a diversity of interests, sometimes because of sectional differences, and sometimes because of unfortunate leadership, the going has not always been smooth. When one surveys the whole picture, I am sure that this movement has had a most notable effect in improving the lot of the workers of America. I think that there are a few outstanding facts that are self-evident. The first is that working conditions are more favorable, and standards of living higher in America today than in any other land. Second, there is less friction and a more cooperative spirit between the employer and the employee than in any other country. Like any other great movement, labor has had its trials and difficulties. At times it has been a house divided against itself. It has also had to fight to rid itself of subversive elements that sought to gain control in some of its branches.

Today, 62 years after that first Labor Day, we find much progress has been made in the lot of the man who toils. Great social and economic reforms have come. They have been universally accepted in principle. Among them can be mentioned: Social security, old-age pensions, unemployment compensation, railroad retirement, employer liability, the right to bargain collectively, and the principle of minimum pay and maximum hours, and many other protective measures, as well as measures for the protection of women and children in industry.

MEN MUST WORK

The world does not owe a man a living, but just as surely as the principles of right are essential to civilization, the world does owe a man a chance to make a living. Under our system of government, we undertake to guarantee to our fellow citizen an opportunity to support himself and his dependents by honest toil.

May I quote to you a few paragraphs from an address that I made on the floor of the House of Representatives on May 16, 1940. We had under consideration an appropriation for unemployment relief. Here is what I said:

"May we indulge for a moment in a little homespun philosophy? In my judgment, one of the factors that have made America a great nation, a nation of which we are proud and that we like to boast about, is the individuality of its citizens, the individuality of their opportunity, the individuality of their responsibility. We are told that under our system of government, there are certain great guaranties, one of the greatest of which is the guaranty of equality of opportunity.

"The opportunity of an American citizen, that our system of government guarantees is the opportunity to work, to live, to support his dependents, to start at the bottom and climb to the top, to establish himself, to own his own home, to acquire and own property, to educate his children, to support his churches, and to hold his head up as the peer of every freeman who lives on the face of the earth.

"Not only that, but he has a responsibility as a citizen, a responsibility to help support this Government under which he lives. He must obey its laws and institutions. He should subscribe to its philosophies and glory in its traditions.

"Bear in mind that this guaranty of equality is not a complete guaranty of property equality. It does not mean that if one man, by brain or brawn, succeeds in accumulating a few dollars some other less industrious or fortunate citizen has a right, by one way or another, to take half of that and divide it up, because of the guaranty of equality of the Constitution. That is not so. That is not the guaranty at all. The guaranty under the Constitution is that under this great scheme of life it will be a fair, equal, open competition on the part of every citizen to work and to live and to acquire property and enjoy the good things of life—the great competitive scheme of America, where 'the race is to the swiftest' and the 'battle to the strong.' Such is the fundamental philosophy upon which our Government was founded, and it is upon that philosophy that it has grown to be the greatest government on the face of the earth."

I have commented upon our great accomplishment in mobilizing for war production. Paradoxical as it may seem, of perhaps of greater importance and beset with many difficulties will be the tasks of liquidation—the liquidation of war production, including, as it does, the cancelation of war contracts and the disposing of Government-owned war plants and surpluses. This is a problem that is right on our doorstep. It will not be met by merely trying to return to a pre-war level of production. That would be an easy goal to attain. We are told, however, that our production in the post-war period, in order to prevent a great crisis, must be 40 or 50 percent greater than that of 1940. This will call for speed in solving the problems of transition and for removing, wherever possible, unnecessary Government interferences and controls. This problem will tax American ingenuity. To shift to a post-war scale of business activity in which there is expanded production and new employment opportunities in private industry will be our problem. The success of the transition will depend upon the unity of the people and upon the readiness of private business, agriculture, and labor to subordinate their personal desires for temporary advantages to the greater advantage of restoring the national economy to a healthy and durable prosperity.

I have stated that this was a big job. We are told that we have now outstanding between eighty and one hundred billion dollars of uncompleted war contracts. These are placed out in between one hundred to two hundred and fifty thousand prime contracts. These contracts will have to be cancelled and adjustments made with the contractors. We have provided suitable legislation for this.

It has been estimated that the surplus war matériel, including contractor inventories, will be some sixty to seventy-five billion dollars. Of this at least three-fourths will be in combat ordnance. Approximately fifteen or twenty billions will be in merchantable goods. The problem of protecting the Government's interests and protecting industry and labor by not flooding the markets with these goods is another problem. We are moving in on that and have called upon the leading production and sales experts in the Nation.

The Government has expended in the present emergency probably $33,000,000,000 in the construction of plants and other facilities. Approximately half of this is on military installations—the other half is the Government's investment in industrial plants. Here, again, the business ability and the genius of American industry and labor will be called upon to cooperate. Being an optimist, however, I believe we can and will lick these problems. The best contribution that the Government can make, or at least a notable contribution, will be to cooperate with industry to see that it gets geared up to peacetime production and that it has expanded markets for its products. On this will depend whether or not we will be able to give jobs to returning soldiers and to our laid-off war workers.

I am convinced that industry and labor, as well as the public, realizing the importance of this task and what it means to our domestic peace, will give to these pressing problems on the home front the same unfailing and patriotic service which has been given to the war effort.

Something for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of September 4, 1944:

SOMETHING FOR CONGRESS

It seems to be a set part of our political make-up that—

1. We sit back in the primaries, when the bosses are picking party candidates, and pay little attention.

2. We direct all of our attention in the general elections to the head of the ticket and do a hit-and-miss on the tail end. And a lot of us don't vote at all.

3. This we follow up by loud and persistent beefs about the people in government.

All the while we are expecting to get brilliant-minded, simon-pure, nonpolitical politicians in public office. And we have been very careful not to overpay them.

This attitude we particularly impose on Congress, until sometimes it is a wonder we get anybody to run for Congress. And it's no wonder we so many times don't get the right men.

Here in Pennsylvania we pay our judges good salaries—$14,000 for common pleas judges in Allegheny County, $18,000 for superior court judges, $19,500 for supreme court judges. And the lower court judges need run for office only once in 10 years and the supreme court term runs 21 years.

We even pay our Governor a fair salary—$18,000.

But Congressmen, from Pennsylvania and every other State, get only $10,000 a year. And no perquisites to speak of.

On this salary they must live in the most expensive town in America—Washington. They must make frequent trips back home to see constituents. They must run for office every 2 years, which means they practically are campaigning the whole time. They must maintain a home in their district and another in Washington. And they are No. 1 victims on every sucker list.

Some have suggested that a Congressman's pay be raised to $20,000 or $25,000 a year.

What figure is the correct amount, we are not attempting to judge.

But it is a fact that few Congressmen, especially in these days of high prices, can make both ends meet on their salary—especially if they keep up their fences at home. This is one reason so many able men, without independent financial resources, decline to run for Congress. They can't afford it. Particularly in the last 10 years or so since being a Congressman has become a full-time job.

The public is forever asking Congress to do something for us.

It's about time somebody did something for Congress.

Not in the Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to note that not only the military authorities but people in civil life are paying justly deserved tribute to our citizens of Japanese ancestry who have served and are serving so faithfully, and in notable instances so heroically, on foreign battlefields. The following editorial from the New York Times of September 2 is well worth reading:

NOT IN THE BLOOD

Their names are Masaki Fujikawa, Shinei Nakamine, Denis Masato Hashimoto, Grover Kazutomi Nagaji, Kenji Kato, Tsugiyasu Toma, all killed in action against their country's enemy. Irving M. Akahosi was cited for his conduct during a daring mission at Anzio. Frank Morihara, Arthur Shinyama, and James Iwamoto all wear the Purple Heart for honorable wounds received in the Italian campaign. Thomas Higa has or will have the same decoration. He was wounded at Cassino. Other Americans of Japanese descent have fought for our flag in the Pacific and in Burma, taking risks, because of their race, over and beyond those assumed by white soldiers. Their comrades of the Thirty-fourth Infantry Division in Italy and of units to which they have been attached in other areas have accepted them wholeheartedly. Letters from other American soldiers received in this office have proclaimed the loyalty and devotion of these men.

What this proves is a fact encouraging for Japanese-Americans, for the country of which they are citizens and for the long prospect ahead. There is nothing in the Japanese blood, or in any racial blood, that makes men ignorant and brutal. Education and environment turn the scales one way or the other. A whole generation in Japan and Germany has gone to waste and worse than waste. Under decent governments, in a decent society, in a decently organized world, the coming generations may be reclaimed. The war must be won by destruction, but the peace will be kept only by education.

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler Supports F. D. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article by Ralph Smith from the Atlanta Journal of September 3, 1944:

CRACKERLAND IN WASHINGTON

(By Ralph Smith)

DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER SUPPORTS F. D. R.

WASHINGTON, September 2.—Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, of New York, the Republican nominee for Vice President on the ticket with President William H. Taft in 1912, is supporting President Roosevelt for a fourth term. So, too, is Mrs. Butler actively for the Democratic Presidential ticket.

The report reaching Washington from the Southampton, Long Island, summer residence of the Butlers, has fallen among Republicans on Capitol Hill like a devastating demolition bomb. It is interpreted as unmistakable evidence that prominent and representative Republicans are unimpressed with Gov. Thomas E. Dewey's indefinite and wishy-washy position with respect to foreign affairs and international issues.

Dr. Butler is an outstanding American. He has been president of Columbia University since 1901, has attended nine Republican National Conventions since 1888, as a delegate from the State of New York, and received the support of the New York delegation for the Presidential nomination in 1920, after having previously been selected as President Taft's running mate in 1912.

A trustee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching since 1905, Dr. Butler has been a trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace since 1925 and is at present chairman of the Carnegie Corporation. He is a director of the New York Life Insurance Co., a trustee of St. John the Divine Cathedral, a former chairman of the American Red Cross (1914–24), and was awarded the Nobel peace prize in 1931.

There has been no statement or explanation of Dr. Butler's desertion of Governor Dewey in the present campaign, yet the impression persists that the far-seeing and studious educator and statesman is mindful of the fact that Dewey is following in the footsteps of Harding with respect to world peace and international amity.

None of the old-timers here in Washington—not even Republican stalwart Senators who are now planning a campaign against "entangling post-war alliances"—has forgotten Harding's pious pose on his front porch in 1920, protesting his support of a society or organization of nations to preserve the peace of the world:

"There are distinctly two types of international relationship. One is the offensive and defensive alliance of great powers. The other type is a society of free nations or an association of free nations or a league of free nations animated by consideration of right and justice instead of might and self-interest, and not merely proclaimed an agency in pursuit of peace but so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility.

"Such an association I favor with all my heart, and I would make no fine distinction as to whom credit is due. One need not care what it is called. Let it be an association, a society, or a league, or what not. Our concern is solely with the substance, not the form thereof."

It was this assurance of Warren G. Harding that moved Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler and 30 other distinguished Republicans to aline themselves behind the Republican nominee of 1920. The joint statement which they issued said:

"The Republican Party is bound by every consideration of good faith to pursue such a course until the object is obtained. We therefore believe we can most effectively advance the cause of international cooperation to promote peace by supporting Mr. Harding for the Presidency."

Joining in this pledge with Dr. Butler were Lyman Abbott, Robert Brookings, John Grier Hibben, Herbert Hoover, Charles Evans Hughes, A. Lawrence Lowell, Elihu Root, Henry L. Stimson, Oscar Straus, Henry W. Taft, William Allen White, George W. Wickersham, Lyman B. Wilbur, and others.

Of course, Dr. Butler is familiar with what happened following the election of Harding. The pious promise given by the Republican nominee on his front porch at Marion, Ohio, was abandoned. The Old Guard felt then, as Governor Dewey felt in Wisconsin when he pledged that "we shall keep completely out of the affairs of Europe."

Forewarned is forearmed. Dr. Butler, America's most distinguished educator and statesman, although a lifelong Republican, is not supporting Governor Dewey, the titular leader of the party with which he has affiliated actively for over half a century.

Freedom and Union—Editorial From the Allegheny Valley Advance-Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, victory is within our grasp, yes; but we must not forget that America is paying the supreme price for victory—the flower of our manhood. Our sole objective is to bring a just and enduring peace to the world. We must avoid the catastrophe that befell this Nation following World War No. 1. We must educate our people to avoid the pitfalls of isolationism. We must reinculcate the spirit of religion into the hearts and souls of all Americans. We must preach and practice tolerance in order that we may live in a better post-war world of tomorrow. It is for us the living to establish democracy—the democracy for which our gallant sons gave their lives.

That burden is in a great part the task of our grass-root newspapers of this Nation. Newspapers like the ones back in our home towns—the Glassport Times, Clairton Progress, Braddock Free Press, the Turtle Creek Independent, Homestead Messenger, the Allegheny Valley Advance-Leader—the kind of newspapers that we find throughout the country. These newspapers have a great responsibility to educate the public through a strong, clear, nonpartisan editorial policy. Len C. Anderson, outstanding young American country editor of the Allegheny Valley Advance-Leader, has set a good example in advocating the spirit of religion, tolerance, and good will so vitally necessary in molding public opinion through his editorial of September 1, 1944, which I am pleased to include herein as part of my remarks. Let the larger newspapers follow his excellent pattern. In this crucial hour, this Nation needs more editors like Len C. Anderson; we need more grass-root newspapers like his Allegheny Valley Advance-Leader.

ADVANCIN'

(With L. C. Anderson, in which a country editor tell how the world is being run and how it should be run.)

FREEDOM AND UNION

America remains a strong nation of free men only so long as America remains a nation of united men. Our enemies know this—know that they cannot conquer us while we are united—know that before they can subdue us they must divide us. It becomes plain and inescapably true, therefore, that the patriotic duty of every loyal American is to resist and overcome attempts of Axis propagandists, and their satellites in this country, to destroy our freedom by destroying the union upon which it depends. Our enemies seek to divide us by pitting Protestants against Catholics, Gentiles against Jews, native-born against foreign-born.

But above all else, we can never forget that just as it has taken men of many races and creeds to make America, it is now taking men of many races and creeds to preserve America during this war. Our heroes and defenders are not men of one race. They are men of many races—but all Americans. Remember that.

Remember Frank O'Brien, of Sugar Grove, Ill. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for his heroic conduct in rescuing an Air Corps officer marooned in the waters of Turnagian Arm, Alaska.

Remember Meyer Levin, of Brooklyn, N. Y. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. As Colin Kelly's bombardier he sank the Japanese battleship *Haruna*, and received a second citation for action in the Coral Sea.

Remember Harry Torgerson, of Lynbrook, Long Island. This marine is credited with having blasted 50 Japanese emplacements and machine-gun nests with TNT in the conquest of Henderson Field.

Remember Dorie Miller, of Waco, Tex. He was cited by the Navy Department for distinguished devotion to duty, extraordinary courage, and disregard of personal safety in face of enemy strafing during attack on the fleet in Pearl Harbor.

Remember George Schaetzel, of Denver, Colo. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for his courageous and skillful participation in bombing raids on Japanese shipping in the Indies waters.

Remember Theodore Boselli, of New York City. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and Oak Leaf Cluster. He has flown more than 125,000 miles over the South Pacific, and safely carried nearly every British and United States general stationed in the Far East.

Remember these men—different in racial origin—different in religious persuasion—but free and united as Americans for the advancement of the great American ideals of freedom, equality, and union.

The Soldiers Did Vote and Will Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, for months there has been a constant flow of propaganda about soldiers voting.

In Missouri our soldiers have voted successfully. The proof of the pudding

is in the eating. Every Missouri soldier who wished a ballot in the past primary election obtained one and voted legally. The same will hold true in the general election. This proves that the many statements claiming that the soldiers were being deprived of their vote are false.

On February 11, 1944, I made a speech on this subject, which was extended into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15. My purpose is to again call it to the attention of the people and the Members of this House. I think it timely to read again:

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE FRAUD

NEED FOR SIMPLE HONESTY

On the eve of the birthday anniversary of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, we Americans approach a crisis in our history. To hope for another Lincoln may be one way to indulge in forgetfulness of the many lessons of this wondrous, though simple, American life. Abraham Lincoln understood the application of simple honesty and plain common sense. America, today, needs the courage to apply common sense to the test of leaders and to demand ordinary integrity as the fundamental motive in the acts of our leaders.

AMERICAN CRISIS

The American crisis today is twofold—military and civil. It intensifies as we approach election day in November of this year. This very critical time in our history is made all the more crucial because of the selfish and avaricious ambition of a group of would-be monarchists operating in our Federal Government. These people have as their symbol and as their head Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the Presidency of the United States. They are more concerned in his perpetuity of power than they are in any degree of America's future. They leave no stones unturned—no paths untrod—in their revolution to destroy freedom in America and to set up in its place a post-war monarchy. To them America is not a democratic nation of 135,000,000 people, or a nation of 48 sovereign States. To them the strength of our Government is not derived from the practiced ability of the people's right to govern themselves successfully. They are the enemies of local self-government. They are the enemies of the sovereignty of the several States. They are guided by the principle that the power of the State stems from the control of the State by the few—instead of the traditional American premise, which has clearly demonstrated that the power and strength of the State should stem from the people. To them America is a mass of robots, divided into controllable or uncontrollable classes, or a mass of voting puppets, divided into controllable or uncontrollable groups of votes. They never think of the voters as individual Americans thinking for themselves and constantly striving to provide good government. They think of the voters of the Nation only as stepping stones to satisfy their greater appetite for individual power.

VOTE FRAUD ATTEMPT

This monarchistic group is known as the New Deal. They are a cancer within a great political party known as the Democratic Party. They have become a cancer within the democracy. They have rotted the very foundation of our Nation by defiance of the peoples' representative government and by repeated attacks upon the peoples' Constitution. They have been guilty of stealing elections—of buying elections—and now have added to their many other crimes a desperate attempt to manipulate an entire Federal election by vitiating constitutional provisions. This attempt is known as the Green-Lucas Federal ballot for the members of the armed forces. They have raised a great issue which may well decide the fate of the Nation. The issue is this: Shall the members of the armed forces be regimented and crowded into the voting of a blank, nameless ballot, on the crest of a wave of biased, partisan New Deal propaganda—or shall the members of the armed services be permitted in the same fashion as every other citizen to vote under a program, which would take to them as individual citizens their regular constitutional ballot? In order to foist this issue on the public, the New Deal has marshaled all of their propaganda forces of the Nation. These forces are dedicated to the eventual overthrow of the Republic. With these forces have been enlisted many loyal innocents who, in good faith and with every sincere intention, have trusted the people in high positions in the Federal Government to be incapable of fraud. These leaders of the New Deal are not only capable of fraud, but have a record of fraudulent conventions and elections.

PRESIDENT ASHAMED OF NEW DEAL

After the return of the President from the Teheran Conference, the New Deal managers started in dead earnest to work on the fourth-term drive. The first public move was a carefully timed political feint on the part of the President. This cute maneuver was made during a press conference when the President related the allegory concerning Dr. New Deal and Dr. Win-the-War. The President said that the New Deal was dead. With the existence of a Congress as strong as the present one—or one even stronger (such as most Americans anticipate next year) the New Deal is dead. While the New Deal totters around the edge of the grave, it will never be considered safely dead as long as new dealers live in places of political power. But, the public is genuinely sick and tired of the New Deal and its repeated failures. The net result of the New Deal, after these past 11 years, has been a back-breaking mortgage on the future.

PEOPLE WANT CHANGE

Elections of 1940 and of 1942 and of 1943, and special elections, have been ample evidence to the White House managers that the people have caught up with them. Accordingly, the first political move must be a feint to make the people believe that these New Deal theorists have given up—that the administration is moving over to the path of sanity. Nothing is further from the truth.

NEW DEAL POLITICAL DESPERATION

After this first move it became necessary to make a positive gesture which would win back certain blocs of votes. The largest bloc of votes today is the members of the armed services—more than 10,000,000. These servicemen had largely lost confidence in the management of the home front because of the reported strikes and general confusion in domestic management. The administration had been guilty of mothering these strikes and smiling upon their continuance. The administration had been guilty of yielding in its own rules which is designed to "hold the line" in the fight against inflation. The administration had been guilty of following a line of no labor policy which was the cause of labor strikes, labor shortages, and labor unrest and distrust. Despite censorship control these items of news had reached the troops who resent the situation. For years the administration had played labor along for the votes they could get by so doing. Now, some of their bad children had come home to plague them. This situation was divorcing them from the soldier vote and from the mass of voters here at home. Their mismanagement of labor was splitting their labor-vote ranks. The labor leaders, who were stooges for the administration, were having trouble holding their thinking members in bondage. Well-managed unions were discouraged by Presidential preferences.

ADVOCATED POLITICAL SLAVE LABOR

In January, at the opening of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Presidential message called for a national service act or a draft of all the people. It, of course, did not mention constant Presidential opposition to all sincere attempts on the part of the Congress to stop strikes. This move was designed to soften any opposition growing in the votes of the armed forces.

DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE

The next move was to follow up on February 1 with one of the most dishonest of all state papers—the Presidential message on the soldiers' vote issue. In this message the President represented himself as sort of a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. He used his Presidential privilege to send a direct White House message to the Congress to represent himself as a private citizen making an appeal. He used the same privilege to assume the role of a lobbyist for civil rights because he is the Commander in Chief of the armed services. With all of these self-assumed titles he proceeded to indulge in the greatest of American falsehoods by accusing the Congress of the United States of perpetrating a fraud against the men and women in the military services. He accused the Congress of attempting to keep the men from voting. American history does not record any occupant of the White House committing such a desperate political move. This message constitutes a new low in national politics.

TRUTH NOT TOLD

The President failed to tell the people and the armed services that his own vote plan was an unconstitutional move to regiment their votes and count them with a New Deal board of five. He failed to state that this move was a conspiracy to usurp the constitutional rights of the States. He failed to tell them that the ballot they were to vote was not a legal ballot but, instead, a blank and a dud. He failed to tell them that under his plan their votes would probably be illegal and uncounted. He failed to tell them that they would not be able to vote the Federal ballot for their State and local officers. He failed to tell them that this was a purely political move to destroy the sovereignty of the States—26 of which are Republican, and a political menace to his fourth-term desires. All of these things he failed to tell them. Instead, he posed a monstrous political hypocrisy. His message got through to the troops. Opposition messages by the majority of the Congress will find little chance of filtering through the lines of censorship.

STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

He demanded that the Congress stand up and be counted. He tried to distort the rules of the House. Throughout the land New Deal mouthpieces howled his partisan propaganda. These voices, heard on the radio and in the stultified press, are behaving like so many stooges. The program was so crude that the great Democratic Party, which enjoys the control of the Congress, split wide open on the issue. Staunch and true Democrats refused to go along with a plot which was designed to reelect them by unconstitutional means. Added to this has been weeks of New Deal congressional filibuster. These are days which demand strong hearts and great moral courage to face the attacks designed to destroy the Republic. Thank God such men are to be found in both political parties in the Congress.

KNOW ALL—KNOW NOTHING?

In Missouri we had the spectacle of having the servile New Deal press acting the usual role of a Charlie McCarthy. In St. Louis the

New Deal Star-Times was found in the embarrassing position of having mimicked weasel words on Wednesday, February 2, only to have to swallow their political Adam's apple on Friday, February 4.

THE SERVILE CLIQUE

Stand up and be counted was the false howl. Well, the House of Representatives at the proper time, and without consulting the New Deal, stood up and was counted. I am proud to say the eight Republican Members of Missouri stood firm for the preservation of the American Constitution. Now let the proponents of this election plot stand up and be counted. Let them tell the truth to the men in the Army and Navy. I'll enumerate a few of these proponents for you. They were and are: New Deal political managers; Members of the Congress, who go along with whatever the White House whip demands; Communist organizations; Communist-front organizations; C. I. O. Political Action Committee, headed by White House stooge Hillman, and organized to promote a fourth term; New Deal subsidized columnists; New Deal subsidized radio commentators; New Deal-controlled newspapers, such as the "pink" New York PM; the Chicago Sun; the Daily Worker, a Communist journal; New Masses, a Communist journal; the "stoogey" St. Louis Star-Times, and others who were pathetically misled despite their sincerity. Among the sincere were those in all groups who fail to understand that the roots of democracy are grown in the soil of local self-government. These good people fail to understand that the strength of our Republic stems from the people, their counties, and States, and not from the Federal Government.

Any public administration which spends more time finding ways of keeping its perpetual power than it spends in doing good for the future of the Nation bodes ill and bad weather for the future of the Nation.

A BRIGHT DAY AHEAD

Next election day can be the blackest in the history of the Nation or the brightest in many a future day to come. Because of such dangerous attacks against the Republic, we are a people half determined, half confused. We are determined that we shall have a change on the muddled home front. We are confused in the question of changing the Commander in Chief. We people must realize that any change for the better is always a good change to make. Any opportunity to obtain sound Executive leadership will be an enormous improvement over the bungling political Executive leadership of today. Any patriotic leadership will retain our good military leadership of today without interference. Any patriotic leadership with competent executive qualities will lend aid to the military which will be of tremendous new aid to the battle fronts. If we have faith in the future of our Republic—if we want a future for our Republic—we will have the simple and plain courage to make this change for improvement in the constitutional manner this year. To ignore the impulse of this simple courage is to yield our Government to a one-man rule. Revival of the New Deal spells American monarchy. I fear the Republic cannot withstand another 4 years of the present New Deal administration. Failure on our part to carry this message to our troops abroad or to our fellow citizens at home will allow a betrayal of our fighting forces. The accursed forces which propagate destructive propaganda here at home and abroad are America's greatest enemies of tomorrow—they are enemies of the boys who fight—the enemies of their children and ours.

MONSTROUS INCONGRUITY

How could anyone believe such a monstrous incongruity as to believe that the same Washington managers could manage so badly at home and yet do so well on the battlefronts? The plain truth is that military successes come from a different management, not the President. The division of that management came back in the middle of 1942 as history will some day reveal. Since then we have gone forward militarily, while domestically we have bungled our present and undermined our future.

Army Order Resented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of September 1, 1944:

ARMY ORDER RESENTED

(From the Montgomery Advertiser)

Montgomery, a tolerant, liberal, and intensely patriotic city, is profoundly disturbed by reports of high Army efforts to impose race customs and habits on the local military reservations that are in conflict with relationships growing out of generations of experience.

Montgomery quickly, firmly, and advisedly wants to let it be known that any effort designed, directly or indirectly, to impose any form of social equality, is something that neither this community nor any other southern community can tolerate. This represents the thought of the better elements of both white and colored races on the subject.

If it be said that Army orders are something from which there is no recourse, the people of this community would have it understood that even Army orders, even armies, even bayonets, cannot force impossible and unnatural social race relationships upon us. It has been tried before and failed. It will fail if tried again.

Orders from Army headquarters seeking at this late date in the war to make whites and blacks mingle on a basis of social equality at the restaurant tables on the military posts or camps of this State can have no other effect than to cause friction which has been happily absent during the 3 years of the war up to this time. Heretofore, there has been common sense recognition of nature's dividing lines. Any other policy can be interpreted only as due to ignorance of conditions. Certainly such orders should not come from anyone seeking the real welfare of the Negro race and the relationship between the races that all men of good will would like to see.

If troublemakers are responsible for this new situation, then troublemakers must be dealt with as such, because these troublemakers are a puny minority which must be shown that majorities rule here.

Since the establishment of our great air fields in this city, Montgomery's relationship has been most cordial with them and with the personnel they have brought among us. The officers and men of the fields have been the type that we were glad and proud to claim as friends and as participants in our social life. The fact that many of them were from the North, or from communities where the race issue is not pronounced, made no difference in the relationships, because the visitors recognized local conditions, had confidence in local judgment, and had respect for customs and traditions that have grown out of many years of trial and experience in the South. Furthermore, they were on the ground. They saw the conditions and the necessity for them. They were not desk men seated in some far-away place acting on some academic or idealistic impulse.

In Montgomery and in other Alabama and southern communities race relationships are a condition and not a theory. This is said kindly and firmly, and in the utmost friendship for the members of the Negro race. We want the Negro soldiers to have the same food, the same pay, the same uniform, the same courts, and the same kind of justice and the same protection as is given the white race. But political and economic and military equality are entirely different from the social equality that is implied in the new order for serving and seating of restaurant customers on the military reservations.

Our insistence upon this is in the interest not only of the white race but of the Negro race. We all know that we are to live side by side in the South, and each race is in a measure dependent upon the other. But domination by the race which is best qualified to dominate will be maintained at all costs. Efforts, even in a small way, to introduce any other practice bring only the deepest kind of resentment and encourage serious trouble.

These are facts which we cannot too firmly impress upon Army officials, our representatives in Washington, and all men everywhere.

Every Eligible Man and Woman in Service Can Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are still too many persons in high places who insist on perverting the facts concerning the so-called Federal ballot. These peddlers of misinformation and hate try to create the impression that their hearts are broken because the Federal ballot was defeated. These peddlers of misinformation talk loud and long about men and women in service not being given a chance to vote.

RECEIPT OF BALLOT PROVES THEIR CRIES FALSE

The very fact that you have already received or are about to receive a complete ballot giving you a chance to vote for every office from President down to precinct committeeman proves to you how false all their statements are. For that reason I want to give all men and women in service from my congressional district the true facts in this whole shameful performance.

WHAT WAS THE FEDERAL BALLOT

An explanation of what kind of ballot these people wanted to give you will be proof enough of their attempt to railroad an election. Here is what the Federal ballot was:

BALLOT

Write in the name of party or person you want for President _____
Write in the name of party or person you want for United States Senator _____
Write in the name of party or person you want for Representative in Congress _____
Write in the name of party or person you want for Congressman at large _____

THIS KIND OF BALLOT IS NOT AN HONEST BALLOT

This is the so-called Federal ballot. This is the ballot that these misinformers wanted to give the service men and women. It is an unfair, incomplete, and misleading ballot. No honest man would want such a ballot and no dishonest man should have such a ballot.

I do not in any way want to tell or even hint who the service men and women should vote for. It is your God given right to vote for Roosevelt, Dewey, or Thomas as you please. That is your privilege—that is what you are fighting for—the right to vote as you please.

Now, in all fairness, do you not concede that a Federal ballot such as shown above gives an unfair advantage to the man that is in office? President Roosevelt has an opportunity to visit all the camps and theaters of war. He has constant opportunity to visit with people engaged in the war. He has complete access to the radio—foreign broadcasts and service men and women broadcasts included. By his position the President has a tremendous advantage because his name is before the service men and women at all times.

On the other hand, Dewey and Thomas have no chance for such contact. Their names are seldom, if ever, given an opportunity to appear before the men and women in service. Under such conditions both Dewey and Thomas labor under an unfair disadvantage. It goes without saying that it is always easiest to write that name one sees most and hears most. Under this condition is it not fair to at least have Dewey's and Thomas' names appear on the ballot? The Federal ballot did not give these two candidates any chance whatever to get their names on the ballot or even give you a chance to know if anyone was running besides Roosevelt.

FEDERAL BALLOT HAD OTHER FLAWS

This ballot had many other objections and twists. How many of the men and women in service know, for instance, whether United States Senator WILEY or United States Senator LA FOLLETTE is up for reelection this November? A ballot without any names does not tell you that. With no names on the ballot, how could you even know who was running for United States Senator? How could anyone vote intelligently with such a ballot?

Likewise, how many men and women in service would know who is running for Representative in Congress from your district? Without any names on the ballot, how could you know? Besides, how many men and women in service know who Wisconsin's Congressman at Large is? Here is a joker—because Wisconsin has no Congressman at Large. But with this excuse of a ballot there would be thousands voting for Congressman at Large when Wisconsin has none.

This, then, is the "Federal ballot" that you heard so much raving about. It is a dishonest ballot, a ballot that misleads, and a ballot that thinks only one office in all America is important—the President. The only concern of the Federal ballot was the Presidency—that is all.

THAT IS NOT AMERICAN

Concern over only one office is not American. In Wisconsin we have a governor, a lieutenant governor, a secretary of state, a state treasurer, and an attorney general. In each county in Wisconsin we have a county clerk, a county treasurer, a district attorney, a register of deeds, a county coroner, a clerk of circuit court, a county sheriff, and a county surveyor. We also have a State senator and a member of assembly. All of these make up the America we are proud of.

Yet the Federal ballot would not give you a chance to vote for any office except President and Congress. Many of you who are in service held a county office before you enlisted. Your wives are maybe holding these jobs for you until you come back. Do you not want to be given a chance to vote for your wife? Of course you do. To thousands of men and women in service these county and State offices are closer to you and more important than President and Congress. Yet the Federal ballot said, "You vote only for President and Congress. You cannot vote for any State office or any county office."

I FOUGHT FOR AN HONEST AND COMPLETE BALLOT WITH NAMES ON IT

The ballot you received or will receive is the ballot I fought for and voted for. This ballot has names on it for national offices and gives every candidate an honest chance. At least you will know who is running for what.

You also received or will receive a complete State ballot. You can vote for governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, State treasurer, and attorney general. You also can vote for a county clerk—maybe your dad or uncle or aunt—maybe your wife or sweetheart. You can vote for a sheriff, clerk of court, register of deeds, surveyor, coroner, county treasurer, and county clerk. Yes; you can even vote for a precinct committeeman with the ballot you received or will receive. That is America. That is an honest election. A ballot with names and a ballot that is hard to defraud. The ballots you received or will receive are the ballots I fought for and voted for. With you giving your life for our country—the least that Congress could do for you is give you an honest ballot—with names—a complete ballot for National, State, and county offices. Yes; a President is important; but thank God that in America a President is not the whole cheese. To us from northern Wisconsin who know life the hard and honest way, a governor and a county office are just as important to us as a President.

SUPPORTED ALL VETERAN LEGISLATION

I am happy to report that in my 2 years in Congress I fought for and voted for every bill of benefit to veterans, men and women in service, and their dependents. All letters from service men and women receive my personal attention and first consideration. There is still much to be done. I shall always go all the way on all veteran legislation as I have in the past.

Good luck. Hope to see you back home soon. Be sure and vote. Vote as you please—and be sure you vote for every office from President down to precinct committeeman. Let us hear from you. Write Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Norris of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following editorial from the Nashville Tennesseean as a tribute to that great American the late George W. Norris.

The editorial follows:

NORRIS OF AMERICA

The life and success of George W. Norris comfort the common faith in the American democracy of which, in his lifetime, George W. Norris was the finest apostle. As our Nation has grown away from the days of its violent birth, when the concept of "faith in the people" was flashing bright, fewer and fewer great statesmen have risen among us to preach the ideals of democratic fundamentalism. The faith had remained as an inherited article, but not many bothered to renew the faith at the fire of conviction.

George Norris caught the torch from Jefferson, Mason, and Paine. Others who surrounded him in his long service in the Federal Government were more gifted, more artful, more eloquent. Norris stood above them and was recognized above them, by the serenity of his trust in his fellow men. He accepted literally the imperishable professions of the American Constitution. The people established the Government and government existed at all times to promote the general welfare and to be responsive to the public will. The people would not always be right, but under this Government their voice was vox Dei.

The people of Tennessee are peculiarly beholden to Senator Norris, and gladly have acknowledged their debt. Not only was he, by his vision and persistence, the father of T. V. A., but into the charter of T. V. A. was written his honesty which is its strength. For many years the Senator from Nebraska, Norris, came to be spoken of as "George Norris of the United States." To him the welfare of the whole had precedence over the interests of any part. There was nothing petty or provincial about him; he spoke in government the American point of view; he sought the greater good of the greater number.

Perhaps the meanest word ever spoken in the United States Senate was spoken by a jealous Tennessean who rose to twit the aged Nebraskan upon his defeat in his final candidacy. Had Norris, said this colleague, concerned himself less with the welfare of his Nation and more with the appointment of postmasters in Nebraska, he could have retained his seat in the Senate.

But George Norris will continue great in the hearts of his countrymen and the history of his land precisely because he placed principles before power. And it is for those who criticize his lack of political acumen to wonder why not they but he is received so securely in the esteem and affection of the American people.

In this Tennessee Valley region the massive dams stand in monument to George Norris of America and millions of people have their benefit each day of this man's life and service in the comfort of their living. One of these dams bears his name. The Tennessean has not the slightest doubt that somewhere in this region an even more special monument to Norris will be erected by a grateful people, and that this monument thereafter will be a shrine for all who keep faith with Paine and Mason and Jefferson and Norris—the faith of man in man.

Agnes Smedley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, on August 29 I brought to the attention of the House a very ugly attack made on the South by one Agnes Smedley, wherein she sought through malicious lies to bring hatred upon the southland and its citizenry, and also to excite race hatred and prejudice throughout the land.

At the time I made this address before the House I did not have any information whatever on Agnes Smedley as an individual, but stated then that she was either motivated by a large sum of money to promulgate these lies or that she was a part of the communistic C. I. O. gang, of which it seems that Sidney Hillman is now the big boss.

That the House and the people of this Nation may be further informed with regard to this person and her purposes, I want to impart to the membership and to the citizens of these United States some information that I have received with regard to her which I have every reason to presume to be the truth. The sources from whence this information came are certainly worthy of belief.

I learned that she is a regular contributor, and has been for the past 15 years, to the New Masses, which is an official organ of the Communist Party in the United States. I learned further that she is a contributor to the Daily Worker, also an official organ of the Communist Party. I further learned that she was an artist for the magazine known as Fight, which was the official publication of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which organization has been found to be a communistic front by Attorney General Biddle and the Dies committee.

In the year 1936 she sent greetings to and was sponsor of a banquet given in honor of Mother Bloor, so-called first lady of the Communist Party in the United States.

She is the author of many books which portray the glory of the Communist Party and its great works. She was the author of Short Stories from China, which was published in Moscow in 1935. She was the author of China's Red Army Marches, in which she describes in glowing language how the Reds with people other than white had overcome the whites in revolutions. She pictures the great benefits received from communistic revolutions. It is right significant that Robert Morss Lovett, whose communistic affiliations and activities have been subjects of concern to the membership of this House which by vote prohibited any further funds being paid to him from the Federal Treasury of the United States, wrote the preface to China's Red Army Marches, wherein he paid glowing tribute to this Agnes Smedley.

There also appears a paragraph that might be of some interest to the public in Benjamin Gitlow's book I Confess. It is probably known that Gitlow was in prison at Dannemora for sedition. The paragraph I refer to is as follows, to wit:

One day Agnes Smedley came to Clinton on the pretext that she was interested in prison problems. She was shown the prison and on her tour of inspection came across Jim Larkin, who knew all about her visit. He greeted her with a smile, which did not go unnoticed by the prison authorities, who became suspicious, investigated her, took her aside later, and ordered her to leave. Then followed a series of articles in the Socialist Daily, the New York Call, about the dungeon at Dannemora and the terrible treatment being accorded to the politicals, especially Jim Larkin. It was a grim story, part true and part good imagination (pp. 116–117).

I might further state that Jim Larkin was the Irish revolutionary imprisoned for his communistic propaganda in the United States.

When this much of the life and activities of this woman is known to the American public, I think it can easily be seen what her purpose was in compiling and permitting to be published the slanderous lies she did about the South.

I hope that the colored people of the Nation will not permit one with so vile a purpose to influence them and cause them to be a part of her un-American efforts to communize this country. I cannot imagine anyone that would suffer more as a result of this democracy being torn to shreds by such vultures and the populace of this great Commonwealth thrown under the rule of communism than the colored people of this Nation.

I appeal to the American people to wake up and crush the progress of this damnable cancer gnawing at the very vitals of our democracy. Frankly, I say to you if this is not done quickly, it is going to be too late.

Blue Skies for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, during the 10 days just passed, Poland has been much in the comments of speakers and editors. Five long years of agony have been the lot of the liberty-loving Poles.

We all vividly remember how on September 1, 1939, without the formality of declaring war, Hitler's hordes attacked Poland. The Nazis went in by land and by air. With an overwhelming advantage in airplanes of 4,320 Nazi to 443 Polish, the odds were tragically unequal. The struggle was over October 5, 1939.

The intervening years have been heavy indeed on a proud people. Dictators are harsh. Dictators are ruthless. Dictators are pitiless.

But, thank God, the forces of democracy are now relentlessly closing in on Hitler, Americans and British from the west, Russians from the east.

Poland will rise again. Poland will take her rightful place amongst freemen and free nations.

Americans on the Pacific coast join in saluting Poland in these days of renewed hope. Skies are clearing for Poland. Right is prevailing.

The San Francisco Examiner expresses our sentiments in an editorial devoted to heroic Poland. The article appearing August 31, 1944, reads in full:

HEROIC POLAND

September 1 will be the anniversary of one of the most momentous and tragical days in the thousand-year history of Poland.

For it was on that date in 1939 when Poland, as the first nation to defy the aggressions of Adolf Hitler, was attacked by the Nazi hordes.

The Polish Government had rejected Hitler's proposal for a joint attack on Soviet Russia, and so World War No. 2 began.

Now, at the beginning of the sixth year of the war Poland still fights on; and the brave hearts of her patriots are cheered by the approaching victory of the Allies.

Much of Poland's war has not been fought in Poland.

Polish soldiers—refugees from Poland and others—have been trained in Russia, in the Middle East, and in Britain.

Germans, as the Polish Telegraph Agency notes, "are surrendering to Poles on every front."

There were Poles in Africa with General Montgomery.

Monte Cassino was taken by Poles who are helping to drive the enemy up the Italian coasts.

Poles form a part of the allied armies that are fighting the great battle of France.

The Polish Air Force, composed of 14,000 men in 14 squadrons, is fourth in size among the United Nations, and Polish flyers have shot down 1,500 German planes during the war.

Likewise, the Polish Navy has kept the seas and is larger than ever, with a cruiser, six destroyers, three submarines, coastal vessels, and a merchant marine.

And in Poland itself, where the struggle has never ceased, Polish guerillas have been fighting steadily with sabotage, bombings, and wreckings; a home army which has replaced the original forces, trained and bivouacked in forests, has met the invaders in pitched engagements; and lately Polish defenders have risen up again within the walls of Warsaw.

With more than 500,000 in the resistance forces in the homeland, the Nazis have been compelled to keep three-fourths of a million troops immobilized in Poland, while on the other hand much aid has been given to the advancing Russian armies.

Moreover, there is an underground government in Poland—a "shadow state" with courts of law, industrial and agricultural

departments, a parliament and 30,000 civil service workers.

But Poland has suffered terrible penalties, too.

Approximately 5,700,000 of her people have been exterminated—2,500,000 of them Jews, thousands of them Catholic priests.

Polish lads have been executed for the crime of belonging to the Polish Boy Scouts.

Farms have been looted and the buildings burned; and all cultural institutions have been closed by the Germans—all colleges, high schools, and professional schools.

And, of course, the Polish press was extinguished long ago.

The services and sacrifices of the Polish people should be gratefully remembered on September 1 in all of the United Nations.

Even more should they be remembered at Dumbarton Oaks, where the great powers are in conference, and at the tables of the peacemakers when the last shots of battle have been fired.

War Department Demobilization Plan After Defeat of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release issued by the War Department on September 6, 1944:

The Army has adopted a plan for the readjustment of military personnel after the defeat of Germany and prior to the defeat of Japan calling for a partial and orderly demobilization from its present peak strength.

When the war against Germany has ended, the military might of the United States will be shifted from the European area to the Pacific area. Military requirements in the European and American areas will be drastically curtailed, while tremendous increases will be essential in the Pacific.

To defeat Japan as quickly as possible, and permanently, the United States will have to assemble, readjust, and streamline its military forces in order to apply the maximum power. Our military requirements to achieve this end, involving men, weapons, equipment, and shipping, have been set forth by the Combined Chiefs of Staff. These requirements are the determining factors of the readjustment and demobilization plan adopted by the War Department.

Military necessity decrees that sufficient men suited to the type of warfare being waged in the Pacific must remain in service as long as they are essential. Certain units of the Army also, of necessity, will have to be retained in the various theaters where action has ceased in order to fulfill such occupation duties as are necessary. Other elements, no longer needed in the theater in which they are assigned, will be transferred to other areas, reorganized and redesignated to meet current military requirements in the theater, or they will be inactivated.

Within each element of the Army, thousands of individuals may become surplus to the needs of the theater or major command in which they are serving. But more thousands will be required for further military service.

First priority in this readjustment program will be the transfer of elements from theaters no longer active to the Pacific war zone, or from the United States to the Pacific war zone. All available transportation will be utilized for this tremendous undertaking.

The readjustment and demobilization plan developed by the War Department after months of study takes into account all of these variable factors. Briefly, the plan for the return of nonessential soldiers to civilian life will start with the assembly in the United States of men declared surplus to the needs of each overseas theater and to the major commands in the United States. From among these men some will be designated essential, and a substantial number will be designated as nonessential to the new military needs of the Army and will be returned to civilian life according to certain priorities.

As an example, the commanding general of the European theater of operations will be informed by the War Department of the types and numbers of his units which will be needed in the Pacific, and the types and numbers of his units which will remain as occupation troops, and the types and numbers of his units which are surplus.

The simplest plan of demobilization would have been to return these surplus units to this country and discharge their personnel intact.

Such a method, however, would operate with great unfairness to many individuals who have had long and arduous service but are not assigned to one of the units declared surplus. If only units in Europe were considered, this basis of expediency would work unfairly to units long in the Pacific or at outpost bases in the American theater. It would operate unfairly to men who have seen extended combat service both in Europe and the Pacific and have been returned to this country for reassignment. It would release men only recently assigned as replacements to units long in combat and would discriminate against veterans of many campaigns in units not selected for return.

Consequently, it was determined that the fairest method to effect partial demobilization would be through the selection of men as individuals rather than by units, with the selection governed by thoroughly impartial standards.

For the standards, the War Department went to the soldiers themselves. Experts were sent into the field to obtain a cross section of the sentiments of enlisted men. Thousands of soldiers, both in this country and overseas, were interviewed to learn their views on the kind of selective process they believed should determine the men to be returned first to civilian life. Opinions expressed by the soldiers themselves became the accepted principles of the plan.

As finally worked out, the plan accepted by the War Department as best meeting the tests of justice and impartiality will allow men who have been overseas and men with dependent children to have priority of separation. Ninety percent of the soldiers interviewed said that that is the way it should be.

As part of the plan adopted, an adjusted-service rating card will be issued to all enlisted personnel after the defeat of Germany. On this card will be scored the following four factors that will determine priority of separation:

1. Service credit—based upon the total number of months of Army service since September 16, 1940.

2. Overseas credit—based upon the number of months served overseas.

3. Combat credit—based upon the first and each additional award to the individual of the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Legion of Merit, Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Soldier's Medal, Bronze Star Medal, Air Medal, Purple Heart, and Bronze Service Stars (battle participation stars).

4. Parenthood credit—which gives credit for each dependent child under 18 years up to a limit of three children.

The value of the point credits will be announced after the cessation of hostilities in Europe. In the meantime the point values will be kept under continuous study. The total score will be used to select surplus men from the theaters overseas and in the United States. The score also will be used when a certain portion of all these surplus men will be declared nonessential and returned to civilian life.

In all cases, however, the demands of military necessity and the needs of the war against Japan must first be met. Regardless of a man's priority standing, certain types of personnel can never become surplus as long as the war against Japan continues.

As an example of how the plan will work, assume that there are four infantry divisions in the European theater. One is declared surplus. Men in all four divisions are rated according to the priority credit scores. The top fourth is selected and those not essential for retention in service by reason of military necessity are designated as surplus. Men in the surplus division who are marked for retention by reason of military necessity are then shifted into the active divisions. All of the men designated as surplus are shifted into the surplus division, which now will serve as a vehicle for eventually returning them to the United States.

No man in a unit that remains in service can become surplus until a qualified replacement is available. If military necessity should entail the immediate transfer of a unit to the Pacific, there may conceivably be no time to apply the plan to men of that unit before the emergency transfer is made. Consideration will be given these men when they arrive in the new theater.

The active units needed against Japan will be shipped to the Pacific. Those units required for occupation duty in Europe will be sent to their stations, and surplus units will be returned to the United States as quickly as possible.

In the United States, the men of these surplus units will revert to a surplus pool in the Army Ground Forces, Army Service Forces, and Army Air Forces. These surplus pools will include surplus men from all overseas theaters and surplus men from the continental United States.

From these surplus pools the reduction of various types of Army personnel will be made. The number to be returned to civilian life as no longer essential to over-all Army needs will be chosen from among those with the highest priority credit scores.

It is emphasized that the rate of return of surplus men from overseas will depend upon the number of ships available. Thousands of ships will be required to supply the Pacific theater. The Pacific theater will have No. 1 priority. All else must wait. To it will be transported millions of fighting men, millions of tons of landing barges, tanks, planes, guns, ammunition, and food, over longer supply lines than those to Europe.

This means that most of the ships and planes that were used to supply the European theater will be needed to supply the Pacific theater. The majority of ships proceeding to Europe will continue on to the Pacific laden with troops and supplies for that distant campaign. Very few will turn around and come back to the United States. The Army, therefore, will not be able to return all surplus men to the United States immediately. It may take many months.

While the process of selecting and returning men from the European theater is taking place, the plan for readjustment and partial demobilization also will be applied in active theaters, like the Southwest Pacific. Individuals in those theaters will be declared surplus to the extent that replacements can be provided. Naturally, since the Pacific will be the only active theater, there will be no surplus units of any type. Military requirements there will demand an increase rather

than a decrease in fighting units. Nevertheless, troops in the Pacific area will benefit by the reduction of the Army, not as units, but as individuals.

Commanders in the Pacific area will be told the number and types of men who can be replaced. They then will select these men, using the same standards as apply in inactive theaters and in the United States. These men then will be returned to the United States as rapidly as replacements of the same type become available and as the military situation permits.

As an example: Normally there will be a great flow of men needed to build up and maintain an offensive against Japan, but say that several thousand men over and above the required number can be shipped to the Pacific each month. Then, a corresponding number of men in the Pacific with the highest priority credit scores can be declared surplus and returned to the United States, where their scores and military necessity will determine whether they are among the personnel no longer essential to the Army.

Simultaneously with the selection and return of men in the overseas theaters, the same selective formula will be applied among troops stationed in the continental United States. Troops in the United States, however, will serve as the main reservoir of replacements for the overseas theaters. For, in general, their priority scores will be lower than the scores of men who have served overseas and have seen combat duty.

Any man who may have been declared nonessential under this plan who wishes to remain in the Army, provided he has a satisfactory record, will not be forced out of the Army if he can be usefully employed.

In the case of officers, military necessity will determine which ones are nonessential. These will be released as they can be spared.

Priority of release for members of the Women's Army Corps will be determined in the same way as for the rest of the Army, but treating the Corps as a separate group. However, in the case of all female personnel of the Army, those whose husbands have already been released will be discharged upon application.

The plan as now adopted will provide some reduction in the Army's Ground Forces and initially considerably less in the Service Forces and in the Air Forces.

Following Germany's defeat, the Air Forces will have to move combat groups and supporting ground units from all over the world to the Pacific areas. The nature of the Pacific area dictates that Service Forces personnel will be needed in great numbers to carry the war to Japan. Long supply lines, scattered bases, jungles, primitive country, all contribute to the importance and necessity for Service Forces personnel. Therefore, the reduction in its strength will be slow at first.

As replacements become available from the Ground Forces and from new inductees, the Air Forces and the Service Forces will discharge a fair share of men proportionate with the Ground Forces.

Surplus individuals declared nonessential to the needs of the Army will be discharged from the Service through separation centers. Five Army separation centers are already in operation and additional ones will be set up when the need develops. A total of 18 in all parts of the country are contemplated. Their wide distribution will enable us to discharge soldiers close to their homes.

The readjustment and demobilization plan applies only to readjustment and demobilization in the period between the defeat of Germany and prior to the defeat of Japan. It sets forth the principles and responsibilities involved during that period. Theater commanders and commanders of all other major commands of the Army will put the plan into operation in as simple a manner as possible based on these principles and responsibilities.

The War Department has determined that the successful operation of the plan requires that the troops themselves, as well as the public, be kept fully informed.

The size of the military establishment that will be needed after the defeat of Germany has been calculated with the same exactness as the size of the Army needed up to now. No soldier will be kept in the military service who is not neded to fulfill these requirements. No soldier will be released who is needed.

It must be borne in mind always that the war will not be won, nor the peace enjoyed, until Japan has been completely crushed.

National Service Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in World War No. 2, as in the former war, the Federal Government has established an insurance system for members of its armed forces. In the present war it is known as the national service life insurance.

National service life insurance in force is a most valuable asset. It is especially valuable to those who may be physically impaired as they may be unable to obtain any other life insurance protection. Even single persons with no present dependents may find it worth while to continue their national service life insurance for the protection of future dependents.

National service life insurance is granted only to persons in the active military or naval service, in any multiple of $500 but not less than $1,000 or more than $10,000, provided that not more than $10,000 of life insurance issued by the Government by virtue of service in the armed forces may be in force on one life at any one time.

The insurance is issued originally on the 5-year level premium term plan which furnishes, during the 5-year term period, the largest amount of temporary protection for the lowest premium payment, because the policyholder pays only what is considered necessary to cover the normal cost of the insurance within the term period.

The 5-year level premium term insurance while in force, in multiples of $500 but not less than $1,000, may be converted in the same or less amount, without medical examination, into permanent policies of national service life insurance on the ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life plan at any time after the insurance has been in force for 1 year and within the 5-year term period.

The ordinary life policy provides the maximum amount of permanent protection for the minimum level premium payment, which is payable throughout the lifetime of the insured.

The 20-payment life policy provides the maximum amount of permanent protection for the minimum level premium payment, which is payable throughout the lifetime of the insured.

The 30-payment life policy provides that premiums shall be payable for 30 years. At the end of the 30-year period premium payments cease and the insurance continues in force for the remainder of the insured's life for the face amount of the policy.

At the option of the insured, in accordance with regulations, the permanent—converted—policy may be made effective as of the date any current premium becomes due on the 5-year-level premium-term insurance or as of the date any prior premium became due on such insurance, including the same date on which the 5-year-level premium-term insurance originally became effective. The converted policy will be issued at the premium rate for the age of the insured on his birthday nearest the effective date of the policy.

All permanent—converted—policies of national service life insurance have guaranteed cash, loan, paid-up, and extended insurance values available after the policy has been in force 1 year. Loans may be obtained at any time after the policy has been in force 1 year, and before default in the payment of any subsequent premium, in any amount not to exceed 94 percent of the cash value. Policy loans bear interest at the rate of 5 percent per annum.

It should be clearly borne in mind that term insurance provides the maximum temporary protection for the minimum cost and is desirable only for emergencies and for those persons who temporarily find it inconvenient to pay the higher premiums required on the permanent—converted—policies. The insured is advised to keep his 5-year-level premium-term insurance in force during the period of readjustment from military to civilian life and to convert it in whole or in part as soon as and to the extent he is financially able to pay the higher premiums on the permanent—converted—plans of insurance. In this way it is believed that the insured and his dependents will achieve the best ultimate results from his national service life insurance.

BENEFICIARIES

The insured has a right to designate a beneficiary or beneficiaries of the insurance within the following classes: Wife—husband—child, including an adopted child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parent, including parent through adoption and persons who have stood in loco parentis—in place of a parent—to the insured at any time prior to his entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year, brother or sister, including those of the halfblood, of the insured.

The insured may designate, in addition to the principal beneficiary or beneficiaries, any person or persons within the permitted class as contingent beneficiary or beneficiaries. A contingent

beneficiary so designated will take the monthly installments of insurance if the specified principal beneficiary should not survive so as to receive any installment or installments of insurance, or will take any remaining monthly installments certain if the specified principal beneficiary survives the insured and receives one or more monthly installments but dies before all the monthly installments certain have been paid.

The insured may change the beneficiary or beneficiaries within the permitted classes of persons herein specified at any time without their knowledge or consent by notice in writing signed by the insured and forwarded to the Veterans' Administration. Whenever practicable, such notice should be given on Veterans' Administration Insurance Form 336—Change of Beneficiary, National Service Life Insurance. A change of beneficiary may not be made by last will and testament although an original designation of beneficiary may be made by last will and testament duly probated.

DEATH BENEFITS AND MANNER OF PAYMENT

National service life insurance is payable in the event of the death of the insured while the insurance is in force, whether or not death results from a condition incident to military or naval service, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries entitled, in equal monthly installments in the following manner: Death benefits under national service life insurance are not payable in one sum.

If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is under 30 years of age at the date of death of the insured, payments are made in equal monthly installments throughout the remaining lifetime of such beneficiary, with the proviso that such monthly installments shall be payable for 120 months certain. The amount of the monthly installment payable for each $1,000 of insurance under this life income provision is determined by the age of the beneficiary at the date of death of the insured, said age being determined as of the last birthday prior to or on said date, in accordance with the following schedule, which is based upon the American experience table of mortality and interest at the rate of 3 percent per year. Since most beneficiaries are women, the value of their installment payments under this life income provision is greatly enhanced by the fact that instead of an annuity mortality table, differentiated for sex, the much more favorable American experience table of mortality is used as a basis of calculation, combined with a 3-percent-interest rate which exceeds that usually used today by private insurers.

If no valid beneficiary is designated by the insured, or if the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries (including contingent beneficiaries) should not survive so as to receive any installment or installments of insurance, or should die prior to completion of payment of the monthly installments certain, the installments of insurance remaining unpaid at the death of the insured or of any beneficiary, as the case may be, shall be paid to the person or persons within the permitted classes of beneficiaries hereinafter specified and in the order named:

First. To the widow or widower of the insured, if living;

Second. If no widow or widower, to the child or children of the insured (including adopted children), if living, in equal shares;

Third. If no widow, widower, or child, to the parent or parents of the insured who last bore that relationship, if living, in equal shares;

Fourth. If no widow, widower, child, or parent, to the brothers and sisters of the insured, including those of the half blood, if living, in equal shares.

ACT ON INSURANCE WHEN DISCHARGED

The important thing for the newly discharged soldier to remember is that his policy has been kept in force in the past by automatic deductions from his pay but these deductions cease when he is discharged. His policy provides a 30-day period of grace for the payment of the premium but this is from the date of the last payment on the policy and not from the date of discharge.

After discharge the insured should forward to the Collections Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C., within 31 days from the end of the period for which premiums were last paid, a remittance in the amount of the premium formerly paid by direct remittance or by allotment from service pay. Ordinarily the first premium after discharge is payable during the month following discharge. The remittance should be in the form of a check or money order made payable to the Treasurer of the United States and forwarded to the Collections Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C. Do not mail cash or currency since such payments are sent at the remitter's own risk. Payments should continue to be made as premiums become due, whether or not premium notices are received from the Veterans' Administration, in order to insure continuous protection and avoid the possibility of lapse of insurance.

G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

One of the broadest laws ever passed by Congress was recenty enacted in the form of Public Law 346, commonly referred to as the G. I. bill of rights. This law contains provisions for servicemen under 25 years of age to continue their education. It provides for loans to returning service people for the purchase of homes, farms, and business property. It contains provisions for reemployment assistance as well as readjustment allowances while the veteran is seeking employment.

Briefly its provisions include the following:

EDUCATION

A duly qualified veteran who desires further education is to begin the course of study not later than 2 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is later. No education or training is to be afforded beyond 7 years after the termination of the present war. Furthermore, the law states that any such person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service "shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with."

Eligible persons are entitled to education or training, or a refresher or retraining course, at an approved educational or training institution. After a maximum of 1 year of such activity, and upon satisfactory completion of an education or training course, the individual is entitled to additional education or training for a period not to exceed the time he was in active service on or after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war. In no event may the total period of education or training exceed 4 years.

Expenses for this education or training are to be defrayed by the Government. Thus, for each veteran so enrolled, academic expenses, not to exceed $500 for an ordinary school year, are to be paid by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. While the veteran is enrolled and is pursuing a course, he is to be paid a monthly subsistence allowance of $50 if single or of $75 per month if he has a dependent or dependents.

LOANS

The same law provides for the guaranty of loans to veterans, not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, on a maximum loan of $2,000. Loans may be made by an individual or by a private or public lending agency and for the following purposes: purchase or construction of a home, making repairs, alterations or improvements to a home owned by the veteran, purchase by the veteran of a farm or farm equipment, or the purchase of business property.

The loans must conform to the following requirements: interest rate must not exceed 4 percent; must be practicable and suitable to the veteran's circumstances; the Government must have the right of subrogation to the extent of any guaranty paid; and the agreement must permit the Government to protect itself in case of default through the right to bid on foreclosure proceedings or to refinance.

ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING WORK

To aid veterans in securing employment, the act states that "there shall be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans to provide for them the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment." For this purpose, the law created a Veterans' Placement Service Board to cooperate with and assist the United States Employment Service. This board is to consist of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, chairman; the Director of the National Selective Service System, and the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, or whoever may have the responsibility of administering the functions of the United States Employment Service. The board is to determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of the veterans' division of the employment service.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The law likewise provides for former members of the armed forces who are unemployed. Eligible veterans who are not employed may receive a readjustment allowance not exceeding $20 per week for not more than 52 weeks of unemployment. However, a claimant will be disqualified from receiving an allowance if—

First. He leaves suitable work voluntarily, without good cause, or is suspended or discharged for misconduct in the course of employment;

Second. He, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work to which he has been referred by a public employment office, or to accept suitable work when offered him; or

Third. He, without good cause, does not attend an available free training course as required by regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of this title.

A claimant will also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week in which he was unemployed through a stoppage of work which was the result of a labor dispute. However, this disqualification does not apply if it is shown that—

First. He is not participating in or directly interested in the labor dispute which causes the stoppage of work; and

Second. He does not belong to a grade or class of workers of which, immediately before the commencement of the stoppage, there were members employed at the premises at which the stoppage occurs, any of whom are participating in or directly interested in the dispute.

REDUCED RAILROAD FARE

For the duration of the war existing reduced round-trip railroad furlough fares available to military personnel of the United States Army, including Army nurses, authorized cadets, members of the Women's Army Corps, and personnel of the British Empire military forces, and armed forces of Allied nations have been authorized by the rail carriers to be continued for the duration of the war. The basis for the fares and the conditions under which they will be granted are given below.

A uniform must be worn and official leave, furlough, or pass papers must be presented to ticket agents and conductors when requested. Female nurses, when traveling in civilian clothes, will be granted the reduced fare only upon exhibition of official papers indicating that they are of the personnel of the United States Army.

The fare is approximately 1.25 cents per mile in each direction, with a return limit of 90 days after date of sale, permitting stop-overs at any station en route within limit of ticket upon application to conductor. Tickets will be coach class and will be honored in coaches or chair cars only, and will not be good for raise in grade to higher class of accommodations.

On certain limited trains the furlough-fare tickets will not be honored, but there is sufficient train service on all railroads on which the furlough tickets will be honored.

Government tax on transportation does not apply on tickets sold to the personnel of the United States Army and Women's Army Corps when traveling in uniform, but will apply on tickets sold to the personnel of the British Empire military forces when traveling in uniform and will apply on tickets sold to Army nurses when not in uniform.

The Rural Electrification Administration in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the largest and most fertile field for national restoration when peace comes will be found in the encouragement and development of small farms in the United States. The significance of this phase of post-war planning to the Nation does not end with the farmer, rather it begins with him. The hard work and straight-thinking characteristic of the American farmer and his family in a large measure contribute to the character and integrity of the American Government. Thus it is apparent that the benefits of legislation in behalf of the farmer inure to the Nation. We cannot help the farmer without contributing to the well-being of the Nation; we cannot legislate against the farmer without threatening the security and welfare of the Nation.

The National Government must plan now if the full benefits of progressive legislation designed to foster the well-being of the farmer are to be realized. With that thought before me I am asking Congress, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the various Federal agencies to assist the men and women in our armed services who desire to return to farms in the arable areas and to aid them in the securing of homes and land of their own.

Such an undertaking will mean a coordinated effort which will bring to all these small farms power and light through the rural electric cooperatives and the Rural Electrification Administration. In this country, and in my State of Pennsylvania, by the Rural Electrification Administration and the R. E. A.-financed cooperatives, not only have the farmers and their families benefited but industry and labor have shared and prospered through this great program.

The big job of electrifying American farm homes was well under way before the needs of the war effort temporarily halted line construction. There is much work yet to be done.

Some 65,000 Pennsylvania farms have received central station electric service for the first time since May 11, 1935, when the Rural Electrification Administration was established by an Executive order of the President. Over 30,000 of these farms are receiving service from the 13 R. E. A.-financed cooperatives now in operation in Pennsylvania. Service has been extended to 2,400 of these farms in the last 18 months under War Production Board regulations in the effort to save labor and increase food production.

Up to June 30 of this year, R. E. A. had loaned nearly $10,500,000 to the 13 Pennsylvania cooperatives. This has provided over 1,700,000 man-hours of work in the construction of rural power lines. Over $2,000,000 was spent for line conductors, $1,200,000 for transformers, $300,000 for meters, $350,000 for pole line hardware, and $1,900,000 for poles.

These farmers have spent $7,000,000 wiring homes and barns and $9,000,000 for electrical farm and home equipment such as milk machines and coolers, water pumps and systems, poultry equipment, electric tools and shop machinery, and household appliances such as refrigerators, quick freezers, ranges, washing machines, and irons.

The record in Pennsylvania is paralleled in the rest of the Nation. Three hundred and eighty-seven million dollars was loaned by R. E. A. to 813 borrowers for the construction of nearly 400,000 miles of pole line up to July 1 o fthis year. These lines are now serving well over a million rural homes. Think of what all this has meant to the farm home and American industry and labor.

Not only has the R. E. A. program directly benefited those farmers now receiving service from its borrowers, but farmers receiving service from private utilities have been helped through more liberal line extension policies and lowered rates as a result of the stimulus provided by the aggressive R. E. A. program. Private utilities have also benefited in Pennsylvania by selling all of the electric energy requirements of the R. E. A. cooperatives.

I am not only proud of what R. E. A. has done in Pennsylvania, but I am intensely interested in seeing that the program is continued with renewed vigor in the post-war period in order that no farm or rural home that can be reasonably reached with central station service will be without electric service. Electricity on the farm should be as commonplace and accepted as rural delivery postal service.

A bulletin entitled "Rural Electrification—A Post-War Market Forecast," has been recently published by the research department of the Curtis Publishing Co. of Philadelphia, Pa., for its magazine, the Country Gentleman. The figures shown in this bulletin are informative and I recommend it to each one of you for careful reading. It tells you what can be expected in your State and the Nation.

In this report it is estimated that over $3,000,000,000 will be spent in the United States for rural electrification in the post-war period and another $500,000,000 between now and the post-war period by both private and public agencies to serve over 5,000,000 farms and rural homes. This is big business.

In Pennsylvania alone it is forecast in the Curtis Publishing Co. study that a total of nearly $130,000,000 will be spent in the war and post-war period

for line construction, farm and home wiring, appliances and electrical equipment, and plumbing equipment to serve 145,000 more consumers. More work for labor, increased business for industry, and better living on the farm.

The R. E. A. cooperatives in Pennsylvania have not had an easy job. Lean territory, active opposition from a few badly advised utilities, difficulty in obtaining low wholesale rates, and the need for helpful legislation made trying days for the early pioneers of area rural electrification in Pennsylvania.

However, progress has been made with the advent of low cost rural construction, better cooperation from private utilities in the matter of competition and wholesale rates, and a model State rural electrification act enacted in the days of the Earle State administration.

Much still remains to be done before we can economically reach all those who need electric service. Engineers must continue their struggle for lower cost construction; wholesale and retail rates must be lowered; cooperatives must be protected against unfair competition; and lower interest rates and more liberal terms for borrowing must be made available for rural line construction.

Following is a statistical summary of the funds advanced by R. E. A. in Pennsylvania as of June 30, 1944:

Pennsylvania—Statistical summary of Rural Electrification Administration borrowers, June 30, 1944—Operating data

	Funds advanced, total	Funds advanced, distribution	Funds advanced, wiring, plumbing, and other	Miles energized	Consumers connected
Northwestern Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, Cambridge Springs, Pa.	$1,164,631	$1,164,631	----------	1,130	4,222
Southwest Central Rural Electrification Cooperative Corporation, Indiana, Pa.	1,326,799	1,310,602	$16,197	1,200	4,242
Sullivan County Rural Electrification Cooperative, Forksville, Pa.	252,639	246,507	6,132	250	777
Tri-County Rural Electrification Cooperative, Mansfield, Pa.	991,379	982,295	9,084	1,009	2,764
The Central Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, Clearfield, Pa.	541,158	541,158	----------	451	1,564
Clavarack Electric Cooperative, Towanda, Pa.	1,330,795	1,295,810	34,985	1,350	3,319
Central Electric Cooperative, Parkers Landing, Pa.	1,278,127	1,277,737	390	1,044	4,068
Warren Electric Cooperative, Youngsville, Pa.	172,250	172,250	----------	170	553
Valley Rural Electrification Cooperative, Huntington, Pa.	893,381	875,503	17,878	743	2,567
Somerset Rural Electrification Cooperative, Somerset, Pa.	659,971	651,926	8,045	634	1,732
Jefferson Rural Electrification Cooperative, Brookville, Pa.	418,776	417,649	1,127	439	1,278
Bedford Rural Electrification Cooperative, Bedford, Pa.	373,779	369,629	4,150	395	1,120
Adams Electric Cooperative, Gettysburg, Pa.	995,590	993,322	2,268	854	2,331
State total	10,399,275	10,299,019	100,256	9,669	30,537

What Does the New Deal Really Offer Agriculture?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the New Dealers are running around telling farmers that the New Deal has over $840,000,000 to give away to farmers before election time. Everyone knows it is their grandchildren's money which these new dealers are using to buy votes. They do not tell the farmers that a third of them will not even get $21 apiece, while the big landowners will continue to get checks up to $50,000 to $75,000 apiece.

The following statement by Franklin Carter—Jay Franklin—who was a special assistant to Secretary of Agriculture WALLACE is indicative of the attitude of the left-wing political agriculturists who have been helping to map the agricultural program of our Nation for the past 12 years. The statement follows:

The problem of farm relief will become not how shall we relieve the farmer but who shall relieve us of the farmer? The farmer has abrogated to himself all virtue and all knowledge. He has voted against progress, against civilization, against the city, against science, against art. He has made and unmade Presidents in the image of man. He has exhausted our soil as he will exhaust our Treasury if given half a chance. He is the great obstacle to human progress, the great threat to political stability. Sooner or later we shall discover, as England discovered, as Soviet Russia discovered, that the pagan, the landed proprietor, the kulak, is simply so much muck on the path of progress and must be swept aside if society is to advance.

The question now arises as to whether the farmer is going to be better off with TRUMAN replacing WALLACE. A man that is not held in very high regard by the farmers in his own State cannot be expected to get much support from other States.

The Missouri Farmer, a farm paper, sheds definite and undisputable light on the question in its January 15, 1944, issue. This is what it said on page 9 of that issue:

Since he has been in Washington Senator TRUMAN has never seemed friendly toward agriculture. At most he has been indifferent and at time he has appeared to be hostile toward the farmer's cause. He has constantly turned a deaf ear to all the pleas of the Missouri Farmers Association State Legislative Committee and at times when farm leaders have called on him in Washington and when replying to letters, he has seemed almost discourteous.

The Missouri Farmers Association is composed of 86,000 members. They are real dirt farmers. They have lived off their land by farming it, and Missouri has never had many large New Deal farm checks to live from as the State was figured safely New Deal by the New Deal.

The average farmer cannot see why funds were not provided to fulfill the commitments made on milk, eggs, pork, and other products when funds appear available for distribution in abundance at election time.

German Atrocities Against Minority Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, over the long and fretful months of the past tragic years of this war I have sat upon the floor of this House, listened to the speeches of the representatives of a free people, participated in debate, and helped to formulate and enact legislation for the prosecution of the war of defense of humanity against the wanton, un-Christian, and inexcusable attacks of the military regime of Adolf Hitler, who unquestionably sought to and did engulf the world in war to enslave all mankind because of his hatred of the Jewish people as a race and a minority group.

This Government was founded upon the principle that it is a government of law, and that the law is designed to protect the weak against the strong, and the poor against the rich. One of the principal foundation stones of this Republic is the right to worship God according to the dictates of your own conscience. It is my belief that Hitler pays homage to no God except the god of force, and that instead of fighting for a principle or for a cause, he has engaged in wholesale, relentless murder. He has violated every principle of international law and forfeited every right to humanitarian consideration.

My committee, in its investigation of American camps for prisoners of war, has found by interviews that there are prisoners in the same camp who are legitimate prisoners of war and are there to be treated as such; but along with them are others who are not only prisoners of war but belong to the group of murderers that slaughtered defenseless women and children whenever and wherever they could lay their filthy hands upon them. We read in the press accounts of wholesale murder of the populations of small towns, and then again we turn to other sources of information and we find that the Germans, under the direction of this ruthless, murderous dictator, maintained and operated gas chambers and infernos for the cremation of human beings by the thousands. They did not stop at the burning of soldiers of other armies, but they included in their murderous and torturous schemes the helpless civilian women and children of surrounding countries, and then engaged

in the barbarous practice of selling their ashes in small containers to distressed and deluded relatives who believed that for a high price they were obtaining the sacred ashes of their loved ones.

This unspeakable conduct on the part of the German military machine is repulsive to everything human and decent. I denounce it, and denounce the German war lords as barbarians and savages, and I pray God that the time will never come when the world shall again be subjected to such relentless persecution and murder of minority groups because of their religious beliefs or business practices.

Mr. Speaker, these words may seem harsh, but I cannot afford, as a liberty-loving citizen of the greatest democracy on earth, to permit this Congress to recess without this expression of my resentment of the conduct of the vicious German regime.

Post-War Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Mayor John B. Gage, of my home city of Kansas City, Mo., appeared before the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when it was in that city to inspect aviation facilities and needs there.

He made a statement before the subcommittee which I feel summarizes exceptionally well the problems that our Nation will face in the field of aviation in the post-war period after peace has been signed. His statement was made on August 28.

It is because I feel that the entire membership of the House and Senate should have this information for consideration that I am inserting his statement in the RECORD at this point:

It is a privilege indeed to have the opportunity of appearing before this committee at a time when it has under consideration matters vitally important to the future of aviation. I have told you in welcoming you to Kansas City that Kansas City and its people are deeply interested in the development and growth of aviation. We have put millions of dollars of our own city funds into the construction of two of the finest airports in the Nation—Municipal and Grandview. Almost directly across the river in Kansas City, Kans., is another great airport, Fairfax, developed largely at national expense to meet war requirements. Our local or city contribution to the cost of the two airports in Kansas City, Mo., has amounted to well over 50 percent of the total cost of construction as against a national average of only 20 percent for local contributions to total cost. Kansas City is the headquarters for two of the Nation's great air lines—T. W. A. and Mid-Continent. Many of our citizens derive their livelihood from aviation. Many former residents of this city, employees of T. W. A., are far away in Casablanca, Iceland, the Azores, and in England working in the great Army air transport services. Furthermore, the character and the climate of the region in which we live with our greater distances and relatively better flying weather create a greater need and demand for the rapid and convenient transportation which modern aviation affords than exists in more densely populated areas. It is therefore most natural that those complex and sometimes controversial problems concerning the post-war control and promotion of aviation which are the particular study of the members of your committee are of profound concern to us. We greatly appreciate this opportunity to give you the benefit of our experience and our conclusions as based on those experiences in the hope that an expression of our views may be of some aid to you in arriving at sound judgment.

At the outset I desire to discuss the proposals for the future development of airports and aviation facilities in the United States contained in the Randolph bill (H. R. 5024) and the Mott bill (H. R. 4811) now before your committee and the House of Representatives for consideration. Under these measures future Federal participation in aviation is to be channeled through State agencies hereafter to be established. Heretofore Federal-municipal relationship has existed in connection with the maintenance of public airports and aviation facilities. A Federal-State relationship would henceforth exist in respect to the construction and maintenance of public airports and aviation facilities. Airport development in towns and cities would be under the control of a department, commission, board, or official of the State known as a State airport agency.

Air-strip development away from congested centers along public highways would be under the control of the existing State highway departments. The Federal Commissioner of Public Roads would be the national authority cooperating with the State highway departments in respect to the development of air-strips outside of congested centers. The Civil Aeronautics Administration would be the Federal cooperating agency with the newly organized State airport agencies. Federal funds would be allotted to qualifying States on a complex formula based on population, area, and number of registered civil aircraft in each State. State funds would be raised by the taxes and fees assessed or levied on aircraft fuel and aircraft facilities or from State licenses for permits to participate in aviation. The approval of the Civil Aeronautics Administration would be required as to the location of airports, character of facilities to be constructed, standards of construction, and maintenance provisions before the joint funds could be expended by the State airport agency upon any specific project. Heretofore the States have not been actively interested in the development of aviation. Little or no State money or tax revenue has been invested in airport construction or maintenance. Manifestly, the proposed change in methods and in procedure is drastic and far reaching.

The justification for it is said to rest in the fact that a sufficient number of large class IV airfields have been developed in the centers of population where it is economically feasible to operate public air transport not only to supply the present needs of commercial air transport, but to meet future needs, and the airport construction of the future will largely be concerned with the provision of some 3,000 new airports in the small towns and cities of the country. These airports will be used very largely for nonscheduled flying and for private aircraft. No one challenges the need for the development of airfields in the smaller centers of population. The question is whether or not the past direct Federal-city relationship which has proved so satisfactory and beneficial to the localities and to the national air pattern can be successfully applied to the expanded program of the future, or should be supplanted with a direct and exclusive Federal-State relationship.

I believe that the present Federal-city relationship in respect to airport development can and should be continued and expanded and not supplanted by a Federal-State system. There is no reason to my mind why the Civil Aeronautics Administration cannot directly participate with the smaller cities and towns in the matter of airport development and maintenance as well as it has worked with the larger cities. The technique and experience of the C. A. A., in my judgment, can be of greater aid to the smaller communities than it has been to the larger cities. This seems to me to be so patent as not to require argument. The proposed shift to the Federal-State airport relationship probably results from the mistaken idea that airports are comparable to highways and that Federal airport funds should be handled as Federal highway funds have been handled. But airports are not comparable to highways. Airports are terminals—airways are the highways of the sky.

I know of no proposal to shift control of the facilities for aviation along these airways from C. A. A. to local authorities. Highways are of benefit to many users who live outside of centers of population and who can enter or leave them at will along their routes. Airports are of direct benefit primarily to the local subdivisions of government. These subdivisions take a pride and definite local interest in these airports. They are mainly useful and beneficial at the points of concentrated population and should therefore be the responsibility of those local political subdivisions of government, whether those local subdivisions of government be cities or counties. The construction of each airport, not only as to its primary location but as to the uses for which it it to be built are primarily matters of local concern and no two airport problems are exactly alike. Physical characteristics of terrain, potential volumes of traffic, types of business vary from place to place. They are not determined by the State population, or the State area, or the number of registered civil aircraft in the State. Furthermore, the setting up of these new State airport agencies would inevitably result in an immense amount of useless overhead. It would require swarms of new State administrative officials to construct, operate, and maintain these airports. The expense would have to be borne by the industry itself—an industry which we are most anxious to see go ahead free and unfettered by the dead weight of unnecessary cost and wasteful expenditure.

I am convinced that it is as necessary to maintain complete Federal control over the great air-sea that flows above us, irrespective of State lines or county lines or city borders, as it is to maintain Federal control over our navigable rivers and harbors. Licensing of those who engage in airplane operation, provision of safety standards, the control of traffic hazards, provision and management of airway lights and beacons, of control towers on airports justifying the operation of control towers should be and remain wholly and solely a Federal responsibility and activity. Nothing less than this makes sense from a safety standpoint. Otherwise State barriers of myriad character would rear their ugly heads and serve to defeat the primary purpose in transportation which the airplane is among other kinds of transport able to best achieve, namely, quick, rapid, and easy movement over great distance. Taxes on aircraft facilities and aircraft fuels might and would vary from State to State. In a

fluid industry like aviation this would force arbitrary removal of operators from State to State. These taxes, if any, should be levied by the Federal Government, the revenue to flow back into the funds that go to promote the developments of this industry.

Take the situation that exists here in Kansas City. I have referred to the fact that we have a municipal airport in Kansas City, Mo. It is on one side of the Missouri River. On the other side of the Missouri River in Kansas is the Fairfax Airport. If Missouri imposed taxes on aircraft facilities and aircraft operation in the State of Missouri not similarly imposed on aircraft fuels and aircraft operation in the State of Kansas, the business on the Missouri airport would move for an artificial and unnecessary reason over to the other port in Kansas or vice versa.

Recently in connection with the operation of airport towers at the municipal and Fairfax ports we had a situation come up which illustrates the necessity for joint control of air traffic. The Army in expanding the Fairfax airport at the beginning of the war in order that it might adequately accommodate test flights of bombers to be constructed at the North American Bomber Plant adjacent to that field designed a runway, the approach zones of which intersected the main approach zones of the Municipal Airport of Kansas City, Mo., across the river. The design of the runway was in violation of the existing C. A. A. regulations. Protest was made by Kansas City, Mo., and formally filed, whereupon the Army Air Corps entered into an agreement to establish a joint-control tower and operate it for the two fields during the period of the operation by the Army of the Fairfax airport. Thereupon the protest was withdrawn and the runway constructed. The unified-control tower was not established but a unified operation of both control towers of the two fields was placed in effect and the expense thereof paid by the Army through the C. A. A. Several months ago the Army suddenly decided that they would abandon the operation of the control tower at the municipal field but continue to operate the control tower at the Fairfax field. Hazards inevitably incident to such abandonment and the establishment of a nonunified tower control at the two fields were pointed out. Soon the order of abandonment was withdrawn. It is certain that if independent operation of the control towers upon these two fields should be established and continue in the future, that accidents will occur in which innocent lives will be lost. It is therefore my opinion that on the airports where traffic demands control towers this should be a responsibility and activity of the Federal Government. There should be a unified control both of traffic upon the airways and in the approach zones to the landing fields. We know too keenly the very disastrous safety situation developed in connection with automobile operation in this country.

Loss of life and injuries incident to it have been vastly greater than those that have occurred, terrible as they are, in the armed forces of our country during the present war. And in substantial part that situation has developed from a lack of unified control over the licensing of automobile drivers and the safe construction of automobile highways. It is even more important to aviation that unified, coordinated Federal control continue with respect to the licensing of those who engage in civil or commercial aviation.

I want to commend the chairman of this committee for his interest in that subject. I hope he continues that interest until his ideas are represented by effective national legislation.

I have understood that it is urged that under this proposed legislation, particularly the Randolph bill, that Civil Aeronautics Administration could continue to exercise full authority with reference to the locale of new airports, the standards of their construction, and with respect to operation thereon or on adjacent airways. Under this view it is proposed that State airport agencies act only as sort of a political buffer between Civil Aeronautics Administration and local pressure groups. The C. A. A. would retain authority while the responsibility for action rested on the State agencies. The city officials would go to the State capitol and there a buck-passing act would be put on—between the State agency and the Federal Government. This makes more people sore, and justly sore, than anything I know. If there is anything we need in this Government of ours, it is to center responsibility where authority rests. I believe Civil Aeronautics Administration is fully as capable of resisting political pressure of a local character as would be any of the proposed new State agencies.

Many of our cities have invested large sums in their present airports. Many other cities have developed for the future far-reaching plans for further airport development. Federal-city relationship has successfully developed aviation in the past. There is no good reason why all this relationship should be now junked and destroyed. There are many reasons why it should not. I hope this committee sees fit to recommend to Congress legislation that will continue the Federal-local government relationship in respect to airport and air facility construction and maintenance. As to airstrips in the country adjacent to public highways, the Civil Aeronautics Administration should have close contact with location, construction, and maintenance. Existing State highway departments could play an important part in this connection and would together with the county governments be appropriate action agencies. But this should be kept well within the general orbit of control by the national aviation authority. So much for the domestic situation with reference to future airport construction.

In conclusion, I would like briefly to present to you our thoughts with reference to the future of American airplane operation in the foreign or international field. This is the subject of much discussion both here and abroad. We are interested here. Permit me to remind you that the vast majority of us out here in the Midwest are not monopolists or monopolistically inclined. We don't believe in monopoly, either in transportation or production. Our real prosperity and progress has come about when competition has been vigorous and at high tide. Then and then only jobs have been easy to get and business has been good. We are not, in other words, a tired and washed-up people. We believe in competition among ourselves and with others. Our boys exemplified this on their athletic fields and have again by their fighting spirit exemplified it on the battlefields of the world. Competition is not dead as an instrument of economic policy. Hence, we do not favor the so-called chosen instrument idea. Monopolistic governmentally fostered domination or operation of either foreign or domestic airline operations is anathema to us. We oppose proposals of that sort—born of the fear of change—unworthy of the resourceful and self-reliant American spirit, fostering and rendering inevitable stagnation and decay. We particularly do not want them applied to a new industry which we desire to see advance and grow and vastly expand.

By the same token proposed combinations of the different kinds of transportation, rail and highway, air and water, under joint management, eliminating real competition regionally and otherwise, are sternly objected to by the vast majority of our people. We recognize that in this technological age highly integrated operations are demanded; that we must have great corporations to conduct these far-flung and intricate business enterprises in important fields of industry and transport. The football field has its umpire; athletic competition has its established rules of the game. We recognize the necessity for public regulation of these industrial giants so that there may not be ruthless and unfair competition. What we believe in is regulation that doesn't supplant competition but rather encourages and protects it and maintains a situation permitting a fair and active contest in which each will profit according to his ability. We believe that this has been substantially the situation in connection with the past development of domestic commercial air transport under Federal regulations heretofore in force and effect. Let this be the fundamental policy governing the entrance of our domestic air lines into the foreign and international fields. We want to see them fly the airways of the world on that basis. An international aviation authority with control of traffic and safety standards should be established, but this control should not be one permitting limitation and restriction of commerce. The right of innocent flight over the lands and countries of others will have to be worked out between the individual nations. The right of cabotage, or internal operation in other countries, may or may not be granted by nations. Let us approach these problems as Americans who are not afraid of the effect of competition. And from what I know about our aviation, our commercial aviation, which was just as far ahead of European aviation as our military aviation was behind at the outset of the war, I believe that our operators will in a fair competitive field hold their own in the post-war era with the airline operators of all other nations.

Finally, let me congratulate you, members on this committee, as the representatives of a national legislative body, our Congress, which has indeed done much for a commercial aviation in the past and which, I believe, will continue to do so in the future.

Can Elections Be Bought?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my unanimous-consent request to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "On the Other Hand," by Lowell Mellett, appearing in the Washington Evening Star of September 6, 1944:

ON THE OTHER HAND—HILLMAN FIGURES MAKE ELECTION-BUYING CHARGE APPEAR SILLY, SAYS WRITER

(By Lowell Mellett)

There are too many things to write about. For instance, there is that intriguing statement made by Sidney Hillman to the House Campaign Expenditures Committee: "The total expenses of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee to date are considerably less than the 1940 contributions to the Republican Party by five wealthy families alone."

Everybody surely would like to know the names of the families. The accepted source of information on the subject is the Report

of the Special Committee to Investigate Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1940.

This official report reveals that the five families are the Rockefellers, the Du Ponts, the Pews, the Sloans, and the Queenys.

The five families gave a total of $432,680, it seems. That is the figure that Hillman apparently would like to have contrasted with $371,086, which he says is the total expenditure of the C. I. O. committee up to August 15. And most of that, he says, was spent for salaries and travel, office rent, equipment, and publicity. Only $67,430, he says, was expended or contributed in primary campaigns or State elections.

MAY HAVE GOOD POINT

If Hillman's figures are correct and the Senate committee's figures are correct, it looks as if Hillman really has a point there. And since Hillman is chairman of the board of one large bank and director of another, he is not apt to be careless with figures. Still he was not very exact in the use of another figure. He said the Republican Party and its cooperating groups (G. O. P. equivalents of the Political Action Committee) had "collected and spent some $17,000,000" in 1940. If he had wanted to be precise, he should have said that $18,156,332 was collected by the G. O. P., but only $16,621,435 spent. That left $1,534,897 not used. These are the figures in the Senate committee's report.

The C. I. O. committee started out to raise $1,500,000, or a little less than the G. O. P. committee had left over last time. It succeeded in raising only $671,214, however, and succeeded in using only $371,086. That makes all of the talk about the C. I. O. buying up recent primary elections and its alleged plans to buy up the November election sound a little silly, doesn't it?

Anyhow, you now know who the five families are:

Let's turn, then, to another gentleman who has been getting his name in the papers—Mr. John Foster Dulles. In writing about him, the boys usually say he will be Mr. Dewey's Secretary of State—if.

A friend has kindly furnished a speech made by Mr. Dulles before the New York Economic Club on March 23, 1939. The friend points out one sentence which he seems to think is significant of something. It reads: "Only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy, or Japan contemplates war upon us."

BORAH'S REMARK RECALLED

This recalls Senator Borah's famous statement to the Senate, "My information is that there will be no war," when he was leading the fight against repeal of the arms embargo that same year. Probably more will be heard of Mr. Dulles' unfortunate utterance if he continues to be Governor Dewey's secretary-of-State-in-waiting.

That brings us to another maker of news, Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, ranking Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee. Mr. KNUTSON was leading the fight in the House the other day against a proposal to provide unemployment compensation for Federal workers—meaning workers in navy yards, arsenals, and the like, as well as Washington and way points—who may need such help when demobilization begins. He declared, "That would add $5,000,000,000 to the operating expenses of the Government." He did not disclose how he reached this preposterous figure, but went on to shout:

"How are we going to restore normalcy in this country when Congress is shoveling out money in scoops?"

Mr. KNUTSON has found a campaign slogan for his party—"Back to normalcy."

O. P. A. Campaign Against Upgrading of Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, as an illustration of the activities of the dairy products manufacturing group—the group that has so long prevented the American housewife from buying a wholesome and convenient table spread made from the vegetable oils of American soybean and cottonseed, I submit the following official release from the Office of Price Administration:

Savings to housewives of about $15,000,000 annually in what they pay for butter are anticipated as a result of a broad campaign to eliminate upgrading, which results in sales at over-ceiling prices, the Office of Price Administration announced today.

The campaign, which was begun by O. P. A.'s enforcement department last June, will cost less than $5,000 a year officials estimate.

Here is how the project is proceeding:

O. P. A. has obtained the services of butter graders employed by the War Food Administration. Some of these graders work in the big Middle West butter producing area. Others work in butter concentrating centers on the east and west coasts.

These butter graders examine butter being prepared for shipment from concentration points. A concentration point is an interim storage center in which butter from producing creameries is accumulated by large wholesale distributors prior to shipment to butter consuming areas throughout the country.

O. P. A. investigators, working with the butter graders, make a note of the place to which a shipment being graded has been consigned. Suppose, for instance, a shipment of butter at a concentration point in the Middle West has been graded and is consigned to New York City. The investigator prepares a grading certificate for the shipment, and prepares a duplicate, which is forwarded to the O. P. A. regional office in New York City. From the New York office an O. P. A. representative contacts the receiver of the shipment of butter, and checks to make sure it was invoiced and sold at the legal price for the grade.

Butter is graded 89-score, 90-score, 92-score, or 93-score, according to tests including the factors of smell and taste. By selling 89-score butter at the O. P. A. ceiling price for 93-score butter, a wholesale distributor could obtain as much as 2 cents per pound above the legal 89-score ceiling price.

The practice of selling one grade of butter at the price of a higher grade is known as upgrading.

Any sales at the wholesale distributor level above legal ceiling prices cost the American housewife money, for retail store ceiling prices are calculated by adding percentage markups to the prices per pound that the store pays for the butter it sells.

It has been estimated that normally only 10 percent of all butter produced in the United States is the 93-score top grade. A check in June of this year, just before the O. P. A. campaign against upgrading started, however, disclosed that at that time an estimated 90 percent of all butter was being sold as 93-score grade. "There just isn't that amount of 93-score butter produced," an official said.

Since the beginning of grade checking by O. P. A. officials, a big dent has been made in upgrading, O. P. A. said.

With the cooperation of the industry's premium butter producers and distributors who want traditional standards of the trade maintained, more upgrading is expected to be eliminated, O. P. A. added.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that it is not the dairy farmer nor the small store distributor who is engaging in this dishonest practice. It is the same people who have so long colored and renovated butter, and who have at the same time been responsible for the remarkable legislation which actually requires naturally yellow oleomargarine to be bleached before it can be sold without a confiscatory tax.

Must a Veteran in Need of Hospitalization Swear to a Pauper's Oath?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, the largest American Legion Post in the District of Columbia and one of the largest in the Nation. The resolution is worthy of consideration by every Member of Congress:

Be it resolved, That the existing and written method of interrogation for admission to veteran hospitalization, as nonservice connected patients or as service-connected patients seeking treatment for ailment other than cause of discharge—either emergency or extensive cases—is un-American, degrading, and in addition clothed with the dubious but legal power of subjecting a veteran of the world wars to the possibility of prosecution by arrogant or antagonistic governmental bureaucrats.

Whereas that the membership of this post respectfully suggests that Veteran Administration officials be requested to authorize and institute a more democratic and more appropriate procedure of ascertaining and determining the financial status of an applicant or his/her eligibility for hospital treatment.

Whereas that these pleadings are not submitted for the intention of removing proper or necessary restrictions and safeguards for hospital admittance but to eliminate the apprehension of being stigmatized in official records by a so-called act of pauperism, and to remove the contingency of being coerced or threatened by overzealous public officials: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Vincent B. Costello Post No. 15, of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, is authorized and directed to recommend for the consideration by the delegates of the national convention of the American Legion to be assembled at Chicago, Ill., September 18–20, 1944, the deletion of questions Nos. 5 and 9, respectively, from Veterans' Administration

Form P–10 "Application for Hospital Treatment or Domiciliary Care," otherwise known as the "pauper's oath."

Approved:

THOMAS COSTELLO,
Commander.
JOSEPH LEIB,
Vice Commander.

Information on Legislation for Veterans and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

PRIVILEGES, RIGHTS, AND BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the Michigan counties of Saginaw, Shiawassee, Gratiot, Clinton, Montcalm, and Ionia there is scarcely a family without relatives engaged in the great struggle of World War No. 2, either in Europe or in the Pacific.

In the present and recent sessions of Congress we have passed many laws to provide benefits to servicemen and their families, yet I frequently learn of citizens who are not aware of the possibility of their entitlement to benefits under these laws.

Congress has been cognizant of the impact of the war on our service families and laws have been passed to make their lives a little more bearable and a little more livable despite the great sacrifices these people have been making. Increase in the pay of the serviceman over that of former wars, provisions for the protection of his financial interests while he is in the service, allotments to his immediate family to ease the financial load, disability and hospital benefits, and the more recent G. I. bill with its many facilities, are among the steps taken by Congress as token evidence of a grateful nation.

In order that men and women of the armed forces from the Eighth District of Michigan and their families at home may have some idea of the various privileges, rights, and benefits of congressional enactments, I desire to submit to them this summary with the hope that it will prove helpful. Should any of them feel they are not receiving benefits to which they are entitled, or should they feel that I can be of assistance in handling matters with the War and Navy Departments and the Veterans' Administration, I shall give their cases prompt attention if they will write me in detail and address me as follows: Congressman FRED L. CRAWFORD, 1123 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

It is important in this connection that the person writing his Member of Congress supply the full name, home address, and the military address and Army or Navy serial number if the service person involved is still in the service, and if the person has been released, then the discharge number should also be included, together with the date of discharge. Frequently it is also helpful to have the last copy of a letter received by the individual from the official agency with which they have carried on correspondence, if the case has been pending.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

Provision has been made to give a measure of financial assistance to dependents of servicemen while the breadwinner is in the uniform of his country. A plan known as the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act has been worked out whereby the Federal Government makes a financial allowance to dependents in certain categories and this is supplemented by a contribution which is made by the serviceman from his monthly pay. A soldier with a wife and one child sets aside $22 per month of his pay and the Government makes an outright allowance of $53, providing a monthly check of $80 for the wife and child. There are three principal classes of dependents benefiting under this act. They are known as class A dependents, class B dependents, and class B–1 dependents, and their classification and the amount they receive follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, up to $42; a divorced wife with one child, $72; a divorced wife with each additional child, $20. Note: A wife separated or divorced from a man in service will get no more than the amount fixed in a court order or decree in case of alimony. If the divorce or separation order does not call for alimony or separate maintenance she will not receive any allowance.

Class B dependents: A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37. Note: Class B dependents, it must be clearly understood, are dependents who are only partially dependent upon service men and women for support. In other words, if the dependents are dependent upon men or women in service 50 percent or less, but are still substantially dependent, they come under class B. Only $37 is allowed no matter if there are one or even four or five more partially dependent. Those who make application for family allowance, therefore, should be very careful to show the full degree of their dependency. This is important.

Class B–1 dependents: One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; and each additional brother or sister, $11. Two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $79; two parents and each additional brother or sister, $11; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parent, $11. Note: These persons must be chiefly dependent on the serviceman.

Ordinarily, the monthly family allowance is payable from the first of the month in which application is filed by the enlisted man or by or on behalf of a dependent. For any month in which a monthly allowance is paid, the monthly pay of the enlisted man is reduced by or charged with the amount of $22, and with an additional amount of $5 if the dependents to whom such allowance is payable include more than one class of dependents. However, an initial family allowance will be paid by the Government to the designated dependent or dependents with no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man when written application therefor is filed by the enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service.

WHO CAN APPLY?

In event the service man or woman for some reason fails to make application, or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out. The Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children, dates of birth, and so forth. Therefore, if any class A dependent does not know for certain just how to apply, he or she could well write a Member of Congress and ask for instructions.

However, dependents falling in the category of class B and B–1 dependents cannot file applications forcing an allotment from the man or woman in service. Family allowances are compulsory only when applied for by class A dependents.

It should also be pointed out that even though the serviceman's wife and child may be receiving $80, for instance, that does not eliminate the possibility of the dependent parents receiving assistance. In cases where dependents of two categories receive an allowance, then only $5 additional is withheld from the serviceman's pay, irrespective of how many additional dependents are benefited. In other words, $27 a month is the most that can be taken out of a soldier's pay under the servicemen's dependents allotment allowance plan. Parents can also be helped by more than one child in the service if they are actually dependent on more than one.

MISSING IN ACTION

There has recently been called to my attention the matter of pay and allowances in connection with persons missing in action. In such cases where any person in active service is officially reported as missing, missing in action, interned in a neutral country, or captured by an enemy, he is entitled, while so absent, to receive or to have credited to his account the same pay and allowances to which he was entitled at the beginning of the absence, or may become entitled to thereafter. Any such person who has made any allotment of pay for the support of dependents or for payment of insurance premiums is entitled to have such allotments continued for a period of 12 months from date of commencement of absence. Where such person may not have executed an allotment or where the allotments made are not sufficient for the reasonable support of dependents or payment of insurance premiums, the head of the service department concerned may direct that allotments not

exceeding the amount of pay and allowances the missing person would be entitled to allot be paid to the insurer or to such dependents as have been designated in the official records or as may be determined by the head of the department. When the 12 months' period has expired and no official report of death, or of being a prisoner, or of being interned has been received, the head of the department concerned, after a full review of the case, or following any subsequent review of the case may direct a continuance of the person's missing status, if the person may reasonably be presumed to be living, or make a finding of death. When a finding of death is made, such date is the day following the expiration of an absence of 12 months or where the missing status has been continued on a day determined by the head of the department.

When it is officially reported that a person missing under the foregoing conditions is alive and in the hands of an enemy or interned in a neutral country, the payments authorized may be made for a period not to extend beyond the date of receipt by the head of the department concerned of evidence that the missing person is dead or has returned to the controllable jurisdiction of the department concerned.

Dependents, upon receipt of information from the War or Navy Department, that a person in the armed forces is missing, or has been captured, should immediately write to the head of the branch of the armed service in which the man was serving, giving name, rank, organization, and serial number; also setting forth the need for financial assistance, and at the same time state whether or not the missing or captured person had previously made an allotment. Dependents of such persons, upon receipt of advice from the service department concerned that such person has been officially reported dead, or that a finding of death has been made, should file claim for death pension benefits with the Veterans' Administration in order to protect their rights.

The monthly family allowances are not assignable or subject to the claims of creditors and are not liable to attachment, levy, or seizure under any legal process.

The family allowance provisions also apply in cases of women in the service on the same basis as related here except that the husband and children must show that the servicewoman is their chief support.

GRATUITY PAY

A gift, known as gratuity pay, is provided by the Federal Government in the case of the death of a serviceman from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct. This is an amount equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received by the serviceman at the time of his death. This is payable to the widow or child of the serviceman or any dependent he may have designated. It is not necessary that death be in line of duty. The serviceman cannot designate the recipient of this gratuity in a will.

The War Department usually sends the widow or child the forms necessary in connection with receipt of this gratuity pay. Should these not be received within a reasonable time after receipt of official notice of death of the serviceman, I shall be glad to have them sent upon receipt of a request for the same.

In cases of persons reported missing in action the gratuity pay is not issued until the expiration of 12 months after the date of the report or until an official report of death has been made.

COMPENSATION AND PENSION

Veterans of World War No. 2, as well as veterans of World War No. 1, who are disabled may either be entitled to compensation or pension. These payments run from $6 to $250 per month and depend on whether the disability is service or non-service connected and on the nature, degree, and permanency of the disability. Veterans' inquiries concerning these matters should be addressed to Mr. Guy Palmer, manager, Veterans' Administration, Dearborn, Mich.

Pension may also be due World War widows or minor children if the soldier died of a service-connected disability or had some service-connected disability of a measurable degree.

Provision has also been made for payments to widows, children, and dependent parents of veterans of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2 based upon death in service or service-connected death. The rates payable are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child)	38
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

The widow or children of a deceased veteran of either World War No. 1 or No. 2 may be entitled to payments if the veteran's death was of a non-service-connected nature, but if he had a disability at the time of his death that was incurred in or aggravated by such war service.

MEDICAL TREATMENT AND DOMICILIARY CARE

Hospital treatment, or out-patient medical or dental treatment, including necessary medicines and prosthetic appliances, with institutional training in the use of such appliances, may be furnished certain veterans medically determined to be in need thereof, for service-connected disabilities. Out-patient treatment may also be authorized for any non-service-connected condition which is associated with and aggravating a service-connected disability, as adjunct treatment.

Hospital treatment or domiciliary care for non-service-connected disabilities under certain conditions may be furnished, when needed, for any war veteran not dishonorably discharged, or for any peacetime veteran discharged from service for disability incurred in line of duty or who is in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

Transportation to, and back from, Veterans' Administration facilities, when authorized in advance, for examination, medical treatment, hospitalization, or domiciliary care.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Most members of the armed forces will be entitled to mustering-out pay when they are discharged. The rates run as follows:

Three hundred dollars for persons in the service 60 days or more who served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska. This will be paid $100 at time of discharge, $100 in 30 days, and $100 in 60 days from discharge.

Two hundred dollars for persons who served at least 60 days and within the United States to be paid $100 at time of discharge and $100 in 30 days of discharge.

One hundred dollars for persons who served less than 60 days and payable at discharge.

Will We Win the Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by me entitled "Will We Win the Peace?" written for the Jewish Forum:

If by winning the peace we mean the growth and extension of the democratic idea, then I firmly believe that we will win the peace. We will win because as a nation we try. The late Stephen Vincent Benet said that in ringing terms in his castigation of totalitarianism, Nightmare at Noon. As a nation I think we try—try to give all men equal opportunity, strive to build the better life, work for the creation of a better world order.

We sometimes backslide. The flesh is sometimes weaker than the spirit, but we try. Our heart is in the right place, and that is what counts.

I believe, too, that there is plenty of evidence of progress. There is, for instance, the fair employment practices program. The committee is turning up evidence of discrimination. But the very fact that there is such a committee shows progress and that we are on the road to removing a blot on our society.

Post-war planning is in the air in Washington. How successful such planning is will be the deciding factor as to whether we win the peace. But everyone is trying. Everyone is aware of the problems and our shortcomings of the past. It will be a hard and long road to win the peace. Perhaps a longer and harder road than the one we are traveling today in the war. But win we will.

We are sometimes shocked by evidences of reaction and bigotry, by the plaform of an American First Party, by an outbreak of vandalism, by an obvious effort to discriminate in employment. But for every such factor there are dozens of examples of progress, of good will and democratic growth. They do not catch the public eye, because they are not so spectacular. It is the disturbing element, the act which arouses righteous indignation, that gets public attention, sometimes out of all proportion to its importance. We must keep things in focus.

I think we will win the peace because I have faith in America.

Criminal Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying, "Waste not, want not." If there is anything that the American people and its Government should conserve and save for the future it is Nature's precious gift of petroleum energy, the gasoline that has freed mankind from so much arduous labor—the power that plows our fields, plants and harvests our crops; power that processes and brings our food to our table; power that has made Alladin's dream come true—petroleum energy that takes us wherever we want to go for pleasure or profit, energy that has conquered the skies and the sea, Nature's greatest gift to man, a boon that our extravagance will deny to posterity. If there is anything that this generation should conserve it is our wasting asset petroleum and the precious gasoline which it supplies. We know that Government officials are notoriously wasteful.

The office files of Congress are replete with reports of Government extravagance and wasteful practices that many of us strive to correct to little avail. But a letter from a responsible educator addressed to Senator THOMAS and sent to all the members of the Idaho congressional delegation calls attention to the most wasteful practice and destructive methods of the Army in the State of Idaho that is beyond reason and little short of criminal.

If low-test gasoline is being burned by the Army—gas that could be used to do everything that tractors and trucks can do to produce and transport food to feed the hungry mouths of this world—then this practice of the Army should be made the subject of a congressional investigation.

There is submitted herewith for the consideration of the House the report of the burning of gasoline by the Army:

BOISE, IDAHO, *August 30, 1944.*

The Honorable JOHN THOMAS,
United States Senator, Idaho,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: The matter which I wish to mention here, we feel is of vital concern to everyone, not only in Idaho but throughout the United States.

For weeks; yes, months, we have noticed great black clouds of smoke back of Gowen Field. We have even thought or mistaken it for an airplane wreck. Upon careful inquiry, these are the facts, if we may call them facts, we have been able to gather. When a tank (railway or truck) of gas comes in to Gowen Field, that is under the required 110, or whatever the standard is, for high octane, the gas is dumped out and burned.

Many people here know about this for I have been told this by a number of different individuals. Why steps to stop such waste have not been taken is a marvel to me. An army officer recently while in a barber shop, said he had labored all day with the base commandant, or officer in charge, to turn a tank back for civilian use, but to no avail.

When we civilians have a hard time getting enough gas to carry on our legitimate occupations, it gets under our skins to have the Army commit such colossal wastes. Now we don't mean by that that we are unwilling to cooperate, skimp, and save for victory. We are glad to save for a purpose, but we resent very much not only what that means to our already dwindling national oil reserves, but also what it means to the taxpayer's pockets, and the use of such gas for civilians.

We believe that Congress is the one body that can put teeth into a rule or law to prevent such wastes. That saving should not be limited to the individual citizen.

We suggest that all members of the Idaho delegation in Congress be apprised of this condition, for we feel that what goes on at Gowen is probably common practice in many, if not all air bases, or other bases for that matter.

Yours very truly,

C. A. SAXTON,
Grade Principal, Franklin School.

Living Memorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following baccalaureate sermon by William Mather Lewis, president of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., June 18, 1944:

LIVING MEMORIALS

(By William Mather Lewis)

In the account of the transfiguration as recorded in the Gospel according to St. Matthew we find these words: "And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart: and was transfigured before them: and His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light.

"And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elijah talking with Him.

"Then answered Peter and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here; if Thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for Thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah.

"While he yet spake, behold a bright cloud overshadowed them; and behold a voice out of the cloud which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him."

This was a great experience for the three simple men who left the great company of people in the valley and journeyed with Jesus to the mountain top. For they had seen talking together, Moses representing the law, representing also those who had passed through death into the kingdom; Elijah representing the prophets and those who entered the kingdom through translation, and Jesus the Messiah, for whose ultimate appearing the lawmakers and phophets had eagerly looked during the centuries.

They were stirred to make some adequate recognition of this momentous event. "Let us build here three tabernacles, one for Thee, one for Moses, and one for Elijah." Here was the age-old reaction of man—to memorialize a great event with a monument, a statue, a cairn, a pyramid.

It has been man's desire since the dawn of civilization to erect monuments to perpetuate their own names or the names of those whom they admire. The earth is strewn with such structures too often symbolic of man's vanity rather than of his achievement. In saying this I do not question the motives of Peter or suggest that the tabernacles would have had no value. I merely point out that his conception was inadequate. Marcus Cato well said, "I would rather have men ask why I have no statue than why I have one." The voice from the clouds said, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye Him." This was, indeed, the answer to Peter's suggestion. Earthly tabernacles could not properly memorialize the event—there must be "a building of God, an house not made with hands eternal in the heavens" built on the teachings of Jesus.

"Can storied urn, or animated bust
Back to its mansion call the fleeting breath?
Can honour's voice provoke the silent dust,
Or flatt'ry soothe the dull cold ear of death?"

I have never seen statistics relative to the amount of money wrapped up in memorials throughout the United States. It must total hundreds of billions of dollars.

Now we are approaching another period when countless people will wish to erect monuments to those who have given their lives or have done some great deed, that we might continue to live in a free country.

God forbid that we should erect dead memorials as has been the custom in the past. After the Civil War few communities in the land failed to erect an angular monument surmounted by the metal effigy of a soldier. Washington parks and circles are disfigured with grotesque equestrian statues. Freakish structures mark many historic spots.

What memorials shall we erect? What will be worthy of the boys who laid down their lives at the Anzio beachhead, along the French coast and in the islands of the Pacific?

If our beloved sons could speak, they would ask us not to misinterpret them in useless panoply, but to carry on for them in high adventure.

There are three types of monuments: those which have no value artistically or functionally; those which have beauty without utility and finally, those which deserve the name "living memorials," which contribute something to the welfare of mankind. Of the first type there are innumerable examples; the second, the beautiful memorials, do have some justification. But for him who suffered on the field of battle, what better memorial than a hospital or an endowed hospital bed or medical research project, or a medical center? Cancer and tuberculosis are greater foes of mankind than are military aggressors. For him who laid aside his books and his ambitions in connection with scholarly pursuits, what more fitting memorial than a perpetual scholarship in some institution of learning where youth generation after generation may join the quest of truth? For those who went out of a community where the opportunities for wholesome entertainment were restricted, a fine playground or a community hall would be splendid living memorials. A community hall open constantly for athletic games, symphony concerts, dances—a place which would counteract the degrading commercialized amusement so common in most cities; a crippled children's clinic; a church center such as the people of Coventry have planned; a music foundation. The list of living memorials is endless if we but give our minds and hearts to the task of realizing the possibilities of immortalizing our heroes.

Every college campus should have its memorial hall—not as a show place but as the

center of some great intellectual enterprise conceived in the interest of humanity. This well might take the form of a Hall of World Affairs; where teachers and students of various nationalities and creeds, living and working together would seek through sound and realistic methods to develop international understandings and trust. Here lies the great hope of enduring peace—not in fantastic programs, not in wishful thinking of a Chamberlain at Munich but a united and far-reaching endeavor to think the whole tremendous problem through. Many times our academic interests have discouraged international good-will rather than promoted it.

You may recall that in the motion picture, Edison, the Man, Mr. Edison is the guest of honor at a banquet where the technical leaders pay their tribute to the great inventor and in his response he says, "To be told by the outstanding men and women of your time that you have contributed a great deal to human betterment is pleasant, very pleasant. I would hardly be human if my heart did not thrill with such a major compliment. But somehow I have not achieved the success I want. Earlier this evening I talked with two school children. Tomorrow the world will be theirs. It is a troubled world—full of doubt and uncertainty. You say we men of science have been helping it. Are those children and their children going to approve of what we have done? Or are they going to discover too late that science was trusted too much so that it has turned into a monster whose final triumph is man's own destruction?

"Some of us are beginning to feel that danger, but it can be avoided. I once had two dynamos. They needed regulating. It was a problem of balance and adjustment. And I feel that the confusion in the world today presents much the same problem. The dynamo of man's God-given ingenuity is running away with the dynamo of his equally God-given humanity. I am now too old to do much more than to say, 'Put those dynamos in balance. Make them work in harmony as the Great Designer intended they should.' It can be done. What man's mind can conceive, man's character can control. Man must learn that, and then we needn't be afraid of tomorrow, and man will go forward toward more light."

That institution which teaches its technical students to put the dynamo of man's God-given ingenuity in balance with the dynamo of his equally God-given humanity will indeed erect a magnificent memorial for those of its graduates who went down in the storm.

Pope Brock, a regent of the University of Georgia, recently said in his charter day address, "It is entirely possible to maintain an endurable social order with a modest amount of technology if there be present the necessary political, intellectual, and spiritual statesmanship. But if this statemanship be lacking, then all the technology, the genius man can create cannot save the world from anarchy. The question is not whether we shall abandon the teaching of the trades and technical skills but it is whether we shall first provide leadership without which the mastery of the vocations is a fruitless expenditure of effort."

Now, you may say that the subject of monuments is out of keeping with the spirit of baccalaureate Sunday. Monuments, however desirable, are after all erected in honor of those who have completed their lives, not for those who are beginning them. This is only partially true.

"All are architects of fate
Working on the walls of time,
Some with massive deeds and great,
Some with ornaments of rhyme."

From the day of his birth every individual builds his monument—some with stone, others with wood; hay; stubble. Day after day they grow. You see them going up all around you—if you have the eyes to see. Every man on the battle front is building his, with blood, sweat and tears, but no less is every man on the home front. For many it is a monument of self-denial; of eager participation in every enterprise which will help win the war, in willing cooperation in efforts to maintain and strengthen the institution in whose service they are; of readiness to withhold destructive criticism until all the evidence is in. For others it is an ugly monument, a monument upon which is inscribed in sharp relief the words, What do I get out of it? the monument of selfishness and pettiness, of evil communication. Will each of us be able to look at the monument he has built during the war with inner satisfaction, with certainty that he gave the best he had at all times to the end that victory might come surely and quickly? There are unhappy days ahead for those whose record is not what they would wish to show to the boys when they come home.

Thus in all the activities of our lives the monuments go up. That is why the subject of monuments is an appropriate theme for a baccalaureate sermon. That is why William Hazlitt said, "Those only deserve a monument who do not need one; that is those who have raised themselves a monument in the minds and memories of men."

We cannot beat the game. Our true monuments may be concealed for the moment but in the end the scaffolding comes down and there it is. The monument into which unworthy thought has gone will profit us nothing. A medieval prince, an atheist, laughed at the assertion of an ultimate resurrection. He built for himself a mausoleum, constructed of tremendously thick stone. "Now let God get my body on his resurrection day," he sneered. But a seed from a tree dropped into a small crack between the stones and in the years a sturdy oak pushed aside the slabs and made a great opening. We can't beat the game.

And, behold, a voice out of the cloud which said "This is my beloved Son, hear ye Him."

The voice from the clouds gives us the best instruction for monument building uttered through all time—"This is my beloved Son, hear ye Him." If you who are going out to meet life heed that injunction, the future will hold no terror for you.

The Pensions for Lame Duck New Deal Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, upon reading this article I wondered how many of the critics of Members of Congress at the time of the congressional-pension legislation will give vocal and written attention to the facts shown in this article. At that time the New Dealers, with their smear brigade, tried to blame Members of Congress that didn't even come under the act. This criticism was made even after the New Dealers had slipped the legislation through Congress and even after the President himself had signed the bill.

Although the President was to receive $37,000 a year for life and many Members of Congress had not been Members long enough to come under the provisions of the act, these New Deal smearers made every effort to use the legislation against the Members that didn't come under it, nor who were in any way responsible for slipping the legislation through in the first place.

These New Deal smearers formerly used the fortification of Guam, but since the New Dealers were forced to, and do, admit that there never was a Presidential request nor a bill to fortify Guam, they will have to think up a new smear.

The New Deal smear brigade may try to use the bobtail-ballot issue which is the same as the congressional pensions, since only Federal office seekers would be benefited. This may not be as good ammunition as they think.

Further if these New Deal lame-duck Congressmen that have attached themselves to the public pay roll through any appointive power and through a trick provision in the law, it is hoped that they will at least render some real public service.

There is no telling where this kind of a road would lead, nor how much the pension would increase, especially under the New Deal.

Elective officials should not come under a pension system or obtain civil-service status in order to get on the pay roll. Prospects of jobs on the Federal pay roll is a club no President should have over any one in the legislative branch of the Government. Such procedures are not conducive to realizing the aims of the Republic. The article follows:

F. D. USES TRICK LAW TO PENSION NEW DEALERS

(By Willard Edwards)

Lifetime pensions for a large group of lame duck New Deal Congressmen have been provided in the last 2 years through employment of President Roosevelt's appointive power and a trick provision in the law, Capitol Hill learned yesterday.

Congressional sources confirmed the existence of this hidden political weapon of the Roosevelt administration, which has been a closely guarded secret. One report was that 39 Democrats, ousted from Congress by the voters, have been thus rewarded.

The disclosure recalls the national furor over the retirement payments which the House voted itself on December 1, 1941, and then repealed by a vote of 387 to 7 on February 24, 1942, under the pressure of public opinion.

Despite that overwhelming rejection of pensions for Congress, there was left in the Civil Service Retirement Act a joker provision, it was learned, which has been used by the administration ever since to put New Deal Congressmen, repudiated by the voters, on the Federal pay roll for the remainder of their days.

ELECTED OFFICIALS EXEMPTED

Defeated Republicans also would be eligible for lifetime payments if they could secure a temporary administrative appointment from the New Deal. The secret system thus provides a political bludgeon of vast value in an election year, it was noted.

Elected officials are specifically exempted from retirement benefits under the law. The joker provision, however, states that if any person receives an administrative appointment, he may, upon leaving that post, apply for a pension and be credited for all the years of service previously rendered the Government if his salary was received from appropriated funds.

Thus, in the case of former Representative William L. Nelson, a Missouri Democrat, who

served 18 years in the House before he was defeated in the 1942 elections, the system functioned in this manner:

Nelson came to Washington and secured an appointment as an assistant to War Food Administrator Marvin Jones. He served in this position for only 60 days, in October and November of 1943, then resigned and immediately applied for a pension. He received full credit for his 18 years of service in the House and went on the retirement pay roll at $150 a month in January of this year.

Efforts to secure the names of additional beneficiaries of the system were temporarily unsuccessful, although officials admitted there was a considerable number.

PENSION BASED ON $10,000

They also admitted that there is no statute of limitations on applicants and hinted that some Congressmen, ousted from office as long as 10 years ago, had recently learned of the New Deal scheme and qualified for pensions.

A lame duck could serve only one day in a humble government post, such as elevator operator or janitor, and then qualify for a pension for life, it was stated. Only Congressmen who have served at least 5 years are eligible, however, and the retirement age is 62.

Government employees are assessed 5 percent of their base pay throughout their years of service before they may qualify for retirement benefits. The secret system requires the lame ducks to pay 5 percent of whatever salary they receive during their 30 or 60-day administrative appointments, but their benefits are based upon the $10,000 salaries they received during their service in Congress.

The Late Honorable George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, there stands in this country a great and lasting monument to a great American. I refer to the T. V. A., for which full credit must go to the late Senator George W. Norris.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following newspaper editorial from the Huntsville (Ala.) Times, and the article by Marquis Childs appearing in the Washington Post on September 5, 1944:

[From the Huntsville (Ala.) Times]

GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT

Few public men have been so useful as ex-Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

While still in the House of Representatives in 1910, he helped to break the power of the tyrannical Speaker, "Uncle Joe" Cannon.

During his 30 years in the Senate, he put through the law authorizing the Tennessee Valley Authority. Norris Dam, one of its most important links, rightly bears his name.

Almost single-handed, he added an amendment to the Federal Constitution. The twentieth, or lame-duck, amendment changed Presidential inauguration from the traditional March 4 to January 20, and required Congress to take office on January 3, less than 2 months after its election. Formerly a repudiated Congress could legislate from election day to March 4; its successor would not meet till the following December. A greater neglect of the popular will is hard to imagine.

Norris achieved in 1936 the surprising feat of reelection as an Independent candidate, beating both the Republican and Democratic nominees.

His defeat in 1942, when he attempted this again, was deplored even by many who did not share his views.

All in all, he might be called Nebraska's greatest gift to the Nation.

[From the Washington Post of September 5, 1944]

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE NORRIS

(By Marquis Childs)

We in America can be proud that George Norris was one of us. Even in this moment of world turmoil, his death makes a mark. It makes us pause and remember what he stood for.

It makes us think what the coming victory can mean if only we've learned just a little from the man who died out in McCook, Nebr., among his own people. That was one of the remarkable things about Norris. In all his years in Washington, he never lost touch with his origins.

He came from the humblest, plainest people. He grew up close to poverty, and he never forgot how wide the gulf is between the rich and powerful and the plain men and women of this earth.

Supporting his deepest convictions was his skill at the business of legislation. He had the know-how. There were good reasons why the correspondents in the Senate press gallery voted him the most useful Member of the Senate in 1941.

We saw him at work there on the Senate floor day after day, following with rare persistence the course of the legislative stream. He could be sentimental but never demagogic. His voice, rarely raised in oratory, carried the weight of knowledge and conviction.

Whenever you went to him you came away with a deep sense of the American past and the character that has come out of it. He walked always like a countryman, in solid, plodding steps that were the same in marble halls as in the furrows he'd plowed as a boy. His face looked as though it had been carved out of oak by one of those shrewd journeymen wood carvers who roamed New England and the frontier West.

When you first talked with him there was something between him and you—his reserve, his skepticism, a patient blankness that might have been self-protective. If he was self-protective, if he was very tired, as he often was, or if his melancholy sat heavily on him, his mood might not lighten. But ordinarily he came to life and his sweet, guileless smile shone out.

Shrewd men, quick-witted men, clever men seeking the prizes in the battle for power often were scornful of Norris. They called him a fake. They could not believe in his goodness. They thought he must be out for something for himself.

But he was not a fake. He was as selfless a man as this self-seeking time is likely to see. Out of his congressional salary he saved, after educating his children, hardly enough to keep him in his last years.

As far as monuments go, no one need worry about perpetuating Norris' fame. This Capitol is filled with marble cenotaphs and granite statues. But Norris has a living monument in the Tennessee Valley Authority, which was possibly the greatest achievement of his career.

If it had not been for his long, courageous fight at the end of the last war nothing like T. V. A. would have been possible. When he stood on the floor day after day to prevent Muscle Shoals from being given away—it would have amounted to that, so big were the stakes—the fight looked hopeless. That was at the beginning of the boom, when the magic of prosperity was to spiral into infinity.

Norris lived, however, to see his dream come true. Norris Dam, in the T. V. A. system, was named for him. He went down there and saw it in all the beauty of its setting.

But more than that, he lived to see the T. V. A. idea take hold on people's minds. Out in his own Missouri Valley Basin the demand is growing for a M. V. A. that will curb the floods, create power, attract industry, stop erosion. It would do, in other words, what T. V. A. has begun to do in the Tennessee Valley.

We're going to need Norris in the era we're coming into. We're going to need to remember his courage, his strength, patience, and persistence.

The Cry of the Tortured: Action!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of September 4, 1944:

THE CRY OF THE TORTURED: ACTION

(By Howard Fast, author of Citizen Tom Paine)

Will there be no end to this? In the name of God, will no one lift a voice? In the name of Christianity, will no one speak? Are there no voices left? Are we without anger? Without shame? Without mercy? Or have the Nazi beasts infected us with their own virus, so that we lend no ear to the shrieks of pain and turn our nostrils from the stench of a blood-soaked earth?

We have no excuses now. Our mighty armies stand on the borders of Germany. We have a voice to speak with, and behind that voice is the might of a righteous cause; but where we might roar with anger and action, we whisper and dawdle.

May God forgive us, for humanity may never forgive us. Safe on the walls of our churches are pictures of the Christ Child without number, but Christians stand silent while children by the thousands are led to the Nazi gas chambers. We have forgotten that He said: "Whosoever shall receive one of such children in My name receiveth Me."

May God forgive us what we have forgotten. We hear that 10,000,000 Christians and Jews have been murdered by the Nazis, and we are unmoved. We see photographs of the gas chambers wherein hundreds of thousands perished, and we are unmoved. We see the disinterred, broken bodies, piled like mountains of sorrow, and we are unmoved. We see the lists of the raped, the ravished, the tortured, and we are unmoved. We see such evil as this world never knew or dreamed of, and we are unmoved. We see the crematoriums, where the holy bodies of men, made in His image, were piled by the thousands and burned, and still we are unmoved. We stand face to face with the hordes of the anti-Christ, creatures of such evil as this world never knew, and still we are unmoved.

May God forgive us, for then the dead may. Their eyes are closed, but their voices are not silent. They accuse us, the fat, the smug, the contented and contemptuous—and we will not silence their voices with our own silence.

In the name of Christ, let us speak. Let us try to save those who live. Let us speak in words of anger and wrath, in words of fire. Let us speak through our Government, our statesmen, our newspapers, our radio, our churches.

With purpose to match hate, and with justice to match injustice.

Let us speak in a voice the Nazis will hear though they crawl to their deepest burrows. Let us speak in words they will never forget. Let us redeem ourselves as human beings, so that we may remember, without too much shame, that He said:

"Whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in My name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward. And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in Me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea."

As a human service we urge you to write or wire your Congressman or your Senator to act now for a unified effort on our part and on the part of our allies to save what people may still be saved in the satellite nations.

He Wants Us To Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, now that the President's campaign for a fourth term is in full swing, it is interesting to note the New Deal efforts to get the soldier vote and the use of the taxpayers' and bond buyers' money for political purposes.

Mr. Morris D. Ervin, correspondent for the Cincinnati Times-Star, recently told of eight Office of War Information publications being sent to the soldiers overseas. Seven of these items bore the imprint, "Published by the Government of the United States of America." The eighth was a four-color photograph on a handsome backing, bearing only the signature of the man pictured, "Franklin D. Roosevelt." Each of these publications contains a large picture of Roosevelt. Mr. Ervin says:

They are not samples of what was going to be done; they are samples of what was done.

These eight samples were from a shipment that was dumped on a pier by an Army transport with instructions to see that they were distributed among the soldiers on duty in that area.

Miliary censorship is such that I cannot tell you where the area is, but it can be said that it is one of the greatest assembly points for United States troops in the world.

And, how many of these samples were in that shipment? I cannot tell you how many, but I can tell you how much they weighed. They weighed 6,000 tons. That is quite a sizable bundle of propaganda.

The veterans remember that the first general law asked by Roosevelt in March 1933 was the so-called Economy Act, which took from many veterans all the benefits they were receiving and greatly reduced the amounts received by many others. They remember that in 1934 Congress voted to restore $103,000,000 of the $450,000,000 taken from the veterans by the Economy Act, and that President Roosevelt vetoed the bill. Congress passed it over his veto. In 1935 the President personally appeared before Congress to deliver his veto message on the veterans' bonus bill. His veto was overridden in the House, but was sustained in the Senate. In 1936 Congress passed another Adjusted Compensation Act. The President vetoed it, but his veto was overridden. In the Seventy-fourth Congress he vetoed four veteran measures. In the Seventy-fifth Congress he vetoed six veteran measures. And, during the depression he vetoed a bill to extend veterans' insurance policies. Congress overrode the veto and saved some 23,000 veterans from loss of their policies.

The President's change in attitude toward the veterans has come about since he became a candidate for the fourth term, and is seeking votes.

The President wants you to forget his failures in running the domestic affairs of the Government; the confusion, the chaos and turmoil, the bungling and mismanagement which have existed in all Government departments and agencies, even in the White House.

The most famous one was between Vice President WALLACE and Jesse Jones, in which each accused the other of practically everything that is bad, and eventually resulted in a directive from the President that the agencies should do their quarreling in private and the threat that if any more public statements of quarrels were made the persons involved would be immediately fired. Even this drastic order failed to stop the quarreling and bickering which has held back war production, as well as placing domestic affairs in a state of general confusion. The last within an agency explosion was the one which sent Donald Nelson on the same path traveled by WALLACE to China and will probably result in Nelson's demise, the same as it did in WALLACE'S, and sent Charles Wilson into private life.

Julius Krug, 36-year-old ardent new dealer, has been placed in charge of the War Production Board, and now the new dealers have complete control in plotting the vital problems of post-war reconversion.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to contrast Senator TRUMAN'S present glowing tributes to the President and the New Deal with his statement about red tape, bureaucratic waste, and bungling in Washington. I quote Mr. TRUMAN:

Leadership is what we Americans are crying for. We aren't complacent. We are fighting mad. All we ask is that we be intelligently and resolutely led. I have pieced together an alarming picture of the threatened break-down of our war effort here at home. We owe it to ourselves to insist that the President act promptly to halt the selfish fights for power, the endless bickering and dissension, which have so far blocked the complete utilization of our productive energies.

Yes, Mr. TRUMAN; we are still crying to be "intelligently and resolutely led," and we are still asking the President "to halt the selfish fights for power, the endless bickering and dissension." This will only come about when Roosevelt is defeated and Dewey assumes the office of President in January 1945.

The President wants us to forget that waste, extravagance, and mismanagement have been the order of the day since March 1933.

The President wants us to forget the enormous sums wasted in the construction of Army, Navy, and Marine Corps camps and bases; for war plants and Federal Housing, under the cost-plus-fee system. Even 39,500 pounds of seed for the lawn, which was never even planted, were purchased and charged as part of the cost of construction at the Vigo Ordnance Works.

The President wants us to forget about Harry Hopkins, who is being kept out of the limelight, but who maintains his same position of influence in the New Deal.

It is noticeable that practically every prominent person, who was actively associated with the President's campaign for his first term, has either become so disgusted that they have resigned or have been deposed by the President, and now we find a situation where the "White House palace guard" of Harry Hopkins, Samuel Rosenman, Felix Frankfurter, Dave Niles, Ben Cohen, and others have replaced the real true Jeffersonian Democrats, and they have been determining the Government's policy. I doubt seriously if any of them could ever be elected by the people to any national office. Then we have Earl Browder, Harry Bridges, and Sidney Hillman taking control to manage the campaign for a fourth term, while National Chairman Hannegan and the big-city bosses, such as Hague, Kelley, and the old Pendergast machine, are playing the "me too" role. Undoubtedly the Communists think well of the President and must have some understanding with him when they went so far as to vote unanimously at their national convention not to put a Communist candidate in the field this year, but to give their support 100 percent to Mr. Roosevelt.

Sidney Hillman must have quite an influence with the President when the President left the choice of a Vice Presidential candidate to Hillman's judgment and required that the nominee must be approved by Hillman. Hillman has occupied very important positions under appointment by the President, and no doubt if the President is successful in November Hillman will be rewarded. Personally, I think Hillman is doing the cause of organized labor more harm than any other force in the country could do. Upon our statute books are many laws in the interest of the laboring man, but none of them were placed there by Hillman. All over the land many members of the C. I. O., good, honest, respectable, and loyal patriotic Americans, are resenting the attempt of Sidney Hillman to dictate to them how they must vote. They are free Americans, they are interested in the welfare of their Government, and they will make up their own minds

how to vote, without dictation or coercion by Hillman or anyone else.

In my district a member of the C. I. O. visited Republican headquarters and contributed $5 to the Republican campaign fund, saying that he was for Dewey, but that he had been compelled to contribute $1 to Hillman's P. A. C., to be used to defeat Dewey, and he wished to contribute the $5 to help elect Dewey.

The President wants you to forget that the New Deal is giving to, spending, and lending almost twice as much money on our neighbors to the south as they spend out of their own treasuries on themselves; that the New Deal is paying for stocking streams and lakes of Venezuela with game fish; for a fish survey in the ocean adjacent to Panama; financing the preparation of collections of Latin-American Indians; for a survey of collections of Latin-American music; to record folk music in several of the countries; reconstructing the province of Oro in Ecuador; to purchase land on which to resettle farmers in South America; for building roads in El Salvador in a made work W. P. A. type of program; more than $2,000,000 given Equador for health and sanitation projects; over $750,000 to Guatemala; over $500,000 to Honduras. These twenty Central and South American countries in 1941 had a national budget totaling $1,067,000,000 and our country gave them more money than their total national budget.

The President wants you to forget such things as the sale of 40,000 batteries at Salt Lake City for $80, which were immediately resold for $20,000 by the purchaser; the sale of another 40,000 batteries for $50, which were resold by the purchaser for $7,200; that over 500,000 pounds of Argentine butter, purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation and determined to be unsatisfactory for Government use was sold to the public for civilian use; the enormous quantity of white diaper cloth sent to the Arabs, which was used by them to make head dressings; that lend-lease money was used to send a symphony orchestra conductor, Eugene Ormandy, to Europe on a concert tour; the Detroit scandal where $1,721,000 worth of precious and scarce cutting tools were sold for $36,000; the hundreds of million dollars' worth of farm machinery sent to Europe and South American countries when our farmers were unable to secure farm machinery; that Government civil-service employment is over 3,000,000, with an annual pay roll of over $8,000,000,000 a year; that while no radio sets have been made for civilian use in the United States since April 1942, 14,000 sets were built last November and sent for civilian use to Europe under lend-lease; that the United States is the biggest publisher in the world, with magazines, pamphlets, and propaganda emanating from every Government agency; that the total Federal tax collected in 1933 was $2,080,000,000 which has been increased until now it is in excess of $41,000,000,000; that in spite of protests of a large number of Congressmen and of a large majority of American citizens, enormous quantities of scrap iron, oil, and gasoline were sold to Japan, with which to destroy China's liberty, and out of which scrap metal were cast the shells, bombs and bullets, and which oil and gasoline Japan used to defeat our forces at Pearl Harbor and at Bataan and Corregidor; about Myras Chaney and her rhythmic dancing; about John Bovingdon, the advocate of nudism in office, factory, and home; about the 3,565 Executive orders used to control and regulate our every action; about the dealings of the War Shipping Administration and the leasing of ships at unconscionable rates of profits to the owners—one example was a ship purchased in 1932 for $48,478 upon which the Government paid the owners a profit of $1,439,559 in rental.

The President wants you to forget about the enormous waste and destruction of food through careless handling and overpurchases; $150,000,000 invested in eggs alone, many of which have been totally destroyed and many sold for as low as 5 cents a case for hog feed—one shipment containing 120,000 dozen was shipped to various places over the country, until a freight bill of $4,200 had accumulated, and was completely spoiled and destroyed; over a million pounds of precious rationed cheese destroyed in Cincinnati, Ohio, and even now, Maine potatoes are being purchased in Maine for $60 per ton, shipped to sugar plants in Ohio, which have been idle because of the curtailment of the production of sugar beets, and now being utilized to make these Maine potatoes into cow feed, through a dehydrating process which requires 6½ tons of potatoes, $390 worth, to produce one ton of cow feed, which is sold for $18 per ton; in addition to the $390 paid for the potatoes, the Government pays the transportation charges to the plants in Ohio and all the labor costs, as well as the profit to the factory owners for the use of the factory.

He wants you to forget about the gasoline and oil consumed in transporting the First Lady of the land to various parts of the world; that on August 14, 1941, the candidate for Vice President, now known as the Missouri compromise, said that "the chief bottleneck which the defense program confronts is the lack of adequate organization and coordination in the administration of defense," and that the only place where the responsibility can be put is in the White House, and that "the summary and precipitate and arbitrary fashion in which priorities and curtailments are being administered is calculated to do infinitely more damage to the United States in the next 6 months than any external enemy possibly could do." Five million dollars were expended to expand the plant of the Marietta Manufacturing Co. and about $1,000,000 worth of tools and machinery installed. After this money was expended, not a single order was given the company. For this plant, a Federal housing project consisting of 450 houses was adopted, the houses constructed, but were never occupied. Finally many of them were loaded on barges and floated down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers to other locations.

The President would like for you to forget the impractical crackpots and so-called economists holding important positions in the various New Deal set-ups; the man who advised the farmers to remove the horses' shoes at night to conserve them; the man who advised the sheep raisers to postpone their lambing season; the man who advised the farmer to convert his Diesel tractor to burn coal when he applied for oil.

Many peculiar things are happening and frequently one Government agency is expending millions of dollars and devoting its entire energy to undo what another Government agency is spending millions of dollars and devoting its entire energy to do.

The O. P. A. has added between seven and eight hundred price-enforcing officials at $2,600 per year each, to keep food and other prices down, while the War Food Administration is spending millions to keep prices up. Through the War Food Administration, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Government is spending more than a billion dollars a year to hold up the same commodity prices it is spending $155,000,000 a year to hold down.

The O. P. A. is certainly doing everything it can to put the small independent retailer out of business. It has classified retailers as class 1 and class 2, and here is an example of the way this classification works against the small independent businessman. Under the O. P. A. rules a class 2 retailer is compelled to pay $19.85 per dozen for overalls, which he must sell for $2.08 per pair, while the class 1 retailer is permitted to buy the same overalls for $16.70 per dozen, and must sell them for $1.55 per pair. In other words, the class 1 retailer sells the overalls for $1.25 per dozen less than the class 2 retailer must pay to purchase the overalls, thereby penalizing the customer 53 cents per pair for trading with the small merchant. Not only does this place the small-business man at a great disadvantage in selling overalls, it has a great tendency to destroy confidence in the small class 2 retailer, as it tends to make the general public believe that the class 2 retailer sells everything at the same relative higher price than the class 1 merchant.

The President has never made a sucess of anything; he has never had a successful business venture; he has never met a pay roll. While Governor of New York, he ran that State into an enormous debt, which has been paid off under Governor Dewey and that State now has over $40,000,000 for post-war work.

The American people sensed the danger of the New Deal, and in 1938 elected a greatly increased number of Republican Congressmen in the hopes that they would be able to stop many of the President's wild and unwarranted actions, but Congress has been only partially successful in this. And while the New Deal still has a majority in Congress, I predict that on November 7 the people will elect a Republican majority; then we will be able to do something about it.

The President has claimed and exercised vast powers which have not been

delegated to him; but with an Attorney General who apparently advised the President he has the power to do whatever he wants to do, even to the point of seizing any private business, it can be readily seen that a majority in Congress is required to stop these unwise and unwarranted actions of the Chief Executive and his subordinates.

We shudder when we think of the enormous debt he has piled upon us. To give an idea of what a billion dollars is: If we should spend $1 every minute, it would require 1,902 years to spend a billion dollars. If we should spend a dollar every minute since the birth of Christ, we would have spent only $1,021,000,000.

Roosevelt has been the greatest spender of all times. He has increased our national debt over $200,000,000,000 and has piled taxes upon taxes, in his efforts to spend and spend, tax and tax, and elect and elect. In all the recorded history of the world, up to date, no human being has spent as much money as Roosevelt. The New Deal's inefficiency, lack of organization and spending policies have doubled the cost of the war. Senator BYRD attributes this to the New Deal policy of spending public money "on the assumption that money borrowed and spent is a means to promote prosperity" and that through "these spending policies every department of Government became inoculated with the germ of waste and extravagance. Those officials who could waste the most were rewarded by promotion and higher responsibilities. Those who attempted to economize were frowned upon and discouraged. When the necessity came for preparing this country for war, these same wasteful policies were carried into the war effort in a new field of greatly enlarged expenditures. This is the chief reason why this war is costing us very much more than it should."

The American people, realizing this, will elect Dewey and a Republican Congress, which will again establish constitutional government, and the checks and balances provided by our forbearers, which have made this Nation a great, free, prosperous Republic. People realize that it is their Representatives in Congress who have voted to protect the peoples' liberties and freedoms, and this new Republican President and Congress will work and cooperate in the post-war era to establish a lasting peace among the Nations of the World, and to again bring genuine prosperity and happiness to the American people.

Fifth Anniversary of Attack on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on September 1, 1944:

The beginning of the sixth year of the European War brings to our attention again the part that Poland has played in that struggle. She was the first country to be attacked by Hitler and she was the first country to resist Hitler's march.

After the fall of Czechoslovakia, Hitler made impossible demands upon Poland and if Poland had not resisted and if the nations of western Europe had not declared war on Hitler, it would have been an easy victory for him and the history of the last 5 years would have been different.

When Germany attacked Russia, Poland again became the battleground and Russia was finally able to defeat the German Armies after Stalingrad. Her armies came to Poland as liberators and considerable portions of Poland have been restored to their rightful owners, but as Germany retreats she burns, kills, and destroys.

With every town liberated from the Germans, stories of untold hardships and the most brutal murder come to be known.

We salute Poland on this fifth anniversary of the beginning of the World War and take our hats off to the gallant fighters whose resistance has made liberty possible.

Poland suffered not only from an attack by its enemies, but it suffered a martyrdom never before seen in the history of the world. Many communities were slaughtered to a man and thousands of Poles have been driven into slave labor in Germany.

Some Americans are now agitating for a negotiated peace with Germany and Japan. "Peace now," they plead. "Let us forgive and forget. Is there no pity in the world? Call back our armies, and let Hitler and Hirohito go on with their bloody work."

In such thought is the very reason why it was possible for Hitler and Hirohito to launch their adventures in destruction.

It was just because our people did not realize in the years before the war that militarism cannot be left unguarded, that it has become necessary for us to pour out our blood and treasure into this fight for the preservation of the world as we know it.

Aggression feeds on itself, and all successful conquerors do not know when to stop.

The press has given us within the last week a most gruesome picture of the most horrible destruction which has ever been the lot of mankind. The scenes described by neutral correspondents who have witnessed German cruelties and massacres cannot be questioned as to their veracity and accuracy.

On the outskirts of Lublin, in Poland, the Germans have established a mass-murder factory. Here they herded together men, women, children, and even babies, from 22 different countries, and in cold blood massacred almost 2,000,000 people.

With a fiendish love of cruelty and murder, they used modern scientific apparatus for the sole purpose of carnage. By the use of electric devices, lethal gas, poison gas, and the most refined instruments of cruel torture, they put an end to 2,000,000 useful lives, simply so as to see the deaths of people they could not control, and who were potential members of a community which the Nazis did not want. They wanted their own race, and no other in Europe.

In the guise of seeking to establish a great Reich, the Lebens-raum for all, they tried to make it impossible for any other nation to remain in existence besides the "herrenvolk."

Now, would it be fair for us to forgive Hitler for his insane plunder, murder, rape, and enslavement of millions of innocent people? Can we just forget what this monster did, and say "All right, boys, go on, you are forgiven—not guilty, but don't do it again?" Of course not. The world cannot be so callous and indifferent. To do so would result in more slaughter and more destruction. It would mean that generations yet to be born would be sacrificed to Hitler's ruthlessness or the ruthlessness of his successors in future years.

No; we must demonstrate in no uncertain terms that crime does not pay, and just as we cannot allow a crime in civil life to go unpunished, we must not permit this adventure of destruction to go on.

If we do that, we might as well free and forgive our own criminals in this country. Open all our prisons and asylums for the criminally insane. Free all the murderers, rapists, arsonists, degenerates, forgers, thieves, adulterers, homosexualists, rabble-rousers, inciters of race and religious hatred, depraved sexual maniacs.

No; we must exact full justice and retribution upon the disturbers of the peace. If peace is to come to us again, it must be based on justice, and it must be based on the first freedom, which President Roosevelt proclaimed to the world, freedom from fear.

We must not allow fear to come into the lives of future generations. They must be allowed to live without ever being disturbed by a war of extermination.

Platform of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following platform of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State, adopted at the sixth biennial State convention held at the Hotel Piccadilly, New York City, on Saturday, July 15, 1944:

We, the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State, declare our complete and unbounded faith in the accomplishments of the national and international leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. His continued leadership is necessary to assure early victory and the return of our soldiers and war-workers to profitable peacetime employment.

We hail the democratic strength of his voice in the ranks of the United Nations. We are proud of the inspiration, and hope, and direct help that this great American has given to millions long oppressed by dictatorship, and to millions more with whom our people join to march and fight in today's struggle for world freedom.

This war to which our Nation has given its young life and its boundless energy will not end when fighting ceases on the battle-front. Victory for freedom on the field must be followed by the triumph of democracy and world cooperation at the peace conference. The continued leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt so effective in uniting our people in America's great and total war effort, which is so formidable in shaping the principles and practices of the United Nations' winning fight against the Axis is essential to complete victory in the war, and in the peace. We are convinced that Republican leadership which restrained preparation for the defense of democracy, cannot be trusted to handle the great post-war task of rendering democracy secure. The mistake of 1920 must not be repeated. America must never again retreat to the shallow shell of isolationism.

Our faith in the President's leadership in these unparalleled world crises of victory and peace is based upon these achievements:

The problems of winning the war have been largely solved by the extraordinary success of the Democratic administration in the greatest industrial and military mobilization in history. The same administration which was forehanded in preparing the Nation for war is the surest hope of sound preparation for a stable and peaceful post-war world in which all peoples can work together for a fuller life.

The cooperation reached by the President with the governments of our fighting allies are future cooperation, vital to a lasting peace, can only be attained by leaders of understanding and experience who have been tested, trained, and proved in action.

The preservation of home-front democracy in the face of war's inexorable and merciless demands. No people of any warring nation today enjoy as much wartime democracy as we Americans have maintained. Despite the sweeping emergency powers available to him, our Commander in Chief has chosen the harder road of democracy in his wartime leadership of our people.

Our Nation has built an armed force of terrible striking power supported by a volume of war production of miraculous proportions under the direction of the Roosevelt administration.

To the end of gaining an endurable and lasting peace among the nations of this world, we pledge ourselves to the following objectives:

1. The continued leadership of our great Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt, supported by a cooperative Democratic majority in Congress. He has guided the country through the worst world depression in history without sacrificing the principles of democracy. He has piloted the country through the anxious pre-war years with a foresight and vision that kept alive the aspirations of all free men. Under his leadership America has become not only the "arsenal of democracy" in a material sense but also the spiritual stronghold of democracy of the future.

2. All measures required to assure early victory of the United Nations over the forces which have sought to destroy democracy and enslave the world under dictatorship by unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers.

3. Immediate establishment of an effective world federation of nations dedicated to the maintenance of world peace and guaranteeing enjoyment of the "four freedoms" by all. We condemn the new mask of isolationism which is based on a jealous regard for so-called national sovereignty. We opposed a system of military alliances as a false substitute for world cooperation. We censure the economic imperialism which would preserve broad regions as raw-material producers for more favored peoples.

4. Continuation of the country's armed might until such time as the readiness of all nations to participate in effective world federation has been fully demonstrated. This should include maintenance of a strong army, navy, and air force, and military training as a part of full educational opportunity for all youth.

5. Measures to carry out the pledge jointly entered into by all countries participating in the international labor conference. This would provide that workers and productive resources shall not remain idle while the needs of large parts of the world remain unsatisfied. It will dispel the fear of want from our own and all people through expansion of the exchange and consumption of goods and the liberation of economic activity from unreasonable restrictions. It will emphasize the interdependence of nations and the need for their collaboration to achieve these objectives.

6. Immediate adoption of a comprehensive reconversion plan from war to peace production which will assure a cushioning of the economic shock to workers and management, protection to small industry, protection of the public's investment in Government war plants, proper use and distribution of war surpluses. This plan should adequately represent the interests of management, labor, farmers, consumers, and producers.

This reconversion program should also include:

(a) For veterans: Orderly demobilization with continuance and expansion of present measures aimed at fair assistance to returning war veterans. Such a program calls for adequate discharge pay, rehabilitation of the disabled including physical and occupational therapy, special machinery for job placement, resumption of education interrupted by the war, vocational training; farm opportunities in connection with restoration of lands acquired for military purposes and new agricultural lands created by reclamation projects. We advocate maintaining and expanding services for adequate and dignified aid to the dependent family members of Americans who give their lives in today's war for freedom.

(b) For war workers: Unemployment compensation with a maximum rate of at least $25 a week for a period sufficient to absorb individual economic fluctuations due to mass conversions; extension of coverage to include Federal industrial workers; provision for transportation of war workers back to their homes or chosen places of employment; guidance and retraining of war workers to assure the best permanent distribution of industry in a balanced economy.

(c) For the country as a whole: An orderly program of construction projects, fully engineered, to fill the valley of unemployment through creating a demand for men and materials; stimulation of a home-building program; provision for extension of credit, where needed, particularly to encourage the early conversion to peacetime activity of small competitive business which still is responsible for the bulk of employment; progressive elimination of controls tending to restrict new enterprise. A sound post-war tax program with taxes lowered sufficiently to meet the post-war economic status of the individual taxpayer but kept high enough on individuals and corporations able to pay to sustain Government solvency and to assure regular reduction of the public debt.

(7) Measures to safeguard the country against inflation through carefully worked out continuation, during the reconversion period, of Government controls over prices, rents, wages, and to the extent required, rationing of supplies, so administered as to assure the gradual relaxation of controls as full peacetime production is attained. These measures should also include principles of taxation designed to maintain business activity and consuming power at high levels, to encourage equity as against debt investment, and to provide for orderly retirement of the national debt without accentuating swings in the economic cycle.

8. Measures to eliminate the restrictive influence of monopoly upon the ability of the country to utilize fully its vast resources. These should include:

(a) Removal of discrimination in financing, transportation charges, and other economic factors tending to restrict the development of any region or enterprise.

(b) Release of scientific and technical advances from the domination of monopoly, whether domestic or embodied in international pools or cartels, in order that inventions may serve the general welfare.

(c) Extension of the principle embodied in government lending agencies to regulate the flow of capital funds in the interest of maximum production and economic stability. Credit and financing should be available to all productive enterprise and, at low interest rates, to noncommercial public developments.

(d) Retention by the Government of industrial plants constructed for war purposes, with provision for their utilization by the Government, or under lease to private, cooperative, or public agencies to the extent necessary and subject to such conditions as may be required to assure full production of necessary commodities at the lowest possible prices.

(e) Encouragement of cooperative enterprise to preserve the force of competition and assure social responsibility in the conduct of business.

(f) Continuation and strengthening of the Securities Exchange Commission as protection to the public against stock manipulation and the evils of widespread speculation.

9. Extension of the principles of the Reciprocal Trade Treaties so successfully conceived and negotiated by Secretary of State Cordell Hull. We urge the breaking up and future abolition of privately owned world trade and industrial combines, secret agreements and cartels. Progressive elimination of all trade and other barriers to economic cooperation among nations, in order that ultimate equality in the use of the world's resources may preserve peace and assure a high standard of living of all peoples.

10. Federal measures to maintain full operation of the construction industry through public-works and home-building programs carefully adjusted to compensate for the swings in private investment. This program should include:

(a) The planned development of the country's river basin resources in general accordance with the principles embodied in the T. V. A. Act. This would provide regional authorities, directed to cooperate with State and local interests, with unitary responsibility for the planning, construction, and operation of projects for navigation, flood control, irrigation, soil conservation, hydroelectric power, and other beneficial purposes.

(b) Early authorization and construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and Power project in accordance with the bill now before Congress which provides for agreement with the State of New York for ownership and operation of the power development on the American side of the river by the Power Authority of the State of New York.

(c) A national program designed to assure modern, healthful, and attractive homes to all.

11. Measures to assure labor that its hard-won right to participate through collective bargaining in the industries which mean its livelihood shall not be curtailed in the post-war era but shall be extended to embrace a genuine partnership status in industry. There must be no open-shop movement to destroy organized labor such as characterized the Republican era following the First World War. Specifically, we favor:

(a) Continuation of the National Labor Relations Act, unweakened by amendments designed to restrict its application or narrow its scope. The act should be broadened to include agricultural labor in those divisions of agriculture which are engaged in large-scale production or which have been organized into cooperative producers' associations.

(b) Continuation and improvement of legislation designed to assure all labor fair and decent working conditions, including reasonable hours and a living wage. Such legislation should be administered by officials fully cognizant of its historical background and sympathetic with the broad purposes which it is intended to achieve.

(c) Continuation of the National War Labor Board, without restrictive or procedural amendments, during the reconversion period,

with a gradual merging of the advisory phases of its dispute-settling function into the National Labor Relations Board after the termination of the emergency.

(d) Immediate post-war repeal of coercive and restrictive portions of the Smith-Connally Act and recognition of labor's rights to strike as the ultimate economic safeguard for all its normal peacetime rights.

(e) Increasing recognition of organized labor as an essential partner in an industrial society and provision for its participation in all phases of government.

(f) Strengthening of the United States Employment Service and its operation on a country-wide basis to assure the soundest possible distribution of labor in the interest of employment stability.

12. Expansion of the social-security program to provide full protection against old age, illness, and economic misfortune for everyone, with benefits adequate to provide a minimum of health and decency, regardless of previous earnings. The program should assure complete medical care for all and should allow no child under any circumstances to want good food, adequate clothing, a decent home, and the opportunity for education. We favor:

(a) Prompt enactment of the Wagner-Murray bill.

(b) Extension of coverage of the Social Security Act to vast segments of the population not now covered.

(c) Greater cooperation of the Federal Government with State plans in order that the national economy, which affects and is affected by local and sectional conditions, may afford reasonable support to State and local activities.

(d) Careful study of existing legislation and enactment of additional legislation to close tax loopholes available to large business enterprises and insure placing the burden of taxation where Congress intended it to rest.

13. Measures to assure farmers equality of bargaining power with other organized interests which effect the balance of our economic system. These measures should include provisions which will assure to all farmers ample markets for farm products, no unwarranted intermediate costs between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays, low interest rates and low prices on the machinery and supplies required for farm operation, good roads, good schools, and rural electrification at rates which will make electricity available in abundance to all. They will be based on recognition of the mutual interest of farmers and industrial workers in high living standards and economic stability as the best assurance of an ample market for their respective products.

Never again should it be necessary to curtail farm production because a large portion of the population cannot afford an adequate diet.

14. Measures to encourage the development of balanced rural-industrial communities, with a high economic and cultural level throughout the country, in order to assure a healthy and stable distribution of population and wealth in the closest possible association with the land which is the source of our spiritual strength.

15. Legislation extending the privilege of voting to all over 18 years of age. Those old enough to fight should share in the determination of governmental policies which vitally affect their lives.

16. Legislation required to end the blot on democracy's shield due to the existence of discrimination in political, social, or economic opportunity based on race or religion. We approve of measures designed to achieve greater fairness to all races in the United States. We advocate repeal of poll taxes, a Federal antilynching bill, and continuance of the Fair Employment Practices Commission.

We, the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, earnestly believe that measures designed broadly to meet these purposes are essential elements to the winning of the war, and the post-war effort to preserve a vital democracy and permit the traditional American way of life to flow on as a mighty stream into the future. Protection of the individual rights affirmed in the Declaration of Independence can only be assured through the achievement of economic as well as political democracy. We believe it to be the will of the American people to control their own destiny and forever retain their freedom to think, and speak, and to be free from fear and want, and to worship God.

Freedom From Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a speech entitled "Freedom From Fear" which I delivered at a win-the-peace rally, Carnegie Hall, New York City, September 12, 1943.

This speech was subsequently printed in Vital Speeches of the Day on November 15, 1943:

FREEDOM FROM FEAR—REMOVE THE ROOT CAUSE OF WAR

(By HOWARD J. McMURRAY, Congressman from Wisconsin, delivered at a win-the-peace rally, Carnegie Hall, New York City, September 12, 1943)

We live in a world which is doomed to more or less continuous conflict until we the people of the United States and, I might add, the people of the rest of the world begin to understand the basic causes of war. War is the great devastating disease of modern civilization. It is a cancer on the body politic, which, if not cured, will destroy all those values which we have developed and learned to hold dear throughout the period of the past 2,000 years. The causes of war are, of course, many, but all these causes may be cataloged under one of three general headings. Each explanation, naturally, is given in many ways and has many advocates. It is my contention that we have war because we have refused to study and to understand the real causes and to do what is essential to remove the germs which create the disease. If we treat the wrong disease, the patient will not be cured, and if we fail to diagnose the disease correctly, the patient will certainly be destroyed. It is imperative to seek out the root cause of war in our world and to do what is necessary in order that our children and our children's chilren shall not be inevitably doomed to mass conflict more frightful and destructive than that through which we are now passing.

The first general theory of war may be stated briefly in the following terms: War is natural; it results from the fact that man is greedy, selfish, pugnacious, and brutal. You have heard this theory expressed in different ways at different times. Some say, "We have always had war and will always have war." Others say, "As long as man's nature is what it is, we will fight." I call this the original-sin doctrine of war, a doctrine which says war is inherent and natural in man. These are different ways, of course, of saying that the causes of war are primarily psychological and man being what he is, nothing can be done about it. Let us examine this theory and these statements. Will anyone contend, if he will take a careful look at his world, that war is simply the result of the nature of man? Is it not evident that all kinds of people live all over the world? There are good people and bad people in the city of New York, but they do not resolve their differences by the use of violence. There are good people and bad people in the State of New York, but they do not fight each other. There are good people and bad people in the United States of America, but force is not used between them. There are good people and bad people within the confines of the political boundaries of every nation-state on earth and yet within these boundaries, differences which arise between men are not resolved violently. This devil theory of war simply is not adequate to explain war as we have it in the modern world. War is not simply and primarily a result of the nature of man. It is not primarily psychological; it is not a result of the simple fact that some people are good and some people are bad. Even in the midst of this great conflict, we know and can admit that all of the people with horns are not confined within the political boundaries of certain nation-states and all of the people with wings are not confined within the boundaries of certain other nation-states. We must, therefore, rule out as the foundamental cause of modern mass conflict the theory that war is natural and that its causes are innate in man. I do not, of course, deny that there is room for improvement in man's nature. If we all lived by the Golden Rule, there would be no war, nor would there be need for any of the institutions of social control which are present in all organized society. You would not have any government because you would not need it; nor would you have churches, or schools, because you would not need them. Our world, however, is a very human one. It is full of a great many things of which we disapprove. Yet, the individual greed and the individual avarice of the average person is not the major cause of violence in those parts of the world which we call civilized. We know perfectly well, for instance, that the violence which we have in the world today is something different and springs essentially from a different root than the original sin of man. We have learned to control man within the organized political societies which men have built.

The second general explanation for war is economic, and it is my intention to show you that both phases of this theory are essentially false when used to explain war as an institution in modern society. The first part of this argument goes something like this—you have heard it many times and many of you have believed it: Stated simply this theory explains war as the result of the maldistribution of economic goods and services. It is most often stated in the following terms: As long as there are "have" and "have not" people on earth, you will have war. This is evidently not true. There are "have" and "have not" people in the city of New York, in the State of New York, in every State of the Union. There are rich and poor people in the United States of America and in every other nation-state on earth. Yet within the city of New York, the State of New York, and every politically organized society on earth, war has been abolished. Just as I admit that man's nature may be and ought to be improved, I make no plea for, nor do I justify the present maldistribution of economic goods among men. I happen to be one of those who believes that a better distribution of income and wealth is imperative and that we should take all reasonable steps to this end. I know, and you know, however, that this maldistribution, as vicious as it is, is not the primary cause of war in our world.

The second part of the economic explanation of war is the so-called Marxian theory which says in essence this: War is the result primarily of the capitalistic organization of economic society. There is a tendency, so this theory goes, for capitalism, as it matures, to develop into monopolies—huge concentrations of economic power which tend to use the political state for their own purposes—and in the competition engendered between the capitalists of one part of the world and the capitalists of another part of the world the root cause of war may be found. One does not need to deny that there are tendencies within nations for wealth to become concentrated within fewer and fewer hands, nor need one deny that this economic power is used to control the policies of government in some cases.

Yet war as we have it in our modern world cannot be blamed primarily on capitalism or on any other form of economic organization known to and used by modern man. War is not a result of economic competition as such. The capitalists of New York and the capitalists of Philadelphia are much more competitive, have many more conflicts of interests than the capitalists of New York and the capitalists of Berlin. Yet New York and Philadelphia have never gone to war with each other. Twice within our generation New York and Berlin have fought. That conflicts of economic interest are present cannot be denied. But these conflicts of interest are not in themselves the fundamental cause of war. The capitalists within the confines of the political boundaries of modern nation-states may compete vigorously and sometimes even viciously, but they do not fight each other. It is only when these conflicts of interest cut across the boundaries of nation-states that war is engendered. People who accept the simple Marxian theory as the primary explanation of war will perhaps have trouble in explaining the fact that the two countries in this present war which have fought each other most bitterly are neither of them capitalistic in their economic organization. Russia is not a capitalistic state nor is Germany a capitalistic state. I do not see how one can blame capitalism for war in this particular case.

There is one thing that is natural about war, as it is natural about almost all forms of human activity. There are conflicts of interest between people when people come into contact one with the other. These conflicts may be economic or social or racial or ideological or of any other origin. Men do differ about things and ideas. When two men want the same wife, or the same job, or the same piece of property, or the same raw material, or the same markets, they have conflicts of interest about these things. It is easy to understand, however, that these conflicts, no matter how serious, do not lead to war except under certain conditions. I submit it is these certain conditions, which I am about to explain, that constitute the primary and fundamental cause of mass conflict in modern society.

If war is not psychological primarily in its origin, or is not economic primarily in its origin, it must be political. War is essentially a result of anarchy, and anarchy is a lack of government. Where men's interests conflict within organized political society, these conflicts are resolved by methods short of war. If we understand war and peace, we can learn how to keep the peace. Peace is not just an absence of conflict; it is a planned way of living among men. All the peace that man has known has been a creation of man's effort, and man has been able to keep the peace because he has been willing and able to dream dreams and to make those dreams come true, to set up institutions to perform certain functions and those certain functions are always performed by all governments in all societies. Peace has been achieved when men organized political systems and substituted reason and justice for force in the settlement of differences which naturally arise among them. Let me repeat, peace is a planned way of living, it is a creation of man. It is a result of the institutions built by man. Men have peace when they substitute law for force in settling their differences. Peace is, therefore, a result of law, and law is a result of government. There can be, let me repeat, no peace in this world of ours without law, and there can be no law without government.

The functions of government are relatively easy to understand. First, there is the problem of making the rules by which men live and of changing these rules when conditions change. This we call the legislative function. You are all quite familiar with it. Then there is the function, or problem, of enforcing the rules by which we live. This is the executive or administrative function. There is also the function of interpreting the rules in their application to individuals and groups of individuals where conflicts arise under the rules. This is the judicial function. Where man has built government to perform these functions, and where he has put the concentrated force of the community behind the law instead of behind the litigants, he has found peace. Peace is, therefore, the result of the monopolization and centralization of the right to use force. One of my great teachers used to define sovereignty as the monopolization of violence by politicians. Although sovereignty may have other characteristics, this is certainly true about it. In a politically organized community the state alone may legally use violence or force. Individuals and groups of individuals within the politically organized state have given up their right to use violence in order to enforce their wills. The right to use violence has been monopolized and this monopolized violence is placed behind the rules by which men live and not behind the men who have conflicts of interest one with the other. In the city of New York this monopoly of violence is the police department. In the United States of America it is represented by the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

It is trite to state that our world is interdependent. Our world is one, and we ought to realize that even Hitler and his advisers know this. They know that the world is going to be ruled from a common center. They know that the differences which arise between peoples from the four corners of the globe must be settled under common rules. This war is not being fought to unify the world; it is being fought, rather, between those who want to unify it on a master-slave basis and those who think that it must be unified on the principle of democratic consent. War cannot be eradicated unless we build a government which has power coextensive with the needs of modern industrial man. Modern industry draws its materials and sends its products throughout the world, and unless we substitute law for violence in the settlement of the conflicts of interest which inevitably arise, we are doomed to perpetual warfare.

Let us look briefly at the historical evolution of political societies. There was a time on earth when among our ancestors the family was the basic and only existing unit of social organization. In those days, war, if you want to use that word, or battle, or violence was continuous when families came into contact one with the other. There was violence because there were conflicts of interest, and there was no organization to substitute reason and law for the use of force in settling these differences. Gradually, however, families coalesced into clans. After this happened, we find peace within the clan, and war between the clans whenever there was conflict of interest. Clans coalesced into tribes, and there was peace within the tribe and war between the tribes. Then at different stages and at different times in various parts of the world there developed a series of political institutions—the city-state, the feudal manor, right down to the modern nation-state. And this has always been true; within the organization that possesses political sovereignty there has been peace, and between the sovereign political groups there has often been war.

You live in a world, internationally speaking, that is anarchy, tempered only by diplomacy, alliance, and a few occasional and feeble attempts at confederation. This is your present-day world; a world so interdependent economically that men within the confines of the United States can perform acts, official Government acts for instance, the results of which may be to thrown thousands of people out of employment in countries half way around the world. Our political system is so organized that we are responsible for our acts only within the boundaries of our sovereign nation-state. Our acts, however, affect people in far-away places, and there are inevitable conflicts of interest resulting which, if not solved by means of law, may easily bring about a condition where violence is used. Let me repeat, man has peace only when he builds for peace and when he creates institutions which will keep the peace. You cannot find any exception to this in history.

Twenty-five years ago, another professor of political science turned politician told the world what it was going to have to face within that generation. We called him an idealist and a dreamer, an impractical college professor, and a great many other names. The American people turned back to another group of political leaders—"back to normalcy"—wonderful words. And when our people did this, the same college professor told us what would happen to this world. He predicted the kind of world which we would have if we did not do certain things. He warned us of what was to come. We have that world today. We are living in it, although we do not find it comfortable. I want to point out to you tonight that Woodrow Wilson was the great realist of his time; the impractical dreamers were on the other side of the fence.

Let me repeat again, we have the techniques; we know how to do this; we have the knowledge and the experience. Wishful thinking will not save us. It is only by doing and acting in an intelligent manner that the problems of our day may be solved and that we may make ourselves fit for survival. This is the great question of our time; the great debate of our generation. It is not dreamstuff; it is not utopia; it is not a question to be faced sometime in the distant future. It is the critical decision which our generation must make.

Pattern for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Sun of Monday, August 21, 1944:

PATTERN FOR PEACE

PART I. REALISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(By the Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago)

Unfortunately the word "realism" when it refers to international settlements, frequently is used as a synonym for compromise with

moral principle. In its name strong nations are permitted to violate the sovereignty, independence, and integrity of weak nations, imperialistic protectorates are set up under the guise of spheres of influence, aggressions are sanctioned under the plea of military necessity or the need of breathing spaces, the seeds of discontent which germinate into wars are sown.

There are those who, concentrating on the failures of the past, assert that it is useless to expect in this world of men a peace based on moral principles. They say that the wise statesman will accept unjust compromises as practical necessities and give his thought to getting from them advantages for his own country. The idealist, they say, in international affairs is stupid and an impractical dreamer.

This sort of thinking assumes that man is incapable in the affairs of life to achieve justice. It is a surrender, a tragic surrender, and is nothing more than cowardly defeatism.

Its consequences are disastrous militarisms, wasteful armament economies, the paralyzing of genuine progress, and periodic world wars. Reason rebels against it.

We know that it is within the power and ability of man to avoid these catastrophic world wars which are exhausting the resources of the nations, bringing suffering and anguish to millions and millions of homes, halting the progress of civilization and disgracing human history. Man can discover the way to a genuine world peace and strong men can travel this way.

It is evident that if there is to be a genuine world peace it must be founded on moral principles. When civil governments were not able to protect their rights, the citizens were forced to arm themselves and defend their rights by force.

Against this unhappy condition they rebelled and set up strong governments, that under law they might enjoy their freedoms.

In the family of nations there must come the reign of law. Already much has been done in the field of international law, but it is patent that much remains to be done before might will become the instrument of law.

During the period following the last World War, the nations entered into many agreements, signed very many treaties, and tried the experiment of the League of Nations. They failed to preserve the peace and to solve pressing international problems. What was the cause of this failure?

Certainly an important cause was their neglect in making the moral law the preamble to international law. You cannot have law without justice, and justice is a moral thing.

They considered national sovereignty to be outside the moral law and tried to settle international problems on the basis of expediency. There were other causes for the breakdown of international relations, but certain it is that disregard of the moral law was at the root of it. In the countries where dictators seized the political power, law was disregarded precisely because the moral law was contemned. The way to world peace is the establishment of the reign of law in the family of nations.

There is a sane realism in international relations, and that is the realism which recognizes moral realities.

Never can a genuine peace be based on a compromise with justice.

It may seem a little thing to permit a great strong nation to violate the independence and integrity of a small weak nation, but history proves that from such violations there have come great wars. When Hitler began his series of aggressions, they were aggressions against small weak nations.

No amount of cajolery or force is able to calm the discontent which comes from violation of rights.

It may be pictured to the injured nation that helpful economic opportunities will be derived from assent to such violation, that there will be given it greater security under the power of the mighty nation, that many benefits will accrue to it, but in that nation there will be the determination to regain its freedom, and against the unjust aggressor it will not fail to use all its resources.

This is history. Injustice begets war, and we know that war in our times is not an isolated happening and that easily it involves all the nations.

The very horror of war in modern times spurs men on to find the way to establish world peace. Every advance toward the perfecting and the strengthening of international law leads to world peace.

But we must keep in mind that international law, which is made up only of international agreements and treaties, is ineffective. World peace will come when the nations recognize the moral law as the preamble to all international law.

This moral law is not of their making. It binds them just as it binds individuals. For them it is an imperative which may not be disregarded without inviting catastrophes. The first advance to world peace is to face the realities of the moral law.

The Senate's Treaty Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Tuesday, September 5, 1944, entitled "The Senate's Treaty Power," which has reference to a very timely and interesting article by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University and president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, entitled "The Hope of the World":

[From the New York Times of September 5, 1944]

THE SENATE'S TREATY POWER

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, as president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has added his voice to those who are advocating an amendment to the Federal Constitution to provide for ratification of treaties by a majority vote in each of the two Houses of Congress instead of by a two-thirds vote of the Senate alone. The present requirement, as Dr. Butler points out, "might easily lead to almost irreparable damage to the prosperity and happiness of the American people as well as to the great movement of international cooperation to establish and maintain world peace."

There can be little doubt that, if the Senate itself took the initiative in proposing such an amendment, it would be immediately endorsed in the House and endorsed overwhelmingly by the country. The Senate alone has stood in the way of this change. It is understandable that when a small body of men holds the great power that a Senate minority now does, it should be reluctant to give it up or to share it. Many Senators doubtless quite sincerely feel that retention of the present system is in the best interests of the country, even though a majority of their fellow-citizens do not share this feeling. But the Senators would do well to ask themselves seriously whether, even from the narrow standpoint of the interest of the Senate alone, it is wise for that body to try to retain its present treaty power in its present form.

Let us suppose that a treaty or a group of treaties is submitted that two-thirds or even a majority of the Senate feels that it cannot conscientiously accept. If such a treaty were submitted to the full Congress and rejected by a majority in both houses, the country would no doubt accept this result as a reflection of its own majority opinion. But a much different situation would exist if the Senate alone, by failure to obtain a two-thirds vote, rejected such a treaty. Especially if a majority vote of the Senate favored the treaty, it would be pointed out that once more a minority had prevented the majority of the country from making the kind of peace it wanted. There would certainly follow proposals, with a great measure of public opinion behind them, to bypass the Senate and hence Congress altogether in future treaties. However unwise that public opinion might be, if the Senate had public opinion strongly enough against it, it would be sure to find itself effectively by-passed altogether by one method or another.

The Senate will be following its own self-interest as well as the interest of the whole country if it takes the initiative in removing the two-thirds requirement and in sharing its great treaty responsibility with the House.

THE HOPE OF THE WORLD

(By Nicholas Murray Butler)

The citizens of our Nation, which is of outstanding influence in the political, economic, and intellectual life of the world, are about to choose the head of the executive department of their Federal Government. Apart from the vast number of those who will participate in making this choice, the method of the choice is itself quite unique. Ever since the democratic principle gained power in Europe, it has been customary to have the administrative head of a government chosen either by the legislative branch of that government or by the ruling monarch with the approval and support of the legislative branch. The term of service of the head of a government so chosen and the policies which he supported and followed have been, in fact, controlled by the legislature whether called a parliament or by some other name. In the United States, however, the President is chosen for a definite term by the people and is responsible to them. The system of choosing presidential electors long since became a mere formality, and these electors have for many years simply recorded the declared preferences of those citizens who had elected them. In the United States, the relationship between the President and the Congress, between the executive and the legislative branch of the Federal Government, is one of independent cooperation. The authority, the duties, and the responsibilities of each are clearly defined by the Federal Constitution. These have been interpreted when necessary by the judicial department of the Federal Government which is the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is the organization, the history, and the practical working of this system of Federal Government which give to each Presidential election its outstanding importance. It is not surprising that at this time the eyes of the whole world should be fixed upon the American people in order to see what those people propose to do in various fields of policy when choosing members of their Government. What is done may greatly affect the security and the prosperity of every nation on the globe. The responsibility of the American people is, therefore,

so great and so far reaching that they should not, indeed must not, approach the task which now confronts them without clear understanding of the issues involved. They must have the insight and the courage so to act as to promote the effectiveness and the influence of their own form of government as well as to establish still more strongly its position and power of leadership in the life of the world of today.

Three times in recent years I have presented in one form or another the relationship of the American people to world organization and world problems. In 1939 the topic was Toward a Federal World.[1] In 1940 it was Our United States in This Backward-Moving World.[2] In 1942 it was The Age of the Americas.[3] Meanwhile, the general subject then presented has vastly increased in importance.

We must not close our eyes to the fact that we are in a wholly new world. We must look backward for that knowledge of the past which brings understanding, but we must not look backward for the purpose of mere imitation. It has been pointed out again and again that the age-old barriers of time and of space have been broken down by the electric current and by the inventive skill of modern man. There are no longer any foreign nations except in an out-worn phrase. No matter on what part of the globe a people may have made their home, they are not now foreign but in the closest possible relationship day by day and hour by hour with every other civilized people. All nations are now neighbors and should always be good neighbors. In this country we hear a voice speaking from Australia, from China, from South Africa, from Brazil, or from Chile as clearly and as instantaneously as if the speakers were at our side. The result of the establishment of these close contacts between peoples once so distant, each from the other, has enormously increased the influence of the people of the United States and added greatly to their responsibility for the peace, the good order, and the prosperity of the world. The word "independence" must now be differently interpreted from the manner which has been customary. A nation may be independent in its form of government but it is not and cannot be independent intellectually, or economically, or industrially, or in the field of religion. All of these forces sweep over and through national boundaries and affect the peoples whom they reach almost as if there were no boundaries at all. It is also unfortunate to emphasize under these modern conditions the term "sovereign nation." This has become a purely legalistic phrase which may easily be harmfully interpreted. No nation, as no individual, can be sovereign in the sense that it is free from control by moral principles. It is the moral law and only the moral law which is sovereign. The phrase "national sovereignty" must be interpreted with that fact in mind. It was Mr. Gladstone who, like Burke, believed that politics were simply morality enlarged in action. Lord Acton saw a never-ceasing struggle for freedom which he identified absolutely with the cause of morality. This is the reason why we must look forward eagerly to the early coming of that day when the surest way to uphold the fundamental principles of freedom and of civilization will no longer be to wage even defensive war with all its appalling happenings. The principles of morality must be so well established that the acts and policies of both nations and individuals will conform to them. The serious question is whether or not it is in the power of civilized man to make this a world of moral nations as well as of moral individual human beings.

Outstanding in increasing the influence of the American people throughout the world and in strengthening their economic system is the literally stupendous development which has taken place in every form of industrial activity. From the mining of coal to the building of ships and airplanes, production has gone forward on a scale and with an excellence which no one would have thought possible a short generation ago. Accompanying this astonishing development and incidental to it has been the growth of corporate activity. It has been usual for persons who do not look beneath the surface to speak of a corporation as merely an instrument of financial power guided and controlled in their own interest by very few personalities. The true facts, however, are quite different. A corporation means cooperation. It is wholly consonant with democratic principles for it involves the cooperation of hundreds of thousands of individuals in common enterprises, each in accordance with the amount of his earnings and savings which he feels can be used for such cooperation. The citizen of very small means may in this way take part with his fellow citizens of great wealth in making possible these amazing industrial developments which become of greater importance day by day.

It is probably not generally known, although the facts are easily accessible, that in the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. there are, for example, no fewer than 651,700 stockholders; in the United States Steel Corporation there are 222,600; in the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. there are 209,600; in the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey there are 149,200; in the New York Central Railroad Co. there are 63,000, and in the Union Pacific Railway Co. there are 55,900. These facts should make it apparent to how large an extent American citizens of every type and kind are taking part directly in our Nation's great industrial system. This of itself should be a most instructive and tempting invitation to the peoples of other industrial nations to go and do likewise.

When His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, took his high office he chose as the motto of his administration this striking phrase: "Peace is the work of justice." There can be no truer or more convincing statement than this.

One may well wonder what would be the reflections of Julius Caesar and of Napoleon Bonaparte on the world of today. Those two great war captains set out to conquer the world of their day. The story of their attempted conquests makes two large and important chapters in the history of the Western World. They did their best—and it was extraordinary—in the effort to bring a large part of the world under practically single control. When such attempts failed, despite their Herculean effort, it was natural for civilized men to turn from the belief that such world conquest was possible and to hope that the centuries next to come would be marked by steady development of peaceful and cooperating nations in the fields of economics, industry, and public law. There were not a few signs during the century which followed Waterloo that this forecast of a new world was still very uncertain. Finally, when the selfish struggle for economic and political dominance reasserted itself and nations began to arm for another great struggle, it was not long before the doctrines of fascism and of nazi-ism made their appearance. They quickly took control of the public policy and life of two great and highly civilized peoples. What followed we all know.

In the field of education almost every nation, whether great or small, has accomplished much. Elementary schools for children and secondary schools for youth have had as their inspiration and source of guidance great universities whose scholars have been the intellectual ornaments of the world for several hundred years. The importance of these educational systems is once more indicated by the fact that the despots who so alarmingly developed fascism and nazi-ism directed immediate attention to gaining control of the schools and universities of the nation over which they were seeking dominance. Of course, they suppressed entirely the universities as organizations and instruments of free thought and free speech. On the other hand, they did not suppress but took entire control of the elementary and secondary school systems to the end that they might use them to train the next generation to acceptance of and belief in their cruel and reactionary principles of thought and of government. As a result, it is said on good authority that of the once great German people there are now millions of young men and young women under 30 years of age who have been brought completely under the control of the Nazis through school instruction and school discipline shaped to that end. Once more the American people will find opportunity in so improving their own system of education that they can offer to other nations an example of how family influence and the school can be used to greatest advantage in a truly liberal spirit both of conduct and of learning.

What appalls us is the fact that after there had been three or four centuries of genuine progress in the political organization and the intellectual life of the countries of western Europe, they should again find themselves subjected to the cruel and relentless control of dictators. Their dominant aim has been the complete suppression of every form of human liberty and the destruction or control by force of freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of economic, industrial, and political life. The result is that the world of today, once believed to be so highly civilized, is back, it would seem, at the very beginning of an orderly and peaceful organization and development. What can this mean for the future?

Even before this world-wide war for the defense of freedom is won we must begin the stupendous task of planning definitely for the days which are to come. We cannot afford to let matters drift in a way which will only complicate the problems to be solved and increase the difficulty of solving them. It is certainly not too much to say that the history of the past two centuries has made the United States of America the Hope of the World It is to our Nation that leadership has come through the operation of purely natural causes, and it is our Nation which must now accept this responsibility which has been placed upon it. A chief service which the United States has rendered and can continue to render to the world is to record the successful and fortunate working of the federal principle of government.

The United States has shown how 48 separate geographic and political units, spread over a vast continent, can unite in the formation and administration of a federal government in which cooperation is complete without the sacrifice of local self-government or local control of many public functions. It is to this federal principle to which the world now seeking for some system of effective international organization must look. The Federal system as established by the people of the United States is too highly and too closely organized to be completely imitated on a world-wide scale. Indeed, a world state would be wholly impracticable. There is, however, much to be learned from the study of the American system of government and its practical operation.

There is one important change which the people of the United States must make in their Constitution without delay. The provision that a treaty with another government requires ratification by a vote of two-thirds

[1] Toward a Federal World, in Why War? (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940), pp. 11–31.

[2] Our United States in This Backward-Moving War, in Why War? pp. 109–128.

[3] The Age of the Americas, not yet published in book form.

of the United States Senate is not only harmful and undemocratic, but antidemocratic as well. Treaties should be ratified, as statutes are enacted by a majority vote in each of the two Houses of Congress. The present system, if not changed, might easily lead to almost irreparable damage to the prosperity and happiness of the American people as well as to the great movement of international cooperation to establish and maintain world peace. The present constitutional provision makes it possible for a very small number of Senators—one-third of a quorum plus one—representing perhaps only ten millions of the country's vast population to prevent the ratification of a treaty of highest importance for national prosperity and international cooperation and peace. Were this done by a majority vote in each of the two Houses of Congress, the people themselves would be responsible. The present plan of action, however, completely separates the responsibility of the American people from ratification or rejection of a treaty. There is no more important question than this before the country at the present moment. To effect this vitally important change, the pending amendment to the Federal Constitution should be adopted by the people without delay. Otherwise, no one can foretell what damage may be done to the public welfare, both national and international.[4]

Still another notable illustration of the federal principle is to be seen in the British Commonwealth of Nations brought into existence, to succeed what had been the British Empire, by the epoch-marking Statute of Westminster, passed almost without dissent by the British Parliament in 1931. In the British Commonwealth of Nations, we have an organized group of independent nations united by common faith in the fundamental principles of free government as well as through personal loyalty to a ruling monarch. This plan of organization might easily be made world-wide in its scope by substituting for loyalty to a ruling monarch, loyalty to a body of ruling principles formulated and agreed upon by the cooperating independent nations. Beyond question, the path of progress lies in the direction of the application in a new and practical form of the underlying federal principles upon which the Government of the United States of America and the governments of the British Commonwealth of Nations so firmly rest.

The time has come when the people of the United States should substitute the term "international policy" for the term "foreign policy," and "international relations" for "foreign relations." As has already been pointed out, it is the thought which underlies the term "foreign" which has been put in the background by the happenings of our time. If the acts of the people of the United States and the policies of their Government are to play so large a part in guiding and shaping the world of tomorrow, then it is imperative that the American people themselves think and act on the highest possible plane of moral understanding and effectiveness. The struggles of petty politics and the mean-spirited ambitions of those seeking public privilege or advantage from government should have no place in the life and political action of our people. We have the opportunity to show the whole world that we can debate and discuss questions of national policy and national aims with unselfish disinterestedness, putting aside the struggles and ambitions of petty politics and gain seeking.

Other nations have also been profoundly impressed by the fact that the people of the United States originally almost wholly Anglo-Saxon in origin, now count in their citizenship millions of representatives of many other racial and linguistic origins. They are Teutonic, they are Italian, they are French, they are Spanish, they are Portuguese, they are Scandinavian, they are Slavic, they are Oriental, they are Latin American, they are Jewish, they are African. It has been found practicable to weld these different elements together, often without difficulty, into a genuine unity of citizenship and understanding. Those who would lay stress upon differences of racial origin in a democracy are not the friends of the democratic principle and the democratic ideal. Moreover, domestic policies and international policy have now become so closely intertwined that they are no longer to be looked upon as separate. There is no nation in the world, whatever its size or whatever its natural resources, which is now able to lead its full and complete economic and industrial life without drawing upon the products of other nations. The notion that a government can build around its boundaries trade barriers as if they were military fortifications and yet have a safe and a prosperous life has become the impossible. It is not so long since in our own country the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922 and the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 gave ample demonstration of this truth.

It is because the nations have become economically interdependent that they must without delay unite in a well ordered plan of international cooperation not only to promote trade and commerce and to build up industry, but to remove the temptation to endeavor to reach these ends by waging military war or, most of all, by seeking world domination. In other words, international collaboration is now absolutely essential to national prosperity as well as to national security. The victory which the Allied Powers will shortly achieve in this stupendous war of defense that we are now waging should be the end of one era and the beginning of another in which international cooperation, on the basis of sound moral principle, will establish and maintain international peace and open the way to generations of prosperity and happiness.

The Pan American Union offers still another example of how international understanding and cooperation may be established and advanced. The suggestion that such a union should be called into being was first made as long ago as 1815 by the distinguished Latin-American statesman, Gen. Simón Bolivar. It was, however, not until 1889 that the first formal conference was held at Washington. Since then there have been many such conferences and the union has been established in the noble building erected for it at Washington, largely through the generous benefaction of Andrew Carnegie. The excellent results of the work of the union are increasingly apparent year by year. Despite their differences of racial origin and of language, the North American nations and those of Latin America are being steadily drawn into closer cooperation with each other. They have year by year a fuller understanding of their several characteristics and problems.

Progress is also making through such important international conferences as have recently been held at Hot Springs, Va., at Atlantic City, N. J., at Bretton Woods, N. H., and now at Dumbarton Oaks, D. C. To establish the habit of consultation and cooperation is to make genuine advance even though the results of any particular conference may seem relatively insignificant.

It is because the American people live under an organized Federal Government and have economic and intellectual relations with every part of the world that they can and must offer leadership in effecting the world organization toward which our wise and far-sighted statesmen have long been looking with confidence and with hope. The protection of our form of government and the constant strengthening of our economic life and our industrial system are largely dependent upon our taking leadership in rebuilding a civilized world which through international cooperation shall be under the dominance of moral law. Then and then only may war pass into history. Then and then only will industrial prosperity, intellectual growth, and social satisfaction be achieved. Truly America has become the Hope of the World.

[4] See Colegrove, Kenneth, the American Senate and World Peace. (New York: The Vanguard Press, 1944.)

Young Pole's Tale Bares Death Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of September 4, 1944:

YOUNG POLE'S TALE BARES DEATH CAMP—ANOTHER HORROR SITE REPORTED NEAR LUBLIN—THOUSANDS OF VICTIMS CREMATED

Moscow, September 3.—The story of another German death camp, situated at Sobibur, Poland, smaller than that at Maidanek but which, nevertheless, is estimated to have been the execution site for "hundreds of thousands of persons," was published in today's Komsomolskaya Pravda, organ of the Young Communist League. The story was told by two Red Army officers, Maj. A. Rutman and Guards Lt. S. Krasilschik.

Sobibur, like Maidanek, is not far from Lublin. The methods of execution were the same, and the Germans exported a huge output, including clothing, shoes and even hair and human fat from bodies of the victims.

Komsomolskaya Pravda's story is, in large part, an interview with a Polish youth, W. B. Feinberg, who said he had been a prisoner in the camp 17 months but had managed to escape in October 1943, in a rebellion planned by Soviet war prisoners.

According to Feinberg there were three separate sections in the Sobibur camp: two of them for working prisoners, who numbered approximately 300 constantly, and the other for executions, for which 8 or 10 trainloads carrying 800 to 1,000 persons arrived daily.

"In June, 1943, I observed the arrival from Bialystok of a trainload of persons packed as tightly as possible," Feinberg told reporters. "In the train were people who were dying and people already dead. They hadn't been fed or given water during the entire trip. Both the dead and live persons were sprinkled with chloride of lime.

"I saw how the Germans lifted children and threw them upon the ground, then kicked them around. I saw how defenseless people were sent out against hungry packs of dogs which chewed them to death. In our camp was a horrible hangman, a German named Boxer, from Berlin, who could with one blow of a stick kill a man—and he bragged about it. Another German, a chauffeur named Paul, specialized in severing heads, hands, or legs with one blow from an axe."

Feinberg's description of the third camp section was second hand because he had never been permitted to enter it. But he said its features were well known to all prisoners. He said the Germans executed approximately 1,800 persons at a time there after herding them into a large building that was sealed and into which poison gas was pumped. The

Germans looked on through a glass opening in the roof, and when the poison had done its job they threw a switch which caused the floor to open, automatically dumping the bodies into the cellar, where they were loaded into wagons.

For a long time the Germans hauled the bodies into a nearby forest and buried them in mass graves, but toward the end of 1943 they began to burn the bodies in a huge open-air, multilayered crematory.

"Daily thousands of corpses were burned," Feinberg said. "Bonfires burned day and night. Flames rose high in the sky. The smell was such that we couldn't eat or breathe. The rails on which the bodies were burned had special pans for the collection of human fat. Sometimes people were burned alive."

Feinberg also described the escape plot of October 14, 1943, when approximately 400 persons broke from camp after killing several German guards and officials. The prisoners broke through the barbed-wire fence, made their way across the moat, then crossed the minefields that covered the approaches to the camp.

He said the Germans trailed them relentlessly, even using airplanes. Of the 400 who left the camp alive, he estimated that only 50 escaped with their lives. After this escape, Feinberg said the Germans blew up the camp, destroying most of the evidence of its existence.

Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News of September 5, 1944:

EXPERIENCE

Senator TRUMAN, in his speech accepting the Democratic Vice Presidential nomination, laid down what is expected to be the pattern of the campaign for the reelection of President Roosevelt for a fourth term.

There is no substitute for experience, said Senator TRUMAN, asserting that President Roosevelt's leadership should not be discarded for that of a man "who lacks experience."

An argument of this nature does have its vote-pulling power if it is accepted at its face value.

But it will not stand up under close scrutiny.

Senator TRUMAN himself is campaigning to replace a man who has far more experience in executive capacity, Vice President WALLACE. Mr. WALLACE has had years of experience, but the Democratic Party discarded him for Mr. TRUMAN, wholly lacking in experience as an executive.

President Roosevelt himself was without experience, if you measure by Mr. TRUMAN'S yardstick, when he was elected to the Presidency, yet he was adjudged competent to take over as the country's Chief Executive in the midst of a depression.

Mr. Roosevelt had served as Governor of New York, it is true, but so has Mr. Dewey, who, according to Mr. TRUMAN, is a "man who lacks experience."

The Nation has had 31 Presidents, all of whom—again by Mr. TRUMAN'S yardstick—were without experience when they assumed office. Some of them were great executives, some were good, and some were ordinary.

But even the greatest were inexperienced when they assumed the duties of President.

And, as far as that is concerned, the country never has suffered from a change in its Executives.

As great as were Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, they were not indispensable. The country continued to grow and prosper and gain in wealth and power after they had stepped out of office.

The truth of the matter is that the progress of America to the heights has been due to the system and principles we have followed, not because of the identity of the men who have occupied the Executive Mansion.

To say that the Nation cannot continue its progress without the services of any particular man is to say that that one man is greater than America, greater than American ideals and principles.

And such a contention just won't hold water.

Letter From Pilot Carl R. Pepper, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I was privileged to read a letter from one of our soldier boys, my dear young friend Pilot Carl R. Pepper, Jr., of my home town of Bristol, Va. Knowing Carl as I do, the letter made a deep impression upon me. It made such an impression that I asked and obtained permission from his mother to insert the letter in the RECORD. The letter, I believe, gives a true insight into the very heart and soul of the Russian people. For this reason I hope it will be widely read.

Somehow I am not afraid of such a patriotic, self-sacrificing, music-loving, and appreciative people. When the heart of man is right, sooner or later other things, if wrong, have a way of righting themselves. My opinion is that Russia will come out of this war spiritually strengthened and will take her rightful place among the progressive, enlightened, and peace-loving nations of the earth.

We should all feel grateful to Russia. Her heroic fight to preserve freedom from the mailed fist of the dictators has saved thousands, perhaps millions, of American lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein the letter above referred to:

JULY 2, 1944.

DEAR FOLKS: You can take it from this kid that there's no place like Uncle Sam's good ole' States as far as really living is concerned. I've really been traveling around and have seen more places than I'd ever dreamed of seeing—the folks living in every place so far are just existing. It's really pathetic. I wouldn't trade a tramp's chances in the States for all these villas and patios, etc., that you hear so much about.

I just wrote you all a very brief note concerning the Russians so I want to really give you a picture as best I can about them. To start with they're the happiest people I've yet encountered. They sing the most beautiful music, Mom, and every one of them has terrific voices. They sing the Russian folk songs, etc., while working or doing most anything. The harmony and expression is really wonderful. I'm only sorry I had to leave before I got a chance to really get in on some of their songfests.

Everyone, both young and old, work like beavers at anything there is to be done. Women work on roads, clear the shambles of those grotesque figures which were once beautiful homes and buildings, work the crops, and a million other equally as hard jobs right along with the men. These women of Russia are unique to say the least. There is no such thing as rationing of any commodities as there is no need for it. These people are truly one for all and all for one. Soap is about the rarest of luxuries as there just isn't any to be had. Even without soap, however, it's remarkable how clean and neat these folks are. The women have the most beautiful complexion in the world. Every one of them is as healthy as can be, which I suppose can be credited to the rough life they lead.

Pop, you'd go for those little Russian kids. They're the cutest, brightest little rascals I've ever seen. In one place we stopped a beautiful little girl kept following us around town. We took her back to the airdrome with us and one of the fellows who speaks Russian found out that she was 13 years old, both her mother and father were killed, and she had been performing the duties of a nurse in the battle of Stalingrad. She was so cute. Hank, the fellow who speaks Russian, asked her if she would like me for a father and she said I was too young for that, but she'd be pleased to have me as a brother. We gave her chewing gum which she would bite off in small pieces, chew the sweet out of and then spit it out. The Russians there treated us like kings. They gave a movie for us—a Russian movie—which we took Gaula, the little girl friend to. Although we didn't understand the movie I sho' got a kick out of Gaula as she was simply fascinated with it. She brought us fruit to camp the next day in appreciation. We gave her all kinds of wings, etc., for souvenirs. She is joining the women's army right away and she'll probably be tops in this. Honest folks I'd given anything to have adopted that little girl and about a thousand and one others there.

The hospitality shown us by the Russians was unbelievable. They couldn't seem to do enough for us. We couldn't fly to our destinated place as the weather was too bad around the mountains so we just dropped in on this field. These people had had no notice of our stopping there but we had no sooner gotten there when they had beds, a hot meal, and terrific entertaining in the form of music all whipped up for us. It makes me ashamed of us when I think of how little we have done for these people. I just wish I could describe how absolutely "swellelegant" they were to us during our entire stay there. They wouldn't let us do anything but enjoy ourselves.

All that bull about morals, etc., in Russia being so low is another piece of propaganda put out by someone who doesn't know the score. The girls are very beautiful as I've already mentioned, but they are interested only in their own kind. They are nice to the Yanks and talk to us, etc.—they even have dances for us, but as for making love they are just a little on the careful side of the fence as lots of the boys found out. The Germans raped and murdered so darn many of these folks that they are leary of other men besides their own. They don't just have babies by carloads and marry as we'd been led to believe. They have weddings by the priest the same as we do, and it really is rough on any girl who has a baby that isn't married. They are really terrific.

The main trouble with our relations with Russia is that we just don't have sense enough to realize that these folks live differently from us in lots of ways. We don't give a damn about learning the truth and if some big-time operator tells us something we just take that to be the truth. All of us feel the same about this trip. We aren't doing enough for these people. They aren't blood thirsty, uncivilized people. They're a people with a soul and heart who love to live in peace with everyone but when they were kicked in the stomach as they have been then they're in there pitching—all for one and one for all—it's a swell set-up. They are a fearless race and the destitution which they've endured is unbelievable. There wasn't a home, or what have you left after the Nazi retreat. I just wish we would wise up and give them the biggest part of our aid instead of some of these other countries which don't really seem to appreciate it. Any skepticism I've ever had about these people has sho' been banished after this trip. We should give these people everything possible. Chub, you can tell Honest that he can take it from us guys that these folks really deserve the very best. I could just go on and on about these people of Russia but I'd best quit as you probably couldn't believe me anyway. I'd give anything to get stationed there though and hope I get a chance to do so soon. I'm sho' going to save candy, gum, soap, and cigarettes for any chance I get to go back there. Those kids are so cute. I'll write you all everything about the remainder of my trip later although nothing has been as interesting or as swell as the visit to Russia.

I'll sho' be glad to get some mail from you all and its probably waiting on me back in Limie land. I can't wait to hear about the skipper and the marines. I sho' miss you all and love you more than I could ever tell you. Oodles of love to each and everyone.

CARL, Jr.

P. S.—Ken and I bought a camera finally and will send you some pictures when we get some made.

Our Privilege and Duty To Vote Election Day, November 7, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, November 7, 1944, is the most important election day we have ever had in the history of our country. As our armed forces move forward to a smashing victory over our enemies, we now face the greatest battle of all time to preserve our form of government and to restore real stability in our domestic affairs and especially in our fiscal system. We must do everything within our power to help win the war and we must do everything within our power also to assist the veterans of this war in their return to civilian life. We must also help in every possible way to make the reconversion of our economy from war to peace as successful as possible. This all calls for outstanding leadership and careful planning and administration.

November 7 is election day, and on that day we must prove to the world that Americans value their right to take part directly in the selection of Government officials and in the management and control of our Government. This right is one that our forefathers fought and died to establish and our men and women of today have fought and died to preserve. It is the duty of each and all of us to vote and to urge every qualified voter to vote in this election. The size of our vote November 7 will prove to the world how much we value that privilege and responsibility and by the size of that vote we can convince the world that the American form of government marches forward with vigor, determination, and strength.

Remember, every qualified voter should vote at the general election, November 7, 1944.

Let us all exercise our own right and privilege and responsibility of voting and then let us call upon as many qualified voters as possible and remind them of this great privilege and responsibility and then urge them to vote.

Liberation of Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in the home-town paper at Corydon, Iowa, a mother, who was born in France and lived in that country until her marriage to an American soldier during the First World War, Mr. C. F. Brubaker, expresses the deep emotions within her breast when Paris was liberated. Her happiness knew no bounds. At the present time Mrs. Brubaker's only child, Gilbert, is in the armed services. As a native of one country and citizen of another she prays that the time will come when "Liberty, equality and fraternity" will prevail throughout the world.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the brief statement from Mrs. C. F. Brubaker as it appeared in the Times-Republican of Corydon, Iowa, in the issue of August 31:

When the fateful message came over the air waves "Paris, the city of light; Paris, the capital of liberty; Paris, the great eternal, has been liberated," millions of people in many lands rejoiced heartily. But for the French people themselves, wherever they were, the word "joy" was entirely inadequate to express their reaction.

When my mother and I heard this historic news, our emotion was so intense that for several minutes we couldn't even talk, and when we finally realized that we were not just day dreaming, that, our beloved Paris had really been rid of the Nazi pestilence, tears of joy streamed down our faces.

Our great city was free again and freed by the hand of Frenchmen. All the humiliation of the last 4 years seemed to be erased by the courageous sacrifice of those men and women who rose to help deliver their oppressed and martyred capital. The tricolor was flying once again.

I remembered how in June 1940, broken hearted and despondent, I had put away my own French flag, wondering when it could be used again. At last the day had come. Reverently, I took it from the box where it had laid for so long and with trembling fingers and a singing heart I unfurled it in front of my house. As I watched it wave in the breeze of this happy August day I never remembered it to look so grand or mean so much. Then the wish came in my heart for a better world, where never again would there be those who would pull it down and despoil this symbol of "Liberty, equality, and fraternity."

H. R. 4650 Embodies Vicious Principle of Religious Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a resolution passed by the executive committee of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists that has reference to H. R. 4650, now pending before the Committee on Military Affairs.

I am personally opposed to this type of legislation, Mr. Speaker, because it embodies the vicious principle of religious discrimination. It is for this reason I am making this resolution available to all Members of Congress:

We, the executive committee of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, respectfully request the members of the House Military Affairs Committee to allow H. R. 4650 to die in committee rather than to approve it for passage or report it out for discussion to the floor of the House.

In this connection we point out that Congress, in the enactment of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, made provision for men of religious conscientious convictions regarding combatant and noncombatant forms of service to be used in the military forces; that the War and Navy Departments made provision for the services of men classified I-A-O in the Medical Department of the Army and the Hospital Corps of the Navy; that in such assignments these men have risked as much and jeopardized their lives equally with all other servicemen; that they have shared the war's hardships, rigors, and dangers wherever fighting has taken place; and that many of them are wearing Purple Hearts, having displayed a courage which is respected by their fellow soldiers and officers. The fact that this courage in the case of I-A-O men accompanies a deep religious faith should be the last possible reason why the United States, avowedly fighting for freedom of religion, should penalize such men as these.

We further invite attention to the fact that Seventh-day Adventist men in the armed forces, of whom there are approximately 12,000, responded to their country's call. Through medical cadet training prepared in cooperation with the Medical Department of the Army, and at their own costs, and encouraged by their church, they prepared themselves for skilled life-saving service before their induction. Their religious convictions regarding noncombatancy have not been a ruse to get out of danger or make them the less willing to risk their own lives to save

their fellow soldiers. A I–A–O medical soldier out on the front line picking up wounded soldiers is under constant fire. A man who goes under fire again and again without protection of arms to rescue wounded fellow soldiers ought not to be accused of lack of courage or denied equal treatment, consideration, and benefits with all other soldiers. Otherwise, many a I–A soldier will receive a class A discharge with full benefits while the I–A–O soldier, who saved his fellow's life while risking his own will be denied these benefits by the class B discharge proposed in H. R. 4650.

That ought not to happen in America, not alone for the soldier's sake, but for America's sake. It is neither fair, nor democratic, nor American.

I–A–O men are going into action on all the world's battle fronts, serving side by side with thousands of I–A men also engaged in noncombatant activities. They are carrying the wounded from the field of fire, manning their stations everywhere, armed strongly with their faith.

When such men come home they ought not to be discriminated against on account of their religion. They have done the same work as other soldiers in noncombatant lines who have been classified I–A. I–A–O men should continue to be recognized as equally eligible for mustering-out pay, bonuses, and other veterans' benefits as all other honorably discharged soldiers. We ask you to exert your influences to see that no discrimination of this nature is put into effect.

J. L. McELHANY, *President.*
E. D. DICK, *Secretary.*

Reconversion Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hope the conferees having charge of the war mobilization and reconversion legislation will reinsert the provision to extend unemployment benefits to civilian employees of the Federal Government. While it is impossible to accurately estimate the number of persons who will be temporarily unemployed, due to the transition period when industry ceases making war materials and reengages in peacetime activity, it is known that this transition cannot take place overnight. It will take some time and there are bound to be large areas of temporary unemployment. One of the purposes of the pending bill is to anticipate this situation and to provide for it. The civilian employees of the United States Government have contributed magnificently toward the war effort and it is unfair to prevent them from sharing the unemployment benefits given to other American workmen doing the same kind of work in private industry. There is no just basis for such discrimination.

Everyone hopes that there will be a minimum of unemployment because the real purpose of democracy and free enterprise is to provide employment—not unemployment. Every effort should be made to provide a decent job at decent wages for each and every returning serviceman. But in spite of all our efforts in this direction, we cannot escape the fact that a nation at war cannot reengage in peacetime activity without resulting readjustments. One of the major objects of this legislation is to provide for the interim period that will be required to make the change. I hope this bill, when finally passed, will fully envisage that situation and provide for it adequately without discrimination to any citizen.

Farmers Help Everybody When They Work Together—Five Questions About Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include Information Bulletins Nos. 3 and 4 issued by the National Council of Farm Cooperatives.

I have previously inserted Bulletins Nos. 1 and 2, and feel that the matter presented in these bulletins is of great importance to the future of American agriculture and to the consideration of the problems of farm cooperatives.

The bulletins follow:

FARMERS HELP EVERYBODY WHEN THEY WORK TOGETHER

Agriculture is an industry of some six and one-half million family-sized units. This is true because farm production is generally most efficient on the family farm. However, the comparatively small operation which is an advantage in farm production is a handicap in the purchasing of farm supplies and in the processing and marketing of farm products.

As industrial production has shifted from the home to the factory and as American business has become big business, farmers still maintaining the family farm have been forced to find more efficient ways of buying and selling.

This they have done by uniting with their neighbors, using the cooperative form of business enterprise. In this way farmers have built their own business institutions for buying farm supplies and marketing farm products at cost. Thus the farmers of America have themselves forged a tool for existing in an economy of big business. Through this tool of farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperatives, farmers have helped strengthen and maintain the American system of free enterprise.

THROUGH THEIR COOPERATIVES FARMERS HAVE CONTRIBUTED MUCH MORE

They have pioneered in the improvement of the quality of food.

They have fostered standardization of products through a system of grades.

They have insisted upon licensed inspection and official weighing of products.

They have improved storage facilities, thus reducing the loss of products through spoilage.

They have reduced transportation costs by pooling small lots, designing improved transportation facilities, and increasing the percentage of truck miles under load.

They have reduced production costs by adapting farm-production supplies to the farmers' actual needs.

They have, through research and education, brought improved methods of production into more general use.

They have lowered the cost of credit by reducing production and marketing risks.

They have made distribution more efficient—less costly.

Through orderly marketing they have tended to stabilize farm prices.

They have acted as pace setters generally in the field of marketing and in the purchasing of farm supplies.

Farmers, through their cooperatives, operated on a nonprofit basis, have made these and other contributions to the general welfare.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

FIVE QUESTIONS ABOUT FARMER COOPERATIVES

1. WHAT IS A FARMER COOPERATIVE?

It is a form of voluntary business organization set up by farmers to perform services on a cost-of-doing-business basis in such fields as the purchasing of farm supplies and the marketing of farm products.

2. WHEN DID FARMER COOPERATION START IN AMERICA?

It started when our forefathers swapped work to help each other raise barns or kill hogs or do other jobs that one farmer could not well do alone. Later, as more and more of his crop and livestock production went to the people in the cities and less and less was consumed at home, the farmer faced many problems beyond his line fence that were too big for him to handle efficiently by himself—problems in the assembling, grading, processing, transporting, and marketing of farm products, and problems in the purchasing of farm production supplies. To meet these problems he formalized early American cooperation, and as early as 1810 we had cooperative cheese factories in America. These early American cooperatives preceded by more than a quarter of a century the founding of the Rochdale Cooperative in England.

3. WHO OWNS AND CONTROLS A FARMER COOPERATIVE?

The members who use its services. Their ownership is usually represented in membership certificates, stock, or some other evidence of the members' investment in the cooperative. Control of the cooperative is distributed democratically among the membership—usually on the basis of "one man, one vote."

4. HOW DOES A FARMER COOPERATIVE WORK?

A farmer cooperative acts as the agent of its farmer members. They use it to provide themselves with services on a cost-of-doing business-basis. Usually to cover their cooperative's operating costs plus a margin of safety, the members provide operating advances in amounts about equal to the going trade margins for similar services. When the year's operation is over and the books have been closed, they get back as patronage refunds the difference between what they advanced for the services and what the services actually cost. These refunds may be in cash or—in cases where members are adding to their cooperative's working capital—in the form of stock or certificates of equity. Interest rates on such member-invested capital is limited.

5. WHY ARE FARMER COOPERATIVES NEEDED?

Because farming, though highly important in sum total to the Nation's economy, is actually a business of more than 6,000,000 individual family farms. These farms, averaging only 87 tillable acres, are faced with as many problems of buying and processing and

selling as the big corporations have—and without their concentration of money, specialized manpower or facilities. Only by joining together in voluntary cooperatives can farmers provide themselves with the capital, manpower, and facilities needed for efficient operation. Only through organization can farmers meet other organized groups on an equal basis. Only by working together can farmers carry on research and develop new ideas that will benefit all people—the consumers of food as well as the producers.

YARDSTICK FOR A FARMER COOPERATIVE

The rules laid down by the United States Government for a farmer cooperative are specific. Generally speaking, a nonprofit farmers' cooperative * * *:

1. Is democratically controlled by its members—usually "one farmer, one vote."
2. Returns its net savings to users.
3. Treats all users alike, whether members or nonmembers.
4. Does most of its business with farmer members.
5. Does, in the case of a purchasing association, at least 85 percent of its dollar volume of business with agricultural producers.
6. Has most of its stock and voting rights in the hands of active patrons.
7. Limits rate of dividends on capital stock to a nominal rate of interest.
8. Maintains records showing its operations and its members' equities.
9. Has only reasonable reserves for necessary purposes.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Magnificent Supply Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been revealed that, in the first 70 days after D-day, in the Normandy invasion area alone, some of the losses in equipment were, for the Ground Forces, 1,750 quarter-ton trucks; 1,500 mortars; 83,000 miles of wire; 900 tanks; 2,400 automatic rifles. In the same period, the Air Forces used over 44,000,000 gallons of gasoline; dropped approximately 55,000 tons of bombs; lost some 3,000 planes—all of which necessarily had to be replaced.

Add to this the problem of supplying our men and the prisoners of war which they capture with their daily food requirements and some idea can be gained of the magnitude of the supply job alone. Already the Army's Quartermaster Corps has secured 1,000,000 pounds of turkey in anticipation of affording a Thanksgiving Day feast for the armed forces; and turkey in 12-ounce cans is also to be sent to our boys interned by Germany. It is hoped also that Japan will allow shipments to our prisoners in their camps.

THE CASUALTY LISTS

The Army has announced that, for all theaters, for the period from Pearl Harbor through August 13, its casualties have been 53,101 killed, 142,686 wounded, of whom 60,314 have returned to duty, 44,643 missing, and 44,408 prisoners of war. In the same period the Navy lost 16,677 killed, 7,250 wounded, 8,577 missing, 2,523 prisoners. Casualties for all services totaled 343,191. The list included many from the Fourth Congressional District.

LEND-LEASE

As of July 1, last, the value of shipments to our allies on lend-lease amounted to $28,270,000,000. Items to Great Britain included 6,000 planes and 9,900 tanks; 4,800 planes, 51,100 tanks and 73,000 trucks and other motor vehicles in the Mediterranean. Russian aid included more than 11,000 planes and 300,000 trucks and other military vehicles.

It will be recalled that when lend-lease was proposed many of us warned that before the books were balanced an effort would be made to write off the debts of other nations. This was denied by the proponents of the plan.

Just a year ago the President, in his eleventh lend-lease report to Congress, stated:

> Victory and a secure peace are the only coin in which we can be repaid.

When adverse comment resulted Mr. Roosevelt said that he had never read the letter transmitting the report, that a mistake had been made while he was attending the Quebec Conference, and he wished to apologize for it.

On August 22 last Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, in a speech before a Capital luncheon club, said:

> Since lend-lease material is being used against our mutual enemy, it is questionable whether our allies should be required to repay us. It is hard to estimate the extent to which American expenditures should be repaid because it is hard to estimate to what extent they are being used to save American lives.

Subsequently that speech was characterized in the Washington press as a "trial balloon." The Washington Evening Star, a conservative newspaper, one which never has been "anti-New Deal administration," in its issue of August 26, carried an editorial containing the following statements:

> Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, has taken what looks like the first step in an effort to "unsell" the people of this country on the belief that the foreign recipients of lease-lend aid are going to repay us in any conventional sense of that term.

After citing the statement of Mr. Crowley, as above quoted, the Star editorial continues:

> Now that statement, or rather its implication that we should not seek repayment, may be sound enough. But the unfortunate part is that this is not what the people of this country were led to expect when lease-lend was first proposed.
>
> At that time the impression was created that we would be repaid for the assistance to be extended, in kind if not in dollars. Perhaps that was helpful in "selling" lease-lend to the country in the first instance; but if it develops in the future that we are not going to be repaid, then the early job of salesmanship is apt to pay dividends in the form of resentment and bad feeling toward our present allies.

DEMOBILIZATION LEGISLATION

The House last week passed its version of the so-called reconversion bill, which would establish an Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion under a $15,000 per year Director to be appointed by the President with Senate confirmation. The House refused to go along with the Senate proposal to give special additional payments to some 3,000,000 Federal employees. The Senate measure provides for administration by an eight-man board, rather than a single administrator. The two measures are now in conference, where an attempt is being made to iron out differences.

Major General Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a great soldier, administrator, and citizen, the late Maj. Gen. Robert Courtney Davis, is deservedly remembered in an editorial tribute in the New York Times of yesterday. The editorial follows:

MAJOR GENERAL DAVIS

Maj. Gen. Robert Courtney Davis, who had a soldier's burial at Arlington Cemetery yesterday, was not yet 68. Few men have worked harder or to better purpose. From West Point he passed through the grades to major general. He took part in the campaign against Santiago de Cuba, in the battle of El Caney, and in the Philippines in various engagements against the insurgents. He was "Major General The Adjutant General" from 1922 till his retirement in 1927. His was the great task, successfully performed, of administering the Adjusted Compensation Act and distributing payment to the returned soldiers. He had a genius for administration, and he plowed his way easily through confusions and complications.

As assistant, acting, or Adjutant General in 1918 he saw in 6 months an increase of the Army from 300,000 to 2,000,000. A member of the board appointed to consider the reorganization of the General Staff, he stayed in the War Department till after reorganization had been effected. In the last 5 years his labors as executive director of the New York chapter of the American Red Cross have made him one of the best known and valued figures of this community. Before the United States entered the war the chapter gave intelligent, fruitful, and manifold relief to refugees and other sufferers abroad. Constantly asking for more nurses, ambulance drivers, contributions of food and supplies, the humane impulses it had quickened responded again and again and always more generously after the country took a hand in the struggle.

The chapter has been fertile in ways and means of aid. The blood banks are but one of the most striking of a whole series of intelligent and effectual helps of our armed forces. Health and life, rest, recreation have been given here and across the seas to the men and to their families. The Red Cross has been multifariously kind and able. As the strong and gentle head of this great stationary and traveling college of benevolence and good will, General Davis endeared himself to millions and added new honor to an honorable career.

First Address of President Sergio Osmeña to His Cabinet, Thursday, August 10, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of President Sergio Osmeña to his Cabinet, Thursday, August 10, 1944:

Gentlemen of the Cabinet, 9 days ago when I performed the painful duty of announcing the passing of our beloved leader, President Manuel L. Quezon, I said, in part:

"President Quezon's death is a great loss to the freedom-loving world. No champion of liberty fought for such a noble cause with more determination and against greater odds. His whole life was dedicated to the achievement of his people's freedom, and it is one of the sad paradoxes of fate that with the forces of victory fast approaching the Philippines, he should pass away now and be deprived of seeing the culmination of his labors—the freedom of his people."

President Quezon was a champion of freedom in war and in peace. The plains and hills of Bataan, where the brave Filipino and American soldiers faced with heroism the overwhelming power of the Japanese invader, were also his field of action during the Revolutionary days. The city of Washington, where his body temporarily rests, was the scene of his early appeals and peaceful efforts for Philippine freedom. It was here, almost 30 years ago, where he secured from Congress the promise of independence which is contained in the preamble of the Jones law. Here, again, 18 years late, he succeeded in obtaining the passage of the Tydings-McDuffie Act—a reenactment with some slight amendments of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law which was rejected previously by the Philippine Legislature. Pursuant to the provisions of the Tydings-McDuffie law, which was accepted by the Filipino people, we drafted our constitution and established the present Commonwealth of the Philippines, and elected Manual L. Quezon as its first President.

When the war came and it became necessary to evacuate Manila, President Quezon, frail and sick as he was, moved with his cabinet to Corregidor, where he shared with the soldiers the rigors of tunnel life, and from there braved the hazards of a perilous journey to the Visayas, Mindanao, Australia, and America, in order to continue the fight for the freedom of his people. Here in Washington with his war cabinet, he functioned as the legitimate government of the Filipino people and served as the symbol of their redemption.

It was largely through his untiring efforts that the Philippines was made a member of the United Nations and accorded a seat in the Pacific war council. It was through his initiative that negotiations were held, resulting in the introduction of Senate Joint Resolutions 93 and 94. By the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 93, the advancement of the date of independence prior to July 4, 1946, was authorized and the pledge given to the Filipino people by President Roosevelt in 1941—that Philippine independence will not only be established but also protected—was sanctioned by Congress. His efforts to secure the rehabilitation of the Philippines from the ravages of war resulted in the enactment by Congress of Senate Joint Resolution 94 which provides for the physical and economic rehabilitation of the Philippines. Even before Congress definitely acted on this resolution he had already created the Post-war Planning Board, entrusting it, together with his Cabinet, with the task of making studies and submitting recommendations looking toward the formulation of a comprehensive rehabilitation program for the Philippines.

In the last few moments before his martyrdom the great Rizal lamented that he would not be able to see the dawn of freedom break over his beloved country, but he prophesied that his countrymen would see that day. "I've sown the seeds," he said, "others are left to reap." Quezon, more fortunate than Rizal, died with the comforting thought that the freedom of the Philippines was already an incontestable reality, awaiting only the certain defeat of the enemy for its full expression.

The immediate duty, then, of those of us who, under the mandate of the Constitution and the laws of the Philippines, are charged with the mission of continuing President Quezon's work, is to follow the course he has laid, to maintain and strengthen our partnership with America, and to march forward with the United Nations with unwavering faith and resolute determination until complete victory is won.

The tide of the war which rose high against us in the early stages of the struggle has turned in our favor. The forces of victory are on the march everywhere—in Europe, in India, and China, and in the Pacific. Normandy and Brittany have been occupied by the Anglo-American forces. Poland is half reconquered by our great Russian ally. Two-thirds of the Italian peninsula are in our hands, while thousands and thousands of planes continue to batter and destroy German communication and production centers, bringing the war to the German homeland.

In the Pacific the progress of the war has been equally impressive. Most of the Japanese strongholds in the Bismarck archipelago, in New Guinea, in the Gilberts, and in the Marshalls have fallen. The Japanese bastion of Saipan is in Allied hands; so is Tinian. The reconquest of Guam is almost completed. B-29's, the American super fortresses, are already penetrating the Japanese inner defenses, causing destruction in the enemy's vital centers of production. General MacArthur's forces are hammering the enemy's outposts only 250 miles from the Philippines, while the United States Navy, maintaining mastery in the central Pacific, is relentlessly attacking Palau, Yap, Ponape, and the Bonin Islands in its steady advance toward the Philippines, China, and Japan.

The size and strength of the Allied landings in Europe, supported by thousands of planes and using thousands of ships, surpasses the imagination. It is no wonder that before them the most formidable defenses of the enemy are crumbling. I believe that when our D-day comes the same pattern will be followed, and the mighty Allied forces will join our brave, loyal countrymen in an epic victory.

But the forces of freedom will not land in the Philippines with guns and tanks alone. They will also bring with them food, medical supplies, and clothing which are so much needed by our suffering people. Thirty million pesos have already been set aside for the requisition of these supplies which will be sent to the front as soon as possible for distribution to our civilian population. As the war progresses and as more troops are landed in the Philippines, increasing quantities of these supplies will be made available. Philippine relief will be prompt and adequate.

As Philippine territory is wrested from the enemy, civil government will promptly follow military occupation so that the orderly processes of self-government may be established under the Constitution. Red Cross units, both Filipino and American, will follow the armies of freedom to help alleviate the sufferings of the people. Hospitals, health and puericulture centers will be reestablished. All the schools in operation before the war will be reopened in order to resume an education of patriotism, democracy, and humanitarianism.

The veterans of our wars for independence, and all those who supported our struggle for freedom, will receive for their labors and sacrifices the full recognition expected of a grateful nation. War widows and orphans will be provided for. Ample compensation will be made for the destruction of public and private properties. Roads and bridges destroyed by the enemy will be rebuilt. Disrupted communications by land, sea, and air, will be repaired and improved. Towns and cities which either were destroyed or suffered damages because of the war will be reconstructed under a systematic and scientific town-planning program. In this program, the towns of Bataan and Zanbales will receive preferential attention. Bataan, the historic battleground where our brave soldiers, Americans and Filipinos, faced the enemy until death, will be made a national shrine.

In providing for the reconstruction of our industries and the rehabilitation of our agriculture, immediate attention will be given to factory workers and farm hands throughout the Philippines, and full and generous assistance will be given to the small farmers who, because of the war, have lost with their nipa hut, their work animals and farm implements.

We are making preparations to meet the manifold problems arising from the closing and insolvency of our banks, insurance and credit institutions, the adulteration of our currency with unsound enemy issues, the impairment of the basis of taxation and the initial difficulty of tax collection. Moreover, we are formulating a long-range economic program with a view to securing that sound economic foundation which will give our independence stability and permanence.

In the gigantic task of rehabilitation and reconstruction, we are assured of America's full assistance and support. The joint Filipino-American Rehabilitation Commission, created by Congress, is already functioning. This Commission is under the chairmanship of a staunch friend of the Filipino people, Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland. To it is entrusted the task of studying and recommending to the United States and Philippine Governments measures calculated to secure the complete physical and economic rehabilitation of the Philippines and the reestablishment as soon as possible of such commercial relations between the two countries as will assure us a reasonable level of public and private prosperity.

In the preparation and execution of the Filipino rehabilitation program, America's support and assistance are essential. But there are responsibilities which we as a people must undertake ourselves, and which can be assumed only if we are faithful to our ideals, principles, and commitments.

We are a Christian people and the faith that we imbibed sprang from our contacts with nations of occidental civilization. We embraced Christianity a century before the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth. For more than 400 years we have kept that faith. We cannot now turn back and be a pagan people.

For centuries we have been a law-abiding people. We believe in and practice democracy. That is the reason why section 3, article II, of our Constitution provides that we renounce war as an instrument of national policy and adopt the generally accepted principles of international law as a

part of the law of the Nation. It is repugnant to our Christian traditions and democratic ideals to be the satellite of a conquering power or to be allied with the masters of brute force, whether in Asia, Europe, or elsewhere.

The mutual relationship between the American and Filipino peoples for half a century has revealed to the Filipinos the high ideals of the American Nation and the good faith that has always animated the United States in its dealings with us. Out of this association have arisen mutual understanding and continuous cooperation between the two countries, resulting in great national progress for the Philippines—progress that is without parallel in history. In the epic of Bataan, where the American and Filipino soldiers fought together, the enduring friendship of our two peoples was sealed.

In this war between a free world and a slave world the Philippines has freely and voluntarily taken side with the defenders of liberty and democracy. In the same manner as the enemy is resorting to every means to attain his evil ends, the United Nations are exerting their utmost to achieve complete victory. Pledged in this war to the finish, we will continue doing our best to help the war effort. Every commitment made by us in this respect will be fulfilled.

The Filipino people, with their wisdom in peace and gallantry in war, have established their right to take a place in the family of nations as a full and sovereign member. We cannot renounce this right nor its obligations and responsibilities. We shall, as a free and self-respecting nation, fulfill our duties not only to ourselves but also to the entire freedom-loving world by participating in the establishment and preservation of a just peace for the benefit of mankind.

Our path of duty is clear. It is the path of national honor, dignity, and responsibility. It was laid out for us by the great heroes of our race—Rizal, Bonifacio, and Quezon. We shall move forward steadily to reach our goal, maintaining our faith in the United States and fully cooperating with her.

In the fulfillment of my duties as President of the Philippines, I ask in all humility but in all earnestness the cooperation of all my countrymen in the United States, Hawaii, in the homeland, and elsewhere in the world. With their full and unstinted cooperation and support, and God helping me, I shall not fail.

Regulations Governing the Operations of State Cooperating Agencies and Others Concerned With Title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Veterans' Administration Instruction No. 1, title V, Public, No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944:

REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE OPERATIONS OF STATE COOPERATING AGENCIES AND OTHERS CONCERNED WITH THE ADMINISTRATION OF TITLE V OF THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

1. Definitions: (A) "Act" means the Servicement's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress.

(B) "Administrator" means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

(C) "Agency" means any agency administering a State unemployment compensation law or the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, which has entered into an agreement with the Administrator to assist him in the payment of allowances.

(D) "Allowance" means the readjustment allowance payable under the act.

(E) "Employment Office" means a public employment office which is utilized by the agency in administering its unemployment compensation law, and also means any facility designated as an employment office for the purposes of the Act by the Railroad Retirement Board.

(F) "Agent" means the readjustment allowance agent appointed by the Administrator under section 1100 (a) of the act, as his representative assigned to a given agency.

(G) "Value of remuneration other than cash," as used in this act, shall be determined by the agency pursuant to its rules and regulations as to such valuation under its unemployment compensation law.

2. Starting date of readjustment allowance payment: (A) With respect to agencies paying benefits on a flexible week basis, allowances for unemployment are first payable for the week starting Monday, September 4, 1944. With respect to agencies then paying benefits on a calendar week basis (i. e., the week beginning Sunday) the first week for which allowances may be paid starts September 10, 1944.

(B) Allowances for the self-employed are first payable for the month of October 1944.

(C) The allowance will be in the amount authorized in chapter IX of the act.

3. Applications for allowances: (A) The veteran's initial application shall be made through local offices or facilities of an agency on a form supplied by the Administrator. Applications may be made by mail pursuant to agency regulations and procedures.

(B) The veteran shall present his discharge or separation paper at the time of making his application whether such application is made in person or by mail.

(C) The agency may require any veteran who files an application and has no social-security account number to secure such a number.

4. Determination of entitlement: (A) When a veteran's discharge or separation paper specifies that the discharge or separation was honorable or dishonorable, the agency shall immediately determine his entitlement and enter its determination on the application form. A veteran's discharge or separation paper may have one of the following titles:

Honorable discharge.
Certificate of active service.
Certificate of service.
Certificate of discharge.
Discharge.
Certificate of unfavorable discharge.
Bad conduct discharge.
Dishonorable discharge.

When the veteran asserts that he has lost his paper; when the paper does not specify whether his discharge or separation was honorable or dishonorable; or when the facts stated in the paper are inconclusive, incomplete, or in dispute, his application shall be cleared with the Veterans' Administration through the agent.

(B) The agency shall determine the maximum number of weekly allowances to which the veteran is entitled.

(C) In determining the maximum number of weekly allowances potentially payable to the veteran, the agency shall, under section 900 (b), count "each calendar month or major fraction thereof of active service." For the purpose of such determination the term "calendar month" means the month starting with the date of the veteran's entry upon active service, and each such corresponding month ensuing consecutively thereafter. (I. e., the first "calendar month" starts on the beginning date of active service and ends on the day preceding the same date in the succeeding month; Provided, however, that if the succeeding month does not include enough days to have a corresponding date, his first "calendar month" will end at the close of such succeeding month. The second "calendar month" starts immediately after the end of the first "calendar month" and its termination is likewise determined, and so on with beginning and ending dates similarly determined.) When a fraction of such a month had elapsed on the veteran's discharge date, any balance of days remaining after the determination of calendar months as herein above described shall be treated as a major fraction if it includes 16 days or more.

(D) The period of active service is stated on some types of discharge or separation papers. All of the period between the veteran's entry upon active service and his discharge is active service. When the discharge does not show the date of entry into active service but does show the date of induction (or date of enlistment) the latter shall be accepted as date of entry into active service except as modified by other remarks on the reverse of the discharge paper.

(E) When a veteran files his first application for allowances the back of the veteran's discharge or separation paper shall be stamped or endorsed in ink with the following: "Application for readjustment allowances made through (name of agency) on (date)."

5. Registration for work and reporting unemployment: (A) Unemployed veterans shall be registered for work in accordance with the employment office regulations, policies, and procedures applicable to claimants under the unemployment compensation law of the agency.

(B) Unemployed veterans shall report their unemployment at such times and in such manner as is required by the agency for claimants under its unemployment compensation law.

(C) No unemployed veteran shall be eligible to receive an allowance for any week in which he was not so registered or with respect to which he did not so report; provided, that such failure to be registered or to report may be waived by the agency on the same basis as would justify such a waiver as to its unemployment-compensation claimants. Registration may be waived in case of illness as provided in paragraph 13.

6. Use of agency's type of week: Claims for allowances filed by unemployed veterans with a given agency shall be based on the weekly time unit which currently applies to claimants under the agency's unemployment-compensation law; provided, that any agency which applies other than a weekly time unit to unemployment-compensation claimants shall adopt suitable procedures to provide for a weekly basis for allowances to unemployed veterans.

7. Time and frequency of allowance payments: Allowances shall be paid at the intervals prescribed for unemployment-compensation payments by the law or regulations of the agency.

8. Required content of agency records: (A) Each agency shall maintain files containing all correspondence and other papers relating to individual veteran's claims, and such files shall be readily accessible to the agent, or other authorized representative of the Administrator.

(B) Each agency shall maintain a separate record for each veteran whose application is allowed. This record shall be maintained in such manner as will facilitate a prompt compilation of required statistical data and shall contain at least the following information:

(1) The veteran's name.

(2) His last service serial number, and branch of service.

(3) The date and place of the veteran's birth.

(4) The maximum number of weekly allowances to which the veteran was originally entitled.

(5) Number of weekly allowances paid, and total amount of weekly allowances paid during each consecutive period of unemployment.

(6) Number of monthly payments made to the self-employed and allowance weeks charged.

(7) Disqualifications imposed (current or past) and weeks involved.

(8) Record of transfer to or from another agency.

9. Required content of claims for total unemployment: (A) The initial, or additional first claim (i. e., the first claim taken after an intervening period of employment) filed by a veteran during any period of total unemployment shall contain a signed statement covering at least the following information:

(1) Residence.

(2) Ability and availability for work.

(3) Registration for work.

(4) Name of last employer.

(5) Reason for separation from last employer.

(6) Recent refusal of job offer or job referral.

(7) Recent failure to attend a free training course.

(B) Continued claims shall contain a signed statement covering at least the following information with respect to the week for which allowances is claimed:

(1) Ability and availability for work.

(2) Registration for work.

(3) Refusal of job offer or referral.

(4) Failure to attend free training courses.

(5) Wages earned.

(6) Benefits, received or accrued under other programs, which are deductible from allowances.

10. Allowance checks—Repayments, etc.: (A) Each agency shall supply its checks or other forms for payment of allowances in such form as is best suited to its own procedures and equipment, provided that the face of each such check (or order for payment) shall bear the following statement: "In payment for readjustment allowances under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

(B) Repayment to the agency of the amount of readjustment allowances paid veterans will be made promptly following receipt of certified voucher (Standard Form 1034) by the agent. Form 1034 will show the designation of the fund to be credited, the total amount to be repaid, the period covered, etc., and will be supported by a schedule or list of the individual items totaling the amount of the repayment claimed. This supporting schedule or list will contain the name of each veteran paid, his service serial number and the amount paid, and may be in the form of a copy of the check (or warrant) register or some similar product of the agency's accounting system.

(C) The amount of canceled checks and collections on account of items for which repayment has been made to the agency will be shown as a deduction from the amount stated on a subsequent Form 1034 and there will be attached a list of the checks canceled and the collections made.

(D) The agency will establish and maintain a separate depositary (banking) account for benefit payments under title V of the act and following each reconciliation of the account will furnish the agent a summary statement showing the balance at the beginning and end of the period, the total charges and total credits during the period, and the total of the checks outstanding at the end of the period.

11. Partial unemployment claims: (A) Each agency whose law provides for partial unemployment benefits shall take and pay veteran's claims for weeks of partial unemployment in a manner consistent with its methods under its unemployment compensation law.

(B) Any agency whose unemployment compensation law does not provide for the payment of partial unemployment benefits, shall provide for payment of veteran's partial unemployment benefits by adopting and putting into effect procedures which are insofar as practicable consistent with those of other agencies.

(C) Each agency's claim form for veteran's claims for weeks of partial unemployment shall contain a signed statement by the veteran covering the following information with respect to the week covered by the claim:

(1) Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 listed in subparagraph (A) of paragraph 9.

(2) Wages payable (i. e. earned).

(3) That work was for less than a full workweek.

(4) Reason for less than a full workweek.

12. Transfer of claims between agencies: (A) When a veteran, who has been receiving allowances through a given agency, transfers to the jurisdiction of another agency, he may continue his claims against the original agency under the interstate benefit payment plan (or, by direct mail with the consent of the original agency), or, at his option, he may request the new agency to have his allowance record transferred so that the new agency may pay his allowances.

(B) The form used by each agency for transferring a veteran's allowance record under subparagraph (a) shall contain the same minimum information specified under subparagraph (B) of paragraph 8.

13. Allowances during periods of illness or of disability: (A) Under the provisions of section 700 (b) (4) of the act, a period of continuous unemployment will be deemed to start on the effective date of the veteran's first claim for allowances during the period of continuous unemployment.

(B) Each agency shall initially, if practicable, secure evidence of the veteran's illness or disability through a certificate of his attending physician. The veteran's signed statement or other suitable evidence shall be obtained.

(C) So far as practicable, the agency shall assist the veteran in reporting weekly his continued unemployment, due to his illness or disability, by mail or through his designated representative.

(D) The first claim for allowance filed by a veteran for a period of illness or disability shall bear a signed statement by the veteran that he is unable to work and shall specify the nature of his illness or disability. Such claims shall also provide space for a physician's certification to the same effect, or for an explanation as to why such a certification could not practicably be secured.

(E) Continued claims for allowances filed by a veteran for a period of illness or disability under this regulation shall bear a signed statement by the veteran that he was unable to work throughout the week or weeks in question.

14. Allowances to the self-employed: (A) Each agency shall determine whether a veteran is engaged in self-employment, consistently with the definition of the employment relationship provided in its unemployment compensation law.

(B) A veteran shall be treated as having been fully engaged in self-employment during a given calendar month only if, throughout that month, he was engaged in his self-employment to the exclusion of any services in an employment relationship. For the purposes of this paragraph calendar month means one of the given 12 months of the calendar year.

(C) A veteran's net earnings from his self-employment include total income from self-employment less expenses incurred in securing such income. Personal or family expenditures shall not be deductible as expenses.

(D) Each self-employed individual shall maintain such records as are necessary for a determination of his net earnings. Such records shall reflect income received and expenses paid, and shall be open to inspection or audit by an authorized agency representative, or of the Veterans' Administration.

(E) Veterans' claims for allowances for months of self-employment shall be filed at a local office of the agency, or by mail on forms prescribed by the Administrator.

(F) Such claims shall be cleared through agency records, and the agency shall enter from the veteran's record, the maximum number of weeks of allowance which may be paid for the month in question. At the time of making such entry on the claim, the agency shall charge the claimant's record with payment of a monthly allowance (which shall be charged as the equivalent of 5 weekly allowances), subject to reversal of the charge, if the claim is subsequently disallowed.

(G) The agency shall deliver the claim, thus endorsed as to entitlement, to the agent, who shall examine the claim and either, disallow it, request further specified facts from the agency, or allow it and determine the veteran's net earnings and allowance payable for the month in question.

(H) If the agent disallows the claim, he shall so inform the agency. If he allows the claim, he shall secure payment thereof by appropriate notification to the nearest Treasury disbursing office.

(I) The agent's determination as to such claim shall be subject to review within the time set by the agency's law and regulations for the filing of appeals from initial determinations. The agent shall, when an application for review has been filed, conduct a recorded hearing and, based upon the record, issue his decision in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 18 (C).

15. Payment of claim after death: (A) In case a veteran dies, and at the time of his death there is due and payable to him readjustment allowances, the amount thereof shall, upon claim therefor, be certified to the agent. The agent shall forward such certification to the Dependents Claims Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., for adjudication. The amount of such allowances shall be awarded under the provisions of R. & P. R-2660 (A) and (C) to the surviving spouse, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the child, or children, dependent mother or father, in the order named. In all other cases only so much of the unpaid allowances may be paid as may be necessary to reimburse a person who bore the expense of last illness and burial, provided that no part of the allowances due the deceased veteran shall be used to reimburse any political subdivision of the United States, or of any State, for expenses incurred in the veteran's last sickness or burial.

16. Agency application of disqualifications: Each agency shall take appropriate steps consistent with its established administrative policies, procedures, and precedent (disregarding the provision "attributable to the employer") to enforce and apply the disqualifications provided in the act. Each agency shall interpret and apply such disqualifications so far as practicable consistently with decisions of the agent on second appeal, and with decisions of the Administrator on final review.

17. Additional disqualifications: Pursuant to section 800 (c) (2) of the act, the Administrator hereby prescribes that each agency may apply the following additional disqualifications. In the case of successive (consecutive) disqualifications and the assessing of

additional disqualifications (except as determined by the Administrator upon referral by the agency) the aggregate number of weeks to be assessed by the agency shall not exceed 13.

18. Determinations and appeals with respect to unemployment: (A) Each determination of the agency with respect to a veteran's application or claim shall be in writing and shall bear a clear statement of his right to appeal.

(B) Such determination shall be final unless within the time set by the agency's law and regulations for the filing of appeals from initial determinations an appeal is taken therefrom. Except as provided in this instruction such appeal shall be heard and decided by the same referee or tribunal which would hear and decide the appeal if it had arisen under the law of the agency. The hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the agency's law and regulations, in the same manner as are appeals from the agency's unemployment-compensation benefit determinations.

(C) Each decision of such referee or tribunal shall contain: The name of the agency whose determination is appealed; the name, most recent serial number, and last known address of the claimant; a complete statement of the case; findings of fact; conclusions of law; and the decision. Such decision shall be signed and dated.

(D) Unless an appeal is heard and decided by the referee or tribunal within 30 days after the date upon which the appeal was filed with the agency the claimant may make written application to the agent to have such appeal transferred to, and heard and decided by the agent. Upon receiving such application the agent may, if after consultation with the agency, he finds that such delay was unreasonable, order the appeal transferred to him for hearing and decision.

(E) The claimant shall be promptly notified of the referee's or tribunal's decision and such decision shall be final unless within 30 days after the date of mailing of notice to the claimant's last known address or in the absence of such mailing within 30 days after the delivery of such notice a written appeal pursuant to section 1102 of the act is filed with the agency, the referee or tribunal, or the agent.

(F) When such appeal is filed the record shall be transmitted to the agent. Upon such agent's request he shall be furnished with a transcript of the hearing on appeal.

(G) Interstate appeal proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with the law and regulations of the agency conducting the hearing and appeal.

(H) The phrase in section 1103 of the act, "the appellate procedures being subject to final appeal to the Administrator" is hereby construed to mean "the appellate proceeding and the decision being subject to final appeal to the Administrator."

(I) For the purpose of this instruction the veteran shall be deemed to be the only interested party, other than the United States, except that in cases involving a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute the employer shall be deemed to be an interested party.

(J) Any appeal to the Administrator from the decision of the agent must be made in writing within 60 days from the date of mailing of notice of decision to last known address of the veteran.

19. Prosecutions and penalties. In case an agency discovers an apparent violation of the act, subject to penalty under section 1300 or 1301, the agency shall report the relevant facts to the agent, who will be responsible for further proceedings.

20. Force of instructions on forms. The Administrator's instructions appearing on forms supplied by him under this instruction shall have the same force and effect as if they were set out in full in this instruction.

21. Statistical reports. Each agency shall report to the agent promptly after the close of each calendar week the number of veterans who, during that week, were paid allowances by the agency on account of unemployment, the total amount so paid, and the number of veterans whose entitlement expired during the week. The agency shall furnish such other reports or information which the Administrator finds necessary. It will be the policy of the Administrator, where feasible, to consult with the agencies before requiring additional statistical reports.

22. Individual reports. Each agency shall, with respect to each veteran whose right to benefits has been exhausted or has expired, or whose record has been transferred to another agency, or at intervals as prescribed by the Administrator, report the following information on forms supplied by the Administrator.

(1) The name of the veteran.

(2) His serial number and branch of service.

(3) Total number of weekly allowances and amount paid during each consecutive period of unemployment and the beginning and ending dates thereof.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1944.

Well Earned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Post of August 31 pays the following editorial tribute to the officers and men of the United States merchant marine:

WELL EARNED

Well deserved are the new war awards authorized by the President for the men of the United States merchant marine. A ribbon bar has been created for gallantry as well as a medal for meritorious service and a plaque for any ship cited for distinguished service. The merchant officers and sailors have been in the thick of this war from the start, first by braving submarines and enemy aircraft to get vital supplies across the two oceans, and more recently by taking part in the invasions which opened the big Allied offensives. They deserve official recognition.

Federal Assistance to States for Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address by Dr. Howard A. Dawson before the Representative Assembly of the National Education Association dealing with pending legislation on the subject of Federal assistance to the States for public education.

In this connection I would also like to call attention to that part of article V of the platform of the Democratic Party dealing with education adopted by the Democratic National Convention, 1944, which is as follows:

We favor Federal aid to education, administered by the States without interference by the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CURRENT BATTLE FOR THE PEOPLE'S SCHOOLS

Fortunately, the teaching profession is not under regimentation, political or military. We are free to put on whatever kind of fight we think is necessary for the benefit of the cause of public education and against those who we think are against that cause.

Recently I heard the story of a colonel who stepped on the captain's sore toe. The captain kicked the colonel's shins. The colonel reciprocated by kicking the captain's shins. A private was standing nearby and saw what was going on. He proceeded to kick the shins of both the colonel and the captain.

A military investigation followed. The colonel explained that he had rather awkwardly stepped on the captain's toes. He was sorry and offered to apologize. The captain explained that indeed his toe was very sore, that the pain was so excruciating he did not have time to take a second thought, that he had impolitely kicked the colonel's shins, that he was sorry and offered apologies. But the court wanted to know from the private why he entered the melee. Said the private: "Your Honor, please, that is very simple. When I saw the captain kick the colonel, I thought the gol-darned war was over."

Some people seem to think that whenever they want to they can kick the shins of the organized teaching profession. They are mistaken. The war against the enemies of public education is perpetually on.

No institution of the people of America has made so great a contribution to the preservation of freedom, to economic progress, and to security among men as the public school. The foundations of the knowledge, skill, character, morale, and patriotism of this generation of young Americans have been laid in classrooms of American schools. There may be measures of shortcomings, but the full measure of their character, skill, and devotion has been demonstrated from Bataan and Corregidor to Bizerte and Anzio to the Normandy Peninsula. No defense of our schools beyond these demonstrations of skill and devotion by the products of schools is needed in this critical hour of American history.

Public education has long since demonstrated its essentiality to the winning of the war. The public-school teachers, who, by the Philistines, the enemies of the children of light, have been charged in the halls of Congress with seeking selfish advantages in asking for living wages, have long since demonstrated that the services they have rendered to the youth of the Nation in the dark days of economic depression and public neglect are the foundation of military victory on the far-flung battlefields of the earth.

If we know anything at all, we know that an army for the defense of the bulwarks of democracy and freedom cannot be fought by illiterates. We do not know the full extent of the number of men who have been rejected for military service because of lack of educational qualifications, but we do know

that up until about a year ago 2,997,000 men between the ages of 18 and 44 years had been rejected because of physical, moral, and educational deficiencies. Nearly a third of these men were physically fit and otherwise qualified except for practical purposes they were illiterates.

Illiteracy and near-illiteracy are the products of neglect in past years and must be stopped at their source. They can be stopped only by giving an American standard of educational opportunity to all of the children of the people of America.

The Nation has never undertaken any such program. For the most part the blessings of education to our national preservation are not the products of any demonstrated interest of the United States Government in the education of the masses of the people. For generations too many of the representatives of the American people, like the swine who fatten on the acorns from the mighty oak, never look above to see from whence their blessings have come.

The public schools of this Nation have been in the midst of a crisis for some months. During the last 2 years 360,000 teachers were new to their jobs. In all there are only about 900,000 school teachers in a normal year.

With nearly 70,000 teachers entering the military service during the last 2 years, and about 62,000 entering industry and similar nonteaching employment, with some 13,000 classrooms vacant because teachers could not be found, and some 17,000 teaching positions abolished as a result of overcrowding classes, abolishing subjects and closing schools, and with over 50,000 teachers teaching on emergency certificates, no further evidence of the crisis in education should be needed.

The origin of the crisis in education is not a shortage of qualified persons to teach school; the shortage is in the funds to pay living wages to teachers so as to meet the competition of the Federal Government and of private industry. Last year 254,000 teachers were being paid less than $1,200 per year; 44,000 received less than $600. Last year the annual average salary of all teachers was $1,507, while for rural teachers it was only $967. Their salaries can be compared with the annual salaries of Federal Government employees, excluding military personnel, $2,235; employees in manufacturing industries, $2,363.

The cost of living has increased during the war period 23 percent in cities and 38 percent in rural areas, but teachers' salaries have increased on the average only 8 percent.

School teachers are the largest class of employees engaged in an enterprise essential to the winning of the war and the peace for whom the Federal Government has done nothing to adjust their salaries to meet the current cost of living. The Congress has increased the pay of Federal employees by about 25 percent. The increase of more than 80 percent in the wages and salaries in manufacturing has been paid almost entirely by the Federal Government, since most of the industries are engaged in production for the Government under war contracts. The Government in making war contracts takes into consideration the cost of wages, has the power and the machinery to fix wages, and guarantees the entrepreneur at least 6 percent profit.

The facts as to the inequalities of educational opportunity among the States of this Union are too well known to need repetition here. It is a known and irrefutable fact that the inequalities and lack of educational opportunity are not due to lack of interest or effort on the part of the communities and States where educational opportunity is least. Only an intolerable bigot or an economic ignoramus would any longer argue that a long-range program of adequate educational opportunity for all American children and youth is merely a matter of the States placing their fiscal houses in order.

The inequalities of educational opportunity are due to the insuperable differences in economic ability of the several States and to the differences in the number of children in proportion to the adult population. As a Nation we are spending the most money for education where there are the fewest children, and on children who in turn will have the fewest children. As a policy for a democratic nation we are fast pursuing cultural, economic, and political suicide.

For years we have endeavored to secure a policy of national contribution to supplement State and local effort to support a standard of educational opportunity adequate to national security and prosperity. Those efforts have as a final result proved of no avail.

Unfortunately, in the Halls of the United States Congress there has for years been a selfish and unenlightened minority who both by accident and carefully nurtured machination and design have been able to prevent the cause of the public schools coming to a fair vote in the Nation's legislative assembly.

Those minority enemies are still in power. It remains to be seen whether a united teaching profession can yield a democratic influence sufficiently strong to produce a genuine expression of majority opinion.

When I make the statement that there are powerful enemies to the cause of education sitting in the Halls of the United States Congress, it becomes an easy matter to cite the evidence. Among the individual saboteurs of public education is the Senator from Ohio, Mr. TAFT. His opening statement in the debate on the Federal aid bill last October was to this effect: "This is a revolutionary proposal, probably the most revolutionary ever made in the Congress of the United States. It does not relate to the war effort. There is nothing that can be done to education that even in the remotest way would contribute to the winning of the war. Nothing we can do about education will in any way affect the conduct of the war."

Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, tossed a challenge to teachers not only of his own State, but of the entire Nation when he said, "I have not had a single request from the rank and file of the people of Colorado to support the bill. Every request I have received has come from the teaching profession."

Then, to make clear his disbelief, the Senator from Colorado added that the 1,000,000 men rejected from military service because of educational deficiencies were for the most part all morons and incapable of receiving education.

It is disappointing that those of us in the educational fraternity have not sufficiently impressed the cause of public education upon the layman constituency and the parents of the children to cause a spontaneous outburst of support for a piece of legislation such as we had before the Congress last October.

For years the House Committee on Education has been deliberately filled by a minority known to be enemies of public education. The situation is no different now, although we have had some very stanch friends on the committee.

I wonder if those who are listening to me realize that there has been only one time, so far as I have been able to find in the written history of the United States Congress, when a major educational bill for the benefit of the masses of the people through the public schools has ever been approved by the House Committee on Education?

In 1917, when the Smith-Hughes bill was enacted, it became necessary for the House itself to take the bill away from the committee, although the chairman of the committee was the author of the bill. We are now in a somewhat similar position with respect to the Ramspeck bill. Fortunately, the Congress has provided a democratic means by which the Members of Congress can overcome the handicap of being blocked by a committee that deliberately undertakes to thwart the will of the majority. This method is known as a motion to discharge the committee. It is a thoroughly democratic method that has been provided by the House itself as one of its rules of operation.

My friends, you will find Congressmen who will tell you that they do not believe in that method of handling legislation in Congress. The answer is that if it is not the proper method, then a majority of the Congress ought to vote to repeal it. As long as it is the democratic official method of handling legislation, there is certainly nothing unbecoming in any Congressman signing a petition to discharge the House Committee on Education, which has now had the bill before it for more than 12 months, and which, although having voted to have a hearing, has continuously postponed action from time to time. Furthermore, it is the solemn duty of the organized teaching profession and of all friends of the schools to urge Congressmen to use this legislative procedure in behalf of the American children.

The fight is on. It is up to us. Do we expect to continue to take a licking lying down or as American citizens do we assume the responsibility of fighting back for the schools of the people's children?

It behooves every one of us when he returns to his home to contact his Congressman, to urge him to sign this discharge motion as soon as the Congress reconvenes. It becomes a duty of each of us to inform the lay constituency of the schools of the situation and have them contact their Congressmen. The time is now. It is not after Labor Day. It will not be after the election in November. After the schools open in September, there will be hundreds of thousands of children victimized every day and every hour by the national neglect of the cause of the public schools.

We have powerful friends in the Congress. I would have you remember that one of the great friends of the cause of public education is Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah, and that he is up for election again in that great State.

It is the duty of every school teacher and every true friend of the schools in Utah to see that Senator THOMAS comes back to Congress to lead the fight for education.

My friends, we have recently had some demonstrations of the power of the influence of teachers working in a righteous cause. It was no accident that LISTER HILL returned to the Senate in the Alabama election. An overwhelming majority of the school teachers of Alabama went all out for Mr. HILL. The result speaks for itself.

It was no political accident that CLAUDE PEPPER will again sit in the Halls of the United States Senate to lead the fight for the common people of Florida and of the Nation. The school teachers of that State made their contribution. In the primary election of that State, Federal aid was an issue; Federal aid won.

Again, my friends, it is no political accident that that not-so-distinguished Republican Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] will not again grace the Halls of Congress.

The power of the organized teaching profession has but begun to find expression and I predict that before next November 7 there will be many people in the Nation aware that the school children of America have a voice of justice and equity as well as a voice of power and of influence.

In these United States of ours, we believe in the democratic doctrine of equality of opportunity. We believe that if by public processes and private belief and practice, we can keep the doors of opportunity open to all Americans, rewards in our economic system will tend to be distributed somewhat

according to merit. So long as we subscribe to that political and economic philosophy there is no choice for us as a democratic Nation, except to make large investments of our economic resources to keep the doors of opportunity open to American youth. These doors can be successfully kept open only by a universal system of free public education. For these reasons, I believe that an action by the United States Congress giving Federal aid to the States for the support of public schools will strengthen the faith of the American people in the long future of American democracy.

The question is, "What will you do about it?"

The Government's Suit Against the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter written by Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge, published in the New York Times of August 30, 1944. The letter deals with an important subject, but it seems to me in many places to show a misunderstanding of the fixing of rates by railroads. In the letter Mr. Berge explains something concerning the suit instituted by the Government to prohibit the railroads from violating the Sherman Antitrust Act in the matter of fixing of railroad rates.

In connection with Mr. Berge's letter I ask also to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of October 22, 1943, which deals largely with the same subject discussed in Mr. Berge's letter.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of Augut 30, 1944]

LETTERS TO THE TIMES

SUIT AGAINST ROADS DEFENDED—ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDS THEY VIOLATED ANTITRUST ACT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial today concerning the antitrust suit against the railroad conveys an inaccurate impression about the procedure for establishing lawful rates, and I think it should be corrected. At one point you state that "railroad rates for more than half a century have been fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission," and at another point you state that "it is obvious that we must choose between Government-regulated rates—the policy evolved through the last half century—or free competitive rates adopted by each railroad."

From your statements it would appear that the scheme of regulation which this country has adopted provides that all rates are to be fixed by the regulatory authority, and that competition is incompatible with the type of regulation provided by law. The fact is, however, that under existing law the railroads themselves initiate the rates by filing proposed rate schedules with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and when rates are thus filed they become effective after 30 days unless suspended by order of the Commission. The Commission may undertake such an inquiry either on complaint or on its own motion. The law does not contemplate that the commission shall review the reasonableness of all rates filed, nor, indeed, would that be physically possible. The Supreme Court has expressly held that the Interstate Commerce Act "did not take from the carriers their power to initiate rates—that is, the power in the first instance to fix rates, or to increase or to reduce them" (*Arizona Grocery Co.* v. *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway*, 284 U. S. 370, 384).

Few rates reviewed

Actually, something less than 1 percent of the rates filed are subsequently reviewed by the Commission. This is entirely consistent with the spirit and purpose of the Interstate Commerce Act, which is to leave the primary function of rate making with the individual railroads themselves, confining Commission inquiry to cases where the Commission has reason to question the propriety of the rate initiated by the railroad.

But this procedure obviously does not exclude the application of the antitrust laws. If railroads act collusively in the initiation of rates, or through agreements bring organized coercion on particular railroads in regard to their rates or other practices, then the antitrust laws apply just as they do to any other field of business. There is nothing in the Interstate Commerce Act which authorizes railroads to agree among themselves to file noncompeting rates for the same or similar services, nor is there anything in the act which otherwise exempts them from the antitrust laws in this connection.

The coordinate application of the Sherman Act and the Interstate Commerce Act is clear. The Sherman Act requires the rates which are filed to be noncollusive; the Interstate Commerce Act provides for a commission wise competitive. The suit in no way involves with power to rectify rates which are otherjoint through rates.

The Supreme Court has held that "the Anti-Trust Act applies to railroads" (*United States* v. *Trans-Missouri Freight Association*, 166 U. S. 290, 341) and that "the Commission has no power to enforce the Sherman Act as such" (*McLean Trucking Company* v. *United States*, 321 U. S. 67, 79).

Collusion is charged

It has also, of course, been held time and again that price-fixing agreements between competitors are per se illegal under the antitrust laws, irrespective of the reasonableness of the prices (*United States* v. *Socony Vacuum Oil Co.*, 310 U. S. 150, 223). Thus, charges that the railroads act collusively in the initiation of rates, or that they make agreements to prevent individual railroads from initiating lower rates or competing in regard to services, involve violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

You state that we must choose between Government-regulated rates or free competitive rates. I do not think that there is any such issue before us, and certainly no such issue is raised by the recent antitrust suit. The framework of our present scheme of regulation contemplates freedom on the part of individual carriers to act independently in the initiation of rates. That is the way we want to keep it, and the antitrust laws step in when the railroads through combination or agreement try to interfere with that freedom. That is what the present antitrust suit is about and it involves no new principle.

There is no way by which the Interstate Commerce Commission can act to keep railroads from organizing to prevent each other from initiating lower rates. The Interstate Commerce Act is silent on combinations and agreements of this sort, and if it undertook to prohibit them the prohibitions would be mere unnecessary repetition of the provisions of the Sherman Act.

The merits of the particular allegations of the Government's complaint will be thoroughly presented to the court in due course. But it did seem to me that what appears to be a fundamental misconception as to our system of rate regulation and its relation to the antitrust laws ought to be corrected now.

WENDELL BERGE,
Assistant Attorney General.

WASHINGTON, *August 25, 1944.*

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of October 22, 1943]

LOOK HOMEWARD, MR. W.

In his new role as No. 1 lambaster for the New Deal, Vice President WALLACE made a two-fisted attack at Dallas Wednesday night on the developing transportation monopoly in this country.

Mr. WALLACE says "plunderers," who, he asserts, are inspired by Wall Street, seek to seize control of new forms of transportation in order to establish monopolistic control over all rail, motor, water, and air transportation. He predicts that unless Congress is on its guard to fight transportation monopoly whenever "this Wall Street inspired creature lifts its ugly head in Washington," the public will insist on public ownership of all transportation.

Whether we accept the Vice President's major premise that this "creature" is nurtured solely by Wall Street, it is clear that the whole trend has been to increase and not to lighten the cost of transportation to business and agriculture.

State and Federal governments have spent vast sums of public money to build highways and waterways in order that people might have cheap, quick transportation. Now the people's money is being spent on a scale never before known to develop air transportation. Yet despite the great public interest represented by these expenditures, the benefits of cheaper and more efficient means of transportation are not accruing in full measure to the consumer.

Why?

Wall Street?

Surely, Mr. WALLACE is too intelligent to be satisfied in his own mind with so oversimplified an explanation of a serious problem.

If transportation monopoly is withholding from the people the full benefit of their investment, whose fault is it?

The clear answer is that it is the responsibility of the Government—which means, during the last decade, the Roosevelt administration, of which Mr. WALLACE is a part.

With the exception of the Attorney General's office which is now endeavoring to prevent legalization of the monopolistic set-up of rate bureaus, the record of the Roosevelt administration has been one that makes bigger and better transportation monopolies inevitable. If Mr. WALLACE were frank he would point out that the White House has not merely failed to prevent the transportation monopoly, to which Mr. WALLACE calls attention, but has actually abetted it.

The benefits of cheaper and more efficient means of transportation are not fully accruing to the people because Government regulation of interstate commerce has ceased to perform the function for which it was created. The Interstate Commerce Act was passed in 1887 to protect the people against extortionate rail rates, unjust discrimination, and undue preferences. With the passage of the Esch-Cummings Act in 1920, this purpose was sidetracked and regulation began to concern itself largely with insuring a fair return to the railroads.

What was begun under the Esch-Cummings Act was carried to its full fruition under the leadership and during the administration of President Roosevelt. The Motor Carrier Act of 1935, the Guffey coal bill and the Transportation Act of 1940 all set the stage for the very dangers Vice President Wallace now sees staring us in the face.

The Transportation Act of 1940, which placed all forms of transportation except air transport under I. C. C. regulation, was President Roosevelt's own answer to the transportation problem. This act amplified by the Guffey Act, has within itself the machinery to produce the monopolistic ogre now haunting the dreams of the No. 2 man in the administration which fathered it.

Small wonder that the only answer Mr. Wallace can discover is a threat of that Frankenstein of all monopolies — public ownership.

The annual transportation bill of the American people is estimated to be $20,000,000,000. Today half of this bill is paid by the Government—by you as a taxpayer.

Anything that reduces this cost without interfering with the efficiency of service directly benefits every farmer, businessman, and manufacturer.

The prosperity and the development of Minnesota and the upper Mississippi Valley depend directly upon the availability of low-cost, efficient transportation of all kinds.

For decades we have ben promised relief from high and discriminatory rates. No administration has been more vociferous in those promises than Mr. Roosevelt's.

What has been the result?

The Motor Carrier Act and higher truck rates.

The Guffey Act and higher priced coal. The Transportation Act of 1940 and the leveling of all transportation rates at more uniform and higher levels.

If Vice President WALLACE is sincerely concerned about the dangers of a transportation monopoly he should do some work in the White House backyard, and address his talents and his voice to the administration of which he is a part.

The Government's Suit Against the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the antitrust suit recently filed by the Justice Department against the railroads has caused widespread consternation among those who are planning the railroad program for the post-war period. While Congress is concerning itself with reconversion legislation, the Justice Department is making it impossible for our great railroad transportation systems to plan for peacetime conversion with any assurance, and for that reason, among many others, it is most unfortunate.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the New York Times of August 25, designated A Political Suit?; and a second editorial from the New York Times under date of August 30, and also a story appearing in the Wyoming State Tribune of August 29 headlined "Jeffers wants Roosevelt as suit witness." I had intended to ask that a letter written by Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge to the New York Times be published in the RECORD, but the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has previously asked that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 25, 1944]

A POLITICAL SUIT?

The antitrust suit filed by the Department of Justice against 47 railroads, J. P. Morgan & Co., and Kuhn, Loeb & Co. has all the earmarks of a political move in the Democratic election campaign. It certainly does not seem to make sense on any other interpretation.

The railroads concerned are accused of collusion in fixing rates or in refusing to reduce rates. Everyone with even an elementary acquaintance with the subject knows that railroad rates for more than half a century have been fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, not by the railroads, and that the Commission has power to fix minimum rates as well as maximum rates. Not a single railroad rate in the United States can be fixed with the Commission's disapproval. When the Department of Justice attacks railroad rates, therefore, it is attacking either the integrity or the competence of the Government's own I. C. C. Is this what the Department of Justice means to do?

The Department of Justice accuses the railroads of fixing unfair rates for Western shippers as compared with Eastern shippers. This looks as if one branch of the administration were trying to assure the Western farmers that its heart was on their side. But if there is any discrimination in railroad rates against the West and in favor of the East (which may be seriously doubted), it is there because the Interstate Commerce Commission put it there. That Commission, moreover, has full power to remove it. This charge about eastern and western rates is ancient and stale. It can only serve to stir up section economic animosity.

Possibly because it recognizes how feeble its accusation about railroad rates will sound to intelligent voters in view of the known facts, the Department of Justice accuses the railroads of collusion also in discouraging improvements in service and equipment. It talks of delays in the installation of air-conditioning equipment. Does the Department expect that in wartime, when every man and machine is needed for the war effort, there ought to be a diversion of manpower and materials to turn out air-conditioned railroad cars? On the question of basic wartime service the record of the railroads speaks for itself. In the last war, under direct Government operation, the railroads of the country increased their ton-mile performance from 1916 to 1918 only 12 percent. In the present war, under private management and voluntary collaboration, railroad ton-miles increased from 1941 to 1943 by 53 percent, and are still rising. Further, where passenger traffic on the railroads increased only 23 percent from 1916 to 1918, it increased between 1941 and 1943 by 200 percent, and is still going up. There has been no serious congestion, as in the last war. If all this is the result of "conspiracy" and "collusion," we might ask for more of it.

The Department of Justice's suit sounds like a revival of all the favorite political targets of approximately 1912. It would not have been the perfect specimen it is of that period if it had not dragged in the names of J. P. Morgan & Co. and Kuhn, Loeb & Co. As neither bankers nor railroads can make a move today without the approval of either the I. C. C. or the S. E. C., the Department of Justice must once more be attacking the competence of another governmental agency.

On the general principle involved, it is obvious that we must choose between Government-regulated rates—the policy evolved through the last half century—or free competitive rates adopted by each railroad. It was the latter system that led to regulated rates. But we cannot have it both ways. And if there is to be a change of policy the proper body to adopt that change is Congress, not Mr. Berge or Mr. Biddle.

If the Department of Justice's suit were suspicious on no other ground, it would be so on that of its timing. It is filed in the midst of a Presidential campaign, with the election less than 3 months away. But Mr. Berge is himself quoted as saying that under any circumstances 6 to 12 months will intervene before the hearings begin in court. The railroads, in other words, will have no legal opportunity to answer the charges until after the election has passed.

[From the New York Times of August 30, 1944]

MORE ON THE RAILROAD SUIT

Elsewhere on this page we publish a letter from Wendell Berge, the Assistant Attorney General, taking issue with our editorial on the suit filed by the Department of Justice a few days ago against 47 railroads and 2 banking houses.

Our editorial declared that "railroad rates for more than half a century have been fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, not by the railroads, and that the Commission has power to fix minimum rates as well as maximum rates. Not a single railroad rate in the United States can be fixed with the Commission's disapproval." This is the essential situation. Regardless of the technical forms of procedure, it is the I. C. C. which to all practical intents and purposes, through its complete power of approval or disapproval, fixes railroad rates.

There are approximately 20,000 classifications of articles, and it is necessary to have published and on file a rate covering possible movement of any one of them from any one to any other one of approximately 75,000 freight stations. That is why the detailed freight-rate structure must be left to the railroads. But the Commission fixes the basic rates which control all the others.

The Commission acts, moreover, not only on the initiative of the railroads, but on the initiative of shippers and on its own initiative. In 1936, for example, to take one especially prominent example, it ordered all the eastern railroads, against their protests, to reduce their passenger fares from 3.6 cents a mile to 2 cents a mile. The Commission has always used its own judgment on the general level of freight rates and on the relationship of rates.

This brings us to the general issue raised by Mr. Berge in his letter and by the Department of Justice in its suit. What is clearly involved here is a question of basic governmental policy. The antitrust suit of the Department of Justice runs head on against the interpretation of the law that has been held by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This may be illustrated in the 15 percent case decided on October 20, 1931. The I. C. C. then declared:

"The records show that in the past decade the railroads have made great strides in improving their service and at the same time operating with greater efficiency and economy. But what they have done * * * has been characterized by continual intensifying of their own competition. At a time when as an industry they have new enemies to face, their warfare with each other has grown more bitter, so that economies in operation have been offset in part by the growth of competitive waste.

"All this is contrary to the spirit of the Transportation Act of 1920. Congress then looked beyond the individual railroad to the concept of a national transportation system. It pointed the way, in the consolidation provisions, to the reduction of competitive wastes. It went to the extreme of removing the barriers of restrictive Federal and State antitrust legislation which might otherwise stand in the way.

"Short of consolidations, it opened wide the door to agreements for the pooling of service and of revenue, whenever it could be shown to our satisfaction that such agreements were in the public interest.

"Much has been accomplished in the way of unification, but much remains to be done, and the pooling provisions of the law stand almost unused. Further progress along the lines pointed out by Congress will aid in bringing about the cooperation which is essential to railroad salvation."

This view was reiterated and supplemented before a Senate committee in June of last year by the late Joseph B. Eastman, who had been for many years a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission and was at the time of testifying Director of the Office of Defense Transportation. Such complaint as there was about the rate-making machinery of the transportation industry of the country had its source, Mr. Eastman declared, "not in the shippers of the country but in the lawyers and economists of the Department of Justice." "It must be evident to any reasonable man," he said, "that the carriers cannot respond to all the duties imposed by law if each individual carrier acts in a vacuum. It is a situation, under all conditions, which plainly calls for consultation, conference, and organization and for many acts of a joint or cooperative character. * * * For my own part, I have no doubt whatever that organizations of the carriers * * * in general serve a very useful purpose and are desirable in the public interest."

Referring to the so-called western commissioner agreement, on which the present suit of the Department of Justice is based, Mr. Eastman remarked that he had known of that agreement at the time it was formulated, that he was convinced "it had no sinister purpose," and that there "never was any secret about it." Saying that, in his judgment, the plan never accomplished much, he added that he sympathized with its general idea—that is, "to put a brake upon competitive waste and extravagance." Incidentally, he remarked, in the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act of 1938, the carriers were enjoined to create such committees. Mr. Eastman concluded that the railroads, in order to fulfill the duties and obligations imposed on them by the Interstate Commerce Act, "must be in a position to consult, confer, and deal collectively."

These statements of the Commission and of Mr. Eastman make one thing clear. Either the present suit of the Department of Justice is an attack upon the integrity or the competence of the Government's own I. C. C. to perform the work assigned to it, or the Department of Justice is seeking to reverse the long-established policy of rate-making that has the approval of Congress. It is folly for one agency of the Government to sue the railroads for actions which another agency of the Government has encouraged them to take. The Department of Justice should take its case to Congress, not to the courts.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune of August 29, 1944]

JEFFERS WANTS ROOSEVELT AS SUIT WITNESS—ANTITRUST ACTION SAID ATTEMPT TO WIPE OUT I. C. C.

LOS ANGELES.—W. M. Jeffers, president of the Union Pacific, declared today that antitrust charges against western railroads seek the elimination of the Interstate Commerce Commission and that as one of the parties to the action he would like to have "none other than President Roosevelt as a witness."

Jeffers referred to an address made by President Roosevelt at Salt Lake City in 1932, when he was seeking his first term as Chief Executive. President Roosevelt's address was a commendation of the supervision of the railroads by the Interstate Commerce Commission. At that time Roosevelt said, in part:

"But as the railroads have been allowed to increase their capacity far beyond traffic needs, the wastes of competition have become more and more insupportable. Now we face the issues: shall we permit them—in fact, force them—to bankrupt each other? Or shall we permit them to consolidate and so to economize through reducing unprofitable services?

"Nearly $5,000,000,000 (of railroad bonds) are owned by savings banks and insurance companies—which means that they are owned by the millions of policy holders and savings-bank depositors.

"When you put money in the bank or pay that insurance premium you are buying an interest in the railroads. Some two billions more are held by churches, hospitals, charitable organizations, colleges, and similar institutions, as endowments. Even railroad stocks are held in small units of a few shares, here and there, by school teachers, doctors, salesmen, thrifty workmen.

"Regulation, in fact, has protected investors as well as patrons and I think that no enlightened railroad man would care to go back to the old days when unregulated railroad operation landed one-third of the railroad mileage in receivership."

MADE POSSIBLE RISE OF WEST

"I believe the policy of enforced competition between railroads can be carried to unnecessary lengths. * * * The railroad mesh is the warp on which our economic web is largely fashioned. It has made a continent into a Nation. It has saved us from splitting, like Europe, into small clashing units. It has made possible the rise of the West. It is our service of supply."

The antitrust action, Jeffers said, aims to bring about the very things the President believed should be avoided.

At a press conference after his arrival in Los Angeles today, Jeffers explained to newspapermen that the action taken by Attorney General Francis Biddle and Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge would have the effect of eliminating the Interstate Commerce Commission and returning the railroads to cut-throat competition which would bring chaos to the industry and to the West.

"It is a matter of common knowledge," Jeffers told newsmen, "that the conspiracy suit is purely political. On the basis of the amazing job the railroads have done in the war effort I think it will eventually occur to Berge and Biddle before election rolls around that it is poor politics.

"The charges lead me to believe that these young men in the Attorney General's office are seeking the elimination of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the transfer of its duties to the Department of Justice. This would tear down what has taken more than 50 years to build.

"No industry is as rigidly supervised as the railroads. Every activity in which the railroads engage is subject to review and approval or disapproval by the Interstate Commerce Commission—and properly so. The Commission has done a remarkable job. It is nonpartisan and nonsectional."

Referring to Roosevelt's 1932 address in Salt Lake City, Jeffers said:

"I don't think there ever was a clearer exposition made of the railroads in this country than Mr. Roosevelt made then. If Mr. Roosevelt was right then—and he was—then Berge and Biddle are wrong now.

"I should think both Berge and Biddle would want to study the President's speech, because they would find all the answers to their charges.

"Everything railroads have done literally conforms to what the President said in that speech. Inasmuch as I am one of the railroad men named as a party to the suit, I would be glad to have none other than Mr. Roosevelt for my witness."

The Union Pacific executive reminded reporters of a recent statement by Col. J. Monroe Johnson, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation. "Colonel Johnson," Jeffers told newsmen, "has said that the best war job is being done by the railroads, and he didn't except the armed services. Johnson appreciates the efforts the railroads are making."

Jeffers said the land-grant rate law, which would be repealed by a House bill now before the Senate for approval, may cost the railroads from three hundred to five hundred million dollars after the war. This is a probability because the Government, which is entitled to a 50-percent reduction on much of the freight hauled, may decide that certain tariffs charged as commercial traffic should have been charged at land-grant rates.

"The Government will tell us we charged a commercial rate when a land-grant rate should have applied and will deduct the amount from what we have coming. We have no recourse. Inasmuch as the Government accountants are 2 years behind in their work, the railroads will be faced with a three hundred to five hundred million dollar kickback."

Education for World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Education for World Affairs—Basis for an Understanding Peace," delivered by Dr. William M. Hepburn, dean of the law school of the University of Alabama, at the summer school graduation exercises on August 25, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When the war is over, peace is not likely to last unless the American people have a hand in making it and understand it. The schools of America must help the American

people to make and keep an understanding peace.

Fourteen months ago the Birmingham Age-Herald published an editorial called A People's Peace, concluding:

"Is it possible that there is entrenched in the Senate enough isolationist strength to thwart the clear wishes of the American people? Such a suggestion would stir all believers in world collaboration into crusading action. * * * It is growing plainer every moment that if we are to have a real peace it will have to be a people's peace." [1]

A peace based on the informed understanding of the American people would probably be unique. I doubt whether there has ever been a people's peace—a peace of understanding among the American people, of understanding by us of other peoples.

In the regulation of human affairs two institutions stand out as successes, one as our saddest failure. The successes are popular government, whether of the American, British, or some other type, all loosely referred to as "democracy"; and popular education, which, together with a free press, is democracy's chief support, its defender, and its voice.

The institution which proclaims mankind's greatest failure is war. Wars, which must be fought by the common man, are not his deliberate creation. To the prevention of wars, and the promotion of stable peace, the common man, who fights all wars, has contributed little. He has contributed little because the institutions of popular government and education have been isolated from world affairs. The common man—you and I and our neighbors—has not deliberately started any war, but once each generation he is called upon to fight one, and when it is over other people and other forces take control, and the common man retires from the place which only war gives him in world affairs, to wait until policies not of his making again require his presence in the camp and on the battlefields.

There are few problems of a public nature, no matter how urgent and grave, that may not be submitted, at least for good advice, to American public opinion, if the public is informed of the facts, free to discuss them, and free to express conclusions. This assumption underlies our form of government, and the institutions it supports. There is perhaps no influence in the world today more powerful than American public opinion, when based on full information and discussion. This influence, informed and free, is the only one of which you and I may be a part in fashioning world affairs. With it to rely upon, Government officials can make their final decisions with assurance that the policies they adopt will bind the Nation together rather than divide it.

History repeats itself, but only if left alone. History will repeat itself in world affairs, if left alone, and war will follow war, as it has always done. But man, by the power of public opinion, can intervene and, although success is not guaranteed, the effort should be worth making.

How can we have an informed and free public opinion on the difficult problems of world affairs? Newspapers, magazines, and books provide much material, of course, and help greatly to make public opinion. But even though everyone reads everything written on world affairs, this will not result in the understanding necessary to sound conclusions on general policies, or to any conclusion at all that can be called the conclusion of public opinion.

We can have an informed and free public opinion on this complicated subject only if we have adequate information in useful form, and opportunity for its full and open discussion. This, I believe, is a job for the universities, and for other groups that will work with them. The great special task of the next few months and years—is that of obtaining and keeping just, stable, and effective international relations, or, in the alternative, of providing all-powerful military and naval forces which will for a time protect, then bankrupt, and then rule the world.

What I want to say this evening, therefore, is based on confidence in the traditions of popular government, and the resourcefulness of education; and on the assumptions I have made—that American public opinion is a necessary element in the stabilization of world affairs, and that this opinion needs information, and opportunity for examination and criticism of proposed policies before they are adopted, and that the universities, and university men and women, should accept a major obligation in this regard.

Now, when we seem to be nearing the final months of our third war in less than half a century, it is time for all of us to re-examine the position of the United States in world affairs. I hope this examination will bring disagreement and discussion, for otherwise it will indicate apathy. We are probably a good deal divided in our thinking on these matters, and our conclusions are apt to be casual, emotional, or traditional. Our interest must not wait too long on future events, but must implement them, and not next year, but soon, even now. For it seems likely that educational institutions have not done all they could have done in this field, or all they ought to have done. Politicians are uncertain of the public mind, and I doubt whether we as a people are much better prepared for the urgent decisions of peace than we were in 1918.

Forces which determine international relationships are varied and subtle. Wars are not caused by some single event, such as the assassination of an archduke. An incident may determine the hour for a declaration of war, but its absence is not likely to deter for long the final event. But a decision for war is the culmination and combination of many things—political ambitions and personalities, difference in language, race, religion; social and economic theories; immigration and boundaries; economics, social conditions, industrial relations; foreign policies and law. These and other elements make up the mixture which stews through years of uneasy calm and finally explodes into war. They combine with each other; some are technical, some ethical, some more emotional than real. But they have one thing in common, as other problems are apt to have, they can usually be solved by something better than force, in this case, better than war. Usually, but perhaps not always, since few people still believe that the possibility of war can be finally eliminated, or that we should abandon our defenses against that possibility.

Because we realize more clearly than we used to the existence of these problems and their complexity, perhaps the opportunity of finding solutions was never better than today.

Is public opinion convinced that world affairs can be governed by law? Certainly, this is the hope of most of us, but hardly yet everyone's conviction. National pride, traditions of sovereignty, the possession of or desire for natural resources, linguistic barriers, are all among the obstacles, fancied or real. And yet, there is no convincing reason why disputes between nations, like disputes between individuals, cannot be regulated by a system of universal international law. People say that history proves that international law cannot be an effective guaranty of peace. History once proved, in the same way, that disputes between individuals could be resolved best by personal conflict. The Normans introduced into England a form of trial known as trial by battle.

"The defendant used it to establish his innocence when charged with crime, and plaintiffs used it to recover land, or chattels, or a debt. Witnesses could be required to fight a duel to establish their veracity." [2]

The speaker at these exercises on June 3, Chancelor Alfred B. Butts, spoke to you of the futility of wars, comparing private dueling, once an accepted and honorable means of settling personal disagreements, now a criminal offense. Dr. Butts urged the establishment of international courts, into which disputing nations should be required to come for an adjudication of their rights, instead of resorting to war. And this analogy between private duels and international wars is a good one, for in the perspective of history, dueling is a recent institution, so recent that both the present constitution of Alabama and the statutes of the State contain specific prohibitions against it. So here the lesson of history may be quite a different one than has usually been supposed. The lesson is not that law cannot supersede force in the affairs of nations, but rather that it has largely done so in the affairs of individuals; and there seems to be no logical or practical obstacle to such a result in international disputes.

It is common to talk of international law as though it exists only in books. Is it simply some dim dream, an academic theory, hardly worth the consideration of practical minds? On the contrary, it has had a real existence, although limited in scope, for a long time. It tends to break down during war, because war is usually the negation of law; but the conduct of war is to some extent subject to it, and even the Japanese have at times recognized it by protests that they had not violated it. As to its appeal to practical minds, the American Bar Association represents such a group, and that organization is definitely committed to furthering the development of international law, and making it the instrument for peace.

On many subjects there has been true and effective international legislation; that is, there have been multipartite international agreements or treaties having the force of law. Slavery, the opium traffic, and other abuses, have all been more or less successfully restrained by international legislation. The Hague conventions and the Covenant of the League of Nations mark steps in its development and recognition. But to have the support of the American public, the American public must know something about it, and must be convinced of its justice, of its impartiality, of its proper administration.

International law, based on popular understanding and support, can surely be a practical instrument for peace. International law, based on selfish objectives, conceived entirely in the minds of professional diplomats—its origins and purposes concealed from the common man, is not likely to succeed. Popular government and education must help create it, or the American public may not accept it, or expect other nations to abide by it.

The fifth article of the declaration on a just peace, made public in October 1943, signed by prominent Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religious leaders and laymen, states:

"5. INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS TO MAINTAIN PEACE WITH JUSTICE MUST BE ORGANIZED

"An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will

[1] A People's Peace, editorial in the Birmingham Age-Herald.

[2] Walsh, W. F., A History of Anglo-American Law, second edition (1932), p. 80.

(a) develop a body of international law, (b) guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, (c) assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law."

What is the role of force in international affairs? The choice, now being debated, between the use of force in the administration of international affairs, or their settlement by mutual understanding, seems to me to offer a false alternative. The real choice is between control by law or repudiation of law. In any case there will be force. Without force in the background there can be no effective law. It is true that as civilization progresses the force that is behind all law retires so far into the background that we may forget its existence. Why do we stop at traffic lights? If we don't we are likely to get into trouble—to meet force. Substantial compliance with domestic laws is not probable unless there are penalties for their breach. The issue is between international law backed by force and force without law. So the writer of an editorial in the Birmingham News for August 13, 1944, quotes Dorothy Thompson as follows:

"Peace cannot be enforced. Only justice and law can be enforced. The enforcement of anything—even peace—except under law, is war."

To the same effect are paragraphs No. (4) and (5) of Senate Resolution 114, submitted in March 1943 by Senators BALL, HILL, BURTON, and HATCH. These paragraphs provide for the establishment of procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations and "for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by the immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation."

Can there be an effective and lasting world organization based on international collaboration and understanding? Those who doubt the practicability of an effective world organization for peace, relying solely on the history of the past 25 years, can often get the better of the argument. They usually cite the evasiveness of the great powers in applying the sanctions of the Treaty of Versailles, particularly in connection with Japan's entry into Manchuria and Italy's Ethiopian war, and the ineffectiveness of the Pact of Paris—the Kellogg-Briand Pact—of 1928, outlawing war as an instrument of national policy.

But with all this history of failure fresh in our memories, the almost complete unanimity of feeling that there must be a world organization to solve international problems and prevent war, shows at least the persistency of that idea.

In the recent book called The International Law of the Future, published under the auspices of the American Bar Association, the authors elaborate a proposal for the organization of the community of states:

"The community of states should be organized on a universal basis. All states which exist or which may come into existence in the future should be included. No provision should be made for the expulsion or withdrawal of any state."

Further on, commenting on the proposal that the Permanent Court of International Justice should be maintained as the chief judicial organ of the community of states, is this statement:

"A generation of effort triumphed in the establishment of the Permanent Court of International Justice. Fifty-two states have given their formal support to the maintenance of the Court, and practically all the states of the world—including all the states of the Western Hemisphere—have become parties to instruments which give it jurisdiction. More than 500 treaties have been concluded which relate to the Court, and many of them continue in force" (p. 102).

I have examined many newspapers and popular magazines in addition to professional material dealing with the matter of a world organization of states. Expressions of opinion in popular magazines and newspapers are likely to have as much significance, or more, than the views of technicians and experts. In an editorial signed by Paul Hunter in Liberty for August 26, 1944, hope for a long peace is justified, the writer concludes:

"Bellicose nations will think twice in the future before starting wars in which we might be involved.

"This does not mean that America needs no international organization to preserve peace. We need it, and the rest of the world needs it. Tranquillity can come only under a code of international law. An organization is needed to create this law and to enforce it."

Newspapers again and again repeat the same idea—there must be a world organization to preserve peace under law and to prevent war.

But the forms which this could take, and there are at least a dozen, and the reaction of the public to one or more of these possible forms, are still at best uncertain.[3] If experts work out a paper scheme that does not have the understanding and support of the common man, of American public opinion, the chances of its success are not good. There must be understanding between the nations, and there must be understanding within our own Nation. American public opinion must support the idea of world organization, and it must be sold on the merit of a particular plan. Popular government and education are the basis on which world peace and world order must be built, at least insofar as American participation is concerned.

What is the relationship between world affairs and domestic affairs?

The seventh paragraph of the declaration on a just peace, referred to before, signed by the religious and lay representatives of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish churches, states:

"A JUST SOCIAL ORDER WITHIN EACH STATE MUST BE ACHIEVED

"Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual States, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare."

Mr. Robert J. Watt, writing of the International Labor Conference held in May 1944, at Philadelphia, expresses the same view:

"An enduring peace [can] only be based on social justice.

* * * * * *

"We know that a world which is half slave and half free will never be a peaceful world."

Whatever the relationship between our own domestic affairs, world affairs, and international peace, whatever solutions must finally be made of some of those problems, if these solutions are to stick, if they are to be practical solutions, American public opinion must be informed about them, fully and with candor. Popular government, and an informed and free American public opinion are elements without which permanent solutions cannot be made.

These and other problems of international law and world affairs, press for wise answers, not too long delayed. They are not new, but we are approaching them today with a new spirit, with new knowledge and responsibility, with a belief that peace and world prosperity are worth working for, and the hope that they are attainable.

American public opinion, aided by a free press and by educational institutions, must be a chief factor in ultimate results. In that sense, we must make and keep a people's peace. You who are leaving the university must keep your interest keen, your minds open, and, in such ways as you can, become a part of public opinion. We who remain here must cultivate each opportunity to the same ends, by institutes, classes, and frequent discussion, in the conviction that the world is now indeed one world, and the people of the world must finally become, in interest and understanding, one people.

[3] See Peace Plans and American Choices, by Arthur C. Millspaugh, the Brookings Institution, 1942.